



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
MAY 14, 2015, Part 3

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on May 14, 2015, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Marcia Neal (R), Chairman
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)
Steve Durham (R)



1 MADAM CHAIR: And we will take up Action
2 Item Number 9.01, CMAS and CoAlt Science and Social
3 Studies High School cut score. Commissioner?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Madam Chair.
5 This is a carryover from yesterday, when you asked if
6 (indiscernible).

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Yes ma'am.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yesterday we presented
10 to you some alternative options in terms of cut scores.
11 There was some conversation amongst the Board members in
12 terms of concerns, and the request was that we would come
13 back today, and you would have the opportunity to have
14 discussion. I think there was at least three different
15 issues that we've tried to address in some way, shape, or
16 form. The first is the issue of really needing to have
17 this be a standards-based system versus providing the
18 normative information, and we did try on individual
19 student reports to provide both. So those people who
20 wanted to be sure to be able to make reference to the
21 standard, they can do that. They will have that
22 reference point. For folks who want to be able to
23 compare their child's performance to the school or the
24 district, they will have those reference points as well.

25 There was conversation about whether or not



1 results should be released for just students or whether
2 results should be released for all. I think that's open
3 for discussion among the Board members. And then there
4 was also some questions about the assessment results
5 could be used, and we did want to emphasize that in House
6 Bill 1323, these results cannot be used for educator
7 effectiveness or for accreditation purposes.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Any comments? Steve?

9 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. I think -- let me
10 start by making a motion, so we get something in front of
11 us, and it'll be (indiscernible) to minus the word
12 "social studies," which would not be included in the
13 motion that I make, and I'll be happy to read it --

14 MADAM CHAIR: So you're just talking
15 science?

16 MR. DURHAM: At the moment, yes. So I move
17 to adopt fully adjusted high school cut scores and their
18 associated performance level descriptors for the Colorado
19 measures of academic success and the originally proposed
20 alternative assessment, cut scores, and their associated
21 performance level descriptors to be used for the purposes
22 of producing individual student reports. These reports
23 will also include descriptors statistics for comparative
24 information. Consistent with House Bill 15-1323, these
25 results will not be used in educator evaluation ratings



1 or for producing accreditation ratings. The cut scores
2 will go through a validation process and be approved by
3 the Board before being used again.

4 And if I may speak to the motion, the -- I
5 think probably the single best comment I heard at the
6 Legislature last session was that these tests have become
7 a way for adults to settle scores among themselves and
8 really have -- are not designed, unfortunately, for the
9 benefit of children, and I think that really what we've
10 seen happen, that the purpose of these tests now is to
11 hold adults accountable. It really has little to do, and
12 that's why I think you see the problem with kids opting
13 out.

14 Nonetheless, having said that, I am
15 persuaded by the argument that those who took the test
16 have a right to know what the results of that test
17 happens to be. I do not believe that the test should --
18 that these results should be for any other purpose, and I
19 think along with this motion, in terms of just dictum
20 that goes with it, would be that the staff will not
21 calculate district comparisons, school comparisons.
22 Those will not be calculated, for obvious reasons, that
23 only individual scores will be sent to their respective
24 schools. I view this as a compromise approach. And let
25 me just say one thing that I don't agree with the



1 attorney general on this matter, that we are under any
2 obligation to produce cut scores. If, by some reason,
3 there's a citizen out there that thinks we are, and we
4 don't, their proper course of action is to sue us, and
5 let's find out. The role of the attorney general is to
6 defend us in that case.

7 So I'm not making this motion because I
8 think we're subject to any litigation or penalties for
9 not releasing these scores, but I do think that this is
10 one of the things that we should do for the people we're
11 supposed to be serving, which are the students, as
12 opposed to trying to settle scores among adults and hold
13 adults accountable.

14 So I'll move that -- I'll move Motion Two
15 with I think the understanding of what goes with it in
16 terms of what's calculated, what records are available
17 and exist. I view it as a compromise, as unaccustomed as
18 I am to that. I view it as a compromised position that
19 will allow at least us to move the science scores
20 forward.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Is there a second?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

23 MADAM CHAIR: Can you second it first?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

25 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Go ahead.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Dr. Scheffel, could you
2 speak into your microphone?

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just wanted to see if I
4 could amend the motion, or if you want to discuss it
5 first.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not seconded yet.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Well, does it have to be
8 seconded before it's amended? (Indiscernible) do you
9 have to have a second before you can --

10 (Overlapping)

11 MS. FLORES: I second it.

12 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Seconded by Val.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. My question is, Mr.
14 Durham, would you entertain an adjustment as requested,
15 instead of releasing all the scores (indiscernible).

16 MADAM CHAIR: Repeat --

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Typically, the scores aren't
18 available until fall anyway, so they're really not
19 holding anybody up as far as how to adjust instruction,
20 per se. Students aren't using the data for any
21 particular purpose, as far as I can tell. Those that
22 took it and want information, can they request it and
23 receive it, as opposed to releasing all the data?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What?

25 MR. DURHAM: (Indiscernible) it's my



1 understanding that they would have been released. It was
2 back in March. Is that not correct? Or when
3 (indiscernible) schools?

4 MS. HOLMES: Madam Chair?

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

6 MS. HOLMES: The data has not gone --

7 MR. DURHAM: No, it hasn't.

8 MS. HOLMES: -- to the schools or the
9 districts yet. We had hoped to be able to release it
10 after the March 4th meeting, but it hasn't been released
11 yet.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So my question is, can we
13 release scores as requested, as opposed to --

14 MADAM CHAIR: Speak up a bit.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can we release scores as
16 requested by students, as opposed to releasing all the
17 scores?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You mean they have to
19 ask for them?

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Correct. It would give us a
21 good sense of how students are perceiving the importance
22 of the test.

23 MADAM CHAIR: And I'm not disagreeing, but
24 it sounds rather overwhelming if each student has to ask
25 for their --



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think a website could be
2 set up. It could be accomplished.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jane?

4 MS. GOFF: Yeah. Well, along with that, I
5 guess I want to know, what does it involve? If it
6 doesn't -- if this says "students only."

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: These are high school
8 students, right?

9 MS. GOFF: Yeah, so there's no access,
10 unless we amend it to talk about upon request.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Speak up a bit.

12 MS. GOFF: You know.

13 MADAM CHAIR: I want to be sure what we're
14 talking about.

15 MS. GOFF: We need to have this looked at,
16 I'm thinking. Whatever. When we have time. This is
17 students only. So in other words, classroom teachers
18 will have no access to this information.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The schools will.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

21 MS. GOFF: But it doesn't say that. I guess
22 I want to know, you know, if we're going to talk about
23 this, where is it going to serve a purpose? It's
24 actually --

25 MS. HOLMES: Madam Chair? And I'm sure I



1 will be corrected if I'm not getting this quite right. I
2 believe that the intent was to release the individual
3 student reports, and typically there is a set that goes
4 to the students, and then there is a set that goes to the
5 school as well.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But this doesn't say
7 that. At least I don't see it here.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Steve, can you clarify?

9 MR. DURHAM: Well, I think that -- I
10 certainly don't have any objection to it going to the
11 schools in a non-compiled (ph) format, but as there's
12 no summary information, nobody's done any calculations
13 for districts or individual schools, so I don't have a
14 problem with that. And I think that's the way I intended
15 it, but if it we want to nitpick, I'll be happy to
16 withdraw the amendment, and go on.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. I'm totally
18 confused. Deb made an amendment? Are you agreeing to
19 the amendment? I'm now totally lost. I saw -- I heard
20 your motion, and then Deb dramatically changed it.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, he's saying that we can
22 release the data on the cut scores --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For kids.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: For science. And I'm saying,
25 can we make it as requested? Because it would give us a



1 good sense of how the public is viewing the test, if they
2 request the data.

3 MADAM CHAIR: But then the next question had
4 to do with does it go to the schools and the teachers, or
5 only to the students.

6 MS. GOFF: Somebody explain to me why we
7 cannot set cut scores and release them, which is our
8 responsibility. I have never given a test that I refuse
9 to give the results to the kids to.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because look at the cut
11 scores.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because adults give
13 terrible meaning to them.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: These standards --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And these are for kids.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: These standards were
17 developed before we had 191, before we had the
18 accountability rule, and they were not intended as any
19 kind of punishment to any adults.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's nonsense.

23 That's not what the intent was.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But when we have a test
25 that's as faulty as this, with all the glitches, with so



1 many people not taking it --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now just move it on,
3 quickly.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, sorry. This is as
5 fast as I can speak.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is getting off
7 topic.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So when we have a test
9 that is really not valid with everything that --

10 MADAM CHAIR: I mean, at this point, we are
11 not prepared to say it's not valid. It may be. It may
12 not. Let's just get to the point of whether we release
13 the scores or not.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I don't think
15 we're going to get any meaning from --

16 MADAM CHAIR: And that's fine. That's fine.
17 I'm just saying, we don't need to get into that.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then why add
19 meaning to meaningless?

20 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Steve, did you intend
21 all of this? I understand what Angelika's saying, but I
22 think we're trying to reach a compromise here, because we
23 were not happy yesterday, any of us, that this, you know
24 -- all of this work was not going to be released at all.
25 So I appreciate the fact that you are working to make



1 some adjustment there, and I don't think we should spend
2 a huge amount of time (indiscernible).

