



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
May 14, 2014, Part 4

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 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The next item on the
2 agenda is review of the Phase I finding from WestEd
3 assessment implementation.

4 MS. NEAL: Yes, it definitely is.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, the WestEd
6 Implementation Study.

7 (Laughter)

8 MS. NEAL: I've got to go, but
9 (indiscernible) --

10 (Applause and laughter)

11 MR. HAMMOND: We'll wait for Marcia.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

13 (Laughter)

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You know, I set the tone
15 incorrectly when I said we'd come back at sunset, so.

16 (Laughter)

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Obviously, our minds have
18 not come back yet, but we will be back shortly, I'm sure.

19 (Talking over)

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Why don't you go ahead and
21 start?

22 MR. HAMMOND: (Indiscernible)

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right. Here we go.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right, bear with me.

25 MS. NEAL: That was really good.



1 (Laughter)

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Now that we have local
3 representation back on the Board.

4 (Chuckling)

5 MS. NEAL: I had a constituent call me. I
6 had to answer the phone.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Nothing is more important
8 than a constituent.

9 (Chuckling)

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I completely acknowledge
11 that.

12 MR. HAMMOND: Are we ready?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Mr. Commissioner.

14 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you. And I have to say
15 I've never heard anybody hit the gavel any harder than --

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, it bounced.

17 MR. HAMMOND: -- former Chairman Bob Schaffer
18 --

19 (Chuckling)

20 MR. HAMMOND: When he took Ms. Elaine Gantz-
21 Berman to the back room.

22 (Laughter)

23 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: You don't know what he
24 said in there.

25 (Laughter)



1 MR. HAMMOND: That has left profound impacts
2 on me. Okay? But anyway, with that said, sorry.

3 As you recall, back in January and February,
4 we talked about -- as we really have been talking with
5 school districts -- the unintended consequences of all the
6 assessments that are hitting our districts, both from
7 their standpoint, because as we've found, many of our high
8 schools, at least half of the assessments are theirs, and
9 half are the State's.

10 Also, when we talk about assessments, we talk
11 about it as a system, not only in early readiness
12 assessments, but in the READ Act as well. We really felt
13 at the time somebody needs to start a study of this. We
14 know that in House Bill 1202 that was passed. There's a
15 formal committee. This report will feed into this, but we
16 needed relevant information now.

17 And that's why we commissioned WestEd, who's
18 been our partner for many years. And I am -- here today
19 is Marie Mancuso from WestEd, as well as Sheila Arredondo,
20 who've worked with us. And their integrity is -- I can't
21 tell you enough how I find them beneficial to the
22 department, and outstanding researchers.

23 And I think you'll see that. This is the
24 first part of the study that have come back to you of what
25 they found based upon our scope of services. And then



1 they'll be coming back, I believe, in June or August, is
2 it?

3 MS. ARREDONDO: August.

4 MR. HAMMOND: August, okay, that's -- with
5 Phase II, and that's the final one, that also will revisit
6 some of what they've learned in the Phase I with the
7 participants. So with that, I'll turn over to you, Jill.
8 And we'll --

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And let me give a
10 programming note. I've asked the panelists to move
11 swiftly through their voluminous information. Please hold
12 substantive questions to the end. If you have clarifying
13 questions as they present, feel free to speak up. Thank
14 you very much. Please proceed.

15 MR. HAMMOND: Thanks, Jill.

16 MS. HAWLEY: Great. Thank you, Mr. Chair.
17 And given the context that the Commissioner provided, I
18 think we'll move straight into the presentation, and Marie
19 Mancuso will kick us off. So I'll turn it over to you,
20 Marie. Thank you.

21 MS. MANCUSO: Mr. Chair, Members of the
22 Board. Thank you so much for the opportunity to share
23 these findings with you this afternoon. We are -- WestEd
24 has conducted this study, this assessment implementation
25 study through the Comprehensive Center, the Central



1 Comprehensive Center, which is part of the national
2 network of technical assistance centers that provides
3 support and assistance to State Departments of Education.

4 This study was intended -- let me make sure
5 I'm pointing this the right way. The purpose of this
6 study was to identify issues and concerns associated with
7 implementation of the new state assessment system and to
8 provide feedback to the Colorado Department of Education
9 and the State Board that could inform policy, practice,
10 and future directions.

11 The study was designed in two phases. We
12 just completed the first phase, and the second phase is
13 underway. You can see on the screen, on this slide, the
14 outline of Phase I, the -- just the focus groups and the
15 surveys that we did. The questions in the survey and the
16 focus groups were designed to examine the value and the --
17 versus the burden of the assessments in the current
18 system, the degree of readiness of the districts, and the
19 factors that are affecting their readiness.

20 The second phase is designed to follow up on
21 some of the findings identified in Phase I, and also to
22 probe a little bit deeper on some of the ideas and
23 suggestions that the field provided.

24 So I'm going to turn this over to Sheila
25 Arredondo, who is our lead researcher on this study, and



1 she'll get right into the findings.

2 MS. ARREDONDO: Yes, okay. All right. So
3 the focus groups, as you see, we had eight districts. We
4 also had three role-like groups, parents, teachers, and
5 charter schools. The districts are listed up there. The
6 districts selected their own participants. So they
7 included students, sometimes parents, teachers,
8 principals, technology directors, assessment coordinators,
9 counselors, all over the place.

10 The survey was voluntary. It was sent to the
11 district assessment coordinators, with two weeks to
12 respond, and they solicited feedback from other
13 stakeholders before submitting their final survey. And as
14 Marie mentioned, it looked at those three areas ,14
15 questions.

16 A couple of constraints, limitations we want
17 to remind you about with this study, and the first one is
18 it went to every district coordinator, right? So you're
19 going to have more representation of rural districts.
20 They were all weighted equally in the analyses. And that
21 doesn't really reflect the student population in Colorado,
22 right, where about 58 percent of your students are served
23 by the metro area districts. So that should be noted.

24 All right. As far as who participated, this
25 gives you the breakdown. Again, you'll notice that the



1 parent and teacher representation in the focus group is
2 larger due to those additional focus groups for those two
3 areas, all right? Everybody else pretty evenly
4 distributed, with the least amount participating from
5 students.

6 Then with the survey respondents, we had 87
7 completed surveys, mostly from the northeast and the
8 southwest. The representation from rural, urban, and
9 suburban reflect those types of districts in the State, as
10 does the student population. About 54 percent of the
11 districts serve less or fewer than 1000 students, so that
12 all reflected it nicely. All right, that's who responded.

13 What did they say? This is focus groups. So
14 this is the qualitative analysis of all of the stories we
15 heard in the 8 to 10 questions that we asked the different
16 groups. What do they value most about the current system?
17 And what they said over and over was we really liked the
18 ACT. We also like the focus on growth, student growth,
19 and we do like the TCAP elements, not the test so much,
20 but we really like the reports. They're kind of cool.

21 (Chuckling)

22 MS. ARREDONDO: They give us good graphics
23 and good information, and we can look at trends. Okay, so
24 they like the way the data is coming back. Value least.
25 What do we value least about the current assessment



1 system, the high stakes.

2 Again, probably a caveat that I should have
3 mentioned earlier. This is about the assessment system,
4 but people couldn't separate assessment and
5 accountability. And so we heard those issues over and
6 over, right? So we did capture those in the report, and
7 you will see those in there creeping up throughout, and
8 then a summary, and the discussion.

9 The high stakes, the utility, the data comes
10 back too delayed for us to do anything meaningful with it
11 to make placement decisions for students to inform
12 instruction, to determine what classes we'll offer next
13 year.

14 Moving into the new assessment system, what
15 are your greatest Hopes? We Hope for, guess what, what we
16 don't value now. We need immediate feedback, and engaging
17 user-friendly tests that kids care about.

18 What are we worried about as we enter this
19 bold new online era of assessment? Student readiness,
20 especially at the elementary level. A lot of concerns
21 about kids sitting in front of a computer screen for three
22 90-minute sessions, and having to type on keyboards that
23 long. Secondary students think they can handle it, but
24 they were really worried about the elementary students
25 too.



1 (Chuckling)

2 MS. ARREDONDO: The caring, caring and
3 concerned.

4 All right, challenges moving forward. The
5 number one theme we heard over and over from the focus
6 groups was the impact on instruction. The testing window
7 has expanded. Its longer. How, you know, when do we have
8 time to teach? And in some of these rural districts that
9 have 106, they have a 4-day week, right? And they're
10 looking at 41 different days of assessments. So not for
11 all students of all the time, but with everything that
12 they're doing across pre-K through 12.

23 So needs, professional development came up.

24 Also funding, right, for devices and staff and materials.
25 And then solutions. The number one idea mentioned from



1 focus groups was this whole notion of holding harmless.
2 You know, let's get this all figured out. Let's make
3 these -- sure these tests are valid and accurate and good,
4 really good measures, and are providing us with really
5 good information about our students before you judge my
6 school, my teacher, my district.

7 Then flexibility over and over. And
8 flexibility was thrown out there. And when we started
9 looking deeper at what they wanted, it's a lot of
10 flexibility for everything.

11 (Laughter)

12 MS. ARREDONDO: Right? How do I use my
13 funds? How can I test my kids? When, where and how
14 frequently do I test my kids with what instruments? I'd
15 like some flexibility there as well.

16 And then secondary changes is a real strong
17 theme, and that has to do with the burden at the 11th
18 grade, as well as incentives for high school seniors to do
19 well on a science or social studies test, when they
20 probably haven't taken it, or they've spent all of fall
21 semester submitting college applications, and really
22 didn't think too much about social studies, so. Okay?
23 Those were the focus group themes.

24 If we break it down for you specifically from
25 key themes, again, that were heard from the various role



1 groups, you'll see students, they're worried about some of
2 these tests. In the pilots they said we saw content I
3 have never seen before. So they're worried about
4 challenging content. They're worried about the amount of
5 screen time, as I mentioned, with having to sit in front
6 of a computer screen, and are my eyes going to stress out,
7 and do I need to do the 20/20/20, right? Every 20
8 minutes, look 20 feet away for 20 seconds. I heard that
9 come -- that recommendation come out last week. So they
10 want, you know, give our eyes a break.

11 And then wanting one section per subject
12 area, instead of three 90-minute sessions for math, three
13 90-minute sessions for whatever, reading. Okay, just --
14 can't we just do it once? And a lot of things we heard
15 from the students who remember, these were middle and
16 secondary students, middle and high school students, that
17 were on these focus groups. And they all said why can't
18 it just be like the ACT? Where we come in. We've got
19 three hours. I get for content areas, and I'm done. So
20 for what it's worth, that's what students said.

21 Parents dislike the pressure on their
22 students, right? As parents, we feel that my kid gets
23 nervous. My kid had an AP test this morning. Ugh. Hope
24 it went well, right? Want more transparency. What's on
25 these tests? We'd like to know more about some of these



1 items. We've seen some of the practice tests, but are
2 those actually what's on the test? And again, these are
3 all issues related to accountability and security, but
4 this is what they're saying. They would like fewer
5 summative tests and opt-out provisions if it's appropriate
6 for their child.

7 Principals, they like the READ Act because it
8 gives them choices. They have a menu of assessments they
9 can choose from a pick the best one that works for their
10 kids. They also want what they're calling age
11 appropriate, but really, it's more of a developmentally
12 appropriate test. And again, this relates back to why are
13 we having all? Why is the same output required of a 8-
14 year-old as an 18-year-old, right? Three 90-minute
15 sessions on a computer, is that appropriate? And there, I
16 have to tell you, there's no consensus on this, but this
17 is what we heard from the principals in this group. Okay?

18 Elementary adjustments. Again, fewer tests,
19 less time, at the elementary level. Gradually increase it
20 as students get older.

21 They view feasibility as a huge challenge,
22 you know, the logistics, getting a computer everywhere it
23 needs to be for kids, making sure that kids that aren't
24 testing have instruction going on, instead of just having
25 a day off.



1 And curriculum materials for their teachers,
2 so that teachers are well-prepared and know what to
3 expect, and nothing is hidden, right? We're managing the
4 expectations.

5 For teachers, they are very familiar with the
6 current system. They, you know, we've had the CSAP.
7 We've had the TCAP. We like it. We know what we're
8 getting. This new system raises -- they express fears
9 about what's coming, because they don't know really what
10 it looks like yet. Okay? That's simple enough. They
11 dislike the stress placed on students and teachers during
12 testing windows. And they want also, like the parents,
13 more transparency about test items, and the testing
14 process, and shared decision-making. I do -- anything
15 that affects the teachers in the classroom, they would
16 like some input, right, in decisions that affect us. I
17 suppose we all want that.

18 And they also, like the principals say, we
19 really need some better curriculum materials to help us
20 make this adjustment and align curriculum instruction with
21 these new assessments, because they are a different
22 creature.

23 Okay, onto the other three role groups here.
24 We have assessment coordinators. Apologies, assessment
25 coordinators. I could not find a good person for you. So



1 you get a clock.

2 (Chuckling)

3 MS. ARREDONDO: Technology (indiscernible)
4 and superintendents. Different, okay? These are a little
5 different. They all share the same ones that we -- I
6 discussed earlier, but the assessment coordinators really
7 fear that the new tests are not going to be user-friendly.
8 And it's more at the elementary level. There's a worry
9 about that at the elementary level.

10 Now, in this new round of data assessment, we
11 haven't heard that. We've heard that the kids love the
12 tests, so -- and they're engaging, all right? That they
13 view science -- or the social studies exams as problematic
14 in the 12th grade because of the timing, right? November
15 of your senior year, it just doesn't make sense. Why are
16 we doing it?

17 And the lack of incentives, okay. Their
18 suggestions are dropping CMAS, and not testing seniors,
19 and moving to end-of-course exams. (Chuckles)

20 MS. NEAL: (Chuckles)

21 MS. ARREDONDO: So this is again, all
22 documented in the list. There's lots of information in
23 that full report. And they appreciate as well, in
24 addition to what the parents said, that assessment
25 coordinators like the idea of local choices, and opt-out



1 provisions as appropriate for individual students.

