



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
February 12, 2014, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on February 12, 2014,
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Paul Lundeen (R), Chairman
Marcia Neal (R), Vice Chairman
Elaine Gantz Berman (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)
Angelika Schroeder (D)



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The meeting will come
2 back to order. The next item on the agenda is
3 consideration of an interim assessment for use with the
4 READ Act. Mr. Commissioner.

5 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Pati,
6 I'll go ahead and turn it over to you, I believe, and
7 we'll go through the process that we did on these
8 assessments as well as the appeals. So you go ahead.

9 MS. MONTGOMERY: Good morning, Mr. Chairman.
10 I think it's still morning.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good morning it is.

12 MS. MONTGOMERY: You are receiving screen
13 shots from part of an assessment that we're going to show
14 you later in our presentation.

15 Okay. As you know -- sorry. So as you
16 know, the READ Act requires the use of an interim
17 assessment to determine if a student has a significant
18 reading deficiency. This year, schools can choose to
19 continue to use one of the currently approved interim
20 assessments -- DIBELS, DRA2, or PALS -- or may begin,
21 upon approval of the Board today, to use one of the
22 recommended assessments.

23 Also as a reminder, once a student has been
24 identified with having a significant reading deficiency
25 on an interim assessment, the READ Act requires that a



1 teacher use a diagnostic assessment to determine the
2 specific area of reading difficulty that the child may be
3 having.

4 The READ Act also gives districts the option
5 of using a summative assessment in grades K through 2.
6 At the March 2013 State Board meeting, the list of
7 diagnostic and summative assessments was approved. This
8 past December, we brought to the State Board seven
9 English assessments and three Spanish assessments for
10 recommendation to be part of the approved interim
11 assessment list.

12 We would like to assure you that the process
13 we have undertaken for this recommendation has been
14 thorough, transparent, and included involvement from the
15 field. Prior to September, we brought together a group
16 of field experts to help create the rubric that was used
17 for this process. In September, vendors submitted that -
18 - those assessments for our consideration. In October
19 and November, the review committee met to review the
20 assessments.

21 It should be noted that this review
22 committee was comprised of teachers, literacy
23 specialists, higher education, and assessment experts,
24 who submitted an application to be a part of this review
25 process. This past December, we brought to you the



1 results of that review process. Since our last meeting,
2 three vendors appealed those recommendations, and in just
3 a minute we will review that appeal process with you.

4 So we are here today to present to you our
5 final list of recommended interim assessments for your
6 approval vote.

7 This is a list of the 14 English assessments
8 reviewed. I'll just review them quickly. Benchmark
9 Assessment System, published by Heinemann; ISIP Early
10 Reading, published by Istation; Diagnostic Online Reading
11 Assessment, published by Let's Go Learn; MAP, published
12 by Northwest Evaluation; PALS, by PALS Marketplace;
13 Classworks Reading, by Curriculum Advantage; i-Ready, by
14 Curriculum Associates; and DIBELS Next, by Cambium
15 Learning; FAST, University of Minnesota; aimsweb,
16 Pearson; STAR Reading Enterprise, published by
17 Renaissance Learning; STAR Early Literacy, Renaissance
18 Learning; Developmental Reading Assessment, by Pearson
19 Education; and Strategic Teaching and Evaluation of
20 Progress, known as STEP, by the University of Chicago.

21 This is the list of Spanish assessments
22 reviewed, and because my Spanish is not the best I will
23 not read those.

24 MS. NEAL: Jane can read them for us.

25 MS. MONTGOMERY: Dian? Oh, sorry.



1 The outcome of the list, or the recommended
2 assessments, are here. They include -- of the
3 assessments reviewed, this is what we would like to
4 present to you. They include aimsweb; Dynamic Indicators
5 of Basic Early Learning Skills (DIBELS Next); the
6 Formative Assessment System for Teachers (FAST); i-Ready;
7 ISIP Early Reading Station, Istation; Phonological
8 Awareness Literacy Screening (PALS; and STAR Early
9 Literacy Enterprise, which was combined with STAR Reading
10 to form STAR Early Learning, and that is one of our
11 recommended. Those two tests were bundled to create a
12 new assessment.

13 MS. PRESTWICH: I actually just noticed a
14 typo on that previous slide, so I want to be clear that
15 DIBELS is Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy
16 Skills. It says Learning, so I want to make sure we're
17 approving the right assessment, if it gets approved.

18 The next slide shows seven English
19 assessments that were not recommended through the review
20 process. We notified all vendors and they were given the
21 opportunity to appeal the decision within 14 days of
22 receiving notification from the Department. The
23 Department had 30 days to respond to those appeals.
24 We've summarized, in this slide, the reasons why the
25 assessments were not recommended, and the full review



1 results are actually posted on the website as well.

2 Five Spanish assessments were also not
3 recommended. Again, we've summarized on this slide the
4 reasons why these Spanish assessments were not
5 recommended by the committee, and a full review results
6 were posted on the website as well. You will recall that
7 a Spanish assessment had to first pass the review for an
8 English assessment before it could be recommended for
9 approval in Spanish. And these are the remaining Spanish
10 assessments that were not recommended.

11 Regarding the review process, all vendors
12 were notified of the committee's decision and given 14
13 days to appeal. Three vendors appealed on behalf of
14 their assessment -- Let's Go Learn, for Diagnostic Online
15 Reading Assessment, or DORA; Pearson, on behalf of
16 Developmental Reading Assessment 2nd Edition, DRA2; and
17 NWEA, on behalf of Measures of Academic Progress, MAP and
18 Measure of Academic Progress for the Primary Grades, MPG.

19 A small group from the original review
20 committee was brought together to review those appeals.
21 We ensured that the appeal committee was made up of
22 reviewers with the most in-depth knowledge and experience
23 of literacy, assessments, and also psychometrics. The
24 outcome of the appeals remained consistent with the
25 original reviews.



1 Today you will vote on the recommended
2 assessments. The Department will conduct an additional
3 review prior to 2016, and remember that districts have
4 until July 2016 to transition to using at least one of
5 the newly approved interim assessments. So they may
6 continue, based on what's included in the law, using the
7 currently approved assessments -- DIBELS, DRA, and PALS -
8 - through July 2016.

9 And now we'd like to show you an example or
10 some screen shots from one of the assessments that's a
11 new recommendation to the list.

12 Oh, we did have a place for questions.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: There will be.

14 MS. PRESTWICH: Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We've got this big paper
16 handout --

17 MS. PRESTWICH: I'll keep going.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- if you want to just go
19 through that.

20 MS. PRESTWICH: Yeah, while Bizy looks for
21 it.

22 So the first slide you see, in the purple,
23 is a kindergarten-level question. This is actually the
24 assessment i-Ready. You'll notice that the assessment
25 offers both auditory and visual supports, so students can



1 hover over that speaker icon and the program will read
2 the items to the student. This helps early readers,
3 English language learners, and students with special
4 needs. This support changes as the questions advance, so
5 we would expect later on that as a child acquires reading
6 skills that we no longer read the text to them, right.

7 So as the questions advance you'll see
8 higher-level questions. This first one is an example of
9 rhyme. On the second slide, in green, you'll see an
10 example of another lower-level question for children in
11 those earliest stages of reading. You'll see that the
12 question also assesses one of the foundational skills
13 from our standards, whether or not a child can match
14 letters to their very basic, most common sounds.

15 This is an example of a computer-adaptive
16 assessment. Three of the assessments that we are
17 recommended are computer adaptive.