3 In general, Steve's motion, can we pass
4 that, in general? And maybe there may be an amendment or
5 two, but we can sit here for an hour and argue about the
6 parents, or not the parents, or whether it's a good test,
7 or a bad test, or any of that. I think we all -- we've
8 done that. Been there, done that. We all have our own
9 opinions about the test, but I believe that you're
10 working to find a way to release this, so we're not just
11 not saying, no, you can't have your test scores.

12 MR. DURHAM: That's -- thank you, Madam
13 Chair. That's correct, and I just simply would say that,
14 I mean, I've made the case a number of times. There's no
15 reason to make it again. I believe these cut scores are
16 entirely too subjective. That's my opinion, and I
17 believe that there could be motives behind these cut
18 scores that I don't like, and I've made -- I don't want
19 to go back and revisit that.

20 MADAM CHAIR: And I got that. And --

21 MR. DURHAM: But --

22 MADAM CHAIR: And basically, I agree. I
23 agree with this. I'm not happy with it. I would much
24 prefer a different way, but in order for the scores to be
25 released, I would vote for your motion, and that's what I



1 think. Is it -- are we going to release them, or are we
2 not going to release them, is the big question.

3 MR. DURHAM: That's --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

6 MR. DURHAM: I think that's the question.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think Steve is right,
8 and maybe what Deb is saying is that -- I would say that
9 that would be maybe a different question that you're
10 asking.

11 MADAM CHAIR: A different motion, perhaps?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A different motion.

13 MADAM CHAIR: You could make that motion
14 separately.

15 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's right.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Could you do that, Deb?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And it would be a
19 different thing, but I think that we could send the
20 scores to the parents. I'm sorry, to the students and
21 the school, and --

22 MADAM CHAIR: And that's what we're doing
23 here.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

25 MADAM CHAIR: That's the topic.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And just leave it at
2 that.

3 MADAM CHAIR: I agree with you
4 (indiscernible) is that -- would that be all right if we
5 wrote on the motion, and then you could make a separate
6 motion?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I make a comment?

8 MADAM CHAIR: Sure.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My issue with the test
10 -- people take a test. Obviously it's great to give
11 feedback to folks on the test. My issue with it is,
12 today, when we approve those cut scores, we are approving
13 the performance level descriptors, and we are not
14 uncoupling them. The nature of the items on the test are
15 driven by those performance level descriptors. The
16 language in those descriptors is quite interesting, when
17 you sit -- when you think that this limited -- this
18 strong or distinguished command is supposed to fit
19 students for success in subsequent subject matter. They
20 claim to be linked to subject matter knowledge and
21 analytic skills. If you look at those bullets, I would
22 question that it's fitting students for success in the
23 next level at all. I ask to find all the subject matter
24 knowledge for scope and sequence in science and social
25 studies. Based on these descriptors, I don't believe



1 it's comprehensive at all.

2 And so I just object to the performance
3 level descriptors and the way that they have been used to
4 drive the cut scores. So we're going to be giving
5 students assessment data that's going to give them the
6 impression that they're distinguished, strong, moderate,
7 or limited, and that they're -- it's going to give them
8 the impression that they're ready for the next iteration
9 of subject matter knowledge in science and social
10 students.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We do one or the other.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's specious
13 information.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Would you prefer that we not
15 pass -- that this motion not pass? I'm asking in
16 advance.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I won't be able to vote
18 for Mr. Durham's motion as it stands, but I appreciate
19 that he's trying to create --

20 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I do too.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- the conditions for -
22 -

23 MADAM CHAIR: And I'm trying to get the --

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- for compromise. I
25 appreciate that. I wish --



1 MADAM CHAIR: We're not going to solve all
2 these problems today.

3 (Overlapping)

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I ask a question --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I ask a question
6 too?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- about the motion?
8 Is it your understanding, Steve, that further validation
9 -- I'm sorry, where's the wording? The cut scores will
10 go through a validation process. Would that validation
11 process include a revisiting of the performance level
12 descriptors?

13 MR. DURHAM: I believe the answer to that
14 question is yes, because I'm certainly not inclined to
15 vote for another set of tests that are -- or another set
16 of cut scores that use the same validation process.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a question.

18 MADAM CHAIR: I would call it a question. I
19 think we could sit here and argue about it forever.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You what?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But I just wanted to
22 ask a question.

23 MADAM CHAIR: But you -- go ahead.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, my question is, I
25 was thinking that we just give raw scores, and not give



1 those descriptors.

2 MADAM CHAIR: I think that's what he said.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you say here that
4 you --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not necessarily.

6 MR. DURHAM: You know, the motion does
7 reference those descriptors, and I -- because I don't
8 think they can be effectively released, if I understand
9 the way they've been done, without those descriptors. So
10 I think we're stuck with that, regardless of our opinions
11 as to how accurate those might be.

12 MADAM CHAIR: And that's kind of what I'm
13 saying.

14 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Let's call it a question. I'm
16 not real happy with it, but I'll vote for it, because I
17 think we need to get it off the plate, and we could sit
18 here and argue for an hour, and not -- and have the same
19 result we had yesterday, which I was very distressed
20 with. So unless anybody has a problem.

21 MR. DURHAM: I'll just make --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Aye. You don't have to
23 call the roll, right?

24 MR. DURHAM: I'll just make one -- can I
25 make one last comment in closing? While I appreciate Dr.



1 Schroeder's motion or proposed amendment, I just don't --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Debora.

3 MR. DURHAM: I'm sorry, Scheffel. Don't
4 mind me. I think it probably clouds the issue further,
5 and I'd rather not have it as a part, so -- and I think -
6 - so anyway, I'll just leave it.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I ask a question?

9 MADAM CHAIR: Would you call the roll
10 please?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And just to clarify,
12 this is for Steve's motion that Val seconded.

13 MADAM CHAIR: I can't hear you.

14 MS. MARKEL: And just to clarify, this is
15 for Steve's motion that --

16 MADAM CHAIR: Steve's motion?

17 MS. MARKEL: -- Val had seconded. Great.

18 MADAM CHAIR: (Indiscernible) motion.

19 MS. MARKEL: Steve Durham?

20 MR. DURHAM: Aye.

21 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Flores?

22 MS. FLORES: Aye.

23 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff?

24 MS. GOFF: Aye.

25 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec?



1 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

2 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Aye.

4 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel?

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

6 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder?

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Aye.

8 MS. MARKEL: Okay.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Motion
10 carries.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair? Bizy,
12 would you please repeat what you said right before that
13 vote? This is just to clarify what --

14 MS. MARKEL: I just wanted to make sure that
15 we were voting on the motion that Steve had originally
16 made, which is here, excluding the social studies, and
17 that Val had seconded.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, okay. I didn't
19 hear the end part.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Does that conclude this part
21 of (indiscernible)?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

23 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just the exclusion of
25 social studies is there -- we would just need some



1 guidance on what you would like us to do with social
2 studies.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Do you want to do anything
4 with social studies, is what you're saying?

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. I'll make a motion --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that we adopt the fully
8 adjusted high school social studies cut scores and their
9 associated performance levels descriptors for the
10 Colorado Measures of Academic Success and the originally
11 proposed Colorado Alternate Assessment cut scores and
12 their associated performance level descriptors to be used
13 for the purposes of producing individual student reports.
14 These reports will also include descriptors statistics
15 for comparative information. Consistent with House Bill
16 15-1323, these results will not be used in educator
17 evaluation ratings or for producing accreditation
18 ratings. The cut scores will go through a validation
19 process and be approved by the Board before being used
20 again.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there a second?
22 Jane? Any discussion?

23 MS. GOFF: Yes?

24 MR. DURHAM: Well, I'll just -- I think I'll
25 be a no vote, but I think the problems with the questions



1 and the descriptors in this subject matter are greater
2 than those with science. So I think I will be a no vote
3 on this.

4 MADAM CHAIR: I would add another
5 (indiscernible) a reason to support it -- of course, you
6 all know me -- is because it's social studies, and it's
7 been proven that we're so bad in social studies. I'd
8 like to know. I'd like to know are we -- you know, I'd
9 like to know what these scores are, and if we don't
10 release them, then we don't know. So I probably would be
11 a yes vote for that reason. I understand the concerns.
12 Jane?

13 MS. GOFF: Well, considering -- my reason
14 for thinking we probably ought to be consistent and
15 include social studies on its own right is because it is
16 still alive and well in our system discussion, so --

17 MADAM CHAIR: It's alive.

18 MS. GOFF: You know, well, I --

19 MADAM CHAIR: I'm not sure how well it is.

20 MS. GOFF: Point taken. But the mention of
21 it, the passage of the bill that created a different tack
22 on it, be it by timeline if nothing else, it's still part
23 of our whole picture conversation, and as we -- I would
24 think that all of the assessments themselves -- I mean,
25 we do have a review cycle. We do have a rotation of



1 input, and we talk about and expect to process different
2 kind of validation. I just think it's okay. I think
3 it's appropriate. I think it's fair, so that right now,
4 where we are, to leave it in the mix, and make sure that
5 we're looking at both things. Not the same, but in
6 consideration of the fact that they're all still part of
7 our work.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Any other comment? Deb?

