



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 5

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 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- were submitted across
2 those grades. And we also have started to do some review
3 of the student feedback. Student feedback overall has
4 been fairly positive. Apparently, from a kid
5 perspective, it's about time we start using the computers
6 and the technology and that paper stuff is really old
7 school and really boring. That's where they're at.
8 They've also been pointing out some challenges with
9 paper-based testing that, frankly, I'm not sure I
10 necessarily thought a lot about. One the Commissioner
11 may have shared with you at an earlier meeting and that
12 had to deal with the tools, and the tools that are
13 available online versus the tools that the student has to
14 use with the paper-based testing. And apparently it was
15 a great relief that tools weren't falling on the floor.
16 That was stressful for that kid. Grade four.

17 We also had a student that wrote quite the
18 paragraph about the challenges of erasing, and the fact
19 that with this online assessment that erasing is so much
20 easier, so thank you, guys, so much.

21 So again, from a kid perspective they
22 pointed out some things that I wasn't necessarily
23 expecting, and they were pretty practical. They also
24 gave some suggestions about how to set up the room
25 differently for this online experience and how to make



1 sure that they couldn't see other kids' screens so they
2 wouldn't be tempted to look at somebody else's answers,
3 so could you help me. They also talked about the
4 difference in terms of level of noise in the testing
5 environment. We suddenly have typing occurring, which is
6 a different kind of noise in the testing environment than
7 when kids are writing with pencils. So they asked,
8 "Would it be possible to utilize earplugs, and, by the
9 way, it would also help with all of the obnoxious sounds
10 in the hallway."

11 So again, although we know that there are
12 some adults who are concerned about making this
13 transition, overall the kids are ready for it, and as I
14 said last week at CAES, as we start to have our stomachs
15 do a little bit of churning as we get closer and closer,
16 I'm looking to the kids, because they're not doubting
17 that this is a good thing. They know that this is a good
18 thing, so we'll follow their lead.

19 MS. NEAL: Can I ask a question? How are we
20 for having these assessments on computer? Are all our
21 schools able to do that, or are some of the rural schools
22 not able to do that? How positioned are we to use this
23 new technology.

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Okay. Since the last time
2 that I met with you, Collin Bonner, who is our technology
3 consultant, and Pearson have continued to do their
4 regional training with district technology coordinators.
5 They have also completed more than, I believe as of this
6 week, 55 site visits across the state, to different
7 districts. We have put that out there to districts
8 repeatedly, saying if you have any concerns please
9 contact us. We will come to you.

10 In the end, we are finding that even the
11 schools that were concerned were able to come up with
12 some solutions. Yesterday was the first time -- and I
13 haven't even had a chance to talk to the Commissioner
14 about this -- we did run into a school that, frankly,
15 their intranet -- okay, so what's happening at the local
16 level -- is very archaic and slow and painful, so our
17 solution of proctor caching for that school may not be
18 the solution. Unfortunately, after we made that trip
19 their technology coordinator was offsite, so we're going
20 to do some follow-up with that particular school.

21 We have tried to invite ourselves into a
22 variety of districts and in a variety of locations. I
23 think there's been a lot of mileage put on cars going
24 into remote locations. And overall, again, it's been
25 very successful in terms of being able to come up with



1 the solutions.

2 We strongly believe that there are probably
3 some schools that are going to struggle with this. We
4 again are pleading, they've got to come forward. They
5 have to get to their districts and their districts have
6 to get to us. There's just not a lot of ways for us to
7 be able to find those people who have been silent. We've
8 been able to utilize the technology readiness tool --
9 that's been out there now for about a year and a half --
10 where we asked districts and schools to give us
11 information about what does your bandwidth look like,
12 what is your device-to-student ratio. Based on that we
13 can target and we can a little bit more strongly invite
14 ourselves in. But there are still some schools for which
15 we don't have information.

16 MS. NEAL: Thank you. Can I make another
17 comment?

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

19 MS. NEAL: I'm not surprised at that because
20 as I worked with the Eaglemap (ph) and all of that
21 situation, for some reason school districts don't like to
22 complain. Because I would send out a memo and say,
23 "Anybody having trouble?" you know, and get no replies.
24 But if I call them then they would tell me that, you
25 know, they're -- they didn't have, whatever. So it's --



1 I understand that being difficult to find out who is
2 wired and who isn't.

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, one of the sets
4 of schools that are struggling are our online schools,
5 ironically enough. Right? So these are kids who get all
6 of their instruction via the computer and via technology,
7 but for testing purposes they can't be testing in their
8 own homes, right. That's not a secure environment. So
9 we're working with those online schools to set up and --
10 well, for them to set up some different options.

11 Some of those online schools are utilizing a
12 strategy that they've used in the past for the paper. So
13 they are literally kind of renting facilities where they
14 used to give the paper-based tests and now they're going
15 to give the computer-based test. We are obviously
16 wanting to provide them with some pretty specific
17 technical advice in terms of what they need to make sure
18 those locations have. Others are trying to bond with
19 their neighborhood schools so that their online students
20 can join the testing with the typical -- I'm sorry, with
21 the kids who go to that brick-and-mortar school. Other
22 schools are starting to open up their doors so that the
23 online students can come in after hours and do some
24 testing. For those folks, this is a challenge, and like
25 I said, we're working with them, trying to help them



1 problem solve, and they're coming up with some creative
2 solutions.

3 Long-term, as we look at the state, and we
4 know that we have a number of online schools, we have
5 suggested to them that they may want to consider pooling
6 their resources and dividing the state so that not all
7 online schools have to hit every corner of Colorado. At
8 this point they would prefer to make sure that they make
9 this transition appropriately and that folks are given
10 the test with fidelity, so that their testing results
11 aren't at risk.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel, then Dr.
13 Schroeder, and then we'll move on. Deb, go ahead.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: I don't know if you
15 referenced the cost issue. It seems like some charters
16 aren't connected, are contacting me saying cost of having
17 their students take these assessments, using technology
18 is beyond their budgets. Can you address that, or do you
19 have much input on that.

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Obviously, when it comes to
23 budgeting, that is a local issue, and I think that
24 schools have struggled with ascertaining, you know, how
25 much emphasis do we place on technology, what is



1 appropriate. Folks need the technology in order to be
2 teaching the standards. The standards require that kids
3 have access to technology on a consistent basis, and you
4 see that reflected throughout the standards. And that
5 includes science and social studies, those areas that are
6 outside of Common Core.

7 We have talked about moving these
8 assessments online prior to me even starting with
9 Colorado. So for about the last four years, this isn't a
10 surprise for folks, that this is happening. As folks are
11 struggling through, some are saying, "This is helping us.
12 This is moving us forward. It's hard. We're not liking
13 it, but we believe that, in the long run, we're going to
14 be in a better position, not just from an assessment
15 point of view but from an instructional point of view."

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just had a follow-up.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: What would you say to parents
19 who feel that they will lack access to the content of
20 what their kids are learning and being tested on if it's
21 all technological and the kids can't bring something home
22 where they can together look at what did you miss, and,
23 you know, why did you get this particular score?