2 Technology directors, they are (chuckles) --
3 and you remember when this was administered. It was the
4 middle of March. It was spring break sometimes in the
5 mix. And they were just really hoping that they were
6 prepared when they had these online tests coming. And
7 that was their greatest hope. Feasibility will continue
8 to be a challenge. They really love the support network.
9 And that was provided, and the assistance from the
10 Department in getting them ready and coming in and doing
11 some analyses and checking what was working and not
12 working. They said that was fabulous. It helped, and
13 they need more of that.

14 Then our superintendents. A little bit
15 different view. They really value the data and the
16 results from current tests. It's helpful to them to look
17 at the big picture and what's happening in their
18 districts. They dislike, however, how the results are
19 used to evaluate them, another accountability issue,
20 accountability system. They are hoping for high quality,
21 accurate, wonderfully engaging exams that really measure
22 student --

23 (Chuckling)

24 MS. ARREDONDO: Right? We want the world
25 here. It's got to be the best test ever, and I need that



1 data back right away so that my teachers have information.
2 My parents have information, and we can intervene and
3 assist students on the spot.

4 Our greatest fear as a superintendent was
5 more burden. You know, I'm hoping with all the boxes and
6 crates of paper that come now that we moved online, I
7 won't see those huge piles in our district office. But my
8 fear is it's going to be more time-intensive human
9 resource-wise.

10 They are challenged by limited capacity.
11 Again, remember, this is heavy rural representation. They
12 don't have the staffing that some of your larger districts
13 do. And superintendents more so -- this did come up
14 across other groups. But the superintendents really want
15 incentives for students and for educators to perform well
16 on these tests and not so many carrots, you know, more
17 carrots than sticks they'd like to see. And they can't
18 have come up with some very interesting ideas about
19 incentives. So we'll see what higher ed thinks about
20 those, but they've been interesting, and we'll record
21 those were round two. All right?

22 Survey themes. Regarding overall readiness,
23 this is good news or the bad news, however you want to
24 take it, but 27 percent in the green. Twenty-seven 27
25 percent said hey, we're ready to go. We've got this. No



1 problem. And only 20 percent are saying there's no way.
2 I can't do it right now. And everybody else is somewhere
3 in between.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And question. Was this
5 people engaged in the pilot or this is --?

6 MS. ARREDONDO: Oh, yeah, that's on the next
7 -- let me see. I have that information over here.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm just trying to
9 understand who the 27 percent are --

10 MS. ARREDONDO: They're the people that have
11 been in it.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- that you've got. Are
13 these people that are just hoping they've got it? Or they
14 actually have proven they've got it?

15 MS. ARREDONDO: No. This is every -- this is
16 the 87 people that submitted -- district assessment
17 coordinators who submitted the survey, Mr. Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

19 MS. ARREDONDO: And then -- but what I want
20 to let you know is that these people are feeling a major
21 burden right now, because a lot of them, 78 percent, were
22 engaged in field testing, and/or the educator pilot,
23 educator evaluation effectiveness pilot. So they have a
24 lot on their plates, and they were doing all of their
25 testing that that was required in addition to field



1 testing, so they may be feeling a little bit more burden
2 than the half the districts who did not submit a survey.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Please, continue.

4 MS. ARREDONDO: All right. All right. So
5 then you just have -- looking at the readiness factors,
6 what mattered most to rurals. And this is what mattered
7 overall again, which would make sense, because rurals were
8 the primary respondent to this. Management and devices.
9 We need better strategies. We have to make this more
10 efficient and effective so that we're not losing
11 instructional time. We need more devices. Okay?

12 Then you see these numbers shift for
13 suburban. See how much higher they are? Seventy-nine
14 percent cited management as a factor influencing their
15 readiness. And IT staff. We need more staffing and
16 capacity. Then network infrastructure cropped up for
17 suburban, where it wasn't so much an issue for the others.
18 It's on there. They're all 40 percent or above in the
19 overall results, but it wasn't big like that. And then
20 for devices again, was the number one issue for urbans.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What about management?
22 I mean, management after the school (indiscernible)?

23 MS. ARREDONDO: Scheduling, person --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)?

25 MS. ARREDONDO: No, as far as the whole



1 testing process. So scheduling --

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It's literally out the
3 window.

4 MS. ARREDONDO: -- administering, figuring
5 out the window, getting everybody where they need to be,
6 controlling the process.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, that makes more
8 sense.

9 MS. ARREDONDO: Yeah, it's the big one. And
10 that is --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we have a bunch of
12 bad managers.

13 MS. ARREDONDO: No, no.

14 (Laughter)

15 MS. ARREDONDO: That's not the issue. It's
16 just the complicated process. You know? All right.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

18 MS. ARREDONDO: Whoa. Forward, backwards.
19 All right. So survey results. Quick summary of what we
20 saw across the survey. We asked them similar questions.
21 We used the focus groups as the basis for the survey.
22 They value their local interim assessments and followed by
23 -- but you'll notice the difference -- 80 percent love the
24 local interim. Fifty percent -- the next highest thing
25 was the early literacy.



1 What do we not value? We don't -- let's put
2 it this way. We don't value as much our science and
3 social studies assessment. Again, this was the first
4 year, so. And they were basing this decision off of their
5 field testing.

6 All right, the burden. School readiness,
7 largest burden, followed by social studies, and then
8 science. The least amount of burden to us, the ACT and
9 other district Postsecondary Readiness assessments. The
10 TCAP, interesting results. Suburban districts value the
11 TCAP assessments far more than urban and rural districts.
12 And about two-thirds of the rural and suburban districts
13 viewed all the TCAP assessments as extremely high burden,
14 compared with only 29 percent of your urban districts. So
15 that's another -- lots of interesting tidbits here. All
16 right.

17 This is a ranking and a ranking of the
18 assessments by perceived value. And you'll see that
19 varies a little. The first question was what is the value
20 for informing student progress? And then we asked them
21 another value question. What's the value for improving
22 schools and districts? Okay? How does that help our
23 district improve? How does that help inform student
24 progress?

25 And it came out number one, the top three,



1 but you'll see again, the district interim, very high,
2 followed by early literacy. And then still with more than
3 50 percent, as far as informing student progress, were the
4 district Postsecondary Readiness. Then if you go down,
5 you scan from the green through the yellow where it slips
6 TCAPs ended up in the orange. It's an interesting
7 clustering, if you notice. Then the CMAS science and
8 social studies end up at the bottom for being the least
9 valued. All right?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry, Marcia.

11 MS. ARREDONDO: (Chuckles) Then if we did a
12 ranking by perceived burden, now this is the opposite.
13 Those were the ones we valued most to value least. This
14 is the least burden to the greatest burden. So at the
15 top, the tests that were perceived as being the least
16 burdensome on districts were the Postsecondary Readiness
17 and the ACT.

18 On the other hand, you go down to the bottom,
19 you'll see we -- our numbers jumped from the 17 percent
20 for those two, to 73, 74, and 76 percent for science,
21 social studies, and school readiness perceived burden.

22 Another way of looking at the data, which we
23 hear that you enjoy in Colorado, because it fits with your
24 growth model charts, looking at burden on the x-axis,
25 value on the y-axis, and plotting it out. So for each of



1 the tests, where do they appear in these four quadrants?

2 And the tests appearing in the upper right-hand quadrant
3 are viewed as high burden and high value by districts.

4 You'll see one. Okay. One up there, the READ Act.

5 If you move over to the upper left-hand
6 quadrant, these are viewed as low burden and high value,
7 and there are two in there, your district post readiness -
8 - Postsecondary Readiness and your interim. So that's for
9 the student progress, okay?

10 Then using the same x-axis values, but
11 changing the y-axis to the informs district and school
12 improvement, everything just shifted down lower a little
13 bit on the value scale. They appear, obviously, at the
14 same -- on the burden, but they shifted down a little bit.
15 So you see the READ Act now drops right at the 50th
16 percentile there.

17 So interesting clusters. You'll note that
18 most of the tests cluster in the high burden, low value
19 quadrant.

20 More fun numbers. Fun with numbers, this is
21 TCAP and CMAS. And it looks at the differences between
22 rural, suburban, and urban districts' value and burden.
23 The arrows that we've put up there -- I don't want to
24 blind anybody with this pointer -- but you can see the
25 arrows. This is why I put them, in case I didn't have a



1 pointer.

2 On the CMAS science, these indicates
3 statistically significant and strong differences between
4 groups. So we see the urban districts value the CMAS
5 science exams far more than rural and suburban. And if
6 you jump to the other side on the burden, TCAP reading,
7 it's not a burden to the urban districts compared to the
8 suburban and rural, and the same with writing and math.
9 So there's some differences, very unique differences,
10 among these different types of districts.

11 If we look at literacy assessments, you have
12 the same rural, urban, and suburban percentages, and these
13 were the ones that indicated a high or somewhat high.
14 Okay, this is a high or somewhat high value or burden.
15 And the only real big difference across, again, you'll see
16 was the school readiness, where all of the urban districts
17 said yeah, we value it for reforming student progress, not
18 so much for district improvement, but it helps us with our
19 kids and knowing where they are. And then the same with
20 the burden. Although they say it's a great, tremendous
21 value. It's a huge burden. Right? So what do you do
22 with it?

23 Regarding the Postsecondary Readiness and
24 local assessments and you have the Colorado ACT on here,
25 you can see again, the Colorado ACT, lowest burden,



1 moderate value. About 44 percent overall say that it is
2 somewhat high or high value.

3 District interim assessments, the absolute
4 highest value, 87 percent reported. And you can see this
5 varies a little bit, but not significantly between the
6 three groups. Rurals do say they value theirs the most,
7 followed by urban and suburban. Differences come with the
8 burden, where urban districts are feeling a much greater
9 burden with having to administer their district interim
10 assessments.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Are these tables in the
12 report?

13 MS. ARREDONDO: Absolutely, yeah.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, I'll find them.

15 MS. ARREDONDO: They're just -- you know
16 what? It's all one table. I broke it up for you here.
17 It's all in one table.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's in the PowerPoint.

20 MR. HAMMOND: The PowerPoint is separate.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, well, I've got the
22 PowerPoint as well. I've been looking through the report.
23 Go ahead with what you're saying.

24 MS. ARREDONDO: Yeah. Oh, that's -- yeah,
25 the PowerPoint is a little different. I just broke them



1 up so they fit up here.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Indiscernible).

3 MS. ARREDONDO: And I wouldn't -- we'd all be
4 going what number is up there? I mean, I know I would be.

5 All right, the important characteristics of a
6 state assessment system, which was also something else
7 that we finished the -- concluded the survey with. You
8 know, if you could have what you want, what would it be?
9 What's most important to you? So there were two questions
10 like that.

11 The most important characteristic overall,
12 and again, this relates to their pain with delayed TCAP
13 results, right? They want timely results. Get it back to
14 me quickly so I can use it to inform instruction, so I can
15 use it to make decisions in my building and in my
16 district. Ninety-three percent. So that's in the green
17 up there.

18 Following that was student growth information
19 from year-to-year. I like having that growth. That
20 concept came up over and over as being highly valued.
21 Where the challenge came were people questioning how it's
22 calculated. Maybe we can adjust that. So those were the
23 comments. And then the length of assessments. It needs
24 to be manageable, and it needs to be different based upon
25 elementary versus secondary.



1 Then looking at the bottom, you'll see
2 there's three areas that were significantly different
3 across groups. The first one are indicators of school
4 readiness, where urbans value that far higher than rural
5 or suburban, 86 percent. Then also, if you look at cross-
6 school comparisons and cross-district comparisons, they
7 are much more important to suburban districts.

8 Overall, these will probably be the six key
9 challenges and issues, if we look across all of the data,
10 the 93 focus group participants, the 87 district
11 assessment coordinators who submitted surveys. The number
12 one issue was the impact on instruction. This is a lot of
13 testing for a lot of different students over a long period
14 of time. When do I find time to teach?

15 Readiness, another issue, especially for
16 those 20 percent. There are 20 percent who are really
17 struggling and need some very different assistance than
18 the 28 percent that are ready to go.

19 The quantity, the number, the frequency, and
20 the length and duration of assessments is another issue
21 for folks. That was brought up over and over again.
22 Again, the theme of results. We need timely, relevant,
23 useful, good measures of student learning that are act --
24 that really reflect where they are, and a lot of folks
25 question whether that's the case. We don't know if it is



1 or not, but that's their perception.

2 Recognition of local assessments. That would
3 be nice. And then trying to figure out what to do with
4 this secondary level, making some adjustments there. And
5 it's also come up that -- you saw the primary two. We
6 need some a little different as you move up the system.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Expand -- I'm sorry.

8 MS. ARREDONDO: Yes?

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Expand on the recognition
10 of local assessments. What's embedded in that?

11 MS. ARREDONDO: That's where they're talking
12 about having some flexibility and choice be -- a lot of
13 the State, a lot of the districts, really like their
14 measures of academic progress. Northwest Evaluation
15 Associates product that they use. And they would like to
16 have that considered if it aligns with the State
17 standards. Right? Or could we use -- and I heard this
18 from several of the districts as well. Could we move to
19 or have the option of using the ACT Aspire Model, or CMAS,
20 or MAPS? That's what they're asking for.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, thank you.

22 MS. ARREDONDO: So given the findings, and
23 what we heard, what we learned, we have presented four
24 approaches that you could take for implementation, and
25 these are certainly not mutually exclusive. You could do



1 part pieces of some and select parts of the other, but
2 here are four options.

3 You could look at it. You could stay the
4 course, and say thank you for your feedback, and we'll
5 consider it. We're staying the course. We need to get
6 this moving forward. We've already delayed enough.

7 Another option could be staying the course but providing
8 the additional supports that some of these none -- the
9 districts that are really struggling and need more devices
10 than capacity. We could provide them with additional
11 supports and possibly make some policy adjustments.

12 A third option would be to purposely delay
13 parts of the system. And finally, this fourth approach
14 was discussed and brought up with the superintendents, the
15 Commissioner Superintendent Advisory Council when we
16 shared preliminary findings on May 1st. And they said
17 well, what about if we selectively eliminate specific
18 assessments? And so we added that approach based upon
19 their feedback.

20 Again, we did share the preliminary findings,
21 and there -- the PowerPoint presentation for the -- your
22 Advisory Council was bit more high level. This one is a
23 lot more detailed because that was their feedback. They
24 wanted more details, more numbers, more data, because
25 these are their stories. They wanted to go deeper.