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: I wanted to just respond to
10 your comment, Madam Chair. I would agree with you fully.
11 We desperately need good history and social studies
12 content to be taught in our schools and to ensure that
13 kids are learning this content, but I would look at the
14 performance level descriptors as suggesting that this
15 will not prepare students with the subject matter
16 knowledge and analytic skills to allow them to succeed at
17 subsequent grade levels. The language in those
18 performance level descriptors is a problem. It's been a
19 problem from the beginning, and I feel that consequently
20 the items that have developed against them has been a
21 rather manipulative process, and I think that's
22 unfortunate, because we had a great opportunity to
23 develop an awesome test in social studies and history,
24 and we didn't do it. So now we're going to be giving,
25 again, information to students that is implying one set



1 of skills and not really delivering on the promise to the
2 kids in Colorado. So I'm sorry about the way that this
3 test was developed, but I agree with you. The need is
4 great.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Great. Any (indiscernible)
6 question? Would you call roll, please?

7 MS. BURDSALL: Steve Durham?

8 MR. DURHAM: No.

9 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Flores?

10 MS. FLORES: No.

11 MS. BURDSALL: Jane Goff?

12 MS. GOFF: Yes.

13 MS. BURDSALL: Pam Mazanec?

14 MS. MAZANEC: No.

15 MS. BURDSALL: Marcia Neal?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

17 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Scheffel?

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

19 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Schroeder?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. That concludes this
22 part of the agenda. (Indiscernible). Thank you Joyce.
23 And we will move on to the graduation requirements
24 scheduled for 12 to 1:30, so I hope we can get through
25 this quickly. I really need to be out of here by 4



1 o'clock, so I'm really pushing here, people.

2 All right, Commissioner.

3 MR. ASP: Thank you, Madam Chair. We're
4 bringing this item back before you today. We talked
5 about this at our last meeting, and we told you we would
6 bring this back for further discussion, along with the
7 table that's (indiscernible) Rebecca Holmes
8 (indiscernible). Rebecca, do you want to start?

9 MS. HOLMES: Sure. All right, thank you.
10 And I promise the double notebook does not mean double
11 the content. You'll remember that we shared with you at
12 length in February the work that had gone on since the
13 May 2013 State Board adoption of the preliminary
14 graduation guidelines document. At that time, you all
15 directed us to take on a process, and we shared that
16 process at length with you in February to get much
17 broader public input into the graduation guidelines menu.
18 In March, we came back and again shared with you both the
19 2013 adopted menu and what was at that time a draft from
20 the assessment workgroup, the final of seven workgroups,
21 and it was their draft and our staff draft related to
22 where they were sort of moving since May of 2013. We
23 wanted you all to see that before you were asked to make
24 any formal vote.

25 Then in March, we also involved Tony Dyl and



1 the Attorney General's Office in what you all requested
2 was an opinion about the minimums that were required in
3 terms of action on the graduation requirements,
4 graduation guidelines, and so that's all been presented
5 to you. We are back at this point with a final staff
6 recommendation. Elliott will walk you through how it is
7 slightly different but not significantly different than
8 what you all last saw in March. And so we just wanted to
9 give a little bit of a reminder of process, but then
10 spend the bulk of our conversation today on that proposed
11 menu and allowing you all to have the robust conversation
12 that you asked for in the last meeting.

13 You'll see our agenda here today, like I
14 said. We just wanted to sort of take us back a few
15 months, revisit our statutory guidance. We do want to
16 have one conversation with you all to determine messaging
17 based on some feedback we've gotten from the field in the
18 last 60 days, and then spend the bulk of our time talking
19 about the new staff-recommended menu.

20 So you can see here, just again as a
21 reminder, the statutory guidance that Tony shared with us
22 in the March meeting of this year that walks through what
23 the minimum requirements are for the graduation
24 requirements. You can see here that they reference the
25 fact that they need to be comprehensive, focus on core



1 competencies, that the evaluation that was done there did
2 give permission that you all could set guidelines or
3 requirements that only address two and not all four core
4 subject areas, and you'll remember that we had a panel in
5 February, and you heard from several educators as to
6 their rationale for why they thought two versus four
7 subject areas was the way to go, remembering that this
8 menu you all are adopting is not student facing, and so
9 any district that wanted to add additional content areas,
10 whether that be science, or P.E., or arts, would
11 certainly be able to do that.

12 You'll see the reference here that the menu
13 does have to be aligned with the postsecondary academic
14 admissions standards established by the Commission on
15 Higher Ed, and so that is the few cut scores that we've
16 discussed in the past that are, at this point, non-
17 negotiable, because they've been established by CCHE.
18 And you'll see that the menu also asks or guides you all
19 and guides us to think about multiple and diverse
20 pathways. And so one of the issues that we've
21 highlighted for you is the new staff-recommended menu
22 that's, you know, finally coming to you all for a vote
23 today, has about almost double the number of options for
24 districts that the 2013 menu did as well, so those are
25 for your consideration today.



1 We want to pause before getting into the
2 meat of this and just talk a little bit about language.
3 At some point this afternoon, it would be helpful for us
4 as staff if you all would make a formal decision about
5 graduation guidelines or graduation requirements. You
6 will recall that Tony walked us through the statute. It
7 is a troubling statute in terms of how it's written.
8 There are guidelines the districts must be or exceed.
9 Therefore, believe me, we've had years worth of
10 conversations with districts where they said, well,
11 ultimately this is a requirement, because we have to meet
12 or exceed it.

13 However, what had happened (indiscernible)
14 two or three years is that counselors and directors of
15 high schools, directors of Postsecondary Readiness and
16 districts had interpreted the menu in the following way.
17 They had interpreted the menu, and I think we had
18 encouraged this, that the menu were guidelines from you
19 all to their district, and what the district then needed
20 to do was choose from the menu to set requirements. That
21 made sense to them in terms of what their task is, in
22 terms of how they have to operationalize this in the
23 field. They have to then lead a community process to
24 determine, from all of the pieces on the menu, what do
25 they want in their local diploma policy?



1 You all made an informal request of us to
2 change the language in the February meeting to call them
3 graduation guidelines -- or, I'm sorry, to call them
4 graduation requirements. I think there was sort of,
5 like, "let's call a spade a spade" conversation. We were
6 then confronted with several questions from the field,
7 where people thought that what you all had meant was that
8 now everything on the menu was a requirement for a
9 district to include. So we got phone calls from
10 districts saying, oh my God, I've never offered IB. Now
11 you're calling these requirements. I am a district and
12 now required to stand up a robust IB program. I've never
13 offered industry certificates. This means I have only
14 two years to put together an industry certificate
15 program.

16 And so we're -- if it your decision and your
17 purview to call them requirements, we will manage that
18 misinterpretation and confusion in the field, but it was
19 a bit surprising to us. And so I just want to flag for
20 you that for several years, the way this has been
21 interpreted is that you all are adopting a policy that is
22 district facing that gives districts a menu that they
23 choose from in deciding what's required for their
24 students in their diploma policy. So we don't have to
25 get into that now. If you'd prefer to table it for a



1 larger discussion this afternoon, that's fine. But in
2 whatever you all determine and vote on related to this
3 policy, some specifics around that language would be
4 helpful to our team.

5 With that, I'll come back to this timeline.
6 We did want to remind you that this is policy that goes
7 into place for the graduating class of 2021. It seems a
8 long way off, but that's this fall's seventh graders. So
9 just helpful I think to ground yourselves in that. When
10 you heard from our panel of educators, they talked about
11 their appreciation for the fact that the State Board in
12 May of 2013 understood that this was a long one way, that
13 you don't want to change the graduation requirements on a
14 student who's already in 10th, or 11th, or 12th grade,
15 and so the long one way that you all adopted in May of
16 2013 was certainly appreciated. We're at a point now
17 though that if a district needs to have a six-month or
18 year-long community process in determining their diploma
19 requirements, they really want to get started on that
20 now, so that those can then be communicated to families
21 when this group of kids are in eighth grade, and so that
22 families understand it's not a moving target in their
23 district about how they're going to get a diploma in
24 2021.

25 So with that, I'm going to turn things over



1 to Elliott to walk through a bit about the old menu and
2 the new menu that you all have in front of you, and I'll
3 highlight, Dr. Scheffel, particularly for you. You
4 raised some very good points in our February and March
5 conversations about the language around the menu, and so
6 if you look at the final document that you have, there
7 are a number of very specific points made in that menu.

8 For example, one of them is that our
9 recommendation today is, in addition to this policy, an
10 assessment workgroup would be reconvened every 18 months,
11 because what we know is that between now, when these
12 students are entering seventh grade and when they
13 graduate, our assessment conversation as a state is going
14 to evolve very significantly. You'll see, for example,
15 the menu still includes PARCC. Last week's legislation
16 pulls that back to ninth grade, and so there's still some
17 nuance to figure out here. And so what I think I would
18 present from the districts who've participated in this
19 you all (ph) is that they would like to see something
20 adopted so that they have enough guidance to move
21 forward, but they understand that if we were to lock a
22 set of assessments in place today and not revisit that
23 for the next five years, it would be quite the opposite
24 of a living document that they could put in place in
25 their schools. So with that, Elliott? Thank you.



