



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
June 11, 2014, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 11, 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: Come back to order. Mr.
2 Commissioner, I believe we're going to talk about budget.

3 COMM. HAMMOND: Yes, in the short time we
4 have. Now at the meeting that we had in Grand Junction,
5 the last board meeting, we went our -- over the purpose
6 of our budget decision items. We have three actually.
7 The list that you have in your packet shows five. Two of
8 those is public program funding and categorical program
9 that comes about later.

10 What we want to today is seek your approval
11 to submit these requests, because today we're bringing
12 this to you much earlier, so as to get ahead of the game.
13 Because they are required to be submitted to the Office
14 of State Planning and Budgeting in July. And that causes
15 confusion if we don't make that timeframe. It's not hard
16 and fast, but we are required to submit something.

17 At the last meeting we have lots of
18 questions on the funding of the State Review Panel and
19 the Best Priority Assessment. We have some updates to
20 share with you based upon things that happened,
21 especially on the priority assessment as was discussed
22 with the Legislative Audit Committee.

23 Other than that, any other questions you
24 have I'd be glad to answer those. That's where we're at
25 today. And I have not received any other questions from



1 anybody since that last meeting, so whatever you have in
2 here -- Jeff, you want to --? I think that kind of
3 frames it. If you have anything you want to say and
4 might open it up to questions given our time frames. Go
5 ahead.

6 MR. BLANFORD: Morning. Thank you, Mr.
7 Chair. I don't often get to go in front of the court two
8 times in a row. This is kind of a special day for me.

9 COMM. HAMMOND: Why don't you put the mic in
10 front of your face?

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Make this second
12 appearance meaningful.

13 MR. BLANFORD: Well, that's interesting you
14 say that, Mr. Chair. That is entirely up to the board
15 and its members today, since my summer's going to be full
16 of first experiences starting with the board voting in
17 our change requests. Then we'll be implementing a new
18 accounting and budget system in July, so we have much
19 excitement to look forward to.

20 UNKOWN SPEAKER: And his son turns 16.

21 UNKOWN SPEAKER: We'll be looking for him.

22 MR. BLANFORD: Which may kill me, just so
23 you know.

24 UNKOWN SPEAKER: Yes, it may.

25 MR. BLANFORD: He's not driving yet, so he



1 can't kill himself, but he may kill me with a heart
2 attack. And I was going to open, Mr. Chair, with: How
3 would you like to structure this. I walked you all
4 through the document last month. I can certainly orient
5 us before we get started, but would you like to go item
6 by item, would you like me to do my standard
7 presentation? Do you have a preference?

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Quick orientation and
9 then walk through.

10 MR. BLANFORD: Okay. Well, why don't I just
11 refer to the table at the top and highlight the change in
12 the Best Priority Assessment, and then we can get into
13 the details with questions.

14 As the commissioner mentioned, the first two
15 items are statutorily required. We just request changes
16 that are in statute for total program and categorical, so
17 those are not at our discretion. And then the last three
18 are items we're choosing to put forward first in front of
19 you, and then hopefully in front of the Joint Budget
20 Committee and General Assembly.

21 The first item is field implementation and
22 support, which is the ongoing financing of the Educator
23 Effectiveness Program now that it's been implemented.
24 That funding expires -- the state piece of it expires
25 June 2015, and the federal Race to the Top piece expires



1 in December of 2015. Funding for the State Review Panel
2 is just additional cost that when we made our initial
3 estimates were not anticipated. And then the last item,
4 which has changed since last month, is the Best Priority
5 Assessment.

6 Last month it was 2.7-million. It's two
7 components of the assessment. The 2.7-million is a
8 contract to update the priority assessment from where it
9 was established, I believe, five to eight years ago. Ms.
10 Emm would know for sure. But then, on top of that, once
11 that assessment's been updated with the 2.7-million the
12 question was: How do we maintain it? Do we contract for
13 that maintenance, or do we bring staff in house?

14 And the division of capital construction
15 staff did an analysis of those two options and they
16 concluded that bringing staff in house would be much
17 cheaper over the long term than contracting for it for
18 several million dollars in two years, or five years, or
19 at some interval. So, the \$2.7-million has been
20 increased to \$3.3-million, almost \$3.4-million. 580,000
21 of that is 6 FTE, and then there's about \$100,000 of a
22 one-time training cost, so that's the biggest change we
23 see in our items from last month when we had the first
24 conversation.

25 COMM. HAMMOND: And, Mr. Chair, I might



1 point out that was discussed with legislative auditor
2 when they -- and we saw an input from them, because that,
3 like, they're the ones who made the recommendation as
4 part of their audit process. So, it -- (indiscernible)
5 question on that, Leanne, that happened after our last
6 presentation, too, meeting with them again. And that
7 (indiscernible) where we're at in the process.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

9 COMM. HAMMOND: So, we're open for
10 questions.

11 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions? Angelika?
12 Come to you, Deb, next.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, I'll just make a
14 comment, and I'll just comment on one of the areas. I
15 did attend last week, or the week before, I can't
16 remember which, an additional session. Four states
17 getting together talking about implementation of the
18 educator effectiveness work. And I continue to be really
19 optimistic about the state model that we've implemented.
20 Impressed by our staff, because there are a number of
21 staff people who participate in these meetings, as well
22 as people from outside that -- a number of people from
23 outside the district.

24 And I really believe that Colorado's going
25 to be an -- ultimately be a model for how to do this



1 educator effectiveness work in a way that is acceptable -
2 - is accepted by our teaching community.

3 I think when I read about the pushback in
4 other states, I'm reminded that in Colorado we have been
5 really working well together with the teaching profession
6 to build a system that's effective. The training is
7 critical. I'll just get myself out there and say that
8 the training at the principal levels is the most
9 critical, and if we don't get that piece right, then we
10 will, ultimately, collapse.

11 And so, the work that we can do centrally in
12 terms of training folks and providing that support is
13 absolutely critical, because it is not going to have --
14 that kind of training is not going to happen in the
15 smaller school district. There's just absolutely not the
16 capacity. All the feedback that I have had and to some
17 extent that we have had from district people around the
18 state on the kind of support that's being provided
19 there's been nothing but positive. I've never heard
20 anything that was not extremely thankful and positive in
21 terms of educator effectiveness work that is being done.
22 So I'm -- I think we need, as much as possible to the
23 extent that we -- I do believe we can do it cheaper than
24 any district can do it by having the staff here that's
25 super well trained.



1 We may find out that we need to be -- we
2 need to do more than what we have right now, but let's
3 just wait and see what comes out in the next couple
4 years. This is a pretty darn critical time for getting
5 that educator effectiveness piece to be tried out and see
6 what the results are.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Commissioner?

8 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you. That clearly is
9 part of the request from the Field Implementation Board.
10 This is about supporting the field, and we've learned
11 that it isn't going to happen unless we're out there.
12 And they want us out there, and it's just they're
13 struggling right now on just how to get -- educator
14 effectiveness is the big part of this -- but it's also
15 around the standards and helping them even understand
16 that they've made great progress, but they're still in
17 many of the more rural communities, still lacking that.

18 And the only way to do it is just being --
19 holding hands with them out there. This is the existing
20 staff that we already have that has been funded in other
21 ways. It's continuing that staff, but at a reduced
22 level. We've still cut several positions out of this.
23 But to maintain that field support, that's what that's
24 about. So, you hit it right on the head, so that's that
25 one particular item.



1 MS. NEAL: Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Madam Vice Chair.

3 MS. NEAL: I would just add to what Angelika
4 said. And sometimes I would -- the commissioner and I
5 are talking, you know, we have, what 80 percent of the
6 school districts are rural, but only 20 percent of the
7 kids go there at -- roughly.

8 And I just think that it's so important for
9 the rural districts. They don't have curriculum
10 directors. They don't have, you know, the people who
11 might come to Denver and learn things and take it back.
12 They just don't have that. And so, it is -- I think it's
13 just really critical if we're going to do this, they need
14 to be supported. So, I would support that field
15 implementation.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane, and then Deb.

17 MS. GOFF: Well, that -- excuse me -- brings
18 up the next dot in the line of that, how does the new --
19 how does the legislation around which we're about ready
20 to make rules -- does the help that was provided to rural
21 districts -- BOCES, it's the specific BOCES support
22 legislation that passed -- is there conversation about
23 how these can compliment one another? Our supplemental
24 request and that possibility as well?

25 COMM. HAMMOND: (indiscernible).



1 MS. GOFF: Does it work that way?

2 MR. BLANFORD: The work -- Mr. Chair. The
3 work that's going on and the support that is going out to
4 the BOCES is in -- is in support of the strategic
5 priorities that this commissioner allocates every year,
6 and so there is some additional support that's going out
7 through that piece for rurals.

8 That's in -- mostly in conjunction with the
9 support that's coming out through the department, so just
10 training them, staffing them up, helping them take on
11 some of that local responsibility. And I think some of
12 the BOCES have committed to that work through ed
13 effectiveness, but also some are doing a lot of work
14 around accountability and the support that they're doing
15 there, too. And so, it's been an interesting model to
16 see the BOCES collaborating across the state and really
17 how they're becoming much more work -- work together.

18 I heard the other day that two of the BOCES
19 have actually gone to common calendars, so getting 15 to
20 20 school districts to go to common calendars to be able
21 to provide professional development for teachers so that
22 15 districts can do professional development in a way
23 that is consistent across their region, I mean, that's
24 just, I think, a testament to the power of that kind of
25 collaboration.



1 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

2 MR. BLANFORD: Yep.

3 MS. GOFF: That's good news.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. I just wondered
6 when the budget is due. I mean, are we voting on this
7 and then this is due? When is it due?

8 COMM. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair. We are required
9 to notify OSPB about these items July 1st. The official
10 budget is due to the General Assembly the first weekday
11 or business day of November, so there's some time in
12 development that we go through, but as far as notifying
13 the governor's office, the first deadline is July 1st,
14 and then the fully developed items that they approve --
15 so they'll review them and maybe decide some go forward,
16 some don't. August 1st is when we're to have final items
17 to them.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: So, we don't get these items
19 to the governor by July 1st what happens?

20 MR. BLANFORD: I can address that. We'll
21 ask him if he can wait a little longer. There's no
22 statutory deadline at that point. September is when it
23 would really start getting difficult to make any changes,
24 so there's -- nobody would die or anything if we don't
25 get it done by July 1st, but it would -- it would be



1 inconvenient from the governor's standpoint.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: My only question is this: So,
3 I looked back at my notes. This is the third time
4 (indiscernible) has been on the board during the budget
5 cycle.

6 The first time there were hardly any
7 questions asked about the budget. You presented it, we
8 voted on it in. The second time kind of the same. This
9 is the third iteration. I think the goal was to get more
10 information in advance. You've provided it. That's
11 great. But even looking at this number, these numbers,
12 if we're supposed to represent the public as priority
13 with 2.7-million and 3.3-million based on somebody
14 suggesting it.

15 I guess I don't feel like I'm doing my job -
16 - doing a good job of really advocating for public
17 accountability, stewardship for funds by just saying:
18 Yeah, looks good to me, let's hire 10 more people and do
19 field implementation support.

20 Does the field want that? Is that an
21 effective model? Having looked at field implementation
22 support in the past I have questions about centralizing
23 PD from CDE. I mean, I don't know if other board members
24 have the same thought, but I guess I don't feel like I
25 have enough information to say: Great, let's approve this



1 -- these requests.