1 We used their findings. We augmented the
2 approaches. A theme that was discussed and heard during
3 that conversation was the notion of requiring the Federal
4 minimum and making everything else optional. Now, there
5 was not consensus. There's been -- there's consensus on
6 the themes, and some of the problems, on the solutions,
7 not so much. Yeah. All right.

8 And then, based upon that, the Department
9 said well, here -- maybe there's a few short-term
10 solutions or options. And also some of these emerged.
11 The same ones emerged from the focus groups as well. You
12 know, for people that are really struggling with online
13 and just do not have reliable bandwidth, could we
14 gradually phase in the online assessments? Could we have
15 that as an option? Especially we've heard stories about
16 some kids being kicked out three or four times and then
17 just saying I'm done with this test. I don't want to take
18 it anymore. So could that kid have a paper pencil option?
19 That's a challenge comparing, but that's one solution
20 being proposed.

21 Emergency funds to purchase devices.
22 Districts are liking that idea for those that really have
23 low numbers and are struggling to have sufficient devices
24 that meet the testing requirements.

25 Reducing the number and length of test



1 sessions is a popular solution at the elementary level.

2 And for the 11th grade and 12th grade as well.

3 Using a sampling approach, very mixed results
4 we're seeing initially on that. And I think it's because
5 we don't want to have to make that decision locally,
6 right? Either take all my kids and test them in social
7 studies, but I don't know if I want you just testing a
8 third of the year, a third of the students, or a third of
9 the schools each year. So there's some mixed sentiments
10 on that.

11 School readiness assessment optional, strong
12 consensus on that one. Make the 9th and 10th grade
13 English language arts and math tests optional and using
14 the summative -- the culminating PARCC I in 11th grade has
15 also been viewed positively. And then adopting the
16 Federal minimum and making everything else optional.
17 Again, some mixed feelings about that. But overall, I'd
18 say there's pretty strong support for that as well.

19 Finally, next steps. We are sharing the
20 Phase I findings and report, the report you have in your
21 hands today. It was completed, what midnight last night?

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Chuckles)

23 MS. ARREDONDO: I think something like that.
24 So you have that final report. I will be coming back next
25 Wednesday to do a focus group and to -- first to share the



1 results with metro area and anyone interested in the metro
2 area about the findings, so they'll see the same
3 presentation that you just had, and then we'll do a focus
4 group with them, because we did feel that was a voice that
5 was not adequately represented in the first phase, because
6 it was heavily rural.

22 Then, well, reaching consensus on the
23 solutions.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Good luck. That's how you
25 do it.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

2 MS. ARREDONDO: (Chuckles) That will be
3 good. (Chuckles) Okay? Whew. Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, thank you very much
5 for a very interesting report to -- this a subject where
6 there's a lot of heat. Sometimes there's light. I would
7 definitely argue that there's some significant light in
8 this presentation. Thanks for bringing it.

9 I also want to comment, you know, and thank
10 all those involved who made it happen. That we were able
11 to expand some of the voices. We were able to bring a few
12 additional voices into this conversation that weren't
13 originally envisioned as part of this conversation. So
14 I'm grateful that that happened as well.

15 So with that, I'll open it up to the Board
16 for questions. And Pam would like to start.

17 MS. MAZANEC: So what was the difference
18 between the perceived problems with the test? And what
19 actually was their experience?

20 MS. ARREDONDO: Mr. Chair, I believe, you
21 know, that the perceived problems where they thought kids
22 were really not going to be ready for it and the kids
23 seemed to handle it beautifully, most of the problems were
24 technical issues and glitches being thrown out, Java
25 updates that came halfway through that they had to deal



1 with. And they had to go back and reconfigure every
2 machine in the building and get it out. So there were --
3 and then there were some other challenges with just
4 finding the spaces and getting kids where they needed to
5 be. But otherwise, it went pretty well.

6 What they're worried about is as, you know,
7 that was two grade levels in science and social studies.
8 And as we move to grades 3 through 11 in English language
9 arts, mathematics, and then the three levels in science
10 and social studies, will our systems be able to handle it?
11 Because systems crashing was probably a big issue for the
12 tech directors, and they didn't have that many problems.
13 And they also said, by the way, that Pearson has been
14 fabulous in providing assistance in a timely response so
15 that they could immediately address and troubleshoot a
16 problem and get a response and fix it. So it went better
17 than they thought, but there were still a lot of technical
18 glitches.

19 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine?

21 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Thank you. I know this
22 was meant to be kind of a, I don't know, a (indiscernible)
23 narrative to the point they had raised.

24 (Chuckling)

25 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: The light is on, but now



1 it's on stronger.

2 (Chuckling)

3 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So should we be concerned
4 about that, about half answered the survey, half of the
5 districts and answered the survey? And I can't help but
6 be concerned that the focus groups did not have good
7 representation from urban. Well, you really hit Cherry
8 Creek, which I don't consider urban. I consider that
9 suburban. I don't know if others consider it urban here.
10 So that concerns me.

11 Now I know this was kind of a snapshot, but
12 it would just seem to me with a topic as important as this
13 is, as we're kind of crafting where we're going for the
14 next 5 to 10 years, that we really do capture a very
15 strong representation from urban, suburban, and rural, and
16 not have it be tilted to one of those three groups. So is
17 that -- before I go into my next question, am I on target
18 here? Would you agree with that?

19 MS. ARREDONDO: Mr. Chair? Yes, I would
20 agree. That's why we have scheduled that focus group with
21 the urban districts next week, to really share these
22 findings and say, does this reflect your concerns, your
23 challenges, your issues, your needs?

24 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And when you say you're
25 meeting with the urban school districts, are you meeting



1 with the sups? Are you meeting with the assessment
2 directors? Who are you meeting with?

3 MS. ARREDONDO: The districts have determined
4 who will come to that session, so they have selected the
5 groups.

6 MS. HAWLEY: So it's the DASC Superintendents
7 group, which you're familiar with.

8 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Oh, boy. Get ready for
9 that.

10 (Laughter)

11 MS. HAWLEY: And they have been invited to
12 bring assessment coordinators with them if they choose to,
13 but that representation is the broad metro area largest
14 districts.

15 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Great. Great. Okay.
16 Okay, several things you touched on that I want to go a
17 little deeper in. You mentioned earlier in the
18 presentation that that some of the districts said they
19 wish they had better curriculum materials to align with
20 the standards. And I've actually heard that as well in
21 schools. This is probably maybe more a question for Jill.
22 But, I mean, I know we have some model curriculum, that on
23 a voluntary basis, that the districts can use. But is it
24 really meeting the needs? Or is it too high level or ==
25 this seems to be a pretty significant issue. That if



1 school districts that don't have the capacity to develop
2 their own curriculum, don't feel that we're providing that
3 assistance in the depth and comprehensiveness that they
4 need. That they're not able to == then they don't feel
5 that they can prepare their students adequately.

6 MS. ARREDONDO: Go ahead, and I'll add on.

7 MS. HAWLEY: So Mr. Chair.

8 MR. HAMMOND: Please.

9 MS. HAWLEY: So I think that it's a
10 combination of a lot of different pieces as we unpack it.
11 In some cases, districts that have a lot of capacity
12 around developing curriculum, it's about having additional
13 resources that they feel are well-aligned with what the
14 expectations of the standards are. And I think you've
15 heard some comments. We may have even had this discussion
16 in the last board meeting, that in some cases, the
17 industry hasn't quite caught up with the quality content
18 and resources that districts are looking for. So that's
19 one area of resource. So you'll hear people talk about
20 that as we don't have the resources we need to support our
21 teachers. They may have their curriculum well-aligned,
22 and it's just the supporting materials.

23 Then you'll have other districts that really
24 have struggled with the curriculum supports. Those
25 districts that have engaged in some of the sample



1 curriculum design work and instructional design work with
2 our team have really valued that. But it's still, you
3 know, one unit in one content area, you know. The scale
4 of it is what is difficult to ramp up. And so that's why
5 we're really continuing to try to deepen that support and
6 build that capacity at the local level to do that.

7 So I think you're seeing a variety of needs
8 pop in that area. And I also think it's fairly normal and
9 to be expected when you're just in year one of full
10 implementation. I think it's going to be a little bit
11 before people start to feel like they've got a good
12 repertoire of materials and resources at their disposal.

13 I will say that I think this issue of tests
14 get very amplified when folks don't feel yet comfortable
15 with the content they're teaching.

16 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Right.

17 MS. HAWLEY: So it says it's not so much I
18 don't like the tests. It's I'm not ready for you to test
19 me, because I don't feel confident in the materials and
20 what I'm -- the content that I'm delivering yet. So give
21 me some time. So I think that's also where you see that
22 more time to implement, to get comfortable with these new
23 standards.

24 Where we've seen districts that have had
25 really quality implementation and the teachers feel very



1 confident, they're the ones that say come in my room. I
2 want you to see what I'm doing. Come evaluate me, because
3 I'm teaching better than I ever have. Because they have
4 that confidence, because they've got those tools, and
5 resources, and supports in place. So it's, to that
6 extreme, is where we want to be able to move all of our
7 teachers and schools.

8 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So when you all come back
9 in August and give the second phase of your results, and
10 the CDE staff, whenever, August or September you present
11 options for consideration for the Board, think about that
12 piece of it, because I think that's a really important
13 piece, that teachers aren't feeling comfortable teaching
14 the content, and they don't feel like they've got the
15 curriculum that match -- that aligns with the standards,
16 then they're going to take it out on the test. It's
17 exactly what you just said, Jill. And that's a piece we
18 haven't spent too much time talking about. We're talking
19 more about the assessment piece of it.

20 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair, if I could say
21 something.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

23 MR. HAMMOND: Jill, you know, stated that
24 very well, because we've heard that as we've gone out
25 among districts. Most recently, I think Joe was in Lamar



1 on Monday night talking to their district and parents
2 relative to this whole issue, and that that clearly came
3 out as part of the discussion. Not so much maybe with the
4 tests, but it's a concern. Have they really -- do they
5 really know the standards, and have the contents well
6 enough to take -- to have them go through the test? And
7 then, that leads into 191, that they're held accountable
8 for. It's circular, if you will, and builds upon each
9 step, so.

10 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And my last question.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

12 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: The other thing that you
13 mentioned that we hear about all the time is more testing
14 time. That that testing calendar has expanded. That our
15 students are spending so much more time testing. And yet,
16 at the same time, we hear that that at least the PARCC
17 test isn't any longer than what we're doing now. So I
18 think there's a disconnect that's causing a lot of
19 confusion for me as a Board Member. So can you enlighten
20 us a little bit about the more testing issue, more testing
21 time issue?

22 MS. ARREDONDO: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

24 MS. ARREDONDO: There's actually -- we had a
25 testing table that we took with us that the Department



1 provided, and it showed the amount of time for each of the
2 grades and what it would be changing to. And it is
3 significantly different for a couple of the grades, but
4 it's comparable for other grades. But still, I think
5 because of the number of tests people feel, and they --
6 the lengthening window, that a lot of the people that we
7 spoke with felt like it was an increased burden.

8 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So would you say that this
9 is a -- kind of a layering of you've got the READ Act, and
10 you've got social studies, and you've got science, and
11 you've got CMAS, and what am I leaving out? You've got
12 ACT.

13 MS. ARREDONDO: ACT. (Chuckles)

14 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And so it's -- but it has
15 increased. I don't know. Jill, can you make any comments
16 on this in the time?

17 MS. HAWLEY: Mr. Chair?

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

19 MS. HAWLEY: I think that your statement
20 around layering is exactly what it feels like. And the
21 lengthening of the windows. So they may not need the full
22 three weeks. That's the window, but they'll block that
23 three weeks on their calendar. And then that will overlap
24 with what they blocked for their interim tests. And then
25 that blocks with what they have for their, you know, early



1 for their English learner assessments. So not every kid's
2 being assessed in all of those windows. But when you look
3 at the calendar for a district, they feel like they have
4 an open testing window from January to May.

5 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So once --

6 MS. HAWLEY: And that is, I think, where
7 you're hearing -- and when you look at their calendars,
8 that, in fact, is how it appears.

9 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: So when you said before --
10 is it Sheila?

11 MS. ARREDONDO: Yes.

12 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: When you said before,
13 Sheila, that -- so there was 41 days of testing. There
14 really wasn't 41 days of testing. There was a 41 days of
15 a testing window. Is that correct?

16 MS. ARREDONDO: Right. Right. The window.

17 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: That's a really, really
18 important distinction.

19 MS. ARREDONDO: Well, and the other thing
20 that we heard was that on some of these tests, the kids
21 really didn't need as long as they were taking. We heard
22 they would really like, you know, three 55-minute tests.
23 That the 80 and 90, it's not needed. Kids that were high-
24 achieving were taking extra time. So there are some
25 things we could do to adjust actual duration and amount of



1 length of testing time for individual kids.

2 But it is the issue that you raised about
3 now, my calendar. We have a separate calendar, which we
4 always did just for testing, but now it's blocked out the
5 whole time. And it's not that every third grader is
6 testing from January through May, but our whole school is
7 testing that time. Hence, the computer labs are taken for
8 testing completely, and no one else has access. That was
9 a huge issue.

10 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And to address that issue,
11 are some of the solutions you put up there, would that
12 address that issue? I mean, for example, if we were to go
13 to the minimum of what the Feds require, would that
14 address that issue? Or would it be more -- would it have
15 to be more than that?

16 MS. ARREDONDO: Mr. Chair? Yes and yes.

17 (Chuckles)

18 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Yes, it would have to be
19 more than that?

20 MS. ARREDONDO: We would have to -- yes, the
21 devices would really help, especially with your suburbs
22 that are saying we don't have enough numbers, right? One
23 technology coordinator said could we just have a state
24 testing van, or an RV, that would travel across the State
25 and pull ups that we could have our testing here, and



1 still keep our lab open for all our teachers and students
2 that need it? Especially -- and the students raised this
3 issue as well? You know, I have an online French course
4 I'm taking. And I'm blocked out of the computer lab for a
5 month. When I'm going to -- when am I going to make up
6 this work?

7 So it was some interesting ideas that came
8 up, but that's the concern. So more devices, more
9 facilities. All other facilities, why couldn't they go to
10 the library if the library had sufficient devices? So
11 some of the ideas definitely addressed that.

