



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO

June 15, 2017 Meeting Transcript -- PART 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 15, 2017, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board Members:

Angelika Schroeder (D), Chairman
Joyce Rankin (R), Vice Chairman
Steven Durham (R)
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Rebecca McClellan (D)



1 MADAM CHAIR: Prudential Spirit Community
2 Award winners and finalists. Commissioner, I'll turn it
3 over to you and welcome all of you (inaudible).

4 MS. ANTHES: Thank you, Madam Chair. And we
5 are really pleased to be honoring the recipients, student
6 recipients of the Colorado 2017 Prudential Spirit Community
7 Awards and -- and finalists. And we thank you for your
8 patience. We had other session go a little bit long. So
9 appreciate you all being here and being patient. And at
10 this time I will call Director Lynn Bambury to come forward
11 and tell us a little bit about you.

12 MS. BAMBURRY: Yeah, thanks. I don't know
13 where the program is. Madam Chair and Members of the Board,
14 today we're going to honor our 2017 Prudential Spirit
15 Community Award winners and finalists. The Prudential
16 Spirit of Community Awards program is the United States
17 largest youth recognition program based exclusively on
18 volunteer community service created in 1995 by Prudential
19 and the National Association of Secondary School Principals.
20 The program honors middle level and high school students for
21 outstanding service to others at the local state and
22 national levels. Thus far, it has recognized more than
23 120,000 young people who have made a difference and inspired
24 countless others to consider how they might contribute to
25 their communities. Eligible applicants need to be 5 to 12



1 years old, be a legal resident of the U.S. State or
2 Washington D.C., have engaged in volunteer activity that
3 occurred during the 12 months prior to the date of the
4 application and submit a completed application to a school
5 or head of a school and an official designate local
6 organization. So the winners will be recognized at a
7 Washington D.C. event during May 6th through 9th 2017. Now,
8 not all students were able to join us. Some were on
9 vacation, and one got sick this morning. But I still would
10 like to tell you about all of them because they're doing
11 wonderful things. And once you are here, I want to
12 recognize the individually, and they'll stand up as I talk
13 about them.

14 So Emma Albertoni is our high school state
15 honoree. Emma is a senior at Watson Dallas Senior High
16 School. She's working to improve financial literacy
17 education to ensure that students in her school district
18 ultimately the entire state are prepared to make sound
19 financial decisions when they graduate. The idea hit Emma
20 one summer when she was working at a summer job shopping for
21 first car and looking at college tuition.

22 And next we have Brianna Ronchio, who is our
23 middle school state honoree. Brianna is an eighth grader at
24 North Middle School in (inaudible) Public Schools. She
25 helped set her school in a variety of ways that have made a



1 positive impact on teachers staff students and the
2 community. She says her motivational, motivation is simple.
3 She wants to help. Brianna began in sixth grade helping to
4 show them check out books at her school library. She stayed
5 after school to help in the school office and has made a
6 positive impact on her community. The following students
7 are all the distinguished finalists.

8 So Bethany, like I said, who isn't here
9 today, is a senior Fort Collins high school. Bethany has
10 worked with her key club advisor since August 2015 to plan a
11 community garden and playground an effort to transform a
12 dirt lot into a safe gathering place for residents of a
13 local trailer park. Bethany has supported the effort by
14 building a website researching materials and more and the
15 playground has now been built and they are planning the
16 community garden beginning this spring.

17 William Gordon, who also was unable to join
18 us today, is a senior at Colorado Heritage Education School
19 System. William is an active community volunteer who has
20 mobilized others to participate in sporting events for kids
21 with disabilities. He has passed shoe boxes for Operation
22 Christmas Child and has distributed bags of food and drinks
23 to the homeless. Moved to help others by his experience and
24 caring for his sister with cystic fibrosis, William has also



1 volunteered with his baseball team to entertain young
2 patients at Children's Hospital in Colorado.

3 And we have Alex Fredman is here with us
4 today, who is a senior at Castleview High School. Alex has
5 volunteered for the past five years with the Castlerock Team
6 Court. Working in roles from attorney to mentor in order to
7 help issue constructive sentences for the first time non-
8 violent juvenile offenders, in addition to undergoing
9 extensive training on his own. Alex has organized training
10 to advance the work of other teen volunteers and has worked
11 to expand the programs local influence as president of his
12 student advisory Board.

13 And the last student is Andrew Kent who is a
14 senior at Jeffco Virtual Academy and works with the
15 organization Love Hope Strength to sign people up for the
16 National Bone Marrow Registry in memory of Daniel, a young
17 boy he met in 2011 when the two of them were being treated
18 for leukemia. Andrew has solicited registry sign ups at
19 dozens of concerts hoping the organization to register more
20 than 1,500 people, 35 who turned out to be matches for
21 people needing bone marrow transplants. So can we have all
22 these thing again. We'd like to hear a round of applause.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you so much. We commend
24 you for the positive impact you've made on your community.
25 Please join me in honoring again our 2017 Prudential Spirit



1 Community Award winners and finalists. Call each of you up.
2 Please come and have your photo taken with the commissioner
3 and your representative Board Member.

4 (Pause)

5 MADAM CHAIR: The next item on our agenda is
6 a resolution. In recognition of our wonderful retired
7 party, Tony Dill, whom we great -- greatly miss.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're not even started
9 yet.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My best.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A motion, please.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Motion (inaudible).

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I move to adopt the
14 following resolution whereas Anthony B. Dill, Esq., having
15 devoted more than 25 years to the service of Colorado
16 Education as legal counsel to the State Board of Education
17 and whereas during that time, Mr. Dill has authored more
18 than 500 rule opinions, imparted wisdom on over 50 charter
19 school appeals, and guided the Board and the department with
20 humor and poise, and whereas over the years, Mr. Dill has
21 also represented and advised the Colorado Department of
22 Education, the Charter School Institute, and the School for
23 the Deaf and Blind with skill and devotion, and whereas Mr.
24 Dill is recognized for his sharp humor which puts a fine
25 point on any double-edged sword that he may wield, and



1 whereas Mr. Dill has defended laws that are the pillars of
2 public education in Colorado including the School Finance
3 Act and the Charter Schools Act, and whereas Mr. Dill has
4 provided wisdom and guidance to aid commissioner bits of
5 education, dozens of members of the State Board of
6 Education, and hundreds of staff, and whereas Mr. Dill has
7 illuminated signposts for the department staff as they have
8 navigated the dark and winding paths of the School Finance
9 Act, and whereas Mr. Dill has been recognized for his
10 remarkable capacity to recite statutory sections and case
11 law from memory, and whereas Mr. Dill's calm demeanor and
12 difficult times has earned him the deserved reputation of
13 Education Laws Zen master, and whereas the length of Mr.
14 Dill's tenure of service is surpassed only by that of his
15 hair. Be it therefore resolved, the Colorado State Board of
16 Education formally recognizes honors and thanks Anthony B.
17 Dill, Esq. for his many years of service to the schools and
18 children of the state of Colorado, his wise and gentlemanly
19 counsel to the state Board, and his advocacy for the
20 Colorado Department of Education and its affiliates.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, all.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Speech.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, I --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You can. We know you
2 can.

3 MR. DILL: I perhaps can. Let's remember
4 however that I am billing you for this time, but thank you
5 all. You know, I've realized over the last several months
6 how emotionally involved I've become over the last 25 plus
7 years in representing this Board and -- and this department
8 and in trying to do what's best for public education in
9 Colorado. It's -- it, it will be a difficult parting for me
10 and I, I thank you all for your consideration.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We know you like
12 cookies.

13 MR. DILL: Oh, yes. My favorite.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's also a little
15 gift from the executive team and a card.

16 MR. DILL: Oh okay. Oh, my actual full
17 resolution.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're gonna do a picture
19 with that one.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh good.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then here's one sign
22 with all the (inaudible).

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that's like if she
25 (inaudible)



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, okay.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's really cool.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If I ever appear before
4 you in a professional capacity, can I bring this with me?

5 MR. DILL: Remember you signed it.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think a picture with
7 the whole Board.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, a picture with all
9 the Board Members.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what it was?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, that's right.

12 It's find my endorsement (inaudible) you know, you just have
13 to recheck everything I say and face value. Okay. Oh yeah.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I gonna need someone on
15 this side.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. We're gonna
17 have to switch. All right so this is a big group. Can we
18 have Jean and John step up? Is that okay? And then can I
19 over on the right? Yeah.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There we go.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There we go. Okay.

22 There we go. I don't wanna miss anyone. All right. I'm
23 gonna have you come a little bit. Perfect. All right,
24 guys. I'm gonna do a few photos. One, two, three. Thank
25 you.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let's say, at some
2 point, somebody will has to replace George.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They're gonna be our one
4 (inaudible).

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Get the
6 suspenders.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And run for governor,
8 too.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh. Okay, yeah it's --
11 what's...? (Inaudible).

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's such a nice
13 envelope for such a little (inaudible).

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I look at them, or -
15 - oh, oh (inaudible). Oh, good. I -- I'll -- I was
16 bringing them home to ensure that (inaudible).

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Perfect. So I was --
18 (inaudible)

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we have to vote on
20 that resolution record?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) We have to
23 take a roll call (inaudible). Sure, yeah.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we -- so I would say
25 Jane made the motion.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, perfect.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've lost --
4 (inaudible). There's no objection.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You can't do that. Are
6 they -- it's you know. There we go. Next item, item on the
7 agenda's consideration of the 2017 SAT and PSAT performance
8 framework targets. Excuse me, Commissioner, stand prepared
9 to provide your overview.

10 MS. ANTHES: We are. Thank you. I will turn
11 this over from Alyssa Pearson and Marie Hatchton. I just
12 want to say this, Principal Statistical Consultant. I just
13 call her Marie, but she -- she really is, she's -- and --
14 and good luck to you because you're kind of losing us here.
15 So may the force be with you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Try to keep our
17 attention.

18 MS. ANTHES: As you do this.

19 MS. PEARSON: We'll just go quick. Yes.

20 (Inaudible). Okay. (Inaudible) is pulling up the
21 PowerPoint for us. But as we start, the goals for today, we
22 -- we know you all would like to consider things for a month
23 before voting on it, and that is absolutely fine if you
24 don't feel ready to vote today. If you feel comfortable,
25 because we're using the same methodology that we've used



1 previously and that we've spent a lot of time talking about
2 with you, we would love it if you felt comfortable to vote
3 today on the methodology for setting the targets for PSAT
4 and SAT for the 2017 frameworks.

5 I'm sorry that we're coming to you in June on
6 this. We've been talking to stakeholders, we've been trying
7 to get, to see if we would have the then time to be able to
8 have the actual numbers. We were -- aren't at a place where
9 we're going to have the results, the student level results,
10 until at least the end of this month.

11 So we wanted to bring to you the input that
12 we've gotten from stakeholders on the methodology, we're
13 setting the targets, and see if you felt comfortable voting
14 on the methodology for that. Since you're not meeting in
15 July, that would mean if we wait to vote in August it's
16 Okay, but it'll just be a few days before, hopefully, just a
17 few days before we are able to release the performance
18 remarks. So however you feel comfortable to that. So we
19 just want to give you a little bit of a reminder and reset
20 the context of why we're talking about PSAT and SAT for
21 accountability.

22 So if you remember back to the spring of
23 2015, House Bill 1323, part of what was in that bill
24 required the state to adopt a new tenth grade exam or that
25 our tenth grade exam was aligned with our eleventh grade



1 college entrance exam, as well as aligned with our Colorado
2 academic standards. So we needed to align with both.

3 So that was spring of 2015. December of 2015
4 is when the results from an RFP process came out, and that's
5 when the state had selected PSAT and SAT to be the tenth and
6 eleventh grade assessments. So that was, like a year and a
7 half ago, just about now. At that point we decided not to
8 use the SAT that spring because students had been prepping
9 and getting ready for ACT's, so the spring of 16, the state
10 gave the PSAT assessment and the ACT. And then this year,
11 this spring, we gave PSAT and SAT, for the first time both
12 of them. So that's -- that's where we are with those
13 assessments. Part of why SAT was selected, we just want to
14 give it a little bit of background, if you all have more
15 deeper questions we'll make sure that you can talk to the
16 assessment unit about it, but just a reminder, SAT is
17 closely aligned with our academic standards and college and
18 career readiness. It's a well-known college entrance exam.
19 SAT measures two major components. There's an evidence-
20 based reading and writing component, just kind of like
21 English language arts. It's called evidence-based reading
22 and writing. So we're trying to get used to saying that,
23 and what that all means in our office.

24 And then there's the math -- math component
25 too. SAT, another benefit of the SAT is through the process



1 students can have the option to send their scores to up to
2 four colleges for entrance for free, they don't have to pay
3 for that, it's optional, but they can do that.

4 Additionally, the SAT essay portion can be taken. Students
5 can opt into that. The state pays for it. It is not
6 required but it's optional to help students if they want to
7 take that and have that for college entrance as well.

8 PSAT, again it's a line with our college
9 entrance assessment, with the college entrance assessment of
10 SAT's and our Colorado academic standards. It can help
11 identify areas of strength and weaknesses for students, as
12 they move forward with SAT and advanced coursework. And
13 additionally, the PSAT is used for a lot of college
14 scholarships for students too. So it opens up the door for
15 them for that. I'm going to turn it over to Marie now, to
16 talk about how, the feedback we've gotten on the use of
17 these two assessments and how they work, the recommendations
18 for using that and the performance frameworks for this year.
19 Thanks.

20 MS. HATCHTON: So as Alyssa had said, that
21 tenth graders attending public schools in Colorado began
22 taking the PSAT in the spring of 2016. So last year, but
23 due to some timing concerns, we were not able to incorporate
24 the 2016 PSAT scores into the performance frameworks.



1 So this year, we have been having
2 conversation about what is the best way to incorporate PSAT
3 results. And based upon sort of our data analysis state
4 statute and conversations with our Technical Advisory Panel.
5 We are proposing to include PSAT 10 as an achievement
6 indicator and report it separately from the CMAS PARCC
7 results for 2017. And we're also going to be splitting it
8 up content areas, so there'll be an evidence-based reading
9 and writing measure, and then a mathematics measure. And
10 then for -- for the multi year framework calculations, we
11 are hoping to include both the 2016 and 2017 scores. Since
12 last year we didn't get the opportunity to use those PSAT
13 scores. So it's incorporating it as an achievement measure.
14 So for high school we will now have, we have pictures in a
15 minute, but the CMAS Grade nine, as well as PSAT 10 results
16 as achievement indicators.