2 MS. NEAL: Didn't we --

3 MR. BLANFORD: Thank you, Mr. Chair. There
4 are time -- there is time for some of those
5 conversations, if that's what you'd like to have. We can
6 certainly notify them this is our intent, but pulling
7 items because we made the determination that in the end,
8 they didn't make sense, or reducing items because certain
9 things didn't make sense; there's room between July and
10 September to make those kinds of changes. The July
11 deadlines is more to notify them of our intent of what we
12 would like to insert as changes into our budget. So --

13 COMM. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair --

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well I guess -- well I guess
15 that's what my question is. Do we, as board, each of us,
16 have we looked deeply at these items and decided that,
17 yes, we believe that hiring 10 more people at CDE to do
18 the field support is the best approach to getting these
19 initiatives implemented with a high degree of fidelity
20 and impact?

21 I guess I'm not there. I don't know if
22 others --.

23 COMM. HAMMOND: I think from our standpoint
24 we've tried to adhere to your request last year to bring
25 this to you early and have a thoughtful discussion.



1 That's why we brought it last month, so that you could
2 talk about it this meeting and, quite frankly, vote on
3 it, because it -- what happens, you know, this is a far
4 from perfect process. Because it goes through all -- who
5 knows if the governor's office will even accept anything.
6 Then after that the legislature gets ahold of it, who
7 knows if they'll accept anything.

8 This is just our priorities. And again,
9 mean the process could -- is far from perfect, but this
10 is the department's recommendations. At this particular
11 point, and -- we -- what happens to us sometimes when it
12 gets, when it gets over to the governor's office, it
13 doesn't go through you, then it causes problems for them,
14 and it just balls up the whole process. So, we really
15 try to do that this time and get all the information that
16 is available. It's never perfect, and ask for your
17 support at this meeting. And that's what we've geared up
18 to do today.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: So, I'm a little confused
21 now by your concern. This was presented to us last time.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, and I had concerns last
23 time, and the budget's gone up.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: No but -- but not --

25 COMM. HAMMOND: On that item, I think.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: But on the Best piece,
2 right?

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I also talked about the
4 FTE --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: What's going to happen
6 between now and August meeting? I mean, what would --
7 what is it that -- what is the information --?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well --

9 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm comfortable based on the
10 work -- the limited work that I have the opportunity to
11 even do with staff and what I hear from districts people,
12 that the work we're doing in areas one -- in area one is
13 critical, and they wish they had more. The State Review
14 Panel is an attempt to address what we're going to hear
15 tomorrow, and the Best priority -- I'm not in a position
16 to -- I know it's my response --

17 COMM. HAMMOND: That is in the Best
18 (indiscernible).

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Huh?

20 COMM. HAMMOND: That will be out of Best
21 funds.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Best funds. I'm not in --
23 it's our job to do this. It's not like going back to the
24 parents and saying: Do you like what we're doing? So,
25 I'm trying to figure out what other information do we



1 need --

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: (Indiscernible) we had a
3 discussion about if field implementation support is the
4 best way to support the field, and we talked about
5 whether or not the Best Priority Improvement Assessment
6 Plan is the -- is the most effective way to do that work,
7 and have we really justified in our minds if someone asks
8 us why the budget went from 2.7- to 3.3-million, why the
9 salaries are at \$500,000, I mean, for how many people? I
10 mean, I just guess I don't have enough detail -- I didn't
11 get it last week --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Well that's what you should
13 have asked for last month. Right?

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: I did. I mean, I did surface
15 a lot of these issues, and I wasn't sure exactly when it
16 was due, and that's why I thought well, we're getting it
17 early so we can discuss it, but is one month enough time?
18 I mean, I haven't met with Jeff or others at the CDE to
19 really flesh this out. Have other board members had a
20 chance to do that? I mean, do you -- in your mind do you
21 --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm fine with it. I --
23 listen, I read everything last time and --

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: I did too, but I didn't get
25 answers as to options. I mean, it was just: This is it,



1 this is the cost, yes or no. In fact, now it's gone up.
2 I don't know.

3 MS. NEAL: Mr. Chair.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Madam Vice Chair.

5 MS. NEAL: I think it's a procedural thing
6 for me is, as we all know, it's very difficult for us to
7 get together in times out, you know, outside of the
8 board.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right.

10 MS. NEAL: We have one retreat a year, and
11 that's a big deal. And we have to remember that we need
12 to do this as a group. If all seven of us go talk to
13 Jeff it'll drive him crazy, but -- I know, you know, if
14 we raise questions in how do we solve them, I don't think
15 we can solve them one person at a time. I think it needs
16 -- we are a board and it needs to be solved as a board.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: And that's why I'm surfacing
18 it, because I looked at my notes from the last two
19 budgeting cycles that I've participated in, this being
20 the third, and raised questions, but no answers. And so,
21 I don't know if we're in a rush --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: What answers are you looking
23 for? I'm not --

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'd like to look at options
25 for filed implementation support. Hiring 10.5 people at



1 the CDE; is that really the best way to support the
2 field?

3 MS. SCHROEDER: There are two options, that
4 one and having districts do everything themselves.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. I'd like to talk to
6 the districts. I'd like to hear what people are saying.
7 I talk --

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh gosh, now I understand.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: I talk to districts, and I
10 feel like they don't always feel like the centralized
11 approach from CDE meets their needs the best.

12 MS. NEAL: Is that -- and I --

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: So, are there other options
14 that we could think about?

15 MS. NEAL: I forgot. Because my approach,
16 and it probably illustrates a difference between our
17 school districts. I know the rural schools want this. I
18 know they need it. I know they won't be able to do what
19 they need to do without the field implementation. And
20 so, you know, that's why I'm in favor of it.

21 I don't know the larger districts all have
22 big staffs and perhaps they could do it without. I don't
23 know. But I don't want to hold it up for -- and it had
24 the small districts lose it, because it's very important
25 to them. And if we are going to have a discussion, we



1 need to work out a better way to have a board discussion,
2 because it's very difficult. We're always under time
3 constraints, we don't have time outside.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Correct.

5 MS. NEAL: I don't think it works for us
6 individually, because we need to work as a board, so I'm
7 all in favor of moving ahead with this today because of -
8 -

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you justify the 10.5
10 people? I mean, are we supposed to be at a granularity
11 level so that if your constituents say: Can you justify
12 \$963,000 and 10-and-a-half people? Would you be able to
13 answer it? I couldn't.

14 MS. NEAL: I could, yeah.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: I could, yeah.

16 MS. BERMAN: I could. Mr. chair --

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean, I could generally
18 answer, but I can't say: Yes, the metric was based on A,
19 B, C and D. I would ask someone to surface that now,
20 then. You know, justify it.

21 MS. BERMAN: Mr. Chair.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I've read the documents.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine.

24 MS. BERMAN: I believe we should bring the
25 budget to a vote. I don't think we're going to resolve



1 this.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well --

3 MS. BERMAN: I'm fine with the presentation.
4 I'm fine with the information that's been presented to
5 the board, and I think the reason we have votes is it
6 gives Dr. Scheffel and opportunity to vote no, and those
7 of us who want to vote yes can vote yes, but we're not
8 going to win this debate right now.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah. It's a good
10 conversation. The one point of the conversation that I
11 have concern about is whether staff has been responsive
12 to previously posed questions or not. Dr. Scheffel, do
13 you feel they have?

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: You know, I didn't pose them
15 directly to staff. I surfaced them for the board to
16 address, and one of the -- I think you're right, Marcia,
17 the way we function is we raise issues and then they kind
18 of dribble off, and then we try to gather up some of the
19 pieces. And I guess I -- maybe it's my fault for not
20 meeting directly with Jeff, I think, take responsibility.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well and that would be,
22 you know, an inherent weakness, perhaps, in this process.
23 Because to get satisfactory answers, whether you agree
24 with them or not, but final answers is an important piece
25 of what we need to be doing. So, Pam, I think you had a



1 comment.

2 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. I think Dr. Scheffel
3 raises a good point. And maybe going forward this -- the
4 way we solve this, is the beginning of the year we get
5 some information on the budget and how many FTEs to
6 everything and we could perhaps deal with a couple of
7 those issues every meeting so that we can explore.

8 I think Dr. Scheffel makes a good point. I
9 understand the rural districts may need a lot of support,
10 but there may be some other districts, more mid-size
11 districts, could training by video, Skype, you know, are
12 there ways to cut costs for some of these budget items.
13 I think we should explore that.

14 And I think she's right. I think we have
15 some responsibility as board members to tax payers rather
16 than just saying: Okay, let's add another several hundred
17 million. So, I think it would be good for us to explore
18 that over the next year. Maybe in smaller bites.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So, I guess I would ask a
20 process question. It has been, you know, in my short 10
21 years chair I -- it's been my effort to bring things to
22 this board when we, information act, can't take action on
23 them. When we can be informed by the information brought
24 by staff and then give our feedback as a board back to
25 the staff in terms of direction. My -- it becomes a



1 process question. We moved the -- you know, this used to
2 be something that happened much later in the year, and
3 was just a fait accompli, that we were, essentially, you
4 know, asked to agree with what's been presented.

5 I've tried to move it forward. Is there a
6 process step? Is there something we could do to, in
7 fact, get at some of -- and it sounds like there's one or
8 two underlying policy issues that have been -- that
9 certain members of the board are unsatisfied in the level
10 of discussion we've had on that.

11 Is -- what would the process look like for
12 us to be able to get at that? Because I want to
13 constantly improve the process for the board, if
14 possible. Please.

15 COMM. HAMMOND: Sure. We thought we had
16 done this, this year, and have provided you as much
17 information as everyone has asked us to provide. Pam is
18 exactly correct in some of the questions. The problem we
19 have; we're not like a regular budget. We -- everything
20 that we have with very few exceptions, and this is one of
21 those, is all controlled by the legislature. Everything
22 is pretty much line item, and they tell us: This is the
23 law. And we say: How much from, you know, the fiscal
24 note.

25 It all starts around that fiscal note, and



1 we talked about that. So, we really can't cut here or
2 there, because it's all set forth in legislation. The
3 only time we have -- there's been two cases since I've
4 been here. One was the IT request last year. That we
5 clearly had reached a point -- because fiscal notes only
6 last two years, and we're to a point we couldn't
7 implement the programs without the additional support in
8 IT.

9 The request that we brought forward to you
10 and talked about last time, the field implementation
11 support, tried to provide all the information we could.
12 We didn't have any questions on that. But that -- but we
13 did point out that though -- these are people that are
14 already existing. They do go away. They are providing
15 us support in the field, and this is primarily around
16 educator effectiveness in helping the field.

17 On the state review panel that was simply,
18 in our discussion, something that helps the poor is we
19 get to the five-year clock, and an external review party
20 to give, really, a third independent opinion.

21 Now, of course, as this go forward, if you
22 like, if the legislature (indiscernible) and in the best
23 priority assessment that really resulted from the audit
24 and the feedback. Even the reason why it changed came
25 about for the feedback from the legislative audit



1 committee who really imposed all this upon us in the
2 first place.

3 So, it's just, it's the nature of the beast.
4 We're in such an odd row, and we're line-item controlled
5 by the legislature, and we really don't have a lot of
6 flexibility to just arbitrarily cut unless the
7 legislature approves. So, this is the second time that
8 we bring, like we did last year, with the Field
9 Implementation's Board, we recognize that everything is
10 not up and running as it should, and districts are really
11 asking us for support, and this primarily, I would say,
12 Jill, correct me if I'm wrong. I'd say 90 percent of
13 this is in the -- in the rural, what we're talking about,
14 maybe 100 percent.