18 Here is an example of a higher-level
19 question -- the slide is orange -- that requires a
20 student to read informational text and then answer a
21 question. Again, you'll see the standard that is
22 assessed. And the fourth slide asks a student to read
23 text and then answer a question about the characters in
24 the story. And again, as you see, as the text -- or the
25 expectations get higher for the student then you no



1 longer have that icon where the child can have the text
2 read to them. So it's an expectation for reading
3 comprehension rather than listening comprehension.

4 And then you'll see an example of a student
5 profile report that a teacher would get, and this will
6 provide the majority of the information that teachers
7 would need to create their READ plans. The reports
8 starts with overall performance for a student, based on
9 nationally criterion-referenced scale scores, that scores
10 that we use to identify a significant reading deficiency.
11 And so you would see, for this student, based on his
12 score of 357, that Jay would classified as having a
13 significant reading deficiency because his cut score or
14 his score falls below the cut score of 372.

15 And then you can look at Jay's results and
16 see that he tested out of phonological awareness, which
17 is that very first area without a bar, but he's still
18 struggling in all other domains of reading. So the
19 teacher can quickly see which components of reading will
20 need to be addressed.

21 And then in the next report we get more
22 information. It sort of digs deeper because this is
23 actually on the approved diagnostic list as well, so we
24 get more diagnostic information for this student, and for
25 each domain. And the report will tell the teacher what



1 the child can actually do and the next steps, and these
2 can be cut-and-pasted directly into a READ plan if the
3 teacher finds that these instructional recommendations
4 are most relevant.

5 And then this final slide is a sample report
6 from i-Ready that shows all of the students in a
7 particular classroom. So it's a class profile chart, and
8 it shows the overall and domain-specific scores for each
9 student in the class. This second-grade class, you can
10 see, has been resorted based on performance in the
11 phonics domain only, so the teacher can sort based on
12 different domains, to support the teacher in making
13 instructional groups.

14 And as we conclude the presentation we want
15 to acknowledge that you have a very important decision to
16 make, and we recognize that some schools and districts
17 may be required to make a change over the next two years,
18 based on the decision that you make today. We do believe
19 that the decision will be good for all students in
20 Colorado and will give districts more choice than what
21 they actually have currently.

22 Thank you. We will take questions.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions of the staff?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Help me figure
25 out what I'm hearing from others versus what we're



1 talking about. What is the assessment that -- I think
2 it's DPS and Boulder --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: DRA2.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- DRA2, and that is
5 one that we are still not defining as adequate. And the
6 reason is -- I was going to say, I needed to have this
7 organized before -- what I'm hearing as opposed to --

8 MS. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Chairman.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. This is a crux
10 question.

11 MS. MONTGOMERY: Okay. And it is. You're
12 right. One of the biggest issues -- and I will tell you
13 that the appeal process was very good for us because
14 there were some things that we realized were -- that it
15 performed in some areas better than we had thought, once
16 we brought assessment to people. And, however, one of
17 the biggest items with DRA2 is that it does not use a
18 progress monitoring in kindergarten.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And what does that
20 mean, exactly?

21 MS. MONTGOMERY: So you cannot --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Get granular for me,
23 please.

24 MS. MONTGOMERY: -- you cannot regularly
25 check the progress of students every two weeks in



1 kindergarten, like all of the other assessments do. So
2 if a student is behind in kindergarten we have no way of
3 identifying how quickly they are catching up. And we
4 know that kindergarten is the most critical area. You
5 can catch a student up in reading, in kindergarten, at a
6 much rapid rate because there's less skills and
7 instruction that needs to be done. So we can identify,
8 or we can catch students up so much quicker in
9 kindergarten. If we do not have a regular progress
10 monitoring tool we don't have evidence that shows how
11 they're doing.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How long do these
13 assessments take a kindergartener?

14 MS. MONTGOMERY: All of these assessments?
15 Well --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would expect the
17 first assessment to be a bit longer, and then the
18 subsequent monitoring ones to be shorter, but what are we
19 talking about?

20 MS. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Chairman.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

22 MS. MONTGOMERY: Yes, that is accurate.

23 Obviously, in kindergarten, it takes less time to give
24 the full assessment because there are, as I mentioned,
25 are less skills assessed. In kindergarten, I would --



1 and I am just guessing this -- most of these assessments,
2 including DRA2 in kindergarten, would take 20 to 25
3 minutes. DIBELS, probably, and PALS and i-Ready and the
4 others take less time than that. So it is a more lengthy
5 test than the others.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So we have just -- may
7 I? I'm sorry.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. Go ahead.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have districts that
10 have been using these. It seems to me that the vendor
11 could actually accommodate this new requirement if it
12 wished to. Is that right?

13 MS. PRESTWICH: Mr. Chairman, yes. So
14 that's really the intent of doing another review before
15 the law mandates that people make that switch in July of
16 2016. So our intent is to do at least one more review
17 over the next two years, so that vendors can respond to
18 the concerns that we have related to the new requirements
19 through the READ Act, and possibly make revisions to
20 their assessments and then be reconsidered.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm sorry.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go and then I want to
23 follow up on the word "requirement."

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, and the
25 monitoring, where is that required? Is that required by



1 us or is that required by the legislation?

2 MS. MONTGOMERY: The statute does say for
3 students that are behind, the progress -- more frequent
4 progress monitoring should occur.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that -- those are
6 the words? There is no specified --

7 MS. PRESTWICH: Mr. Chairman, and you also
8 approved in the State Board rules. So in the State Board
9 rules there's a note about students identified with a
10 significant reading deficiency being monitored more
11 regularly, or more often.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it's not two weeks,
13 right?

14 MS. PRESTWICH: It doesn't give a specific
15 time frame.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Time frame? Okay. Is
17 there no monitoring in DRA? I'm sorry. I just -- I need
18 to get in the weeds on this one in order to understand
19 better what we're doing. Is there no progress monitoring
20 in this one -- in these three that we don't think are
21 ready for prime time, or is there just not enough
22 monitoring?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

24 MS. PRESTWICH: Mr. Chairman, so the results
25 of the appeal, the committee noted that weekly progress



1 monitoring was not a requirement. However, multiple
2 forms were required for the purpose of progress
3 monitoring. The kindergarten word analysis tasks do not
4 include multiple forms for that purpose.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

6 MS. PRESTWICH: There's actually only one
7 form of the word analysis task, so the teacher, the
8 kindergarten teacher would have to use the same form
9 every time that he or she chooses to progress monitor,
10 which would make the results less reliable and valid,
11 because you're using the exact same test.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could districts create
13 this monitoring system?

14 MS. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Chairman, I suppose the
15 districts could create a progress monitoring, but we
16 would hope that districts are using the same rigor of
17 validity and reliability that any assessment they're
18 giving has, has established. So even though,
19 theoretically, yes, I would question the rigor and
20 reliability of a school-made assessment.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Unless they run it by
22 the Department, for example, the experts in the
23 Department or some other group, or your committee group
24 of experts. Would that not -- you know, I'm hearing a
25 real strong support for some of these because they've



1 been used often and the teachers are familiar with them.
2 I kind of get that it's a pain to start all over and to
3 have a completely different testing system, because of
4 all the training and the timing that goes with it. So
5 I'm thinking about what are the modifications? One
6 modification certainly is on the part of the vendor, to
7 get with the program. Did you hear any feedback from
8 them that says we want to continue to serve these
9 districts that use us and we'll add this?