17 MS. PEARSON: So it's really thinking about
18 the PSAT taking the place of the tenth grade assessment that
19 we had last year. They just would have the results. Well,
20 yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In 15?

22 MS. PEARSON: Sorry. Sorry, in '16-'17. We
23 just -- so we take the place of the tenth grade CMAS that we
24 had from, in the 2016 frameworks. We'd really think it
25 mattered that way. It's just the results won't be put



1 together, because it's different scales, right? So you
2 can't put it all into one number. Yeah. Sorry.

3 MS. HATCHTON: No, it's good. And then for
4 the SAT's, this is the first year that anyone has taken the
5 SAT's. So for the eleventh graders, we also had to consider
6 what was the most appropriate place to put that. So based
7 upon conversations with our Technical Advisory Panel, and
8 sort of looking at state statute, we're proposing to replace
9 the Colorado ACT with the SAT as a post secondary and
10 workforce readiness measure. And then doing that by
11 individual content areas, so that evidence-based reading and
12 writing and mathematics. And that is a little bit different
13 from the ACT where we had only reported the composite score,
14 but ACT had like four individual content areas within the
15 composite score and there are some other things. But with
16 evidence-based reading and writing in math that lines up
17 really nicely with the ELA in math that we have from the
18 PARCC assessment results. So we feel that that is, sort of
19 continuing in two pathways all the way from grade three.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it's a PSAT, just
21 English language arts, and math?

22 MS. HATCHTON: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

24 MS. HATCHTON: Yeah. All of -- now all of
25 our assessments follow these -- these two sort of English



1 language arts, or evidence-based reading and writing and
2 mathematics content areas. And then the intention is also
3 that, for the students who last year took PSAT 10 and this
4 year are taking SAT's as eleventh graders, that we are going
5 to run the Colorado Growth Model and produce student level
6 growth percentile results. And our hope is that we will be
7 able to include these in the 2017 performance frameworks and
8 in the growth indicator.

9 We heard very clearly from all of our
10 technical folks that high school growth is incredibly
11 important, and they really want something that represents
12 students at the upper level of high school to have growth
13 recorded for them. So then we have a picture to try to
14 represent the inclusion of these measures.

15 So you can see that in 2016 and 2017, grade
16 nine and -- has always or we've had results for grade nine
17 in both years for English language arts and math on the CMAS
18 PARCC assessments, and we've been reporting that for both
19 achievement and growth and will continue to do so in 2017.
20 In 2016, we didn't actually have an assessment for grade 10
21 students. And so in 2017, we'll be introducing that PSAT 10
22 and mean scale score for achievement. And we will also be
23 introducing PSAT 10 to SAT median growth percentiles, as the
24 growth measure in 2017.



1 I mean, you can also see here in the
2 intention of replacing the 2016 Colorado ACT scores with the
3 SAT scores in 2017, as the post secondary and workforce
4 readiness measure. So it's a little bit of a -- of a
5 shuffling a -- around of some of the assessment results that
6 we have, but we think this is sort of the -- the most
7 consistent use of the data, with how we have previously
8 conceived of these indicators.

9 And then, as Alyssa had said, the student
10 results from the spring 2017 PSAT 10, and SAT
11 administrations are not going to be available until later in
12 June. So we can't present you the actual cut, the specific
13 cut scores, until we have those data available.

14 So we're asking today that you all approve
15 the methodology for establishing the performance framework
16 targets and then we will return to you once we actually have
17 specific data available in August. I was like (inaudible)
18 that. And so they just sort of remind you of, and as we
19 always do, the statutory requirement is that the Board shall
20 set, reaffirm, or revise as appropriate, ambitious but
21 attainable statewide targets for the measures used to
22 determine the levels of achievement -- obtainment, sorry, of
23 the performance indicators for the coming academic year.

24 So this is that process that we get to get
25 through with you guys all the time. And so the methodology



1 that we previously have discussed with you, we spent lots of
2 time last spring working through this for all of the CMS
3 Park measures, we're just proposing to continue using that
4 methodology. So then all of the -- not all.

5 The majority of the measures on the
6 performance framework will have that consistent target-
7 setting methodology. And so the way it's set up is so we
8 have the four rating categories of does not meet
9 expectations, approaching expectations, meets expectations,
10 and exceeds expectations. And that -- that bottom does not
11 meet category, represents about the bottom 15 percent of
12 schools that are approaching expectations is between sort of
13 the 15th percentile and the 50th percentile and it
14 represents approximately one standard deviation below
15 average. So meeting state expectations is that 50th
16 percentile of schools. And so that's, you know, average
17 results for the state.

18 And then exceeding expectations, you know, is
19 sort of knocking it out of the part is the 85th percentile
20 and that's approximately one standard deviation above
21 average.

22 So this is, you know, the normative system
23 that we have set up to be able to identify the schools that
24 are meeting the state expectations and those of that are



1 pretty far, you know, above or below our expectations as
2 well.

3 So the intention is that both the PSAT 10 and
4 SAT targets will be initially baselined on the 2016-17 data.
5 And then once we have additional years of data we will be
6 reviewing these baseline targets to determine if they need
7 to be modified.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, Dr. Flores.

9 MS. FLORES: Yes, didn't you add another one?
10 I mean like the, shouldn't that be it be like maybe 90 to
11 100? And in between the 50 and 84, between the blue and the
12 green, I think there should be another one.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it will be consistent
14 with the system that we've been using all along.

15 MS. FLORES: And didn't we have a fifth one?
16 You know, I remember that we had another one because we
17 thought that -- that --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You might be remembering
19 that the District Accreditation categories, there are five
20 levels for district accreditation categories. This is the -
21 - these are the detailed components in -- for each measure
22 in the framework but with that we have a district like
23 distinction for the districts and have that extra one.

24 MS. FLORES: When you have 84 and then the
25 cut score is like 85 there, I just really believe there --



1 that you meet expectations, maybe you should be a little
2 higher and I mean 50, maybe the 60 if you're going to do
3 that because 50 seems kind of -- but yet 84 and there is 85
4 up there.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We --

6 MS. FLORES: The disparity is just so great
7 between one point to be -- exceeds expectations and meets
8 expectations.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Rankin.

10 MS. RANKIN: Ms. Pearson, I have a questions
11 on page eight on our inclusion on District of High School
12 Frameworks. Why is really evidenced-based and writing
13 evidence-based but I don't see math. Why -- why does it
14 have that besides the fact that we have to have it for ESSA?

15 MS. PEARSON: It's the language that SAT uses
16 in test development. It's -- it's language from the vendor.
17 They call it evidence-based reading and writing, I don't
18 know-

19 MS. RANKIN: But that's language that is not,
20 like, proven.

21 MS. PEARSON: I -- I don't know why they call
22 it that. I can -- I can try and phone a friend.

23 MS. RANKIN: That just seems like it is what
24 I think of evidence-based and if they just said determine
25 that I -- that's very disturbing.



1 MS. PEARSON: I think -- I think it's from
2 what I read very briefly, and Joyce if you're listening,
3 tell me if I should say something else. But it's because of
4 the way they're asking the questions on the tests are based
5 on students showing not their reading and writing knowledge
6 based on evidence from the text, I believe is what it is.
7 You're looking at me like --

8 MS. RANKIN: I know -- well no, it's -- I
9 hear what you're saying but I -- but I find that very -- I
10 don't know, it's just not right. It's just not right from a
11 definition of evidence-based.

12 MS. PEARSON: It's not that same evidence-
13 based --

14 MS. RANKIN: I know.

15 MS. PEARSON: -- as ESSA. But it's a good
16 phrase to use now, isn't it.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we have any data on
18 how students do on the PSAT and the SAT who don't aspire to
19 go to college?

20 MS. PEARSON: We do not at the moment.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Since we have not yet
22 gotten the data for 2017, we don't have that information.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What about nationwide?
24 Like do we --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think the problem is
2 that we're one of the first states to go to census testing
3 with the SAT. So I don't know that -- that the -- that --
4 that college board actually has information about students
5 who are not intended to be college bound because they don't
6 tend to previously take any SAT results. Taking -- start
7 taking the SAT assessment.

8 MS. RANKIN: This is interesting. I think
9 we're -- I think probably this is happening in all districts
10 that --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah but -- but --

12 MS. RANKIN: There is a growing number of
13 students who don't aspire to college and are now sort of
14 looking more toward the CTE or the vocational training and -
15 - and we also know there's plenty of businesses out there
16 that needs those kinds of workers so it will be interesting
17 to see how that -- what tells us about those students.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. And that's
19 actually something that we should continue to look into.
20 Like we've had some conversations about looking at our state
21 results and seeing how they vary from the college going
22 national results and what that -- what that would mean for
23 our students. So that's a really great suggestion.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores.



1 MS. FLORES: Naturally there are -- there is
2 data that shows that a lot of kids who could go to college
3 and who score high on the SAT are not going to college, and
4 that's white and that's all levels of kids. So poor kids
5 are not going to college and they do score, you know they do
6 score where they should be going to college. But they don't
7 go to college because, you know, the money's not there.
8 What I wanted to say is that I think to make it more
9 meaningful, maybe this has more meaning. If we had an -- an
10 A, B, C, D, F kind of scale, which we would have, and we
11 know we can do anything with numbers. That would be more
12 meaningful to people out there. I mean that's what I wanted
13 to say.

14 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

15 MS. FLORES: And can you help me (inaudible)
16 it would be more meaningful.

17 MS. PEARSON: That's definitely -- we can
18 come back to you with that conversation about labels and
19 scales and all that. Our philosophy has been for at least
20 to get some stability between 2016 and 2017 with the
21 frameworks and have, you know, trying to get a little
22 comparability and consistency for those two years since
23 we've had so much change. But I think that -- that's a
24 conversation that -- there's a group of people that are very
25 interested in having, so we can always revisit that.



1 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

2 MADAM CHAIR: Any other questions or
3 comments?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think I had one a
5 minute ago.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we'll wait just sort
7 of a second. Here's what the next question is. Are we
8 ready to vote for this today, which would help staff in
9 their efforts to get full information to us in August or do
10 you want weigh this over? Feedback? You ready to vote?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm ready to vote.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Anyone not ready to vote?

13 MR. DURHAM: (Inaudible).

14 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Durham, could I have a
15 motion, please?

16 MR. DURHAM: I move to adopt the standards
17 suggested by the -- by the staff.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Is that the motion that's on
19 your cheat sheet?

20 MR. DURHAM: I don't have a cheat sheet.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham.

22 MR. DURHAM: I'll use Val's cheat sheet. I
23 move to approve the proposed methodology for setting PSAT
24 and SAT targets for use in the 2017 school and district
25 performance frameworks. Amen.



1 MADAM CHAIR: I thank you -- I thank you very
2 sincerely. Do I have a second?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.

4 MS. FLORES: In the name of the Father and
5 the Holy Spirit.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we have a prayer, so
7 we're ready to go with (inaudible)

8 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham.

9 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

11 MS. FLORES: Yes.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

13 MS. GOFF: Yes.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

15 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

16 MS. MCCLELLAN: Board Member McClellan.

17 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

18 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

19 MS. RANKIN: If we take evidence-based out,
20 yes.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Schroeder.

22 MR. DURHAM: Just kidding.

23 MADAM CHAIR: I'm just kidding, yes. Thank
24 you all.



1 MS. CORDIAL: I was going to say -- did you -
2 - did you say yes, Board Member Schroeder.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

4 MS. CORDIAL: Thank you.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Appreciate it.

7 MADAM CHAIR: All right. We're done with
8 multidistrict standards review and revision.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, no.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. The next item on our
11 agenda is an update on the standards review and revision
12 process. (Inaudible).

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, thank you, Madam
14 Chair. Just as we've told you before, we just wanna keep
15 you all up-to-date on this process and bring you along with
16 us. So I'll turn it over to Dr. Colzman, and also Lulu Buck
17 and Holly Porter to talk to us -- to give us some updates on
18 the standards revision process.

19 DR. COLSMAN: Good afternoon, everyone. I'm
20 glad that at this point, we are actually all here so we
21 didn't have to resort to CDE karaoke with Mr. Durham, a
22 reference to yesterday's bad singing and commiseration.

23 MR. DURHAM: Who said it was bad?



1 DR. COLSMAN: No, I think we both self-
2 admitted. So -- well, good afternoon chairman --
3 chairperson Schroeder and Members of the Board.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You sound like you have
5 been in the State Board meeting for two days.

6 DR. COLSMAN: Right. And we appreciate the
7 opportunity to be with you today. This is one of our
8 regular updates on the standards review and revision
9 process. Joining me today is Dr. Holly Porter. She serves
10 as the chair of our Colorado English language proficiency
11 standards committee for this work, and she is also the
12 director of language support and services for Cherry Creek
13 Schools. And also joining me is Lulu Buck, who is our
14 English -- she has a very long title, so hang in there --
15 English language development specialist and world language
16 content specialist.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It wouldn't fit on her
18 tag.

19 DR. COLSMAN: Right, it would -- she has
20 multiple name tags that she wears in sequence. So our
21 purpose today is to provide you with an update on this
22 standard review and revision process and provide you with an
23 update on the English language proficiency standards
24 committee as a -- as a taste for the next year to come
25 because a year from now, and by the time we get through



1 June, is when this process will have concluded and where
2 we're endeavoring to keep you up-to-date on the process and
3 bring forward information from different committees as this
4 year goes forward.

5 So we'll start off with that, just a brief
6 overview and a brief reminder of the guiding principles that
7 we're using for this process, is that it be transparent,
8 inclusive, research-informed, consistent, substantive, and
9 improvement oriented. And you'll see these principles play
10 out through -- through the work that we're doing with our
11 committees and some of the information that we're gonna be
12 sharing with you today.