15 UNKOWN SPEAKER: Actually, no. Mr. Chair,
16 we have 160 districts that have opted to use the state-
17 model system, so most of the metro area districts are
18 large districts: Cherry Creek, Aurora, Littleton, along
19 with nearly all of the -- I mean, it's all rural, as
20 well, but they all use the model system, so they actually
21 -- even your Cherry Creek, Littleton, Aurora; they
22 actually ask our staff to come and provide the training
23 and the support. They look to the department to actually
24 do the validity and the research on the model that's
25 required by law.



1 We know that in the two districts that run
2 pretty robust educator evaluation systems the staff size
3 is larger than what we are proposing for CDE. We -- this
4 actually reflects a decrease of five FTE from our current
5 staffing, so we did look at what do we think we can
6 remove in order to sustain it. It also includes the
7 licensure cost for, and licensing fees, for two systems
8 that the districts have opted into using. One is an
9 inter-rater agreement system that's actually a training
10 system that, to Pam's point, is one they can do remotely
11 and actually go in, but it does require staff support to
12 create the videos, to score the videos, to do all of
13 those kinds of things.

14 And then there is also a performance
15 management system that it -- each district had to
16 actually contract on their own that costs would be
17 greater than our overall request. Just for them to do
18 that we're able to essentially offset that cost and make
19 that free to every districts. So, there are some
20 considerable economies of scale by doing this.

21 I think that when we saw that 160 districts
22 wanted to use the state-model system it requires a
23 different, you know, level of support then if we had most
24 districts designing and using their own. So that's what
25 this reflects.



1 COMM. HAMMOND: And then in our discussion,
2 what we've talked about, if we don't have that support
3 the larger districts can compensate in other ways.

4 UNKOWN SPEAKER: Right.

5 COMM. HAMMOND: I mean, they have better
6 resources. Then it really plays out from a negative
7 standpoint in rurals. They just don't have the resources
8 to do it -- so anyway --

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine was waving her
10 hand and then -- oh, okay. We're -- I'm not -- I don't
11 want to cut off conversation, so please go ahead, but
12 let's limit our comments to succinct points, if possible.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: I just have one more
14 comment. I would just say that I appreciate all the work
15 on the budget, and I know we've had one month to look at
16 it. I would just say as a board we're responsibility for
17 the -- we're responsible for these funds; how they're
18 allocated, public funds. And I've just been involved in
19 budgeting on many -- in many entities, public, private,
20 for profit, not-for-profit, and I've never been involved
21 in a budgeting cycle where everything that's asked for:
22 Great, absolutely. There's no really critical discussion
23 that I can feel coming out of really analyzing these
24 items and determining if the money's being used to the
25 best affect.



1 Of course, based on trust, we're all
2 professionals. Some would say: Hey, we trust you, you're
3 asking for what you need. That's all good. But I just
4 think as a board we -- perhaps on the next round can go
5 deeper on -- there're options to the way these funds are
6 spent isn't the best use of public funds.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Elaine and then Jane and
8 Angelika. And I'm trying to get us to a (indiscernible)
9 of action (indiscernible). And I've got a question.

10 MS. BERMAN: Elaine is moving to action. I
11 move to approve the department's annual budget change
12 request as set forth in the published agenda.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So, I get a second and
14 then we'll discuss.

15 MS. BERMAN: We're 20 minutes over time.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: (indiscernible) this over
17 and over again.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a second?

19 MS. BERMAN: Is there a second? If there's
20 no second we'll start --

21 UNKOWN SPEAKER: Madam Schroeder, even with
22 the second the --

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The debate can go on.
24 Get me a second.

25 MS. NEAL: The debate can go on. Okay, then



1 I'll second it.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. It's been moved
3 and seconded. Is there discussion? Angelika, please.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: So, basically, it's a
5 request, and that is -- if you look at the item on the
6 \$963,000, I think it helps that there was a huge amount
7 of information on why this money was requested. And I
8 thought it was pretty -- for me it was thorough enough,
9 but for you it was not, and so rather than talking
10 individually to -- all of us talking -- we need to, in
11 all fairness, tell staff what else do we need to know. I
12 have the hunch that maybe there's an accountability piece
13 for you that you want to know that districts value this.

14 Now I hate to go to districts and ask them
15 one more question for feedback, but if it helps us to
16 allocate the funds to make this a strong department of
17 education, then maybe we are going to need to have that
18 discussion. That we need some kind of a feedback system
19 to assure us that the districts, the work we do in
20 districts, does, in fact, serve their needs.

21 Is it too much? Is it too little? Do they
22 have to wait more than three months to have those come
23 out? That kind of stuff. That might be your concern.
24 I'm not sure. I'm trying to --

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: Return on investment for



1 money. Is there --?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: It's hard to -- it's not
3 always easy to do when you're not making widgets, and
4 we're not making -- I mean, I come from a business
5 background. When you're making widgets it's pretty easy
6 to figure that out. Return on investments on these kinds
7 of things, which are basically building human capital,
8 the measures are very, very difficult.

9 UNKOWN SPEAKER: They are, but --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: In their survey, and I hate
11 to ask for another survey, but I think if it -- if it
12 helps the board to do that, maybe that's what need to
13 assure yourself that the kind of work that's, you know,
14 we've shifted from a regulatory to a service and support
15 system, but maybe we're not assuring our tax payers that
16 that service and support is of deep value.

17 COMM. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair, I might just
18 point out that as a part of the process, that when this
19 goes over to the GBC they do pass CASE, CASB and other
20 proofs to poll their membership and see if they support
21 our request or not. I mean --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Well then that needs to be
23 shared with us, maybe, Robert?

24 COMM. HAMMOND: Yeah.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So with regard to this on



1 top this section of the conversation, then I've got a
2 question and then we'll, perhaps, take action on the --
3 so, I will endeavor -- we will continue to move toward a
4 more satisfying, more complete method of engaging this
5 board with regard to the budget that crosses the street.
6 I think we've made strides, we're moving it in the right
7 direction, the conversation issue's being brought sooner.
8 Now if we could just get them to a complete level where
9 we've got a full-throated support of the action going
10 across the street. I'd like to get to where the board
11 has the ability to do that.

12 Then to my question. With regard to this,
13 we're asking for 963 this year, 160 -- or a-million-six
14 next year, and back to the legislative report we had
15 earlier: Was this envisioned in a fiscal note at any
16 time? When the Educator Effectiveness Law was developed?
17 Was it anticipated that we need a million bucks this year
18 and a-million-six next year plus 10.5 FTE to make this
19 happen?

20 COMM. HAMMOND: The answer I would say,
21 correct me if I'm wrong, the answer is, well, fiscal
22 notes only go for two years, and that's what we've run
23 into. And as Jill stated, we really have so many, I
24 mean, overwhelming support of the state model system. I
25 don't think even the legislation anticipated all that,



1 and the use and the services it would require for the
2 department.

3 If the fiscal notes could go past two
4 years that would be great, but that's all we're allowed
5 to submit when we write one.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So, in short answers, as
7 we're moving here, it was not anticipated; the cost, the
8 ongoing cost, the centralization of effort and the cost
9 born at this department were not anticipated in the
10 legislation?

11 COMM. HAMMOND: If I was -- thank you, Mr.
12 Chair. I was involved in the fiscal note and the two-
13 year limitation, or sort of the box that they put that in
14 was part of it, I don't think we could say we anticipated
15 these precise numbers, and it was not documented what we
16 anticipated going beyond the 250,000 in the first two
17 years.

18 However, I think it was understood that it
19 was going to be an additional cost over the 250 that
20 initially created this program.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So once outside the box
22 of the fiscal note we've had an exponential by factors
23 increase in cost and employees necessary to provide the
24 service.

25 COMM. HAMMOND: That is correct. Although



1 it came in well below the cost studies that were done, if
2 I understand correctly.

3 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah, that's right.

4 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. And to that point
5 and back to the points that Dr. Scheffel was making, you
6 know, that becomes -- this board has the opportunity to
7 maintain a role as a custody -- or custodian of the
8 public's fund and the public's trust in terms of
9 understanding what happens with the dollars and as
10 they're spent.

11 And so, it supports my notion and my desire
12 that we, in fact, have a process whereby we get a more --
13 more engagement from this board on these substantive
14 issues that underly the dollars that are brought.

15 Having said that --

16 MS. NEAL: Nope, I got --

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, Vice Chair gets the
18 final word, and then maybe we'll call the roll.

19 MS. NEAL: Final word, because I need to go
20 back -- when you -- during an election year when you're
21 on a campaign there is a great deal of emphasis on quit
22 wasting our money, don't, you know, saving the money.
23 But I think what Mr. Hammond said, a lot of people don't
24 realize. We have almost no control over the budget. It
25 comes from the legislature. Everybody wants us to save



1 money, well, you know, we change the legislature maybe we
2 will. We have almost no control.

3 And so, really, when you look at it, you
4 know, the best -- that's not -- so we only have two
5 things on here that are under our control. And so, I
6 think it, you know, I just think it sort of belittles --
7 and I don't mean it in that way, but it -- the whole
8 effort is like, almost like, we're, you know, trying to
9 convince people that, boy, we're really saving money.

10 And, again, when you talk about the rural
11 school districts, I have no trouble justifying this. I
12 don't know the exact amount. Could it be 943-million
13 instead of 6? I don't know, you know, but we have to
14 have some faith in our staff, which I do.

15 So, I just think people need to realize and
16 really emphasize we have very little control over the
17 budget as a whole. We have almost none. This is about
18 the only thing we do have control over, so I kind of hate
19 to see us hassle about it all that long.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Motion before us. I move
21 to appress (sic) the department's annual -- or to approve
22 the department's annual budget change request as set
23 forth in the published agenda. Staff will please call
24 the roll.

25 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman.



1 MS. BERMAN: Aye.

2 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.

3 MS. GOFF: Aye.

4 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Aye.

6 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

8 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

9 MS. NEAL: Aye.

10 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

12 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Motion carries.

15 COMM. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair I --

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

17 COMM. HAMMOND: I also told the -- as part

18 of this discussion, we'll bring the budget up to you a

19 month earlier, so we'll have three months to talk about

20 it and answer questions.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So, the footnote on the

22 us, as a board, improving our policy, we're going to pick

23 this up a month earlier next year.

24 MS. NEAL: So, we could --

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, and then -- no.



1 The point is then let's get to the policy issues
2 underlying the dollars.

3 MS. NEAL: Right.

4 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Right. I would like to
5 reiterate. I would really like to see a lot more a lot
6 sooner. I'd like to also see -- I'd also like to see
7 (indiscernible) added online. I would like to see all
8 the staff of CDE and their positions (indiscernible) big
9 picture and --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right, a broader picture,
11 probably.

12 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Broader, you know, we have
13 name (indiscernible).

14 COMM. HAMMOND: We've done some of that.
15 We're right in the process -- excuse me, Mr. Chair.
16 We're right in the process of trying to make that easier
17 to read than you've seen in the past. Haven't put --
18 thought about the names. We could certainly do that in a
19 chart and provide that to you, but we, because of those
20 requests, have kept up, really, it indicates how
21 legislation is driven, and then where those exceptions
22 may not be. All right?

23 So, we'll -- as soon as we get that done in
24 the next few weeks we'll get that to you. Okay?

25 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah. I just wanted to make



1 sure they're (indiscernible). Not just for me, so
2 (indiscernible).