12 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika? You're next.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: So looking at -- overall at
15 your results, I would suggest that part of this
16 conversation is extremely familiar, because we had it when
17 we first started this the CSAP tests, which is one, at the
18 school level, we don't necessarily value accountability,
19 because that's for the citizens, for the taxpayers.

20 That's not for the schools. And so the fact that the
21 information from these assessments doesn't serve
22 instruction, is by definition. If you listen to Dr. Laura
23 Shepherd, she'll say you cannot mix the two up. And yet,
24 we're doing the same thing again by saying that we want to
25 use the accountability assessments for instructions, and



1 that's part of the frustration at the school level.

2 So you didn't -- and we didn't ask you to ask
3 taxpayers how they feel about whether we should have
4 assessments or not. And to what extent? How much do they
5 really want to know about what kids know in social studies
6 and about civics? Because very often, you'll hear them
7 say they certainly want our students to be graduating with
8 a strong civics understanding. But those aren't the folks
9 we asked.

10 So I think we got what we asked for in this
11 study. And those are the folks that we're hearing from.
12 So this is important, but I think we have to recognize
13 that that we've got a different purpose for some of these
14 assessments.

15 So then the question comes. Are we testing
16 too much for accountability and not enough for to help
17 with instruction? Given new technology, is there a way
18 that we can talk to Dr. Shepherd and say, let's talk about
19 ways that we might do both. I mean, I think this raises -
20 -- the question is are we doing the wrong thing? Or are
21 we doing the right thing the wrong way? And I'm still not
22 convinced that we're doing the wrong thing as yet. But
23 I'm pretty confident that we're not yet doing it the right
24 way. And I think everyone is saying we have a lot of
25 things to learn about this new way of assessing.



1 As I said earlier today, the tech, the fact
2 that we are lacking in technology is a crime for our kids,
3 because they deserve that technology for learning, not for
4 testing. And we haven't been giving it to them in
5 Colorado. Some states have been fortunate enough.
6 They've been able to give them more.

7 So that's a whole nother discussion that we
8 ought to have with our policymakers, in my opinion. But I
9 think we need to expand the conversation about what is
10 quality testing, and how can we do this. The one thing
11 that I am in complete agreement with in the discussions
12 we're having is that we need to hold harmless some of the
13 consequences of the assessments until we understand that -
14 - to where we agree that these things are good. And I
15 think so much of the pushback we've gotten from the
16 education community is because they are such high stakes
17 at this point. And it doesn't feel fair. And if there's
18 anything that we as a Board should be insisting on is a
19 sense of fairness for our teachers, for our kids. And I
20 think that's what we're hearing from our parents too,
21 because they're worried about their kids being too
22 stressed out. Testing in and of itself shouldn't be seen
23 as a bad thing for kids, if it's done well.

24 So I Hope you might be able to, when you have
25 the discussions, especially with superintendents, you



1 might want to ask them how much they like accountability.
2 Because I think they're going to say, well, yes, than
3 well, no. And that's a real rib.

4 MS. ARREDONDO: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

6 MS. ARREDONDO: I was just going to say that
7 the superintendents were actually the voice of reason
8 (chuckles) in a lot of these focus groups.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: So you have to talk to Dad.

10 (Chuckles)

11 MS. ARREDONDO: So the reason we have to have
12 all of these tests is --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

14 MS. ARREDONDO: -- that, you know, for
15 accountability purposes, and we're trying to, you know,
16 we've moved to a new point where, you know, this isn't
17 1950 anymore. And we can have maybe one test that
18 provides -- does -- suits multiple purposes. But they did
19 bring that up several times about the mixed purposes. And
20 yes, it is a bias sample, right? I mean, you speak up
21 when you have something to say. If you're kind of feeling
22 good, you might just go eh, another survey. Who needs to
23 deal with it? And the districts that did -- were having
24 issues and concerns were the ones that did want to
25 participate.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Do either of you know,
2 whether at the PARCC level, or the Smarter Balance level,
3 that kind of a discussion has occurred, as to whether
4 there's a way to better balance out the formative
5 assessment piece and the accountability piece, and to find
6 ways to have maybe the same questions serve in both ways?
7 Is that a discussion somewhere other than in our mind's
8 eye?

9 MS. MANCUSO: Mr. Chair, I know that both
10 PARCC and ESBAC (ph) have attended to formative interim
11 and summative assessments. And the point you made about
12 the purpose of the assessment, summative assessments we
13 know have a different purpose than formative or interim.
14 And I think we see that in the results. Districts value
15 the local assessments because they're formative. They
16 inform instruction in real time. And summative
17 assessments are really about how the organization is
18 functioning, the trends over time, and that's always been
19 the purpose of a summative assessment. Rather than to
20 inform instruction for the kids sitting in front of you.

21 So, you know, I think we certainly need both.
22 You need to know, you know, teachers need information that
23 informs their instruction while they're teaching. But
24 they also need summative to reflect on how they did.

25 But in terms of your question, and I'm sorry,



1 I'm drifting. In terms of PARCC and ESBAC (ph), I'm not
2 sure if they're doing anything to link the items in
3 interim and in summative, and whether or not that would
4 reduce time or burden. I'm not sure that it would. I
5 think it would help to align what you're getting in your
6 interim information versus, you know, how well it's
7 predicting how the kids are going to do in the summative.

8 MS. HAWLEY: Mr. Chair? I just want to pick
9 up on your earlier point about high stakes. One of the
10 things that folks did not know who were being interviewed
11 is the fact that this legislative session to -- that folks
12 were given -- sort of a gift of time for next year,
13 because as you know, the bill that we brought forward to
14 you for your support around the transition time with
15 accountability. So the results of the assessments next
16 year will not be counting. They'll be used as baseline.

17 And then there was also the bill that Senator
18 Johnston move forward that allows that to be the same case
19 for educator evaluation. So next year is more time for
20 them to have practice with growth measures and not be held
21 to those new tests. That information hasn't gotten out
22 yet to the field. So there still is a perception that
23 those tests will count next year, both for teacher
24 accountability and school and district accountability. So
25 we're really working on the messaging around that to help



1 relieve some anxiety on that piece.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Wow. I use the
3 (indiscernible).

4 (Chuckling)

5 MS. SCHROEDER: That's important, I think.

6 (Indiscernible) because there's so much at stake.

7 (Indiscernible).

8 MR. HAMMOND: It's so big.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane?

10 MS. GOFF: (Indiscernible).

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel? Deb?

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just want to thank you for
13 the excellent report. And also, as Paul suggested, for
14 bringing more voices in the conversation, being somewhat
15 flexible. It was excellent report, and I appreciate also
16 the way you visualized the data. One of the challenges
17 with this is how do you render it meaningful when you've
18 got lots of data, and you've some -- got focus group data,
19 different types of data. So you did a nice job with that.

20 I think the interesting piece is around this
21 curriculum materials piece, because for what we've heard
22 is, the Colorado academic standards and the portion of the
23 80 percent or whatever that represents the Common Core
24 doesn't drive curriculum, is not associated with
25 curriculum. And yet what you have is the educators asking



1 for curricular materials. And that's my experience in
2 schools as well, that the teachers need curricula that's
3 either written to a line, or they've purchased it, and it
4 aligns. And that relates largely to the way the questions
5 are asked on these assessments, because of the adoption of
6 Webb's Depth of Knowledge model and other models that are
7 different than the other question models that have driven
8 the way the content is assessed.

9 And so I think it's a really important
10 detail. And it's interesting that the educators are
11 picking up on it and saying, we need aligned curriculum,
12 or we need we need to either write it or purchase it. And
13 so it's a really significant point. So thank you so much
14 for great reporting. I really appreciate it.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions? Let me
16 just echo that. That was one of the things that I
17 highlighted and wanted to speak to, and I -- this is a
18 recurring thing as we're getting further down this
19 pathway. I'm hearing this again and again and again. And
20 it contradicts the Statement that the standards and the
21 assessment will not drive the curriculum. That they, in
22 fact, are independent, and you can keep your local
23 curriculum if you like your local curriculum.

24 MS. NEAL: (Chuckles).

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The reality is we're



1 seeing -- the teachers are asking for a curriculum that's
2 aligned to the test, which is aligned to the standards.
3 And so it's proving that this argument that there is a
4 continuum that's tied up in all of this. And it doesn't
5 speak specifically to the report that you're bringing,
6 other than you're bringing back a report that validates
7 exactly what some of us have been concerned about from the
8 get go. So enough with the speech.

9 The quote -- one of the questions I have is
10 really, and I'm hoping that as you move further into this
11 process, some of these details that you tease down, and
12 some of these issues you tease down from people will give
13 us insights in how to manage this. And I liked the idea
14 of incentives. I universally liked the idea of
15 incentives.

16 And you mentioned incentives with regard, I
17 think, specifically the student engagement, and then you
18 kind of trailed off. Can you give me a little window into
19 it to what you found out there?

20 MS. ARREDONDO: That was coming a lot -- oh,
21 sorry.

22 (Laughter)

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

24 MS. ARREDONDO: That was coming mainly from
25 superintendents at that level, and then the teachers as



1 well. And it ranged the gamut from, you know, can I feed
2 this kid breakfast, or if we have a nice breakfast to get
3 the kids in in the morning to help them to do better? To
4 what if we provided parents tax breaks as an incentive for
5 their -- if their students perform proficiently on exams
6 third through eighth grade?

7 MS. NEAL: Really? (Indiscernible).

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Indiscernible) my cousin.

9 (Laughter)

10 MS. ARREDONDO: Yeah. I'm not allowed to
11 identify anyone, but he looked familiar. No.

12 (Laughter)

13 MS. ARREDONDO: So it's a full range. It's
14 how do we get students to take these tests seriously and
15 to do better? And could we give them tuition discounts
16 in-state? I think somebody said a three percent discount
17 for every year that they're proficient. Do we have tax
18 breaks for parents? Do we tie it to a driver's license?
19 Do we reward teams of educators that move whole groups of
20 students, rather than holding one responsible for the
21 English language arts scores in the classroom?

22 So very different, new ideas about what we
23 could do to (indiscernible).

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I love hearing these
25 things. Is there an opportunity for us to see raw data of



1 things of that nature?

2 MS. ARREDONDO: Actually, what I put together
3 before, because we're right now trying to divide -- design
4 the Phase II survey, was a list of the challenges, the key
5 challenges that came up and solutions that.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I personally would be very
7 interested.

8 MS. ARREDONDO: Because it would be better
9 fleshed out, so.

10 MS. NEAL: Yeah, that's very interesting.

11 MS. ARREDONDO: It will promote dialogue.

12 (Laughter)

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika? Please, go
14 ahead.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Did they talk about having
16 scores on transcripts?

17 MS. ARREDONDO: Yes, of course.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Because Marcia, when I
19 went back and read the chalk beat report on years ago, we
20 apparently, as a Board, talked with CCHE about our
21 commitment to having the assessment scores on transcripts,
22 and I can't help but believe that that won't help student
23 take it seriously, because they liked ACT because it --

24 MS. NEAL: Yeah, it goes --

25 MS. SCHROEDER: -- it goes somewhere. So



1 that's something we can continue to pursue.

2 MS. NEAL: And we can have our -- yeah.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. It was a great
4 report.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you.

6 (Chuckling)

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Fair enough. If there are
8 no more comments or questions --

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, I --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I could speak. I could
11 speech -- I've got -- I could speechify here. I've got
12 all sorts of things I want to say.

13 (Laughter)

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And then -- so I can
15 filibuster if we need to. Have you got a question?

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, I'm having a hard time
17 not responding to something you said, so I'm --

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, just -- this is
19 surprising.

20 (Laughter)

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I'm going to have to. So
22 for the past -- I know you've never heard this before.
23 For the past two decades, that means about 20 years.
24 We've had --

25 (Chuckling)



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: We've had standards.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Indiscernible) public
3 school grad. I understand that.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, we've had standards.

5 And it's always been the intent that assessments are
6 measuring the standards, and the curriculum is how you
7 teach what's in the standards. So it's always been that
8 way. So I'm confused about a statement you made about
9 that you have a concern about that.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. I'm concerned about
11 the creation of a channel. That's a nationwide channel
12 into the beginning edge of which you may pour a thought
13 that, an ideology, if you will, in its worst case
14 application, that flows nationwide across an enforced
15 device, which includes standards, assessments, and
16 curriculum, and transforms and changes the perspective of
17 a country by virtue of an educational channel that's been
18 created. That's my primary concern.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, so your concern is not
20 that we have standards, and that we are assessing how much
21 students learn the standards. And there's a curriculum to
22 teach the standards. That's not your concern. Your
23 concern is how its developed.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: To the extent that it's --
25 exactly. To the extent that it's (indiscernible).



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. I just wanted to
2 clarify that, because the way you said it first --

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: To the extent that
4 neighbors and neighborhoods and individuals can stand up
5 and say, I like this, I dislike this, and engage in a
6 meaningful way of changing what that looks like, I'm fine
7 with that.

8 But to the extent that it's taken from their
9 hands, and it's developed and applied from somewhere
10 beyond their community, I have strenuous objections to
11 that.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. We're not going to
13 debate that. You and I are completely in disagreement on
14 that, but I just want to make sure that you weren't saying
15 you don't agree with standards. You don't agree with
16 assessments. You don't agree with curriculum, but now I
17 get it.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, thank you.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Stop. The end.

20 (Chuckling)

21 MS. NEAL: And I'll be (indiscernible).

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Since that was a brief
23 exchange, I will not speechify further. I will say thank
24 you very much.

25 MS. NEAL: Thank you very much.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: For your nice reporting.

2 MS. NEAL: Yeah. That was great.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes, thank you.

4 MS. NEAL: Very enlightening.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: This was great.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Do we need a quick break,
7 or shall we move on?

8 (Talking over)

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think we're going to
10 move on.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Move on.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Next item on the agenda is
13 an informational item concerning Title I allocation
14 alternatives for multi-district online charter schools.
15 Mr. Commissioner?

16 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you. Mr. Chair. What's
17 that?

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: This is item --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, 17.01.

20 MS. NEAL: 17 --

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: 17.01. Correct.