13 As a reminder, the review committees that
14 have just begun working in May are the group -- or the
15 groups that are going to be synthesizing all of the input
16 from our stakeholders to provide you with recommended
17 revisions to consider. Our job as staff is to help
18 facilitate this process. And all of this is to support you
19 in making the decisions that you need to make with respect
20 to proposed revisions to the standards. The timeline for
21 this work, we actually began planning for this a year and a
22 half ago. So it's really exciting in -- in May to actually
23 have the committees begin meeting. You'll recall that from
24 November through April, we had our online standards feedback
25 system open, to provide -- to gather input from the field in



1 terms of recommended revisions. That's part of the
2 transparent and inclusive nature of this process. We had a
3 process to and get -- to solicit members for our committee
4 that was open February through March. We had a blind review
5 process to select committee members and our chairs, based
6 solely on their qualifications to serve within their roles,
7 and the committees began meeting this past May. The
8 committee work will continue roughly through April of next
9 year.

10 And you'll notice that on the graphic, we
11 have another public feedback opportunity in the October,
12 November, December timeframe. At that time is when we will
13 anticipate having initial recommended revisions from the
14 committees available for the public to comment on and to
15 present to you as a Board so that you are aware of the work
16 of the committees as this goes forward.

17 And then we've provided a few months at -- in
18 -- within 2018 to help facilitate that adoption process and
19 we'll be working with you to take it -- to determine the --
20 the most expeditious and appropriate way for that to -- to
21 move forward.

22 I'd like to just give you a quick update on
23 the review and revision committee themselves -- the
24 committees themselves. So he -- we have two graphics that I
25 can't displace side by side but the two slides, slides eight



1 and nine, will give you a sense of the applications that
2 we've received by region and then the committee
3 representation by region.

4 So what you'll see on slide eight is that 57
5 percent of the applications came from the Denver metro area,
6 20 percent from the Pikes Peak area, 11 percent from the
7 north central area of the state. And then for west,
8 central, northwest, northeast, southwest, and southeast,
9 some varying percentages of the applications.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: These are the
11 applications from -- we go on this district, someone to
12 participate in the process?

13 DR. COLSMAN: That's correct. Participate in
14 the committee.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So this is really
16 lopsided.

17 DR. COLSMAN: And -- and what we found is
18 that when you look at the actual representation on the
19 committees, what we are determined to do was to take as many
20 of the applicants as we could from those regions and ensure
21 that those -- those people who applied were on the
22 committees.

23 So what you'll see is if you compare on slide
24 nine, you'll see that while 57 percent of the applications
25 came from the Denver metro area. What you'll see is 54



1 percent were selected from there and we bumped up and then
2 ensured that we had a greater representation on the
3 committees than that applied. If that makes any sense.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it's not just Denver,
5 it could be -- it could be --

6 DR. COLSMAN: The Denver metro area which
7 would -- I don't know how far north that would extend in
8 terms of-

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just tell us only what's
10 in North Central.

11 DR. COLSMAN: Right. Right. Right. Right.
12 So we're used our -- for this, we use the regions that we
13 commonly use within the -- for the state for all of our work
14 for the department. There are eight regions I believe. And
15 so -

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Every entity has sort of
17 a different-

18 DR. COLSMAN: No. No.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other (inaudible)
20 12, et cetera --

21 DR. COLSMAN: Right. Right. We -- we've --
22 we've settle on, as a department, I think just eight regions
23 that we typically go -- use as a reference. And we have it
24 available on our website so you can see what exactly that
25 map looks out to be. And we can also provide you with a map



1 of the -- of the districts that our committee members come
2 from and all of the committee names and their affiliations
3 of districts or whatever, if they're -- if they're a parent
4 or a business person. All of their affiliations are also
5 included on our website. So again that's part of our
6 transparent process. We want to make sure that all those
7 committee members names are -- are publicly available.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And this are all
9 voluntary --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Applications, right?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right. And --
12 and the, the work on the committees tends to be something
13 that is in many ways more than is -- we appreciate all of
14 the work that goes into it because we tend to estimate that
15 some work will, you know, entail X hours and it ends up, up
16 honestly being more than what we've anticipated. What we
17 find is our committee members are really, really dedicated
18 and -- to the work and put in those extra hours. They'll be
19 working quite a bit actually, over the summer. We have five
20 face to face meetings scheduled.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

22 MS. COLSMAN: So we have five face to face
23 meetings scheduled between now and I believe, October. But
24 committee members will be working virtually over the summer
25 as well.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Have you had any
2 meetings yet?

3 MS. COLSMAN: Yes. We've had, we had a two-
4 day meeting in May, and it was partially a training meeting,
5 as well as a beginning meeting. And actually, the committee
6 members started to look at the comments that came through
7 the online standards feedback system, and there's a meeting
8 tomorrow as well. So -- so the committees you -- probably
9 will be able to take your feedback directly to the English
10 language proficiency committee.

11 Our chairpersons, we also want to acknowledge
12 the tremendous amount of work that they do because they came
13 in for a full day training in early May to serve in their
14 roles and they worked to develop the agendas and the work
15 plans for the committees along with our content specialist.
16 So they put in a tremendous amount of hours, all without
17 pay, but with very deep gratitude on the depart -- on the
18 part of the department.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

20 MS. COLSMAN: So if you take a look at slide
21 10, what you'll see is what the composition of the
22 committees turned out to be. We've collapsed a few
23 categories together. We can tease this out further for you
24 if you would like to know what, what number of the educator
25 -- of the 40 percent -- 47 percent of the committees that



1 are educators, what percent of those are early childhood,
2 elementary, middle, and high school. And you'll see that
3 there's 34 percent administrators. That's a big category
4 that include -- includes school principals, but it also
5 includes district level curriculum coordinators or district
6 level content specialists, or teachers on special
7 assignment. So they may fall into that kind of
8 administrative category.

9 You'll see that we have 11 percent higher ed
10 representation and 6 percent business, and 2 percent parent
11 representation. Now, we recognize that there's not as great
12 of an involvement of, of individuals who identify themselves
13 strictly as parents. Obviously, there are many folks on
14 these committees that are also parents, but they didn't
15 apply with that as their primary role. We're working on
16 ways to engage more parents in the process by working
17 through the State Advisory Council on Parent Involvement in
18 Education and developing some engagement sessions between
19 now and October, to get some parent input and feedback on
20 the standards so that we can make sure that that voice is
21 part of the process.

22 Where -- we've also done that with business
23 as well. In fact, we just met last week with, with two
24 business groups to get some of their feedback on the
25 workforce readiness aspect of the Colorado academic



1 standards, which is a piece that needs to -- is one of the
2 statutory requirements that our standards lead to workforce
3 readiness. So we're trying to work on, on those pieces in
4 ways that make sense.

5 We also recognize that for, for a parent or a
6 business person sitting in on some of the committees may not
7 feel as, as useful with the piece of their, their time,
8 especially when you put a whole lot of educators in a room,
9 and you're looking at a standard statement, and the word is
10 analyze, and there's somebody intent on changing it to
11 evaluate, and they'll spend a half an hour debating that.
12 That's really exciting to educators, but a parent may say
13 "That's really nice and all, but does my -- is my child
14 gonna read by the end of third grade?" And so we're trying
15 to make sure we have developed some engagement strategies
16 for parents and business that actually match the, the type
17 of engagement that, that matches what they would prefer.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And don't talk in
19 acronyms.

20 MS. COLSMAN: Right, exactly. No acronyms-

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No acronyms.

22 MS. COLSMAN: -- no jargon, which is a little
23 challenging when you put a group of educators together.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is, but it's a good
25 thing to do?



1 MS. COLSMAN: Absolutely. Absolutely.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's good training?

3 MS. COLSMAN: Exactly. So right now on our,
4 on our website, we have a few resources that are available
5 for you and for the general public. This is part of being
6 transparent.

7 So the online standards feedback system,
8 you'll recall, closed at the end of April. We have two
9 versions of the -- that feedback available for the public to
10 review, as well as for you to review. One of them is a
11 direct spreadsheet download of every single comment by
12 content area and grade level. So it's, it -- it's a
13 challenge to read through because it's a spreadsheet, but we
14 wanted to make sure that it was transparent, that it -- that
15 every single comment is there and people can review and see
16 if their comment is included.

17 We've also through the work of our math
18 content specialist who's also a great computer programmer,
19 was able to figure out a way to take that from a spreadsheet
20 and actually turn it into documents that are really useful
21 and easy to read. So for every content area, the comments
22 are organized by the different components of the standards,
23 documents, and the grade level. So the -- those are all
24 available. So if there's a particular subject area you're
25 interested in, you can open up that comment or that document



1 and see every single comment. You'll notice, when you open
2 those, that some of them -- that, that folks went through
3 and copied and pasted the same comment all the way through.
4 And so those are all included.

5 You'll also notice that there are some very
6 long comments as well. And so these have been given to each
7 of the committees and this is what we're asking the, the
8 committees to work from.

9 Also on our committee resources page I'd
10 indicated that the names and affiliations of the committee
11 members are posted by content area, but there also is a
12 specific page for each content area that, again, includes
13 the online standards feedback. But there's also a report,
14 what we call a benchmarking report, which is a, a
15 requirement of the -- a statutory requirement for the
16 standards that are standard to be comparable in scope,
17 relevance, and rigor to national and international
18 standards. So we've engaged outside experts to conduct
19 those reports. So those reports are also on those web
20 pages.

21 So our committees will be using the
22 benchmarking reports and the public feedback to make their
23 recommendations for revisions. We're asking our committees
24 to, to stick to those and to not come in and think that they



1 are the -- now that they're on the committee, they get to
2 make whatever changes they want.

3 We're saying that we need to see that there's
4 a demand for change and that they consider the impact of the
5 change. And if there is, for instance, a high demand and a
6 low impact, it's probably gonna be a change that makes a lot
7 of sense. Some of those might be, you know what, this --
8 the wording of this standard has never made any sense, can
9 you just clarify. High demand/low impact, it doesn't change
10 the intent of it, just makes it more understandable. If
11 there's low demand for something, that's a high impact.
12 Like, we should no longer have algebra. Well, that's one
13 comment: high impact.

14 What we would assume is that if that was a
15 recommended change that the committee would go along with,
16 that they would have to have a strong rationale. And that
17 would actually be something we'd would bring before you
18 because if it's a high impact, low demand we would want to
19 make sure you have an opportunity to weigh in on that before
20 the Committee moves further. So we have this decision make
21 -- making matrix based on those two pieces.

22 I'll, I'll conclude on this particular slide
23 with just making sure that you know all committee dates are
24 available on the website, so that the general public can
25 come and attend. We do have guidelines about the general



1 public attending. Just like here, there, there, there can
2 be an opportunity for a public comment, but it is -- they
3 are not participants in the committee. So we do have some,
4 some, some restrictions around that. We do have a public
5 comment opportunity available through our standards email
6 system, that we do get comments coming in still. And those
7 will all be addressed as well.

8 Just to give you a quick sense of how many
9 comments were received by content area through our online
10 system, we do have this summary tally for you. If you take
11 a look there, people typically are drawn to where the most
12 number -- what is the greatest number of comments, that
13 makes us wonder why, why are there so many comments there.
14 I'll give you an example. If, if you look, I think World
15 Languages is the winner, the clear winner in the most number
16 of comments. When you take a look at what those comments
17 are --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Two commenters.

19 MS. COLSMAN: Right. Exactly. So what
20 you'll notice there is when we -- when you download the
21 actual comments, there were many of them, which were those
22 repeat cut and paste kind of comments. And they were
23 actually -- this person was really interested in having the
24 committee look at the ACTFL standards. So, so --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: American Council
2 Teaching of Foreign Languages.

3 MS. COLSMAN: There you go. I knew I didn't
4 have to memorize that one because Board Member (inaudible).

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's interesting that --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: social Studies and then
7 P.E. have the most commenters.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. Right. Yeah.
9 And social --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hot topic among on P.E.

11 MS. COLSMAN: So that's a good question. I
12 don't know the answer to that. But social Studies, I want
13 to keep in mind our social Studies teachers are -- are ones
14 who are really about civic engagement. And so that's who
15 you see.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They got some of that?

17 MS. COLSMAN: Yes, they were very civically
18 engaged in this process and had really thoughtful, deep
19 comments. So in reading through, I thought, "Wow. I got
20 him on that social studies committee because they're adding
21 a lot of really great thinking to the -- to the committee's
22 work." And again I'm very glad that I'm not a part of that
23 particular committee. Really good work though.

24 So we're going to shift to just focus for a
25 few minutes on the Colorado English Language Proficiency



1 Standards subcommittee. Just gonna start off with a little
2 bit of information, and hopefully with a little bit of
3 information I can be very dangerous because I don't have the
4 depth of knowledge here, I'll hand it off to those who
5 really do know this in just a moment.

6 So just to give you a little bit of
7 background on Colorado's English Language Proficiency
8 Standards. Back in 2009, when the standards development
9 process was underway the State Board of Education -- I was
10 going to be like really informal with you. But I'll say
11 education-approved Readers English Language Proficiency
12 Standards as the framework for Colorado's English Language
13 Proficiency Standards. This was after the recommendation of
14 the of the English Language Proficiency Committee at that
15 time. The CELP standards, as we lovingly call them,
16 Colorado English Language Proficiency Standards, include
17 standards to develop English for students identified as
18 English learners kindergarten through 12th grade. This CELP
19 standards addressed specific context for language
20 development of social and instructional language in the
21 content area. So English language, Arts, Math, social
22 Studies, and Science.

23 So I'll give you an example of what we mean
24 by social and instructional language. Years ago when I was
25 a seventh grade Math teacher, I had an English learner



1 during my classroom. Because I don't want give personally
2 identifiable information, I will say his name is Randy. So
3 Randy came in, and he had very good social English skills.
4 So he could come in and he could speak with me. And I could
5 say something like, "Oh, could you go pick that up from the
6 table." And he knew what I was talking about because he
7 understood social language.

8 When we started to get into instructional
9 language, is where I thought he -- where I found the
10 disconnect. Because I would speak to him about, "Oh, we're
11 going to create a table to compare and contrast." And he,
12 in his mind, this was a table. The instructional language
13 of table for him was not part of his vocabulary. So I
14 needed to directly teach him that language, and compare and
15 contrast. Those are, that's not language that typically
16 occurs in a social setting.