10 MS. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Chairman, we did not
11 hear that specifically from a vendor. One would hope, as
12 Dr. Prestwich mentioned, that they do have a year to make
13 -- two years -- to make those accommodations, and we
14 would think that they would, and that they would come
15 back again for another review. So the hope would be that
16 districts, if they want to, could continue to use that
17 while that is being accomplished.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So, to this point, I want
19 to get to a fine point here. What are we approving?
20 We're approving a list that can be amended, and what is
21 our process for amending, what does the statute allow
22 for, et cetera?

23 MS. MONTGOMERY: So the list that you are
24 approving would go into effect by July of 2016. They
25 would have to be choosing from one of the seven on that



1 list. However, we have agreed that we would do one more
2 review process between now and that time. We haven't put
3 --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When? When?

5 MS. MONTGOMERY: We have not yet put a
6 specific date on that.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. And this agreement
8 is just the Department saying, to whomever, and this
9 complies with statute.

10 MS. PRESTWICH: Mr. Chairman, the law
11 actually only says that the Department will review new
12 assessments regularly, so it doesn't give a specific time
13 frame. It doesn't say annually. Just that we would
14 continue. Because new assessments do, you know, come
15 out.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. And so I think we
17 have public comment that might enlighten, you know,
18 further. So let's -- if we don't have -- we do have
19 specific questions here? I'll let you guys guide me as
20 to whether you want to hear public comment and then come
21 back to additional questions or whether you want to
22 continue with questions.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can go --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Say that again. Do you
25 want to --



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: She can go either way.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can go either way.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'd like to make a comment.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. Go ahead, Deb.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I think just because it
6 happens to be an area that I'm pretty familiar with, and
7 I'm very familiar with almost all these assessments and
8 have given many of them, I think one of the confusing
9 pieces is the word "interim." And so the word "interim"
10 suggests, hey, let's have lots of assessments. Let's not
11 worry about, you know, if something doesn't meet the
12 letter of the law. People can use whatever assessment
13 makes sense. If they've used it for years and they like
14 it, what's the problem? The problem with that is that
15 the interim assessment is actually being used as the
16 summative assessment and it -- the money is tied to the
17 interim assessment.

18 So the question is, we've had Colorado Basic
19 Literacy Act for over a decade, and I was very involved
20 in administering it, and we never could figure out if it
21 made a difference. And there was a tight \$19 million
22 tied to it, and it served over 300 schools in the state.
23 And the schools assembled bodies of evidence and
24 assessments that were very hard to hold schools
25 accountable for in terms of achievement. Why? Because



1 they weren't valid and reliable.

2 And so from a psychometric perspective if we
3 are holding districts accountable for gains, if money is
4 tied to students, and if we're trying to address the
5 literacy issue, then it seems to me that if we -- if we
6 review these assessments for validity and reliability and
7 their ability to give teachers good information for
8 instruction, it seems to me we should choose the best
9 assessments we can, if that's our approach to addressing
10 literacy.

11 And a law was passed to address it through
12 the READ Act. We had people all across the states
13 looking at the psychometric adequacy of these
14 assessments. It seems to me that their recommendations
15 hold up quite well because there's a lot out there on
16 specifically DRA2 and its technical adequacy and validity
17 and reliability.

18 So I appreciate the detailed processes you
19 went through to get this list figured out, and the
20 legitimacy behind it. I also understand the districts
21 who have used it for a long time and don't want to
22 change. But I would say they've got two years to do it.
23 The vendor is Pearson, which is a huge behemoth in
24 education and has fully the -- the resources to adjust
25 the test if they so chose, so that they could continue to



1 be used in Colorado. And so I guess I support the list,
2 because I think that it gives teachers the kind of
3 information they need to address student achievement in
4 reading, because it's based on the components that
5 comprise raising student achievement.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So comment, or -- we have
7 a public comment. Bill Good, if you want to -- Goodwin -
8 -

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Bob.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- Bob, I'm sorry. If
11 you want to come, introduce yourself, we'll take the
12 public comment out of order, which means you're living by
13 the rules of three minutes, and then if Board members
14 have questions we'll let you stay at the podium and
15 answer those questions.

16 MR. GOOD: To keep in three minutes I'm
17 going to do a bit of reading here, so I'll try to
18 maintain eye contact.

19 Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board,
20 Commissioner Hammond, my name is Bob Good and I'm
21 speaking on behalf of the students and staff of Denver
22 Public Schools in support of adding the DRA2 and the EDL2
23 to the list of approved interim assessments in support of
24 the READ Act. I want to elaborate on the written
25 comments we submitted last week and center on one primary



1 point -- where there are honest differences in opinion
2 about credible and widely-used tools, deference should be
3 given to school districts regarding their continued use.

4 The READ Act statute and rules require only
5 that the interim assessment chosen be reliable and valid
6 for assessing the five components of reading, and do so
7 three times a year. The evidence for the DRA and EDL is
8 described in detail in the technical manual and has been
9 seen with its use across the state and the country. It
10 was clear that there were differences of opinion that
11 existed among the reviewers as to how to evaluate the
12 evidence given the huge range in scores for the DRA and
13 EDL. While some reviewers assigned extremely low scores
14 that ignored submitted materials, other assigned scores
15 that were high -- as high or higher than several
16 assessments that have been recommended.

17 However, regardless of these differences,
18 CDE's own data demonstrate the validity given that the
19 percent of students identified as being significantly
20 below grade level by the DRA in 2013, was identical to
21 that of the DIBELS -- and these are actual data from CDE
22 for 2013.

23 With specific reference to many of our
24 English language learners, the EDL provides valuable
25 instructional information that helps our teachers and



1 students in reaching the goal of English literacy. CDE
2 and DPS are currently working together to learn more
3 about effective literacy instruction for all English
4 language learners, and the EDL is a pivotal tool in this
5 understanding. A forced shift in assessment will impose
6 an unnecessary burden on teachers working with some of
7 our most vulnerable students. Mandating a change in our
8 reading assessment will require a substantial financial
9 and human resources. Depending on specific agreements,
10 the cost of implementing a new assessment for our K
11 through 3 students alone could reach \$500,000, just for
12 the licensing, plus another \$200,000 for grades 4 and 5
13 to maintain continuity across our elementary schools.

14 Even though districts would have until 2016,
15 many of the purchasing and professional development
16 processes would need to be started relatively soon. DPS
17 has clearly seen successes with our literacy instruction.
18 Since 2010, our third-grade reading TCAP proficiency rate
19 has increased by 10 percentage point. Although we know
20 we have a long way to go we are certainly headed in the
21 right direction.

22 With so much going on in districts today a
23 forced change in assessment due primarily to differences
24 in opinion is not something we should be spending our
25 time and resources on. The widespread use of DRA2 and



1 EDL2 throughout Colorado and across the country -- and,
2 by the way, we have about 22 districts that use DRA2 for
3 reporting, which represents over 40 percent of the
4 children, and we have, for those districts not using it
5 for reporting makes it over half the kinds in Colorado
6 get a DRA administration. Across the country it's in the
7 millions and it's on, I think, half a dozen state lists.

8 The evidence is sufficient that they have
9 value and support. Please let us focus on developing
10 literacy of all of our students in a manner that is
11 credible and has shown results. We respectfully ask that
12 you add the DRE2 and EDL2 to the list of approved interim
13 assessments and let us continue to move our students
14 forward.

15 Thank you very much for your time.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, stay, and let me
17 be clear. State again your name and your position.

18 MR. GOOD: Oh, I apologize. I had that in
19 my notes and I didn't read it.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No problem.

21 MR. GOOD: My name is Bob Good. I work for
22 Denver Public Schools. I'm in the Teaching and Learning
23 Division.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine, questions?