22 MR. HAMMOND: Keith, where you at?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Chuckles)

24 MR. HAMMOND: Are we ready?

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We're ready. Please,



1 proceed.

2 MR. HAMMOND: Thank you. Mr. Chair, and
3 Members of Board. This has been an issue, the Title I
4 funding, and how that is allocated to districts,
5 especially multi-district online charter schools for some
6 time. It's different than state funding on a per-pupil
7 basis. Its Federal funding through -- and it flows
8 through a formula process.

9 It's probably very easy to say that you --
10 one tries to make this a simple process. But if you've
11 worked with the Feds, and some of you have, this is
12 probably one of the most convoluted, complex processes and
13 formulas that you can come up with. Because every time I
14 try to understand it, there's a hold harmless there, and
15 there's a hold harmless here. And it is incredibly
16 complex, how this system works.

17 One of the ideas that have been talked about
18 originally I think with you as a Board and when Chairman
19 Schaffer was Chair of the Board, was how can we have Title
20 I funds be more portable. In other words, for example,
21 and the quiet -- and you'll see a part of the discussion
22 we'll today -- today regards Hope Online.

23 Here is somewhat -- well, we would say -- a
24 unique situation. You have a multi-district online school
25 that has learning centers, which makes it unique, in



1 variety of locations around the State. They're a high
2 poverty, multi-district online school, but they're in a
3 very high socioeconomic district. That affects their
4 allocation. In other words, they're serving students that
5 by all rights, they should get Title I dollars for, but
6 they don't, because the methodology is different.

7 We've tried for three or four years, based
8 upon requests not only from Hope and others, is there a
9 possible way that that can be solved? And the answer
10 always from the Feds, because it is their money, and it is
11 their rules, no. We've tried and looked at other ways.
12 For example, other states have done other things, such as
13 making charters LEAs, where the money could flow directly
14 to this particular school for the charter.

15 But that would be a whole separate process.
16 And in fact, Hope Online this year tried to pursue
17 legislation similar to that. But that does take a
18 statutory requirement. And I think, given the political
19 landscape, Hope dropped that. I can't speak for them, but
20 they have been trying this concept for some time.

21 The issue really evolves for us, and the
22 Chair, Mr. Lundein, has expressed that concern, and some
23 of you expressed that concern. Why can't Title I's, in
24 cases where districts are serving kids, why can't they
25 simply receive the funds like other districts do, that are



1 out serving the kids? In fact, these kids, in Hope's case
2 and in multi-district onlines -- and when I say other
3 multi-district onlines, that includes districts and
4 charters. Why can't the money flow more portable?

5 You're also -- you're going to hear from us.
6 There are issues around that. First of all getting
7 approval. And secondly, just the sheer manner in how
8 that's calculated. If we were given the approval to do
9 it, we don't even have the systems that can do it.
10 Because right now, we are doing it by hand for CSI. To do
11 anything outside of that, we'll have to do it by hand.
12 And it is just an incredible, complex calculation, if we
13 have approval.

14 What we've talked about some time is trying
15 to set up a pilot project, and that's what we're going to
16 talk to you today. We want you first to understand the
17 complexity of the issue, the current situation, and we
18 believe -- we want to pursue a pilot project for a period
19 of two years. Because I think we can learn from it,
20 because I think this will eventually lead to a complete
21 redesign of how Title I funds are done statewide.

22 But that can't happen right now without
23 jumping through a lot of hoops. But we think you'll never
24 get a written reply from the Department of Education. But
25 I think if we can get general concurrence, we can get the



1 Attorney General's office to approve something. We
2 believe that that may be a possibility to do.

3 The reason in the report you'll see that
4 we're recommending bringing back a recommendation in
5 September was we weren't sure at the time whether we could
6 even accomplish something for next year, based upon the
7 things that have transpired. And really, the U.S.
8 Department of Education, it's seemingly much more workable
9 now. We may be able, and I cannot promise you we won't do
10 that, to do something, if you're in favor of something for
11 next fiscal year. But to do that, we really need to make
12 sure we have everybody agreeing. And then, the most
13 important part is we need to have the Federal government
14 and the AG's office concurring with that.

15 That said, that you'll see we'll be bringing
16 back to you a recommendation not in September, but a
17 recommendation next month to do one pilot. And one would
18 say why one pilot? We're going to explain that and why we
19 think we've found the perfect pilot for that.

20 So this has been going on and off for five
21 years. It leads to a whole different design. It is
22 probably within our department's authority to do that.
23 But as you have asked me on many different occasions,
24 including what we did on the waiver process and others,
25 when there are big issues that quite frankly affect the



1 State, you would like to have a say in that. You would
2 like to be involved in that discussion. And this is
3 clearly one that I think will lead to much more
4 portability of Title I funding, or are we setting a
5 precedent if we can pull this off.

6 So anyway, it's a very big issue. It's one
7 not without controversy, trust me, because when you
8 reallocates money, especially --

9 MS. NEAL: Debt money.

10 MR. HAMMOND: Yeah, there are losers, and
11 there are winners, and allocations have gone out to
12 districts, especially for next year. But those are
13 preliminary allocations. Final allocations go out
14 sometime during the summer.

15 So that again, as we've talked about it
16 internally, now, if we're going to make a decision, if we
17 can get approval, then now's the time to get it, and if
18 you're on board with this.

19 So I've talked enough.

20 MS. NEAL: I have a question first. I was
21 just curious. Did the Feds ever give you a reason when
22 they -- you said they just said no. Did they ever say why
23 they were saying no?

24 MR. HAMMOND: They just said you -- hey -- I
25 can't really -- at the time. God, we've tried several



1 years. The answer is just no. But Keith, it goes into
2 (chuckles) -- they're real good about saying no, and never
3 putting it in writing.

4 MS. NEAL: I was just curious. Did they just
5 say no? Or did --

6 MR. HAMMOND: I their stance is if you're
7 going to do this, you have to do it for the entire system,
8 of which we don't even have the capability of that. Then
9 they had a lot more other criteria. Let me just stop
10 there, Ms. Neal.

11 MS. NEAL: It doesn't matter. I just was
12 curious.

13 MR. HAMMOND: I'm going to over to Keith.
14 And we're going to start the dialogue with you and talk
15 about this.

16 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair, so just real quick to
17 that question.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Indiscernible).

19 MR. OWEN: The Department's been approaching
20 this from the standpoint of an LEA, a Local Education
21 Agency, and how to -- how we flow funds to school
22 districts. And stepping away from the concept of an LEA
23 and how to flow funds, we think we maybe have figured out
24 another way to do this outside of that, but initially,
25 trying to run it through an -- yeah, the lens of an LEA



1 has been one of the big barriers that we've been up
2 against. It's just the history that I have --

3 MS. NEAL: So come from a different
4 direction.

5 MR. OWEN: The history that I understand,
6 from what I've read.

7 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

8 MR. OWEN: Quick point. Just one quick
9 clarification, Commissioner Hammond. Hope does get Title
10 I funds right now. It has an impact, though, on Douglas
11 County, who their authorizer, their ability to run Title
12 programs in their school districts. So they do get some
13 funds. Whether that's the full amount that they should
14 get -- and the impact on Douglas County, that's something
15 that we'll talk about today and discuss with you a little
16 bit further.

17 Leanne Emm, Associate Commissioner for School
18 Finance, is going to walk you through this presentation,
19 and then we'll be happy to take questions. So you're in
20 for a rare treat today. You get Leanne Emm, who usually
21 can confuse you fairly well with her numbers and finance.

22 (Laughter)

23 MR. OWEN: And then you've got me with
24 accountability and the work that we do around Federal
25 programs. And we're going to combine those two efforts to



1 --

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It's a hat.

3 MR. OWEN: -- thoroughly pummel you today in
4 the late afternoon with confusion, but --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: What is Trish going to do?

6 MR. OWEN: We're going to -- Trish is going
7 to help out with the Federal components as well.

8 MS. NEAL: (Chuckles)

9 MR. OWEN: So with that piece, I'm going to
10 let Leanne walk you through. But this, like the
11 Commissioner Hammond said, this is really complex. And
12 one of the things that we think is going to be helpful,
13 that we want to try to do, is we're not going to fully
14 understand the impact of this till we really actually
15 pilot it. And then once it's piloted, I think we'll have
16 a much better understanding of how this plays out across
17 the State. And this will not be without controversy. So
18 everyone needs to understand that, and we'll try to
19 explain that as well. And there will be challenges and
20 issues that we have to work through. But ultimately,
21 trying to make sure that students that generate the
22 Federal funds are beneficiaries of the Federal funds is a
23 goal that we have in alignment with this as well.

24 So Leanne, I'll turn that over to you and let
25 you walk the State Board through the presentation.



1 MS. EMM: Great, thank you for that
2 introduction. Mr. Chair.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

4 MS. EMM: Members of the Board. The first
5 thing I need to do is thank staff for putting together
6 information that really takes it from a very complex
7 system into something that we can at least talk about and
8 get some foundational understanding about that. So I do
9 want to thank all of the work that was done on this.

10 So First of all, as the Commissioner and
11 Keith had outlined, we're really looking at -- let's see,
12 where's the -- this way? Ah. Okay.

13 MR. HAMMOND: (Chuckles) Now you can't put
14 it -- you can't point it at that wall. Or do you?

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm not sure where the
16 machine is.

17 (Laughter)

18 MS. EMM: Oh. Okay, it's not going.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: She can understand --

20 MS. EMM: Oh. Oh, it's the bottom.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: -- the most complicated
22 school finance model known to man.

23 (Chuckling)

24 MS. EMM: Okay. Okay. Okay. So in the
25 afternoon, we skip no logic.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: She's able to qualify.

2 MS. EMM: Okay, so anyway, with this problem
3 statement, the current methods for allocating Title I
4 funds really do not accurately any more reflect where
5 students are receiving their services. Why is that? It's
6 because the formulas that the Feds have used over the
7 years and developed way back when are outdated. They
8 developed them under the premise that you are going to
9 your neighborhood schools, and your neighborhood schools
10 reflect what is happening in those communities.

11 Since we have changed the educational
12 landscape, as you all are so well aware, that formula or
13 those methods of allocating funds don't necessarily work.
14 When you are serving kids over here, on, you know, through
15 online methods, through hybrid methods, and things like
16 that, we're very much more mobile than we used to be.

17 So that's why we're bringing this -- looking
18 at studying how this reallocation might be able to help us
19 make some informed decisions about how we could proceed
20 forward. And it is not, like Keith said, without
21 controversy.

22 So we're going to start with just some basic
23 understanding. Title I, Part A is the Federal program
24 that provides the financial assistance to LEAs and schools
25 based on low-income families that meet those challenging



1 state academic standards. So this is kind of the snapshot
2 of the Federal definition of Title I, Part A. They're
3 allocated through formulas that are based on the
4 population, census poverty, and the cost of education in
5 the State. So it's -- yeah, we're getting there.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're getting there.

8 MS. EMM: We're getting there.

9 (Chuckling)

10 MS. EMM: She's keeping me on track. She'll
11 let me know if I'm straying here. And Trish is the
12 knowledge base for this program absolutely. So I don't
13 know why I'm actually doing this.

14 But anyway, the four formulas are the
15 population census and all of that. But moving on, I want
16 to go through some of these acronyms and definitions that
17 we're using throughout the presentation.

18 So Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind and
19 CSI both have adjustments that are made through the
20 allocation methods since they are considered special LEAs.
21 And so we go through a process in order to get funds to
22 CSI and CSDB. The EFIG is Education Finance Incentive
23 Grant, and that's really a grant that we'll talk about
24 here in just a moment. But that's that acronym
25 there.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: (Indiscernible) Title I?

2 MS. EMM: Yes. So we're -- this is purely
3 Title I. Everything we're talking about is Title I, Part
4 Eight. She keeps -- Part A.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Chuckles)

6 MS. EMM: Okay, formula children are the 5 to
7 17-year-olds from the low-income families that are
8 determined through the Census Bureau. And that's very
9 important to know. We do not calculate these. The
10 Department of Ed does not calculate them. It's done
11 through the Census Bureau to determine those numbers of
12 students.

13 Then you've got LEA SEA. The special LEA,
14 they are not listed on the Census Bureau listing. So the
15 census -- sorry -- the census goes through and looks at
16 the State county by county and then starts moving the kids
17 around into districts, and a special one is one that's not
18 listed on the Census Bureau. CSI is not listed on the
19 Census Bureau. CSDB is not on the Census Bureau. So
20 that's what makes them that special LEA.

21 So then moving along, Title I, Part A
22 components. There's those four basic grants in there. So
23 you -- or one of them is basic, and then you have three
24 others. And you have the chart here that talks about what
25 constitutes an allocation for each one of those, for each



1 one of those components. So under basic, normally, an LEA
2 is going to receive basic allocations, but there are some
3 districts in the State too. Let me know which ones.
4 Which ones?

5 MS. BOLAND: They're done -- one is down in
6 the southeast, and one's up in the northeast.

7 MS. EMM: So very small districts.

8 MS. BOLAND: It won't start. And it's not
9 playing view. It's the one right next to playing view.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

11 MS. EMM: Small, small districts, and then
12 then the next tier up is concentrated, and then you have
13 targeted, and then you have the Education Finance
14 Incentive Grant. And that's allocated to states based on
15 how much effort the State puts into funding education. So
16 we are relatively low compared to another state that has a
17 high contribution to education.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Ms. Emm, please pause for
19 a moment.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: How does this relate to the
21 frame of this launch? Or does it relate at all to it?
22 This has nothing to do with the information that districts
23 collect about their students. This is strictly based on
24 the census report.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.



1 MS. EMM: Thank you. I think I'll answer
2 that question in a little bit.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

4 MS. EMM: If that's okay.

5 MR. HAMMOND: (Indiscernible).

6 MS. EMM: Oh, okay. Okay.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, I'm trying -- well, I'm
8 just trying to get a picture of who we're talking about.

9 So --

10 MS. BOLAND: So Mr. Chairman, basically, it's
11 the census numbers, and it's the estimates done through
12 TANF, American Community Survey, that are used to strike
13 allocations for states and districts. Once districts get
14 their allocations, they have several things they can
15 choose from in terms of measuring poverty. And free and
16 reduced lunch is one of those. They could also choose to
17 do free. We have about two dozen districts that just use
18 free. They could use TANF.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: So that's how they allocate
20 it. That's how they allocate it once the district gets
21 the money. But to the -- for the money to come to the
22 district, it's actually based on the census. It's not
23 based on how many families come forward and identify them.