17 So the CELP standards help develop ensure
18 that students have a social language, but also the
19 instructional language and through the content areas.
20 Because in Math I can say compass, but that means something
21 different in a social Studies classroom. And if I say
22 kingdom in Science, I mean something different than I am in
23 social Studies. And if I see Phylum, that's a whole
24 different ballgame. That's a really specific concept to
25 specific content area.



1 So that's, in a nutshell, what the English
2 Language Proficiency Standards do is they help with the
3 social, instructional, and the content specific language
4 development. So when a handoff now to Lulu Buck, who's
5 going to talk us through a little bit about what input the
6 CELP Committee received specifically around our standards.

7 MS. BUCK: Thank you. We at CDE conducted a
8 survey to gather some additional feedback on the approach on
9 revising the Colorado English Language Proficiency
10 Standards. And the survey was open from January 25th to
11 February 28, 2017. We received a total of exactly 350
12 individual respond -- responses. Ninety percent of those
13 responses were educators, followed by 4 percent representing
14 state agencies, and the 2 percent being students, and 4
15 percent being in the category of other that varied from both
16 CS, to parents, to media staff, to taxpayers, and
17 professional organizations.

18 From that 90 percent of educators, we had the
19 following breakdown. Where we had 60 percent of the
20 Educator responses were English language development
21 teachers, followed by the 11 percent being district
22 administrators, 9 percent being district level non
23 administrators staff, and then 8 percent the classroom
24 teachers, 4 percent being school administrators. Three
25 percent being the school level non instructional staff.



1 Another 3 percent being a non-peak K through 12 educator,
2 and lastly a 2 percent being bilingual educators.

3 In the survey conducted, the overall
4 impression of the Colorado English Language Proficiency
5 Standards was positive. We had 21 percent of our responses
6 were very positive. Forty-one percent being positive.
7 Twenty, 25 percent had a neutral feeling. Eight percent
8 were negative. One percent were very negative, and four
9 percent were not sure.

10 Lastly, the survey inquired about the
11 preference of our approach and to the review and revise the
12 Colorado English Language Proficiency Standards. Sixty-
13 seven percent of our stakeholders requested that to continue
14 our to -- our use of the WIDA Framework without
15 modifications, and to develop and support resources around
16 implementation for Colorado. Followed by an 18 percent
17 request to continue to use the WIDA Framework without
18 modifications. Then we had a 13 percent request to
19 reference the WIDA Framework for developing an original
20 Colorado English Language Proficiency Standards. And then
21 lastly, we had two percent requested to develop the self
22 standards from scratch without referencing the WIDA
23 Framework. And that was the entire survey.



1 So at this time I'd like to introduce Dr.
2 Holly Porter, to provide you an update for the -- with the
3 committee work.

4 MS. PORTER: Thank you, Madam Chair and
5 Members of the Board. Can you hear me?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just get closer.

7 MS. PORTER: Okay. Thank you so much for
8 having me here today. I really appreciate it, and I really
9 enjoyed my time on the committee. As you can see, we met in
10 May for the first time. And what we did the first day when
11 we started was we had everybody come in, and we, we talked
12 about the WIDA standards and the self-standards and how they
13 were aligned, and talked about everyone's thoughts on that
14 similar to what this survey had asked. And everyone was
15 unanimous that we keep the standards and make some
16 recommendations for how we make them more (inaudible)
17 specific. So we would keep self standards the way they are,
18 and then use them more Colorado-specific resources or
19 trainings or things to go along with that.

20 We went through all of the survey results, we
21 went through every single comment, and we actually coded
22 them into some themes to talk about what was the field
23 requesting from us. And so the themes that came out we had
24 some training themes where we needed some more specific
25 training. We had some themes around supporting us with



1 alignment to Colorado's standards, because some of the
2 materials that we currently have with the WIDA Framework are
3 aligned to standards that are maybe in other states because
4 they're all examples. So we wanted to make sure that we had
5 some or very specific Colorado alignments. And then the
6 other requests that came out of that was just to develop
7 additional supports for accessing some of those materials.

8 So we did that. We discussed some of the
9 resources that we're using, and then really it came down to
10 our next steps we're going to be looking at how do we more
11 closely align WIDA, CELF standards with our current Colorado
12 content standards to make it a very Colorado-specific thing.
13 And one example that I'll give you is there's a little bit
14 of a mismatch in some areas with some of the examples that
15 we did provide.

16 So the standards are there, and the standards
17 align with any content standard that you have. So in any
18 state you have your content standards and then WIDA like Dr.
19 Colsman said, is the alignment of the language of that. So
20 we have the language of language arts, the language of math,
21 the language of science and social studies. So depending on
22 what state you're in, and depending on what standard you
23 have, you will be aligning the language to that standard.

24 And so one of the samples that WIDA has an
25 example topic of ecosystems in third grade. In Colorado,



1 ecosystems is not included in the third grade standards. It
2 would be included. There would be things like states of
3 matter, life cycles and organisms, and earth materials.

4 And so what we'd want to do is make sure that
5 the examples that we're providing for districts to use are
6 very closely aligned to Colorado standards and that we
7 provide support to our districts in Colorado, because we
8 want to be local support and not necessarily having some of
9 these things out there that may not align perfectly.

10 So that's really what a lot of people have
11 been asking for and then in ensuring that people have access
12 to that and providing some support with potential trainings
13 or links to things that would, that would be Colorado-
14 specific. So that was the gist of what we did in the
15 committee, and our next steps and we are meeting tomorrow
16 again. So we're looking forward to continuing to go down
17 that path and see what we can create and develop for our
18 state.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what are the next
20 steps for this work? As you know, tomorrow is another
21 meeting day for the committees. They'll continue working
22 throughout the summer. They will convene again in September
23 to actually start drafting what revisions they are
24 recommending and we will start to bring forward some of the
25 highlights of that over the fall. What I'm interested in



1 and I think what we're very interested in learning is how to
2 best present some of that information to you.

3 So I'll be interested to hear your thoughts
4 on how best to ensure that you're made aware of what
5 revisions are coming forward, so that, you're not
6 overwhelmed with those all at once. We don't wanna wait
7 until May of next year and look at stacks and stacks of
8 documents. We're looking at ways to help summarize what the
9 main changes are and perhaps code them in ways of, "Here is
10 a change that is a greater impact," and deemphasize some of
11 the things that might be a grammatical change so that you're
12 really focused on those things that are more about
13 substance.

14 So we'll be interested in working with you
15 all over the next couple of months to hear your thoughts on
16 how to best present this information over these next 12
17 months. So we ain't -- we're very interested in hearing any
18 questions that you have right now, or any comments that you
19 have right now.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you very much (inaudible)
21 Colleagues, Ms. Mazanec, how do you get feedback from
22 schools districts, I guess that have high ESO students, high
23 number?

24 MS. PORTER: So I'll start that question, and
25 then I'll ask Lulu to elaborate. So through our Office of



1 Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Education, we do have
2 contacts for districts and we are aware of the districts and
3 schools that have higher numbers of English learners. And
4 we have communication networks in order to make sure that
5 they're engaged and they're understanding what's happening
6 through the -- through all of this process. That's actually
7 the mechanism that we use to make sure that when we send out
8 our survey, that we're getting at the places where we know
9 have the greatest numbers and percentages of English
10 learners.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So when you say
12 communication networks --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- so I assume there's
15 some sort of network between that office and those schools.

16 MS. PORTER: That's correct.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you -- does the
18 office reach out to them?

19 MS. PORTER: That's right. We have -- we
20 have stakeholder meetings as well where we -- where we
21 gather input and then their feedback on what they would like
22 to see changed.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what if they don't
24 come to your meetings, are you reaching out to them to get
25 their feedback?



1 MS. PORTER: Correct. We do it both via
2 email, as well as phone calls, as well as stakeholders, and
3 face to face meetings.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a really
6 important point because-

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well actually,
8 truthfully not just some ELO, but all of these.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know, because I --
11 I'm assuming there are some schools and districts that can't
12 spare somebody to come to all of these meetings and
13 participate and at the same time we still need to hear from
14 them.

15 MS. PORTER: That's a -- it's a really
16 important point. It's something that we're continuing to
17 think of like, how do we ensure engagement throughout this
18 process? So we do have a -- we have a like a monthly --
19 monthly newsletter that we've started to develop, we have
20 monthly webinars and the standard to review and revision
21 process.

22 But making sure that that gets pushed out is
23 really, really important because people only find out when
24 we contact them that this is available. We can make
25 available that -- that information about how to sign up for



1 the newsletter as well as the webpage where all of this is
2 to -- too busy so that you can also have that available for
3 your constituents as well. I think that would be really
4 helpful.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Anything else? Questions,
6 comments, input to the committee members? Mr. Durham?

7 MR. DURHAM: Now these are the standards, the
8 systems in English language proficiency standards
9 (inaudible) .

10 MS. PORTER: No, the -- the English language
11 proficiency standards that we live develop actually does
12 inform the WIDA assessment, but it does not inform the PARCC
13 assessments.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The WIDA assessment
15 (inaudible).

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The -- the -- correct.
17 Correct.

18 MS. PORTER: So that would be possible for me
19 to -- for this standards to where stand with great
20 (inaudible) level sorry, (inaudible) should be able to read
21 at a certain level in English have great force is that
22 correct?

23 MS. BUCK: So I'm going to give like a really
24 simplistic answer and then I'm gonna hand it over to Holly.
25 So that would -- I think your question would be assuming



1 that a student starts in a school at kindergarten and
2 progress's through fourth grade. You'll have to recall that
3 there are students who join us --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I under -- I understand
5 that, but we tried to make some accommodation for that in
6 levels (inaudible) 60, but that didn't work. So I guess the
7 question is, is it legitimate for this Board to try and set
8 a standard that would require a level of English language
9 proficiency after one year? Let's say their first year was
10 grade four, they were expect -- expected to accomplish
11 something in grade three, and if they'd been there for two
12 years, their standard would be higher and so on through. So
13 this -- this process could be used to ensure that the
14 children actually are taught English.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I'm gonna ask Lulu to
16 comment on one piece, and then I think I'll ask Holly to
17 elaborate. So the standards fell out like expectations and
18 around language development. How that language development
19 is tracked. Is by moving kids through different levels from
20 -- and now I'll (inaudible) Lulu to just kind of talk about
21 that.

22 So I don't know this necessarily the
23 standards themselves that would ensure that. I think it
24 would be around providing really supportive guidance about



1 how to move kids through the different levels. So I'll ask
2 Lulu to maybe make sense out of what I said.

3 MS. BUCK: At our English language
4 development programs do provide a framework for English
5 language proficiency to happen. It's -- we do around --
6 around the number of years, we can't really put a death in a
7 year around that only -- only because we follow statute.
8 Statute allows the language development to arise, but there
9 is accountability for our programs to ensure that they are
10 having kids grow in their language proficiency. So we do
11 monitor that through the monitoring process of once a year.
12 We do require students to assess language proficiency and
13 then we engage in those results and we can keep distance-

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think there's
15 any --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Around the language
17 proficiency of schools.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think there's
19 any -- there's no statute that governs the standards in that
20 way. The statute requires that we revise our standards.
21 We're in the process of revising them. They could be
22 revised to a standard that this Board thought appropriate
23 for progress in learning English. Failure to learn English
24 at that pace would reflect poorly on the district that
25 failed to instruct in English at that level.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So -- so if you're
3 looking for feedback for -- to take to the committee, is
4 that the ability to read in English is a critical skill. It
5 is better developed in earlier grades than later and that
6 the standards would -- would measure at various grade
7 levels. Because I remember when I read the current
8 standards when I first came on the Board. It was quite an
9 exercise actually, in boredom mostly, that -- that we could
10 -- those standards could reflect a certain requirement and
11 then we could ensure then that our testing regimen measured
12 progress toward those standards. Districts that failed to
13 meet those standards might be held accountable.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have some very
15 amazing districts to model that from. Our ELPA excellence
16 reports show a number of trends in their success with
17 English learners. One of those main trends is their
18 understanding around the way the framework in instruction
19 for English learners. So that is part of the revision
20 process that we would like to take, is to learn from our
21 ELPA excellence districts and to replicate that for the
22 state.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Ms. Colman (inaudible)
24 things I would like to see them regardless of the standards
25 that may or may not be recommended by the committees, is



1 that are prepared at least for the consideration Board
2 standards that in fact provide hard measurement for progress
3 in English language, that this Board might choose to adopt
4 regardless of the recommendations of the various committees.
5 I think some of this value progress in English more than --
6 than certainly some in the field do. So I think this might
7 be an opportunity to -- for this Board to try and ensure
8 that we have. We make adequate progress toward that goal.

9 MS. COLSMAN: So, so Mr. Durham, thank you
10 for that. And I, and I, do hear that loud and clear that
11 it's a, a high priority of the Board that, that we're really
12 working towards ensuring kids are getting to English
13 language proficiency as, as, as quickly as possible.

14 MR. DURHAM: It's a high priority by law 43.

15 MS. COLSMAN: Right. Well, I would, I would,
16 also say that you know our reading by third grade is a
17 strong, and strongly held department goal, and we'll make
18 sure that we share that with the committee. I think there's
19 --

20 MR. DURHAM: I think it is a strong hard to
21 go. It is not a strongly held goal on, goal on the part of
22 some of the districts with whom this Board deals.

23 MS. COLSMAN: I would -- I'm going to ask Dr.
24 Porter to just elaborate on one more piece around a lever
25 that the Board has with respect to this.



