



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
November 12, 2015, Part 3

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on November 12, 2015,
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Steven Durham (R), Chairman
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Joyce Rankin (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- start. We'll get
2 started with the delayed rulemaking hearing on educator
3 preparation and licensing.

4 The State Board will now conduct a public
5 rulemaking hearing for the rules of educator preparation
6 and licensing 1 CCR 301-37. The Board approved the
7 Notice of Rulemaking at its September 9th, 2015, Board
8 meeting. The hearing to promulgate these rules was made
9 known through public -- through the publication of a
10 public notice on September 25th, 2015, through the
11 Colorado Register, and by the State Board Notice on
12 November 4th, 2015.

13 The State Board is authorized to promulgate
14 these rules pursuant to CRS 22-2-107(1)(c).

15 Commissioner, is the staff ready to provide
16 an overview?

17 MR. ASP: Yes, we are. Thank you, Mr.
18 Chair. I'll turn this over to Dr. Colleen O'Neill and
19 Dr. Katy Anthes, and take us through the review.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ladies.

21 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you very much, Mr.
22 Chair.

23 Good afternoon. I'm Colleen O'Neill. I'm
24 the executive director of educator preparation and
25 licensing. With me today is Dr. Katy Anthes, who is our



1 interim associate commissioner of achievement and
2 strategy.

3 Today is the hearing on the updated
4 education preparation and licensing rules. I'm going to
5 set the stage just a little bit for us, and then we will
6 be able to kind of turn it over to our audience members,
7 and our stakeholders for public testimony. So on -- we
8 will just continue on with setting the stage.

9 Today just so that you know, it is not an
10 action item in front of you. The purpose of today is
11 really to review the process that we've used to create
12 the current draft of the updated rules; share the
13 feedback from the written comment period; conduct a
14 hearing to receive verbal testimony from stakeholders;
15 and then to review our next steps.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And I think once again,
17 we'll probably withhold testimony, or questions until
18 you're finished with the presentation, since this is not
19 an action item, so we'll let you walk all the way through
20 the presentation before we go to questions, because we
21 are a little behind schedule, so --

22 MS. O'NEILL: Excellent --

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- please proceed.

24 MS. O'NEILL: -- Chairman Durham. Thank you.

25 In your Board packet, you will have found



1 several documents. Included in those documents we gave
2 you a memo, which kind of is a large compilation of the
3 materials that you received. Additionally, you will find
4 that there is written feedback in that; the CDE draft
5 responses to that feedback; an exceptions report that
6 clearly points out the large changes that have been made
7 in the rules; and then you will also find a draft of the
8 rules with track changes on it.

9 Remember, the rules right now are about 300
10 and some pages with track changes. As you accept those
11 track changes, it does come down a little bit smaller to
12 about 200 and some pages, right at 300. So this is a
13 large endeavor. I will just remind us that it's a large
14 in Denver -- endeavor.

15 So as we go forward, I wanted to just remind
16 you a little bit about why are we updating these rules.
17 There was a very clear call from our stakeholders, across
18 multiple areas of education in Colorado, for us to take a
19 look at our rules and update it to current state statute
20 and best practice. That feedback included our educators,
21 our educator preparation entities, and our district
22 leadership.

23 The rule revisions also brought alignment or
24 are bringing alignment of several of our statutory
25 initiatives, which include Senate Bill



1 1 -- sorry -- Senate Bill 212 and Senate Bill 191. Those
2 respectively outline the student standards, and the
3 educator standards, and evaluation.

4 During this process we were able to make
5 revisions also to clear up language, and/or any other
6 items that were associated with not appropriate statutory
7 recommendations.

8 Thus, far, the rulemaking process has
9 included feedback, and input, and draft development,
10 which occurred from May 2014 -- so this has been an
11 extended period of time -- May 2014 through August of
12 2015. In September of 2015 the Board initiated the
13 formal feedback and formal rulemaking process.

14 Written comments were taken from September
15 9th of 2015, through October 12th -- sorry -- October
16 21st of 2015. Those comments were submitted to the State
17 Board, and then they were passed along. As a reminder,
18 you have a summary document in your packet that has all
19 of those written feedback pieces in their entirety.

20 Today we will take a look at the updated
21 drafts, but more than anything, today we're really
22 listening to feedback from our audience members about
23 the -- the process, and/or anything else in the rules
24 that they want to comment on.

