



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
May 14, 2014, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on May 14, 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 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sure.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right. The State Board
3 will come back to order. Staff, please call the roll.

4 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz-Berman.

5 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Here.

6 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.

7 MS. GOFF: Here.

8 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good morning.

10 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

11 MS. NEAL: Here.

12 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

14 MS. MARKEL: Debora Scheffel.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

16 MS. MARKEL: Angelika Schroeder.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Here.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Wonderful. So I tell you
19 what. Since you're our Western Slope Representative,
20 would you lead us in the pledge --

21 MS. NEAL: Oh that would be --

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- Madam Vice Chair?

23 MS. NEAL: That would be very nice. I'd be
24 glad to do that, if I can find the flag.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Back and to the right.



1 MS. NEAL: I pledge allegiance --

2 ALL: -- to the flag of the United States of
3 America, and to the Republic for which it stands. One
4 Nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice
5 for all.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

7 (Talking over)

8 MS. NEAL: I so move that the Board will vote
9 to approve the agenda.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: I'll second.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: There's a second. It's
12 been moved and seconded without objection. The agenda is
13 accepted.

14 Before we move on, I would like to welcome
15 those of you are here (chuckles) --

16 MS. NEAL: And not. (Chuckles).

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And acknowledge that we
18 are very pleased and happy to be here at Colorado Mesa
19 University. It's a beautiful campus, and a beautiful day,
20 and a wonderful thing to be out here on the Western Slope.

21 I would like to give the Vice Chair an
22 opportunity to make a couple of comments with regard to us
23 being in her home district.

24 MS. NEAL: I would echo the Chairman's
25 statements welcoming you all here. And then note in this



1 case, you all traveled quite a while -- a bit to get here.
2 And now you know, every month when I travel over there,
3 (chuckles) this time you all traveled over here. And I
4 really sincerely appreciate being able to have this
5 meeting in Grand Junction. Seeing the western half of the
6 State.

7 And I thank Tim Foster and his secretaries,
8 Jennifer and Tina, who were wonderfully helpful in setting
9 up the room and helping our staff. And I thank Tim Foster
10 for being so gracious to invite us to be here. And I'm
11 just really excited about today, and I thank you all for
12 being here and traveling over here. Thank you.

13 Now, would you like the consent agenda, Mr.
14 Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

16 MS. NEAL: If I can just find it. Oh. Mr.
17 Chair, I move to place the following matters on the
18 consent agenda.

19 18.01 regarding disciplinary proceedings
20 concerning the license of an authorization, charge number
21 2012EC427, to direct the commissioner to sign the
22 settlement agreement.

23 18.02 regarding disciplinary proceedings
24 concerning license, charge number 2013EC104, instruct
25 Department staff and the Attorney General's office to



1 request a formal hearing for the revocation of the license
2 holder's professional teacher license pursuant to 24-4-104
3 CRS.

4 18.03 regarding disciplinary proceedings
5 concerning a license, charge number 2013EC1733. Instruct
6 Department staff and the State Attorney General's office
7 to prepare the documents necessary to request a formal
8 hearing for the revocation of the license holders license,
9 pursuant to 24-4-104 CRS.

10 18.04 approve two initial emergency
11 authorizations as submitted.

12 19.1 approve payments to administrative units
13 under the Exceptional Children's Educational Act for
14 reimbursement of payments for students in high cost in
15 administrative unit and out-of-district placements or
16 programs, 2012-2013 for payment in fiscal year 2014 as
17 submitted.

18 This is the end of the consent agenda.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's a proper motion.
20 May I have a second? A second, any objection? No
21 objection. Motion carries.

22 Miss Markel, would you please report to the
23 Board?

24 MS. MARKEL: Good morning, Mr. Chair, Madam
25 Vice Chair, Members of the Board, Mr. Commissioner.



1 Welcome to Grand Junction. It's a beautiful morning, and
2 I just want to bring to you a couple of things this
3 morning.

4 You have your updated events calendar. As we
5 grow closer to the end of the fiscal year. In your Board
6 packet, you have your expense reports, and I would just --
7 you guys have been the best in getting your expense
8 statements into Bizy in a timely manner. But as we
9 approach the end of the first fiscal year on June 30, it
10 will become more and more important that we continue to do
11 that.

12 In 7.01, under the legislative report, you
13 have Jennifer Mello's 2014 end-of-year session report.
14 She will provide a brief overview of the end of the
15 session this morning with a further in-depth analysis
16 coming in June when we're back in Denver.

17 In 7.02, you have several documents. You
18 have -- for the school finance report from Leanne Emm.
19 You have the fiscal year 2013-14 total program funding.
20 You have funding for 20 -- fiscal year 2014-15, the final.
21 And then the estimated change as they are provided you
22 between this year and next year.

23 In 8.01, you have a copy of the Colorado
24 Measures of Academic Success PowerPoint as part of the
25 assessment update that Jill Hawley and Joyce Zurkowski



1 will be providing you later this morning. And you will
2 also have -- which will include an update on the PARCC
3 field tests.

4 In 10.01, under budget priorities, you have,
5 as an information item this month, which will be an action
6 item for you next month, the Department budget request for
7 fiscal year 2015-16.

8 In 11.02, you have a copy of the Colorado
9 Content Place and Practice Summary. It's an information
10 item this month. You also have a copy of a PowerPoint.
11 It will be back before you next month as an action item.

12 In 14.02, you have materials that Delta
13 County has submitted on behalf of its application to
14 become a District of Innovation, and you'll be hearing
15 from the Delta County Representatives later today.

16 In 16.01, you have a copy of the WestEd
17 Assessment Implementation Report regarding Phase I. It
18 includes an executive summary of the Phase I findings, a
19 PowerPoint. And late yesterday, we posted the final
20 preliminary report of Phase I, and you'll be handed copies
21 of that report this afternoon when we begin that
22 discussion.

23 In 17.01, you have some information
24 pertaining to the discussion of Title I allocation
25 alternatives for multi-district online schools. You have



1 a PowerPoint and a fact sheet. And I believe that this
2 month is an information item, which will be up for action
3 in June when we're back in Denver.

4 In 19.01, you have a copy of the high cost
5 reimbursements for special education students and
6 administrative unit placements for program 2012-13.

7 And for tomorrow's meeting, you have copies
8 of the materials that were submitted by Montezuma Cortez
9 as part of their turnaround priority improvement district
10 presentation that they will have for you, as well as some
11 supporting materials pertaining to Ignacio School
12 District. So for tomorrow's agenda, we have two items,
13 assuming that we remain on schedule today. It will be
14 presentations from Montezuma Cortez and Ignacio.

15 And just as a brief reminder, following
16 today's session, we will be going to the ballroom at 5:00.
17 At 5:00, the ballroom will be open for those of you who
18 want to just go over to the ballroom. Dinner begins at
19 6:00. I will email you a list of the special guests.
20 There are area superintendents, council members, and the
21 mayor pro tem will be joining you tonight for dinner.

22 And that's the end of my report, unless there
23 are questions.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any questions? Thank you
25 very much.



1 across the street. But as I said to Jennifer yesterday,
2 as we had a discussion about an update on the legislative
3 session, you have in your packets a report from Jennifer.
4 And later on, as we did last year, we'll have a very
5 comprehensive report on the things that we have to do
6 within the appropriate timelines.

7 I do want to personally thank Jennifer for --
8 I mean, she was put in tough spots many different times.
9 And she always does follow-through for the Board, and I
10 just want to compliment her, at least from my standpoint.
11 And I'm sure you would agree about all of the good work
12 she did. So thank you, Jennifer, and I'll turn it over to
13 you.

14 MS. MELLO: Thank you for those kind words,
15 Commissioner. It really is fun representing you guys.
16 It's challenging occasionally. But it also is really fun.
17 So I appreciate the opportunity.

18 I'm just going to dive right in, because it's
19 a little bit awkward being on the phone and not being able
20 to see any of you all. Just yell out if you have a
21 question, or you want me to stop and give more detail
22 about some things, since obviously, I can't see you. I
23 can't kind of pick up on those visual clues.

24 I thought I would start by talking about the
25 Student Success Act and the school finance. Those were



1 really the two major pieces of legislation that came out
2 of the session. They were introduced, not at the very
3 beginning of session, but relatively early and really not
4 wrapped up until that very last week.

5 Typically, the way it works is we go through
6 the whole budget process and then the School Finance Act
7 gets introduced. And they do that because they figure
8 out, you know, where all the dollars are going to go, the
9 big picture, you know, how much higher ed is going to get,
10 how much K-12 is going to get, how much corrections is
11 going to get. And they kind of a placeholder in the long
12 bill. And then they do the School Finance Act, which has
13 more detail about how that money is distributed in the K-
14 12 system.

15 This year, they did it differently. They
16 actually moved what they called the Student Success Act.
17 I know you guys have heard a lot about that. And the
18 School Finance Act together. And as that -- they were
19 separate bills, but they moved through the process very --
20 pretty much along the same timeline. And things got moved
21 from one to the other and kind of back-and-forth a little
22 bit. So it was it was unusual. And that's why I talk
23 about the two of them together, because it's pretty hard
24 to consider either one of them on their own.

25 You know, as it was introduced, the Student



1 Success Act included a number of different reform
2 measures. A \$40 million implementation fund. It had the
3 requirement that we shift to an ADM system. It would have
4 required districts to provide school-level data on fiscal
5 transparency. And had some direction about how to
6 allocate the \$40 million in marijuana money to the BEST
7 Program. It would have restructured and provided
8 additional funding for English language learners and also
9 increased funding for charter school capital construction.
10 That was how it introduced.

11 In its final version, it included \$110
12 million reduction in the negative factor, some money for
13 the READ Act, funding for charter school capital
14 construction, and fiscal transparency. And that was it.
15 That was all that was left in the Student Success Act at
16 the end of the day.

17 Now, some of those divisions, as I mentioned,
18 got moved over to school finance, including the English
19 language learner being the most significant one over
20 there. And there are a few other income smaller
21 provisions included in the School Finance Act, including
22 5,000 new e-care spots, which of those flexible preschool
23 kindergarten slots for school districts. And we -- there
24 was a \$24,000 allocation for the Teacher of the Year
25 program. So like I said, you know, some more minor things



1 there.

2 When you look at both bills together, they
3 will be \$18 million this year in funding for capital
4 construction for charter schools, and then \$25 million a
5 year going forward. Unless, of course, the legislature
6 decides to change that, which they always can.

7 So that's a quick summary of those two pieces
8 of legislation. I'll stop there and see there any
9 comments or questions?

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions? The Vice Chair
11 has a question.

12 MS. NEAL: Jennifer, this Marcia Neal, thank
13 you. I just wanted to make the comment that I was at a
14 meeting yesterday, in which I was questioned about why
15 they took the \$40 million marijuana money and put it in
16 BEST, because that was only one small group of people.
17 That they had sold the bill on the fact that they were
18 going to this money was going to go to education, and they
19 objected to the fact that it was narrowly interpreted. I
20 just pass that along for your information.

21 MS. MELLO: Okay. It's my understanding, and
22 I'm not an expert in this -- and you may have people who
23 are more experts in the room there. I thought the
24 language that was passed as part of the marijuana
25 initiative actually did specify the BEST Program. But I



1 could be wrong about that (indiscernible) in there.

2 MS. NEAL: And I'm not sure either, yeah.

3 MS. MELLO: Okay. But that's good to know.

4 I mean, I think the bottom line is it -- as the bill was
5 introduced, there were a lot of kind of directives to the
6 BEST Board about how to spend that \$40 million. Those all
7 went away. So it's \$40 million that gets put into the
8 BEST Program to be used however the BEST Board sees fit.

9 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

10 MS. MELLO: Okay, sounds like I should move
11 along.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead. I don't
13 see any other questions.

14 MS. MELLO: Okay. (Chuckles) This is so
15 awkward.

16 So I think the other really significant
17 conversation that happened at the Capitol this year, and
18 it has been happening, frankly, I know at your Board
19 meetings and around the State, is this issue around
20 assessments and our standards. I don't need to tell you
21 all that it is a controversial topic. That we are in the
22 midst of implementing a lot of new policies and
23 procedures. And those changes are concerning to some, are
24 challenging to some. So lots and lots of conversation
25 about that.



1 Just as a reminder of kind of what happened
2 from a legislative perspective is, I mean, at the end of
3 the day, the only thing that really came out of the
4 legislature was this taskforce on standards as an -- and
5 assessments. The shorthand for that is House Bill 1202.
6 There's directives in that piece of legislation about who
7 should be in the taskforce, who should appoint the people
8 that are being -- to be in the taskforce, and what the
9 taskforce should look at.

10 I think it's intended to take a broad group
11 of people, you know, everything from superintendents, to
12 parents, to people who have expertise in test development,
13 you know, a real broad swath. Put them all in the room
14 and have them really think through and understand some of
15 these issues we have around testing and assessments. I
16 know you're going to be getting a presentation on the
17 WestEd study this afternoon and night, and I that will
18 certainly feed into the 1202 conversation as well.

19 So that's all that passed the legislature as
20 it relates to standards and assessments. There were a
21 couple of other bills introduced that did not pass. Early
22 in the session, we had set up a 136 by primarily by
23 Senator Vicki Marble that would have created a taskforce
24 as well, and it would have delayed implementation of those
25 statewide assessments by a year.