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. Could you repeat
25 the question?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. I'm just saying, what
2 would you say to parents who say, "We are concerned about
3 losing access to the content that our children are being
4 held accountable for because they can't bring home a hard
5 copy of an assessment with what they got correct and not
6 correct, and go over it with them"?

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Sorry. Mr. Chair.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I apologize because I
10 misunderstood the question originally. I thought it had
11 to deal with instructional issues as opposed to testing
12 issues. As another Board member indicated, the state
13 assessments, they are secure. They do not go home to a
14 parent. Those are retained by our vendors and parents do
15 not see that. What they get are the reports and
16 aggregated information, but they don't get the actual
17 tests themselves. It has never happened in all the years
18 of state testing existing in Colorado.

19 One other thing, too, as we are working with
20 some of the charters, and the charters are really working
21 with their districts, districts are helping charters come
22 up with some solutions, so they are offering, in some
23 cases, district resources so that the charters can test.
24 I think it is fair to say that the relationship between
25 charters and districts isn't always the best, and this is



1 a situation where they need to be working together, and
2 folks seem to be coming to an understanding of that. So
3 charters aren't necessarily left out there floating on
4 their own. They've got to work with their districts.

5 MR. HAMMOND: And I might just add, Mr.
6 Chair, we have really tried to broker that. Even though
7 the charters have to work with their LEAs, we don't have
8 the capacity with that. That said, I think we're down to
9 maybe one or two that we still have some issues with.
10 But, you know, really -- and we've asked, even, at the
11 CAES conference, we've got to have our schools working
12 with their charters, and working out their problems
13 because often times they're the authorizer. They're tied
14 to their networks and they need to be working with their
15 charters.

16 And so I think, by last count we were down
17 to maybe one. We have kind of a unique situation we're
18 trying to work through. That's -- that's going to
19 happen, but we're trying to make this all right.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Follow-up and then
21 we'll come to Dr. Schroeder.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just have a final follow-
23 up. This has always confused me. If we have standards-
24 based instruction, and we have standards-based
25 assessment, why do we not, as a state, release the items



1 at a certain point and a blueprint for the assessments?
2 A lot of states do that, and we've never done that. So
3 there's kind of a disconnect. You don't release items on
4 standardized tests because each of the items represents a
5 domain of knowledge and it's a different model, but with
6 standards-based assessment many states release the items
7 after they're -- and they recycle the items. And perhaps
8 that's a cost issue, but how is it that we have
9 standards-based teaching but not assessments that match
10 that model?

11 MR. HAMMOND: Yeah.

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, you mentioned
13 about sampling of domains. That happens within a
14 standards-based assessment as well as other types of
15 assessments. So we still have that issue.

16 You are absolutely correct that in order for
17 us to generate a brand new test every year the amount of
18 money that the state would need to spend on assessment
19 would go through the ceiling, and some people think it
20 already has, so that would be problematic.

21 The intent is for us to release items once
22 they have been used and are not intended to be used
23 again. It will be at a smaller or lower rate than entire
24 tests. Right now there are some sample items that are
25 available so that folks can get a look at what types of



1 questions are being asked, kids can get used to those
2 types of questions, parents can look at what that content
3 looks like, what the skills look like. Also, teachers
4 can get a sense of how things are going to be scored.
5 Once we administer the tests this spring we will be
6 releasing, on a small scale, items of every type, but it
7 will not be the full test. We can't afford it.

8 Also, keep in mind that we do have the
9 frameworks that are publicly available, which indicate
10 specifically which standards are eligible for assessment
11 on the summative test.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Schroeder had a
13 question here.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: I didn't have a question. I
15 was going to share this with (indiscernible). They
16 talked about how many computers do you have to have.
17 It's not necessarily about one-to-one. Ideally, their
18 suggestion was one-to-two. But you can still do the
19 testing (indiscernible). You just need much different
20 scheduling, and you certainly need that -- that
21 technology is not available for student learning during
22 the testing time. So it's not that it can't be done but
23 it has some ramifications (indiscernible).

24 Putting a whole lot of computers in a room,
25 you not only have the problem of putting up a shield so



1 that kids can't look at each other's computer screens,
2 however, if you've got (indiscernible) keyboards for
3 mice, you might be moving your neighbor's mouse. So
4 there are all these little things that they are learning.
5 There are settings that we have on our computers, for
6 example, that might automatically download updates, and
7 you don't want that to happen in the middle of a testing
8 period.

9 So my point is that there are a number of
10 lessons that are being learned. The other learnings were
11 then different -- the learnings were different in
12 different districts, and they highly -- highly
13 recommended that every district participate in one of the
14 pilots before -- especially before the PARCC but maybe
15 even before the online social studies and science
16 assessments, just to try it out, because they will learn
17 some things within their particular school that will be
18 helpful. The kids need to have had some exposure to the
19 particular devices that are going to be used, but they
20 said it's nothing like the time it takes for an adult to
21 figure out how to use it. It takes them a whole lot less
22 time to be very comfortable with the varying kinds of
23 assessments, whether you go like this or find other ways
24 to change the screen, et cetera.

25 So they were very strongly recommending that



1 everybody try it out. And I know we can't make the
2 students do that, but I think it would be helpful if
3 other districts heard from the folks who were going to be
4 participating, rather than just from us.

5 And then the other thing that they did make
6 a point of saying -- I hope it wasn't because I was
7 sitting there -- is how supportive CDE has been in
8 helping districts and being available when they go to the
9 trainings. They were really very laudatory
10 (indiscernible). But they too, these two individuals,
11 also worried about districts that just haven't sort of --
12 haven't been ready to face that, either thinking that's
13 going to go away or just being willing to take
14 (indiscernible). They said solving the problem isn't
15 that difficult, but identifying the problem is really
16 important, and you don't want to do it necessarily in the
17 -- so that's my board feedback.

18 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Mr.
20 Commissioner, please.

21 MR. HAMMOND: I just had one comment. I
22 think that's why we're so thankful that you all agree to
23 allow us to do the science and social studies for
24 participation only, and not for the high stakes. That --
25 that just gives that extra room for -- you know, for



1 things to learn from before they become much more
2 intensive when we enter the new assessments in PARCC.

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You may pick back up and
5 move on from where you were.

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Thank you. We will be
7 posting new or updated sample items at the end of this
8 month. You may recall that with the original test engine
9 that we were using it was -- it wasn't compatible with
10 tablets so it didn't work with iPads and it didn't work
11 with Chromebooks. We heard loud and clear from districts
12 that they wanted a system that would work with iPads and
13 Chromebooks, and understanding that that meant that we
14 were going to be developing right up until that last
15 hour. They said go for it anyway.

16 So that is what we have chosen to do, so
17 we're moving forward with the new system that will work
18 on iPads and will work with the Chromebook. That does
19 mean that some of the way students interact with the test
20 engine has to change, right? You suddenly don't have a
21 mouse when you're dealing with an iPad. So all of that
22 is being updated. Those will all be available at the end
23 of this month for -- again, for students to start using
24 to review, for schools, for parents, and for Board
25 members, at your leisure.