25 MS. BERMAN: I have some follow-up questions



1 for you. In the previous discussion, the argument that
2 the staff is making, primarily, if I understand it
3 correctly, is that the DRA2 does not do progress
4 monitoring in the kindergarten. Can you comment on that?

5 MR. GOOD: So I think, number one, we would
6 argue it does through the word analysis tool. However, I
7 do want to make it clear that progress monitoring is not
8 a specific requirement of the statute or the rules for
9 interim assessments. So the requirement for interim
10 assessments is that they be given at least three times a
11 year, and the DRA2 meets that responsibility.

12 Now I would also argue, however, that we can
13 use the DRA2 for progress monitoring purposes, and those
14 data are not reported to the state. It's the end-of-year
15 results for the interim. And as Member Scheffel said
16 that it's effectively a summative use of that assessment.

17 MS. BERMAN: And does DPS currently use
18 DIBELS, and how do you -- how does that fit in?

19 MR. GOOD: So, in general, we do not use
20 DIBELS. There might be a few schools that still use it.
21 There's also some carryover in aimsweb. What we do after
22 we've identified students who are significantly below
23 level is identify specific interventions and assessments
24 that will be used to help monitor their progress. And
25 again, those specific programs are not required by rules



1 or statute.

2 MS. BERMAN: Okay. My third and my, right
3 now, last question, is we keep talking about what's in
4 statute and what's not in statute. Can you, from your
5 perspective, reflect on why you think DRA2 meets the
6 requirements of the statute?

7 MR. GOOD: The primary purpose of the
8 interim assessment under the READ Act is for the
9 identification of students who are reading significantly
10 below grade level and need to be placed on a READ plan.
11 That's the primary intent. The Board has already adopted
12 a list of diagnostics that get to the specific issues
13 that underlie the reading deficiencies. So the interim
14 assessments is strictly for placement or identification
15 and placement on a READ plan.

16 There does need to be additional information
17 that teachers need to gather to figure out how to make
18 progress with a student. That's not the primary purpose
19 of the interim assessment, as situated under the READ
20 Act.

21 MS. BERMAN: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for all your comments.
24 Could you speak to the reliability and validity
25 coefficients for the DRA2 and also the sample size on



1 which those coefficients are based, because that is a
2 specific excerpt from the law, as far as the interim
3 assessments.

4 MR. GOOD: Yes. It requires that there be
5 reliability and validity evidence. There are no -- my
6 understanding is there are no thresholds for either one.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: But there are thresholds, and
8 best practice --

9 MR. GOOD: Yes.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- suggests what an
11 acceptable reliability and validity coefficient is.

12 MR. GOOD: Typically in the mid 7's to low
13 8's. I can't speak specific --

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: To DRA2's --

15 MR. GOOD: Yes.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- coefficients and also the
17 sample size?

18 MR. GOOD: Yes. Yes. As far as the sample
19 sizes I can't speak to specifically what it is. I know
20 there are some current concerns for subgroups being just
21 a few hundred kids. But, remember, that -- so
22 reliability is of a score, not an assessment, and so as
23 we look at stability of scores over time one of the basic
24 principles under reliability is the extent to which we
25 can depend on the results. And we have found that we can



1 depend on them, that they relate very well to our
2 summative assessments in TCAP, and that they relate to
3 other information that we gather along the lines of
4 helping our kids progress, and other assessments that we
5 have.

6 That spills over into the validity argument.
7 The validity argument relates to the use and
8 interpretation of an assessment. And so, for example,
9 the classification accuracy, it is identical to the
10 DIBELS, 16.6 percent for both DRA and DIBELS.

11 So we have validity evidence. There are
12 about 60-some-odd pages within the technical manual of
13 the DRA that go over what this evidence is, so I can't
14 speak to that. I'm not representing the vendor.

15 I will admit that for all of these
16 assessments I think the evidence could probably be
17 improved, and that holds true for both the DRA and EDL.
18 But I will say, after, you know, almost 15 years of using
19 this, and given the success that we've had over the last
20 few years, we have seen a relationship. If we had seen
21 too many mismatches we'd be willing to switch, and we
22 would do it on our own, regardless of the presence of the
23 READ Act.

24 So I think we have enough internal evidence
25 to show that the data are both dependable and valid for



1 the use that we're implementing, and I think that that
2 speaks true to districts across the state and country.
3 We've got several million kids across the country who use
4 this.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I guess I would just say
6 that if we really want to get into the weeds on this
7 assessment we should pull a technical manual and read
8 from that portion on validity, reliability, and sample
9 size, and if what you're saying is that your experience
10 in DPS doesn't match the technical manual, I would like
11 to see your evidence, because I think those are the
12 issues about the DRA2 that have surfaced, based on
13 experts looking at the technical adequacy of the test.

14 MR. GOOD: I think the bigger issue that I
15 wanted to bring forth is I fully agree that this is a
16 debatable issue. I hope it is understood that there is
17 evidence. It's just whether or not the evidence is
18 sufficient. So, for example, the two review committees
19 that looked at the DIBELS, one gave it a perfect score,
20 one gave it a score lower than the DRA. I think it's --
21 I'm not arguing for the DIBELS to come off the list. I'm
22 not arguing for any of that. What I am arguing is that
23 when the information is debatable, and professionals can
24 disagree, deference should go to the districts who have
25 shown success and have confidence in the measures that



1 they are using. This is not a product that we sort of
2 made up in our garage. This is something that has been
3 used for years.

4 And I understand that there are differences
5 of opinion, but I would say that a district as large as
6 ours, the impact that we have seen, and the impact this
7 will cause is justification to add it for choice. We're
8 not forcing anybody to use it. We're just allowing those
9 who have been using it. And almost every large metro
10 district is using it, and it's one of the widest-used
11 across the state.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just have two more
13 comments. So I would just like to say that it's great to
14 have deference to districts, and I'm all for that, except
15 that when there's a law passed that says we haven't done
16 a lot with raising literacy achievement, we need a law
17 that really targets those kids with significant reading
18 deficiencies. In order to figure out if we're making
19 progress we need some assessments with good technical
20 adequacy. Let's make a list, based on experts in the
21 state that put together a rubric against those tests that
22 exist, and let's give folks a shot at finding an
23 assessment that can really drive instructional change.
24 That's what we're trying to do with the READ Act.

25 We tried with CBLA to leave it very open-



1 ended and it didn't function well. Everybody did their
2 own thing, with their own body of evidence, and when I
3 had to stand before an audit committee and say does this
4 work I had to say, "I don't know, because the tests that
5 are being used aren't technical adequate."

6 So I would say, I would hate to see us make
7 the same mistake with this new iteration of a bill that
8 was passed saying let's have valid and reliable
9 assessments based on decent sample sizes. So again, if
10 you want to reconsider this, we should pull the manual
11 and you could submit additional data on why you think
12 it's valid, reliable and such. But the technical manual,
13 which I have read, does not support technical adequacy
14 from any sense of best practice and psychometrics.

15 Secondly, do students in DPS use the STAR
16 Early Literacy?

17 MR. GOOD: Yes.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is that required in DPS of
19 students?

20 MR. GOOD: Well, it's required for students
21 -- to students for whom it's appropriate, yes.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Which would be students with
23 significant reading deficiencies?

24 MR. GOOD: No. It's -- so STAR Early
25 Literacy is the early literacy assessment. So students



1 who are below a certain scale score threshold need to
2 take it. By and large, we give it to all of our K-1
3 kids.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: K-1-2-3? K-1?