1 And then late in the session, as my friend
2 Marcia Neal knows, Senator Andy Kerr brought forward
3 Senate Bill 221, which would have delayed the 12th grade
4 social studies test for a year and allowed CDE to
5 administer social studies assessments on a representative
6 sample basis. That also died. I think that died
7 partially because there were a lot of people who were
8 concerned. I mean, for -- there were people who were
9 advocates of social studies and the importance of that
10 curriculum, and they weren't happy with it. It was also
11 really late in the session. I mean, the bill got its --
12 didn't get into the house Education Committee. It's in
13 the second body until the Monday of the last week of
14 session. And I think it was a big topic to do in in those
15 waning days, when everyone's pretty tired and grumpy.

16 So I'll stop there again and see if we have
17 any questions about assessment and standard-related
18 legislation.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Madam Vice Chair?

20 MS. NEAL: (Chuckles) Surprise, surprise,
21 Jennifer, I have a comment to make.

22 First of all, I would like to comment, and
23 I'm sure other people have, on this session in general and
24 the topic of late bills, which are supposed to be only in
25 use when we really need them. And they were doing late



1 bills up to the last minute, which of course gave us no
2 chance to discuss or take a position on 221. And I hope
3 that they have discussions on that as the legislative
4 leaders, because I thought it was very disconcerting.

5 As to 221, I just want to remind the Board,
6 our institutional memory is sometimes so short because we
7 keep changing Board members. But some of us remember when
8 three years ago at a Board meeting, when the State Board
9 and CCHE reaffirmed the importance of social studies in
10 that program. And it was not one of our finest moments,
11 if you had a chance to read the minutes of that meeting.
12 It was sort of hectic. But we did affirm that, that
13 social studies should be a part of the whole program.

14 And the main reason that I objected is that
15 the unintended consequences, the message you send, is that
16 social studies is not important. I know that's -- they
17 kept saying, oh, no, we just want to, you know, but you
18 send that message. And there was a very good letter that
19 one -- another participant sent about that. The
20 unintended consequence is social studies is not important.

21 Also, on a personal teacher level, the idea
22 that we can't teach social studies because we're too busy
23 teaching these other things, you read social studies, and
24 you write about social studies. (Chuckles) And actually,
25 it probably would be one of the, you know, the best uses



1 of our standards, is to actually use social studies as a
2 part of that. And that's just an editorial comment.

3 Jennifer, I really appreciate the work you
4 did in the last few days. I know it was really hectic.
5 And we, you know, I had people say, why didn't you take a
6 position on it? And all I could say was we didn't have
7 time. So thank you for your work there. I know that was
8 real hectic the last few days. But I just wanted to
9 remind everybody that we have a future ever -- a pass
10 point affirmed. Social studies has been an important part
11 of the program.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions before we move
13 on? All right. Whoops. Jane's got a question, Jennifer.

14 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

15 MS. MELLO: Okay.

16 MS. GOFF: Jennifer, thank you also from me.
17 This is more of a generic, general question about whether
18 it's tone, or whether the session was left with any firm
19 position or thinking about use of the State Education Fund
20 money, because it seems like a lot of those final bills
21 and others throughout the session were pretty much --
22 there was a one-time spending thinking, and let's take it
23 while we got it, versus a little bit better thinking
24 towards the future.

25 I've just wondered if you got a read at all



1 on legislators in general, and where they ended the
2 session in that box of thinking?

3 MS. MELLO: That's a really great question,
4 because that did become a really important conversation,
5 particularly -- sorry -- particularly towards the end of
6 the session.

7 You know, I would characterize it as I think
8 there's a real difference of opinion about the State Ed
9 Fund and its use and the appropriate kind of end balance
10 in any given year. And on the one hand, you have folks,
11 largely school districts, but others as well, who looked
12 at that and say, look, there's a ton of money in there,
13 and we should be getting more money, because we need more
14 money. That's kind of position they take.

15 I think you have other folks and I would say
16 Henry Sobanet with Governor Hickenlooper's office of State
17 Planning and Budget is kind of the lead in this camp, but
18 a number of the JBC members are there as well, saying,
19 look. We really have to look at the long-term
20 sustainability funding for our K-12 system. And to some
21 extent, the State Ed Fund is, in Henry's opinion, not that
22 different from the General Fund. And so because we don't
23 -- there's not enough money in the State Ed Fund to fully
24 fund the Public -- the School Finance Act every year. I
25 mean, we always have to do a combination of State Ed Fund



1 and General Fund. But from his perspective, I mean,
2 there are -- obviously, we have to keep two separate pots
3 of money. But from a practical perspective, he doesn't
4 see a real distinction there. And I don't mean to put too
5 many words in his mouth.

6 But I've heard him give presentations on
7 this. And his point is look. If we're going to be able
8 to fund our K-12 schools at the level we're doing right
9 now, in five years, we cannot spend down that State
10 Education Fund balance below a certain point, because we
11 won't have enough money to meet our kind of current
12 obligations plus inflation as enrollment grows.

13 You know, I don't think it -- I don't think
14 that conversation is finished. So I can't fully answer
15 your question, Jane, in saying that is there any
16 consensus? I don't think there is. I think it's people
17 are disagreeing about it right now. And we'll see how
18 that conversation progresses over the summer and fall and
19 then into the next legislative session.

20 I do think it will get harder for
21 legislators. It's been very common in recent years, if
22 you want to do a bill, and it has to do with education,
23 you fund it out of the State Ed Fund. And that's been
24 perceived as an easier place to get money than the General
25 Fund. I think that's come to a halt. I think it's going



1 to be a harder process to get money out of State Ed Fund,
2 just like it is to get out to the General Fund. It
3 doesn't mean it won't happen. It's just going to be
4 harder, in my opinion.

5 MS. GOFF: Yeah. Thank you. I was -- I am
6 not surprised. I guess I'm -- I have confirmation now
7 that there is no confirmation about --

8 (Chuckling)

9 MS. GOFF: -- about where they are. But
10 there's -- it seems like there's definitely been movement
11 in having us -- you're taking a serious look at it from
12 different viewpoints. So I appreciate it.

13 MS. MELLO: Absolutely.

14 MS. GOFF: Thanks again for your work this
15 session. It was great.

16 MS. MELLO: Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions on this
18 section? Elaine's got a question, Jennifer.

19 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Hi, Jennifer. Switching
20 to marijuana.

21 MS. NEAL: (Chuckles)

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Let's not.

23 (Chuckling)

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Chuckles) Yeah, that's
25 -- it's so early in the day.



1 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: It's so early in the day.
2 So \$40 million was in the statute to go to BEST for
3 capital construction. Do you know how much additional
4 revenue was allocated? And could you, at some point, not
5 necessarily right now, give us the final list of how it
6 was distributed?

7 And then the second part of the question is,
8 how is the Tabor Issue resolved?

9 MS. MELLO: So let me start with the second
10 part of the question. And just to refresh everybody, we
11 talked about this briefly. But the Tabor Issue that is
12 being referred to has to do with -- there's a part of
13 Taper that says if you have a revenue estimate in the blue
14 book, which you know is that publication that the leg
15 council mails out to everybody before the vote, you have
16 to stick to that in the first year.

17 And there was some consternation earlier on
18 in the legislative session well, what if we collect more
19 marijuana revenue money than that? We can't do -- we
20 can't spend it. We have to give it back, and we don't
21 really know how to give it back. That was very confusing.

22 I think that quieted down because the
23 projections about marijuana revenue were lowered as the
24 session went on. So people were less worried about excess
25 collections.



1 The approach they decided to take was, in
2 terms of money that legislature could allocate, they did
3 about 25 or 30. I'm not sure of the total. They went
4 ahead and allocate about \$25 or \$30 million to a variety
5 of programs.

6 One of those is the School Health
7 Professional Grant Program, which received \$2.5 million in
8 funding for next year, or next fiscal year, to get that
9 program kind of off the ground and running. There are a
10 variety of other programs in the Department of Public
11 Health and Environment, some kind of public outreach
12 campaigns and education campaigns. Some money went over
13 to the healthcare policy and financing for the Medicaid
14 program.

15 So they allocated a portion of it. They do
16 think more is going to come in, but they're trying to be
17 conservative. So look, this is brand new. It's not like
18 we can look at other states for examples of how much
19 marijuana money they got when they legalized marijuana,
20 right? Because us in Washington are the first, and we did
21 it at the same time.

22 So they allocated some of it. They expect
23 that there will be more, but their plan for the additional
24 funds is to essentially allocate them after we know how
25 much is there. So instead of doing it prospectively,



1 we're going to say, okay. We got another, whatever it is,
2 \$10 million, \$15 million, and now we're going to allocate
3 those dollars.

4 What I don't think has been decided at all is
5 so do you -- if you get additional money, do you take it
6 and beef up the programs that you created with the first
7 bunch of money? Or do you create new programs or put it
8 in different ways? And I don't -- I mean, I just think
9 that was a conversation they weren't prepared to have
10 until next year.

11 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And who --

12 MS. MELLO: Does that answer the question?

13 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Yes, that was interesting,
14 actually.

15 So is it the legislative body that makes the
16 determination about addressing your ladder -- you know,
17 how the additional revenue would be spent, and whether it
18 would be built on existing programs, or looking at a whole
19 new way of distribution. I mean, who makes those
20 decisions?

21 MS. MELLO: Yes, it's the legislature that
22 will make those decisions. And I believe there are some
23 requirements that were included in the ballot initiative.
24 And I don't think for -- I'm trying to think of something
25 would be completely unrelated to marijuana. And I'm



1 having a hard time coming up with subjects. I mean, you
2 couldn't go fund an agricultural program that has to do
3 with egg or potatoes, for example, which I don't think
4 have anything to do with marijuana. I mean, you have to
5 have some Nexus to that. But there's a -- that gives you
6 a whole -- there's a lot of wiggle room there, if you
7 think about it. I mean, education, health, a lot of areas
8 that could have an impact there.

9 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And my final one on this
10 particular topic is earlier on, we had talked as a State
11 Board, and I know I'm the Chair had promoted this, is
12 collecting data so that school districts have to report up
13 students that are suspended or expelled because of
14 marijuana use. Did that actually get up -- get passed,
15 and will we be implementing that?

16 MS. MELLO: Nothing on that was ever
17 introduced, nor passed. And I think that's something that
18 we should look for -- we should figure out how to make
19 that happen next year. And there's a variety of ways we
20 could do that.

21 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: (Chuckles)

22 MS. MELLO: We're not the only people who
23 think that that's important. Part of the challenge was,
24 and this goes to the point that that Marcia made earlier,
25 is they introduced so many of these bills so late. I



1 mean, this bill on the marijuana revenue allocation was
2 like, I don't know, maybe it was the last two weeks of
3 session. And there wasn't room under that title to
4 incorporate the language you're speaking about right now.
5 When we talked -- there was discussion about it, but we
6 just couldn't do it in that bill. And, you know, it's
7 like we didn't know what the bill was going to look like
8 and what the title was going to be until two weeks before
9 session. So we didn't have a lot of options once we
10 realized it wouldn't fit under that title.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So I know somebody who
12 might be interested in dealing with that next session.

13 (Chuckling)

14 MS. MELLO: Okay, well, we'll have a
15 conversation about that.

16 MS. GOFF: To add onto it, Elain, you did get
17 your answer to how much besides the \$40 million?

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah.

19 MS. GOFF: And I was thinking that probably
20 Ms. Emm might -- how much money was allocated to BEST in
21 addition to that \$40 million for the marijuana money? Do
22 you have that?

23 MS. EMM: The first --

24 MS. MELLO: I don't think there was any money
25 allocated beyond current resources.



1 MS. GOFF: Oh, okay.

2 MS. MELLO: I think it was just the \$40
3 million. Yeah.

4 MS. GOFF: Just the \$40 million?

5 MS. MELLO: Yeah.

6 MS. EMM: Well, there's been one more --

7 MS. GOFF: (Chuckles) Thank you.

8 MS. MELLO: But Leanne -- it sounds like
9 Leanne is in the room, and then it -- she -- I defer to
10 her.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Leanne's coming to the
12 mic.

13 MS. MELLO: (Indiscernible).

14 MS. GOFF: Yes, she's coming here.

15 MS. EMM: Sorry. So the normal permanent
16 fund money is going over into BEST. And then the first
17 \$40 million annually of excise tax also comes into the
18 program from the marijuana fund.

19 MS. GOFF: Yeah, but I think Elaine's
20 question was how much else? What was the original amount
21 of money that went?

22 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, my question to
23 Jennifer was I knew about the \$40 million, because that
24 was in the statute. That was on the initiative that was
25 passed.



1 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

2 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: But then my question was
3 over and above that, how much additional revenue generated
4 for marijuana is getting distributed be -- outside of
5 BEST. Outside of BEST.

6 MS. GOFF: Oh, I thought you were talking
7 about how much additional money went to BEST, but -- so I
8 misunderstood.

9 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And I think Jennifer said
10 it was another, what? You said \$30 or \$40 million?

11 MS. GOFF: Of (indiscernible).

12 MS. MELLO: I think it was \$25 to \$30
13 million. I'll get the exact totals for you. That they
14 decided to allocate.

15 MS. GOFF: I misunderstood your question, and
16 thank you. (Chuckles) But we know about that BEST money.

17 MS. EMM: Yes, we do.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, other questions on
19 this section? Okay, Jennifer, please proceed.

20 MS. MELLO: So the final topic I thought I
21 would address, just because we've had a lot of discussions
22 about it, is the data privacy issue. The Board did take a
23 position in support of House Bill 1294 by Carol Marie in
24 the House and by Pat Steadman and Sherry Jean over in the
25 Senate.