25 Just as a summary of your written comments,



1 there were approximately only 18 comments that were
2 submitted. Of those comments, there were really mostly
3 comments around fundamentals -- you know, questions around
4 how does this really work for us; what would this really
5 look like if we were to implement it. There were a
6 majority of those comments that were just simply
7 clarifications, or they were calling out some small
8 changes that they were requesting with regard to wording.

9 The majority of the comments were also
10 associated with statutory references. So I think it's
11 important to know just kind of what was the general
12 comment structure. Of those two, there were some
13 substantive requests. The first one is really our
14 director of special education. That particular one was
15 actually a copy and paste error, so you will see in your
16 feedback, that they said, is this really what the
17 director of special education should be doing.

18 There was a copy and paste error associated
19 literally with a gifted talented piece, so you will see
20 several letters like that. And we clarified that. Your
21 updated drafts have been corrected to reflect those
22 changes.

23 The other one was really around our
24 educational interpreter authorization. You will see
25 several letters or written pieces of feedback around



1 educational interpreters. I think what you'll hear today
2 is that this is still somewhat of a large conversation
3 that remains on the table. I believe you will also hear
4 some testimony from some of those folks that are coming
5 to the table making some recommendations.

6 So with all of that noted, and knowing that
7 you have a very large packet full of rules -- draft
8 rules, exception reports, and written comments, and
9 feedback, I'd be very interested to take any of your
10 comments that you have, or questions that you have about
11 the material that's presented to you today, before we go
12 to the hearing.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions? Yes, Dr.
14 Schroeder.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, be -- being very far
16 from someone who knows much about special education, I
17 tried to understand the letters about educational
18 interpreter authorization. And what I didn't hear, or
19 wasn't able to find was, what level of expertise is
20 necessary in order to properly serve kids. What I heard
21 about -- I thought I read were shortages, but that didn't
22 seem, to me -- I mean, that part didn't resonate so much
23 as our -- our prep programs for this position inadequate;
24 is -- is that what we're -- you know, what are we really
25 talking about? Because ultimately, our concern it is



1 about shortages, but it's really about do we have people
2 serving the needs of our kids.

3 What I -- I don't understand, and I didn't
4 understand -- it was alluded to, but it's not something I
5 understand very well, are the legal requirements. And so
6 it worries me a lot that we might be making an argument
7 around shortages when, in fact, we have a legal
8 obligation to provide a higher level -- our -- our
9 instructors need to have a higher level of competence
10 than we're willing to accept. So I got -- I got a little
11 twisted in trying to understand all that, and maybe today
12 is -- right now is not the answer, as we -- or maybe the
13 answer will come as we hear from folks. What is it that
14 kids need?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

16 MS. SCHROEDER: This is called educational
17 interpreter --

18 MS. O'NEILL: Authorization.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: -- authorization. And
20 if -- if you want to explain what that is. I think I
21 understood what it is. It has something to do with kids
22 who don't hear.

23 MS. O'NEILL: It is -- it is for --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

25 MS. O'NEILL: -- our deaf and hard of



1 hearing students. There is an educational interpreter
2 that does sign for them. And so that is something that
3 any of schools are required, by IDEAs, so by our special
4 education law to engage in part of their instructional
5 methodology so that they can interpret for any of our
6 deaf students.

7 I think, Dr. Schroeder, that is an
8 incredible question, and one that is the continued
9 conversation that we're having. I think, again,
10 testimony today may help us with some of that. We've
11 started engaging in conversations about how the educator
12 interpreter authorization is really kind of that -- that
13 middle ground of we need somebody to be able to interpret
14 just what the teacher is saying, except for the fact that
15 this is an educational environment, in which it's not
16 just what they're saying; it's really about the pedagogy
17 behind that.

18 And so I think coming forward, one of the
19 recommendations that people have had is actually creating
20 another layer of a teacher, and so that's where a lot of
21 our conversation really needs to come forward. And
22 I -- I agree with you that I think we need to have a
23 really honest conversation about what's best for a kids.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

25 MS. SCHROEDER: And when we have that



1 conversation, can we make -- sorry --

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: -- can we make sure that you
4 get it to a level of dummies like me, who have not
5 had -- I -- I don't think I've had any encounter with
6 this at all? So make it -- just, please make it kind of
7 basic.