1 There are -- sorry. For PARCC, PARCC is
2 also moving forward this spring with a field test. It's
3 two components, just like the actual test will be. So
4 there is that performance-based assessment that will
5 occur first and then there is an end-of-the-year
6 assessment that will occur closer to the end of the year.
7 We have approximately 113 districts who have signed up
8 for that at this point in time, about 470 schools. Some
9 of those are duplicates to the science and social
10 studies. Some of them are brand new. So they have
11 heeded the advice of their -- some of the folks like from
12 Aurora and Littleton, and said, "I better get this on
13 board. I better start doing this, even before the
14 science and social studies assessments."

15 Students will be taking either English
16 language arts or mathematics. In the vast majority of
17 cases, they will be doing just the performance-based or
18 the end-of-the-year. There will be some kids who do both
19 of those pieces. Again, this is voluntary. We put the
20 message out there. Schools were sampled. Not a lot of
21 pressure. We said, "PARCC has done some sampling. You
22 have been selected. Do you want to participate? Yes or
23 no." And the response has been very positive.

24 We expect, again, that we will be learning a
25 lot throughout this spring, and every chance I get I have



1 been trying to remind people that there are going to be
2 bumps, so we all have to prepare for the bumps and not
3 panic. We'll make it through and it will make for a much
4 smoother administration next year. There are a lot of
5 lessons to be learned. This is different than anything
6 Colorado has tried to do before.

7 The results of the PARCC assessment field
8 test, we'll utilize those to, again, assess the quality
9 of the items, to make decisions about what will and will
10 not be included on the actual operational test. We will
11 also look at testing time -- what is appropriate testing
12 time for these types of items, test length, and things
13 like that.

14 PARCC also -- PARCC also has released their
15 items. Their items are on the updated platform at this
16 point in time, so you can go right there, look at those
17 sample items. There are definitely some differences
18 between what the PARCC items are like and historically
19 what our items are like. One of the areas where we see a
20 significant difference is in the writing. The writing
21 assessments are closely tied to portions of the reading
22 assessment, and the writing is all text-based, evidence-
23 based. So we are no longer just kind of giving kids a
24 scenario about "please tell us what you did on your
25 summer vacation, and tell me what your favorite part was



1 and your least favorite part." It is now, "You have read
2 through three different sources. Please tell us how the
3 character across three compare, contrast, et cetera."

4 Having to navigate and utilize multiple
5 sources is going to be a challenge for all of our kids.
6 This is new. We're also seeing this within our social
7 studies assessments. It's expected, right. We want kids
8 to be able to integrate across sources, and that's one of
9 the messages that we have been sharing. From a standards
10 point of view, from an instructional point of view, kids
11 have to be able to see more than one piece of information
12 at a time in order to be able to integrate information.

13 For 2014-2015, we have put out a tentative
14 testing schedule for all of the assessments at this point
15 in time. I say it's a tentative testing schedule
16 because, again, PARCC is going to learn some things after
17 their field test about appropriate timing, and additional
18 conversations may be held about appropriate timing. But
19 we knew that schools and districts were planning their
20 calendars so they needed to see what that was.

21 Keep in mind that for the typical student,
22 as we make the move to the CMAS assessments, we are not
23 expecting an increase in testing time for the individual
24 student, for the typical student, aside from we've added
25 an 11th grade -- that's new. We've added in social



1 studies. We knew that that was going to add testing
2 time. And it is higher for our third-graders. For a
3 school, it's a different story. It's all going to depend
4 on what their device situation is. And again, if those
5 schools and districts are doing well from an
6 instructional point of view, this assessment is going to
7 be easier for them. For those schools and districts who
8 do have to have lots of students sharing the devices, the
9 assessment is going to require more school time in order
10 to get it done.

11 We are still hearing from districts that
12 they think the old rules of paper-based testing still
13 apply. As you may recall, in the past, within a school,
14 all fourth-graders had to test in the same area at the
15 same time. Right? We were not flexible about that. We
16 understood that some of the policies were going to need
17 to change as we moved forward and we needed to be
18 responsive to what was actually in the field. We
19 utilized that technology readiness tool to inform our
20 window length and to inform our policies.

21 So we know that schools no longer will be
22 testing all of their fourth-graders at the same time.
23 What we are encouraging is test them sequentially and as
24 quickly as possible, and get them through that process.
25 The vast majority of schools, based on the information



1 that we have, will be able to do a section of the test
2 within a day, so all the fourth-graders will be
3 completing a piece within the very same day.

4 It is my understanding that this morning
5 you talked about the multiphase WestEd study.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Briefly. It was
7 mentioned.

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Okay. We are looking at the
9 -- WestEd will be meeting with several districts. About
10 a week and a half ago, the Commissioner sent out an email
11 to all the districts and said, "We would like to have
12 conversations with you, with a third party, so you can be
13 open, you can be honest. You don't have to worry about
14 ramifications of what you're sharing." We got responses
15 back. A representative group was selected and WestEd
16 will be going out and meeting with those districts and
17 having conversations about what are the implications of
18 the new testing, what are the things that you are
19 expecting that are going to be good, what are some of the
20 unintended consequences that are causing you problems.

21 Also, we know that we're moving forward and
22 really trying to get folks to look at assessment from a
23 more holistic kind of perspective. So rather than
24 sitting down and going, I have classroom-based
25 assessments. The school is going to talk about the



1 school assessments that they want to have in isolation,
2 and then the district is going to talk about the
3 assessments they want to have in isolation, and then we
4 have the state assessments. We have to help kind of
5 engage in the conversation about how to make that more
6 systematic and make sure that we aren't being overly
7 redundant with what it is that we're trying to do.

8 This will be a multiphase study so the first
9 part is happening, like I said, actually within the next
10 couple of weeks. We'll have some information from that
11 this spring, but it will be an ongoing kind of a study,
12 because we do want to see what are the results of the
13 movement with the new standards and with the new
14 assessments.

15 Contingency planning. I know that some of
16 you have consistently asked, you know, what happens if
17 PARCC falls through? PARCC is on target to provide an
18 assessment for spring 2015. The fact that they're going
19 to be doing their field test is a very good, strong
20 signal that that is going to happen. Obviously, there
21 are other pieces coming into play here, and we are
22 keeping very aware of, hm, if, for some reason, we
23 couldn't use PARCC, what would we do in 2014-2015?

24 So we are continuing to talk with other
25 states who have moved forward, just as possibilities, as



1 options. There are also some off-the-shelf options that
2 we may be able to look at and utilize. What will be
3 important, as we kind of go through that process, should
4 we really need to dive deeply into that, is keeping in
5 mind the values that Colorado set already, over three
6 years ago, in terms of what they wanted from a new
7 assessment. And again, this was done with the
8 stakeholders and those assessment subcommittee members
9 before I got here. So what was presented to me was we
10 want an online assessment, we want a performance-based
11 assessment. We do not just want a multiple choice
12 assessment. We want our kids diving deeply into content
13 and into the skills and concepts. That takes time in
14 order to do that.

15 There are obviously cost implications.
16 There are also issues of determining how much involvement
17 does Colorado want to have in the development of these
18 assessments and the ongoing development of those
19 assessments, and that's both from a Department point of
20 view as well as a Colorado educator point of view, right,
21 because depending on which direction we may choose to go,
22 we may get less or more direct involvement, and that
23 includes Board conversations in terms of things like cut
24 scores.