1 That bill was very much directed at the
2 Department of Education in terms of putting into statute
3 some good practices for us to follow, many of which the
4 Department has already been working on implementing. It's
5 not as if this was brand new, but I think the Department
6 staff and then obviously, all of you, in taking a position
7 of support on the bill, agreed that it made sense to put
8 those requirements in statute. So that bill did pass.

9 There was another bill that came very, very
10 late in the session again, (chuckles) I think those last
11 two weeks of session, that would have -- was broader than
12 the bill that passed. It was directed, I think, at more
13 at school districts. Some CDE implications too, but
14 primarily at school districts.

15 I think one of the key provisions in that had
16 to do with parent opt-out and basically parents being able
17 to say kind of yay or nay in terms of personally
18 identifiable data being shared anywhere beyond the school.

19 That bill died for a variety of reasons, I
20 think. I mean, school districts expressed a lot of
21 concerns about the way it was written. Again, it was late
22 in session. It was a big topic. And I think the appetite
23 for kind of diving into the detail of that just wasn't
24 there.

25 That being said, I think, you know, I was --



1 I stayed through that whole hearing, and it was very clear
2 to me, and I think to other people in the room, that this
3 topic isn't going away. And we certainly -- I mean, when
4 I say we, I mean we as a state or as a collective
5 community, need to figure out a way that we can be
6 responsive to parental concerns, and how we can balance
7 some of those concerns with some of the other needs in the
8 system.

9 So I think that -- I feel like I'm using a
10 conversation -- the word conversation too much today, but
11 I mean, that's another conversation that will happen over
12 the summer and fall is, you know, how can -- what's the
13 right balance to strike there? Because I think if those
14 conversations proceed, there will be legislation next year
15 along those lines.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: So Jennifer, it would be
18 helpful to me if you could articulate sometime for us what
19 are some of the pieces of that bill, not the parental opt-
20 out, but the other pieces that might actually give parents
21 the confidence that their student's data is being
22 protected at the district level? And then along with
23 that, what is the cost to the district to comply? Because
24 from my understanding on a national level, the concerns
25 really are of data protection at a school and district



1 level, not so much at a state level, because that's really
2 where the breaches potentially can occur with absolutely
3 no oversight. I think if we can get to that point, we
4 might get away from the wish to opt out simply because the
5 perils will be removed.

6 MS. MELLO: Yeah, and the bill that did pass,
7 1294, which I said was primarily focused at the
8 Department, does require the Department to come up with
9 guidance for school districts around those issues. But it
10 didn't mandate that any school district actually follow
11 that guidance.

12 And I think what you'll start to see is as
13 some districts are going to be oh, okay. We really need
14 to think about this and look at this seriously, and that's
15 just really helpful guides from the Department. Others
16 may be less interested in the topic, and I think that will
17 fuel the desire for more mandates. You know, it gets hard
18 because we're a local controlled state, and people are
19 sensitive about statement. It's on the districts. You
20 point out the cost is a real issue.

21 And so, I mean, I'm having to provide more
22 detail about that particular bill. I don't have that in
23 my head at the moment. But I would agree with what I
24 think you're saying is we really do need to figure out a
25 solution at the district level, because that's where the



1 parent concerns are.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any other questions on
4 this?

5 I'll just make one general comment with --
6 while we're talking about this data privacy issue, just
7 kind of insert this into the conversation. I think this
8 is a place where CDE can lead on the issue. I think we've
9 made some comments in public sessions about how CDE is
10 providing full disclosure of information. I don't know
11 that that's completely happening as well as it should. We
12 should be more vigorous in getting identification of
13 contractors, contract relationships, the various vendors,
14 what they are collecting, what we're allowing them to
15 collect, what the life cycles on that data are, and so
16 forth. But making it just a vigorous, visible, obvious
17 effort. That CDE is working hard to get ahead of this to
18 restore or try and build some trust around this issue,
19 because it is an issue that is gaining a significant
20 amount of energy and concern among parents and community
21 members.

22 And so I think to the extent that we can
23 begin to set a tone of this is something that is very
24 important to us, and we will not allow it to go unimproved
25 upon is something that should be happening at CDE, as you



1 know, as legislation and guidance is offered to the
2 districts. By setting that tone, I think it will give
3 them an encouragement to be more present and more
4 transparent in what's going on within the districts as
5 well. So just a general comment on that area. Yeah?

6 MR. OWEN: May I comment?

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

8 MR. OWEN: Just for everyone's edification,
9 we are, and we take that very seriously. We can only
10 provide guidance to a district. We continually update
11 that document and lead as we talk about it in various
12 meetings.

13 As from an internal standpoint, as Elliott
14 asked who leads this effort has a team, any memorandum of
15 understanding, any contract, anything that involves data
16 sharing goes through an extensive review process now that
17 includes all the elements that we want to see, that have
18 to be there from all the stuff we've talked with you
19 about, all the current best practices. And its extensive.
20 And I feel very good about that. And we're trying to put
21 all those on the net. Once we do that for public review,
22 it's not that everybody will agree with everything. But I
23 mean, we really take it very seriously.

24 And we're trying to go back as time, as time
25 is available, with past contracts. That, quite frankly,



1 will take a long time. And those are agreements that are
2 already been made. So as they come up for renewal, then
3 we go through our process and change them as appropriate
4 to bring everything up to date. I mean, it's not a
5 perfect process, but given our staffing and everything.
6 And we're -- we do take it extremely seriously. And we
7 constantly revise it, as it there is new and other things
8 that come about.

9 So as Elliot will tell you, it's -- it
10 started with a team of 15, I think, that it -- everybody,
11 we're driving nuts, because everybody has to sign things
12 that are part of this. Anybody that gets into data, we
13 know who they are. And it's -- I think you'd find it --
14 everything that we promised you we do, we did. Okay?

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Absolute. Dr. Scheffel?

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just have a question about
17 the nature of how that's depicted for parents, because I
18 think there's a lot of detail around these contracts and
19 the specific stipulations, how long the contract is for,
20 and so forth. Is there a way that, as you're developing
21 that for website, that you can be very cognizant of the --
22 of making it digestible for parents? And really what they
23 want to know is what kind of data is out there on my
24 child? Who can see it? How long is it there for? What's
25 the plan for encrypting it or disposing of it at a certain



1 point in time? And I think sometimes with all the
2 educationese and legalese, that specific detail gets lost.

3 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair?

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

5 MR. OWEN: Agreed. To the best of our
6 knowledge, and we'll do that. I will not sit here and
7 guarantee that we can do that in every case, because this
8 is an extensive field. I understand the need for that.
9 And the understanding of parents. We've met with parent
10 groups to try and make the process as transparent as we
11 can.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And I commend the
13 Department in -- to the extent we don't appear defensive.
14 And in fact, the Department appears as though this is as
15 important to us as parents and community members as it is
16 to everyone else. That's helpful. To the extent we
17 appear defensive, or, you know, squawk when we get called
18 on an error, that creates a problem because that creates a
19 breach of trust.

20 So good conversation. I appreciate the tone
21 of this, and I appreciate again and encourage the
22 Department to lead in terms of establishing a tone that
23 disclosure is of paramount importance and making clear
24 what is and what is not happening visible and
25 understandable to the members of the community. I think



1 that's very important.

2 So Jennifer, did you have another section, or
3 was that it for you? Oh, I'm sorry.

4 MS. MELLO: That was all I was going to
5 address in terms of a formal presentation. I'm not sure
6 how formal that was. But I'm happy to answer any
7 questions about specific bills or anything else.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so let me repose
9 that question to the panel here, the Board. First of all,
10 are there general questions for Ms. Mello before we let
11 her go? Or do you have questions on other specific pieces
12 of legislation or other things that happened during the
13 session that you'd like to engage at this time?

14 MS. NEAL: I would just like to reiterate
15 what has already been said and thank Jennifer a great deal
16 for the work you've done this year. I think it's been,
17 for, you know, the first time, exemplary (chuckles) and
18 must require a lot of patience and fortitude. So thanks,
19 Jennifer.

20 MS. MELLO: No, that's very nice. Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Stand by one. Angelika
22 has a question or a comment.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry, Jennifer. I'm just
24 looking at my notes I made when I read this. There's a
25 late Bill, 1370's -- House Bill 14, 1376?



1 MS. MELLO: Mm-hmm?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: I don't think I understood
3 exactly. What is the report that CDE estimates?

4 MS. MELLO: So what Representative Buckner is
5 concerned -- I mean, what he's trying to get at is the
6 achievement gap. And so what it does is direct -- so we
7 are already collecting the data under the accountability
8 system in Senate Bill 163. And it directs us to take the
9 course data that we're collecting and essentially look at
10 the kinds of students who are in different courses. And
11 to maybe set it aside a little bit.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Is this high school?

13 MS. MELLO: I mean, what we're --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: High school, Jennifer?

15 MS. MELLO: Yes, I think it's primarily
16 targeted at high school. I could go back and look at the
17 bill and see if it's all grades.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

19 MS. MELLO: But I think the goal -- I mean,
20 his concern is, what he says is if you go into any high
21 school in this country, we have our re-segregated, because
22 the lower-level classes are full of kids of color, and the
23 higher-level classes have primarily white students.
24 That's his argument. It's not my argument. That's his
25 argument.



1 What he's trying to do with this piece of
2 legislation is make that really clear to people. Make
3 people really have to look at that and see that. Because
4 I think his belief is, is that if people really look at it
5 and see it and understand it, they'll change the behavior.
6 And that's his end goal.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: And this is course by course,
8 based on the course-level data we're now collecting under
9 the Educator Evaluation Act. Okay. Thank you.

10 MS. MELLO: Yes.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine?

12 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So Jennifer, as we end one
13 legislative session, and we recuperate and think about
14 2015, what do you see in addition to the data privacy as
15 kind of the unfinished business and key education issues
16 that will be bubbling up next year?

17 MR. OWEN: Great question.

18 MS. MELLO: So yes, data privacy, I think the
19 conversation around standards and assessments is going to
20 continue to be a very vigorous one. I think this
21 conversation around funding, you know, at the end of the
22 day, school districts, I think, in many ways, had a lot of
23 victories, right? They got \$110 million reduction in the
24 negative factor.

25 But if you talk to districts, most of them



1 will say it wasn't enough. We still need more funding.
2 And I think, I mean, I'm not judging that statement. It's
3 it may be true. It may not be true. I'm not in a
4 position to say.

5 What I can say is that the State budget isn't
6 growing at a rate that would allow for the kind of
7 increases that I think districts want. So that sets up an
8 inevitable conflict. And I think we haven't seen the end
9 of that.

10 I'm just trying kind of run to the list in my
11 head of other topics. I think those are the main ones
12 that will continue over into the next legislative session.
13 As you all know quite well, we have elections coming up,
14 and, you know, that always has the potential to change the
15 landscape quite a bit. It's controlled by their chambers
16 shifts from -- they're both currently in democratic hands.
17 If it should shift the republican hand, I think that could
18 also change the conversation quite a bit as well.

19 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions, comments?
21 I'm not seeing any. I will add my voice of thanks to --
22 and speak on behalf, I'm sure, of the entire Board.
23 Jennifer, thank you and your team for working through what
24 is always a compressed and challenging, in many ways,
25 experience. Thanks for representing us well. And we will



1 look forward to continuing to develop our initiatives and
2 engage the process as effectively as we can. Thank you
3 very much.

4 MS. MELLO: Great. Well, you all have a
5 great trip in Grand Junction. Say hi to my friends there
6 at CMU.

7 MS. NEAL: (Chuckles) Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We sure will.

9 MS. MELLO: Take care.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

11 Mr. Commissioner. I think the school finance
12 update is next on the agenda.

13 MR. OWEN: And thank you. An important
14 processes is, of course, what happens in school finance
15 relative to our school districts and how that turned out.

16 Well, I think in your packets, you have a
17 spreadsheet that's been prepared by Leanne, and we'd like
18 to go through that with you. That was really late this
19 year, given all the discussions, where everything was
20 settled. So this is fairly recent. This has gone out
21 now. So Leanne?

22 MS. EMM: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

24 MS. EMM: To the Board. Yes, we do have the
25 final demonstration of total program funding



1 (indiscernible) by House Bill 1298. And since --

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Can everybody hear Leanne
3 okay? We're good?

4 (Talking over)

5 MS. EMM: Oh, sorry. Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And pull it in a little,
7 too.

8 MS. EMM: All right.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thanks, Leanne.

10 MS. EMM: Okay, thanks. So in your packets,
11 you have the spreadsheet that illustrates the final
12 funding for House Bill 1298, which was the School Finance
13 Act, that also incorporates the impact of 1292, which was
14 the Student Success Act.

15 So as Jennifer Mello was talking about, once
16 the long bill is finalized, then the School Finance Act
17 and any other bills, such as 1292, come in and adjust
18 those numbers to get our final funding for school finance
19 for the next fiscal year.

20 So within your packet, you have an updated
21 spreadsheet that's posted on our website that districts
22 can now use in order to plan for their budget next year.
23 One of the things that I do want to point out is this
24 includes the 5000 additional preschool slots, the e-care
25 slots, but those were proportionately allocated based on



1 where those students are currently. So again, those --
2 the student counts are only estimates for 14-15. And
3 there will be a process that the CPP -- the Colorado
4 preschool office goes through in order to do those final
5 allocations.