3 COMM. HAMMOND: I can get you some pictures,
4 but we run into some other issues on that.

5 MS. NEAL: Yeah.

6 UNKOWN SPEAKER: You can have
7 (indiscernible) picture day, just like all of us do.

8 COMM. HAMMOND: (indiscernible) deal with
9 privacy --

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: The next item on the
11 agenda is an information item concerning the standard
12 setting process for CMAS, Science and Social Studies
13 assessments. Woops. Jane has a question. Are we --?

14 MS. GOFF: Yeah. I would like -- before
15 Jeff leaves --

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Mr. Blanford, please.

17 UNKOWN SPEAKER: Jeff, good try.

18 MS. NEAL: Jane's calling.

19 UNKOWN SPEAKER: You were almost there.

20 MS. GOFF: I'm sorry. Very quick.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We can always call you
22 back.

23 MS. GOFF: I'm sorry. Very simple yes or no
24 answer. Two parts -- two part, but yes or no.

25 MR. BLANFORD: Two yeses, two nos.



1 MS. GOFF: Are we still -- will we -- we
2 will be, but will the budget forecast -- the economic
3 forecast, and I assume there's one due in June?

4 MR. BLANFORD: Mm-hmm.

5 MS. GOFF: And we have in September,
6 usually. Are those seriously going to possibly have any
7 impact on what we're able to do here at all? So do we
8 need to keep that in mind? Will there be any big, scary
9 prediction one way or another?

10 MS. NEAL: Oh, good question.

11 MR. BLANFORD: There has been no indication
12 of that up to this point. In fact, there is actually a
13 statewide request for a timekeeping system that the
14 September forecast will determine whether the
15 legislature's willing to fund it or not. So, there's
16 actually some optimism.

17 I can't speak to June. We were talking
18 about September, but presumably if September's looking
19 rosy I would think that June is in pretty good shape as
20 well, so there haven't been any dire communications about
21 that. In fact, it seems to be trending upwards even if
22 it's not at the growth rate we'd like to see.

23 So, there's no -- there's no bad news that I
24 know of at the moment.

25 MS. GOFF: Well, or just any kind of news



1 that would put us having to go into another kind of
2 thinking on this first place. That's all, that's all.

3 MR. BLANFORD: And by and large these items;
4 they would consider them -- if the budget were to take a
5 big hit, they would look at all agencies request,
6 prioritize them, and we might lose out, we might not, but
7 this is a small enough request that they'll tend to
8 consider it on it's own merits without too much worry
9 about the overall budget.

10 COMM. HAMMOND: But they have the authority
11 to simply --

12 MR. BLANFORD: Yes. Yes.

13 MS. GOFF: I know.

14 MR. BLANFORD: They may consider it, but
15 that's unlikely.

16 MS. GOFF: They can handle it.

17 MR. BLANFORD: They would probably look at
18 it as our department and either did we justify it or not,
19 and if they did -- if we did, they would approve it, if
20 not they wouldn't. There are huge budget issues out
21 there that would just eliminate these out of hand, that I
22 know of.

23 MS. GOFF: Thank you. And thank you for --

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Thank you, Mr. Blanford.

25 MS. GOFF: And thanks for coming back.



1 Everybody's indulgent.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So, the next item is an
3 information item regarding standard setting for CMAS.
4 Mr. Commissioner.

5 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you. In three minutes
6 or less.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No. We want to give --

8 COMM. HAMMOND: Yeah. This is -- this is an
9 information item, and it is in keeping, now that we have
10 done our science and social studies, and it's much like
11 we've talked with you about. Now comes the challenge of
12 benchmarking and setting the cut scores. And what we
13 want to just keep before you, what that process looks
14 like when that will happen, so this won't be very long,
15 but just -- this is just for your information and
16 knowledge, okay? Joyce.

17 JOYCE UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair and board.
18 As the commissioner indicated, this is really just an
19 introduction to the process so that when I come back in
20 August you can all reflect back and say: This is not the
21 first time I heard that we were setting cut scores.

22 COMM. HAMMOND: Please remember that.

23 JOYCE UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you. And I
24 want to be sure that when I do come back in August that,
25 where possible, I have the information that you need in



1 order to feel comfortable making those cut scores.

2 Colorado adapted their new science and

3 social studies standards back in December of 2009.

4 Setting the cut scores is kind of getting closer to the

5 end of that process. We did administer the elementary

6 and middle school science and social studies assessments

7 this spring, and as the commissioner indicated, this

8 summer we will be setting what we refer to as the

9 performance standards. Not content standards, but the

10 performance standards, the actual cut scores to the test

11 that indicate proficiency.

12 Why do we set the performance standards?

13 It's really to help support the interpretation of

14 results. Folks will come to know our new proficiency

15 standards in that language. That will be more meaningful

16 than a score of 512.

17 As we move forward with the new assessments,

18 we are looking at new labels for our performance levels.

19 For the science and social studies we are looking at

20 limited command, then moderate command, strong command,

21 and distinguished command. These labels are consistent

22 with what we expect to have for our English language arts

23 and mathematics assessments in about a year.

24 We are collapsing two levels at the bottom

25 level for ELA and math. We expect to have minimal and



1 partial for science and social studies. Again, we're
2 collapsing those into just limited.

3 As part of this process we will also be
4 reviewing what we refer to as performance-level
5 descriptors, and those performance-level descriptors will
6 be finalized. That's where we'll define what does
7 limited command mean. What does that look like? What
8 skills and concepts are reflected at that level? What
9 skills and concepts are reflected at moderate? What
10 skills and concepts are reflected at strong, et cetera?
11 So, I'll be bringing you those definitions as well.

12 Who'd going to be adapting those new
13 performance standards? That's you. That will be the
14 board, but you will adapt those based on the
15 recommendations of the standard setting panels that will
16 be convening this summer.

17 Who will be participating in those standard-
18 setting meetings; we'll have approximately 50 panelists,
19 they will be educators who are very competent and
20 knowledgeable about the Colorado academic standards.
21 They are familiar about the process of students learning
22 of those standards. They will also be knowledgeable
23 about the range of characteristics in our population, so
24 we will have representatives of folks who are familiar
25 with our English Learner population, our students with



1 disabilities, as well as, you know, our general
2 population.

3 They will also be individuals who are
4 interested and understand how these results will be used.
5 What we want in the end is to have panelist
6 recommendations, and panelists who will stand behind
7 their recommendations with confidence, and in order to do
8 that they have to understand how the scores ultimately
9 will be used.

10 We will select those panelists from our
11 educator database that we have been collecting over the
12 course of the last two years, and we will want those
13 panels to be balanced in terms of gender and geography
14 and district size, and race, ethnicity, et cetera.

15 Who will be facilitating those meetings?
16 There will be both Pearson, our contractor, and CDE staff
17 at those meetings. We will have psychometricians who
18 will lead those meetings. We will have data analysts who
19 will be processing all of the numbers that need to be
20 processed during that process, and we will have content
21 experts who will be available to answer any content-
22 related questions that come up.

23 For day one there will be a general session.
24 During that session we'll obviously deal with logistics.
25 More importantly we'll explain at a high level what the



1 process it is that we will be following. Sorry. We will
2 also be sure that we are very clear about what this
3 group's task is and what their task is not. This is not
4 going to be an opportunity to relook at the content
5 standards. It is not an opportunity to critique, at this
6 point in time, items. That's all been done. Their job
7 is going to be to set recommendations for actual cut
8 scores.

9 There will be four different panels, one for
10 fourth-grade social studies, one for seventh-grade social
11 studies. One for fifth-grade science and one for eight-
12 grade science.

13 They will go into those groups. Panelists
14 will do their introductions, so they'd know how it is
15 that they are working with. They will review those draft
16 performance-level descriptors, what we think limited
17 means. They will develop descriptions of threshold
18 students.

19 You've heard that concept of threshold
20 students in reference to, I believe, the PRAXIS tests.
21 Same kind of process is followed here. So, what does a
22 kiddo look like who has just crossed that cut score.

23 They will be trained in the actual process
24 that they will follow. They will have an opportunity to
25 practice before they actually engage in it. They will be



1 reviewing actual items that the students experienced on
2 the tests, and they will complete what we refer to as a
3 readiness survey. Essentially it is: Do you understand
4 what you are now being asked to do? Do you understand
5 what the process is, and folks are not allowed to engage
6 in the process until we have everyone indicating: Yes, I
7 clearly understand what my role is here today in what we
8 will be doing.

9 Overnight the data analysts will be
10 processing all of those first-round recommendations. In
11 the morning those recommendations and the data that's
12 been analyzed and the report that has been generated will
13 be shared with the panels.

14 In addition they will receive information on
15 those items in relationship to how students actually
16 performed on the tests themselves for -- so on day one
17 panelists are doing it based strictly on content, on day
18 two, they now will have the content, the items, they will
19 also have student performance information that they can
20 take into consideration.

21 They will then do a second round of ratings.
22 After we have the second round of ratings all of those
23 will be processed over lunch time, and then the panels
24 will be given that feedback report. In addition, they
25 will be given impact data. When we look at impact data,



1 they will now have information about the percentage of
2 students that are falling into each one of the categories
3 and by sub-group.

4 If necessary, they will engage in a round
5 three set of ratings. They will make adjustments to
6 their recommendations, and in the end, they will be asked
7 to complete a questionnaire mostly focusing on how much
8 they can support the group's suggested cut scores. And
9 again, the goal is to have the group be able to say we
10 stand behind these and, yes, go forward to the board
11 based on these recommendations.

12 Day three. Remember we had the four panels,
13 so we had a fourth-grade social studies group in a
14 seventh-grade social studies group. We're now going to
15 combine portions of those groups and have them look at
16 what they had come up with, their individual
17 recommendations, and make sure that they make sense
18 across the grade levels.

19 By no means do the percentage of kids who
20 are going to be considered proficient need to be the
21 same, but it needs to have some kind of logical sense so
22 that when you are asked how come, board, you approved a
23 cut score that resulted in, I am making this up, 47
24 percent of our 4th graders meeting standards and 92
25 percent of our 7th graders meet standards, you understand



1 why and they understand why.

2 Again, I don't expect there to be that much
3 discrepancy, but that's the point of this day is to make
4 sure across grade levels these make sense. This is a
5 part of the process that's really important when you are
6 doing English Language arts and mathematics so that you
7 have third grade making sense with fourth grade making
8 sense with fifth grade, so you don't suddenly have a lot
9 of jumping that you can't explain occurring.

10 As part of the near evaluation for that
11 reasonableness cut they will be looking again at impact
12 data and they will be looking at that cross grade
13 performance.

14 So rough timeline here, high level timeline,
15 we did do the administration of the test this spring from
16 April 14th through May 2nd. The materials have been
17 processed, responses have all been scored in May. In
18 June we are in the process of having the districts look
19 at their demographic data for their students to make sure
20 that all of our demographic information is correct. You
21 know, students are indicated with the appropriate race,
22 ethnicity, free and reduced lunch status, disability
23 status, et cetera.

24 We are in the process of selecting the
25 panels. Those panels will be convened in July, and then



1 again in August I will be back to share with you the
2 recommendations of the panels. At that point in time you
3 are going to be asked to adopt both the descriptors for
4 the performance levels, what does limited mean, as well
5 as those performance standards or those cut scores.

6 I just went through rather quickly. I heard
7 the time reference. What we plan to do for CMAS, we will
8 be following a very similar procedure for COWAT (ph).
9 Remember we have a different set of assessments for our
10 students with the most significant cognitive
11 disabilities, and we will need to set the cut scores for
12 those assessments as well, and I'll be bringing those to
13 you for review at the same time. Questions.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions. Pam.