1 MR. ASP: Good afternoon. Is this on for
2 you?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

4 MR. ASP: Okay. Basically, let me just
5 point out a few key features from the original menu that
6 is currently in force, I might say. Basically, it
7 required competency demonstration in postsecondary and
8 workforce readiness in four subject areas. English,
9 math, science, and social studies. And also, the
10 available pathways was somewhat limited, some because
11 they would be determined like capstone or industry
12 certificate, and so forth.

13 As the -- we reconvened the group that you
14 asked you to do and added some more voices to the
15 conversation. A couple of big issues came up, just to
16 remind you of those. One of those is, do I have to show
17 -- do students need to show postsecondary readiness in
18 all four of these subject areas to be prepared to go on
19 to higher ed, or just to some career training? Do they -
20 - also, are we talking about postsecondary and workforce
21 readiness, or are talking about success? And that was a
22 major issue for the group.

23 So with those two in mind, if we go to the
24 recommended menu -- and I apologize. It's a little hard
25 to see, but I believe you have this in front of you.



1 There's a couple of key differences that came through.
2 But before I do this, I want to reemphasize something
3 that Rebecca brought up earlier, and that's that this
4 menu is a staff recommendation. While most of the
5 elements have been our -- accepted by the folks on the
6 assessment workgroup, this isn't -- moving this forward
7 is their endorsed version. We took their recommendations
8 and came to as much consensus as we could, and then we
9 made a couple of key decisions, which I'll point out in
10 just a moment.

11 Also, before I review the menu, I also need
12 to let you know that there was some feedback from the
13 group that we wanted to make sure that folks understood.
14 While there was basic agreement around the elements of
15 the menu, there's not basic agreement around some of the
16 policy itself. There were some folks that felt this was
17 an overreach into local control of school board setting
18 and graduation requirements, and there were also some
19 folks who said that there weren't enough pathways here
20 for rural folks, given particularly their available
21 resources. Now we had some other people this was useful
22 to them, and it helped them in their work with their
23 communities, which are also rural, but I wanted to make
24 sure you heard those viewpoints, because they were
25 expressed in the group.



1 So two major differences here in this menu
2 from the original one. First of all, we narrowed the
3 focus of the competency demonstrations to English and
4 math. That came out of some discussion within the group
5 and particularly with a number of higher ed folks about
6 the requirements of this law were to reflect the
7 requirements of the Colorado Commission on Higher
8 Education, which only outline requirements to get into
9 credit-bearing classes in those two areas.

10 A second piece is, and it is a large debate
11 -- and I say debate in the best way. The folks who came
12 to this group were very committed and very professional,
13 but also shared what they were thinking, and we had a
14 chance to discuss these thoroughly, and that was the
15 difference between being ready and demonstrating success
16 already. So for example, on an advanced placement exam,
17 to get earned credit, at least at some universities,
18 you'd have to have at least a three. In some cases, it's
19 four or five. So if a student earned a three on that
20 exam, they would have been demonstrating already, at
21 least according to folks in the group, that they are --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a three.

23 MR. ASP: I'm sorry. (indiscernible).

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I interrupt, or
25 should we wait?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For who?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just while you're
3 talking about that. I just wondered if there is the
4 concept of creating numbers as cut scores. I mean, not
5 cut scores. Numbers though as thresholds, right. I was
6 just looking at the guidelines, and I'd have to pull the
7 exact language from the statute, but it says minimum
8 standards, be aligned with, use the recommendations of,
9 be aligned with, be aligned with, and so forth. Never
10 does it say you must set a number as a minimum threshold
11 of acceptability. Where was the critical mass of people
12 calling for those numbers? Because I think, you know,
13 we've just heard from rural superintendents saying give
14 us flexibility. Now we're ready to dive into yet another
15 pool with numbers that are fixed at thresholds, and I
16 truthfully would have to look at each one of those
17 numeric thresholds to look at what percent of individual
18 scores at that threshold to be able to comment on how
19 strict this menu of items is, and I'm just wondering what
20 was the appetite for those threshold numeric entities, as
21 opposed to aligned with standards based and so forth.

22 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? (indiscernible).

23 The pieces came some from the Colorado Commission on
24 Higher Ed. The way the group interpreted the alignment
25 or aligned with was that they should at least reflect



1 what the cut scores were that they set for getting into
2 credit-bearing courses and Colorado community colleges
3 and four-year universities. So that's where the ACT and
4 the SAT there, and they've been on the menu for quite
5 some time.

6 The Advanced Placement and the International
7 Baccalaureate pieces came from folks in the group saying
8 a student who takes an Advanced Placement course and at
9 least scores at that level on an exam would demonstrate
10 their ability to move into a course and be successful.
11 That's where those pieces --

12 (Overlapping)

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So am I right a number
14 of the rural districts did not like this approach?

15 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? A number of the
16 rural districts didn't feel good about the available
17 pathways here. So some would say I need more options,
18 and the group tried to create those as best they could.
19 So pieces like the standards-based performance assessment
20 pieces, as well as trying to get a concurrent enrollment
21 were reflections of trying to create more pathways for
22 different kinds of students through the menu.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. (Indiscernible).

25 MR. ASP: So we -- Madam chair, we already



1 moved on with the -- and I appreciate the question. The
2 Advanced Placement piece, the group came to a conclusion
3 that we would lower the score to a two, so that students
4 who at least attempted the exam and scored at a
5 reasonable level could use that as a way to demonstrate
6 their college and career readiness. The piece that was
7 also -- you see that reflected in the International
8 Baccalaureate score of four. That's the concordance of
9 with Advanced Placement a two.

10 We also lowered the cut score for the ASVAB
11 assessment after a lot of feedback from people in the
12 group and some discussions with the folks who administer
13 that assessment about what the meaning of that score was
14 and what it allowed students to do. We had additional
15 discussion about concurrent enrollment and originally had
16 removed that from the menu and brought it back on as a
17 result of feedback from folks across the state. So the
18 students who took a remedial course and were able to pass
19 that, basically it demonstrated they could go on to
20 credit-bearing courses. That was reflective now in a
21 number of folks from our Colorado Commission on Higher
22 Ed, as well as from our community college system, Excel
23 (ph).

24 And then we also added long-winded title to
25 assessments that we hoped might even be able to be an



1 integration of the kind of accountability discussion you
2 heard this morning with these requirements, so that if
3 districts could come together or within districts develop
4 some assessments that would demonstrate competency in
5 English and mathematics, and an ability to go on to
6 postsecondary workforce endeavors. There may also be
7 some assessments they could use in an accountability
8 system, if we can move this pilot language forward to
9 allow some of those pieces.

10 So at this point, we have received feedback
11 and continue to get it. We made sure you got a recent
12 letter from Bret Miles, who's the superintendent at
13 Holyoke, commenting on the pieces. And I think Bret does
14 a nice summary of giving you the concerns of rural
15 districts, as well as their opinions of where the menu
16 has gone. Generally, we see folks saying that it's
17 improved, it's more feasible for us, but we still have
18 some issues. Others are using the menu in hopes that it
19 will approved as they're starting to have discussions
20 with their colleagues across their districts.

21 With that, I'll turn it back over to Debora.
22 Debora. Excuse me. You're Debora. Rebecca. Sorry.
23 Been a long day.

24 MS. HOLMES: So with that, really, we're
25 just open for discussion from you all. This is the



1 landing point at this point, in terms of a staff
2 recommendation of a menu that we would put forward to
3 districts. I think Elliott has walked you through the
4 variety of assessments on here and where their cut scores
5 were chosen.

6 I'll just put one slightly finer point on
7 the question that Dr. Scheffel asked. It is in statute
8 that the guidelines must be aligned with CCHE policy.
9 CCHE policy has set those firm cut scores on the ACT and
10 SAT, so those numbers have remained unchanged since your
11 adoption in 2013. And then the policy says that every
12 pathway, while not identical, needs to be equally
13 rigorous. You can imagine the rather insurmountable task
14 of trying to set every pathway as then equal to the ACT
15 and SAT scores. There simply aren't concordance tables
16 for all of those things. We've had really robust and
17 fascinating conversations, for example, with the military
18 about the ASVAB, and is there really a score that is
19 completely aligned to an 18 or a 19. They have now
20 pulled their concordance table and said there is not.

21 But what the menu is that's in front of you
22 as a staff recommendation for a vote today is as close as
23 our many workgroups and experts can get to meeting that
24 statutory requirement that each pathway here that a
25 district could choose from in crafting their diploma



1 policy is equally rigorous. So with that, we're open for
2 questions.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Angelika.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: So I remain -- I mean, I
5 didn't get to read this in advance, but I remain confused
6 what the concerns are of the rural districts. Clearly,
7 we're not saying that all these conditions need to be
8 met, but are they saying that none of these work for
9 them? And if so, what is it -- what is their wish in
10 terms of setting -- I mean, because it's their job to set
11 the requirements at their district. But I'm awfully
12 confused what it is that they want to see.

13 MS. HOLMES: I'll defer to Elliott, but
14 Madam Chair?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

16 MS. HOLMES: I think one of the primary
17 concerns we've heard is about cost and equity, that if
18 you are a small district having a robust IB program, for
19 example, is much more challenging.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: But they don't have to.