1 MS. PORTER: I would say as a district who has
2 a lot of English learners in the state, one of the largest,
3 we do feel the accountability comes from our, our school
4 performance framework and our district performance
5 frameworks because we are required to look at adequate
6 growth for English learners on the English proficiency test,
7 and that is measured on an expectation of six years. And so
8 that's, that's what's, I think that's in the statute. I
9 could be wrong, but I think it's a five to seven year kind
10 of goal that we have. And I'll tell you that we look at
11 that really clearly to say --

12 MR. DURHAM: That six years of instruction
13 in, in --

14 MS. PORTER: In English.

15 MR. DURHAM: Sure.

16 MS. PORTER: Yeah. That, that's pretty much
17 based on research. That's the research that's out there as
18 well. And so we look at if, if kids are not proficient and
19 having been in a program within six years, that's a, that's
20 a problem. So all of our growth is based on that, and so
21 what we look at is are they moving through the levels of
22 proficiency? So those self-standards have language levels
23 of proficiency that kids would come in. So they may come in
24 the entry, and, and this is a graphic here that you may not
25 be able to see, but there are levels here. As a student



1 arrives here, they would have time to get here. But if they
2 arrive in the middle, it may take them less time.

3 MR. DURHAM: Right.

4 MS. PORTER: So if they -- right. The very
5 beginning, the maximum amount of time we would expect would
6 be six years. But all of our growth on our school
7 performance framework is based on that, and so we get to see
8 if we have adequate growth percentiles, or not, and so we're
9 always looking for that adequate growth percentile, and
10 that's also what ELPA excellence is based upon is if you
11 have high growth and high achievement for English learners.

12 MR. DURHAM: Is the objective, let's presume
13 a six year time-frame is reasonable for them, is the, is the
14 standard then at the sixth year complete proficiency?

15 MS. PORTER: That would be my understanding.
16 Complete proficiency in English.

17 MR. DURHAM: Complete proficiency in English.
18 So if you had a non-English language learner arrive in
19 kindergarten, then by fifth grade the expectation would be
20 full, fully proficient.

21 MS. PORTER: Fully proficient. And I can
22 only speak from my district's experience. Eighty-five
23 percent of our kids who start their first year in the
24 program are at Monotrona or exited from our program within
25 three years, 95 percent in five years, and then we have a



1 few that kind of hang on a little bit. Some of those may
2 have some disability or some other (inaudible).

3 MR. DURHAM: Presuming --

4 MS. PORTER: That I can only speak from my
5 experience. And that's been my experience is that yes,
6 that's, that's the trajectory that we all aim for.

7 MR. DURHAM: So we would be able to hopefully
8 have some standards that if we were to test to those
9 standards could hold districts accountable.

10 MS. PORTER: And that's what I was trying to
11 say is we already do. And that's already held (inaudible).

12 MR. DURHAM: I understand but there are
13 districts who don't.

14 MS. PORTER: We know as a state, we have our
15 state test does that, and measures -- measures levels of
16 proficiency, and so can give us that trajectory and that
17 adequate growth using that current assessment that we are,
18 that we have.

19 MR. DURHAM: And which says --

20 MS. PORTER: That's the way the readers
21 (inaudible). If you remember but we were going through all
22 this when we were doing the ESSA.

23 MR. DURHAM: Right.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My request was that by
25 this fall, we would get a deeper tutorial on this particular



1 thing because we're, we're all kind of learning. We, we're
2 all at different levels of understanding.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And like I was saying, I
4 took myself out of the chair, but just having had experience
5 in that district.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My own take a little
7 time here. But I think the objective is, is noble.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wanna ask you
9 something, isn't that important?

10 MS. PORTER: Yes.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So when your kids in
12 Cherry Creek start out, do they start out as (inaudible)
13 classroom or they start learning English, or is it
14 (inaudible) as they start out, let's say in Spanish.

15 MS. PORTER: Okay. So our programming model
16 in Cherry Creek is a co-teacher model that we've been doing
17 since 2007. So when our, when our kids come in, they go
18 into a co-taught classroom where we have a language
19 specialist in there for part of the time, and a classroom
20 teacher.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And what are the
22 languages that are there?

23 MS. PORTER: We have 140.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I, I would tell you
25 that --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You have 140 teachers?

2 MS. PORTER: Languages.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So let's say you have --

4 MS. PORTER: We teach in English.

5 Everything's in English. We don't have any bilingual

6 programs. Sorry.

7 MR. DURHAM: You don't have any?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

9 MS. PORTER: No, we don't have any, any

10 language that has enough kids that we would ever have a

11 concentrated number to be able to do any of our languages

12 and any instruction in other language.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or we just don't have

14 instruction in English.

15 MS. PORTER: Yes.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Like are (inaudible).

17 MS. PORTER: We just don't have the resources

18 for that.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you -- I mean they

20 have really Spanish is the only kids.

21 MS. PORTER: They do because I believe Denver

22 is more closer to 80 or 90 percent Spanish speakers, and

23 their and their programs are just about 35. The most

24 powerful district.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Obviously in Denver,
2 they get maybe 15 minutes in kindergarten and maybe 20
3 minutes (inaudible) and in English. So that's all the
4 interest they get. So mainly in Spanish. So by first
5 grade, you know. They're reading in Spanish, but English.
6 So reading is, and I'm not saying it's native, but English
7 needs to be taught. It takes time to learn English, and it
8 takes time to learn to read, to be instructed in English, to
9 be able to read in English. So remember that.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you for that
11 report. I have a couple of questions for you, Ms. Colzman.
12 First of all, why did we choose Colorado's English language
13 proficiency standards as an example. Today, I'm, I'm a
14 little confused. We have a lot of standards and a lot of
15 areas. Why was this chosen?

16 MS. COLSMAN: So we wanted it, we chose this
17 area for two reasons. First of all, we need to start
18 rolling out and we believe that we will be bringing forward
19 to you different content areas over these next few months.
20 So we wanted to get a sense from you and gets -- have you
21 have some -- an opportunity to reflect and say, how is the
22 best way to get these updates. We could do two to three
23 content areas at a time, and say this is what's happening
24 and you know with math science and social studies, so that
25 you have a sense. And so that's one thing as we wanted to



1 get some feedback from you. And then we also wanted to make
2 sure that you understood the approach that the English
3 language proficiency standards committee was taking because
4 it's, it's, it's a -- it is a revision, but it's more about
5 making some Colorado specific like resources.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. And so tomorrow
7 you have a meeting that's all day, 9:00 to 4:00. Do all the
8 committees meet or just one meets from 9:00 to 4:00 at one
9 given meeting, or do they go in different rooms? Tell me
10 the process, how that works.

11 MS. COLSMAN: Well, it's, it's, it's a, it's
12 a really complicated and well managed process. There are 13
13 different committees that meet, and the committees, the work
14 of the -- try -- we try to make sure that the committees are
15 doing similar things at the same time, so that we are, are
16 managing that process in a way that makes a lot of sense.
17 So yes, there are 13 different committees that are meeting
18 simultaneously.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And do you have people
20 that are volunteered to be on this committee that are
21 extremely vocal about one specific issue? I, I find when I
22 go out in my district, there are people that won't listen
23 anything because they have that one issue, and I worry about
24 overpowering some of them. Could you, do you have a kind of
25 a feel for that?



1 MS. COLSMAN: Right. So there there's about
2 200 total committee members.

3 But what we've done is I mentioned that we
4 had it training for chairpersons. Part of that training was
5 how to manage conversations, how to get groups to consensus,
6 how to, and specifically how to deal with you know if, if
7 there is someone who's kind of stuck on their part issue,
8 how to, how to deal with that in a respectful way that keeps
9 the committee productive, and our, our content specialists
10 are also trained, they receive extensive training and that
11 is well, so that we can manage that. We think everyone
12 deserves a voice on the committees, but we also recognize
13 that when someone dominates that you need to manage that in
14 a way that is, is respectful, keeps their voice involved but
15 elevates the other voices as well.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One of the things I
17 would be really interested in that you bring forward is when
18 you have these meetings and then you start reporting back to
19 us, if there's things that, that really pop up, that we had
20 not even considered maybe or that you had not even
21 considered, but it seems to be something that, that the
22 people in Colorado on this committee, and it's a valuable,
23 very valuable input, but that's kind of what I think I'm
24 looking for just because my superintendents have said, you
25 know, we don't want you to change everything now in the



1 middle of you know what we just got used to, and I -- I
2 really didn't see this as a total over throw. I, I see it
3 as kind of tweaking maybe some of it.

4 MS. COLSMAN: Yeah. Your -- that feedback is
5 really helpful. I may think with that. As, as we get
6 things that are a little surprising to us, we'll bring that
7 forward. We'll also bring forward those things that if a
8 committee is recommending a large impact item, that's
9 something that we definitely want to bring forward to you.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

11 MS. COLSMAN: Thank you.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So do you have a -- do
13 you have a schedule or do you want -- would you like for us
14 to come up with a schedule of what -- when?

15 MS. COLSMAN: I think that I'd be very happy
16 to work with, perhaps even in the vice chair to, to develop
17 a --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- kind of a -- a
20 schedule for this. And that would be based on when the
21 committee recommendations would -- the initial ones would be
22 coming forward in October, so that we can pace the
23 conversation out in a way that doesn't overwhelm the Board
24 all at once.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. It the -- as I
2 recall when I came on the Board, we were adopting standards
3 and it did seem rather overwhelming.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Even though I had gone
6 through the listening process around the state beforehand.
7 It was still a lot of material and even though we're looking
8 at potential changes, I think for most of us, we'll be going
9 back and looking at what remains as well to -- in order to
10 refresh our -- our memories and our understanding.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And -- and we're working
12 on a way to help flag with it -- with the revisions are in a
13 way that's not overwhelming. And what we're not -- again,
14 we're working on some prototypes and we may run that by you,
15 to get some of your feedback on some prototypes so that we
16 don't put our energy into one approach that doesn't work for
17 you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you foresee just
19 based on the things that have occurred in some areas having
20 more dramatic -- some subject areas having more dramatic
21 changes.?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we might be a
23 little bit early to say that because the committees have met
24 just twice and they are just getting to know their resources
25 and materials. I think tomorrow will be a really important



1 day. I think that's when people have started to grapple
2 with all of the comments and have started to think through
3 what the -- what they're going to do with it all.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some suggestion that was
5 I guess that was brought to all of us or I just sort of
6 vaguely remember was to think about combining dance, art.
7 You remember this , Ms. McClellan? It's been discussed
8 before but I can't remember now what the in -- into, a sort
9 of, a general arts category rather than having them as
10 separate content area -- areas per se.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I think -- I
12 think that there's -- dance has always been an area that is
13 really specialized and I think that -- that is one that
14 we've just grappled with how -- how do we manage to those --
15 or how do we think about those standards cause they're a bit
16 different than like let's say music standards because more
17 kids would obviously be involved in music than in dance. So
18 I think that'd be something I'd bring to our director of
19 standards and instructional support, Karol Gates, and our --
20 ours, the folks that we met, are part time helping out with
21 these committees to help think that through.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Just to start to
23 think about it in a way that we have social studies, which
24 is three or four different standards areas that -- that
25 maybe there's another one that actually combines them. It's



1 not anything I'm dying on but I do recall that being
2 suggestion since there were so -- so many of those. Well,
3 member Goff?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Another thing that might
5 come up that could be of interest in the integrated picture
6 down the road, is if any of their -- their content team's
7 conversations are germane to the teacher shortage or, you
8 know, or if there are particular things about teaching in
9 that content area -- on that are -- people are thinking
10 about that are by chance more than the general topics, more
11 specific to a content area. I'd be interested in knowing
12 that.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And a kind of along with
15 combining of content areas. Talk a bit, you know -- I know
16 there are -- we will -- well that question is and I -- I
17 guess we know the answer. Computer science -- isn't that
18 part of this work as well? Are -- are the teams actually
19 starting that out?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're right that there
21 is actually a committee.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Were not just revealing,
23 we're actually developing-

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Creating a new set of
25 right.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is the only
2 committee that's actually developing standards since our
3 computer science committee. And then pretty -- this is
4 pretty related specifically to social studies, but there are
5 people that will say it goes all over the place. Any
6 conversation among the groups so far, especially social
7 studies content team around civic engagement, and that may -
8 - that may come in to be, I don't know, anything community
9 related. So most of the content areas can get off into that
10 topic if they want to. So curious about that, we'll be
11 interested in that. What we need to do.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So when we do -- when we
13 bring forward our content area kind of updates, we can --
14 those would be a great opportunity to hear what those
15 conversations have been.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. In any foreseen
17 barriers to our ability as a state to implement those
18 standards, whether it's resource-wise or like common ground
19 on just technology, in general right now so . Thank you.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Mazanec.

21 MS. MAZANEC: Sort of along those lines, I
22 wonder if we are engaging in or -- or should engage in
23 discussion. Let's try we call it Civic Engagement or call
24 it Civics. Colorado does require, that's the only require -
25 - graduation requirement, right?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct.

2 MS. MAZANEC: And it's what? A half credit -

3 -

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think I will have to
5 look at the actual --

6 MS. MAZANEC: -- in Civics?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- statute this -- to
8 the specific requirement.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've folded that into
10 social studies. A lot of districts simply teach social
11 studies as opposed to something more concrete that you might
12 learn in American government class. So I think it's a good
13 time, in our history, for students to have better
14 instruction -- civics so -- and civic engagement -- civil
15 civic engagement. It might be a good idea too.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I would like to
18 invite that kind of discussion --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- into this. I'd like
21 -- I think that there's plenty of evidence too many young
22 people don't understand how government is supposed to work.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Somebody else?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much. We
25 look forward to further --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The next year to come.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- presentations. And
3 in particular, Mr. Durham and I are definitely serious about
4 our request to have a better understanding so that we start
5 speaking the same language.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When they say she --
7 when she says Mr. Durham and I, be afraid. Be very afraid.

8 MADAM CHAIR: So some -- somebody told me to
9 hit the snooze button, so I'm gonna say five minute break.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. And that was
13 approved and we thank you for your support on that. That
14 way we -- yeah. That way, we can actually reimburse for
15 travel so we don't pay our committee members but we do
16 reimburse for travel which is really helpful for folks
17 coming from Durango and so on so on. It is -- it's
18 critical. Thank you very much.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Have a good July.
20 Five minutes. I hit the snooze button. That was great
21 advice. Next item on the agenda is a presentation of a
22 research data request for student PII, commissioner?

23 MS. ANTHES: Yes, thank you Madam Chair. I
24 will turn this over to Jill Stacey, our data privacy



1 analyst, Marshal Mohammed, our Chief Information Officer and
2 Terra, is it Waas?