6 Pages one through four of the spreadsheet are
7 this year's final allocations, 2013-14. And then the next
8 grouping of pages, five through eight, are the
9 illustration with -- for next year's. So you have your
10 estimated pupil counts. You have your fully funded total
11 program, the negative factor, and then what their total
12 program is after the negative factor in column O. And
13 then columns P, Q, and R, are those splits between the
14 funding that makes up that total program, the local share
15 versus the State share. And then you have the estimated
16 per-pupil funding after the negative factor.

17 And then the last grouping of pages, pages 9
18 through 12, are the changes within that. And if you
19 looked at page 12, you would see that the estimate for
20 funded students is going up by 14,303. The funding for
21 inflation and growth in students, including the e-care
22 slots, would be 296.4 million.

23 The next column over, that column W, you see
24 110 million in there. That is that buy-down of the
25 negative factor, so the change was the 110. So the entire



1 increase into total program funding this year compared --
2 or for 14-15 compared to 13-14 is 406 million, of which
3 the State is picking up 365 million. And the local share
4 is anticipated to be about 40 million towards that
5 increase. And the Statewide average increase in per-pupil
6 funding is going up \$368.30 cents per student, on average.

7 Okay? That's the biggest increase that I've
8 seen in a number of years. So it's looking better. But
9 as Jennifer was also pointing out, districts will, I'm
10 sure, be coming back next year and wanting additional
11 funding and buy-down of the negative factor.

12 So with that, do you have any questions?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika has a question.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm not sure it's a question,
15 but looking at the last few pages, there are definitely
16 winners and losers. That's kind of dramatic that there
17 are a couple of districts that the increase per student is
18 in the \$2,000 range.

19 MS. EMM: Yes.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Can you explain to me the
21 situation in Clear Creek County, because I don't
22 understand that?

23 MS. EMM: In which county?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Clear Creek.

25 MS. EMM: Clear Creek. So Clear Creek is one



1 of the odd districts that is funded with a lot of local
2 share.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Fully with local share.

4 MR. MORTON: Yes. And so when they are
5 mainly funded with local share, they are not absorbing the
6 full negative factor, because the negative factor only is
7 applied to the State -- well, let me back up. The
8 negative factor is applied first to total program, but
9 it's only pulled out of the State share portion. So for a
10 district like Clear Creek, that has very little State
11 share or none, they are not absorbing the full negative
12 factor. So therefore, their per-pupil funding is going to
13 increase at a greater rate.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. But there was
15 something like eight or nine districts that were in the
16 same category. Do they --

17 MS. EMM: That's correct.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Do they have the same effect?

19 MS. EMM: If you looked on the back page, if
20 you looked at Pawnee, they would be one of the districts
21 like that. Also, Briggsdale, if we looked at Briggsdale
22 up in Weld, they would also be in that situation.

23 If you kind of look at the ones with the
24 categorical buyouts, those are going to be the main
25 districts that that are impacted in that situation.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, thank you.

2 MS. EMM: Yes?

3 MS. NEAL: Well, just to add to that, in
4 western Colorado, De Beque and Meeker --

5 MS. EMM: Yes.

6 MS. NEAL: -- had a similar problem, which
7 was, particularly in De Beque's case, was dramatic, though
8 the legislation did come back and kind of tweak that just
9 for now. But they still had a dramatic drop because of
10 that change in their property tax value.

11 MS. EMM: Yes, right.

12 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

14 MR. OWEN: In reference, Ms. Neal, to what
15 you're talking about, and correct me if I'm wrong, Leanne,
16 that was a one-year fix. And that's going to be a
17 challenge for them as they adjust down for the following
18 years.

19 MS. EMM: Yes, thank you. And both the
20 superintendents for Meeker and De Beque were in the budget
21 and finance training held in Delta yesterday, and I was
22 talking to them about the need for them to pay very close
23 attention to what their assessed values are doing this
24 year and to contact their county assessors to find out
25 where that is looking to be this year, so that they can



1 plan for that potential drop in funding next year.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine?

3 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: I'm just making sure that
4 I understand how to read this. So where it says property
5 tax, that's the local property tax. And then the State's
6 share is what supplemented to reach the formula.

7 So I'm curious. In a city like Aspen, which
8 the property tax, local property tax, generates \$10,000.
9 Maybe it's -- is that \$10 million? And then this -- the
10 State puts in \$3,000,875. Why would the State even be
11 putting in \$3,000,875?

12 MS. EMM: Mr. Chair, thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

14 MS. EMM: Through the State equalization
15 formula, it first calculates what a district is entitled
16 to, and then then legislative council estimates the amount
17 of property tax and local share that would be generated
18 towards that formula funding that amount. And then
19 whatever is not generated locally, the State would
20 backfill up to that amount.

21 So in the case of Aspen, they -- even though
22 their wealth is -- the property wealth is very high up
23 there, they're not in the situation of a of a De Beque or
24 a Cripple Creek that's generating all of their total
25 program via local share. If their assessed value were to



1 skyrocket, then they could potentially be in that
2 situation. But also since mill levies are frozen, the
3 assessed value needs to grow significantly in order for an
4 Aspen to pick up the total share.

5 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: It seems like there's a
6 bit of a flaw at -- I mean, even looking at some place
7 like Cheyenne Mountain, they're getting more from the
8 State than they're generating from local property taxes.
9 And that doesn't seem to make any sense. So is this is
10 the main problem, the freeze in the property? What's the
11 main problem? How we're assessing property value? Or is
12 it in the formula?

13 MS. EMM: Mr. Chair, that's a very difficult
14 question to answer given all the dynamics of --

15 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Yeah, and I probably won't
16 understand it, so that's okay.

17 (Laughter)

18 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: But it's interesting to
19 look at this because it's intuitively not very -- it's
20 intuitive up to a point, and then it doesn't make sense.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: The specific ownership taxes,
23 are they also equalized?

24 MS. EMM: Thank you. The way the specific
25 ownership taxes are calculated is there's an amount that's



1 attributed to total program. And then there's also
2 amounts that can be generated above and beyond that, and I
3 would be happy to get you the spreadsheet on how that's
4 all calculated through, but there's various pots that go
5 into the specific ownership. And I --

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Really? So this is the tax,
7 the extra taxes we pay when we buy certain assets within
8 our communities? For an automobile, for example.

9 MS. EMM: Yes, for vehicles.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

11 MS. EMM: And then there's --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: And some of its equalized?
13 Some of it's put into the equalization piece and some of
14 it's above and beyond?

15 MS. EMM: Yes, that is correct. And what
16 happens at the County is that all of the specific
17 ownership tax goes into a pot.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: By county?

19 MS. EMM: By county.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

21 MS. EMM: And then it's distributed to all of
22 the taxing entities based upon their mill levies and their
23 proportionate share that they're generating in property
24 taxes. And then there's some other various calculations
25 that go into that also with bonds and things like that.



1 But it's very prescriptive.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: So when you have a County
3 that has multiple districts, that's also then distributed?

4 MS. EMM: Yes. Yes.

5 MR. OWEN: In the case when they were in
6 Boulder, the SOT, that was -- he was part of the
7 equalization that she talked about is one thing. We
8 always received an additional amount from Broomfield,
9 Boulder, and the other counties that -- I think part
10 Gilpin, based on the mill levy overrides. Based upon the
11 mill levy overrides and our -- and the bond issue as well
12 as it drove up the mill levy. And we applied that back to
13 --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, so St. Vrain has, I
15 think, four different -- maybe four different counties in
16 their district. So again.

17 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Oh, boy.

18 MR. OWEN: Yeah.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: No wonder none of us really -
20 -

21 (Talking over)

22 MR. OWEN: We're not so sure (indiscernible).
23 That's very complex.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I'd like to understand it.
25 I'll just keep trying.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Keep -- Dr. Scheffel?

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: I want to thank her for the
3 website you put together on school finance. I think it's
4 nicely laid out, and it answer a lot of questions.
5 There's a couple of details in there that are still
6 unclear to me, and I can follow up later, but I appreciate
7 the effort, because it just is nicely laid out.

8 MR. OWEN: Yeah, please let us know, because
9 we're continually evolving on a website that could make it
10 better.

11 MS. EMM: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Any other questions for
13 Ms. Emm?

14 Thank you.

15 MS. EMM: Thank you.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I believe the next item on
17 the agenda the State assessment update.

18 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Mr. Commish.

20 MR. OWEN: Thank you. This is one of your
21 most favorite topics. I --

22 MS. NEAL: Oh, yeah. We love this one.

23 MR. OWEN: And that's what we picked this
24 morning.

25 (Chuckling)



1 MR. OWEN: No. But first, this has been, as
2 you know, we've gone through our first science and social
3 studies test online. That was -- that counted for
4 participation only this year. That enabled us to work out
5 the bugs, but of course, there was bugs.

6 We're also in the process of doing the PARCC
7 assessments. Those who want to participate this in our
8 schools and districts are part of the field testing, not
9 only for the performance-based assessments that happened a
10 few weeks ago, but now the summative examples. We just
11 felt that as we evolve into this area, we want to report
12 our findings and what we're seeing out there.

13 I do have to tell you, this has been a
14 challenge for our districts as I've gotten used to
15 something brand new. Many have worked through it. Some
16 still have struggles. You'll hear this afternoon from the
17 WestEd study, at least the first presentation of that.
18 Some of the additional findings, as we look at the whole
19 burden of testing in this state, but I have to say kudos
20 to our districts. There's a lot of grunching. There's a
21 lot of good things people say.

22 And I have to also tell you that the staff,
23 being as few as we have in this State, to do everything
24 that we're doing right now, trying to work with our
25 districts to the extent possible, has been utterly



1 amazing. I've never seen -- our staff are working night
2 and day. And they have for quite some time. As Joyce
3 probably gets very frustrated sometimes with the immense
4 amount of workload, her attitude and her help with
5 districts has been amazing. So I want to thank her
6 personally for that. It's been a very trying time, and
7 also Ms. Holly for all her effort in this.

8 So anyway, with that to do, I'd like to turn
9 it over to her.

10 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Welcome.

12 (Chuckling)

13 MS. NEAL: Welcome to Grand Junction.

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Thank you very much. This
15 morning, as the Commissioner indicated, I do want to talk
16 about two different pieces of our assessment system, the
17 new assessment system.

18 The first is going to be our science and
19 social studies (indiscernible) administration that
20 occurred this spring for elementary and middle schools.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Whispers) What?

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: And the second is going to
23 deal with the -- our English language arts, and
24 mathematics field tests. We do know that folks in the
25 field are still very much confused about the relationship



1 between the science and social studies assessments and the
2 English language arts, and mathematics assessments. So
3 we're trying this umbrella, kind of a picture to help them
4 understand it's all part of the same assessment system.
5 We'll see how that works.

6 So when I first came to Colorado a little bit
7 more than three years ago, I was told Colorado has made
8 the decision to move to online assessments full force.
9 Here we go. Welcome to Colorado. My great niece kind of
10 had the experience that I had, as well as many of the
11 districts and schools saying, you think this is a good
12 idea? Moving to online?

13 In the last three used -- years, Colorado has
14 made some decisions about how to make that move a little
15 bit more gradual, rather than saying all content areas,
16 all grades, at one time.

17 So this year, again, we started with the
18 science and social studies. The rationale being we only
19 test one of those at the elementary level, one grade
20 level, sorry, and one at the middle school level. So we
21 could dabble rather than dive in and not know what we're
22 getting into.

23 I do need to extend my sincere appreciation
24 to our districts and schools. I am nothing but humbled by
25 the amount of work that they did to pull off this



1 administration. We worked with our district assessment
2 coordinators very closely. We've had that relationship
3 for years, working with them for over a decade. But we
4 also had established new relationships with the district
5 technology coordinators. They also had to establish
6 relationships with each other. And oftentimes, they met
7 each other for the first time when we walked into the
8 districts and said, hello, Mr. District Assessment
9 Coordinator. This is Ms. District Technology Coordinator.
10 Please converse. Say hi.

11 (Chuckling)

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Figuring out who was
13 responsible for which pieces was a challenge. We did have
14 some district assessment coordinators who thought if it
15 has anything to do with the technology, that must go to
16 the district technology coordinator. When the entire
17 assessment system is online, it doesn't quite work that
18 way. So we had to kind of reestablish roles and
19 responsibilities. And our DAX did need to extend
20 themselves and learn some new skills. They had to be
21 comfortable touching computers in order to pull this off.

22 We also historically in Colorado have very
23 much respected the relationship between the State and the
24 District Assessment Coordinator, and the contractor and
25 the District Assessment coordinator. And that's always



1 held -- sorry, communication has funneled. That couldn't
2 happen anymore.

3 Now, we needed to be communicating directly
4 with those district technology coordinators, as well as
5 communicating directly with the schools, because
6 obviously, as schools were testing and they ran into some
7 challenges, we could not wait for them to go through the
8 entire system. They needed to have direct access to
9 support. And that's something else that we need to work
10 through.

11 In the end, as of Friday, May 2nd, we tested
12 251,302 students in the State of Colorado online. That
13 does not include our kiddos who tested on paper.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Out of 850,000?

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: This is our students who are
16 right in fourth grade, fifth grade, seventh grade, and
17 eighth grade. So we have a little bit more than 250,000.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And (indiscernible)?

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: We got almost all of them.
20 We had less than 400 students per grade rely on paper. In
21 order to complete testing, we were expecting for
22 accommodations purposes only that we would have about 1
23 percent or 600 students need paper for accommodations, not
24 due to technology.