21 MS. HOLMES: Exactly, and so we've tried to
22 work with them, and you'll see some references. For
23 example, the addition of work keys was very satisfying to
24 them. The addition of ASVAB at a lower level was very
25 satisfying to them. Industry certificates, the



1 collaboratively built assessments, and then a capstone
2 option, I think, are things that feel like they would get
3 at that equity piece. Ultimately, there is also the
4 issue of cost, that many of these items to stand up do
5 have some kind of cost to a high school to carry forward.
6 But Elliott, you've worked more closely with them. I
7 don't know if there's anything you would want to add.

8 MR. ASP: Madam Chair?

9 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

10 MR. ASP: I just echo what Rebecca said
11 about this. Basically what they see is that the menu's
12 kind of reduced for them. They don't have as many of
13 these options available as a larger district would have,
14 so they may not be able to have an AP program unless it's
15 district learning. They may not have an IB program. So
16 the attempt was to create some additional pathways, but
17 that would be -- I think that would be the reflection of
18 some of the rural folks in the room --

19 (Overlapping)

20 MS. SCHROEDER: So what we've added is still
21 not enough for them?

22 MR. ASP: Madam Chair?

23 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

24 MR. ASP: I would say for some.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: And are they -- are they



1 offering -- I mean, are they suggesting some other add-
2 ons? I'm just confused, because it's up to the school
3 district itself to pick. There's not a requirement that
4 you have five of these or whatever. What is the
5 expectation based on these guidelines, that a Board
6 chooses one or two, right?

7 MS. HOLMES: One, or as many or all as they
8 would like to have in their diploma policy, and then they
9 can be additive, not in terms of adding options, but in
10 terms of adding additional subject areas, so sort of
11 adding out to the right, but not in terms of adding down.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: They can't add anything at
13 the bottom on their own?

14 MS. HOLMES: No. So that would be adding an
15 additional pathway. You could add something -- in that
16 case, you would add, you know, four years of coursework
17 in English, and that would be a way to keep the
18 historical seat time based requirements.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: And that's not allowed.

20 MS. HOLMES: That has not been interpreted
21 as allowed, based on our statutory review.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Thank you.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Deb.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: So am I right in assuming
25 that the district capstone, the industry certificate, and



1 the collaboratively developed standards-based performance
2 assessment are all to be approved by CDE if they're to be
3 used? Is that right?

4 MS. HOLMES: Madam Chair?

5 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

6 MS. HOLMES: Based on your feedback
7 specifically, we changed that language. You'll see in
8 the menu it's very specific that the district capstone,
9 as an example, says district approved. We are providing
10 best practices about how one might do that, but we would
11 not be approving the content or the outcomes of a
12 capstone, as an example.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: So what is the involvement of
14 CDE in those three assessments?

15 MS. HOLMES: In district -- Madam Chair?

16 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

17 MS. HOLMES: In district capstone, we're
18 simply putting out some -- a collection of best practices
19 from districts that already have strong capstones. In
20 industry certificates, you see language that does suggest
21 CDE guidance, only because you, as a district, would need
22 to adopt an industry certificate that is recognized in
23 the state of Colorado by a community college or a
24 technical program. And on collaboratively developed
25 standards-based assessments, that's really a placeholder,



1 depending on what comes out of the legislation that was
2 passed last week.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then is there -- do we
4 need to have PARCC in here? Why do we have PARCC as an
5 option? Do we have to have it?

6 MS. HOLMES: Madam Chair?

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: The Board decides.

8 MS. HOLMES: The only rationale for having
9 PARCC there is that it was part of the 2013 menu that you
10 all adopted. No district raised the removal of PARCC.
11 Like I said, I think in a few months, it would be worth
12 reconsidering. If PARCC only exists in the ninth grade,
13 using it as a diploma cut off is a bit challenging. But
14 for now, we didn't have any district raise a rationale
15 for removing it, in part because I think people are
16 waiting to see what happened in the legislative session.

17 The other rationale for including PARCC is
18 that the statute does speak to the options being aligned
19 with our standards, and so that is the option that is
20 most strongly aligned with our standards, unless you were
21 to develop a capstone or performance-based assessment
22 that was deeply aligned.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then I just -- you may
24 have presented this earlier. I don't know. But, like,
25 when we look at a 62 on ACCUPLACER or a 31 on ASVAB, can



1 you create a relationship in terms of a percentile rank?
2 In other words, what is that? I'd have to go look up
3 each one of those assessments and say, gee, a 31 on the
4 ASVAB is in the 50th percentile, or it's one standard
5 deviation below the mean. Or what is it? I don't know
6 the meaning of these numbers without looking them up.

7 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? The 31 actually
8 refers to a percentile rank on the ASVAB.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: So it is the 31st percentile
10 or better?

11 MR. ASP: That's correct.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. And is that what the
13 field asked to be shifted so that it doesn't reflect just
14 an officer training threshold score?

15 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? Yeah, that's
16 correct.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. And how about the
18 others?

19 MR. ASP: Madam Chair? The others were a
20 reflection of -- and I don't know the percentile rank on
21 those. I can get those to you, but they were a
22 reflection of common practice in a community college
23 system, and so we adjusted the ACCUPLACER, for example,
24 on the basis of recommendations from the Commission on
25 Higher Ed, and our community college, and four-year



1 college members of the taskforce, and we did adjust those
2 because they were higher than they were before. And as
3 we talked through it through the group, the standard
4 ACCUPLACER varies a bit from how they use ACCUPLACER to
5 put students in particular courses at various
6 institutions, and these were a little bit lower than the
7 standard piece because of current practice.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I would just ask, before I
9 would be able to vote on this, I'd need to know what each
10 of those numbers represented. Like, a four on IB out of
11 Advanced Placement two out of ACT COMPASS 79, 63. Are
12 those percentile ranks? What is the standard error?
13 What's the standard deviation? I mean, so that the
14 numbers mean something. And maybe all of you know that
15 already. I don't. But I appreciate it.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

17 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In the International
19 Baccalaureate, is there a number five and a six, or in --
20 I'm just looking down at the International --

21 MR. ASP: Madam Chair, I didn't quite hear
22 the --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there a ranking of a
24 five and a six?

25 MR. ASP: For?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And a seven. IB.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For IB.

3 MR. ASP: IB? Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Five and six?

5 MR. ASP: I think it goes to seven.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, up till seven?

7 MR. ASP: And they're labeled with various
8 pieces. These two are -- the AP and the IB come from a
9 concordance table that shows the relationship between
10 those two scores.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A what table
12 concordance?

13 MS. HOLMES: Concordance table that tries to
14 get you -- you know, if you know that you have to be an
15 18, what's comparable in terms of an AP, and what's
16 comparable in terms of an IB score?

17 MS. GOFF: Well, sticking with the AP, I
18 don't know why -- I will tell you, I was a little
19 dismissed to see it go from three to two. I think that's
20 a false -- I don't know what. It's a false message.
21 High schools and I believe most kids, especially those
22 involved in AP currently, are well aware that a three is
23 pretty much the minimum where there can even be
24 conversation opened up about admission, depending on
25 schools, placement in certain courses, the level of



1 placement for higher ed. Financially, I mean, all kinds
2 of things. I was disappointed in that, and I don't know
3 -- I don't really need to hear what the group's rationale,
4 push for that was.

5 As far as IB is concerned, same thing. I am
6 not familiar with the scoring, the category, the ranges,
7 and the rationale for IB tests, but I do know that
8 lowering that -- I don't know. I'm just concerned about
9 message that sends to communities whose kids start to
10 take part in this with certain expectations.

11 The other thing that I'm struck by -- I'm
12 going to have to process this a little bit today. It
13 actually says at least one of the following. So we have
14 two columns, two major content areas here, and the
15 guideline is one of quite a variety of options here, each
16 of which has its own unique purpose, message, future
17 ramifications, predictability, whatever. I'm concerned
18 that it's one. I don't know that a child -- if we're
19 telling districts that you've earned your diploma, you've
20 earned your diploma from a standardized test score, which
21 we all have our -- I think we have a pretty much joint
22 opinion about all of that, versus enrollment, having
23 taking part in a concurrent enrollment. I don't -- I'm
24 probably not making any sense here. I'm just thinking
25 that to limit to this one, at least one, will districts



1 tend to -- I'm trying not to project on them, but will
2 they tend to go to the bare minimum, rather than stretch,
3 encourage, search out, seek out ways in their own
4 community where they could have district capstones and
5 involve people in their communities in creating the
6 projects for kids to show that they're ready to move
7 ahead? I don't -- I'll stop there, because then I'm
8 going to get repetitive.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

10 MS. GOFF: One seems crazy, to me. It seems
11 very, very limiting. Very low expectations.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Did you have --

13 MS. HOLMES: Madam Chair, I'll just offer
14 one response. I think it's helpful to remember that, you
15 know, many of you have been deeply involved with district
16 boards, and that there where we see districts move ahead
17 with this already in the intervening two years, they've
18 had those conversations really robustly in their local
19 communities. And for the most part, the sample policies
20 that we're beginning to see from districts who did not
21 wait for a next round of menu to move forward is just
22 that and that in many cases they've done one of two
23 things. They've either said we feel like it should be
24 more robust, and so we really do want some kind of
25 performance of learning. If you have a 19 in math, we



1 still want you to prove that you can carry out a science
2 experiment over the course of many weeks, for example.
3 We also -- and the language above the menu is clear on
4 this -- gave districts guidance that they could also
5 change the cut scores up as representative of their local
6 community. And so you'll have -- we've worked with some
7 districts who've asked for support, where they've said,
8 you know, we really need to drive more of our students to
9 take AP.