3 MS. WAAS: Waas.

4 MS. ANTHES: -- who is the principal
5 researcher for this research and I believe Meg Williams, the
6 manager for the -- the Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice
7 Assistance is on the phone with us today. But just to --

8 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes just to let you know
10 this, this is our first research, was it our first or
11 second?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's our first
14 since you all have voted to approve. You had asked us to
15 come up with a process for you to approve research requests.
16 And this is the first one that is coming to you under that
17 new process that you approved. So I'll turn it over to
18 Marsha? Or Joe?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You can go straight to
20 Jo. She's gonna...

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She can go straight to
22 me. As mentioned, this is the research process that you
23 guys approved back in September of 2016. We have been
24 evaluating the number of requests that we have received and
25 we're also working on process improvements, so this is just



1 our first go with this. We have this research request which
2 is the first to make it through this -- to this stage of
3 this process and is now ready to be reviewed and approved by
4 you. We are providing this just as an information of --
5 information item today and you will have the opportunity to
6 vote on it in August.

7 Okay, so as mentioned the -- the two
8 participating parties right now are Meg Williams on the
9 phone and Terra Waas. The research is from, the request is
10 from the Colorado Division of Colorado Justice and
11 specifically the Office of Adult and Juvenile Justice
12 Assistance. And the general overview of this is that they
13 want to use some limited student personally identifiable
14 information from us to research the impacts of secure
15 detention related to truancy.

16 We understand that that anything related to
17 criminal justice is usually pretty sensitive topic, and we
18 do understand that. And so what we asked the researchers to
19 join us today to provide you with an understanding of what
20 the benefits are and have been in terms of this research.
21 So just as a reminder this is the process that was approved.
22 We're currently now at stage four. And then we'll continue
23 should this be approved with stages five to eight.

24 So we want to provide you with a high level
25 understanding of the timeline involved. We received this



1 request in September of 2016 and in the meantime between
2 this and when we had the researcher approval panel we were
3 working on clarifying items with the researchers, gathering
4 more information, working on the process and evaluating the
5 number of other requests that we had received prior to this.
6 Then we held the research approval panel meeting which was a
7 meeting of CDE staff who might have input or thoughts about
8 this particular research. We gathered them together we
9 asked them to review a number of questions that you guys
10 helped us design, and then we tallied the results and
11 determined that it would be sufficient to take it to the
12 next step.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And if I could add just
14 one thing, just -- just remind you of the RAP, the Research
15 Approval Panel Group. That's the internal group now that
16 reviews research requests in place of an IRB here at CBE.
17 We still require researchers to get IRB approval externally
18 but I know last year we had a lot of discussion about
19 whether CBE has an IRB or not. So I just want to remind you
20 that that's the RAP kind of serves that purpose for our
21 internal review.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So then they also have
23 to do IRB at their institution.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is correct.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And do all government
2 institutions have that?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I believe what it
4 happened in in (inaudible) is that they did it through.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we'll get into this
6 in a little bit but you did get approval through the Center
7 for Research Strategies?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And who's on the
9 (inaudible)?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is a good question.
11 So we had myself, we had Marshable Henen, we had
12 representatives from the business side of things including
13 Gen Pietro and Ben Severson who does discipline information.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry, they are all
15 CDE (inaudible) right?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They are all CDE staff
17 who have either expertise and data privacy security in
18 research or in the subject matter itself.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So does the route
20 change depending on --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's kind of a core
23 group like --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Depending on what the
25 request for PII is a route and you change.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The content people would
2 be different depending on what the request is.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah that's correct. So
4 after the RAP meeting determined that this could move
5 forward, we then had a couple of additional requests of the
6 researchers and then we prepared it for presentation to you
7 today. So I'm going to turn this over to Terra Waas who
8 will give you an understanding of the research itself.

9 MS. WAAS: Thank you. I want to thank the
10 Board for being willing to review our proposal and consider
11 allowing the review (inaudible). Yeah, yeah, we do
12 understand that that is a sensitive information and we
13 appreciate, we appreciate your attention.

14 So the purpose of our study is to look at the
15 impact of utilizing secure detention for truancy. And so
16 when I refer to security detention, what I am referring to
17 is, holding a youth in a locked state facility that is
18 typically utilized for youth who have either been charged
19 with or accused of or convicted of a delinquent offense. In
20 the state of Colorado, we do occasionally use secure
21 detention --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A delinquent offense.
23 Are we talking about the compulsory attendance law which,
24 and correct me if I'm wrong, it's at age 16?



1 MS. WAAS: Yes. I'm not referring to truancy
2 as a delinquent offense. What I'm trying to explain is what
3 security detention is. That security detention is typically
4 utilized to hold youth who have been accused of a delinquent
5 offense or convicted of a delinquent offense but that same -
6 -

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But not violating the
8 compulsory and violating compulsory attendance is not a
9 delinquent offense?

10 MS. WAAS: It is not. It is considered a
11 status offense. And so a status offense is something that
12 you could be, that is not legal to do if you are under the
13 age of 18 but would be fine to do if you are over the age of
14 18. So if, for example, you're 18 years old and you are
15 enrolled at the University of Colorado, and you chose not to
16 go to school, no one is going to come and tell you that you
17 have to go to those classes that you are involved in. It's
18 a different situation if you were under the compulsory age
19 of school.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Compulsory attendance
21 age in Colorado is 16, is that correct?

22 MS. WAAS: I believe that is correct.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we're really not
24 dealing with --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She's just explaining



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- what I characterize
2 as truancy, which is violation of the Compulsory attendance
3 ACT.

4 MS. WAAS: We are.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would you say that's a
6 status offense, not a delinquent offense?

7 MS. WAAS: In the state of Colorado, we
8 judges, and when I use that term we judges, have the leeway
9 to use secure detention as a sanction for youth who have
10 court oversight for truancy, if they are not obeying a court
11 order to attend school. So there is a, there is a valid
12 court order exemption to the OJJDP ACT which I can assure
13 you that Meg could give you extraordinary level of detail
14 on, if you would like. But the OJJDP ACT essentially says
15 you can not hold youth in secure detention for a status
16 offense but there is an exemption. So if a judge has said,
17 you must do this and there is a valid court order in place
18 and the and the youth has been found in contempt of court
19 for not following that court order, then the judge can put
20 the youth in secure tension for a status offense which
21 truancy counts as a status offence.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't mean to hold
23 this up, but if a judge ever does that just for violation
24 compulsory attendance law or other extenuating crimes or, or
25 offenses.



1 MS. WAAS: Judges do --

2 MS. WILLIAMS: I can answer that. I can
3 answer that. Senator Meg Williams, I'm with the Division of
4 Criminal Justice, and I'm responsible for monitoring towards
5 the (inaudible) I don't have my number in front of me so
6 (inaudible) several years ago we had over 480 truants
7 (inaudible) detention because of truancy. There was like no
8 other criminal reason. There was no delinquent behavior.
9 They were just delinquent reasons for them to be delayed.
10 When we went in to check from that record, the reason why
11 that juvenile was placed in detention was because they
12 failed to abide by a court order. Generally, that court
13 order is he must attend school.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some district must be
15 looking for the ARB. Go ahead, I'm sorry.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's okay. So the goal of
17 this study is to understand what are the impacts of
18 utilizing secure detention for truancy. The reason why this
19 was brought to our attention, and we initiated the study, is
20 because Meg's office is responsible for oversight. For
21 ensuring that courts follow the legal process, if they are
22 going to use secure detention for status offenses. And she
23 was concerned that Colorado was using the valid court order
24 exemption, at rates that seemed higher than some other
25 states. And part of her job is to go out and inform judges,



1 and inform school districts, and inform local jurisdictions,
2 about whether or not, there are positive or negative impacts
3 of secure detention. But the reality was that, there was no
4 literature on that. So there -- there was no literature
5 looking at what's the impact of secure detention for
6 truancies -- for truant youth. There was literature looking
7 at low-risk delinquent offenders.

8 But when you have the conversation with
9 judges, they often will say, "Well, truants are not low-risk
10 delinquents." So that literature doesn't apply to them, or
11 that literature doesn't apply to Colorado. And Meg engaged
12 with us because she really felt that she needed the research
13 data to say, what are the impacts, whether positive or
14 negative, of using secure detention for truancy.

15 And so part of what we found when we started
16 the first phase of this study was, there was very little
17 that we really understood about youth who went to secure
18 detention for truancy. We didn't know how many youth had
19 court oversight for truancy. We knew how many were filed
20 on, but we didn't know how many have court oversight. So we
21 didn't even know what our denominator was, to say what
22 percent of youth ended up with a secure detention stay. We
23 didn't understand the characteristics of those youth. Were
24 they similar to the Colorado student population, were they
25 different from the Colorado's student population, was there



1 over-representation of minorities? So there were a lot of
2 basic questions that needed to be answered in the first
3 phase, before we even got to the second phase.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What is secure
5 detention?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So secure detention
7 means holding a youth in a state-operated, locked facility.
8 So a facility such as Mount Beauty Services Center, Lookout
9 Mountain, Platte Valley Youth Services Center, Mesa Youth
10 Services Center. These facilities are typically used to
11 house juveniles who have been either accused, or convicted
12 of, a delinquent offense, not a status.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But these aren't
14 facility schools, are they? These are -- these are --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there are facilities
16 schools there. But while you're being housed for truancy,
17 it's typically a short-term stay. So the educational
18 services you would receive are fairly limited.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One of the ways I laid
20 it and helped folks understand the juvenile system is that
21 detention centers are akin to what the adult go to jail. So
22 it's a -- it truly is a jail setting. There are cells for
23 the most part, and they are locked, and you cannot leave,
24 but they're generally for shorter periods of time. Versus
25 youth commitments is akin to adult prison. So they are



1 separated out. So when you think of detention, or juvenile,
2 it's similar to what you would find in an adult jail
3 setting. Only in the juvenile world, the school district
4 comes together to at least provide some educational
5 opportunities while the kids are detained. I hope that
6 helps.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So what do you consider
8 short periods?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm not finished.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So they're there, they
12 being held there, but they're not receiving -- it just
13 sounds like she just said something about they get some sort
14 of educational services provided.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Limited.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there are facility
17 schools in detention centers. However, when you're talking
18 about detention and not commitment, detention is typically
19 shorter stays. The facility is not doing educational
20 assessments to understand where that youth is currently at,
21 what, where, what instructional level they should be at
22 across different disciplines, because the youth is typically
23 there. You know, when you're talking about the juvenile
24 justice population. It's an average of 14 days, a median of
25 7 days that youth are there for a delinquent offense. For a



1 truant offense, I don't know that we could truly say what
2 that length of stay is. I couldn't off the top of my head.
3 So the -- the schools are doing their best to educate these
4 youth while they are there, but they do not have an
5 individualized plan for each of these students. And
6 usually, there's not much of any communication with the home
7 school about what is -- which of the student (inaudible) the
8 time frame is too fast.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just wanted to clarify
10 that they're not -- if they're in a facility of school for
11 detention, they're still getting some access to education.
12 Whether it's --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Maybe not.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, probably not.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The big plan or not,
16 they're, they're not just being held there. Usually. Maybe
17 sometimes, sometimes yes, sometimes no?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I think there are
19 -- if you're there over a weekend, you're not going to get
20 any educational services.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right, I understand
22 that.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you're there during
24 the summer, you may, or may not get educational services.
25 And depending upon behavior, if there are problems in the



1 classroom, they may be taking it out of the classroom. I
2 would not claim to be an expert on the educational services
3 that are offered.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's probably an
5 appropriate attempt.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are attempts to
7 ensure that they attend the classroom setting while they're
8 there.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I add that in recent
12 years, we have legislation that was passed that now limits
13 detention for this population of youth to a maximum of five
14 days. So I would say that within five days, they probably
15 are not getting education that would meet their needs
16 because they haven't even had a chance to get any material
17 then. So five days won't allow for real quality education
18 at that point.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Flores?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, but five days would
21 be traumatic for any child that age, and where are the
22 parents here?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh my gosh! Oh, God.
24 Can we kind of go on maybe with the explanation and then...



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no. I wanna, I -- I
2 -- I. I'm serious. Where are the parents here?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I understand you're
4 serious, but let's let the -- the presentation finish and
5 then we can make our comments and questions because we --
6 we're getting --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a question.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's the really big
9 question?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're getting mixed up,
11 we're getting a little...

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Why are the children on
13 the streets?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know what might be
15 helpful. Know that I think you actually -- we understand
16 your concern, and we think that actually that can contribute
17 to our ability to engage family better. We'll have a better
18 understanding of what's driving that behavior in the kids,
19 like with the court intervention. So we appreciate your
20 concerns. That's exactly why we're doing this. And we can
21 talk about how this study would really help us to address
22 some of those issues. And we just want to make sure you
23 understand the study.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So let me get this
2 straight. Secure detention that's used in Colorado is
3 limited to five days max. Is that correct?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the laws --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Towards (inaudible).