25 Our schools and our districts managed to do



1 the science and social studies tests online. There were
2 some bumps, and there are some bruises. But we
3 successfully tested 250,000 kiddos this year.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Can you back up?

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Sure.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Can you break that into
7 percentages, just to give a relationship? Do you have
8 that, those figures handy? Maybe not.

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: It's about 99 percent of our
10 kiddos. (Chuckles)

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so it's -- that's
12 what I was looking for.

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes. So what I have up here
14 for you is the number of daily testers. So you can see,
15 rather surprisingly actually, on the very first day of
16 testing, we had more than 42,000 students who engaged with
17 the system. I was actually expecting that to be lower,
18 letting, you know, those brave people go first, watch what
19 happens, and then dive in. That's not what Colorado chose
20 to do. Our highest day of testing was actually our third
21 day of testing, and it approached about 90,000 students
22 touching the system.

23 We had a three-week window. We intentionally
24 developed that three-week window based on the information
25 that we had. And we acknowledged all along that we were



1 dependent upon the information that the districts and
2 schools provided. So it was self-reported, voluntary, and
3 missing pieces. That three-week window allowed for our
4 districts to complete the testing. You can see that in
5 that last week of testing, the number of kids engaged with
6 the system dropped off considerably. We'll need to take
7 that into consideration next year as we discuss more about
8 Windows and testing time and things like that.

9 When we look across the testing experience,
10 keep in mind that students needed to engage with the
11 system approximately three times. There's a section one,
12 a section two, and a section three for each of the
13 assessments. So in the end, we had kiddos who engaged
14 with the system about 750,000 times. When you look at the
15 daily numbers, it doesn't add up to 750,000 cumulatively,
16 because some students did take section one in the morning
17 and took section two in the afternoon, and they would only
18 be counted once for that day.

19 Challenges. We have been saying, hopefully
20 consistently, for about the last three years, that as we
21 make this transition, we were doing our best to prepare.
22 We were working with schools and districts to prepare.
23 And Colorado Department staff, as well as our vendor, did
24 83 site visits to districts, as well as regional site
25 visits, as well as many webinars and WebEx's and lots of



1 technical support via the phone.

2 And one of the things that Colorado chose to
3 do about a little more than a year ago was to shift the
4 test engine that we were going to use for this spring.
5 You may remember that we had conversations about PCs,
6 desktops, laptops versus tablets, and the old system did
7 not accommodate tablets. What we heard from the districts
8 loud and clear was we have to be able to use tablets.
9 That meant that Colorado made the decision to be the first
10 to use that new system operationally in the country.

11 We forewarned folks that that meant, those
12 bumps and those bruises, there are going to probably be
13 more of those. And again, what the districts told us was
14 we don't care. We want to be able to use tablets.

15 So as we look at some of the challenges, we
16 can't underestimate the number of combinations of devices,
17 with operating systems, with browsers, and the test engine
18 itself, and those interactions. We did put out
19 information to the districts ahead of time saying these
20 devices are what will work. Here are the specifications
21 that you need to meet. Here are the browsers that we
22 expect to work.

23 We did test each of the forums prior to them
24 going live, both obviously with the vendor, but also
25 internally. So we were testing on laptops and desktops



1 and iPads and Chromebooks and using Internet Explorer, 8,
2 9, 10, and 11. And using Chrome, and using Mozilla
3 Firefox, and all of those things. What we couldn't mimic
4 is what the districts have on their own systems. So as we
5 looked at the variety of antivirus software and content
6 filters, and other nice little programs that they have
7 running in the background, it wasn't until we went live
8 that we could really start to understand the
9 complications.

10 So to address some of those, we did have an
11 open bridge line for the first week of testing, where the
12 district technology coordinators could call in and say,
13 hello, help fast. Not only could we have our own folks
14 responding and the vendor responding. We also got to have
15 other districts responding to other districts' questions
16 and engaging and problem solving together.

17 We also had Pearson folks on site, and that
18 included within the Grand Junction area. So that, as
19 districts and schools were having challenges, if we
20 couldn't help them via the phone, and if we couldn't help
21 them via email, and we couldn't help them via chat, we
22 would send folks out.

23 We did also have new item types for not just
24 this system. But I would suggest we push the envelope in
25 science for across the entire country. There's perhaps



1 one state that has engaged in simulation-type testing.
2 But we pushed that further than they had. That presented
3 challenges too in terms of how that functioned on all of
4 those different devices, and with all those different
5 browsers, and with all those different operating systems.

6 For tools, when we had done our field
7 testing, we had a lot of the tools available that all kids
8 had access to. So things like the highlighter, but when
9 we went to the operational tasks, we added in things like
10 text-to-speech. So for students who are struggling
11 readers -- and we are trying to get a gauge on their
12 science and social studies knowledge -- they were allowed
13 to utilize text-to-speech, which essentially allowed them
14 to push a button. And they would be able to listen to
15 what the passages were for social studies, or listen to
16 what the questions were for science.

17 We also had color contrast forms available
18 for our students who have visual disabilities. And
19 there's a combination of those.

20 We did discover that when you take all of
21 those different devices and operating systems and
22 browsers, (chuckles) and test engines, and then you
23 started to layer on those tools and those accommodations,
24 that that sometimes can slow things down a little bit.

25 Students who are very eager to engage with



1 all of the tools simultaneously, that sometimes was
2 problematic. We suspected that might happen. And so what
3 we did do is engage -- sorry -- encourage schools and
4 districts to allow students to engage with those tools
5 prior to testing. So we had sample test items out there
6 ahead of time. And we said let kids engage with this.
7 Let them see what the system is like. Let them see how
8 this highlighter works. Let them see what the text-to-
9 speech is like. Let them engage with the color contrast.
10 Do all of their play, and get it out of their system
11 before they went into actual testing.

12 We know that for PARCC, less than 50 percent
13 of the kids actually engaged in those practice
14 environments prior to testing. So we know that there are
15 a lot of kids who are experiencing the system for the
16 first time when they sat down for that test.

17 Software updates. Our system is dependent
18 upon third-party software, operating systems, browsers.
19 Chrome came out with an update literally days before the
20 opening of our window. Java came up with a security
21 update the second day of our testing. They also came up
22 with a new version of their software about a week ahead of
23 time. We were able to tell folks don't update. That's
24 not what you want to use for the Java 8.

25 The Java 7 update we knew was coming. We had



1 prepped people. We had talked to people about how to deal
2 with this. Again, this is all up to districts and
3 schools. All we could do was give suggestions. Here are
4 some options for how you might want to approach this, but
5 on the second day of testing, you need to know Java is
6 doing an update, and that's probably going to impact your
7 kiddos.

8 Remarkably, I was expecting things to come to
9 a screaming halt on that second day. And remember, our
10 second day actually had more kiddos testing than we did
11 our first day. So either the prep worked, or I don't
12 know. (Chuckles) I don't know. I know that I lost many
13 night's sleep over the Java issue.

14 Then, we also experienced a customer service
15 outage during our testing window. And that would be on
16 the first day of testing. Not the most convenient. We
17 very quickly got out email communication to the field and
18 gave them reminders that that bridge line was open for
19 them for the technical issues. And then I also gave them
20 direct numbers to a number of the Pearson program staff.
21 And I'm sure they will all keep those numbers handy, and
22 they will never lose them, and Pearson will regret that
23 customer service outage for the duration of our contract.

24 Again, it was, considering what it could have
25 been, remarkably quiet. And obviously, the field also



1 knew how to get in touch with us.

2 The following week, CenturyLink had an outage
3 on Tuesday, and that impacted CenturyLink not just in
4 Colorado. It impacted them nationally and
5 internationally. It, at first, was pinpointed to a
6 Chicago issue, and then it spread from there.

7 Our districts were impacted in two different
8 ways. The first was is that the link to the application
9 for the test engine was through CenturyLink. So people
10 struggled making the connection to that application. Once
11 the connection was made, testing went fine. But we also
12 have districts who are dependent upon CenturyLink for
13 their own internet, as their internet provider. So when
14 that crashed, that crashed.

15 Pearson worked very closely with CenturyLink,
16 and that issue was resolved the following day. Pearson
17 has also built an increased redundancy into their own
18 system so they will not be dependent upon a single third-
19 party provider in the future. They will have some backup
20 behind that bandwidth, which I know was a concern in the
21 field. I know some of you mentioned bandwidth concerns.
22 In the end, bandwidth was not a huge issue. It did not
23 prohibit anyone from being able to test. Now, it did have
24 impact sometimes on how quickly items loaded, you know, so
25 the testing experience may have been longer. We did have



1 some tests that froze, so they would need to restart. But
2 we did not need to provide paper to anybody because of
3 bandwidth issues.

4 MR. OWEN: And the caching, you might talk
5 about that.

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Sorry. And then keep in mind
7 that when we put out the original RFP, we said that the
8 contractor had to have a solution for our low bandwidth,
9 schools and districts. And so what they offered as a
10 solution was what we referred to as proctor caching. And
11 what that allowed schools and districts to do was to
12 download the tests encrypted ahead of time. And that
13 significantly decreased the amount of demand on the
14 internet bandwidth during actual testing.

15 We did encounter, interestingly enough, that
16 there were some schools and districts that actually had
17 better internet bandwidth than they did in trough nut
18 (phonetic) bandwidth. So for those folks, we didn't want
19 to proctor cache, right? So their local connection --
20 connectivity was actually worse than just going straight
21 up to the internet. So our recommendation of proctor
22 caching for those folks didn't always work. They're also
23 looking at their own local issues and wondering if they're
24 adequately meeting all of their needs on a day-to-day
25 basis. You know, we had heard about that ahead of time



1 from, you know, some folks saying, you know what? We
2 haven't even had email within our school for the last
3 week. So folks are needing to deal with challenges, and
4 the assessment is definitely putting a spotlight on them.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: I don't think I understand
6 this way, this way, proctor caching.

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Right. (Chuckles) So it's a
8 lot to understand. And if I'm getting to weedy, tell me
9 to stop.

10 So essentially, what you can do is we could
11 identify, within this room, that Angelika's computer is
12 going to hold the test for us. Okay, and so ahead of
13 time, we have downloaded the encrypted test to Angelika.
14 And then we can set it up so that Angelika's computer can
15 talk to all of your computers, okay. And that's your
16 local. That's your intranet capacity.

17 The internet capacity is the ability to go up
18 into the cloud and get it in the first place. So we could
19 have all of you downloading simultaneously, which could
20 clog the system, if you don't have a lot of internet
21 bandwidth. Or we can have it you're just talking locally.

22 MS. NEAL: Could I intercept? Because I'll
23 forget by the time he interjected. Maybe Dr. Owen.

24 (Chuckles) How much of this is related to our whole
25 problem with now, some school districts not having the



1 proper bandwidth? Is that a factor?

2 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I can take the first stab at
3 that. Obviously, the schools in the districts that have
4 higher bandwidth had less issues with the testing. What
5 we know from going through this testing this spring is
6 that even in our areas that have poor bandwidth, they were
7 able to complete testing.

8 MS. NEAL: Okay, good. (Indiscernible).
9 Yeah. So it wasn't a huge problem.

10 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Again, the tests would load
11 slower. Sometimes, it would cause issues with freezing
12 kids out, and they would have to sign back in, so it's
13 more problematic, but they were able to make it through.

14 MR. OWEN: And Mr. Chair?

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

16 MR. OWEN: I might point out some districts,
17 you know, we were very frustrated when some of these
18 things happened. And oftentimes, that's what we would
19 heard -- would hear. But after we follow back through,
20 then that completely changed in most cases. Others no,
21 but I mean, the majority, if they really were frustrated,
22 were able to work through, liked what they saw. Again,
23 that's our science AND social studies. As we do -- as we
24 talk about PARCC for next year, we're -- and you'll hear
25 that this afternoon. There are options for paper and



1 pencil if they really can't do it. So we're trying to --
2 we've learned so much from this of where we can help
3 districts even more. Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika, go ahead.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Just so I have this in the
6 back of my mind as you go on, what were the timing
7 requirements for the assessments? Were kids pretty much
8 free to take as much time as was necessary, and so they
9 could log back on, etcetera? Or was that an additional
10 stress factor for students?

11 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair. We had originally
12 established what we expected to be the testing time based
13 on our field test data. So we knew based on our field
14 test data that the average student completed the field
15 tests in 50 minutes.

16 We looked at the rest of the data and said
17 that we knew that the vast majority of kiddos would be
18 able to finish testing within 80 minutes. So that's what
19 we set for east -- each test section, was 80 minutes. If
20 kids finished at 52 minutes, it was up to schools or
21 districts to determine whether or not they could leave the
22 room. That was a local decision. But kids had up to 80
23 minutes.

24 That 80 minutes was intended to be focused,
25 test-taking time. So when we had the situations where



1 testing was interrupted, it essentially stopped the clock.
2 And then the clock would restart once the kids got
3 reengaged again.

4 This spring, our priority was to allow kids
5 to go through the experience, and that did mean we had to
6 give in some of our standardized procedures. And it was
7 more important that students get the appropriate amount of
8 time than to say, hey. Eighty minutes is up. Too bad
9 that your computer was frozen for 15 of those. So again,
10 schools and districts knew that they had that flexibility,
11 and they utilized it.