10 So for us, having our AP cut-off score for a
11 diploma at two makes perfect sense. Meanwhile, other
12 districts who've said exactly what you said. No way. We
13 want the cut score that if you can't get a three on the
14 AP, we haven't done our job as your high school. We're
15 going to keep you. We won't offer you a diploma.

16 So I think it is helpful only to remember
17 that what you all are being asked to adopt then goes
18 through a round that is guided by a local district board
19 in terms of the options that make the most sense for
20 their community.

21 MADAM CHAIR: I think that's a good point,
22 that, you know, they could reach higher. We'd be very
23 happy if they reached higher. Anybody else? Angelika?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I appreciate that answer.
25 I'm also reflecting a little bit about yesteryears, when



1 courses like IB and AP had weighted grades within the
2 system, and that was an encouragement, and I think that's
3 the job of the district, to make the decision about
4 encouraging kids. I'm not sure that our communities
5 would actually accept for the State to set aspirational
6 goals. I think that's the job of the community. There
7 are states that do have a state graduation definition,
8 and everybody's got a --

9 MS. HOLMES: Forty-nine of them.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Pardon me?

11 MS. HOLMES: Forty-nine of them.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. And we struggle with
13 that, but I think at this point, even though I initially
14 had the same reaction that you had Jane, that, oh my
15 gosh, here we are, lowering it, I think what we're doing
16 is actually transferring the responsibility to set high
17 standards to the communities themselves.

18 MADAM CHAIR: That's a good thing, right?

19 MS. SCHROEDER: I think that's a good thing,
20 having served on a board. I think that's where you have
21 the really -- I believe, the really, really hard
22 conversation with families about college readiness versus
23 career readiness, and we've not had that conversation
24 here, but there are so many folks who see that as being
25 very, very different. What we heard in 2008, 2010 when



1 we were setting the standards, what we heard is that
2 that's not really different, but that conversation needs
3 to go within the communities so that parents understand.
4 Parents who believe their kids are not going to go on to
5 college, but they are going to seek directly careers,
6 have that understanding, and have that conversation, and
7 set those expectations of what they have to be. If we do
8 that here, it will not have meaning out there in the
9 communities.

10 I understand some of the pushback from the
11 rural communities, but it is my guess that when they
12 start having those conversations, everyone of those
13 parents actually -- 99.9 percent of those parents -- I
14 know it's not everyone -- have high expectations for
15 their kids and high hopes for their kids, and when they
16 see that to be a farmer, to have any job, even within
17 their own communities, that they are going to need some
18 skills that are greater than when those folks first
19 started out, that we're going to get there.

20 So I have struggled with this too, Jane, but
21 I really worry about us being aspirational, rather than
22 transferring that responsibility to the folks who we in
23 this state actually believe have that responsibility.

24 MS. FLORES: Madam Chair?

25 MADAM CHAIR: Did you have a response to



1 that?

2 MS. HOLMES: No, Madam Chair.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, Val.

4 MS. FLORES: I just wanted to say that I
5 don't think that rural districts would have lower
6 expectations than any -- I mean, I think that communities
7 want to have the best possible education that they can
8 provide for their community, and I think that one of the
9 issues -- I mean, the big issue that I heard rural
10 districts say was the monies. Where are the monies going
11 to come from to provide equity, to provide, you know,
12 this quality that they want to provide? I don't think
13 any of them, from the people I've spoken with, have said
14 we just want to go to the bare minimum. I don't think
15 that's the case, and I think too that we have to think
16 that indeed different communities provide or are
17 different, and that even with all of our imagination, we
18 really can't think of what they're going to be coming up
19 with, and they just want the right to be creative and to
20 provide the best for their community.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I make a motion?

22 MADAM CHAIR: Any other comments? Jane?

23 MS. GOFF: Yeah, I -- it's important. I
24 apologize if my statements came out as being, I don't
25 know -- sounding like, you know, overtaking the --



1 putting any kind of any an evaluative statement on what
2 this group has come up with. I really -- I've always
3 been interested in what's the background of the
4 conversation? I mean, how do people get to the point
5 where they are? It just surprised me. It was maybe a
6 momentary thing, but when I saw that the -- just taking
7 AP as the example. When the score expectation had been
8 lowered, curious as to how did that come about to be
9 presented as a consensus opinion? To me, it's
10 interesting. Same with all the other ideas, you know,
11 and that because of and recognizing the fact that every
12 district of any size has its own unique view, and unique
13 interests, and unique challenges and obstacles. We all
14 have a resource challenge, no doubt about that. But if
15 we limit our conversations and our thinking, our
16 consideration of what's policy to concepts and just this
17 context, there are so many opportunities, and talents,
18 and possibilities in districts of any size to effectuate
19 any one of these things.

20 I'm just curious as to how to a district get
21 to a point where they make a decision? If they're going
22 to take just one, no prejudgment on how aspirational
23 they're going to be and how motivating they're going to
24 be in their district. I don't know. Just curious as to
25 how people get to that point where they can do it.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Pam.

2 MS. MAZANEC: We have Paula here from the
3 Rural Alliance. Maybe she could explain a little bit
4 about the issue with rural districts. Can you? Would it
5 be all right if she just commented on the rural -- would
6 it be -- Paula is here from the Rural Alliance. Maybe
7 she could explain the issues for the rural district.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Sure. It's okay. We give you
9 permission, Paula.

10 MS. STEPHENSON: Thank you, Madam Chair,
11 Board members, and Ms. Mazanec for allowing me to speak.
12 I have to admit I walked in sort of midway through this
13 conversation, so I might have missed some of your
14 comments. With regard to the concerns that the rural
15 districts have though, around these graduation
16 guidelines, they've been the same concerns we've been
17 raising for 11 years now, and quite honestly, Dr. Flores,
18 they're very much what you enunciated. It's resource
19 issues. We're looking at these things and saying, oh,
20 rural schools can't even offer most of these pieces of
21 the revised menu. It's not that we don't set high
22 expectations. Our communities are more involved in our
23 schools than many other places. We know exactly what our
24 kids want to do, you know, where their interests are, how
25 to help guide them there, use the ICAP process to have



1 those kinds of conversations. We've had to cut programs
2 that are incredibly important to our kids to make up for
3 unfunded mandates in other areas.

4 So our ability to respond to our children's
5 needs has gotten more limited over the last eight years
6 because of the way the State has decided to address
7 education, and this is one more limitation being put on
8 our rural schools and our rural children. Our parents,
9 like any parents anywhere, have high expectations for
10 their children, but they also realize they may want to be
11 a farmer. Bret Miles, superintendent in Holyoke, his son
12 just graduated. He's going to go to school at the
13 community -- or the -- it's not the community college,
14 sorry -- the college in Fort Morgan, because he wants to
15 take over his grandfather's farm, and that's great, and
16 they've been helping him get there, you know.

17 So we're looking at alternative schools.
18 Some kids want to go and open their own salon, different
19 things like that. It's that breadth that we're trying to
20 provide for our kids, and what we feel like is our
21 ability to provide those opportunities that are student
22 specific, no matter what they are. Some of our kids are
23 Boettcher scholars, go into military academies, but it's
24 limited when you put this type of menu up. It's great to
25 set high expectations and say as a state, here's where



1 we'd like to go, but we're still asking to have the
2 ability for local control to maximize the use of our
3 resources, to do what's best for our kids, to help
4 increase their learning, and to make them successful.

5 I have no idea, as I said, what was said
6 prior to when I walked in, but this is my third go around
7 on this. I've been involved in these discussions since
8 2008. I was part of Governor Ritter's Graduation
9 Guidelines Development Council. I was part of the last
10 go around with CDE several years ago, and I served on two
11 of the subcommittees for this work, the last one being
12 this assessment group. This was not consensus at all.
13 And in fact, our rural schools were amazingly vocal that
14 this will not work. Again, not because we don't have
15 high expectations for our kids. Because we don't have
16 the resource ability to provide a lot of these things.
17 We'd love to. Maybe the State will get there someday.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Paula, could you give me a
19 couple of examples of things you wouldn't be able to do?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: First of all, can you
21 provide one? Can your district not provide one of those?

22 MS. STEPHENSON: One, but it's -- to tell a
23 kid that, for some reason, let's say you -- what am I
24 looking at?

25 MS. SCHROEDER: Paula, the discussion is



1 that it's a menu, and that as long as you pick one and
2 possibly add some of your own from your district -- I
3 mean, that's what we're trying to get to. Obviously,
4 even some big districts are not going to offer all of
5 those, and that is never the intent. A menu is about I'm
6 going to have maybe only an appetizer today, and that's
7 all. I'm going to have one item off of a menu, and I
8 think what we need to hear from is there are not one of
9 these that can be chosen by a district.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Paula.