25 And then time, obviously, we know that you



1 are all hearing concerns about testing time, and that has
2 to be one of the factors within our decision-making. I
3 would encourage us not to forget some of those other
4 values that you set up before.

5 In terms of --

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You said three, and I
7 only caught two. Online, performance-based -- what was
8 the third one, of the values of the assessment, the
9 desires of the assessment protocol?

10 MS. ZURKOWSKI: You -- sorry, Mr. Chair.
11 Also there was that Colorado wanted to have involvement
12 in the test development --

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Thank you.

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- and involvement in
15 setting what cut scores and things like that would look
16 like.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: (Indiscernible.)

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Earlier you said that if
20 something happened and we don't do the PARCC assessment
21 that you would look into other possibilities and one was
22 other states that have moved on, other states that have
23 backed out of PARCC.

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. Not necessarily
25 states that have backed out of PARCC. There are states



1 that have similar standards to what Colorado has, but
2 they have opted to develop their own assessment systems.
3 And there are possibilities that, you know, should PARCC
4 not be an option for us that rather than trying to come
5 up with a way to very quickly develop our own we might
6 want to say, hm, there are these other states who have
7 developed assessments that are aligned to our standards.
8 Is there a way to partner with them?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane, go ahead.

11 MS. GOFF: A real quick --

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And just to fellow Board
13 members, we're trying to bring this home before 3:00, so
14 just wanted to guide your comments and questions,
15 interactions.

16 MS. GOFF: This is just a -- when you say
17 "off-the-shelf," is that -- can that include a computer-
18 based and a quick return, and so forth, as that, or when
19 we -- sometimes I think some of us think when we hear
20 off-the-shelf we're talking about the old-fashioned. So
21 it would be more the traditional version. It would be
22 pencil and paper, and that would be the biggest part of
23 it.

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Off-the-shelf, that just
2 means that we would be purchasing a proprietary product
3 that belonged to a vendor, and they've already created
4 it.

5 MS. GOFF: Okay.

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Vendors are creating
7 computer-based assessments, so it does not necessarily
8 mean that it would have to be paper-based. In response
9 to your other question which was the fast turnaround,
10 that is another area where we've had to try to strike a
11 balance between wanting to have performance-based types
12 of activities that require scoring that is beyond the
13 capabilities of the computer. So it's a balance that
14 we've tried to strike, right. We want it faster, we want
15 it sooner, but we want it rich and deep.

16 Keep in mind that as we're moving forward
17 with the science and social studies we have pushed those
18 assessments later in the year. We will be able to
19 provide, not this year but next year, those results,
20 individual student-level results by the first Friday in
21 June. That's what we're targeting. We're ending testing
22 the first Friday in May. By the first Friday in June
23 we're hoping to have individual student results in the
24 hands of schools and districts. That's an April-to-July
25 difference, right, which is what we currently have in our



1 system.

2 MS. GOFF: Right.

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So we've moved this way and
4 this way, and we'll continue to work with our vendors to
5 kind of shorten that turnaround time. Again, at this
6 point, when we were talking, or Colorado was talking with
7 their subcommittees and with their stakeholders, they
8 were not willing to sacrifice completely the performance-
9 based kinds of activities for the sake of immediate
10 turnaround.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Madam Vice Chair?

12 MS. NEAL: When you talk about, you know,
13 the possibility of not using PARCC, of having something
14 else, I know that not long ago, somewhere I was, I talked
15 to an ACT man and he said they were giving. I've heard
16 about STRIVE. I've heard -- do you have any experience
17 with any of the alternative tests?

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. I believe that
19 we may have somebody from ACT sitting right in the
20 audience today.

21 MS. NEAL: Oh, really?

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So --

23 MS. NEAL: I didn't know that. I really
24 didn't.

25 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- we have been having some



1 conversations also, to be aware of what is going on.
2 Keep in mind that, historically, what ACT has had has
3 been that ACT test that Colorado has chosen to give at
4 the end of 11th grade, also Explore and Plan, they have
5 now -- they have an offshoot to ACT that is called, I
6 believe, ACT Aspire. It's an LLC, separate from ACT.

7 And they have developed, along with another
8 vendor, a three-through-ten system that is aligned to the
9 ACT given -- what we give it, in 11th grade. It is
10 written to the ACT college and career readiness
11 standards, along with Common Core. We have been working
12 and having some conversations about what does that mean?
13 ACT is one of the organizations that was also involved in
14 giving feedback on Common Core at one point in time, so
15 they believe that there is a fairly high consistency.

16 We see a big difference in terms of
17 mathematics at high school, between what PARCC is going
18 to have and what ACT has. Within the ACT Aspire system
19 there is a ninth-grade math test. There is a tenth-grade
20 math test. What PARCC is offering is that those two
21 different series of tests -- so it's the algebra,
22 geometry, Algebra II -- and it's Integrated I, Integrated
23 II, and Integrated III. The field has been pretty
24 positive about liking that closer alignment to what is
25 happening instructionally, and having those choices. ACT



1 doesn't have quite as expansive set of choices there.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: How is it on the ELA?

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So for ELA, as we look at
4 writing, again, writing tends to be, for ACT, what I'm
5 going to call scenario-based, and they do have three
6 different types that are called reflective narrative and
7 persuasive argumentative and analytical expository.
8 students do one of those a year, so they're not doing all
9 of those within a year. It looks much more traditional
10 than what we are seeing with PARCC, and I believe that
11 ACT would agree that it's looking very different. As an
12 example --

13 MS. NEAL: Excuse me. Are they computer-
14 based, though?

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, they are
16 computer-based --

17 MS. NEAL: Okay. I just wanted to --

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- and remarkably comparable
19 to the system that PARCC will be utilizing within its
20 first year.

21 So in terms of writing, that is probably
22 where we see the biggest difference between PARCC
23 assessments and with the ACT Aspire assessments, as well
24 as that high school math. ACT Aspire does not include
25 the performance events, so they have selected response,



1 they have technology enhanced, they have some constructed
2 response, but they don't have the performance events
3 included within their system, for the summative system.

4 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel, you had a
7 question?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Are we holding our questions
9 until the end?

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm -- how much
11 presentation do you have left?

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: One more slide, I think.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So let's go ahead
14 and keep -- we've had a good dialogue and we're moving
15 fairly effectively. Dr. Scheffel, please go ahead.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. I'm just wondering.
17 I'm just kind of looking at the big picture for a moment,
18 just because those are the types of questions that I get.
19 We are called a governing state with PARCC, and then
20 we've hired Pearson to develop our assessments for
21 science and social studies. They're our vendor.

22 Question -- as we sit at a table as a
23 governing state with PARCC, how do we influence the
24 process, or do we? I mean, we were required to partner
25 with them and become a governing state, which we are, go



1 to the meeting. Robert, I think goes. You go. Who else
2 goes? And what is our role once we get there? I mean, I
3 just think of all the various approaches to assessment,
4 all the underlying assumptions. Some would say that it's
5 not the issues that surface in a discussion about some of
6 these initiatives, it's the issues that don't surface and
7 the assumptions that are presumed out of hand that drive
8 the actual end product. And I just wonder, when you get
9 there, what kind of discussions are had? Well, how do
10 you spend your time?