24 MS. BOLAND: Right.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh.



1 MS. BOLAND: So that's why when you look at
2 the census data, there's a real disconnect between that
3 percentage and the percentage that the district might have
4 based on free and reduced lunch. It's because you have
5 populations of parents that don't respond to census, so
6 they don't get counted.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: So just one -- pressing that
8 one a little bit farther. So when there's a big
9 disconnect, that districts tend to have a higher number of
10 low-income kids that is represented in the in the census?
11 Is that what you -- what you're alluding to?

12 MS. BOLAND: Yeah. So, Mr. Chairman?

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

14 MS. BOLAND: Essentially, yeah, you've got at
15 least three metro districts. The Census poverty says that
16 the -- so Mapleton, for example, the census says their
17 poverty is 24 percent, 26 percent. So we know that there
18 are certain populations. Undocumented families tend not
19 to want to respond to census. It's just a -- it's not an
20 equitable way of striking funds, except that it's the only
21 method that they have that crosses all 50 states and
22 territories. And so it is what it is. It's not equitable
23 for anybody. (Chuckles) So maybe it is equitable in that
24 it is the measure that is used.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you. Leanne, go



1 ahead.

2 MS. EMM: Thank you. And that's another
3 reason why the allocations are not on a per-pupil basis.
4 They're determined through the Census Bureau. But they're
5 not on a strict per-pupil. Now the district, once it gets
6 to the district, they can start looking at it on a per-
7 pupil basis. But from the Feds down to us to the
8 districts at least, it's based on this poverty as derived
9 by the Census Bureau.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So let me understand
11 clearly. The Fed has basically got a metric model it uses
12 to establish a bucket of money where it wants to pour into
13 economically disadvantaged, to county. Or where the way
14 we're receiving it, the county. Is that a fair statement?

15 MS. BOLAND: By district, so yeah, census
16 takes the county and then breaks it down by district. So
17 you have Adams County, but you have what, four or five
18 districts within Adams County?

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So the county is the Feds
20 kind of -- it's the top end of the fund from the Fed's
21 perspective.

22 MS. BOLAND: Yes.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. I just wanted to
24 clarify.

25 MS. BOLAND: Yes.



1 MS. EMM: So this is how the pie comes into
2 Colorado. So we have, for 14-15, \$152.4 million. And
3 then the basic makes up about 46 percent of that. Then
4 the EFIG is about 24 percent, the targeted 22, and then
5 the concentration 8. So those are the four components and
6 the buckets of that.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: And that's by formula.

8 MS. EMM: Total. That's by formula. Yes.

9 MS. NEAL: Based on census.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Based on census.

11 MS. EMM: It's on consensus.

12 MS. BOLAND: Estimates, census estimates.

13 It's really important to remember it's an estimate.

14 MS. EMM: That's true.

15 MS. BOLAND: Just not --

16 MS. EMM: And it's also dated.

17 MS. BOLAND: It's two or three years in
18 arrear.

19 MS. EMM: Yes.

20 MS. BOLAND: Yeah.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So in concentrated, where it
22 says 6500 kids, is that per district?

23 MS. EMM: Yes.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: So that leaves out a lot of
25 districts in concentrated. That's only going to be in the



1 great big districts.

2 MS. BOLAND: Correct. We had some districts
3 this year drop out of concentration. So it's a pretty
4 significant hit for the district when that happens.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: So one other question. I
6 find this absolutely fascinating, (chuckles) I have to
7 tell you. Has there been no effort on I guess the Fed's
8 part? I don't know who's part. To try to align the free
9 and reduced lunch with the census?

10 MS. BOLAND: So free and reduced is actually
11 isn't -- is an estimate as well. So it's something that
12 parent fills out, thinking that, you know, they want their
13 child to get a free breakfast and lunch. As you look at
14 free and reduced going from elementary to middle to high,
15 the -- it's reduced, and it's reduced because the kids
16 don't want (chuckles) --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: But there is no reliable
18 indicator of poverty.

19 MS. BOLAND: There's not, and I think what we
20 try to do every time we know that the American Community
21 Survey is coming out, because it's one of the tools used
22 to estimate poverty, but when you don't have that diannual
23 (ph) census is make the public aware of the need to
24 respond to these inquiries.

25 It's been -- Denver does a great job.



1 (Chuckles) They always have, but this is two decades'
2 worth of very, very focused outreach to -- particularly to
3 families in poverty, families that may be undocumented.

4 MS. NEAL: And I would just add to that, with
5 the gamete of (chuckles) rural perspective. I'm always
6 doing the rural perspective. In many rural areas, parents
7 will not fill out those forms because I they don't want
8 people to know that they --

9 MS. SCHROEDER: They're afraid.

10 MS. NEAL: And that's -- yeah. That's not
11 just once in a while. That's fairly, fairly obvious.
12 They won't do that.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Excellent parenthetical
14 moment. Please proceed.

15 (Chuckling)

16 MS. EMM: Thank you. And Trish made a very
17 brief comment there. But I think it's also important to
18 note that districts can move in and out of those
19 eligibilities of those four components. You can move from
20 concentrated out, from concentrated to targeted, and
21 things like that as the population shifts. So that's --
22 that was an important concept there.

23 Moving along. This is an illustration of the
24 flow of those funds, so that you go from the Census Bureau
25 that looks at the poverty indicators, down to the USDE,



1 where the USDE strikes those allocations or determines
2 those allocations down to the district level. And then
3 once we get those district level allocations, again, it's
4 based on the district of residence. Because the poverty
5 is measured where you live. It's not where you're
6 receiving the services, which is one of the things that
7 we're talking about. Then we take those allocations from
8 the USDE, and then adjust them as needed for the LEAs.

9 Once the -- once we get those adjustments,
10 then it goes down to the LEA, and the LEA is determined,
11 based on their criteria, which schools are going to
12 receive the funds to support those students. So in all
13 reality, if you had someone fill out the census form or
14 something that the Census Bureau actually uses to measure
15 poverty in that county, they -- that student may not even
16 be attending or receiving services through a Title I
17 school. So it is not a per-student allocation that
18 follows a student down to the school level.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. Keep it brief,
20 please.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry. So one more question.
22 You just used the term that's Title I School. In terms of
23 how the -- once the money goes to the district LEA, does
24 that school board decide, then, the allocation? Or are
25 their state rules that require concentrations in who gets



1 money, or Federal rules?

2 MS. BOLAND: There are Federal rules.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: There are Federal rule?

4 MS. BOLAND: So yeah, Federal rules. So the
5 statute says that there has to be stakeholder involvement
6 in how the funds are going to be spent, which includes
7 which schools are you going to serve. Districts tend to
8 serve elementary schools, because there's the belief that
9 intervening early will result in kids being proficient by
10 middle School.

11 But there's also conversely, the sacrifice
12 that gets made if you serve a secondary school, because
13 you've got large numbers of students. And the way the
14 allocation is -- works for schools is you multiply a per-
15 pupil amount times the number of poverty kids in that
16 school. So if you have a high school of 2000 kids, and
17 it's 60 percent poverty, that's a lot of kids. And so
18 what you probably are not going to be able to do is serve
19 three elementary over here.

20 So there's a lot of decisions districts have
21 to make.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: So if they're --

23 MS. BOLAND: And they're supposed to do it
24 with stakeholders, and they generally bring their
25 application to their local boards for approval.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: For approval. So if you got
2 a Title I school, those funds are used to benefit all the
3 kids in that school, the poor ones and --

4 MS. BOLAND: It depends on the program that
5 they're operating. If they're operating a school wide --

6 MS. SCHROEDER: But that's a district
7 decision on how that's handled.

8 MS. BOLAND: Yeah, very much.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

10 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair, just to --

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

12 MR. OWEN: Just to clarify and hit on that
13 point as well, that process that districts go through,
14 when some districts that are high poverty, school
15 districts as a whole have to make decisions about which
16 schools they will serve. And so sometimes, they'll make
17 decisions around criteria where we have many examples of
18 districts that are serving. They have to cut it off at
19 like 75 percent free and reduced lunch. And above is
20 where they'll serve at the elementary level, because maybe
21 they have so many schools that would qualify under a 50
22 percent or 60 percent threshold, that the Feds also are
23 concerned about the dilution of funds. So you got to be
24 careful about diluting them so much that you don't have an
25 impact. So you got to watch that.



1 But you also -- I think Leanne's point was a
2 good one, that you have many schools that have 60 percent,
3 70 percent free and reduced lunch student populations that
4 receive no Title I funds to that school. And that happens
5 as a decision that the LEA makes.

6 MS. EMM: Okay. Robert had mentioned hold
7 harmless provisions. And there are some hold harmless
8 provisions that guarantees various amounts. And within
9 the basic and the targeted and the EFIG grants, if you
10 fall out of one of those, then you're not held harmless
11 anymore. But then you -- this gets a little bit
12 confusing. On the Concentration Grant however, you are
13 guaranteed four consecutive years of hold harmless, and
14 there's no eligibility requirements in there. So you have
15 to measure this each year and see where a district has
16 moved in their eligibility, and then determine if they're
17 -- what their guaranteed funding amounts might be also.
18 So we have to measure that also. That's another
19 complexity that gets into the allocation. So it's just --
20 it's not a straight up divide the pie and put the pie out
21 there.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Leanne, I'm sorry, I didn't
23 understand this part. What do you mean by hold harmless?

24 MS. EMM: So do you want her -- do you want
25 to go into that a little bit more?



1 MS. BOLAND: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

3 MS. BOLAND: So hold harmless is a provision
4 that keeps the district from seeing a dramatic decrease in
5 its Title I, Part A allocation. So let's say St. Vrain
6 Valley's allocation got struck by the Feds. You know,
7 they took a 70 percent cut. It would never happen, but
8 just for sake of argument.

9 So hold harmless allows the State to
10 reinstate some of that allocation, depending on the
11 district's poverty. So if you're at 30 percent poverty,
12 they can -- the State can hold you harmless to 95 percent.
13 It's just a way to avoid that funding cliff. You know,
14 because the rates of poverty can vary depending on who's
15 reporting.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: So it's the poverty
17 (indiscernible)?

18 MS. BOLAND: Mm-hmm.

19 (Talking over)

20 MS. BOLAND: Yeah, just -- that's just
21 Concentration Grant.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead. I'm
23 fighting with my notetaking capability here.

24 MS. EMM: Thank you. So once we get the \$152
25 million -- remember, we talked about those four



1 components, and then the State then takes and slices that
2 pie again. So you can see on here that one percent of the
3 allocation is for delinquents services to delinquent
4 students and those kind of services. Then there's \$6
5 million allocated to school improvement grants. The State
6 does keep about one percent for State Administration, and
7 then the rest are direct allocations out to the LEAs. But
8 it is also important to know that 99 percent of this pie
9 is distributed to LEAs through either the delinquent or
10 the School Improvement Grants or the actual distributions.

11 This is the illustration of how the CSI in
12 actually, CSDB would work also, that the funds are -- we
13 first determine how much each LEA would receive, and then
14 go in and determine how much is attributed to students
15 that would attend CSI. And basically peel back the funds
16 from the individual LEAs for those CSI schools, and then
17 put it back into CSI. And it is an iterative process.
18 It's not just a one-time thing. It's you do it. You see
19 what the impact is. You do it again. And because you've
20 got all of those hold harmless provisions, and someone
21 might fall out of eligibility if you pull out CSI
22 students, so you continually go through a reiterative
23 process in order to get there.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: By hand?

25 MS. EMM: By hand. Manual process.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Shoot me.

2 (Chuckling)

3 MS. SCHROEDER: So are we -- Leanne, before
4 you keep going. So on a related note, I believe we passed
5 legislation that requires districts now to have the Title
6 I dollars go to their charter schools in their district.
7 Is that correct? I made that up?

8 (Chuckling)

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Wasn't there a bill that was
10 being considered along this line?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

12 MS. EMM: Mr. Chair, I think you might be
13 referring to the bill that allowed charter schools to
14 become LEAs to apply for Competitive Grants. So that's --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: So I -- no, I actually
16 wasn't thinking of that, but that was good.

17 (Chuckling)

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So right now ,it's up to an
19 individual district whether Title I dollars are allocated
20 to their charter schools that are authorized in their
21 districts?

22 MS. BOLAND: Mr. Chair?

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, proceed.

24 MS. BOLAND: So --

25 MS. SCHROEDER: So this is all related.



1 MS. BOLAND: Schools are served in rank order
2 of poverty. There's a really fundamental rule in Title I,
3 Part A that you serve schools according to their poverty.
4 So you can serve -- so in Denver, they're -- they --
5 Denver serves about 110 schools, and many of those are
6 charters, because the charters fall into that rank order
7 of poverty.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh. So by -- they are
9 required to have the Title I dollars go where the poor
10 kids are, regardless if they're charter or not charter.
11 So it's not an issue.

12 MS. BOLAND: No, it's not an issue. It only
13 becomes an issue when a charter doesn't want to take Title
14 I. (Chuckles)

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, give me an example of
16 that. Is there such -- is there?

17 MS. BOLAND: There have been a couple over
18 the years. Yeah.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure. I think James Erwin
20 down in Springs doesn't -- know that's a -- that's coming
21 from the back of my brain. Don't take that anywhere.

22 MS. NEAL: (Chuckles) With the back of your
23 brain?

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah.

25 MR. HAMMOND: Okay, Leanne?



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

2 MS. EMM: Thank you. So we just talked about

3 kind of the complexity. And again, this CSI is considered

4 a special LEA. So the USDE does provide us guidance on

5 how we must allocate that, and in your packet, you had

6 this lovely flowchart. And this is the rules surrounding

7 the way that we are told we have to allocate to special

8 LEAs. So we don't just go in and make up the formulas and

9 all of that in order to determine how much we would hold

10 back from CSI. And again, they're manual adjustments,

11 because we have to take the students from the district of

12 residence and then put them into where they're potentially

13 served in CSI and the iterations. And these lovely

14 bubbles are the picture of this.