12 The other challenge that was reported to us
13 by districts is that there is a great deal of spread in
14 technology, comfort, and knowledge of their staff. So
15 even within the same district, when you went from school
16 to school, they were experiencing this very differently,
17 even as you moved from proctor to proctor. So there were
18 occasions when, you know, there would be a blip in the
19 system, and a very tech-comfortable proctor would say
20 click the back arrow. Click the forward arrow. See if it
21 works.

22 There were other folks that, as soon as there
23 was any kind of a flash, they immediately went into panic
24 mode and needed to call in major support. That is fair,
25 and it was our job to support those folks. But what the



1 districts have indicated is that that's a really strong
2 indicator that they may need to look at the professional
3 development needs of their own staff in terms of
4 technology. Not in relationship to the test, but in
5 relationship to their ability to make sure that their
6 students are going to be adequately engaged in technology
7 in a meaningful way to learn the standards.

8 So when we talk about, you know, what worked
9 well, where did it work well? We cannot say oh, things
10 went wonderful in District A, and things went horribly in
11 District B. It is more idiosyncratic than that.

12 (Chuckles) So there were cases when we had some schools
13 within a district where it went swimmingly. And then
14 there were other schools within that district where they
15 really struggled. I am not saying that that is all the
16 adults' influence, because we also know that there were
17 true technology differences. The challenge was is that
18 even within the district, they didn't always understand
19 their technology. So as we would engage in having
20 conversations about all right, what browser are you using,
21 folks didn't necessarily know that. When we would talk
22 about okay, so what kind of filters do you have that we
23 might need to look at, folks wouldn't necessarily know
24 that.

25 So it definitely is -- we definitely needed



1 to dig much deeper than we do when we're dealing with
2 paper and pencil. And we also had, as we were talking
3 earlier about how do we divide the responsibilities
4 between the DAC and the DTC, we had some DTCs who went on
5 vacation during the window.

6 MR. OWEN: I'm not sure if they understand
7 the whole DAC and DTC.

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Sorry, the district
9 assessment coordinator and our district technology
10 coordinator. Those are our two key people within our
11 districts. Thank you.

12 So again, I think as we're moving forward,
13 we're going to really need to deal also with that adult
14 comfort level.

15 The kiddos were probably the last to get
16 anxious about the testing experience. The adults were
17 probably the first to. We did have the opportunity to go
18 in and observe in some locales. We were in a local middle
19 school and typical 12, 13, and 14-year-olds. They were a
20 little bouncy, off-task, moving around in their seat as
21 people went through the directions on how it was that they
22 were supposed to, you know, start this test, and engage
23 with this test. And then they got to hit start.

24 And there was a room of 25-12, 13, and 14-
25 year-olds, focused on taking the test, without anyone



1 having told them now it's time to get focused.

2 So again, from the kid perspective, they
3 seemed to definitely appreciate this. Keep in mind that
4 even with the field tests, we had, you know, kids saying
5 that about 80 percent of them really preferred this online
6 testing. That is also something that we saw during the
7 operational assessment. Part --

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Can I ask (indiscernible)
9 before you gone?

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yes, you may.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: So this is not -- maybe the
12 technology, but what we heard a lot was more of the
13 capacity of how many actual computers or pads or whatever
14 it is that schools had, and the amount of time it would
15 take to rotate the students through. I don't think I
16 heard if -- did you talk about that? Did I miss that part
17 of it?

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So again, when we established
21 our initial window, we did look at the data that we had.
22 And we did determine that the vast majority of the schools
23 for which we had data would be able to do the testing
24 within our 15-day window.

25 When we look at what we actually saw on a



1 daily basis, if we were really utilizing every device
2 every day, every moment of the day, we would expect that
3 to be relatively flat. Right?

4 We don't see that at all. So we know that we
5 weren't occupying the computers for every minute of every
6 day for those 15 days. Does that make sense?

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Yep.

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Okay. Now, we do know that
9 there were some districts who, you know, they've moved
10 forward in schools who have one-to-ones, right? So every
11 kiddo has their own device. And obviously, when you start
12 talking about testing time at the school level, for those
13 schools, there's less testing time. For schools that did
14 require to have like three groups of kiddos funnel through
15 their labs of 25 computers, that meant testing took
16 longer.

17 PARCC field tests also occurred this spring
18 and are occurring this spring. Remember, PARCC has two
19 components to their test. There is the performance-based
20 assessment. That field test ran from March 24th through
21 April 11th. And then there is the end-of-year component,
22 which started May 5th, and goes through June 6th. Now, if
23 you take those dates, and you put them with our state
24 testing dates, you'll notice that the first one kind of
25 fed at the end of TCAP, right before the science and



1 social studies. Then we did science and social studies.
2 And now, there are folks who are engaged in the end-of-the
3 year.

4 Participation in the PARCC field test, just
5 like in this the science and social studies field tests,
6 were voluntary. So districts and schools were invited.
7 We did a random kind of selection, but they could decline
8 if they didn't want to participate. We --

9 MR. OWEN: Joyce? Mr. Chair, the science and
10 social studies, they had to take.

11 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Science and social studies
12 was an operational assessment.

13 MR. OWEN: Thank you.

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Everybody had to participate.
15 And apparently, that was a surprise to a couple of
16 districts. And we provided them a friendly reminder when
17 we got the phone call saying this is optional this year,
18 right? And we're saying no, it's not optional this year.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: But the test -- but the
20 results didn't count.

21 MR. OWEN: Right. Correct.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, so the decision
23 was made a while back that as we were making this move to
24 the online assessments, we kind of asked ourselves, what
25 else is it that we can do to kind of alleviate some of the



1 anxiety and to really push this transition this year as
2 hard as we could? And one of the decisions that was made
3 was that for purposes of SPS and DPS, the, you know,
4 school performance framework and the district performance
5 framework, what would count this year was participation.
6 Right? So did you have your kiddos actually test, and
7 we're going to utilize the performance information just as
8 baseline, right? So not a lot of high stakes attached to
9 it for this year.

10 And that is also what allowed us to really
11 push the go online. Let's see if we can do it. Had the
12 results carried more weight with them, we may have had to
13 allow more districts to use paper than what we ended up
14 having to do.

15 MS. NEAL: You provided that information. So
16 they know. I mean, it doesn't count, but they know what
17 their results were at school districts, whether they did?

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, we don't have
19 results yet. So --

20 MS. NEAL: But they will.

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: They will know. So we have
22 finished testing. We'll now go into the scoring aspects,
23 the scoring at the item level. This summer, we will do
24 what is called standard setting. So we will bring groups
25 of educators together and talk about what is that good



1 enough cut point, right? What's going to be proficient,
2 and what's not proficient? What's going to be advanced,
3 etcetera? And then --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: And those performance levels
6 will be utilized when we do our actual reporting later
7 this summer, early this fall. But again, that's for
8 informational purposes, not for high stakes or
9 accountability.

10 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair, as clarification for
11 the Board, that will come back to you for the cut scores.

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And weightings and items
14 like that, that will be part of that process as well? Or
15 no?

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I --

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, I guess maybe it's
18 cut scores is what I'm asking about.

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Right. So what we will do is
20 we will basically take performance on items, and then
21 educators will determine which performances indicate this
22 performance is good enough in order to be called
23 proficient. This is what kids need to demonstrate in
24 order to be called advanced. It's a multi-day process.
25 While we go through that process, we'll also look at



1 impact data. We will also look at some external markers.
2 So we will utilize NAPE results and TIMSS results just as
3 kind of an external marketing for hmm. What do you think
4 about this? You know, right now, this is where you guys
5 are saying we're at. This is what NAPE is saying. This
6 is what TIMSS says. Does that make sense? And again,
7 those cut scores will come before this Board for final
8 approval.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And that's in the fall
10 we'll be seeing those?

11 MS. ZURKOWSKI: It will be later this summer.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Later in the summer.

13 Jane, question? And footnote, we're were pushed over on
14 time. Let's keep moving quickly. But please, go ahead.

15 MS. GOFF: Yeah, I understand. This is real
16 quick. Thanks.

17 This is for the standard setting cut score
18 decision by this Board is for social studies and science.

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, correct.

20 MS. GOFF: Okay. And the other quickie thing
21 is real -- going back a little bit, Joyce, well, two
22 things. Scores will not be counted. They will be
23 reported. Has there been decision on a format for the
24 form that eventually parents, teachers -- parents will
25 see? What is the actual report card-type thing?



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. --

2 MS. GOFF: Have we decided on that yet?

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So what we have done is we
6 have developed what we refer to as individual student
7 report shells. And those are the reports that go home
8 with the students.

9 We did run those by some parents. We expect
10 we will get additional feedback after this year, and we'll
11 make revisions as necessary. We will also provide
12 information that is similar to what we've provided in the
13 past in terms of school-level reporting and district-level
14 reporting and state-level reporting, so that we can look
15 at performance on physical science, versus Earth space
16 science, versus life science of boys versus girls.
17 Students who are eligible for free and reduced lunch
18 compared to students who are eligible for free and reduced
19 lunch. All of those typical comparisons.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, onward.

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: All right. So with the PARCC
22 again, indicated that there are those two different pieces
23 for the performance-based assessment and then the end-of-
24 the-year assessment. In most cases, students participate
25 only in one or the other. There are a small group of



1 students who do both pieces. Students participated in
2 either math or English language arts, so they weren't
3 doing all of it. For that performance-based assessment,
4 for the online version, we had about 54 districts who
5 participated, 195 schools that participated, and over
6 13,000 students who participated. We don't have the
7 paper-based numbers yet. We have the online version, and
8 we have the paper version. We don't have paper numbers
9 yet.

10 For the end-of-the-year assessment, we are
11 expecting to have 85 districts participate and 342
12 schools. We are also keeping in mind that schools and
13 districts signed up for this several months ago. And the
14 reality of being in May, they might change their mind.
15 Folks are tired, and they want to get through the year.

16 Initial feedback that we have gotten from the
17 kids is that they are finding the math assessment more
18 difficult than the English language arts assessment.
19 About 65 percent of our kiddos are saying that the math is
20 more difficult than what did they experience in their
21 classrooms. So as we had conversations about rigor of the
22 assessments, that's a pretty good indicator of where we're
23 at. That is very high-level and very preliminary. We
24 will be getting more information on the PARCC field
25 testing student responses at the end of the summer, and we



1 can look more specifically at grade levels at that point
2 in time.

3 PARCC challenges were similar to what we
4 experienced with the science and social studies.
5 Remember, it's the same system. So we do have some
6 different kinds of items in our science and social studies
7 tests, right? We have science simulations, and those
8 aren't included in the PARCC ELA and math tests. But the
9 same challenges of utilizing these different devices, and
10 these different browsers, and these different operating
11 systems, etcetera, etcetera, they did have -- also have
12 some different tools than what we have.

13 One of the tools that they struggled with,
14 and this is out there in the public, was the equation
15 editor. So they will be looking at how to refine that a
16 little bit more. That is where the student basically gets
17 to put in I need to have parentheses, X to the 2nd plus Y
18 minus 7, end of parentheses, divided by etcetera,
19 etcetera. I mean, it's you're doing your full-fledged
20 equations.

21 Improvements will be made to that particular
22 tool before next year's testing. We did find that
23 students were more comfortable taking the ELA test online.
24 They were more cautious about how comfortable they were
25 with the math test online. So for ELA initial



1 information, it looks like again, we have that 80 percent
2 of the kids saying put it online. For math, that drops
3 closer to 50/50. That also may be more reflective of what
4 happens instructionally for students. So that students
5 are used to doing reading online. They're used to doing
6 some of their writing on a computer. They may not be as
7 comfortable doing math on a computer.

8 So as we look at what we have learned at a
9 very high level at this point, and how that informs what
10 needs to happen for spring of '15, is we can now say that
11 our elementary and middle schools can give online
12 assessments. Again, with some bumps and some bruising,
13 but they were able to do it. But it is dependent upon the
14 number of devices they have available. Bandwidth may
15 limit the number of kiddos that they can do at the same
16 time. Schools and districts who need to do multiple
17 groups at each grade level, especially more than four
18 groups per grade level, might be redirecting an awful lot
19 of their technology to assessment.

20 When we look at the PARCC design for next
21 year, there are going to be five sections per student for
22 that performance-based assessment, three for English
23 language arts, and two for math. And they are going to be
24 four sections in the end-of-the-year. Two for math, two
25 for ELA. As we start to have conversations about what



1 does this next step in the transition look like, we are
2 taking into consideration some of the feedback that we've
3 gotten from schools and districts. We're looking at what
4 we learned this spring.

5 And one of the options that we do have is to
6 say that for next year, we can offer those mathematics
7 assessments as paper-based assessments. Districts can
8 opt-in to the online if that's what they want, right? So
9 for those districts and schools who are ready and are
10 comfortable, and it's matching instructionally, they can
11 opt-in to do that.

12 But for other districts, as we look at that
13 next step, what we could say is be ready to move forward
14 with English language arts online, and we'll move into
15 math online down the road.

16 Keep in mind that that will not change how
17 much time the individual student engages in testing. But
18 what it does do is it changes what happens at the school
19 level. Right? So now I can go back to all of my fourth
20 graders taking the fourth grade math test at the same
21 time, as opposed to needing to have three separate groups
22 running through the system.

23 We are also having conversations with PARCC,
24 encouraging them to look at their test design, and to see
25 if there is room to shorten some of those test sessions.



1 And when we look at how long students engaged in the
2 testing process, it looks like they took less time than
3 what was originally expected. So that may also be an
4 option. With that said --

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions.

6 (Chuckling)

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We'll start at the far
8 right and move to the left.