11 I just was working on a project in writing
12 and we were going through all the various models that
13 aligned with teaching writing. And obviously, the way
14 one teaches it should align with the way one assesses it,
15 and I don't know if any of those issues emerge. And, of
16 course, they're replete across these content areas.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: It's important to keep in
21 mind that sitting at the governing board table is only
22 one piece of Colorado's involvement with these
23 assessments and the assessment development. You have our
24 content specialists who are involved with item review.
25 We have folks who are reviewing passage and items for



1 bias and sensitivity. We have folks who are --

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Define -- when you say
3 "we have," this is -- explain more broadly. Okay.

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Sorry. All right.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Define how that happens
6 here within Colorado.

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Okay. So two different
8 pieces. One is the Colorado Department of Education's
9 involvement, and then the other one deals with Colorado
10 educator involvement. Okay? So I'm distinguishing
11 between those two, if that works.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So we can look at our math
14 content specialist here in the Department as well as our
15 English language arts content specialist. They are both
16 involved in the review of items for their respective
17 areas. There are also Colorado educators who are
18 participating in those item reviews and passage reviews,
19 as well as participating in bias and sensitivity reviews,
20 and that's external to the Department. PARCC has a
21 variety of layers to their review process.

22 There also is something referred to as
23 educator leader cadre. We have more than 40 members who
24 belong to that group. They just had a conference call
25 yesterday. But those are folks who are more intimately



1 involved with PARCC and have a higher level of knowledge
2 of PARCC. And as we move from this transition of science
3 and social studies to a more hefty transition to PARCC we
4 expect to have them more involved and really working
5 across the state and communicating what is happening with
6 the PARCC assessment.

7 Higher Ed has also been involved, and so
8 there have been higher education folks who have
9 participated in item reviews, technical issues, how do we
10 build this test, psychometric issues that are related.
11 And then obviously that kind of culminates with Robert's
12 role within the -- within the consortium, and he, as
13 Commissioner, sits on that governing board. As the
14 governing board, do they review every item? No. That's
15 not their place. They set the policy that, frankly, the
16 worker bees are to execute.

17 So it is the board that has had
18 conversations about -- some conversations about testing
19 time. They've had conversations about cost. They've had
20 conversations about accommodations policy. They have
21 also been kept abreast of what is happening on a week-to-
22 week basis within the critical work for the
23 administration of the field test. The Commissioner sits
24 on Wednesday morning, 6:00 calls every single week, so he
25 is very aware of what is happening, where the challenges



1 are, what the red lights are and how they're being
2 addressed.

3 So Colorado is very much at the table and
4 influencing what this test will be. Obviously, we are
5 working with other states, and so that does lead to
6 compromise in some situations.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I just have --

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Compromise. Go ahead,
9 Dr. Scheffel.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I guess -- and this is a
11 question maybe that's more appropriate for the larger
12 board -- but I guess parents, of course, are very
13 concerned about these assessments, and a lot of the
14 media, concerned about the content, the time, the models,
15 all of that. And I don't know if this Board is
16 comfortable just ceding that to folks at CDE that are
17 carrying this out, and we're required to join PARCC as a
18 consortium. We know this is coming. I'm glad Robert is
19 on the phone getting a sense of how -- to the extent --
20 the extent to which PARCC is on track for accomplishing
21 the task by the deadline.

22 The larger issue, I think, and perhaps I
23 would say the more important one, is really what is the
24 test going to do in terms of driving instruction? And so
25 I think that it would certainly lend itself to a deeper



1 dive on the part of the Board. If there's interest, I
2 have a great interest in it because it drives what goes
3 on in classrooms, ultimately.

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: One of the things that I
7 also failed to mention was, I believe about a year and a
8 half now, both the K through 12 commissioners and the
9 higher ed -- whatever you want to call them -- leads,
10 voted on what they referred to as performance level
11 descriptors, and those are really those college and
12 career ready determinations -- what it looks like, what
13 do we expect kids to walk out of the schools knowing, and
14 what does the test have to measure? I would suggest that
15 that's a critical piece, and that was very foundational
16 to the creation of the assessment system, and to what is
17 and is not included on the assessments.

18 There are publicly available, again, the
19 frameworks, the blueprints, sample items. There's a lot
20 of information available on that PARCC website and I
21 encourage you to dive deeply into that and to look at
22 what those items look like, and if you have concerns,
23 share your concerns and we can obviously carry that
24 forward.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Follow-up, Dr. Scheffel?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I just have a follow-up,
2 just because I have searched the website extensively and
3 downloaded the rubrics for written language, for example.
4 There's a lot of layering, linguistically, in the nature
5 of the questions and parents are concerned, teachers are
6 concerned. I look at it and I think, how will this be
7 scored, because obviously it's high stakes now. It's
8 high stakes for teachers' jobs, high stakes for -- on a
9 number of levels.

10 So if one looked at those rubrics and said
11 laying linguistically is very dense for a third-grader,
12 and the type of rubric against their responses is going
13 to be so complex -- think of a time you made a difference
14 in life. Now, write a story about making a difference in
15 life. You've got third-graders -- you know, I mean, the
16 linguistic layering is very substantial as I've looked at
17 both websites of Smarter Balance and PARCC.

18 So I'm just saying, if one looked at that
19 and felt like maybe we need to relook at the levels of
20 questioning here and look at developmental
21 appropriateness and -- I mean, there's a host of
22 connectivity -- what would one do?

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

25 MS. ZURKOWSKI: There is no doubt that these



1 assessments are going to be rigorous. There is no doubt
2 that the expectation for kids is higher under the new set
3 of standards than what we've had in the past. That was
4 the intent, right? If we wanted to maintain status quo
5 you wouldn't have moved forward with all of these other
6 reform efforts, right? It's where SB 212, right, came
7 from.

8 Keep in mind that those items are not being
9 written in a back room by a single person. Items are
10 being reviewed by experts in the area of English language
11 arts and mathematics. I would put Mary Pittman, who is
12 our math person, up against any other math person in this
13 country. She knows her stuff. She's reviewing items.
14 She is the one who is giving the stamp of approval, and
15 it is the other states who have also put forth their
16 equivalent of Mary. So Mary's not carrying the whole
17 burden on her own shoulders, right.

18 I would suggest that there is more review
19 occurring with the PARCC assessment than traditionally
20 has occurred.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel, do --

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: I would just say there's
23 continuing discussion, I think, in the public, looking at
24 rigor versus complexity, and I think that -- I mean, just
25 because I've done a lot of this work in schools and I'm



1 actually working on the assessments with groups myself, I
2 think there's -- there's some question in the public as
3 to whether complexity equals rigor. And I'm just asking,
4 for this Board, do we have a role in doing a deeper dive
5 on this than we are? I feel like this is a great update.
6 It gives us some time sensitivities on when things will
7 be ready and when assessments will be released and such.
8 But in terms of the content of the assessment I feel like
9 we have a pretty superficial sense of it and I feel
10 uncomfortable with that, on behalf of the public.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good. Thank you, Deb.
12 Elaine actually had her hand up first. Go ahead, Elaine.