15 (Chuckling)

16 MS. EMM: Of these words. And I hope you

17 don't ask me to explain this in -- right now, because I

18 don't think I could. But I told -- I did a staff. Yes,

19 you please include this because of the work. But the main

20 takeaway from this is that it is not on a per-pupil basis.

21 We have to get amounts of money as a derivation of looking

22 at poverty according to the census. We do factor in the

23 at-risk counts and the districts of residence to determine

24 how much should be going to CSI.

25 So again, it's not a simple process. And



1 this is what process we would need to use to look at any
2 kind of reallocation method under a pilot project.

3 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair, I might add this helps
4 illustrate too the issue that we've struggled with about
5 LEA status, because to run this for CSI as an LEA, then
6 they have to make decisions about how they're going to
7 utilize those funds with all the schools that are inside
8 of CSI. They have to make some rank order decisions about
9 the schools that they'll serve. And so that's been a
10 fundamental challenge is to try to figure out how to fund
11 individual schools in a similar manner when LEAs make that
12 -- historically have made that decision. So we're going
13 to get to that concept in a minute. But I wanted to point
14 out again why that LEA piece has been such a critical
15 factor that we've been looking at over time.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

17 MS. EMM: So going forward, to adjust the
18 current methodology that we will -- that we currently use
19 for allocating out to LEAs and CSI and CSDB, we would need
20 to consider USDE. What would we need from them? We would
21 need to consider our system changes, and just the capacity
22 that we have within the Department, because as I said, you
23 know, manual calculations like this are not -- they take
24 some time.

25 Then also the impact on eligibility and the



1 current allocations would need to be looked at. Would we
2 need statutory changes or any kind of rule changes? And
3 also the reporting structures? Currently, schools report
4 up through their LEAs, and for that accountability and all
5 of that. And would there need to be any kind of reporting
6 changes if we were to revise the methodology of how things
7 are allocated?

8 So just to kind of bring us back, we talked
9 about how the current allocation methods do not
10 necessarily reflect where our students are being served.
11 And is it time? Can we go down the path of relooking at
12 that and study this issue and really make some informed
13 decision on how we could move forward.

14 So what we had planned as a recommendation,
15 but Commissioner Hammond had talked, that we could
16 potentially move this up a little bit into June. But I do
17 want to say that we would not be able to identify all of
18 the implications and everything that would need to be
19 considered if we were to change allocations for 14-15. So
20 I apologize. This slide is -- does not reflect the
21 current thinking or the current comments that the
22 Commissioner had made. That these were what we had
23 planned to recommend, that we would look at Hope as a
24 method of reallocations, and then report back to you all
25 as to what that could potentially look like.



1 I think in June, what we could bring back is
2 the methodology that we would use in order to look at any
3 kind of reallocation and at least the financial
4 implications for the LEAs, because we are looking at a
5 zero sum game. We're not going to get any more money. So
6 anytime you're looking at a reallocation, you're going to
7 have winners and losers. And we would need to identify
8 that.

9 MR. HAMMOND: And I think what made this --
10 as we've talked about doing this -- if the Board
11 wants to do this for next year, we need to act upon it
12 now, because the file allocations have gone out to
13 districts. And now is the time for change, not
14 afterwards, okay? And also, the reason why we wanted to
15 paint a picture of the macro is the sheer complexity once
16 you get into trying to look at a whole, which I think at
17 some point, this will lead to a whole systems change.
18 That's exceeding complex, time consuming.

19 So if we can learn from a pilot, whether it
20 be this year next year, we need to do that, and do that
21 for a period of couple years, because I'm convinced it's
22 going to take a lot. And it's just such an archaic system
23 the way the Federal government has established. That was
24 the picture we want to probably paint for you.

25 And what makes it hard for districts, even



1 districts, multi-line district schools, they're serving
2 kids in other districts. And many of those kids are in
3 poverty. But they don't -- they're not able -- they're
4 actually providing the services they don't get funded for.
5 And I think that's at the heart of this whole issue.

6 So Keith, if you would go ahead and take it
7 and finalize.

8 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair, I might just sum up and
9 then see if there's questions.

10 MR. HAMMOND: And just -- and why.

11 MR. OWEN: Sure.

12 MR. HAMMOND: Okay.

13 MR. OWEN: So what we hope to do at the June
14 State Board meeting is bring back information that will
15 show what this pilot potentially could look like and the
16 impact of, in effect, of running this pilot in the 2014-15
17 school year. So when I say impact, we want to make sure
18 that when we look at all of the schools, districts where
19 students that currently attend Hope reside, if we were to
20 make an adjustment, a special allocation, and this is how
21 we're considering this right now. We'll bring it back a
22 little bit more detail in June. Is a supplemental
23 allocation in addition to the normal allocation that
24 Douglas County gets, as the LEA, that we would try to
25 pilot this special allocation based on this unique



1 situation of a high-poverty school, multi-district online
2 school inside of a low-poverty school district, and look
3 at what that strike of a different allocation would be.
4 And also bring back to you the impact of what that would
5 look like for the districts that currently have students
6 attending Hope, where the students reside inside of those
7 school districts, which we think. But based on last
8 count, maybe 20 to 30 school districts around the State,
9 with some with significance in numbers. So not -- I don't
10 know if there's -- if it's more than 30 across the State,
11 but at least the -- that's what the ones that have the
12 majority of the numbers in them.

13 And so when we bring that back, you'll be
14 able to see the full impact of making this kind of
15 decision in the 14-15 school year. And then it will be an
16 opportunity for us, if you want us to move forward with
17 that, to go ahead and make those adjustments to the
18 allocations now, so that before they're final, school
19 districts can have those adjustments made inside of their
20 formulas for next school year, because school districts,
21 as you know, are getting ready to staff, hire people. And
22 adjustments to allocations, we would want to make sure
23 we're sensitive to that and do that as quickly as possible
24 as well.

25 And so again, for the reasons for Hope, the



1 high-poverty school inside of a low-poverty school
2 district, they have learning centers, which is a little
3 bit unique as well, throughout the State. And we also
4 think Hope might have one of the more accurate counts of
5 actual student poverty, because it's my understanding --
6 and we can have anybody from Hope correct me if I'm wrong
7 -- is that they do serve breakfast and lunch or some types
8 of meals at their centers. And because of that, they
9 probably have a more accurate count of actual poverty than
10 most multi-district online schools would, because a lot of
11 the multi-district online schools do not have lunch or
12 breakfast programs.

13 And so that gets us a little bit closer to a
14 truer picture of what the actual poverty is inside of the
15 multi-district online school. And so we hope to learn
16 from that opportunity, if you want us to push forward with
17 it, what could hopefully influence our ability to do maybe
18 all multi-district online schools in the State. And then
19 potentially maybe just a new way of allocating or working
20 with the Feds to allocate these funds in a manner that
21 really tries to make sure that we're consistent and fair
22 across the State as a whole with the way that we put the
23 funds to the school districts.

24 And so with that, we'll take any questions
25 that you might have.



1 MR. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair, I'd just like to
2 make one comment.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

4 MR. HAMMOND: As we pursue this issue, I
5 mean, I can hear already from the districts. I can also
6 hear from other multi-district online, because why? Hope.
7 And Hope is the perfect example that is different than any
8 other that we know of. And it makes it a perfect example
9 to try this as a pilot. And so -- but you know, you'll
10 just have to realize that. I mean, anytime you're looking
11 at a vast change, people will question that. And but
12 actually, when you're looking at who is serving children,
13 and that's the whole purpose of this, is that's what's
14 fair. And I think that's what you've expressed as a
15 Board, many of you. And we've tried to work it out.

16 What we would come back, in all likelihood,
17 if you were supportive of this, is that we -- this would
18 be conditional upon getting approval from the Attorney
19 General's office, and getting a consideration approval
20 from the Department of Education. We'll never probably
21 get it ever in writing, but they're changing too. And
22 some of the recent discussions we've had with them, there
23 appears to be a possibility.

24 Now I can be shut down tomorrow, or something
25 can happen. They'll say you have to stop this practice.



1 But that's the intent we want to go. We just have to
2 realize there's a couple more hoops we have to go through.
3 But we'll know more about that when we meet in June.

4 And anyway, this is a concept you've asked us
5 to bring forward for some time, and we think we found a
6 way, so.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The journey of 1000 miles
8 begins with a single step. This is an important journey.
9 Questions? Angelika.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: In this particular example,
11 the way I understand it, the districts will have their
12 Title I money distributed, and then there is a pot
13 remaining that will be for next year for Hope. Does Hope
14 decide how they're going to distribute that, or does it go
15 back to the Douglas County School Board? I'm still
16 working on the --

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Process.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: -- process of how districts
19 make these decisions.

20 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair? That's a great
21 question, and one that we've just -- were talking about as
22 well. I think we'd have to work through our guidance with
23 USDE on that piece. But I mean, we strike allocations to
24 LEAs. And so it would go through the LEA. If it were
25 specific purpose allocation, it's something that we can



1 talk about. I think we'll have more information for you
2 in June, if it would be restricted in any way. Those are
3 things that we're going to consider and think about.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Would we have the authority
5 to restrict it?

6 MR. OWEN: I don't know. I mean, I think we
7 -- let us think about that one a little bit more and try
8 to work through the complexity of it, but it's a good
9 question.

10 MS. NEAL: I would just say, given the
11 complexity of the (chuckles) -- of your discussion and
12 your arguments that a pilot is, to me, provides the
13 perfect way to work through that. And if -- that's what a
14 pilot is about. If it works, then we can do it, but I
15 certainly am in favor of the project and the work you've
16 done, which I've (chuckles) -- is exhaustive. So thank
17 you for that.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Other questions? Pam?

19 MS. MAZANEC: I'm really confused about the
20 LEA versus district versus the Department of ED or the
21 Federal government intended these funds to go to poor
22 children. Right? I'm really confused about why we have
23 to -- I mean, are you telling me that in every state in
24 the nation, funds are allocated by residency, not by
25 district? I see a lot of heads going this way in the



1 audience.

2 MR. OWEN: You want to cover the actual
3 allocation process? There are differences between states.
4 A lot of charters --

5 MS. MAZANEC: Because, I mean, there --
6 aren't there plenty of states with open enrollment? It
7 doesn't make sense to me.

8 MR. OWEN: There are states where charters
9 are their own LEAs by statute. So that changes the way
10 that the funds would flow within states. But my
11 understanding, and Trisha, you can correct me if I'm
12 wrong, is that the USDOE uses this methodology in striking
13 all states allocations.

14 MR. HAMMOND: Trisha, go ahead.

15 MS. BOLAND: Mr. Chair, so, yes, you're
16 absolutely right. So there is open enrollment. So it's
17 the best formula they have. And they have to have a
18 uniform method of identifying poverty across all 50 states
19 and territories. And it's not perfect, but it's the
20 method that they've used that seems to make the most
21 sense, at least each state is being held to the same
22 measure of poverty.

23 And you're right. In an open enrollment
24 situation, it seems like it might not be fair, except that
25 we don't have the student-level data. We don't know which



1 students parents filled out census. We don't know which
2 ones didn't. So as much as the allocation is based on
3 poverty, the funds are intended to serve any kid that's
4 not proficient. So a kid that, you know, comes from a
5 middle-class family may, in fact, benefit from Title I
6 services in that school.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Any kid that's not proficient?

8 MS. BOLAND: Mm-hmm.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Is that --

10 MS. BOLAND: Poverty drives the allocation.
11 So poverty is the measure they use, because there used to
12 be. It's not as strong anymore. There used to be a very,
13 very tight correlation between poverty and achievement.
14 And that's changing, which is good. It's a good thing.
15 But Title I has always been you spend it on services for
16 kids who are not proficient. And we tend to think of it
17 as reading and math, but there's actually a lot of room
18 for providing it in other areas.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine?

20 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: No, I think Pam wasn't
21 finished.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Oh, I'm sorry.

23 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry, one more. Does
24 every state allocate their funds by district of residency?

25 MS. BOLAND: Yes, yes. In fact,



1 (indiscernible) --

2 MS. MAZANEC: Because I've heard otherwise.

3 I've heard the other states interpret it differently and
4 send the funds to the actual district being attended, as
5 opposed to being their district of residency.

6 MS. BOLAND: So in 2011, there's an
7 organization called the National Association of Title I
8 Directors. And it's represented by all 50 states and
9 territories. I actually queried -- I sent out a query
10 through our listserv asking if there were any states that
11 changed the way in which they struck allocations once the
12 State's preliminaries were received from the Feds, and no
13 one did. I think there was one exception because of a
14 OCR, some sort of violation between two districts in
15 Missouri. But everybody else strikes the allocation as
16 outlined in statute.

17 MR. HAMMOND: What you find though, like in
18 Arizona and some other states, they would designate --
19 they're -- correct me if I'm wrong, Keith -- you -- if we
20 were to designate, and that's been talked about before,
21 charters as LEAs, just pure LEAs, they can receive funding
22 directly if you have that by statute. And there probably
23 could be workarounds. You're in LEA for purposes of
24 receiving Federal funds. I don't know about that. There
25 are workarounds. Trish is exactly right. There is a



1 master thing that happens.

2 But if you're by -- defined by your
3 particular state as a as an LEA, a school district, and
4 that has come up before, and that changed 178 school
5 districts to it, you can imagine how large in this state,
6 it just increases the complexity. But it can be done, but
7 it hasn't been done in this state (indiscernible).

8 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair, one other thing that
9 might help kind of paint the picture I think a little bit
10 is there's never been enough money in Title I to serve all
11 kids that come from poverty. And so that's another thing
12 that I think there's a little bit of a misunderstanding
13 around, is that there's many school districts in the State
14 that have schools, like I said earlier, that are 60
15 percent, 70 percent free and reduced lunch. Kids'
16 populations at that school that received no Title I
17 funding from the school district, because the school
18 district has made a decision about serving the more
19 impacted schools within that district.

20 And so it's again, it's not perfect. And
21 because of that, there's not enough funding to roll out to
22 every one of those students that may be contributed to the
23 overall dollar amount that's been sent to the State. And
24 so that that's an inherent problem in the way that it's
25 funded and the way it's pushed out to the State.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine, and then I'll come
2 back to you, Angelika.