5 MR. GOOD: Well, and then you start
6 transitioning into STAR Reading --

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right.

8 MR. GOOD: -- at late first, early second.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: So is that assessment
10 required of the same population that would be taking
11 DRA2?

12 MR. GOOD: By and large, yes. There are
13 some concerns with our English language learners who are
14 instructed primarily in Spanish, which several thousand
15 students. So far we have not seen an appropriate product
16 other than EDL for that.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm saying that you have a
18 redundancy here in testing. I guess I would ask, just
19 from a practical standpoint, why you need the DRA2 if the
20 students with significant reading deficiency are already
21 taking STAR and it's the same population and yet you -- I
22 mean, in other words, you already a valid and reliable
23 instrument here with STAR Early Literacy.

24 MR. GOOD: So we --

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I'm questioning why --



1 MR. GOOD: Mm-hmm. It gives us different
2 information. One of the unique things about the DRA2 is
3 it's one of the few assessments out there and on the list
4 that actually require students to read to you in depth,
5 and it can be -- that information, from effectively a
6 running record, can be very easily segued into
7 instruction, and that's what our teachers do very often.
8 The STAR does give us very valuable information, and we
9 like to put the information together to make
10 instructional -- for instructional decisions. The data
11 align fairly well. They're not identical, and I would
12 argue that they're not completely redundant. But they
13 each give us important information, and that's why we
14 want to continue to be able to use the DRA.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: I would say you could
16 continue to use it but why would it be an interim
17 assessment if that validity and reliability are in
18 question?

19 MR. GOOD: Because we've seen success with
20 it. We've had three times the growth of the state in
21 terms of TCAP percentage in our third grade, and we're
22 happy -- not satisfied, but happy -- with that direction.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane, did you have a
24 question here?

25 MS. GOFF: Oh, yeah. I guess, Bob, would



1 you describe again, aside from the funding, the money
2 part of this, what would be the biggest impact on DPS if
3 this was to be changed? Know there are two years --
4 there's still two years to make adjustments, what would
5 be the biggest challenge?

6 MR. GOOD: So briefly I will describe two
7 significant impacts to that, outside of just money. In
8 just the business arrangement we have to issue an RFP, we
9 have to go through all the negotiations that would be
10 encumbered with making that kind of commitment. So that,
11 I'm estimating, would take a fair amount of time and, in
12 most negotiations now with vendors around large-scale
13 assessment projects you're looking at professional
14 development, because those kinds of requirements are
15 pretty large.

16 And then I'll segue into an instructional
17 piece, and that is depending on what is chosen, we would
18 have to figure out how to get teachers -- and we're
19 talking thousands -- to start thinking in ways of
20 interpreting the information they're getting out of the
21 new assessment. Again, it's not being critical of the
22 other assessments on the list. It's saying what kinds of
23 mind shifts and what kinds of new professional learning
24 would we have to develop our teachers, and how much time
25 would that take?



1 Another very important subset of this is
2 what are we going to do for our English language
3 learners? Quite frankly, we are not satisfied with the
4 manner in which the assessments on the list assess
5 English language learners, particular those who are
6 instructed in Spanish. So we would have to figure out
7 how we would shift that as well, in alignment with both
8 our instructional philosophy and our language allocation
9 guidelines, under our federal court order. It would be a
10 massive lift for us to shift at this time.

11 MS. GOFF: May I just --

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure, a follow-up
13 question.

14 MS. GOFF: Which English -- which Spanish
15 assessment are you using right now?

16 MR. GOOD: The EDL2 --

17 MS. GOFF: Okay.

18 MR. GOOD: -- which is the Spanish version
19 of the DRA2.

20 MS. GOFF: Right. Are you familiar with the
21 three here that are recommended? Have they been used,
22 tried, applied in the district, on any level?

23 MR. GOOD: So I'm most familiar -- but I
24 need to qualify how much "most" is. I know enough to be
25 dangerous. We looked into what PALS offers in terms of



1 Spanish literacy and assessment. The Spanish DIBELS is
2 not used broadly, that I'm aware of, in DPS, and I'm not
3 familiar with the ISIP being used. But I do know that
4 our literacy folks have looked into these in more detail,
5 and actually, we started to do this long before the READ
6 Act discussions asked us to do it. We do it periodically
7 just to see what's out there. One of the concerns with a
8 lot of Spanish stuff is it's just a translation. It's
9 not a true assessment of Spanish speakers. So we keep
10 our eyes open for that, in general, and we're quite
11 satisfied with the EDL2.

12 MS. GOFF: Okay. Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any other questions?
14 Angelika and then we'll come back to staff and wrap this
15 up.

16 MR. GOOD: Thank you very much for your time
17 and consideration.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think -- Angelika, did
19 you have a question for Bob?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: No.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Thank you very
22 much, Bob.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible.)

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, no. I'm -- let's
25 pick up on the issues that are out there. Does staff



1 want to respond?

2 MS. MONTGOMERY: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I have one other
4 question?

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Other -- and we
6 are taking public comment out of session, or out of
7 order. Three minutes, and we will pepper you with four
8 hours worth of questions.

9 MR. RAGLAND: All right. State Board
10 Members, Commissioner Hammond, my name is Luke Ragland.
11 I'm a vice president at Colorado Succeeds, which is a
12 nonprofit, nonpartisan coalition of business leaders who
13 are dedicated to improving the state's public education
14 system. On behalf of our membership, I'm here today to
15 voice our continued support for the READ Act and the
16 process it created to review and approve literacy
17 assessments.

18 By enacting the READ Act, Colorado took an
19 important step in ensuring that every child has the basic
20 literacy skills necessary to succeed. The READ Act
21 changes the culture around early literacy, from one of
22 bureaucracy and compliance to one that's focused on
23 effective, scientifically based reading intervention.
24 And this is accomplished by establishment more
25 consistency in statewide implementation so that



1 regardless of the student's location he or she will
2 receive the very best scientifically based reading
3 instruction and intervention.

4 A key piece of this consistency stems from
5 the process laid out in statute for reviewing and
6 approving literacy assessments. CDE conducted a thorough
7 review of the assessments to select the tools that best
8 met the criteria outlined in statute. As part of this
9 public process, a strong and diverse review committee
10 evaluated all the assessments against a rigorous rubric.
11 I have personally confirmed with national literacy
12 experts that top-notch research was used to develop the
13 rubric and that the review committee was carefully
14 balanced to ensure an unbiased process.

15 And if that were not enough, the assessments
16 that failed to meet the basic quality standards were
17 given the chance to appeal that ruling. Their
18 assessments were reviewed a second time, ensuring that
19 every assessment was fairly and comprehensively
20 evaluated.

21 Unfortunately, some districts are seeking to
22 circumvent this process because the test they are most
23 comfortable with did not meet the basic quality standards
24 provided in statute. The reality is to transform our
25 system in order to better serve our student population we



1 have to make some changes that might make districts and
2 adults somewhat uncomfortable. Local districts still
3 have significant flexibility in determining which test to
4 administer, because the review committee identified
5 several other assessments that meet basic quality
6 standards. Further, the assessments don't go into place
7 until July 2016, giving them plenty of time to prepare.

8 Finally, the gentleman from DPS, he pointed
9 out that when professionals disagree we should defer to
10 districts. I think that we might actually all agree with
11 that premise, but even under his own premise it doesn't
12 hold. Professionals don't agree. That's not the case
13 here. The review committee reviewed it not once but
14 twice and found that it was not adequate.