15 MS. MAZANEC: I perhaps should already know
16 this, but can you tell me what the scope of Pearson's
17 involvement in this is, and their -- the scope of their
18 work?

19 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Absolutely. Pearson,
20 remember, is our contractor for the CMAS assessments.
21 They will be providing significant psychometric help, so
22 running all the numbers, doing all of that analysis.
23 They will be facilitating the groups. They are not the
24 ones who make the recommendations in terms of what the
25 cut scores should be. They provide the information. So



1 when you had the panelists go through that process in
2 round one and round two and round three, Pearson provides
3 the impact data. It is not their job to evaluate the
4 impact data. That's the panelists' jobs.

5 So, the recommendations that you will get
6 will be from Colorado educators. They will not be from
7 Pearson.

8 MS. MAZANEC: But going forward will Pearson
9 be creating the CMAS test questions, and what will that
10 be based on?

11 JOYCE UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. So,
12 Pearson is our contractor. They do have a multi-year
13 contract with us. Item development is an ongoing process
14 so that we can refresh the assessments on an ongoing
15 basis. What we have done with the science and social
16 studies assessments is follow a very similar procedures
17 to what we have done with our historical assessments.
18 Which means that every item that appears on a Colorado
19 test is reviewed by a group of Colorado educators not
20 just once, but multiple times. They change --

21 MS. MAZANEC: Is that the same group of
22 educators that's on this -- excuse me -- on this panel,
23 or a different one?

24 JOYCE UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There may be some
25 overlap in those educators, but they will not be -- it's



1 not a direct overlap. What we are looking for, both with
2 our item writers as well as with our standard setters,
3 our educators who are very familiar with the Colorado
4 Academic Standards, because they obviously need to have
5 that understanding before you can either write items or
6 set cut scores based on the standards.

7 One of the things that we did add with our
8 science and social studies assessments is actually
9 engaging Colorado educators in the initial item
10 development as well, so as we move across time more and
11 more of that responsibility is going to be with the
12 Colorado educators, and Pearson's job is to do things
13 like verifying facts and doing a lot of the editing,
14 getting the graphics, getting permissions, but the actual
15 items we want more and more to be developed by the
16 Colorado educators.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Pam.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Just one follow up. So, the
19 goal is to increase the role of Colorado educator sand
20 decrease the role of Pearson.

21 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: The goal is --

22 MS. MAZANEC: Going forward.

23 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair --

24 MS. MAZANEC: As far as creating the
25 questions.



1 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. So,
2 again, historically what we have done is that our
3 contractor -- so our contractor under our current
4 assessments with CTB; they initially developed items and
5 then brought them for feedback to the Colorado educators.
6 What we want to do with our science and social studies
7 assessments is get that participation more at the
8 beginning, so that Colorado educators are involved from
9 day number one in that process.

10 COMM. HAMMOND: To that (indiscernible).

11 MS. MAZANEC: And the other part of that
12 question was to decrease Pearson's role in developing the
13 questions. I don't mean that as a specific goal, but
14 that will necessarily happen if you increase the role of
15 Colorado educators in developing questions, as opposed to
16 Pearson.

17 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. So, as we
18 look at Pearson's role in that initial item development,
19 that obviously will be reduced. We still will be
20 dependent upon Pearson for, again, fact checking,
21 editing, getting the graphics, getting the permissions.
22 It's much more complicated than just having an item on a
23 piece of scratch paper in terms of how we get from
24 initial thought to produced test.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Dr. Scheffel.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for the update. Can
2 you -- I have three questions. The first is, why does
3 Pearson select the panelists?

4 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. Pearson
5 is selecting the initial set of panelists because right,
6 now, frankly, they're the ones who are holding our
7 educator database, and they do that randomly. So, they
8 will look to make sure that they are selecting panelists,
9 you know, geographically representative, to the extent
10 possible gender representative and race and ethnicity
11 representative, so they do that initial pull for us, and
12 then we review it.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: And how do they -- I guess
14 I'd like to know in more detail about how they get pl
15 into the CMAS database that Pearson uses from which to
16 select. Where is it posted? I mean, I understand they
17 make buckets once people put their information in, but
18 what kind of information goes in?

19 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: I don't know if there's a
21 template or something. I'm sure there is.

22 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

24 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: So we have build --
25 been building that CMAS educator database now for about



1 two years. We have consistently gone to districts
2 through our DAX, through content, through the
3 superintendent's list serve. We have had it posted on our
4 website indicating if you are an educator with interest
5 in participating in the development of the CMAS
6 assessments please go to this link and fill in this
7 questionnaire. The questionnaire asks, basically, for
8 background in relationship to the standards in terms of
9 instruction, and then again, those critical demographic
10 variables like geographic region, size of the district
11 that you would be representing, your own gender, race,
12 ethnicity, things like that.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: So, I've had some teachers
14 say they've tried to go and apply and become part of the
15 panel and they didn't hear back, or they weren't chosen,
16 or whatever. I assume there's some rubric that's used,
17 or some mechanism that puts enough people in the bucket
18 and it seals out, or --?

19 JOYCE UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. Exactly.
20 So, if we have, you know, and I again am making this up
21 as an example, because this is not the case. But if we
22 suddenly had a huge number of folks from Northeast part
23 of Colorado, that does not mean that everyone who is on
24 the list will actually become part of one of the panels.
25 Right? It's a representative sample from across the



1 state. So, I reference that we're going to have panels
2 of about 50 people will be participating in our data
3 pace. We have closer to about 300 folks, so not everyone
4 who's in the database will be elected to participate.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: So, I would just -- this is a
6 question for the board. Do board members feel
7 comfortable with Pearson choosing these folks? I mean, I
8 don't know if that'd be appropriate for the board to have
9 a little more active role, but what we'll get next month
10 is a list of people and we'll basically rubber stamp them
11 because they'll be in the right buckets. I guess I'd
12 like a more active role, but I don't know how others
13 feel.

14 My third question is what psychometric model
15 is being used to inform the panels work --

16 COMM. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair can I -- let me,
17 if I may, clarify your question.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

19 COMM. HAMMOND: Let me see if I'm right.
20 What we're saying, we provide the names, they just have
21 the mathematical modeling for their computer, if you
22 will.

23 JOYCE UNKNOWN SPEAKER: They have all the
24 information.

25 COMM. HAMMOND: They -- it just -- they



1 randomly select based upon a program those educators, and
2 if I'm correct about what you were saying, Joyce, it's
3 not a matter of them going in and doing that. It's all
4 randomly -- a random generator that picks the names like
5 that. So, to ensure objectivity, quite frankly, I mean,
6 it's just a computer selecting names. If that helps.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, that's helpful. Okay,
8 and then what's the psychometric model that Pearson's
9 using to inform the panel's work that results in setting
10 the cut scores.

11 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. So, when
12 we are looking at that first set of data that we will be
13 sharing during the second round. I talked about item
14 level difficulty statistics, they're basically using a
15 classical model there that will generate those --

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: You said a classical
17 model?

18 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Classical, yep.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is there a document with --

20 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: That's --

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because there's a lot of
22 different models even within the classical approach that
23 would inform their work.

24 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: I can definitely
25 share with you what the classical models -- the classical



1 model is in order to generate the P values, which are the
2 item-level statistics.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: That'd be great.

4 JOYCE UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Absolutely.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because what will happen, is
6 they'll -- the panelists will get there. They'll be
7 working with Pearson, the psychometricians, and they will
8 provide documents to the panelists that will inform the
9 work. I guess I'd love to see what they are. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions over here?
11 I've got a couple questions.

12 MS. NEAL: And just to --

13 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: And will we all get that,
14 by the way?

15 COMM. HAMMOND: Oh, of course.

16 MS. NEAL: Just a quick comment. I know
17 that because of the bill it was -- came up late in the
18 legislative session about doing away with testing
19 history. That there is a strong local Colorado group of
20 Colorado Economic Council, History Colorado, you know,
21 geography, and they're meeting again, and I'm quite sure
22 they'll be very involved in the process. I don't know if
23 any of them are on the committee, but I'm sure they'll be
24 very involved in the process as it moves forward.

25 So, I have quite a bit of faith in those



1 people. They're -- they really are, you know, focused on
2 the educating and social studies, which, of course, is
3 the big thing for me, as everybody knows. So, I have
4 been back in contact -- we've kind of fallen apart. We
5 all got back together again, and I know they're meeting
6 and I'm sure they will have strong voice and one that we
7 can depend on as being a local Colorado voice.

8 JOYCE UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. There
9 definitely is a very active social studies group that
10 were integral in, you know, really conveying what they
11 felt was important to include social studies within the
12 assessment system.

13 Also really involved in the personal
14 financial literacy standards themselves. So, we are in
15 contact with those folks as well.

16 MS. NEAL: I'm sur they're in contact with
17 you.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane?

19 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Two quickies,
20 promise. First is how -- yeah, I know it was recently,
21 so date doesn't matter. How long ago was the bias check
22 process carried out? And then part two of that is I know
23 we talked about if there was any overlap between folks
24 who did work like that and this next step panel.

25 But I guess the other -- the other maybe



1 more important, you know, we're talking about process
2 here and we're talking about documentation and we're
3 talking about the Genesis and the roots of the groups
4 involved in how they got to where they got to know about
5 it, whether they had free will and signing up and such.
6 How is this different, if at all, from what we went
7 through in previous years around the early days of CSAP.
8 And I'm not sure any of you were born yet. I remember it
9 pretty well. But I'm just curious as to what, you know,
10 if we -- if we're trying to help people -- or trying to
11 go elbow to elbow with everybody through these new
12 things. Is there some examples, some analogies, some
13 stories we can tell about how this is better, how it's
14 more promising, what are the advantages to it, what
15 should we always be alert to and wary of? Just advice.

16 JOYCE UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. Your
17 first question dealt with bias and sensitivity review.
18 Actually, for bias and sensitivity there are two
19 different steps in the process. The first is when we
20 review the items, we review them for content. We also
21 review them for bias and sensitivity issues. That
22 happens before items appear on a field test form.

23 There is a second step in the process which
24 is post-field-test, so that first reviews is based on
25 expert judgement of the educators. The second step is we



1 look at the actual data that was generated during field
2 testing and we look for anomalies within that data, and
3 then we can bring that data along with those items to a
4 second group of people and say: Okay, you know, this has
5 already gone through a content review, it already went
6 through one bias and sensitivity review without data, now
7 we're back because we have some data that looks a little
8 bit anomalous. Please review these items again and tell
9 us whether they are appropriate or not appropriate to be
10 included on an operational assessment.

11 Now there are times when we do that second
12 review, and we now have that data to indicate: Hm,
13 interestingly enough, we have females out performing
14 males, and somehow during that qualitative review we
15 missed a piece that really somehow unrelated to content
16 made the item more interesting to our boys and our girls.
17 And then we would make the decision not to use that item.

18 In other cases, when we would look at the
19 item, literally, I have had items like $6+8=14$ come up
20 with a bias flag. And when we have that panels look at
21 that item and we say: Can you explain why this particular
22 item may be bringing in irrelevant information? And then
23 the panelists say: No. So, the data itself isn't --
24 doesn't make the determination it's just a flag for us to
25 go back to the items to make sure. So, first time before



1 its on a field test, second time we look at it is post-
2 field testing before it goes on the operational
3 assessment. And then obviously on an ongoing basis we
4 are looking at that information. It is included in the
5 technical manuals that are posted every year so folks can
6 -- who are interested -- can also look there to see what
7 those statistics look like.