9 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, I think mine is not
10 a question. Mine is a statement. And that is I'm just
11 amazed at what you and your team have been able to do. I
12 mean, it seems like, I mean, this whole online assessment,
13 people have been worried about it. We're doing it right.
14 We're testing it. We knew there were going to be bumps.
15 We're identifying those bumps. We're approaching it just
16 the way we should be approaching it. So kudos to you and
17 to everybody that has gotten us this far, because this is
18 truly -- this is groundbreaking. And I'm just thrilled to
19 see Colorado in this kind of leadership position and in
20 really testing the waters, because everything's not --
21 everything is going to be more and more and more and more
22 online.

23 I mean, I was with somebody here who said I
24 don't even have a pencil. Who carries a pen or a pencil
25 anymore? So we're at the front end of it, and we're



1 trying to do it right. And you and everybody else that's
2 helping you is trying to help us do it right. So thank
3 you very, very much.

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I will definitely carry that
7 message back to the assessment unit. They have definitely
8 worked very, very hard. And again, the districts in the
9 schools again, even though they were concerned, they put
10 forth a lot of effort, and when there's no way we could
11 have done it without their commitment to seeing it
12 through.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika?

14 MS. SCHROEDER: My thanks also. I'm actually
15 not surprised. I think fear was a huge factor. I mean, I
16 did expect more of the technology problems than we had.
17 What I heard from a few sources was that they were
18 extremely pleased with the support that they got. That
19 you guys helped them so much. They learned a lot.

20 I'm going to repeat what I've said before.
21 This whole assessment, online assessment, is the tail
22 wagging the dog in terms of providing -- having technology
23 for our kids to learn, for our teachers to use as tools
24 and teaching, etcetera. So this is pushing that. And I
25 know there are some parents and citizens who are not



1 comfortable with that. But boy, our kids are.

2 So I went to an event, I guess, last week,
3 where some School Board Members came up to me and said
4 boy, you're right. The kids really appreciated the online
5 tests. We didn't believe when I had passed on information
6 I'd heard from elsewhere. So that's really great.

7 I'm curious what kind of feedback that we
8 will get from PARCC. I'm assuming they're collecting
9 information from us about how the testing went and the
10 responses from other states. And how long will it be
11 until they sort of put together some information?

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, PARCC did survey
13 students across the PARCC consortium, as well as like the
14 district assessment coordinators or whatever they're
15 called in the other states. And we will get that
16 information at the end of the summer. That will be broken
17 out by grade level. We have some very high-level
18 information based on a subset of the responses right now.
19 So that's what I can say to you. It looks like students
20 found the math assessments more challenging than they
21 found the ELA assessments in terms of their self-
22 perception. And, you know, as they were gauging how that
23 compared to their regular school work.

24 They asked questions such as I mentioned, you
25 know, how does this compare to what you're doing on a



1 daily basis in school? They asked questions about were
2 the instructions clear? Were you able to utilize the
3 tools? What kind of device did you use? What would you
4 do to improve the system? Would you prefer to take your
5 tests online or on paper, etcetera?

6 We will have that broken out by state and
7 then overall by PARCC, so we'll be able to do an
8 independent Colorado analysis. But we'll be able to do
9 that within context of the other states in the consortium
10 as well.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So we've always heard that
12 we're going to be able to get data back so much more
13 quickly when we do things online. And I'm not feeling
14 that that's -- that's not what I'm hearing. It's still
15 taking --

16 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair? The problem that you
17 have anytime you do a test, because you have to benchmark
18 it.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

20 MR. OWEN: And that takes time to go through
21 the process, as when Keith was explaining how this, and
22 Elliott worked with our accountability system, that always
23 takes time. The goal of this is to get the result back
24 ultimately before they get out of school. That's hard.
25 You can't do that right now until we get all -- am I on?



1 Apparently. Okay.

2 That's hard to do right now until all these
3 science and social studies have to be benchmarked.
4 There's a process. It ends up with you. The same thing
5 we talked about in PARCC. That goes on a whole different
6 level, at the, you know, the consortium. Then it still
7 comes back to you for approval, if I'm right. Okay.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is that a one-time
9 experience?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, it's --

11 MR. OWEN: Yeah. Once you set the bench --
12 I think it is, okay? But you can always -- can you always
13 change those? You'd have to answer that.

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair? So it went --

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The root question is can
16 we get an assessment that gets back in the classroom
17 immediately? Go ahead.

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Oh. I was misunderstanding
19 the question at first. So there obviously is a lot of
20 push to get assessment results more quickly than what has
21 happened historically, and that is going to happen. They
22 are not going to be instantaneous results. There are a
23 number of things that need to happen. PARCC intentionally
24 broke their assessment into two pieces, so that that
25 performance-based assessment that will require human



1 scoring, that can be happening while instruction
2 continues. And then kids will take the end-of-the-year,
3 and then those pieces will be merged together. But we
4 still need to go through a lot of psychometric work,
5 technical work, to make sure that scores from one year to
6 another year can be compared. And so that will not allow
7 for instantaneous results for the first few years of
8 PARCC.

9 There may come a time when we can do
10 something with all those technical pieces ahead of time,
11 but we can't do that until we have a really strong trend
12 and stabilization.

13 So will we get results more quickly than we
14 currently do? Absolutely. So with like the science and
15 the social studies, we're ending testing at the first
16 Friday in May. We expect to have individual student
17 results by the very beginning of June. Right now, those
18 are coming at the end of July. And we've moved testing
19 closer to the end-of-the-year.

20 So we wanted to bring that window together.
21 But as long as we value performance-based types of
22 activities and open responses and constructed responses,
23 tests that get beyond the multiple choice, we're going to
24 have to allow time for that scoring and that reporting to
25 occur.



1 MR. OWEN: Until artificial intelligence
2 takes over. But that's not even here yet.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm not quite finished yet.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, go ahead.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: I know. I will hurry up.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: (Indiscernible) before. Let
7 me summarize what -- I want to make sure I'm hearing
8 correctly.

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We've got a benchmarking
11 process, a big process, that's going to make for a very
12 slow turn cycle one.

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Cycle two, it gets a
15 little bit faster, etcetera, etcetera, as we move through
16 the various cycles. But you're not characterizing a
17 picture where we will ever get instantaneous or immediate
18 feedback results.

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Unless we go to multiple
20 choice in those kinds of --

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Correct.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, thank you.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: And it is the performance
25 assessments that were most called for by our educators,



1 right? This is what they said are the really meaningful
2 ways of assessing whether true learning has -- so that's a
3 conversation that we've not really had with our community.
4 That these -- this is a different way of having kids
5 retrieve what they learned. And it requires a different
6 assessment, just a different process that we cannot
7 respond to immediately.

8 It would be interesting if it would be
9 possible for teachers to see the responses that kids make
10 so that they individually themselves. You know, if
11 there's enough of a bank of different assessments, that
12 even though we're sending it off to la la land to have it
13 be graded, that they also themselves can see how their
14 kids did in order to actually see the feedback and they
15 themselves know how.

16 And then I have one more. I don't know if
17 it's common or not, but I know that as we -- as Board
18 Members are getting more available information online,
19 what I struggle with most are numbers, which is why I
20 actually need sometimes to have the paper pieces in order
21 to go back-and-forth. And I'm beginning to wonder whether
22 there is a connection with the online. I mean, I don't
23 know that I could do an equation, a complex equation, very
24 easily either on the keyboard, and I hope some researcher
25 does some research on whether it's actually a challenge to



1 be doing the math thinking and the writing and the actual
2 -- unless that's how we do it in the classroom. That's
3 not how we do -- the kids actually do it. Most math
4 tactile, in fact, that's the way we try to teach math is
5 in a tactile way, sometimes even with manipulatives.

6 So I think that's an area of research for us
7 to actually figure out whether it were, with the math
8 thinking and visualizing translates into the verbal thing.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And I'd like to just
10 piggyback on the question. This is one of those areas
11 where the -- this conversation we're having about
12 standards assessments and curriculum, where clearly the
13 assessment is driving curriculum as it changes potentially
14 in the way that, you know, math is being taught,
15 especially at the lower grade levels. But go ahead, and
16 please respond to the question.

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, they are
18 definitely looking into doing comparability kinds of
19 analyses between the online version and the paper version
20 for math. I think as we've been having conversations
21 internally, again, on the one hand, trying to look at
22 transition and what makes most sense, we had originally
23 said that we wanted to move forward with science first,
24 because we really thought that the online assessments with
25 the simulations provided a whole new avenue for assessment



1 that would allow the kids to actually engage in a more
2 meaningful way than just, you know, a paper-based test.

3 As we're looking at this transit --
4 transition with the ELA and the math assessments, we have
5 said for ELA, the English language arts assessments, we
6 know that students, they are learning how to write, and
7 they're doing that with a computer. There are students
8 who -- and adults who are far more comfortable in the
9 writing process with a keyboard than they are with the
10 pencil and paper.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Right.

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So when we look at that match
14 between instruction and assessment, it seems to be a good
15 fit. And in fact, to force people to utilize a paper and
16 pencil for writing, that's actually more of a hindrance
17 for an awful lot of our kids.

18 When we look at math, and that is one of the
19 reasons why we're suggesting math. Let's do math on
20 paper. It's a lot to allow that research to move forward.
21 And for us also to have more conversations in terms of
22 what is happening instructionally. We know that math
23 instruction is moving more towards a technology-based kind
24 of a system, but I'm not sure it's there yet. And our
25 kids are indicating they don't think it's there yet.



1 So again, as we're looking at our transition
2 plan, that is part of the reason why we're putting that
3 out there as a suggestion, very much recognizing are we
4 really comfortable completely with that? And in this
5 case, we'll look at our fellow states and see what they
6 learned. (Chuckles)

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane?

8 MS. NEAL: Uh, me?

9 (Chuckling)

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry.
11 I'm sorry.

12 MS. NEAL: (Chuckles) You can't. I'm here.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You typically don't ask
14 permission, so if I missed you, (indiscernible).

15 MS. NEAL: Well, I just thought we were going
16 down the line. And that's okay, because I will be very
17 brief.

18 I would echo the thanks for the work you did.
19 I know that the Commissioner has read to us some of the
20 comments that kids made when they did this assessment,
21 particularly in social studies, as I recall. And how they
22 thought it was fun to do the assessment, which is a
23 wonderful achievement. (Chuckles)

24 I also personally find it very interesting.
25 And want to be sure the public all understands that the



1 social studies and science testing are state testing.
2 They're not part of the national testing that that PARCC
3 is providing. So that may be very important to us as we
4 move on, that everybody realized that's state testing, and
5 I appreciate that. Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane?

7 MS. GOFF: Very quickly. Were there special
8 education students included in both? So when we're
9 talking about the coming -- it's terrible. The coming
10 CoALT, our normal system around the cognitively disabled
11 and in other particular categories is to make it real
12 clear to people is that special education students who are
13 in programs and classrooms are also included in this pilot
14 trial practice runs of everything or not?

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So the vast majority of our
18 students with disabilities will participate in the CMAS
19 assessments, the science and social studies, and the
20 PARCC-developed ELA and math.

21 There is a very small percentage of students
22 with disabilities that will continue to take an alternate
23 assessment. And those are our students with the most
24 significant cognitive disabilities. That represents
25 probably about one percent of our total population. And



1 approximately 10 percent of our special ed population.

2 We did move forward with new alternate
3 assessments for science and social studies. We feel
4 tested at the same time that we feel tested our general
5 assessments last spring for elementary and middle school.
6 We did not need to do a second one in the fall. And then
7 we did high school this past fall. And those assessments
8 also went live this spring. So in addition to what we
9 talked about today, there were alternate assessments for
10 those kids this spring.

11 MS. GOFF: Thanks.

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: And results will be released
13 at the same time.

14 MS. GOFF: Okay, thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Deb?

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, thank you also. I have
17 a questions about I've been meeting a lot of parents and
18 teachers over the last couple of months, just because of
19 this assessment. I think what they cared most about is
20 the content of the test. Number of question types in the
21 subareas of the knowledge domains. The number of points.
22 Question formats is a big issue. How the test is scored,
23 the rubrics. And as the test becomes more high stakes for
24 the teachers and the students, since this was a held
25 harmless year, how do parents and teachers get that



1 information? And I'm questioning the test prep materials.
2 You know, some have spoken of that. But I think that as
3 we look at it, I've actually watched kids take the test.

4 And it's interesting. The memory load and
5 also the text density of the screen, I think, will be
6 enhancing achievement gaps in some sub parts of the --
7 subgroups of the population just because of those two
8 human factors variables, where kids are struggling with
9 items. Not because of the content of the item. Because
10 of the memory load and because of the density of the text
11 on the screen.

12 So having watched that happen, a lot of
13 sighing from kids around that, even though I know there
14 are instances where kids are loving the online format.
15 But how do teachers and parents get this kind of detailed
16 information as the test becomes high stakes?

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, two of the key
18 places that I'm going to suggest is, especially for the
19 teachers, is that they can look at the frameworks. And
20 the frameworks are what put out -- what we have put out at
21 least a year ago. It's a blur. (Chuckles) But that does
22 show the percentage of items that come from each of the
23 standard areas. So how many points, how many -- the
24 percentage of points for life science, for physical
25 science, for Earth space science, for history, for civics,



1 for economics, etcetera. So they can see that breakout.

2 They also see the standards that are going to
3 be assessed. So they see those actual evidence outcomes,
4 where they list this is what the kids are expected to be
5 able to do. And they can see that.