11 MS. STEPHENSON: Sure. Thank you, Madam
12 Chair, Representative Schroeder. Yes, I would say every
13 district can probably offer one, but is it fair for a
14 rural student to have the weight of their high school
15 graduation be based on one item from this menu, because
16 that's all they might be able to offer. Again, we're
17 looking at a body of evidence for our kids, and I haven't
18 talked to every single district, but I know these
19 sentiments came up these sentiments came out loud and
20 clear in our discussions, and they have for the last 11
21 years. I get that it's a menu, but again, this is a
22 local-control state, where our parents, our students, our
23 communities, our boards are incredibly engaged. We're
24 doing community engagement processes around setting local
25 graduation requirements. We believe we're providing



1 great opportunities. Our kids have amazing high school
2 graduation rates. They're going on to college and
3 postsecondary workforce opportunities. So this --

4 MS. SCHROEDER: So Paula, we're saying --

5 MS. STEPHENSON: -- feels limiting.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that if you pick one of
7 these and add whatever you as your boards add, that's
8 what we expect. I think we're trying to not to say it's
9 got to be all of these, or it's got to be three of these,
10 but it's got to at least be one, and then it is up to
11 your community to actually set the requirements for your
12 kids. Am I wrong? Is that the conversation you all have
13 been having?

14 MS. HOLMES: I don't know if I should answer
15 for, or if --

16 MADAM CHAIR: You want to respond directly
17 to that?

18 MS. HOLMES: -- Ms. Scheffel wants to say
19 something.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, I was just going to
21 respond that what I'm hearing is that it's a double-edged
22 sword to say it's a menu, you only have to choose one,
23 because then if you only have the resources to choose
24 one, that cut score stands. And you can add whatever you
25 want to it, this isn't a suggestion. That's a



1 requirement, and districts can only add to it. So once
2 they land on one, the menu is then shut down. Now if
3 they're in a district where you can offer five options,
4 then I guess they could score one -- you know, if they
5 could hit one of the thresholds on COMPASS, or
6 ACCUPLACER, or whatever, they have more options, but
7 these districts are going to have to choose one, because
8 of the expense --

9 (Overlapping)

10 MADAM CHAIR: Board, let one finish.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: You're creating one gate.

12 That's the problem.

13 MADAM CHAIR: May I ask a question here of
14 Rebecca? Have you had this conversation, Rebecca?

15 MS. HOLMES: Madam Chair, yes.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Many, many times.

17 MS. HOLMES: For two years. It's very
18 familiar --

19 MADAM CHAIR: What sort of recommendations
20 do you -- does your group have?

21 MS. HOLMES: I would say that the other side
22 of this conversation, and by offering this point of view,
23 I'm by no means personally or siding (ph) Elliott with
24 this, is the voice that says that if 50 percent -- what
25 we know is 50 percent of our kids are not hitting an 18



1 or a 19 on the ACT, which means that by that standard 50
2 percent of the kids in our state are not college ready,
3 we have an over 33 percent remediation rate, and that is
4 not all rural. That is urban, that's rural, that's
5 across the board. And so I think that the other side of
6 this conversation for the same 11 years has been, is
7 there a way that at the state level we could set a floor
8 that wouldn't inhibit the creativity of local districts,
9 but that would start to find a cohesive and comprehensive
10 way of getting at what has been interpreted in the data
11 as students that aren't ready for the day after high
12 school?

13 That said -- like I said, I just wanted to
14 point out there are two sides to this conversation. That
15 said, I think we have worked -- and I'll have Elliott
16 speak, because he's done the bulk of this. We've worked
17 with those rural districts, and we've really focused on,
18 how do we take the work of the districts that have moved
19 very quickly forward? And those are places -- those are
20 not all urban places. For the most part, they are places
21 like Archuleta, La Veta. Very small, who have said this
22 actually enables us to do some work we're pretty excited
23 to do, and they've now given us best practices that we're
24 looking at sharing statewide this summer, where they've
25 created robust capstone projects, where students actually



1 are demonstrating something that's far more meaningful
2 about their career readiness than an 18 or a 19 on the
3 ACT.

4 And so I think we've tried to find that sort
5 of middle ground landing point between two polarizing
6 sides of that conversation, and do that by putting out
7 the work of districts who've moved forward fairly
8 quickly.

9 MR. ASP: Madam Chair?

10 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

11 MR. ASP: I would just echo what Rebecca
12 said, but add a couple of pieces, and that's -- and I
13 think the statement before Paula entered the room. We
14 described that when you look at this menu, the objection
15 is not to what's on here. I mean, there were some
16 arguments about a two or a three and those kinds of
17 things that you already described. The objection more
18 was whether or not there were enough pathways for rural
19 districts to do, and there were objections about whether
20 or not this was overreach, as I said earlier in my
21 opening remarks. So one of the values as a group is to
22 add as many different pathways as they could. These are
23 the ones that we could come up with within our group that
24 seemed like reasonable responses. We also tried to take
25 a reasoning approach to the requirement that there be



1 four different kinds of demonstrations across each
2 subject area, and reduce that as well.

3 So there are folks on either side of this
4 argument, but we certainly don't mean to discount at all
5 what Paula brought to the table, and I was hoping that we
6 had made -- expressed that earlier in our presentation.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. I think we need to move
8 on here.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Deb has --

10 MADAM CHAIR: We're repeating each other
11 now. Paula, thank you for your --

12 MS. STEPHENSON: Thank you for letting me
13 comment as well.

14 MADAM CHAIR: You know, I don't know where
15 we'll land, but I certainly understand what you're
16 saying, and I get a little confused -- not confused, but
17 I think we're both -- we're trying to meet, very
18 sincerely trying to meet everybody's expectations. So
19 thank you.

20 MS. STEPHENSON: Thank you. I appreciate
21 that.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Deb, did you have -- or Val.

23 MS. FLORES: Madam Chair? I know we give,
24 or the State gives \$600,000 for startups for charter
25 schools. Is it possible to provide --



1 MADAM CHAIR: Take the 600,000?

2 MS. FLORES: Provide the 600,000, and give
3 them to these school districts so that they can --

4 MADAM CHAIR: I don't think so.

5 MS. FLORES: -- then have more options. I'm
6 asking this of Tony.

7 MR. DYL: I suspect not. I --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What about a magnet
9 school?

10 MR. DYL: Well, I think the problem there,
11 assuming you're talking about the federal funds that are
12 given, you know, that are granted out to charter schools,
13 that's really a dedicated pot of money that has to be
14 used for that purpose.

15 MADAM CHAIR: And this is --

16 MS. FLORES: Well, if they're going to --

17 MADAM CHAIR: Wait, Val. This is far
18 outside this. This was not --

19 MS. FLORES: Well, I'm just speaking
20 creatively.

21 MADAM CHAIR: -- included in the discussion,
22 and it shouldn't be. Deb, did you have something more to
23 say?

24 MS. FLORES: And if it's a magnet school.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Deb?



1 MS. FLORES: Like a charter school.

2 MADAM CHAIR: No, Val, not here. Later.
3 We'll take it up, bring it up separately.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: I was just going to say I
5 think the goal of this is to ensure to or to provide the
6 conditions so that students can be ready to go to
7 college, or be ready to seek a career. Question. What
8 is the root cause that some percentage of them, and it
9 differs across districts, are not ready to do either?
10 And then what is a good solution for that? And I think
11 setting numbers like this, I'm not confident at all that
12 it will get those students to where they need to be, and
13 so I think, again, we're looking at underlying
14 assumptions to address an issue. We're looking at kind
15 of a one-size-fits-all approach, and we have lots of
16 different reasons inside that that account for why some
17 kids aren't ready to go to college and why some are not
18 ready to get a job of their choice. So again, I guess I
19 wish we could get underneath the assumptions.

20 MADAM CHAIR: My -- and I (indiscernible).
21 When we look at our -- I understand exactly what you're
22 saying, but when we look at our history, when we don't
23 have any expectations, what did we get?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Nothing.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Nothing. You know, we're



1 trying very hard to find that balance. We need to have
2 expectations. They need to have, you know, have a level
3 that they need to meet, but it's very difficult,
4 absolutely very difficult to find the difference between
5 a small rural school and Denver Public Schools
6 (indiscernible). They're hardly even related to each
7 other. I don't think this -- I mean, I really appreciate
8 what you said, but I don't think, frankly, carrying on
9 the discussion much longer carries -- Steve's falling
10 asleep over here.

11 MS. HOLMES: Madam Chair, can I just
12 (indiscernible) two implementation points that it would
13 just be helpful for us to make you aware of? You did
14 have to adopt a menu by May of 2013, so this is the
15 standing menu. So without edits to that menu that have
16 been formally adopted, our team will go forward to
17 support districts in achieving the formally adopted menu.
18 Just want to make that clear. And then if you all have a
19 strong opinion about the guidelines versus requirements
20 language, some sort of unified decision on that would be
21 helpful as well. Otherwise, we will, I think, probably
22 communicate in a way that is a bit confusing.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Madam Chair?

24 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: So I move to approve the new



1 menu of career and college ready determinations for the
2 2021 Colorado graduation requirements. Otherwise, we're
3 stuck with that, right?

4 MS. HOLMES: Correct.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Second?

6 MR. DURHAM: No.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Well, is there a second?

8 Jane? Nobody's going to second Angelika's motion? Dies
9 on the floor. That's great. Isn't that wonderful?
10 (Indiscernible).

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I inquire first?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just second, and then
13 move forward.