8 MS. GOFF: My experience with bias checks
9 and such as that, sensitivity are with the really early
10 days of place, so it was in the world language
11 certification place test, that that experience -- granted
12 it's my one big example of that particular type of work.
13 It's very exacting. We knew a lot then about how hard
14 that was going to be, so it's important, and it's
15 important that people who make decision around it know
16 what they're doing.

17 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

19 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: And I should point
20 out, because you were asking about, you know, how have
21 things changed from, you know, how we were doing things
22 previously; that second check that we're doing under our
23 old system, under CSAP, that was a check that was done
24 with solely contractor staff and CDE staff. And with
25 CMAS we opened up that up again for an educator review.



1 Again, we have been trying very hard to make
2 sure that we increase educator involvement into this
3 assessment, and we've learned some things in the last 10
4 to 15 years about how to develop state-wide assessments.

5 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Questions down that way.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

8 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry. So, couple things.
10 One, in a standards-based system we make the case that
11 there are no surprises and there're no secrets, and that
12 we share with students not only what the general
13 expectation is, but that we demonstrate the rubric, what
14 is -- I can't remember what your terms were, but what is
15 exemplary, what is acceptable, what is getting there and
16 what is you're not there yet?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Limited command, moderate
18 command, strong command, and synchronous command.

19
20 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. I have no
21 command today. That's what I just said you're not --

22 UNKOWN SPEAKER: You have limited command.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: I have no command today on
24 this machine.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well (indiscernible).



1 Next question.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: No, no. So, what's the
3 process once we do this benchmarking of communicating
4 that piece?

5 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. And so,
6 we -- after we have those actual cut scores we will then
7 move into production of actual reports. There will be
8 information included on the actual reports in terms of
9 this is what the limited command means in terms of
10 concepts and skills. This is what distinguished command
11 means in terms of concepts and skills. Frankly it's a
12 lot of words, so what we also know that we need to do is
13 release sample items that kind of correspond to: These
14 are the types of items -- examples of items that our
15 kiddoes who are at the limited command could answer: Here
16 is distinguished command and what they could answer that
17 my limited kids couldn't answer. To try to make that a
18 more --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Wait a minute. For the same
20 question?

21 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: They would be
22 different questions. Right. And then we can also --

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Why can't we have -- why
24 can't we have a question and then demonstrate: This is an
25 answer that represents this, this, this and this.



1 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: So, remember we have
2 different types of items that are on the test, so we have
3 some items that are going to be selected response, so
4 kids are going to get them right or wrong. Then we have
5 separate from that for our constructed response items
6 that can be scored on a 0, 1, 2 or a 0, 1, 2, 3 kind of a
7 scale, and for those what we'll do is we will release
8 sample papers that represent: This is what a 1 looked
9 like on this item. This is what a 2 looked like, this is
10 what a 3 looks like. And across time we'll be able to
11 build that bank, but we will have example papers out
12 there.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So, one of the things
14 that -- I mean, I don't want to go in the kind of detail
15 that I'm hearing others say.

16 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Sure.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Because I feel that's
18 micromanaging. But I do want to know the parts of what
19 are we going to share with teachers and students, what is
20 competency. And we had that promise in the 90s for about
21 a year, or maybe two, and then it fell off. So, I hope
22 as a board that we commit to maintaining that kind of
23 information for parents.

24 Then my second -- I -- I don't know if it's
25 a question or a comment. One of the things that I heard



1 -- that were sort of the general scuttlebutt about the
2 CSAPs is that by the time you got to the high school math
3 that that group of teachers who set those cut scores just
4 had very, very high standards. And then it didn't align
5 with the preparation that those kids had to get there.

6 And I don't know -- I just expect that there
7 might be the kind of feedback that says: This is too
8 hard, or this is too easy. How do we go about having
9 those discussions in a meaningful, fair way, without
10 giving away everything?

11 JOYCE UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair. One thing
12 to keep in mind -- and I didn't mention this earlier --
13 when we were looking at our panels, the panels will
14 consist of teachers who are currently instructing at that
15 grade level, but also the teachers who are instructing at
16 the following grade levels. That you are getting the
17 perspective of as a fifth-grade teacher: This is what I
18 think my kids should know walking out the door. But
19 you're also getting the perspective of the sixth-grade
20 teachers who are saying: This is what I expect of my kids
21 walking in the door. Right. So, you're looking at
22 trying to get across grade consistency so we're not
23 working in isolation.

24 Frankly, based on what I know about how that
25 original standard-setting occurred in Colorado, they made



1 -- followed a similar path that a lot of states did,
2 which is they had one set of panelists who are looking at
3 grades of 3 through 5, a different set who are looking at
4 6 through 8, and a different set who are looking at 9 and
5 10, and they never got together to say: Does this all
6 make sense as a system?

7 So, when I referenced our day 3 that we will
8 do, that's what we're trying to get at is to say: Does
9 this make sense as a system? Again, because science and
10 social studies is not administered in every year, it is
11 not as impactful as when you do that with ELA and math
12 and you have folks all sitting in the room and they have
13 to justify how expectations are being set across the 3
14 through 10. That will happen with ELA and math. They
15 will go through that vertical articulation process so
16 that you don't have as much as historically we have had
17 saying: This group was just functioning really
18 differently than this group and you have to get a pre --
19 agreement across in terms of what expectations are.

20 And, again, the biggest area we tend to see
21 that in is releasing our eight-graders, leaving middle
22 school, and an entering high school. And when folks
23 aren't meeting the expectations there's a lot of finger
24 pointing in terms of did those eight-graders, new ninth-
25 graders, come prepared, or did they really all of the



1 sudden just fall apart in high school?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: So then one final question.

3 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Sure.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Do we have the option of a
5 different level of rigor for the fourth-graders who have
6 been on the -- under the new 2010 Colorado standards, their
7 entire educational career versus the eight-graders. The
8 eighth-grader. I forgot what level the middle-school test
9 is. Eighth grade?

10 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Social studies is at
11 seventh, science is at eight.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Do we have the option so that
13 we, in fact, benchmark differently maybe two or three years
14 from now at those higher grades, or do we -- is it a do-
15 or-die right now based on those new standards?

16 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair?

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead.

18 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Two-part answer. The
19 first is, remember, we will be setting the cut scores based
20 on the standards as they exist today, right. So, you want
21 to have a correlation and your performance expectations
22 with what those content standards are, and you don't want
23 to suddenly change what's expected of kids because of the
24 assessment. So, I would encourage us to look at the
25 standards to lead the direction in terms of where those cut



1 scores should be rather than looking at historical events.
2 So it is that grade-specific standards that should dictate
3 what the cut score should be.

4 Second is: Do we expect that across time we
5 will see kids performing differently on the test as they
6 get to, A, really understand what the standards are, and
7 the educators get to understand those standards. We do
8 expect to see that. We will also need to, across time, do
9 what we refer to as standards validation. Meaning we're
10 going to do our best right now with the information that we
11 have, but it may very well be that down the road the board
12 makes a determination that you want us to look again and
13 make sure that the expectations that are represented in
14 those cut scores are indeed appropriate.

15 One of the challenges that we are going to
16 have with science and social studies, is that we're doing
17 elementary and middle school now and we're not doing high
18 school until the fall. We may need to look at some things
19 down the road to make sure that, again, we have consistency
20 and as system that makes sense across those.

21 So, A, set the standard -- set the
22 performance-level standards based on the content, B, be
23 ready to expect there to be shifts across time, and C, be
24 ready to also say: We need to re-look and make sure that
25 where we set those is appropriate in 2019. As appropriate



1 as it was in 2014.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: More questions down this
3 way? No? Dr. Scheffel?

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Just have a quick follow up to
5 Angelika's comment, which I think was on target. As we
6 know, the depth of knowledge model of cognitive complexity
7 informed the writing of Colorado Standards and also the
8 portion -- the common core portion, heavily influenced by
9 that. Also heavily influences the two federal consortia
10 for assessment and it heavily influences Pearson's work.

11 Question. When you set the score, the cut
12 scores, of the very -- the four levels the depth of
13 knowledge embraces as far as looking at cognitive
14 complexity and mastery. How does that inform the work?
15 Will that be inside the documents there? I mean, I guess
16 just am thinking based on what Angelika's saying we have to
17 help the teachers and the students, and the parents
18 understand on what basis they're being held accountable.

19 And we know that the models sitting underneath
20 of this work are quite explicit. Where is that information,
21 or will it be, so that people can look at it and say: I
22 know how to help my kids do better. I know how to help my
23 son and daughter do better.

24 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Great question.



1 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: So within -- depth of
2 knowledge is definitely taken into consideration when items
3 are written and when the test itself is built. When you're
4 looking at your four range -- your four levels of depth and
5 knowledge, the fourth level is typically pretty hard to do
6 within a statewide assessment, because frankly, it requires
7 typically pretty extensive multi-day kinds of activities,
8 so mostly what you see on a state test is going to be your
9 DOK1, DOK2, DOK3. You may have some DOK4, but we shouldn't
10 mistake that DOK1 items automatically fall into our first
11 performance level, because that's not the case. And we're
12 looking at DOK1 that is: Can you recall some facts? Well,
13 there are some facts that may be easier for you to recall
14 and there are some facts that are really difficult to
15 recall, so cognitive complexity is not the same,
16 necessarily as level of difficulty.

17 Within the standard-setting process, folks
18 will have access to the actual items, but it is much more
19 focused in standard setting on level of difficulty and
20 embedded within that is that cognitive complexity.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: So, I'm just going to
22 follow up, because as -- you know, just trying to think
23 through the parents: How do I use whatever tools we're
24 giving them to help their student? What's the answer to
25 that question? How -- what's that going to look like?



1 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: So when -- as we're
2 looking at, you know, some of the things that we can provide
3 for the public and the parents, again, I think we need to
4 do a very systematic approach to what it is that we can
5 release, and the examples that we release, and being able
6 to start to have communications with parents about this is
7 where this fell and why it is falling there.

8 Also, when we do our release of items, we do
9 release the depth of knowledge. There -- we're kind of
10 walking a line here in terms of where it is our job to kind
11 of work and educate with parents versus what individual
12 districts and individual teachers want to do in terms of
13 their own purview. Our approach is going to be: Let's make
14 sure that the information is out there and we share it and
15 it is accessible, but ultimately a lot of this is relatively
16 complex, and it has to be conversations between --
17 ultimately I would suggest -- parents and teachers in terms
18 of what does this mean for my own individual child and how
19 do we now move forward.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, make it quick and
21 then I've got a question (indiscernible).

22 UNKOWN SPEAKER: So -- right. We had the 90s,
23 whatever, standards.

24 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right.

25 UNKOWN SPEAKER: Our school district actually



1 prepared little booklets; grade one, grade two, et cetera.
2 And it is direct in par to the curriculum, and for that
3 reason we would have to be careful at the -- at the board
4 -- state board level to be saying that it -- at grade such
5 and such here specifically is how you help your kid.
6 Because it's going to be a decision at the state and
7 probably the -- to some extent -- the classroom level based
8 on how you help your child.

9 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure.

10 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: That puts responsibility on
11 the school districts, but it is extremely welcome by
12 parents, and so I certainly encourage districts once they
13 are set on their new curriculum, curricula, to start
14 preparing those kinds of documents for the parents in order
15 to support their children.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay. So, my question is
17 really about critical path and timeframe. This comes back
18 to us in August. We'll -- what kind of a box are we in
19 operationally in terms of time frames that we have to take
20 action on in August?