8 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. Thank you.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: So can I just get the right
12 frame. Is this true that we are opening up the whole of
13 the Colorado Educator Licensing Act of 1991 for revisions
14 in all areas, correct?

15 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you, Dr. Scheffel. That
16 is -- actually, there are two separate entities.
17 The -- the Act, itself, is a legislative requirement that
18 we are not touching right now, that literally lives over
19 with our -- our legislators.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: But no, we're -- but what I
21 mean, is the rules that are associated with it; we are
22 opening --

23 MS. O'NEILL: Correct.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- opening up the rules --

25 MS. O'NEILL: We are opening --



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- broadly speaking.

2 MS. O'NEILL: -- yes, we have
3 opened -- you're -- you're correct.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

5 MS. O'NEILL: We have opened up the rules,
6 broadly speaking, for -- and I've talked a little bit
7 about this, so I want to make sure that it's very clear,
8 for alignment purposes today; not for holistic changes.
9 So those were the three -- and I'm going to say this
10 word -- I'm going to say bucket. I'm going to say it.

11 MS. FLORES: Oh, no.

12 MS. O'NEILL: Dr. Flores, I apologize, but I
13 am going to use a bucket. But there are three buckets
14 that the feedback over the course of the last year have
15 definitely come forward.

16 So the first bucket is really about
17 alignment with current state statute, and it's really
18 about best practices; alignments here.

19 The second bucket is really about, there had
20 been a lot of conversations that have come forward
21 regarding additional endorsements, or additional
22 pathways, or more, you know, stronger career
23 opportunities for our teachers. That's really sitting in
24 what I am considering bucket 2 today.

25 And then there is a third bucket that is



1 truly -- as we listen to the feedback, we will absolutely
2 admit, that there have been people who have come to the
3 table that said I think we do need to take a look at the
4 Act, itself, and law. We have set that over while we're
5 collecting information. We are absolutely not acting on
6 it, because that is part of our legislator's
7 responsibility, kind of across the way. So we've been
8 collecting that information, but we really haven't
9 migrated towards it at all, as -- as far as --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: (Indiscernible) --

11 MS. O'NEILL: -- ooh, I'm sorry. Please.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So, but let me see if I have
13 it straight. We only have 18 comments. This is possibly
14 getting voted on in December. We're opening up the rules
15 broadly for the Licensing Act of 1991, which hasn't -- I
16 think the last time we did that was what, five years ago?
17 And do we have to re-look at those rules every five
18 years, or that's just our own cycle?

19 MS. O'NEILL: I think that's also a good
20 question. What has prompted this really is that the
21 people have noted that there's a misalignment associated
22 with them. We have -- this has been a year-long process
23 actually from May of 2014. It's been about a year-and-a-
24 half process from May of 2014. We started focus groups,
25 and feedback, and we had surveys that were associated



1 with it.

2 So while there are only 18 comments, with
3 regard to the written feedback, beginning last year in
4 September -- so September of 2014 through November of
5 2014 we held focus groups across the State of Colorado.
6 From that, we had about 788 comments that came from that,
7 in which it went to a new draft in December.

8 So then we took that new draft and we
9 created a survey on top of it, around that new draft.
10 And we identified, I think, it was -- if I'm -- the
11 numbers are going to elude me, and I don't have them in
12 my head right now -- a couple hundred additional requests
13 for updates. So we've gone back to all the stakeholders.

14 In June of this year we developed yet one
15 more draft. We posted it for public comments, and
16 created a survey, and ability for them to insert survey.
17 From that draft we had approximately -- probably only 20
18 to 25 comments that came back for it.

19 So this is yet again, our formal rulemaking
20 hearing, but it starting in --

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: So we're not probably going
22 to be looking at these rules for another five years; is
23 that correct, unless there's some nuance, you know --

24 MS. O'NEILL: So --

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- clean up type language?



1 MS. O'NEILL: -- I think that's a good --

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is that right?

3 MS. O'NEILL: -- here's what I will say. Is
4 I think --

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: In other words, I'm trying to
6 get a frame for how important this is.