13 MS. BERMAN: So we've -- I think we've had
14 these conversations before and I think I'm going to say
15 something I've said before. I think what you're
16 suggesting is the role of staff and not the role of
17 board. I think our role is at the policy level, and I
18 think that's -- we hire the Commissioner. If you're not
19 satisfied with the work the Commissioner is doing then we
20 should make change in Commissioners. But I think --
21 which I'm not suggesting. What I'm suggesting --

22 MS. NEAL: (Indiscernible) wouldn't care.

23 MS. BERMAN: Yeah. (Indiscernible) wants to
24 go home and take a nap.

25 But what I am suggesting is that I think



1 that's the role of staff and not a board. I think you --
2 I think our role is to ask the big policy questions and
3 then to direct the Commissioner to have his staff respond
4 to them. But the deeper dive I don't think is our role.

5 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. I'm going to let
7 Angelika speak. Do you want to respond back into this?
8 Okay. Go ahead, Commissioner.

9 MR. HAMMOND: Debora, you've raised a very
10 good point, and part of the issue -- and so does Elaine -
11 - when you're -- by the very nature, when you're part of
12 a consortium you're one of several voices. And what
13 we've tried to encourage you and everybody else, and
14 we've been very vigilant on the status of PARCC, you
15 know, if we don't like something we let them know, okay.
16 And as you see things that you're unhappy with, for
17 goodness sakes let us know, and we'll transmit that on.
18 Because we do that, and sometimes we win and sometimes we
19 don't. That's the very nature of being part of a
20 consortium, which, as you all know, obviously, that gives
21 some of us --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Heartburn.

23 MR. HAMMOND: -- more to that end, but
24 that's what we have right now.

25 And so I would encourage you all, because



1 the good thing, at least with PARCC or whatever, they've
2 tried to include as many sample items, which we can't do
3 ourselves, with our current exam because of the cost.
4 But their intent is to be as transparent as we can, but
5 as you see stuff that bothers you please let us know and
6 we'll get you -- we'll do everything we can to get you a
7 response, okay?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: So if I could just respond
9 then, Angelika. What I've -- what I'm -- what I find
10 difficult when folks ask me about these assessments is I
11 don't even know what questions to ask others. I wouldn't
12 know what to say. I would like to be able to say,
13 "Robert, when you go to the PARCC consortium as a
14 governing member, would you please let them know that the
15 model they're adopting to generate items for written
16 language assessment is not the model that's considered
17 best practice in linguistic circles? Would you ask them
18 to address that?" I don't know what model they've
19 adopted. There's like six different models for teaching
20 writing, and for assessing it, and I don't know which one
21 it is. I can look at sample items but they're
22 decontextualized. And I can look at them and say, "Gee,
23 there's six language stems that have to do with the final
24 question to the child." If I were a third-grader I'd
25 have a hard time sorting through this, not necessarily



1 because it's more rigorous but because it's highly
2 complex, linguistically.

3 So I -- I'm just saying I don't think
4 we've ever had a discussion, as governing members, of
5 what model they've adopted to generate these items, so,
6 therefore, I'm not sure I would know what to say to you,
7 as you act as a governing member.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'll let Angelika respond
9 and then I'd like to get in this conversation as well.
10 Go ahead, Angelika.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm not sure those are the
12 questions parents are asking us, but maybe they are.
13 They're not asking me anything to that depth. But they
14 do want to know what it's going to be. They do worry how
15 their kids are going to perform.

16 I agree with what Elaine just said, that our
17 role is policy, but it is also to listen and to evaluate
18 what's happened. And so after Year 2 of the PARCC
19 assessment, at the latest, I think we should dive deep
20 and analyze what -- not only the results that we're
21 getting but to listen to teachers. Does this mean that
22 we all have to be on page 52 of this book on a certain
23 day, or does this allow for the richness, the variety of
24 curricula that we have across the state? Are our kids up
25 to it?



1 I have to confess that when I look at
2 difficult questions I almost always underestimate how
3 smart and strong and bright all of our kids are. It's
4 just so easy. You know, when I listen to my three-year-
5 old I'm just blown away, and he or she is not any
6 different than any other kid.

7 So I think it's very easy for us to look at
8 questions that are difficult and think, well, really,
9 that's too difficult for a kid. A kid's going to answer
10 it very differently, based on what they've learned and
11 what they understand, but chances are pretty good that
12 we're going to learn a lot about our kids through these
13 assessments. I would say that within two years of this
14 assessment we really should do a deep dive, and we may,
15 in fact, find that there are enough problems with this
16 that this isn't where we want to go in Colorado. But to
17 do so now, sort of in advance, you might be the one that
18 can come up with six different models, or whatever it was
19 you just said. I actually didn't even understand what
20 you just said.

21 I'm a layperson and I get the standards, and
22 I can look at the questions and say, yeah, they're hard,
23 but these are worthwhile questions and these are things
24 that I'd like to have kids know. Whether they're age-
25 appropriate or not, we'll figure out. It's very



1 difficult, in fact, to talk about age-appropriate because
2 one of the things we're learning is that kids are all
3 over the map, developmentally. And so we're going to
4 find that standards-based system really is what we need
5 because kids are able to do different things at different
6 ages. But I'm not ready right now to evaluate this
7 assessment.

8 So, time-wise, I don't think you're wrong,
9 but time-wise, and I do think it's more than just policy.
10 I think we do need to listen. We need to hear from our
11 teachers in a couple of years whether this aligns with
12 what they're trying to do, and whether this is value,
13 whether they think it's worth it for kids.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: To the -- and I'm going
15 to jump in right here. To the question of policy, I
16 think we -- we identified in our conversations around
17 inBloom that we are moving into brave new worlds in some
18 significant ways. In the inBloom conversation, I think
19 it was clearly argued, and effectively argued, that
20 fields, data fields are policy. That's an incredible
21 level of granularity to say that which data fields you're
22 choosing to put into a database is policy. But I would
23 argue in very significant ways that is true.

24 With regard to this particular question, the
25 assessment question and the standards question which



1 precedes it, it appears to me that when we stepped into a
2 consortia, when we -- when we, in some significant ways,
3 ceded the authority and the policy-making effort to
4 bodies beyond this body, which had previously been the
5 body that set policy, we crossed over a significant
6 threshold, and that changes this dialogue about what
7 actually constitutes policy, because it is now held --
8 it's been ceded, in some significant ways, to a different
9 body.

10 So I would say trying to figure out what we
11 want to feed into that, so that we can, through the
12 narrow funnel point that we have, to effect that
13 consortia, to understand and be more prescriptive
14 perhaps, as a body, because now we're dealing with policy
15 in a different way than we've dealt with it before, I
16 think it is appropriate for this Board to step to that
17 level and to try and understand at a deeper level, so
18 that we can be more prescriptive to the people who are
19 our very narrow funnel point, into that conversation.

20 So that's a comment. Now I've got a couple
21 of lines of questioning that I actually wanted to go to,
22 and we're out of time. So I'm going to ask my questions,
23 because I have the gavel.