21 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: The hope is that, yes, you
22 will take action on this in August, and then what that will
23 allow us to do is to move forward with the processing of
24 the scores and have electronic information available to
25 schools and districts by the end of August in terms of their



1 individual student performance and the school and district
2 and state level performance. And then to have actual hard
3 copy individual student reports in the district's hands by
4 mid-September.

5 If you don't take action all that's going to
6 be delayed and deferred even longer.

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Kids come back to school
8 you can't get the reports. Yeah.

9 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: So that's the urgency in
10 terms of why we're hoping that you will be able to come to
11 a decision in August.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure. Sure. It's a little
13 bit, you know, disconcerting that the first time we get to
14 actually see, you know, substantive information we're
15 taking action on it immediately. That's a little
16 disconcerting, but I understand the timeframes and, quite
17 frankly, getting feedback to the students is something we
18 need to be figuring out ways to do better of, so I'm kind
19 of on the horns of a dilemma with regard to that.

20 Other questions? None. Great. Thank you very
21 much.

22 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (indiscernible) information
23 over the summer instead of waiting till the board meeting?
24 Is it safe to give us something for (indiscernible)? I
25 mean --



1 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER: Mr. Chair.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

3 JOYCE UNKOWN SPEAKER:: We will be having those
4 panels in July. WE can get you what I'll refer to as messy
5 -- no I'm kidding you. Not as clean as we will have for
6 you by the board meeting, but we can get you some
7 information shortly after those standard-setting panels so
8 that you can see some of the information.

9 I will not be able to generate all the
10 information that I want to bring to you in August much
11 before that August meeting. But I will be able to give you
12 that impact data that we're sharing with the panelists.
13 We'll be able to get that out, if that is helpful.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

15 UNKOWN SPEAKER: And then we can structure
16 some questions that might help your presentation in August.

17 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay.

18 UNKOWN SPEAKER: So that it won't be --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Slag it and share it. Thank
20 you. Okay, now to my colleagues. We have the ability to
21 kind of pick up some of our schedule in our executive
22 sessions, fairly light executive session today. We've got
23 another executive session tomorrow. The question is this.
24 The PRAXIS review is next. Do you want to just stay in
25 your seats right now I would prefer, quite frankly, to just



1 stay in our seats, take the PRAXIS review, which is -- but
2 we're -- but I want to be sensitive to the fact that we're
3 kind of running past the time we would normally give
4 everybody a chance to take a break right now.

5 So, I think we're staying in our seats. PRAXIS
6 review is on the agenda next. Next item is a review of
7 PRAXIS scores for English language, arts and mathematics.
8 Mr. commissioner.

9 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you very much. For the
10 second time I'm just going to turn this over to Ms. Coleen
11 O'Neil (ph) and welcome, Terry (ph). Thank you very much
12 for coming.

13 MS. O'NEIL: Thank you, absolutely. Good
14 afternoon.

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Ms. O'Neil.

16 MS. O'NEIL: Good afternoon. Under state
17 statute the Board of Education is responsible for
18 establishing the methods by which each candidate, educator
19 licensing candidate, is tested through their content
20 assessments. In June of 2013 educational testing services,
21 or ETS, and CDE staff made a recommendation for the adoption
22 of regenerated exams that are associated with the English
23 Language Arts Assessment, and that is Assessment 0583 for
24 the PRAXIS, as well as our mathematics assessment 5161.

25 During that approval the state board adopted



1 the recommended multi-state standard cut scores with the
2 condition that the scores be re-examined and evaluated and
3 reviewed one year later. So today, as an informational
4 item, for the state board you are presented with information
5 from ETS. And joining us today is Dr. Terry Owens, who is
6 a representative of Educational Testing Services has been
7 with us for quite some time now to help support our PRAXIS
8 review assessment and to make sure that we are, indeed,
9 having a strong positive impact with our cut scores on our
10 assessment.

11 So, at this time I will go ahead and turn it
12 over to Dr. Owens to talk a little bit about what we know
13 about our math and our English language PRAXIS assessments
14 within a year.

15 MS. OWENS: thank you Mr. Chair, Mr.
16 Commissioner, members of the board. I'll try and keep this
17 brief. I know we're under some time constraints.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: But at the same time,
19 please, make your case.

20 MS. OWENS: Just as an overview licensing
21 testing is regulated by each state, and testing is just one
22 of multiple requirements in order to get a license or a
23 certificate in any given state. The point I want to make
24 on this slide is that the test must be legally defensible.
25 That means there has to be a deliberative process in



1 something that is psychometrically sound. Tests do not
2 predict teaching performance, but it is a qualitative
3 measure that can be used to filter out the people that
4 should not be in the profession and the ones that should
5 be, at least, have that knowledge. And then there are other
6 qualitative measure that kick in after that.

7 We do have periodic state score reviews. We
8 encourage that process, and usually the licensing authority
9 or the boards or commissions will consider a standard
10 setting studies as recommendations for cut scores, but also
11 looking at available performance data, supply and demand
12 issues, and access to the profession and practitioner
13 input. So, a lot of times if you get a lot of kickback
14 from the public that will come back and might set off a
15 score review, and that has happened in some states.

16 Today we're looking at the Colorado Score
17 Reviews, and there are two of them, the English language
18 arts, content knowledge, and that is test number 5038 on
19 our Praxis list, and mathematics content knowledge number
20 5161.

21 Both of the -- these tests are regenerated in
22 2013 and adopted by this body. They both had multi-state
23 standard-setting panels that went through a rigorous
24 process to determine a recommended score. And that process,
25 by the way, is very detailed and ETS is the one that



1 invented the process to do this and then shared it with the
2 other testing company. Colorado did adopt the recommended
3 score with the condition that the scores be reviewed in one
4 year, and that's the reason for my presence today.

5 We'll start with English language arts, 5038:
6 There were 22 states plus the District of Columbia and Guam
7 represented by 37 panelists and the standard-setting study
8 was held in March of 2013. It was adopted by 20 states and
9 also Washington D.C., Guam, and the Virgin Islands. One
10 state out of that list set a score that was higher than the
11 multi-state recommended score and three set a lower score.
12 And again, this is something that the recommended score is
13 simply a recommendation. It is not a mandate.

14 Just give you a quick overview. The
15 panelists, the use of the states that were represented for
16 the English language arts assessment. Now the cut scores
17 you'll see across this line that 167 was the recommended
18 score for English language arts, and we had one that set it
19 a point above a couple of them slightly below, and one
20 substantially lower. That was their choice and, again, ETS
21 does not recommend any state set anything other than what
22 the panel sets up, and it's a recommendation ETS never sets
23 a score.

24 To get into the performance data I know this
25 is a little hard to see. This is a snip from our data



1 manager, and this is refreshed weekly, so on any given day
2 someone could call up and ask for that, or it's accessible
3 by the members of the Department of Education and on the
4 English language arts test. This is all test takers, this
5 is anyone across the nation that took the test and if it
6 were set at the 167, which Colorado chose, then 81 percent,
7 roughly, would have passed that test. And that's in the
8 ballpark for general performance on the tests. You would
9 hope that your IHE's would be able to get them to the
10 program, and most of them should be passing.

11 For Colorado, though, and this is anyone who
12 took the test and it's within the institutions of Colorado,
13 but it's also anyone that wanted the scores sent to Colorado
14 to become a teacher here. So, anyone that took it with
15 Colorado as a designated institution there was a 90 percent
16 pass rate.

17 Going on to the mathematics, 5161, there are
18 24 states, District of Columbia, and they made up a panel
19 -- there were 35 panelists on this study that was conducted
20 in March of 2013. It was adopted by 26 states along with
21 Washington D.C., Guam and the Virgin Islands again. There
22 were no states that set a higher score, but there were three
23 states that did set a lower score.

24 Give you a quick overview of the panelists,
25 again. These are the states and the panelists that were



1 represented in that study.

2 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I don't see Colorado. Am
3 I missing it?

4 MS. OWENS: No. Colorado was not -- Mr. Chair
5 the -- Colorado was not represented. Colorado, every state,
6 was invited to recommend panelists, and it was a matter of
7 whether or not they sent anybody, and they did not
8 participate in this.

9 UNKOWN SPEAKER: Since I can't see this, is
10 Massachusetts up there?

11 MS. OWENS: On this one no.

12 UNKOWN SPEAKER: Who?

13 MS. OWENS: Massachusetts is not --
14 Massachusetts does the Pearson tests. Even though most of
15 the -- I'm sorry. I should have asked Mr. chair. Sorry.

16 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please, go ahead. You're
17 fine.

18 MS OWENS: I'm sorry.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: We're pretty informal.

20 MS. OWENS: Massachusetts is a Pearson state,
21 although most of our Pearson states do pick up the ETS
22 assessments one point or another.

23 PRAXIS has a more comprehensive coverage of
24 assessments. We have roughly three times the number of
25 tests that Pearson has and so most of the Pearson -- all of



1 the Pearson states have some ETS represented in there, but
2 this is not one that was picked up by Massachusetts.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a way to norm them?
4 Get apples and apples between them?

5 MS. OWENS: Mr. Chair, between Pearson tests
6 and ETS tests?

7 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Yeah, yeah.

8 MS. OWENS: I don't know the answer to that.
9 I don't know if they could, but I think they would be
10 different enough it would -- it would be a very difficult
11 task to go in and do an equating study. Would have to have
12 the cooperation of Pearson to be able to get their tests
13 and a lot of times that's proprietary information.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure, sure. Just a
15 curiosity. Please, proceed.

16 MS. OWENS: Okay, these are the cut scores for
17 math: 5161, as you can see from this chart here, there were
18 most of the states picking up the recommended score of 160
19 and three that were below -- at least two of them were
20 substantially lower.

21 This is a performance data. This is for anyone
22 that took that test at the cut score of 160, and of course,
23 you know, the states set their own, but if they all were at
24 160 then the pass rate would have been 43 percent for every
25 -- for the amount of people that passed at 160, it was 43



1 percent, and for the state of Colorado there were 47 percent
2 passing this particular test.

3 And at this point I am going to turn it over
4 to --

5 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair. With those data we've
6 had an opportunity, actually, over the last month to take
7 a step back and take a look at the data, kind of do an
8 analysis between what the national recommendations were,
9 what our cut scores recommendations were for the last year,
10 as well as what the performance has been for the state of
11 Colorado in both the English Language assessments and the
12 math assessments.

13 Right now, this is an informational session
14 only, and as we've had the conversation with stake holders
15 in a couple of institutes of higher education in a very
16 informal, not a formal, way.

17 We pretty much are coming to the board saying:
18 This is information for you to consider. We actually
19 believe that we are on track with both of these assessments
20 with the cut scores today. As we are embarking on our
21 rules' alignment over the next year and really taking a
22 look at this in more detail all the way across the board
23 with regard to rules, statutes, PLACE, PRAXIS and other
24 content assessments. We would like to loop this back into
25 that process and bring more -- a larger group of



1 stakeholders to the table to talk a little bit more about:
2 Okay, is a 40 percent, or a 47 percent pass rate on our
3 mathematics scores an appropriate pass score? What would
4 happen, you know, as we do some comparisons across our
5 rules, what would really happen if we were to change that
6 cut score, and what are some thoughts in the field to be
7 able to bring back to the board for recommendations.

8 So as we stand today, we are basically saying
9 we would like to continue forward with the cut scores we
10 have, unless you feel very differently, and we're happy to
11 revisit that knowing that we are going to loop it back into
12 our rules alignment conversation that we're having in the
13 next 12 to 18 months.