15 The READ Act framework provides a powerful
16 incentive for teachers, districts, and parents to
17 seriously engage in early literacy efforts and holds all
18 stakeholders accountable for making progress, and through
19 accountability the business community believes that the
20 READ Act positively changes the culture of literacy in
21 Colorado and takes steps forward.

22 We should trust the thorough and unbiased
23 process conducted by the Department for reviewing the
24 assessments and avoid making exemptions in order to make
25 adults feel more comfortable with changes.



1 Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Are there
3 other public comments? Please.

4 MS. WELCH: Hello. My name is Maureen Welch
5 and I am a mom of three kids, and my concerns around the
6 READ Act is that I feel like the READ Act needs to apply
7 to all children, including students who are in special
8 ed. And I feel like my son who -- my youngest son is six
9 years old and he is nonverbal and he has Down syndrome,
10 and I feel like he's being excluded from the expectation
11 of learning to read. So my question to this group is how
12 to set that expectation from the state level to the
13 school district level. I am actually recommending to my
14 IEP team that we retain him for first grade because I
15 want him to learn to read before he goes to second grade.

16 So just a little background on myself. I'm
17 a general educator. I taught in Denver for eight years
18 and then I went back and got my special ed license after
19 my son was born. So I am now taking the year off to
20 learn more about the system, so you'll probably see me at
21 more meetings here, in getting to learn a little bit
22 more.

23 So I guess my question is, to you, is to
24 raise those benchmarks for the grade level to all
25 children, not just children that aren't on IEPs. My



1 other question is, for my third-grader, how are you going
2 to trigger RTI? How does that overlay with the READ Act?
3 That's something that I don't quite understand, because
4 if someone isn't learning to read with effective
5 instruction when do you kick that in?

6 So anyway, thank you for all the work. I
7 just wanted to give a little kudos. I really enjoyed
8 your website. I can't -- the accessibility of
9 information agendas, past audio, things, that's something
10 we don't have in Cherry Creek and something I want to
11 take to their board. So I just want to thank you for all
12 of that, because I can tell there's a lot of work and
13 effort to put it in, accessible to people that can't be
14 here. And I have some friends that are turning in over
15 the internet today to hear this discussion, so thank you
16 so much.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Other public
18 comment? We've got a popular issue today.

19 Name, organization, and three minutes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great. I'll be higher
21 level so we'll go quickly. My name is Riley Figaro (ph)
22 and I'm the vice president of education for the Colorado
23 Children's Campaign.

24 First, thank you to the Board and to the
25 Department staff for your leadership and commitment to



1 the rule promulgation and implementation process for the
2 READ Act in alignment with the spirit of the law. The
3 Children's Campaign was one of the organizations that
4 helped pass the READ Act in 2012, and we knew that the
5 changes would not be easy but were in the best interest
6 of students and their needs.

7 Recognizing the importance of literacy and
8 that early literacy serves as a strong indicator for
9 future educational success, we know that currently too
10 many students are struggling to master literacy. In
11 2013, overall reading proficiency in Colorado for fourth-
12 graders was 68 percent, and broken down by race and
13 ethnicity only 51 percent of our Hispanic and African
14 American students were proficient. We also know a
15 student is six times more likely to drop out when they
16 have not mastered proficiency in reading by the time that
17 they leave third grade.

18 The READ Act's commitment to identifying a
19 student's specific reading deficiencies, based off of the
20 science of reading, is imperative to successful
21 intervention. I urge your continued commitment to a
22 system that supports the science of reading, and thank
23 you for all your work.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

25 MS. NEAL: Thank you.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any other public comment?
2 Okay. So here's what I'd ask, just to keep
3 the ball moving. If you, staff, would like to make a
4 brief summary response then we'll open back for questions
5 and conversation among the Board and take action.
6 Please.

7 MS. MONTGOMERY: Okay. Mr. Chair. Yes.
8 First of all, I would like to respond to some of the
9 suggestions that Mr. Good did. We did have a range of
10 scores. However, I want us to be clear that we
11 understand exactly what that range of scores was. The
12 scores were a 7 for DRA2, a 7, a 10, 11, 14, 22, 24, and
13 one 37. The 37 consistently scored the DRA2 higher. So
14 from that range you can see that most of our reviewers
15 did judge the DRA2 in a very similar fashion. And as Mr.
16 Good does say in his letter to the Board, we should be
17 wary of any outliers. So he is right -- we should be
18 wary of any outliers, and there was one outlier for the
19 reviews.

20 Also, he mentioned that the DRA2 identifies
21 the same number of kids as DIBELS and PALS. Actually, in
22 kindergarten, the DRA2 identified 3.7 percent of
23 students, whereas both PALS and DIBELS identified 10 to
24 12 percent of students. So there is a huge discrepancy
25 between the number of students identified in



1 kindergarten. I want to emphasize how important the
2 identification of students is in kindergarten, because we
3 can prevent reading difficulties in later years.

4 Further, DPS, as Mr. Good did say, does
5 require the use of STAR Early Learning, so professional
6 development would not be required additionally. STAR
7 Early Learning is one of the assessments approved on our
8 list.

9 When this review process was done it was not
10 based on a difference of opinion. We gathered people for
11 the review process that had a very large review --
12 opinions, including reviewers from Boulder who were on
13 this process. Instead, the outlying -- the outcome was
14 based on a high -- no, that's okay. I was saying that in
15 reference to, they do also use DRA2, and they were part
16 of this committee. The outcome of this review was based
17 on a highly rigorous evaluation process. Opinion did not
18 play into this.

19 I would also like to say that 21 districts
20 do report on this, but nearly 160 do not. And I
21 understand that it's a majority of children in the
22 metropolitan area, but across the state other districts
23 are using other assessment. Further, the intent of an
24 interim assessment is not to report out at the end of the
25 year. It is to ensure that all students, not those just



1 behind, are on track to continue to learn to read. And
2 if we think of an interim assessment as only identifying
3 students with a significant reading deficiency we are not
4 using our interim assessments as they are intended, and
5 that is through the RTI process, so that we can regularly
6 measure that no child is falling behind, and so that we
7 identify them quickly so that we know exactly what they
8 need to do.

9 Also, I would like to point out -- never
10 mind. I'll ask Dr. Prestwich if she has --

11 MS. PRESTWICH: I have three points to add,
12 and if I miss anything you can follow up.

13 It was suggested that neither the rules or
14 the law require progress monitoring of students. If you
15 refer to Section 4.01(b) of the State Board rules for the
16 administration of the Colorado READ Act you'll this
17 statement: "Monitor the ongoing process of students
18 determined to have a significant reading deficiency by
19 administering the selected State Board-approved interim
20 assessment periodically throughout the school year until
21 the student demonstrates grade-level proficiency and is
22 removed from a READ plan."

23 We feel it's very important that that same
24 State Board-approved interim assessment is used so that a
25 teacher is able to compare the data that she or he gets



1 across time. If teachers are using a number of different
2 assessments then they don't have enough data points to
3 make those really good comparisons and make the best
4 instructional decisions for kids.

5 It was also noted that some of the
6 assessments do not require students to read aloud to the
7 teacher. We do want to point out that of the seven
8 interim assessments that we are recommending, four of the
9 assessments do require a child to read aloud to the
10 teacher. And we would also suggest that it's important
11 that a teacher listens to a child read aloud on a daily
12 basis, and we would suggest that that is should be taking
13 place during instructional time, perhaps in small-group
14 instruction, when children are accessing text, and we
15 completely agree that that's extremely important because
16 it requires a teacher to make decisions about how the
17 child is progressing in their reading ability.