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Per -- per instance.
7 And so it depends how it's interpreted by the judge. So
8 even since that law was passed, we had sentences handed down
9 that were longer. If for example, the judge -- you'd every
10 -- so I told -- I ordered you to attend all of your classes.
11 You missed ten classes. I'm going to give you five days in
12 detention per class. So there is a limitation of five days.
13 However, there is some judicial interpretation and I'm not
14 saying that that is widespread that is interpreted that way.
15 I know that there have been couple of instances that I've
16 heard about that and interpret it that way. But there is a
17 limit. That all I want to say.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But this is just the way
19 the law is right now, and it's up to the judge to make that
20 determination. Now, let me go to this next step. Truancy
21 and secure detention study, phase one showed -- did you
22 already complete phase one?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we take completed
24 phase one and you have a copy of a back sheets that we
25 produced based upon phase one.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So you're asking
2 to continue on with phase two. Is this correct?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is correct.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And what kind of bothers
5 me is this point: secure detention for truancy increased
6 the likelihood of labor criminal filing. I'm sure you have
7 a lot of statistics about that, but boy, that's a pretty big
8 leap in my mind that it was the secure detention that
9 increased the leader criminal file.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it was one of several
11 factors that was associated with a higher likelihood of
12 criminal filing. It was not the only factor --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I see.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- that was associated.
15 So we looked for example, do they have a delinquent filing
16 in addition to that truancy filing. We looked at, for
17 example, do they have child welfare involvement or a
18 placement for child welfare, and did that increase the
19 livelihood of labor filing as well. So it was one of
20 several factors.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you've been
22 commissioned by the criminal justice system to produce this
23 report that judges will use this emphasis, correct?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the Division of
25 Criminal Justice works to ensure that Federal OJJ Plea Act



1 is appropriately enforced. So if for example, if you are
2 going to use secure detention for a status offense, are you
3 following the law to do it legally, and are you looking at
4 other options to ensure that's the best option in this
5 situation? The challenge that we have in Colorado is that
6 judges already do the best thing for the juveniles that come
7 in front of them. But juvenile court judges don't
8 necessarily have to have training in development, in
9 juvenile, or adolescent brain development and education.
10 And so a lot of judges are coming to the juvenile bench
11 without a lot of training in that area. So they need
12 information that they can use to understand what's best
13 practice. In this area, there is no information about
14 what's best practice with respect to secure detention. So
15 we do have some judges in the state of Colorado that we
16 strongly believe that secure detention is effective in, is
17 an effective tool in working with youth who are (inaudible).
18 They believe that, that it, the kids are going back to the
19 classroom because they don't come back to their courtroom.
20 They believe that it's a, a useful deterrence to make sure
21 that the next youth on the court docket goes to school
22 because they saw that the last youth went to secure
23 detention. And right now, there are no good data other than
24 our first phase one that say whether or not the use of
25 secure detention is beneficial or harmful to youth who are



1 (inaudible) . Does this help us achieve our goals, which
2 hopefully is that we get the youth reengaged in school and
3 ultimately graduating?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So -- and I don't mean
5 to be disrespectful but the details of the actual, "What it
6 is you're doing and what I feel about that it should be
7 taken back from this?" It looks like CDE has approved all
8 of our state requirements for phase two. And they've
9 already done phase one, which was in Colorado I'm assuming
10 too. And so --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry, I didn't mean to
12 interrupt. Phase one occurred in 2013. They received data
13 from us in 2014. So that was far before our current
14 processes are in place. So we don't know exactly what the
15 vetting was done at that point.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But the vetting from
17 this point forward, what we as the Board decided should go
18 forward CDE has approved their process to our requirements
19 now for our state. Is that correct?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is correct.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The purpose of phase two
23 is that while it fades when we are able to characterize who
24 are the current user you going to secure detention and are
25 they similar or different from youth with (inaudible), not



1 for secure detention. We are also able to see does going in
2 secure detention increase or decrease your risk, your risk
3 of later criminal filing? Does it increase or decrease the
4 likelihood in graduating? That study laid the groundwork.
5 However, many of the students were not old enough to
6 graduate by the time our study ended. So if you look at the
7 age of students in the sample, half of them are under 18 at
8 the time that the first study ended. If we received data
9 for the second study, we'd have over 12 percent that were
10 under 18 at the time of the study ended, which would give us
11 a lot better information on how likely is it for this
12 growing population to graduate, if they do this secure
13 detention versus they do not go secure detentions.

14 So we really have this comparable population,
15 where we have youth who all have court oversight for
16 truancy. And the judge has a lot of -- has total discretion
17 about whether or not they are going to go to secure
18 detention or not going to secure detention as a result of
19 complying or not complying with that court order. The other
20 thing is judges are concerned that perhaps we missed
21 something. We don't see any difference between those youth
22 who go to secure detention and those youth who do not go to
23 secure detention. Their demographics are exactly the same.
24 But the judges are convinced that there's something
25 different about them, that they'd only use it in the most



1 severe cases. And we have some helpless that -- and so
2 we're trying to do the second study to look further to say,
3 "Are there other things that tell us about the severity of
4 the truancy case, disparity problems in the family that
5 would allow us to say, "Okay, maybe it sees other issues and
6 not the secure detention that is accounting for the findings
7 we see, or maybe it is a secure detention in addition to
8 these other issues, or maybe just other."

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Ms. Faith, one more
10 question. How many years do we -- or this was -- how many
11 years are we looking at phase two before it's complete?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it depends on when we
13 receive the data. So as Stacey indicated, we received
14 (inaudible) approval for this study last July. We submitted
15 our application in September. We had hoped that by this
16 point, we be further along in our process. I would
17 anticipate that we would have our analyses done for the bulk
18 of the data within about nine months. That would be our
19 goal. We do have -- so we are compiling data from not just
20 CDE but from other state agencies. All of the other state
21 agencies have already agreed to provide their data. Either
22 we have it, or we have a signed data use agreement. We're
23 waiting on CDE's data because we really think that the
24 graduation piece is critical to understanding the impacts
25 and threw it in.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And if this does go for
2 a year, CDE does get to reevaluate this on a yearly basis.
3 Correct?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is correct.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan.

6 MS. MCCLELLAN: I just wanted to thank you
7 very much for bringing this before us. This is an issue
8 that I -- I represent the 6th Congressional District, and
9 this is an issue I've been doing a lot about at town halls,
10 and when I interact with constituents. So I specifically
11 value this data, and I hope that we will go forward for
12 years to come because I think it's really important.

13 I'm also curious to know what the costs are
14 of the detention, although those aren't born directly by the
15 Department of Education. It's a societal cost nevertheless.
16 And obviously, while the youth is in secure detention, they
17 cannot physically be in class at the same time. One would
18 hope that they would be and we -- that's an unanswered
19 question I know in many cases. But I think this is really
20 important for us to better understand, and I thank you for
21 doing this -- this research, and I look forward to more
22 information. It speaks directly to a concern that I hear a
23 lot in my district, particularly out of Aurora's. So thank
24 you very much.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. And -- and
2 your district is one that has used information from the
3 state. So the 18th judicial district, I think in judicial
4 district, sorry --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- as opposed to
7 congressional districts. So the 18th judicial district, use
8 -- used to use secure detention for truancy, a substantial
9 amount, and over a period of time. And they came to an
10 agreement between the judiciary, and the school district,
11 and -- and other stakeholders to stop using secure detention
12 for truancy.

13 But what the experience has been in Colorado,
14 locally, is that when the judges turned over, that education
15 has to start all over again. And the values of the
16 community have to be expressed and worked out all over
17 again, as you have any judge who may or may not have the
18 information that is factual to drive the decisions about
19 whether or not detention is going to be utilized.

20 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yeah. I -- I'm getting that
21 from my district, and I would even go so far as to classify
22 this as a hot topic in my district. It's a topic, a very
23 immediate and urgent concern for my constituents. So I
24 really appreciate it. Thank you.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we'll go ahead
2 and, and move on in the presentation, so you can see what
3 we're talking about more detail. This will show you the
4 phase one data that we provided previously as well as the
5 data that they're requesting for phase three. I would like
6 to point out a one distinction is that as it mentions, we
7 will be providing them with a mask say, said a student ID
8 number. That is something that's basically -- it'll be
9 redoubled and a -- a set of random numbers will be assigned
10 instead of each say, said CDE. We'll know who those
11 students are, and we'll be able to connect those, but the
12 researchers will not. That is pretty much the only
13 identifier -- direct identifier, that will be provided.

14 So there might be a question about whether or
15 not this is truly personally identifiable information.
16 However, under the law, they define it as anything that
17 could identify an individual student. And so we take a
18 pretty conservative approach, and we felt that the
19 demographic information plus the sensitivity of the issue
20 would necessitate it going through this process as opposed
21 to a different process. So as part of the RAP meeting,
22 these are the questions that we evaluated in terms of this
23 research. They're not all of them, but these were the most
24 pertinent ones. Will this research comply with laws and
25 city policy? The answer is yes. Provided that it makes it



1 through this process and that once a data sharing agreement
2 is signed, it'll be covered for that as well. We do have
3 the information to provide to them. We'll do our best to do
4 it within our resources. But we should be able to provide
5 it to them and we do have that data. The researcher does
6 have IRB approval, which is a good requirement of ours. And
7 then we asked ourselves, are there any concerns about the
8 data requested or any limitations on the data that we should
9 make? Aside from the determination to do the must say said,
10 we also worked with Tara and Meg to determine what exact
11 data they needed, and this data that we're providing now is
12 smaller than what they originally requested. And we were
13 able to work with them to refine that. I think we know the
14 answer to this first question. It is of a sensitive nature,
15 but the IRB approval does show that they -- the IRB
16 determined that there was no risk to human subjects through
17 this research. As for the potential and the benefits of
18 this to Colorado -- education in Colorado, I'll get and turn
19 it over to Tara who can go over what that could be.

20 MS. WAAS: Great. Well, thank you. So with
21 respect to improved conditions for students, for the
22 specific students who were in our truancy sample -- this is
23 not going to impact them. Most of those students are 18 at
24 this point in time. What we are looking at is the potential
25 to affect policies or laws that could affect and impact



1 future students. So is it the case that in Colorado, we
2 want to -- we want to secure detention as an option for
3 youth who have not committed in criminal offense, but have
4 committed a step -- a status offense are not going to
5 school? Is that a choice that we as a community and as a
6 state want to make? And do we understand the ramifications
7 of that choice on students?

8 So the research can really help us, and it
9 really makes office to help inform the conversation about
10 what are the community cost, what are the community benefits
11 if there are any of continuing to pursue the use of secure
12 detention for truancy. And Meg, I think, can speak to this
13 even better than I can make from the first phase instead.
14 He has had conversations with the chief justice. There --
15 there was -- I believe legislation that required the
16 judiciary to develop plans around truancy. Each local
17 judicial district had to have a plan for how they were going
18 to address truancy at the court level. And some of the data
19 from the first phase of the study was communicating with the
20 chief justice, (inaudible) to the other -- of the judicial
21 district around the state. It's also been used to inform
22 Senate Bill 94 coordinators.

23 So Senate Bill 94 is a statewide program.
24 They work with youth who are pre-educated. Sometimes,
25 although not usually, they work with youth on diversion as



1 well. They definitely work with pupils who are sentenced as
2 well, but those youth who are going through the court
3 process for truancy often end up working with Senate Bill 94
4 as well. And so we have made sure that we're communicated
5 to Senate Bill 94, who actually advocates to the court
6 whether or not they think secure detention is an appropriate
7 option in many cases. The coordinators have been requesting
8 information because they don't see secure detention as an
9 appropriate option for truancy. They would rather see youth
10 who are a risk to the community in secure detention as
11 opposed to youth who are not going to school in secure
12 detention. Meg, I wonder if you wanna speak to other ways
13 in which the research can, and will improve conditions for
14 students, and impact local practices.

15 MS. WILLIAMS: And that is what I was
16 speaking to earlier. I think the more that we understand
17 the term population and -- and the trajectory that they,
18 that they are on. So learning more about the need for this
19 it's like you know, when you're looking at the mental health
20 how the other things that contribute the more that we can
21 access this all and in the community agency if you really
22 are aspect of the issues to address those needs though. I'm
23 really hopeful that, the more that we understand that the
24 more that we do what we know the (inaudible) is working in a



1 fact is actually leading to up and about because I know that
2 you don't want to make, though sort of cool.

3 They want the kids to attain high school
4 education and (inaudible) get in impeding that possibility
5 work of them do issues may have to do with other conditions
6 within the home or within the unit that we might be able to
7 do differently. So I'm hoping that opens the door to that
8 collaboration that will help the school. And I do I think
9 some of the truancy and getting the other system to the
10 table so to open collaborative management programs that are
11 out at the Department of Human Services, which are costly
12 when everything you know, the school can't be the aspect on
13 everything and truancy is the any issue that is still beyond
14 just education. Let's work together on this, and I think
15 this study will help with us.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And one of the things
17 that Meg's office does is they also provide grants for
18 evidence-based problem solving courts around truancy to try
19 and reduce the use of security tension and to encourage the
20 exploration of other evidence-based practices that have been
21 tried either in Colorado or in other states and bring
22 communities together to talk about what are other practices
23 that could be used effectively to help students and families
24 return to the school system.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Dr. Flores, now's a good time.



1 MS. FLORES: Yes, I mean I -- I think that a
2 what is being done is very cruel and harm -- harmful to --
3 to students, not your study but what is being done by -- by
4 the Court and --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So do you -- do you
6 approve this study? Do you approve the study?

7 MS. FLORES: Well, no let me let me finish,
8 please. I think it's cruel, and I think it's harmful. I
9 think if we approve it, I think it will continue. So I'm
10 thinking --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) this study?

12 MS. FLORES: Wait a second, let me first
13 finish --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have a topic.

15 MS. FLORES: We have a topic. Yes, but I
16 think -- I think this is so awful -- this is so awful just
17 to even hear that this is happening. I really think that
18 even if it's five days, they should be getting some
19 education finding you to go to school, and you cannot just
20 detain children. These are children that are being jailed.
21 And this is awful and harmful. And I just don't think this
22 should be happening at all. And you don't even address how
23 parents are -- are part of -- of this of what's happening.
24 I mean, I really think it's if I say yes to this research, I
25 think it will continue.



1 We should be having other means by which we
2 help children attend school and putting them in jail is --
3 is just one step in, in keeping them in that, in that
4 system. And it's no wonder that we have so many people in
5 jail right now. This is awful. I never knew this happened.
6 This I -- in fact I am going to get involved to see that
7 this stops. So this has to stop.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I appreciate your
9 sentiment.

10 MS. FLORES: No, not your research but what
11 is happening?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I appreciate your
13 sentiment and I will.

14 MS. WILLIAMS: Can I speak to that?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Go ahead. Go ahead, Meg.

16 MS. WILLIAMS: This is Meg. I totally
17 understand. And I'm gonna say, commissioner -- is that the
18 right -- right way to -- to address you? I totally
19 understand how you are feeling, and can I tell you that the
20 first phase of this study to help us fight having this
21 information to drop from 97 kids last year in a nine-month
22 period called in detention to 15 this year. So the study is
23 actually is actually doing what you want to do, which is
24 it's helping us to eliminate the youth, because it's
25 providing actual research evaluations to tell the powers



1 that be this is not a good practice. So you -- by going
2 through the phase one, it's helped us quite a bit.