3 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, I have to say I --
4 that that was absolutely fascinating. I did -- had no
5 idea how complicated and archaic the whole system of
6 figuring out Title I dollars were. So you did an
7 excellent job of educating us.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

9 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Yeah, yeah. I have a
10 bunch of questions. One is I know why we have to go to
11 the Department of Education to get -- to see if it's all
12 right to do this pilot, but --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, why?

14 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Because it's their money.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's their money?

16 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: It's Fed -- it's --- what
17 I mean is they allocate it. They distribute it. It's
18 their rules.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank goodness the
20 government gives us their money.

21 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: It's our money. It's our
22 money.

23 (Chuckling)

24 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: But what -- why do we go
25 to the AG, the Colorado AG? What's their role?



1 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair?

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

3 MR. OWEN: To make sure that we're just
4 consistent with the way that we're applying it with state
5 laws as well, and that inside of our funding formulas, and
6 the way that we distribute, and the way that we utilize
7 special -- this special allocation for CSI and for CSDB --
8 that it's just another set of eyes to ensure that it's
9 being done from the State perspective in a very consistent
10 manner as well.

11 MR. HAMMOND: Yeah.

12 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Okay. I'm really
13 struggle. With this whole notion of how you define
14 poverty and how you measure for poverty, given that the
15 census data is not accurate. Free and reduced lunch is
16 inaccurate. Am I correct that there was just some Federal
17 legislation that was passed regarding food? That's going
18 to be looking at poverty differently? Do we know how that
19 differently is?

20 MR. OWEN: Trish?

21 MS. BOLAND: (Chuckles)

22 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: No? Okay.

23 MS. BOLAND: Mr. Chair.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: That's a painful question.

25 MS. BOLAND: Mr. Chair. So there's something



1 called the Community Eligibility option. And Leanne and I
2 both said we're not going to talk about it.

3 (Chuckling)

4 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Sorry.

5 MS. BOLAND: But you're absolutely right. So
6 the Department of Agriculture, the Office of Nutrition,
7 has been piloting this process for the last couple of
8 years. And essentially, what it does is it reduces the
9 likelihood that that kid is not going to get fed lunch
10 because the parent didn't return the free and reduced
11 lunch form.

12 So that count for free and reduced or free
13 lunch is going to go away for some schools. Districts can
14 opt-in starting July 1.

15 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: But how do they measure?

16 MS. BOLAND: If a school meets the 40 percent
17 threshold of poverty, you can turn around and say that all
18 kids are now eligible for free lunch and breakfast.

19 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Well, I understand that
20 part of it. But how did they meet the 40 percent?

21 MS. BOLAND: Well, they do that through the
22 prior year's October 1 count, and what were they reporting
23 in there as free and reduced lunch percentages?

24 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Oh, so we're back to free
25 and reduced lunch?



1 MS. BOLAND: Yeah. Well, that's -- if that's
2 -- there's only one district in the State that doesn't use
3 free and reduced lunch. Everybody uses that, because it's
4 data that is easy to collect, that they have, that they
5 use for other purposes. But what that -- it does, it will
6 create challenges next year. (Chuckles)

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Pam has an amplification?

8 MS. MAZANEC: Yes, thank you.

9 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: We work at a
10 (indiscernible).

11 (Chuckling)

12 MS. MAZANEC: I know, and we could -- what we
13 could do.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Indiscernible).

15 MS. MAZANEC: We could do a whole study
16 session just on the Community Eligibility provisions. But
17 the other thing, the other measure, is through the direct
18 certification process, that when students are eligible for
19 the --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Free and reduced lunch?

21 MS. MAZANEC: Not only that, but it's a
22 direct certification through Health and Human Services,
23 that there's data that's shared between --

24 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: Agencies.

25 MS. MAZANEC: -- agencies that determine that



1 eligibility also. So it's an attempt to reduce
2 bureaucratic burden.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: But it may or may do so.

4 MS. MAZANEC: It may or may not. We'll see.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. So I think doing a
6 pilot makes a lot of sense because this is extraordinarily
7 complicated, extraordinarily complicated. I would agree
8 with you that there will be controversy over this. There
9 will be controversy over doing it this year and changing
10 peoples' anticipated allocations. Particularly, it's
11 going to affect some districts more than others. And I
12 guess my main question is have we let other multi-district
13 online programs know that we want to do a pilot? So if
14 they want it to be considered, they could be considered,
15 as opposed to just anointing one online school? Because I
16 would imagine we will definitely hear about that. Like,
17 well, had we known, we would have stepped forward.

18 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair?

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

20 MR. OWEN: It's a great question. And I
21 think that it's one that USDOE will ask us as well. You
22 know, how did you allow or how did you pick one multi-
23 district online school?

24 I think that what we could do -- and again,
25 these are details that we're going to try to work through



1 and present to you before next month -- is specifically
2 layout the criteria that makes these few multi-district
3 online schools unique. And I think we've outlined Hope as
4 one of those as an example. There might be another one
5 that comes if we go through the criteria. But once we
6 establish that criteria for the pilot, I think it would be
7 our responsibility to reach out if there were potentially
8 others that met that specific criteria, and just see what
9 that burden would be and that lift. Again, the purpose of
10 the pilot is to try to learn but also to understand the
11 load that this places on the staff to be able to get this
12 done, because it's such a manual process. So if we get
13 too many that would qualify --

14 MR. HAMMOND: We can't.

15 MR. OWEN: -- it really reduces our ability
16 to run an effective pilot, because the load becomes too
17 big. But I do think there'd be an opportunity, once we
18 land on the criteria, to be able to look and see who would
19 qualify, and then maybe make some type of decisions around
20 can we expand it if it was just another one? Do we have
21 the capacity to be able to do that? Or is this pilot just
22 one that we would then let people submit to be a part of
23 the pilot? Those are pieces that we would have to, I
24 think, work through.

25 But ultimately, based on the criteria, I'm



1 not so sure that we would maybe establish as a special
2 allocation that we would have too many that would qualify
3 on the front end if we tried to get it really tight.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm not suggesting that it go
11 into more than one, but I'm suggesting that we have an
12 open process.

13 MR. HAMMOND: Sure.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: So it doesn't look like we've
15 handpicked.

16 MR. HAMMOND: No, we --

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: One, I think we need to
18 establish the criteria. I don't know what that criteria
19 would be. I'm assuming we're talking about online, multi-
20 district with a certain threshold of serving poverty
21 students.

22 MR. HAMMOND: And learning centers and the
23 uniqueness of being in a high-poverty or being in a low
24 socioeconomic district, a high -- operating a high-
25 poverty, multi-district online school with specific



1 learning centers at each of the locations.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, well, I'm not sure why
3 the learning center piece is critical to the criteria.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Go ahead.

5 MR. OWEN: One of the things -- Mr. Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

7 MR. OWEN: One of the things that we thought
8 would be helpful is the learning centers, and their
9 ability to serve breakfast and lunch really gives you a
10 good indication of what the actual free and reduced lunch
11 count for the multi-district online school would be.

12 Other multi-district online schools -- and again, I -- we
13 -- we'll bring back more details on this next month.

14 We're not as confident that they actually
15 have accurate information on what that count is. And so -
16 -

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's very reasonable. I
18 just think if we write this criteria such that only Hope
19 meets it, we're going to get highly criticized.

20 MR. OWEN: Sure.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: So it needs to be written --
22 if we're -- if we -- if it's about getting the accurate
23 count, then that's what the criteria should be. Not that
24 they have learning centers that serve, because we'll get
25 cremated, or I think. I think we want to be fair and



1 transparent.

2 But other than that, I love the idea of pilot
3 as long as we do develop their criteria.

4 MR. HAMMOND: I think too ultimately, this
5 could change the entire system.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: One more question, Elaine?

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Excuse me?

8 MR. HAMMOND: I said ultimately, this could
9 change the entire system.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes, I -- yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Indiscernible).

12 MS. SCHROEDER: So another quick, quick
13 question, if I may. We talked about the fact that the
14 funds in Colorado -- that come to Colorado are a zero sum
15 game. Is that the same nationally? That there's only one
16 pot of money, and depending on relative changes in poverty
17 amongst states? Or changes in the way the Feds were to
18 allocate?

19 MS. BOLAND: Yes.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: It's still a zero sum game?

21 MS. BOLAND: To a degree. So this year,
22 Colorado saw a 9.2 percent increase in its Title I, Part A
23 allocation. The allocation from --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Because we (indiscernible)?

25 MS. BOLAND: Nope.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: No? Okay.

2 MS. BOLAND: This is actually pretty
3 interesting.

4 MS. GANTZ-BERMAN: And I like this.

5 (Chuckles)

6 MS. BOLAND: So the -- Congress passed a
7 budget that only increased Title I by I think 4.2 percent.
8 But we saw 9.2. What happened was it's not that
9 Colorado's poverty went up. It's just that some other
10 larger states of poverty went down, New York State being
11 one of them. And so what happened was Colorado just got a
12 bigger piece of the pie this year. It doesn't mean that
13 will happen next year. Again, because those estimates
14 change every year. They're using data that's three years
15 old. It's hard. You can't predict, which is why hold
16 harmless exists.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Then that's why I
18 asked the question, because I wondered if this is
19 something that -- it's not a certain amount of dollars per
20 student, per core -- per poor student. It is a pie. And
21 it's relative --

22 MS. BOLAND: It is a pie. There's no
23 question about it, and we happened to luck out this year
24 and get a larger portion of that pie.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for putting all the
2 great information together. I just have a question about
3 timeline. Is this slide suggesting them that we're doing
4 a study on it, which will be presented in September --

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: June.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- so that the earliest --

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We're coming back in June.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: It says report back to the
9 Board in --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We're coming back in June.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, earlier. And so could
12 this be implemented in in September in this coming school
13 year?

14 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Or will it be, or could it be?

16 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair. Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

17 This slide was done in advance of the Board meeting. And
18 since then, in working with the commissioner and staff, we
19 actually wanted to make sure that it was noted that we
20 wanted to come back in June. And the potential for
21 striking allocations on a pilot project for 2014-15 will
22 be something for your consideration at the June meeting.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: So it could be implemented in
24 Fall of '14.

25 MR. OWEN: We're looking at it based on



1 understanding the full impact and then also making sure
2 that we consult with USDOE and don't see any major
3 roadblocks from them and also from the AG's office. But
4 yes, with those two caveats, we want to come back in June.
5 And that's a possibility that we'd like to explore or at
6 least give you the information on it for the June meeting.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: So --

8 MR. HAMMOND: Because what we've realized, if
9 we waited till September, and you wanted to implement this
10 year, then we would literally have to withdraw money from
11 districts, because those allocations haven't been firmly -
12 - had been permanently set.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then the other question
14 is, how does this differ from the same question I think we
15 visited three years ago? That we could go through this --
16 it seems like I remember a very similar conversation and
17 have similar data set that we were looking at. What was
18 our impediment at that time?

19 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair? It comes back to, I
20 think, the conversation. And again, I -- working with
21 staff and trying to get some of that historical
22 background, from my own perspective. The LEA crux was
23 really a piece of the puzzle that was difficult for
24 everybody to get their arms around. And I think some
25 reluctance on USDOE's part to understand how to operate



1 outside of an LEA.

2 Since then, and I think, you know, in our
3 communications recently with USDOE, we feel like there's
4 the potential to look at a pilot. They seem open to this
5 idea of a pilot. They want to make sure that we're being
6 fair in the way that we distribute and work on a pilot.
7 But that seems to be a shift on their part as well from
8 where they were in the past, based on what my
9 conversations with staff.

10 And so USDOE, our understanding of working
11 outside of the LEA restriction that we've always felt was
12 on top of us, all of these pieces now, we feel like
13 there's an opportunity here to try to look at a different
14 way of doing it. And I think USDOE is starting to
15 acknowledge and see as well that the online landscape, and
16 really even district-to-district landscape, is changing
17 such that census information and districts of residency
18 and where kids are educated, that's really been blurred.
19 And trying to keep up with the times, I think there's an
20 opportunity here to help push and maybe lead again, the
21 USDOE in a method that might be better for all the States
22 eventually that they could learn from.

23 So I think that's the main reasons why the
24 shift from two, three years ago to current day.

25 MR. HAMMOND: And this --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So what we --

2 MR. HAMMOND: And this is responsiveness of
3 the Department now is we would wait months get told no, or
4 more than months, and now we're hearing back within weeks.
5 Okay. Just the same week.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: So is it true then we're
7 proposing essentially the same thing, but we have
8 different people to speak with, who we think are more
9 receptive to this request? Or do you think we're
10 proposing something quite (indiscernible)?

11 MR. HAMMOND: Different.

12 MR. OWEN: Mr. Chair, I think it's something
13 different because it's outside of the up. You have to be
14 an LEA conversation that we've been locked on in the past.
15 So I -- and from my perspective, looking at the history,
16 it seems to be a different conversation and a workaround
17 the LEA restriction.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So no more questions? All
20 right. So I've heard door to antiquated, outdated, the
21 complexity? Did somebody use the word labyrinthine? Or
22 was that just running in my brain as we were walking
23 through the weight of this order?

24 MR. HAMMOND: Your brain.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And then the --



1 (Laughter)

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Your brain?

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: It was in the brain. But
4 now, it's crossed my list. And so it's in the public
5 domain. The idea of a pilot to begin to unwind or to at
6 least begin to figure out what the procedures and
7 processes of figuring a pathway through this labyrinth, I
8 think makes so much sense.

9 So the -- what we're after here is
10 essentially consensus. And as I'm listening to the
11 questions, as I'm listening to the conversation, I'm
12 hearing consensus that in fact, staff should in fact, go
13 forth, come back in June, bring us something that we can
14 then take action on. And I think that's exactly where we
15 are as a panel. And nobody's standing up saying shut up,
16 Lundeen, so I think that's where we're going.

17 Thank you very much for this conversation.

18 MS. NEAL: Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I appreciate it.

20 MR. HAMMOND: Let's do a break.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We'll take a short break.
22 We'll come back to Board reports and then public comment,
23 I believe.

24 (Meeting adjourned)

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.

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

10 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
11 and seal this 30th day of May, 2019.

12

13 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

14 Kimberly C. McCright

15 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

16

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

18 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

19 Houston, Texas 77058

20 281.724.8600

21

22

23

24

25