6 In terms of test prep, the best thing they
7 can do is teach the standards. That really is the best
8 preparation.

9 Now, I acknowledged earlier that you want
10 kids to be able to engage with the test engine ahead of
11 time so they can figure out how all the tools work.
12 That's should not take lots and lots of time. The best
13 preparation is teaching of the standards.

14 Also keep in mind that we do have sample
15 items out there. And they represent all of our item
16 types. So they can see what does a constructed response
17 item look like? What does a simulation look like? What
18 the heck is a performance event for social studies? What
19 does that mean? What does a drag and drop look like?

20 This is terminology that kids are starting to
21 get. And they can experience that, again, prior to
22 testing, and parents can go and see that. That's publicly
23 available.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: May I do a follow-up?

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please. (Indiscernible).



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I would just say that the
2 teachers and parents I've worked with and talked to don't
3 find that information detailed enough to help them. So
4 that's a larger conversation. And we'll talk about that
5 as we move into the next year where the test becomes high
6 stakes.

7 And a follow up. What happens to the
8 student-level data on CMAS and PARCC? And does the fact
9 that it -- the test is now online change what happens to
10 the data? So in other words, this is another question
11 about privacy and the length of time the data is
12 available, and where, and to whom, and so forth.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, so I'm going to
15 start with the science and social studies assessments, in
16 part because we don't have a contract yet for the PARCC
17 assessments. So there are a lot of details to be worked
18 out yet with PARCC. So for science and social studies --
19 the science and social studies contractors have
20 historically gotten personally identifiable information
21 that has been part of the system all along. We do
22 reporting out based on male, female, free and reduced
23 lunch, not free and reduced lunch. We report out based on
24 race and ethnicity. So that is information that they
25 have.



1 We will continue to do that with the science
2 and social studies assessments within the contract. There
3 is a lot of language about what the vendor can and cannot
4 do with that information. And essentially what it says is
5 they cannot use that information for anything other than
6 reporting out the state assessment results. That is by
7 contract. And then there are destruction clauses within
8 the contracts, all of the assessment contracts.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: So those details would be nice
10 for the State Boards, you know, I would think just because
11 they're really direct questions by teachers and parents.
12 I'll see my parents on that one. One final question --

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And I echo that. I'm
14 getting a lot of questions around these things, so I
15 haven't had specific, detailed information. It would be
16 very helpful.

17 MR. OWEN: Well --

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just had one final comment.

19 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. I'll make this
20 (indiscernible).

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure, sure.

22 MR. OWEN: One of the things we can do,
23 where, as we get any questions on technology, security,
24 privacy, we're developing a frequently asked questions
25 page, because I mean, because many times, we have the same



1 questions. But I'm not sure if it's on there, but if it's
2 not, we'll make sure that's on there and easy to access.
3 Okay?

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel, go ahead.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Pearson is the vendor for
6 science and social studies, PARCC obviously. Are they --
7 is Pearson the vendor for PARCC also?

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Pearson has very recently
9 been awarded the PARCC contract through New Mexico ,and
10 Colorado will be engaging in its own contract negotiation
11 process. Well, actually, we've started that. So that is
12 going to be Pearson as well.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Pearson is the only
14 vendor, right? Is that correct?

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Pearson is the only vendor
16 for what? For PARCC, they're the chosen vendor.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just -- I would love a study
18 session on this and go deeper with Pearson, and invite
19 them to come talk more specifically about how they do test
20 development, if any other Board Members have an interest.

21 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

23 MR. OWEN: That contract, the way we're
24 setting the contract, to fulfill our obligations from a
25 statutory standpoint, is that it will be done with me and



1 with staff with all the issues that you've talked about
2 before. The only thing that makes sense for us on a
3 contract, it has to meet our -- meet all of our state
4 standards and the contractual standards of this state.

5 And secondly, we will amend our contract with
6 Pearson. That's how that -- we don't need a separate one.
7 We can amend it, because it is with the same vendor. But
8 what we add to it is all the privacy and the other issues
9 that makes what we want to see in the contract.

10 What you're asking about is a little bit
11 different issue, and we can talk about that some more.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, I think Angelika had
13 a follow-up question here.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: I did. It was a sort of a
15 follow-up to what Deb was talking about. I'm wondering if
16 it wouldn't be very, very helpful for someone -- and I'm
17 not sure it's necessarily CDE staff, but maybe getting to
18 bring you together some teachers to put together a
19 parent's guide with links to some of the questions, but
20 with also teachers spoken word about here's the standard.
21 And here's what a sample assessment looks like.

22 I'm not the best navigator on the CDE website
23 either, but to put together an actual parents' guide --
24 and it might be for elementary kids or some -- just
25 something to think about. But have it be -- I would



1 prefer it to be in the teacher's voice rather than our
2 voices. We tend to speak educationese much more than
3 teachers who are used to speaking to parents.

4 The other comment that I would have is I've
5 been sort of following what the SAT folks are doing. And
6 they're being very open, I think, about what you need to
7 know and be able to do in order to do well on this new
8 SAT. And I'm kind of hoping that we could be the same
9 way. It's not -- it shouldn't be a big secret or any kind
10 of a gotcha, these assessments. And I think that kind of
11 an approach will be very helpful. And I think that might
12 be more common to -- calming to parents and students.
13 This is not a gotcha. Here's what you need to know. Here
14 are the different ways that we might ask you to
15 demonstrate what you know. Tie it to the standards. I
16 mean, that's the whole idea behind the standards, that
17 it's not a big secret what we want kids to know and be
18 able to do, but that kind of an approach.

19 I don't even -- frankly, I don't think it's
20 critical whether the tests are timed. However long it
21 takes a kid to demonstrate what they actually know. But
22 that's sort of a mindset, I think, would be a lot more
23 helpful. And it might take some of the stress out for
24 folks.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, thank you. Dr.



1 Scheffel?

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Just in follow-up to
3 Angelika's comment. I think testing is increasingly
4 being viewed by teachers, at least, and increasingly by
5 parents as they see the high stakes of the test as a genre
6 in itself. How do you take the test and be successful?
7 Lest we increase the achievement gap with the haves and
8 the have nots, and the kids who are savvy about how to
9 take the test, where there are specific skills implicit in
10 doing well on these online tests? Those kids do well, and
11 the other kids are really struggling with the tools and
12 the highlighter and some of the implicit features of the
13 item. So I think that being as transparent as possible,
14 so that everybody has an even playing field, is really
15 essential. So thank you. It's a great comment, Angelika.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. Jane?

17 MS. GOFF: Well, a comment, food for thought
18 perhaps.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think here's where we're
20 going. (Chuckles) I think we need to study this a little
21 more. So instead of having an implicit debate, I think we
22 probably will cue something up and come back to this. But
23 go ahead with your comments, Jane.

24 MS. GOFF: Thank you. I'm thinking that
25 there is an awful lot of good work, examples, exemplars



1 samples, within the content collaborative work. And so
2 when you look at the BOCES in the districts, curriculum
3 work together that they have set up in the samples and the
4 units that they provided. I think that might be just
5 hypothesis, imagining here. That that might be a place to
6 start for looking for things. I totally agree. It's
7 great to have the teacher example, provided with both
8 parents and educators, so -- to get started there. That's
9 all, Paul. Thank you.

10 MS. NEAL: If we don't take this break here -
11 -

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'll be real quick. So
13 let me preface all my remarks with commendations to you,
14 your staff, the team at CDE, the districts, everybody
15 who's worked so hard to make this successful. And it is a
16 significant change from the way we'd behave -- all this
17 interaction with technology. And the large first part of
18 your presentation, Ms. Zurkowski, was about the fact that
19 technology changes daily. And that's something that's our
20 brave new world. That's something we need to be prepared
21 for as we move through that. So commendations to
22 everybody for just kind of stepping into that and dealing
23 with it so effectively.

24 The questions I have are largely generated by
25 the questions that are coming in to me. The first one is



1 actually my second one, but I'll take the first one, and
2 you've kind of interacted with it already, is around this
3 issue of item visibility.

4 The one place, and I appreciate your answers
5 and all -- and I, you know, take those to heart. The
6 sample items, to my experience, are largely unsatisfactory
7 or unsatisfying, is I try and offer those out as response
8 back. The frameworks, I'll go ahead and spend a lot more
9 time personally with that. That's something that might be
10 helpful to me.

11 The next question I have is regarding the
12 PARCC feedback and redirection process and into the
13 contract negotiation is part of that. And I guess I'm not
14 really looking for an expansive answer to that. If you
15 want to give me a summary answer, and then maybe I could
16 get some more detail of that offline, but kind of
17 understanding exactly what that's going to look like.

18 And then the last thing is a very broad
19 question. It isn't specific to this immediate test. It
20 predates this test, and it's the -- an opt-out. I'm
21 increasingly getting asked by parents. What are the
22 rules? What are the laws? What are the things around
23 opt-out? And I don't want my kids to be -- or I don't
24 want to be arrested for truancy, because I'm uncomfortable
25 with my kids being part of the standardized test. So if



1 you could tackle those in the order you'd like, you have
2 exactly 15 seconds, please. Go!

3 (Chuckling)

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: No problem. I'll go fast.
5 All right. (Chuckles) So in terms of the PARCC contract,
6 we are obligated to follow pieces of the New Mexico
7 contract obviously, right? We're going to give the same
8 test. We're going to report in the same way etcetera,
9 etcetera. We will be putting a Colorado spin on it. We
10 are looking specifically at that issue of allowing kids to
11 take ELA online and do math on paper, and that's not part
12 of the New Mexico contract. So that will be unique to
13 Colorado.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And in the timeframe of
15 the process. The timeframe on all of this happening. How
16 does --

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yeah. What we have put out
18 there is 100 days. (Chuckles)

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So by end of summer, this
20 (indiscernible).

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: By the end of summer, we will
22 -- we need to have a contract in place for the ELA and
23 math assessments. We will move forward as quickly as we
24 can, but we want to make sure that Colorado needs are
25 addressed appropriately and accordingly.



1 Colorado State law says that all students
2 will take the State assessments, period. End of story.
3 There is not within the Colorado State law, except for
4 parents who don't want the students to take the test.
5 That doesn't exist in there. So we do not have a parent
6 opt-out provision within our State assessment system.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: But is there an
8 enforcement?

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Now when we look at the --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: What's the enforcement of
11 that?

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: There is not a lot of teeth
13 until you get to when you don't meet your participation
14 requirements at the school and district level. Remember
15 that as part of SPS and DPS -- and I'm looking at Keith to
16 jump in if he needs to -- for schools and districts who do
17 not meet that 95 percent participation in two or more
18 content areas, there are implications for accountability.
19 We are not going and --

20 MR. OWEN: (Indiscernible) -- sorry.

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- and finding parents. That
22 that's not part of our monitoring --

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The 95 percent
24 (indiscernible). The 95 percent was the threshold?

25 MR. OWEN: Right.



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes, absolutely. Now in
2 order for us to have an accountability system that is
3 going to provide us accurate information, we need to make
4 sure that we have our results coming from all of our
5 students. If we suddenly have a group of students who are
6 either very low performance or very high performers
7 exiting the system, that's going to be problematic.

8 MR. OWEN: I just want to tell you that, Mr.
9 Chair, that we've talked about this before. This is
10 unusual. We know a lot of parents are choosing -- not a
11 lot, but in some districts, I think that it's obvious.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And it totally, it does
13 seem like a lot.

14 MR. OWEN: It does. And when we look at the
15 ratings, and if it -- a school does drop in the rating,
16 they can appeal that as part of the reconsideration
17 process. And we've said we will look at that. But we
18 also -- we will look at the district make every effort
19 they can to encourage their parents to take it in
20 accordance with state law. If they didn't do that, then
21 I'm not going to prove it.

22 But if they did, and made every effort, like
23 I see many districts are trying, including those if that
24 goes down, then we'll take that under consideration, but
25 they'll have to show us what they did.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can I say something? Once
2 again, though, I think this is an area that we really
3 could help parents out. I think parents should be able to
4 go to the CDE website, and Google what's the effect of
5 opting my child out of state assessments? And get a good
6 explanation for that. A good explanation of the possible
7 effects, which Keith and I have been talking about.

8 MS. NEAL: (Indiscernible) over here. A good
9 explanation for what?

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, a good explanation for
11 parents of the possible effects of opting out. And a
12 variety, you know, districts are doing it differently.
13 Even certain schools in the same district are handling
14 this issue differently. Some are threatening parents.
15 Some are doing nothing and everything in between.

16 MS. NEAL: Good point.

17 MR. OWEN: We can put that on -- we won't
18 call it opt-out the students, because I can't -- there's
19 no provision that suggestions statue but we --

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Participation.

21 MR. OWEN: Participation.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, I would appreciate,
23 just for my ability to communicate clearly on this issue,
24 because, you know, the answer always is State law says
25 Thou Shalt Test.



1 MR. OWEN: Right.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And the reality is that's
3 not what happened -- what is happening out there. There's
4 confusion around this, and so giving clarity across the
5 178 districts would be helpful.

6 MS. EMM: Mr. Chairman, we have to take a
7 break.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, exactly.

9 (Laughter)

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We will. I mean, can we
11 just -- thank Ms. Zurkowski.

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Thank God for coffee.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And I'm losing my panel.
14 I think we need to maybe take a break. So we'll take a
15 ten-minute break.

16 (Bangs gavel)

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

18 (Meeting adjourned)

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 30th day of May, 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