24 You had, Joyce, suggested two alternative
25 pathways that you didn't say "seamless" or anything that



1 strong, but you alluded to the fact that it would be, you
2 know, reasonably effective or aligned to move to
3 something like ACT Aspire or to one of the efforts that
4 another state -- I don't want to put words in your mouth;
5 that would be nonsanitary. But if you would please give
6 me feedback to the comments I'm making. I would ask if
7 there's a third pathway, perhaps a -- you know, we've got
8 Pearson developing other assessments, whether we could do
9 a state assessment, and how disruptive -- and with
10 transition there's always disruption -- but how
11 disruptive would that be? I heard that it might not be
12 horribly disruptive. So I'll let you pick your
13 adjectives.

14 MS. NEAL: Think about that, Joyce.

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: All right, Mr. Chair. I
16 wouldn't say seamless. There has been a great deal of
17 work that has already been put into play with moving us
18 in a direction of PARCC-developed assessments for spring
19 2015. To veer off that path at this point in time I
20 think would give a lot of people, at a minimum, whiplash,
21 and that includes people in the field, which are the
22 folks I am most concerned about.

23 When we look at what our -- some of our
24 other options are, I would hardly say that they are our
25 first option, in terms of what we want to look at. And



1 we would definitely need to dive more deeply into like
2 what some of those other state assessments are, and
3 again, look at their priorities and look at their values
4 and look how they developed, what's the design, and
5 things like that. Is that a conversation we could have?
6 Absolutely.

7 When we look at the ACT Aspire, I mentioned
8 earlier that it was developed to the ACT college-
9 readiness benchmarks as well as Common Core, I'm not sure
10 what that means, in detail, so I would have some more
11 questions in terms of what is that alignment. And ACT
12 has had -- let us have a peek, but it's a first-level
13 peek and they know that we're coming back to try to dive
14 deeper. But I would be concerned about really are they
15 hitting that depth that we want to have, in the way that
16 we want to have.

17 When we look at high school and the
18 culminating assessments, and we look at, right now, for
19 PARCC, the Algebra II and the Integrated III,
20 approximately 85 percent of those assessments are going
21 to be based on that third-year math course. When we look
22 at ACT, I believe it is 15 percent of their test is based
23 on intermediate algebra, 7 percent is based on
24 trigonometry. The expectations of the PARCC assessment
25 is definitely different than what ACT is. I would



1 suggest we would want to look very carefully at that.

2 The writing -- that's the other big one for
3 me is do we want to have text-based, evidence-based
4 writing, so kids are analyzing and coming up with
5 arguments based on actual information, or do we want to
6 continue with our scenario-based writing that we've had
7 in the past. I'm just putting that out there.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: In terms of developing our
10 own assessment, we do, frankly, have the ability within
11 the Pearson contract to decide that we would move forward
12 with our own ELA and math assessments. There is no way
13 it would be ready for 2015. I think that's fair to say.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: To meet the 2015 deadline
15 you'd need to take something off the shelf, and there are
16 a couple of alternatives, but there may be some breakage
17 on the pathway.

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes. And then the other
19 thing that we would need to take into consideration, too,
20 is, you know, cost of all of these different options.
21 And there is a variety. PARCC is -- has put out
22 projected costs. It's fair to expect that as they go
23 into their negotiations they're going to try to come in
24 under that. We do have some cost estimates from Pearson
25 that were provided a couple of years ago. They are



1 higher than what PARCC is.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So I have another
3 question, and I don't want to run out the clock on my
4 colleagues, but I do have another question, with your
5 permission.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, but I thought we
7 could go until 3:10.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. We'll go until
9 3:10.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what my
11 annotated --

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I was trying to move us
13 ahead a little bit, but --

14 So under the law that mandated we sign into
15 consortia or become part of the consortia, it says, "If
16 Colorado is a governing board member of the consortium of
17 the states, the State Board is strongly encouraged" -- I
18 would say that's not exactly permissive language -- "to
19 conduct a fiscal and student achievement benefit analysis
20 of Colorado remaining a governing board member of the
21 consortium."

22 So the question is probably more for the
23 Commissioner. Just as a matter of process, what does
24 that look like at this point?

25 MR. HAMMOND: Nothing, to be very frank with



1 you. And as we've talked before, that statement is
2 really a good statement. But when you don't have a
3 fiscal note or any money that the legislature
4 appropriated to do a study then you don't have the
5 wherewithal to do it.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So there probably should
7 have been a fiscal note attached to this thing, and there
8 was not, was there?

9 MR. HAMMOND: Well, what we've seen -- and I
10 know there's legislation being talked about now, and as
11 we've looked at that, and without going into the --
12 because I don't think that's been released yet, a fiscal
13 note on that. They've asked us some opinions -- it would
14 probably be about a \$75,000 study to do something --

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: To do this --

16 MR. HAMMOND: -- to do something --

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- to satisfy this
18 requirement.

19 MR. HAMMOND: -- yeah, to do it in, I think,
20 a very well thought-out way. Because there -- no matter
21 what you do at this point, there is going to be
22 disruption, no matter what. I mean, if PARCC doesn't
23 deliver it there is disruption, obviously. And as I've
24 always told you, we'd be foolish not to do -- always have
25 a risk analysis out there in case something happens. But



1 there are disruption issues that we would face, and that
2 -- you can always work around those -- but that carries
3 with it cost.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

5 MR. HAMMOND: And then that carries with it
6 discussion that has to be held with the legislature. So,
7 I mean, they all go together in some form. We're kind of
8 -- as every day ticks by now we get more and more set in
9 a course that causes more issues (indiscernible).

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That analysis of study
11 I assumed meant after we did it.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, the law is clear.
13 "On or before January 1st, 2014, and on or before each
14 January 1st thereafter." So we're a noncompliant,
15 essentially.

16 MR. HAMMOND: Now we could do a study. You
17 know, as we've looked at this, that study can be done on
18 or before here into forever. Just give me the money to
19 do it. I mean, that's what it takes to do it.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

21 MR. HAMMOND: Right now -- and we've talked
22 about that before -- there's been no money designated for
23 that purpose.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So kind of the law
25 pulling us into this, also said, hey, do a cost benefit



1 analysis. Make sure it's affecting student achievement
2 the way you'd like it to, and start January of '14, but
3 we haven't been funded to do that.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I wonder if that
5 related to the estimated cost of the test versus the
6 funding we now get for tests?

7 MR. HAMMOND: No, I mean --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm just trying to
9 figure out what the --

10 MR. HAMMOND: -- when we originally proposed
11 it, to do our own assessments, and that's what the --
12 which was pretty neat, we did an RFP that's sitting --
13 which was wise. That was the only way we were able to
14 pull science and social studies off so quickly in the
15 state, is we decided let's do an RFP for everything, and
16 which turned out to be smart, but it also kept alive, in
17 case something else happened. Well, as every month goes
18 by that gets older. But I think at that point, to right
19 now to do our own test, if we were to reactivate that and
20 revise it, I think we're still talking about \$24 or \$26
21 million. That would be -- am I right about that?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, you can go
23 down a little bit from that.