14 Any questions that we can answer for you? And
15 Dr. Owens is an excellent resource, and so I will encourage
16 you to ask questions at will.

17 MS. NEAL: To ask her.

18 MS. O'NEIL: I will do my best to answer them
19 as I defer to Dr. Owens.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Angelika, Dr. Schroeder,
21 please.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, I'm not going to give
23 you a pass, because this is a -- sort of a Colorado -- I
24 think a Colorado question, although it looks like it's
25 somewhat similar throughout the nation. Is a discussion



1 that we raise the bar and we raise the understand -- basic
2 understanding of math, or do we lower the scores given the
3 challenges we have for our students I know what my
4 recommendation would be, but I'm one of seven. So that's
5 my first.

6 The second one, is this for elementary
7 teachers? Who all in Colorado takes the math -- takes
8 either one of those?

9 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair, this is all secondary
10 assessments right now, so these are 7 through 12-grade
11 teachers who are coming into the state. Some of them may
12 be elementary, that are looking for -- and we can certainly
13 provide that break-down, but some of them may be elementary
14 that are looking for multiple endorsements, so they're
15 elementary looking for an endorsement, especially in our
16 middle schools where they want to teach a 7th or 8th grade
17 math class.

18 With regard to the question about raising the
19 bar, one of the reasons that I do actually want to hold, is
20 because we have not -- remember in our rules, we have not
21 formally for educator preparation programs, adopted the
22 Colorado Academic Standards with math. And while that has
23 been integrated into our system in a very strong and
24 comprehensive way today, for our educator preparation
25 alignment and the review, we have not adopted that. I would



1 contend that at least from the way that we moved forward
2 and how the conversations with our stake holders, that we
3 are very interested in raising the bar, not changing the
4 scores.

5 However, we do know that a score of
6 (indiscernible) 47 percent of our graduates passing this is
7 creating a difficulty in a high-needs area of recruitment
8 at our district level, and we're very well aware of that.
9 However, we do want to be very thoughtful and deep about
10 what is the best solution.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: What's the retake rate?

12 MS. O'NEIL: That is -- Mr. Chair, that is a
13 good question.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: What is -- and what are the
15 scores on the retakes?

16 MS. OWEN: Mr. Chair. The retake would be
17 something I could look up. This is for the final. These
18 are the people that have taken it first time and any
19 subsequent time after that, and so this is the total that
20 you're seeing right here, so this would be including the
21 retake rate.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, okay.

23 MS. OWEN: If I were to look at the first-time
24 rate, though, I would pull that out separate.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Right.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I would be grateful for that,
2 because I am aware of candidates. Not just math and -- I
3 mean, I'm aware of candidates retaking, particularly in the
4 sciences where there's some real challenges with
5 assessment, I don't know if it's your assessment or not,
6 but with assessments that include all the area of the
7 science and many high school candidates are, in fact,
8 focusing on either a science or biology or that -- there
9 seems to be a pretty high retake just for candidates
10 catching up on an area that has not been a part of their
11 undergraduate study, whatever. So, I -- I'm aware of the
12 retake, so that's actually pretty critical, so I don't think
13 there's anything wrong with a retake, because that's what
14 clarifies the areas that you -- of content that you need to
15 brush up on, if that's possible.

16 MS OWENS: There was also a lot of discrepancy
17 between the institutions and I would say overall the
18 Colorado institutions, some more than others, tended to
19 perform a very high rate, some even 90 percent of their
20 grads were passing this test, and so that's another
21 consideration.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, make you feel a little
23 better. Do you share that with the department? The
24 institution by institution results?

25 MS. OWENS: About -- Mr. Chair. We have what's



1 called our ETS Data Manager, and that information is in
2 there. And Dr. O'Neil and I spent time going through that
3 where I did show where that's available and I can pull that,
4 or Dr. O'Neil can pull that, either way.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: I think it's important for
6 staff to know based on the accrediting that we do of higher
7 ed institutions. I don't know that it's critical for me to
8 hear math scores, honestly.

9 COMM. HAMMOND: Mr. Chair, you raised a good
10 question, and I'm standing up for, I'd love to know.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, you should know.

12 COMM. HAMMOND: Because, I mean, we were
13 looking at this at a national basis, but I mean, I really
14 would like to know the differences.

15 MS. O'Neil: Mr. Chair, we absolutely can
16 provide that to you, and we have just started to dig into
17 it as we've talked about our reauthorizations as well, so
18 absolutely can bring that forward.

19 COMM. HAMMOND: Is that something that we can
20 share with the board as well, is that I think that's --

21 MS. SCHROEDER: In that -- in that situation
22 I'm interested in both subject areas but given our high
23 pass rate I'm not as anguished as a math person about the
24 math piece. Because I know that's where our kids are
25 struggling. So, if our teachers are struggling there also,



1 then we've just got a huge disconnect.

2 Thank you very much for the report.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Jane.

4 MS. GOFF: Thank you. The three states that
5 were, in both examples, way below the rest of the pack, do
6 you know of, or can you -- do you know what other types of
7 considerations are made? I mean, we were chatting a little
8 bit about it. What -- that, because that's a dramatic
9 picture, nothing else. So, what other kinds of things are
10 taken into consideration as far as being licensable, or
11 being recommendable for passing? Because -- do you have any
12 idea, Coleen, what other states --?

13 MS. O'NEIL: Mr. Chair. Are -- I'll ask, are
14 you speaking specifically about Colorado, I guess,
15 standards, or about like, why -- why did Iowa choose a 134
16 cut score when everyone else was --?

17 MS. GOFF: Yeah, and maybe I can help a little
18 bit better.

19 MS. O'NEIL: Okay.

20 MS. GOFF: One example would be probably one
21 you already cited; the state has an interest in -- set in
22 addressing some recruitment challenges. Or there are --
23 whatever a state defines as hard to -- hard to place, hard
24 to find -- we all have those, so just, you know, if there's
25 a -- if something that we can find of value when we talk to



1 people about: Here's where the differences are among -- I
2 find myself a lot these days. What's the difference between
3 this state and this state? And I'm gathering all the
4 information I can.

5 But aside from that, other achievement area,
6 other -- in the program areas what are some other -- yeah,
7 the standards would come into it. Is there a difference in
8 how states interpret a candidates' ability to meet the
9 standards? What percentage of those standards? What types
10 of rubrics are different in those state --

11 And the other thing I would question -- ask
12 about not question, ask about, is how -- what is -- you
13 don't have to answer this. How hard is it for states --
14 I'm going to say sign on, get in on PRAXIS. That currently
15 we are still -- we still had content areas that are using
16 place and I -- my instinct is there's a general agreement
17 that our place test is -- we're not updating that, so I --
18 it's feeling like there's a lot of good quality left
19 unmeasured. We have lots of unknowns. Because certain of
20 our content areas are not -- they don't have access to the
21 Praxis, which is a nationally norm -- nationally regarded
22 assessment, where our Colorado PLACE -- opinion, yes, but
23 I'm hearing this from peers, in a particular content area
24 that it's important that we keep modernizing -- we address
25 those needs as well.



1 This is more than a Colorado exam for our
2 teachers. We have people coming in from other states. It
3 makes a lot of difference how in line we are with what
4 expectations are elsewhere.

5 MS. O'NEIL: OKAY, Mr. Chair.

6 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

7 MS. O'NEIL: Very quickly, I would like to
8 address the conversation. Just the question about PLACE
9 PRAXIS and other -- even other assessments that are opening
10 the door. As we talk about our rule alignment and the
11 review of PLACE and our PRAXIS and our content assessments
12 as a whole for educator licensing, there will be much more,
13 and deeper, conversation about what other tools represent
14 -- adequately represent content knowledge and how can we
15 make sure that we're getting the best tools to ensure the
16 high rigor and accountability that we expect of our
17 educators in Colorado. So that will be opening up that --
18 that door will be opening up, so I'm excited about that,
19 and I'm excited about the opportunities that brings to our
20 educators.

21 I know Dr. Owens has a couple of things to add
22 as well to a few of your questions, too, if we may, Mr.
23 Chair.

24 MS. OWENS: Thank you. Thank you very much Mr.
25 Chair.



1 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Please.

2 MS. OWENS: As far as the first question about
3 why do other states set higher or lower scores, a lot of
4 times I've seen in other states -- I have not been
5 privileged to sit in other boards outside of my own states.
6 I have 10 western states, but I do know their process, and
7 a lot of them will take the multi-state recommendation,
8 because it is so deliberative and legally defensible. But
9 if they change it, sometimes it's because they do want to
10 open it up, and the most frequent reason given is for the
11 demographics. If they want more diversity in their teaching
12 force, a lot of times they will look, and if one group is
13 underperforming -- I did see this in one state that was not
14 mine where they lowered the score significantly so they
15 could have more candidates of color become teachers, and in
16 a way that's looking at more of a norm referenced model
17 than a criterion referenced model.

18 And if you go by the multi-state it's more
19 criterion. They have to know this amount of knowledge,
20 which is considered essential, whereas if you look at the
21 performance and then set the score based on the performance
22 then you're looking at norm referenced and the Bell curve.
23 But that's the most frequent decision -- reason that's given
24 as the demographics. They look through the performance and
25 they see one group seriously underperforming. They want



1 more of that group represented in their school-aged
2 population for teachers, and that's the reason given.

3 As far as adding on to Dr. O'Neil for what she
4 said about how hard is it -- she answered the question: How
5 hard is it for states to sign on for PRAXIS. She answered
6 Colorado. I would say it's very easy process. Most often
7 we do it through RFI, Request for information. We don't
8 have to go through an RFP. RFP usually gets down to a
9 matter of price and quotes, and a lot of times the RFI is
10 looking at the broader base; what's the cost coverage, you
11 know, the -- as far as the number of tests that are offered,
12 the quality of the tests, the processes that we go through,
13 and price is just one of those things. We think quality is
14 also a huge factor, so a lot of times states have chosen to
15 not lock into an RFP, but go into an RFI, which is a little
16 easier for the flexibility. So, the decision making is
17 with the -- a board or commission, rather than an office of
18 procurement and rather than a budgetary quote type of thing.

19 But ETS does not do contracts unless it's a
20 custom state. There are custom tests, then that will be a
21 contract situation. Otherwise we are at will at almost all
22 of our states. There are only a few that have custom, the
23 rest of them -- in fact, Colorado is one where we could be
24 told tomorrow if that were the pleasure of the board, that
25 we withdraw the PRAXIS tests from Colorado. We could do -



1 - we could have that happen.

2 Because we don't have a contract it's year-
3 to-year, day-today. It's whatever that state needs we will
4 supply it or not supply it as the state decides.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: No other questions? Thank
6 you very much.

7 MS. O'NEIL: Thank you.

8 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

9 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you very much.

10 MS. O'NEIL: Thank you.

11 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

12 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Thank you.

13 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Ms. Markel, will you please
14 announce an executive session.

15 MS. MARKEL: An executive session has been
16 noticed (indiscernible) performance (indiscernible)
17 matters required to be kept confidential by federal law,
18 rules (indiscernible).

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I have a -- do I have a
20 motion convening executive session?

21 MS. NEAL: I so move.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Is there a second? Moved
23 and seconded. No opposition. We will enter into executive
24 session.

25 (Meeting adjourned)



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 25th day of April, 2019.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright
Kimberly C. McCright
Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165
Houston, Texas 77058
281.724.8600