14 MADAM CHAIR: What is your problem?

15 (Indiscernible) what is your --

16 MS. GOFF: I will second it, just so we can
17 keep talking for a minute.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me, Jane.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She seconded it.

20 MADAM CHAIR: You did second it?

21 MS. GOFF: Yes.

22 MADAM CHAIR: With great glee and gusto.

23 MS. GOFF: Absolute gusto.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Call the roll, please.

25 MR. DURHAM: Oh, no, no, no.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no, no.

2 MR. DURHAM: No, no.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

4 MR. DURHAM: I have a substitute motion that
5 the Board revoke its approval of the original menu of
6 2013 and that we continue to work on this particular
7 issue into the future.

8 MADAM CHAIR: And how does that -- didn't
9 you say we have a timeline on this?

10 MS. HOLMES: I'm just deferring to Tony,
11 based on the statutory requirements, for what that would
12 mean.

13 MADAM CHAIR: You love it.

14 MR. DYL: I almost hesitate to comment at
15 this point in time. There is a statutory requirement
16 that you have the graduation guidelines in place as of
17 2013. As this point in time, you of course are in
18 compliance with the statute. If you revoke the prior
19 graduation guidelines and don't replace them, you will
20 not be in compliance with the statute. I guess take that
21 for whatever cautionary principle you want to take it
22 for.

23 MR. DURHAM: May I ask Counsel a question
24 here? Did the statute say "adopt"?

25 MR. DYL: Yes, I believe it did.



1 MR. DURHAM: And that happened
2 (indiscernible).

3 MR. DYL: Let me take a look.

4 MR. DURHAM: So they were adopted. Looks
5 like we're in compliance.

6 MR. DYL: I have to tell you that I would
7 have a difficult time standing in front of a judge and
8 putting my ethical reputation on the line by making that
9 particular legal argument.

10 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. All right. So
12 will you call on the original motion, please?

13 MS. MARKEL: Yes. Two motions are on the
14 floor.

15 MR. DURHAM: No, on the substitute motion.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Did you get a second?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll second it.

18 MR. DURHAM: I did.

19 MADAM CHAIR: (Indiscernible).

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: God, you guys.

21 MADAM CHAIR: On the --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we hear it, please?

23 MADAM CHAIR: We don't do the substitute
24 motion. Thank you, Tony.

25 MR. DYL: I'm sorry. You have a motion that



1 was made and seconded, then during discussion you had a
2 substitute motion that was made and seconded. I don't
3 believe that necessarily replaces the first motion.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

5 MR. DYL: I think probably what you need to
6 do, don't you, is vote on the first motion.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Vote on the first
8 motion.

9 (Overlapping)

10 MADAM CHAIR: If it doesn't carry --

11 MR. DURHAM: That's not what Robert's rule
12 says on page 154, primary amendment to substitute.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's amendment.
14 That's not a substitute.

15 MR. DURHAM: No, a substitute -- I'll find
16 it here. Just a minute. A substitute can be offered for
17 a paragraph or main motion for only one sentence. In the
18 case of paragraph, substitute can contain several
19 sentences. A substitute offered for a main motion or
20 resolution for a paragraph or resolution, then the
21 primary amendment can therefore be moved. Only when no
22 other amendment is pending. There was no other amendment
23 pending.

24 MR. DYL: So what you would be doing is
25 voting on the substitute.



1 MR. DURHAM: The substitute prevails, then
2 it carries, and that's -- the motion's adopted. If it
3 fails, we're back to the original motion.

4 MR. DYL: Okay.

5 MADAM CHAIR: I've never heard that. Bizy?

6 MS. MARKEL: Okay.

7 MADAM CHAIR: We're voting on the substitute
8 motion.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To rescind what we
10 have, and to have no graduation requirement.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Suspend it, and don't have any
12 graduation requirements. That's just what we need,
13 right?

14 MS. HOLMES: Yes, to revoke the menu of
15 2013, that was adopted in 2013, and continue working on
16 graduation guidelines.

17 MR. DURHAM: It's the -- I'll withdraw the
18 motion if the second will be withdrawn, and then maybe we
19 can discuss some other possibilities.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I agree. I'll agree to
21 that.

22 MR. DURHAM: The --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

24 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. The -- I don't like
25 getting lobbied by rural districts who tell me they can't



1 comply, take what they tell me in good faith, and I
2 believe it. I appreciate for a change being able to
3 actually hear a position contrary to that which staff
4 takes, and I think that's refreshing that we had Paula
5 here for that purpose. But until we resolve the issue of
6 whether or not in fact rural districts can comply with
7 this, then I'm a no vote on this, and I would hope that
8 staff, if in fact this motion fails, staff would come
9 back with something that works for rural Colorado, and I
10 think you should -- staff should agree that they're going
11 to work aggressively to come up with something that rural
12 Colorado can support. So presuming that we'll get that
13 kind of cooperation, I'll withdraw the motion, but I will
14 vote no on the main motion.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Call the roll on the main
16 motion.

17 MS. MARKEL: On the main motion? Okay.
18 Steve Durham? No.

19 MR. DURHAM: No.

20 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Flores?

21 MS. FLORES: No.

22 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff?

23 MS. GOFF: Jesus.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Jane?

25 MS. MARKEL: On the original motion.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, I thought maybe you didn't
2 hear it.

3 MS. GOFF: No.

4 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec?

5 MS. MAZANEC: No.

6 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

8 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel?

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

10 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder?

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Having been here six years and
13 having never spent a more miserable two days in my life
14 than I have the last two days, our Board doesn't usually
15 operate this way, and I feel, you know, really badly
16 about it, and I think that perhaps, Mr. Durham, you don't
17 -- well, I know you realize. You're very -- you seem to
18 blame this on staff, that staff is doing all these things
19 that they shouldn't do, and gee, if the staff did it
20 right, we'd be just fine. Staff is doing what they are
21 legally bound to do. So I -- and obviously, you want to
22 take that apart, and you're like six years worth of work
23 that you want to take apart, and therefore -- well, it
24 may take you a year or two to take it apart. You can't
25 take it all apart in a couple of weeks. So I think we'll



1 just suspend this discussion, and thank you very much,
2 and we won't take any action at all, and we'll deal with
3 it later, because I think we're reaching a breaking point
4 here. So thank you very much, and we'll move on.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I comment, Madam
6 Chair?

7 MADAM CHAIR: No. Well, from that subject,
8 we will move on to a much more pleasant subject. Don't
9 go clear away. This is the good part. Yes, stay here.
10 Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) dismiss
12 my staff.

13 MADAM CHAIR: No, but before we do that --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Before staff
15 (indiscernible).

16 MADAM CHAIR: Before we do that, I want to
17 remind you all that, as you know, Carey Markel has taken
18 an exciting job opportunity, and tomorrow is her last day
19 at CDE. Congratulations, Carey. We're sad to see her
20 leave, but very excited for what lies ahead of her. She
21 will be greatly missed by both the State Board of
22 Education, members, and CDE staff, as she has left, and
23 truly left, a meaningful imprint on all of us. Carey has
24 served the Colorado Department of Education since October
25 2011 as our State Board relations director and policy



1 analyst. She then took on an additional role as data
2 privacy officer last year. Since her time in this
3 additional role, she's been noted as one of the top state
4 educational agency privacy experts in the country and is
5 the only certified information privacy officer in the
6 state education agency. I didn't know that, Carey.

7 For almost four years, Carey has worked as a
8 liaison with State Board of Education members and staff
9 to ensure board member requests are met and that board
10 meetings run smoothly. She has been a vital voice and a
11 perspective to CDE'S executive team, and provided counsel
12 across the organization to ensure CDE is doing its job to
13 meet the requirements of law and rule. Please join me in
14 thanking Carey for her outstanding service and
15 congratulating her on her next endeavor.

16 (Applause)

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Speech.

18 (Overlapping)

19 MADAM CHAIR: I know Carey said -- or Deb
20 said she couldn't carry it around, but --

21 MS. MARKEL: It's beautiful. I'm very
22 touched (indiscernible).

23 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, nice. Very nice.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is nice.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, lovely.



1 MS. MARKEL: Thank you very much. It's been
2 an honor to be of service.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Is that all you have to say?

4 MS. MARKEL: Well, you guys took me -- you
5 know, I plan things out, and I like to know what's going
6 to be next, and Bizy would not tell me what would be --
7 what was coming. I just kind of picked up that something
8 might be coming, and I had just to deal with it. So you
9 saw -- see what happens (indiscernible) by surprise, but
10 it's been my honor to serve you all and to serve the
11 previous boards.

12 MADAM CHAIR: And you will be greatly
13 missed.

14 MS. MARKEL: And I wish you all the very
15 best.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Carey.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

18 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Ms. Burdsall,
19 would you read us into executive session, please?

20 MS. BURDSALL: Absolutely. An executive
21 session has been noticed for today's State Board meeting
22 in conformance with 24-6-402(3)(b) CRS concerning an
23 employee of the State Board of education who requested
24 the matter be addressed in executive session 24-6-
25 402(3)(b)(I) CRS.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Okay (indiscernible) executive
2 session. Any opposed? Motion passes. The Board will
3 continue an executive session, and the public is excused.

4 (Meeting adjourned)

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



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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