24 MR. HAMMOND: That's fine. \$10, \$5, I don't
25 know. No, it's -- what do we estimate if we were to do



1 that today? I don't know.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: What was our request? It
3 was \$22.

4 MR. HAMMOND: It was \$24, I think.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: \$24?

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, the request
7 included a number of other pieces.

8 MR. HAMMOND: Yeah, it was \$24.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was comprehensive.
10 It included science and social studies interim
11 assessments.

12 MR. HAMMOND: That's right. We'd have to
13 factor out the science and social studies.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Those would be factored
15 out. I think Joyce has some of the ways that we've
16 attempted to meet the intent of that piece of the law.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's kind of several
19 different ways we have. Do you want to --

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I believe we can utilize
23 that WestEd study to help gain some information that can
24 inform our conversations and inform decision. Remember,
25 I indicated that the first phase was happening now, but



1 it will be ongoing. So again, I think we can shape that
2 in a way that may give us some more information in
3 relationship to outcomes, in relationship to the PARCC
4 assessments.

5 Also, we're going to get more information
6 after we complete that field test, and we'll see more
7 information. We'll see how kids performed. We'll see
8 how items functioned. We'll see the reaction from the
9 practice test that will also be available this spring,
10 from the field. The field will be able to react to that
11 practice field test in a much more meaningful way than
12 they've been able to react to just the sample items.
13 There will be more of them, and --

14 MR. HAMMOND: Yeah. But, Mr. Chair, I
15 wouldn't want to give anybody any hopes that that --

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The WestEd study.

17 MR. HAMMOND: -- the WestEd study won't even
18 compare to what the study was talked about in that
19 original proposal that wasn't funded. It will give us
20 good data but it won't come close to making the decisions
21 that contemplated and a cost benefit nature, because it's
22 going to have to require a lot more analysis, and
23 probably a completely different company. So anyway, I
24 didn't want anybody to walk away from the table thinking
25 the WestEd study complies with that.



1 MS. NEAL: You're getting ready to study.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right. Well, thank you
3 for your forbearance, letting me kind of get ahead of the
4 curve here. There were other questions? We've got a
5 little time here to finish this out.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll make a comment,
7 because, why not?

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. We believe in
9 the First Amendment here, richly and strongly. Fire
10 away.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm just going to
12 respectfully disagree. I actually think, on the student
13 privacy issue, that's exactly a policy-level topic, and I
14 think the role that the State Board has played on that
15 has been extraordinarily appropriate, and I'm really very
16 much looking forward to the meeting and the session we're
17 going to have tomorrow, because I think we can really be
18 a model for the country in that. So I think that was at
19 a different level than perhaps what some people might be
20 suggesting, in terms of the deep dive.

21 I'm not an expert in education. I actually
22 have a master's in public health. I don't want to be an
23 expert in that level. That's not why I joined the State
24 Board of Education. I joined the State Board of
25 Education to pass policy on what I think is best for the



1 students of Colorado. There you go.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. I appreciate
3 your comments. Other questions? Did we actually let you
4 get to your last slide?

5 MS. NEAL: Are you finished?

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, with that, then, I
7 think, unless there are further comments, I'll say thank
8 you very much and we're pretty doggone close to schedule.

9 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

11 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you all very much.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we do another two-
13 minute stretch?

14 MS. NEAL: No.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No?

16 MS. NEAL: No, I'm just -- I'm not saying --

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No, no. Let's knock this
18 out and then we'll take a short break.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We've got some voting
21 items here. Next items on the agenda are items
22 concerning agenda item 16.04, 16.05, 16.06, it must be,
23 as well as agenda item 16.16, OAC Case No. ED 2012-10.
24 If the Board is ready -- and I do want to pause because I
25 want everybody to get a chance to kind of get their head



1 gathered.

2 MS. NEAL: Think about it while I ask you a
3 question. What was your feeling on this last one? I
4 kind of felt like --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Careful of your mic.

6 MS. NEAL: (Indiscernible.)

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So I don't think
8 the Commissioner is here at this point. Is the Board --
9 (Overlapping)

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So are we re-
11 gathered here? We're still gathering. Okay.

12 Yeah. So let's take a two-minute break
13 please.

14 Is there a motion concerning agenda item
15 16.04?

16 (Pause)

17 MS. NEAL: Mr. Chair, regarding disciplinary
18 proceedings concerning an application, Charge No.
19 2012EC1789, I move to instruct Department staff to issue
20 a notice of denial and appeal rights to the applicant,
21 pursuant to 24-4-104.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Staff will call the roll.

23 MS. MARKEL: We need a second.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm sorry. A second from
25 Dr. Schroeder.



1 Now, staff will 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: Aye.

8 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

10 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

11 MS. NEAL: Aye.

12 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

14 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Do we have a motion for

17 agenda item No. 16.05.

18 MS. NEAL: Regarding disciplinary

19 proceedings concerning an application, Charge No.

20 2013EC791, I move to instruct Department staff to dismiss

21 the charge.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Second? There is a

23 second. Call the roll.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Which number?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 16.05.



1 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman.
2 MS. BERMAN: Aye.
3 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.
4 MS. GOFF: Aye.
5 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.
6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No.
7 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.
8 MS. MAZANEC: No.
9 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.
10 MS. NEAL: Aye.
11 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.
12 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.
13 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.
14 MS. SCHROEDER: Aye.
15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The motion carries.
16 Is there a motion for agenda item 16.06?
17 MS. NEAL: Regarding disciplinary
18 proceedings concerning an application, Charge No.
19 2013EC841, I move to instruct Department staff to dismiss
20 the charge.
21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a second? There
22 is a second. And the staff will call the roll.
23 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman.
24 MS. BERMAN: Aye.
25 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.



1 MS. GOFF: Aye.

2 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No.

4 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

5 MS. MAZANEC: No.

6 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

7 MS. NEAL: Aye.

8 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

10 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Aye.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Motion carries.

13 Is there a motion for agenda item 16.16?

14 MS. NEAL: With regard to agenda item 16.06

15 OAC Case No. ED 2012-10, I move to affirm the decision of

16 the Administrative Law Judge.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a second? Dr.

18 Schroeder seconds.

19 Staff, call the roll.

20 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman.

21 MS. BERMAN: Aye.

22 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.

23 MS. GOFF: Aye.

24 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Aye.



1 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

2 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

3 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

4 MS. NEAL: Aye.

5 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: yes.

7 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The motion carries. And

10 16.17, I believe it is on the agenda.

11 MS. NEAL: I make a motion to authorize the

12 attorney general to enter into a common interest and

13 joint defense agreement with Denver Public Schools

14 regarding the Masters case.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a second?

16 MS. BERMAN: Second.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Second from Ms. Berman.

18 And the staff will call the roll.

19 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman.

20 MS. BERMAN: Aye.

21 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.

22 MS. GOFF: Aye.

23 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Aye.

25 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

2 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

3 MS. NEAL: Aye.

4 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

6 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The motion carries.

9 All right. The next agenda item, after we
10 take a brief break, will be Board Member reports and then
11 public comment. Let's take a couple of minutes for
12 break. Thank you.

13 (Meeting adjourned)

14

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 10th 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