18 There was one more. Oh. We also want to
19 note, it has been suggested that a number of different
20 states are using DRA2. We did do our research. Five
21 states were mentioned: Connecticut, Ohio, Oklahoma,
22 Rhode Island, and Texas. In Ohio, the DRA2 is not an
23 approved assessment. In Connecticut, new legislation was
24 recently passed that specifies that all kindergarten
25 through third-grade students must be tested with a



1 universal screener. The DRA2 will no longer be allowed
2 to satisfy this requirement, effective this summer, for
3 next year's reporting requirements in Connecticut. In
4 Rhode Island, the DRA2 is permissible in grades one and
5 two, but not in kindergarten or third grade.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think we're ready to
7 discuss and take action.

8 MS. PRESTWICH: Okay. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Are there questions at
10 this point, interaction among Board members? Angelika,
11 please comment.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, my first comment is
13 that I noticed that you guys are not at all passionate
14 about how the children in Colorado read, nor our
15 speakers, and I'm very grateful, on both sides of the
16 discussion.

17 And, yes, Boulder has also had concerns
18 because they do not wish to change. And I would just
19 argue that the provider or the developer of this program
20 has the opportunity to meet the expectations that we have
21 in Colorado. I recognize that change is hard and it can
22 be expensive. That's not a reason not to do what was
23 intended. So I will support the recommendation that
24 you've made. I will recommend to the school districts
25 that feel passionate about this particular program that



1 they go back to their vendor. I mean, this is a market
2 economy and we do give feedback to our various providers,
3 and this is solvable, one way or another.

4 When I came today -- and I'm going to
5 confess that I did have a conversation with a constituent
6 today because I thought we had already voted, so I just
7 want to be open about that because I should have done it
8 differently, but I was between mascara and lipstick when
9 the call came in. I wondered, to this individual and to
10 myself, whether there needed to be a change in the law,
11 and I just don't hear that at all today. So I don't
12 think that option is a realistic one, but there are two
13 options that are available to some of the districts.

14 Thank you for your very thorough work and
15 presentation.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other comments? Elaine,
17 would you like to make a comment?

18 MS. BERMAN: Well, I think everybody admits
19 that this is an area, I don't want to say that's
20 controversial, but that people have strong feelings about
21 and that people perhaps may interpret the data
22 differently. So in my mind this is not a matter of
23 whether the CDE staff is right, we didn't do a good
24 process. I think we did probably an adequate process.
25 Whether it was fabulous, I'm not in a position to say.



1 My main concern with not including the DRA2
2 is success, and I was listening very carefully to what my
3 colleague on the other side of the table was saying. But
4 if you look at not only are the largest school districts
5 in the state of Colorado using DRA2, but the school
6 districts that are showing the most growth and highest
7 levels of student achievement are using the DRA2. So if
8 we were looking at school districts that weren't showing
9 growth using this assessment tool I think I would
10 absolutely say this is an adult issue.

11 I did not agree with the gentleman from
12 Colorado Succeeds that says that people in DPS were
13 circumventing. I do not think that's the case at all. I
14 think they're using it as a very -- I think the only
15 thing that DPS cares about is improving student
16 achievement. I think they are singularly focused on
17 identifying individual students when they fall behind and
18 getting them to grade level. And not only are they
19 singly focused on it but they're showing results.

20 So why would we take away an assessment? I
21 mean, this Board talks about -- particularly my friends
22 on the other side of the aisle -- talks about flexibility
23 --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible.)

25 MS. BERMAN: (Indiscernible.) Other side of



1 the seat?

2 We talk about giving school districts
3 flexibility. We talk about giving school districts
4 choice. We talk about not overburdening school districts
5 with change and additional financial burdens, and I would
6 assume that there is no money that goes along to school
7 districts to make this change. Is that correct?

8 MS. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Chairman, yes, that is
9 correct, unless they are part of our ELAT project, and
10 then it is at no expense to them, which is using DIBELS
11 Next.

12 MS. BERMAN: Okay. So if we care about
13 flexibility, if we don't care -- if we're concerned about
14 burden, if we're concerned about choice, and if we're
15 concerned about success, I cannot -- I would argue that
16 DRA2 should be put into this group of assessments.

17 MS. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Chairman, both of my
18 colleagues, to both sides of me, reminded me that they
19 can use per-pupil funds to offset this cost. So they
20 could use their per-pupil funds for the purchase of an
21 assessment.

22 MS. BERMAN: That's in addition to the money
23 they already have --

24 MS. PRESTWICH: Correct.

25 MS. BERMAN: -- over and above.



1 MS. PRESTWICH: I just wanted to clarify,
2 it's not their regular per-pupil. They get a per-pupil
3 allocation from the READ Act, which is above their
4 allocation for regular operating.

5 MS. BERMAN: Okay. Thank you, and thank you
6 for the clarification too.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I'm not a reading
8 expert. I would defer to others that are reading
9 experts. But I know that I've heard directly from DPS,
10 I've heard directly from Aurora, I've heard directly from
11 Boulder, I've heard indirectly from Cherry Creek that
12 they seem very satisfied, and those are very high-
13 performance school districts, all of which who are
14 starting -- who are showing, you know, growth. So I -- I
15 don't see how we can make the determination not to
16 include DRA2.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Pam, and then we'll come
18 back to the vice chair, and then wrap up.

19 MS. MAZANEC: So if we approve -- I mean,
20 given the discussion around Pearson, the vendors can come
21 back and appeal again, where are we at on that? If we
22 approve this list today, will you come back to the State
23 Board with a vendor appeal, saying, you know, we want you
24 to reconsider and put them back on, or -- I'm just
25 wondering whether we lose --



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, what does that
2 process look like?

3 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. Do we lose our ability
4 to do anything about this?

5 MS. MONTGOMERY: Mr. Chair, it really
6 wouldn't be through an appeal process but we would open -
7 - we would have a request for information again, as we
8 did prior. And so they would have the opportunity to
9 resubmit their assessment with any approved, or improved
10 things that they might have added.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any other comments from
12 this side? Dr. Scheffel, go ahead.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I just wanted to comment
14 on Member Berman's comment, which is a good comment, and
15 I agree with you that we -- if we can give folks
16 flexibility that's all great, but the problem is with
17 that right now is when laws are passed they are not
18 surgically passed, and targeting specific issues there,
19 they're much more broadly so. And so if we're trying to
20 implement a statewide literacy initiative with specific
21 language that requires assessments to benchmark against
22 best practice and validity and reliability and sample
23 size, with respect to how the scores are used and how
24 they qualify students for services, then it seems to me
25 we should be true to the intent of the law. If we don't



1 want that kind of a legislative approach to reform, in
2 this case in the area of literacy, we should work with
3 our legislators on a different approach.

4 MS. BERMAN: And I would argue that if -- if
5 -- if were the opinion of the majority of the State Board
6 to add DRA2, and if Legislative Council thought we were
7 going beyond our purview, they would point that out to
8 us. So I think this is within our purview to -- and I
9 think it is also consistent with the statute. I do not
10 think the recommending of adding DRA2 is outside the
11 statute. But as I said, if it were, it would be brought
12 to our attention after we vote on it -- voted on it.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So I'm going to jump in
14 with some final comments, as we walk through this, and
15 this was a very interesting and robust discussion. I
16 appreciate this.