3 Phase two will not only help us continue that
4 message and -- and really make it even stronger, but I think
5 it will give us more information that will help us define
6 what we do instead to meet these families -- these kids and
7 families needs. We'll have a much better understanding of
8 the dynamics of these young people by virtue of that.

9 So I think that the study, it's not going to
10 encourage it. I think what it will do is give us more
11 evidence to say, "You need to find a different alternative."
12 And I think we're going to get there. I think we will find
13 that, that we will be -- we're at 15 now. We are -- we will
14 get there. And it's only through this study that -- and
15 your help with CDE in getting the data for phase one that we
16 were able to get down to 15. So I wanna say that it's
17 moving in the right direction, and I think we can get there
18 with the knowledge we will gain from this study.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Ms. Williams. Board
20 Member McClellan.

21 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes, I wanted to thank a
22 Board Member Flores for her passion. I know that echoes a
23 lot of the concern that I hear from my district, where this
24 is a hot topic. And I wanted to express that this study
25 should continue, because I think it's beneficial to our



1 understanding so that we can address this really important
2 issue that, that has taken on some urgency particularly in
3 my district. And with that in mind, I move that we approve
4 a continuation of this study.

5 MR. DURHAM: Pardon me, Madam Chair. This is
6 not an action item.

7 MADAM CHAIR: It was not an action item. It
8 can only become an action item if we all decide to do that.
9 This is an information item, and if there's anyone who
10 objects to voting on it today, we need to hold it over until
11 August. Do you object, sir?

12 MR. DURHAM: I'm not sure yet. I just have a
13 couple questions.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Please, go ahead with your
15 questions.

16 MR. DURHAM: One, what's of the cost study?
17 How much is -- is being paid and by whom?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. So the Division
19 of Criminal Justice is paying us approximately \$85,000 for
20 the purpose of doing this study, and that covers the costs
21 of institutional review board, data use agreements,
22 negotiating with various state agencies to acquire data,
23 safely handling those data, doing the analyses, writing up
24 that report, and -- and presenting it to various agencies.



1 MR. DURHAM: What's the per diem rate cost
2 for a -- per day of detention? Do you know? Or does anyone
3 know?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Meg, do you know that?
5 I haven't looked at that any time recently. I could get you
6 --

7 MS. WILLIAMS: Oh, I wish I could remember
8 the cost. I cannot remember, but per -- per day for sure.
9 You caught me off guard. I do not know, but it's
10 significantly higher than you would suspect.

11 MR. DURHAM: I suspect -- I suspect it's
12 high. Then finally, a couple of things. I think the -- the
13 problem I have with State more than anything else is I think
14 I know the answer, and -- and I -- which to me makes it a
15 waste of money. But you probably, in order to get the
16 answer -- and they're not likely to take our word for it, I
17 guess. But you're not really dealing with the root cause of
18 the problem.

19 I think over 40, around 40 years ago I voted
20 to -- to eliminate the Compulsory Attendance Law, which is
21 the root of the problem. You know, you're trying to make
22 kids do something that neither their parents or they are
23 interested in, and unless you impose real penalties they're
24 not going to go to school. This is a real penalty I don't
25 know whether it makes them go to school or not. I tend to



1 think it doesn't work either. The problem is in the
2 Compulsory Attendance Law, not in the -- the penalties that
3 don't work for -- to enforce it. And I know politically
4 you're not ever going to probably repeal the Compulsory
5 Attendance item -- Law, but it's as bad an idea today as it
6 was 40 years ago. But I -- I think -- I -- I -- I don't
7 know whether I -- I -- the bottom line with this study, I --
8 I just think that the answer is obvious. I don't think
9 secure detention works to achieve the result of getting kids
10 in school. And that's -- and I think that's what's going to
11 show. I should probably write down the findings and see if
12 I get close enough in a sealed envelope. Maybe the chairman
13 would give me a hundred dollars or something.

14 MADAM CHAIR: No.

15 MR. DURHAM: No? Okay. But I -- but I --
16 but the reason I -- the reason I wanted -- I wanted just a
17 few minutes on this is -- is I -- the Chalkbeat -- and --
18 and I'm -- I'm not a big fan of studies. I think there are
19 too many of them in education. They achieve too little
20 result, but this is one that Chalkbeat reported and actually
21 I think almost gave some credibility to, which is the -- and
22 I'm -- I'm -- I'm going to try and encourage you all to take
23 a look at it.

24 But it's -- it's a study that was done in
25 which says girls outnumber boys in charter schools, studies



1 -- studies shows. And so I thought, "Well, I'll -- that's
2 interesting. I'll read that," and you -- you kind of get
3 through it. And then you get down to the -- and this is, I
4 think, some of the absurd stuff that we study. So 50.7
5 percent of charter school students were girls compared with
6 48.8 percent of the students -- students in traditional
7 public schools. Small but noticeable gap. Well, that's --
8 that's -- that's a not only small gap, but I think likely
9 statistically insignificant.

10 MS. RANKIN: Not to mention charter schools
11 are public schools.

12 MR. DURHAM: Yeah. Not to mention the fact
13 they miss that basic premise, but you know, it -- it's just
14 -- it's just like we're really spending taxpayer dollars to
15 study stuff like this? And I think I put this almost in
16 that same category. I don't wanna -- I don't wanna object
17 if I'm the only one to the consideration of the study, but I
18 wanna vote no on the study.

19 MADAM CHAIR: But weren't you willing to
20 bring up?

21 MR. DURHAM: I'm willing to bring it up, yes.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

23 MS. RANKIN: But we're not paying for the
24 study, right?

25 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan.



1 MR. DURHAM: No, we're not.

2 MADAM CHAIR: We are not.

3 MR. DURHAM: No, we're not.

4 MS. RANKIN: So all we're doing is providing
5 the data?

6 MR. DURHAM: That's correct.

7 MS. FLORES: Okay.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan?

9 MR. DURHAM: And we -- we don't get
10 compensated for that. So we're doing it gratis.

11 MS. RANKIN: But I think you should
12 compensate us for that.

13 MR. DURHAM: Correct?

14 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member McClellan.

15 MS. MCCLELLAN: I -- I find myself
16 questioning how I can respond to Mr. Durham and that we find
17 ourselves in violent agreement that they're not going to
18 take our word for it. And this is an issue on which real
19 children actually really are suffering right now in -- in my
20 district, and I'm hearing about it quite a bit. So I think
21 it's necessary, and I'm highly supportive of it. And I -- I
22 hope that sways your vote.

23 MR. DURHAM: No, it won't sway my vote. But
24 --

25 MS. MCCLELLAN: Well, I tried.



1 MR. DURHAM: I -- I recognize when it's gonna
2 be six to one. So we ought to just -- we'll go ahead and
3 get it over with.

4 MS. MCCLELLAN: All right.

5 MADAM CHAIR: So is there anyone not in
6 agreement with our bringing it forward today, even though it
7 originally listed only as an information item? I think some
8 of us are feeling the compelling pressure to get on with
9 this study in order to provide the information to the
10 appropriate folks.

11 MS. FLORES: I think some of us are feeling
12 just outraged that this is happening.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I think, I totally -- I
14 totally agree with you. Well, I don't know where you've
15 been either, because we do know this has been going on.

16 MS. MCCLELLAN: Well, I can -- I'll be a
17 motion - I'll motion if that would be all right.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Probably it would be better
19 than what just kind of --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There you go.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

22 MS. MCCLELLAN: I move to approve the request
23 from the Colorado Division of Criminal Justice to use
24 student PII for research on the impact of secure detention
25 for truancy.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Do I have a second?
2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.
3 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Any more comments?
4 Would you call the vote, please.
5 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham.
6 MR. DURHAM: No.
7 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.
8 MS. FLORES: No.
9 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.
10 MS. GOFF: Yes.
11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.
12 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.
13 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member -- or McClellan.
14 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.
15 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.
16 MS. RANKIN: Yes.
17 MS. RANKIN: Board Member Schroeder.
18 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.
19 MS. CORDIAL: Okay. This is four to three.
20 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.
21 MS. FLORES: Do we need to have 100 percent
22 for this to be --
23 MR. DURHAM: No, no.
24 MS. CORDIAL: I'm sorry. Vote of two -- five
25 to two.



1 MS. FLORES: -- well, maybe I don't know.
2 I'm just so -- this is just so jarring. I mean, I --

3 MS. MAZANEC: This subject matter is jarring,
4 but their subject matter, they're trying to study this
5 (inaudible).

6 MS. FLORES: The subject matter.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Dan -- Dill -- I just
8 renamed you.

9 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

10 MR. DURHAM: I think you wanna vote yes.

11 MS. FLORES: Okay. I'll change my vote to --

12 MR. DILL: I believe -- I believe that the
13 motion -- that the -- the motion was properly voted on and
14 passed. You had unanimous consent to bring it up.

15 MADAM CHAIR: That's what I mean, unanimous
16 consent, okay.

17 MR. DILL: Even though two members then vote
18 -- voted against it, they did consent to have the vote at
19 this meeting.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Excellent.

21 MR. DILL: Right.

22 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Mr. Dill.

23 MS. MAZANEC: So what was the -- what was the
24 final count?

25 MS. RANKIN: Six to one.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Five.

2 MS. CORDIAL: Five to two.

3 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, five-two?

4 MS. CORDIAL: Five to two.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Of course.

6 MS. FLORES: Oh, what?

7 MS. MAZANEC: So are you a yes now?

8 MADAM CHAIR: What's your vote, Val?

9 MS. FLORES: Wait a minute. Wait a minute.

10 MR. DURHAM: Oh, it's six to one.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's six to one.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I was gonna say, she

13 voted for it, I thought.

14 MR. DURHAM: It's six to one, yeah.

15 MS. FLORES: Yeah, but -- but I think one of

16 the things we need to do is we need to go to the legislature

17 and -- and really --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You go right on over

19 there, today.

20 MS. FLORES: Well --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Be my guest.

22 MS. FLORES: Please, don't make fun of me. I

23 think it -- I think we should be doing something about it.



1 MADAM CHAIR: I appreciate that. I think we
2 all are very upset about this and have been. This is how we
3 hurt kids.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I'll just close
5 things up with next steps, and thank you guys for voting on
6 this, and -- and approving it. What we'll do next is we'll
7 work with the researchers to set in place a data sharing
8 agreement that will cover all the requirements of laws, as
9 well as our best practices for the privacy and the security
10 of the data. And then, we'll provide the data.

11 As mentioned, we do an annual review of our
12 data sharing agreements in order to ensure that we're still
13 on all the right footing. We'll go ahead and do that. And
14 then once the data has -- or the research has been
15 completed, we'll get a copy of the results. And then, we
16 will -- this -- the researchers will destroy the data on --
17 according to the timeframe listed in this data sharing
18 agreement, and we'll confirm that that has been completed.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you very much, folks.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Bye Meg, thank you.

23 MS. WILLIAMS: Thank you all very much for
24 considering this. Thank you, thank you.



1 MADAM CHAIR: So folks, we are going to stand
2 in adjournment. Oh, no. We got two more things.

3 MR. DURHAM: I'll move right on 15.13.
4 Questions I had have been answered. And it was on the --
5 removed from the consent agenda. I don't think there's a
6 problem with it.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Are there any objections?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, second.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, oh, what? You what?

10 MADAM CHAIR: Do we need to call the vote?

11 MR. DURHAM: To just approve.

12 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Okay.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Would you like me to call the
14 roll?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, sure.

16 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham.

17 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

18 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

19 MS. FLORES: Yes.

20 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff. It's --

21 MS. GOFF: What are we voting on, please?

22 MADAM CHAIR: A consent item that was pulled.

23 MS. GOFF: Was there an actual motion made?

24 MR. DURHAM: Yes.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Does that mean we're gonna vote
2 yes on before we pulled up the consent agenda?

3 MS. GOFF: Yeah, I just kinda like to know
4 what --

5 MS. CORDIAL: Sure, just one moment. It's to
6 -- it's to --

7 MS. FLORES: To -- to remove the item from
8 the agenda that because the item that was taken off for
9 consent so it -- because we've already discussed it.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Sorry?

11 MADAM CHAIR: The item was removed from --

12 MS. GOFF: If you have a motion, please re-
13 read it to me.

14 MS. CORDIAL: It's to approve the Denver
15 teacher residency authorization request of its special
16 education generals, ages 5 through 12 endorsement program,
17 as set forth in the published agenda.

18 MS. GOFF: Yes.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

20 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan.

22 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

23 MS. RANKIN: Board Member Rankin.

24 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Schroeder.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. So I would like to move
2 that we approve the waiver request from state statutes by
3 Douglas County School District on behalf of Challenge of
4 Excellence Charter School.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Call the roll, please.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Durham.

8 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores.

10 MS. FLORES: Yes.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

12 MS. GOFF: Yes.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

14 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member McClellan.

16 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

18 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

19 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Great. Thank you.

22 MADAM CHAIR: So we will stand in adjournment
23 until the next regular meeting of the Colorado State Board
24 of Education, which is scheduled for August 16th. We will
25 not have a Board meeting in July.



1 I wanna encourage everybody. Please, have a
2 great summer. I also want to thank in particular my
3 colleagues for the incredible amount of work that we've done
4 this last six months. I don't think people know how -- how
5 much there was, except some of the folks in the room. And I
6 thank you very much. Same to staff and to our commissioner
7 for your hard work and your leadership for the last six
8 months, to the school districts that also stepped up to a
9 new and not necessarily happy event, but did an absolutely
10 great job, and to wish Tony Godspeed. Hammer.

11 (Applause)

12 (Meeting adjourned)



1 C E R T I F I C A T E

2 I, Kimberly C. McCright, Certified Vendor and
3 Notary, do hereby certify that the above-mentioned matter
4 occurred as hereinbefore set out.

5 I FURTHER CERTIFY THAT the proceedings of such
6 were reported by me or under my supervision, later reduced
7 to typewritten form under my supervision and control and
8 that the foregoing pages are a full, true and correct
9 transcription of the original notes.

10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
11 and seal this 25th day of October, 2018.

12

13 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

14 Kimberly C. McCright

15 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

16

17 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

18 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

19 Houston, Texas 77058

20 281.724.8600

21

22

23

24

25