17 But to the subject matter issues with regard
18 to thresholds and best practices and norming and progress
19 monitoring, the primary objection agrees that there is
20 some debatability within that. And then following on to
21 that, what I heard, as the primary objection to moving
22 forward, was the difficulty of transition. And to my
23 thinking that's an inadequate response, especially given
24 the fact that there's tons of headroom. We've got a lot
25 of runway in front of us. If DRA wants to bring positive



1 answers back to some of these questions, these spaces
2 where we're all in agreement -- there is some
3 debatability. If they want to bring an improvement to
4 that, that could alleviate some of the administrative
5 challenge of making a transition.

6 So based on that reasoning, it would be my -
7 - I'll support the motion.

8 MS. NEAL: Which I haven't made yet.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well --

10 MS. NEAL: It's my turn now.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- the motion -- staff
12 recommendation. Let me change my language to say staff
13 recommendation.

14 MS. NEAL: All right. This has been a very
15 interesting conversation for me because I am not a
16 reading expert -- I always taught the older kids -- so I
17 was kind of catching up here all the way along. But
18 relying upon our Board member down there who is a reading
19 expert, a couple of things.

20 It is a response to legislation. It's not
21 as if these ladies decided on their own to go out and do
22 this. It is a response to legislation, and we don't
23 always, you know, have the control over legislation. But
24 as such, what you did was required and you did extensive,
25 thorough work, and I always feel like I should, you know,



1 listen to the experts here.

2 I understand perfectly the loyalty that
3 people have to a long-used program, and that is because
4 they are very good people and they work hard and I have
5 no doubts that they have made it a success, but I also
6 have no doubt that they can make a different one a
7 success. And I know that's not a real thoughtful
8 conversation there, but I just -- you know, this was the
9 law. You guys did a wonderful job, very thorough, and,
10 you know, I always listen to the experts.

11 So with that in mind, Mr. Chair, I would --
12 where are we? -- I would approve to improve the list of
13 Department recommendation interim reading assessments for
14 the READ Act.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a second? Dr.
16 Scheffel seconds. And I think we'll take a roll call
17 vote on this.

18 MS. BERMAN: Can I put an amendment in
19 there, or do you want to take a roll call on this, or how
20 do we do this?

21 MS. NEAL: No, I don't think you can.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, we're mid-motion.
23 We could accept an amendment. So I will give you the
24 opportunity to offer an amendment.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, with all due



1 respect, we have a motion and a second.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, so we have to -- we
3 need to move at this point. Okay. So we'll take a roll
4 call vote on this issue. Please call the roll.

5 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman.

6 MS. BERMAN: I think I need a protocol
7 thing. So if we vote on this, then can I then submit
8 another motion with an amendment to it, or will it have
9 passed and then it's too late for an amendment?

10 MS. MARKEL: You would be able to make a
11 motion and it would require a second.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It would require a
13 second. That would be a separate motion. It wouldn't be
14 an amendment to this motion.

15 MS. BERMAN: Okay. So I can vote on this
16 and still do a whole separate one on this topic. Okay.

17 Yes.

18 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.

19 MS. GOFF: Yes.

20 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes.

22 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

24 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

25 MS. NEAL: Yes.



1 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

3 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So the motion carries.

6 Now, I'll give the floor to --

7 MS. BERMAN: Okay. So I move that in
8 addition to the assessments that we have just voted on
9 that we add the DRA2, but I need a second.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You need a second.

11 MS. BERMAN: No second?

12 MS. GOFF: I'll second.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So we have a
14 second. Jane you seconded, yes? Okay. So we have a --

15 MS. BERMAN: Okay, and just before -- may I
16 make --

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

18 MS. BERMAN: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I was just going to
20 clarify what the motion was. So the motion is to add the
21 DRA2, moved by Member Berman and seconded by Member Goff.

22 Now, discussion is in order.

23 MS. BERMAN: Thank you. I've said it
24 before, so I'm just going to -- this is kind of a
25 summary. My main point is that particularly in DPS,



1 which is the largest school district in the state of
2 Colorado, which has a high concentration of low-income
3 kids and kids of color, we have seen significant -- more
4 -- higher growth than in any other school district in the
5 state of Colorado, and they have been using this
6 assessment. So why would we not allow them to continue
7 using this assessment? And if there are other school
8 districts that want to use it, so be it. But not to --
9 not to allow them to do that seems to me to be very
10 counterproductive, if our goal is increasing student
11 achievement, which they have shown that they have done
12 probably a better job than any other school district in
13 the state of Colorado.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And my response to this
15 valid motion, and good conversation is that the
16 opportunity for an improved version of the DRA2 still
17 lies pregnant in the possibility, or this could happen.
18 It seems to me there are some challenges to it -- the
19 validity of it, the value of it -- and if, in fact, those
20 challenges, the questions that are gray in the edges,
21 could be improved upon, at that point I would be more,
22 you know, receptive to the motion. But at this point I'd
23 have to oppose your motion.

24 Dr. Scheffel.

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: I would just say that the



1 blanket statement that they've made so much progress
2 would really have to be deconstructed, because I've
3 looked at DPS's data and I would question your assertion
4 that they've made so much progress in reading.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Schroeder.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, I'm going to go out on
7 a limb and say they've made a heck of a lot of progress
8 because they have teachers teaching kids how to read, and
9 they're doing quite a great job. And whether this
10 assessment is actually the best one that they could be
11 using to help them be more effective, we don't know.
12 That's something we don't know, whether another
13 assessment wouldn't make them even more effective.

14 But it's not the assessment itself that
15 makes readers. Testing kids doesn't make them readers,
16 but it certainly is a tool. And whether this is the very
17 best tool for any of our teachers is kind of what we're
18 talking about, not the fact that they've had success.
19 And for that reason we don't know that. We just know
20 that there's been a lot of research on an awful lot of --
21 on a lot of assessments, that suggests that some are
22 better than others, and that's the best we're trying to
23 do here.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So the motion before us
25 is to add the DRA2. Moved and seconded appropriately.



1 Staff, call the roll.

2 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman.

3 MS. BERMAN: Aye.

4 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.

5 MS. GOFF: Aye.

6 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No.

8 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

9 MS. MAZANEC: No.

10 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

11 MS. NEAL: No.

12 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

14 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: No.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And the motion fails.

17 Thank you very much.

18 MS. PRESTWICH: Thank you.

19 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure. We're done with

21 this business. It is the --

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Except for (indiscernible)

23 the staff.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: So this may not be the right



1 time to pose the question, but I know there was a
2 question in the last meeting about a subset of students
3 in Denver Public Schools with respect to what language
4 they're assessed in, and cut points, and all that. And I
5 don't know when we're going to address that but I think
6 the AG's office was brought in to bring an opinion.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Clarification on law.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, and I didn't know when
9 we were going to talk about that. Later? Later. Okay.
10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you very much.

12 MS. NEAL: Thank you, ladies.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: May I ask one more question?

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right. We'll take a
15 two-minute break and then we'll come back to --

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can I ask one more question?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: One more question before
18 we move on.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: I have heard that Pati
20 Montgomery is leaving the Department. Is that correct?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not yet.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: All right. Well, I just
24 wanted to thank her for all the work that she's done on
25 this initiative.



1 MS. MONTGOMERY: I will be here until May.
2 I am here through May. I will be retiring at the end of
3 May.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you for your
5 service.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: We thank you for all the work
7 you've done on this initiative.

8 MS. MONTGOMERY: Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you very much. And
10 we're going to take a two-minute break and then we'll
11 come back to the Dropout Prevention and Student
12 Engagement Report, scheduled for 30 minutes and we're
13 hoping it will be shorter.

14 (Meeting adjourned)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 7th day of February, 2019.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright

Kimberly C. McCright

Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

Houston, Texas 77058

281.724.8600