7 MS. O'NEILL: How big is this?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: It strikes me as very
9 important.

10 MS. O'NEILL: Uh-huh. I can --

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because I -- I think to say,
12 well, it's just alignment, I think there's -- I haven't
13 read this line-by-line, but I mean, I -- I -- it strikes
14 me that there will be a lot of issues in here to talk
15 about, I think, in terms of voting in December. I mean,
16 I -- I really need time to go through it line-by-line,
17 and look at the implications. And I'm just wondering,
18 from your perspective, do you see ten percent of this
19 document having changed substantially, or are you -- I
20 mean, I think what we're talking about is sort of, oh,
21 well, it's just being aligned. I'm not so sure.

22 Can you speak to that?

23 MS. O'NEILL: I -- I can -- I can. Thank
24 you. I think -- let's see. I heard kind of three
25 questions in there. One, is kind of how much of this



1 document has been updated and aligned.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Substantively changed.

3 MS. O'NEILL: Substantively changed.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: And what are we looking for
5 in here? Though, I will read it line-by-line.

6 MS. O'NEILL: Sure -- sure. I think that's
7 the exceptions document. That's one of the reasons that
8 we gave you the kind of a -- a matrix of the exceptions
9 document. It looks a little bit like this. And that's
10 really the one that says, you know what, these are the
11 massive changes throughout. I would say that we're
12 running at about 25 percent of the rules that have
13 actually had any massive changes, with regard to outcomes
14 associated with them.

15 The rest of the document was really about
16 updating, either requirements associated with the
17 legislature, even aligning language, so that we could
18 really see that it was in alignment with Senate Bill 191.
19 So that's kind of the first question. So I'd say about
20 25 percent of the document.

21 The second question, how often are -- should
22 these be reviewed. They actually should be reviewed
23 annually. So them not coming to the Board for this
24 extended period of time is -- is somewhat of a -- of an
25 interesting conundrum for us. We -- we would have wanted



1 to bring it forward just a little bit faster, as we
2 listened to the initiatives and everything that was
3 moving.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Excuse me. You said, "They."
5 Who is they. Who didn't come forward?

6 MS. O'NEILL: I would have to say
7 it's -- it's my unit.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Oh, okay.

9 MS. O'NEILL: It would have been me and my
10 predecessor. Those are the individuals that would have
11 needed to come forward, so me and my predecessor.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So may I just -- so I guess
13 I'm just saying, as we begin this discussion, I just
14 guess I'd like to make sure that we're hitting on the
15 important issues that occurred in these focus groups,
16 because I haven't reviewed all the minutes from those
17 focus groups. I'm not sure we even have that to know the
18 subtext of the linguistic changes that are
19 always -- there's always what's written and then what's
20 underneath that, in terms of what was the discussion, and
21 what's the implication of the language change. And I
22 think if we just focus on hey, some people would like a
23 director of spend endorsement, and an education
24 interpreter authorization. I think we're kind of missing
25 really what went on in those meetings.



1 So as we have time to think through it,
2 let's make sure we get to the substance of the
3 discussions that occurred before we see these documents.

4 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you.

5 MS. FLORES: I think Dr. Scheffel
6 understands it, but I'm still kind of dealing with -- so
7 you are recodifying this thing? I mean, that's basically
8 you're going through and saying this has to be struck
9 out. This has to be -- that would be a good idea. I
10 would -- if it -- if you could get all the rules that are
11 worthless, and make problems, and --

12 MS. O'NEILL: So Mr. Chair, and Dr.
13 Flores --

14 MS. FLORES: Is that what you're doing?

15 MS. O'NEILL: -- I think many of our
16 rules -- and you guys have been doing this over the past
17 several months -- many of our rules come to you to be
18 updated for alignment issues. Actually, our office of
19 legal services periodically reviews all of the State
20 Board rules, and checks for alignment and those sorts of
21 things, so actually, the whole, you know, start of this
22 really was that -- that this -- these rules haven't been
23 updated in a while, and so we really do need to look at
24 them for an alignment, and a clear statutory, you know,
25 linkage, so -- so these have, you know, this -- this



1 truly is an alignment issue.

2 I think some other things are coming up, Dr.
3 Scheffel.

4 MS. FLORES: So alignment is -- is -- is a
5 kind of a recodify?

6 MS. O'NEILL: You could say that.

7 MS. FLORES: That I understand.

8 MS. O'NEILL: Yes. I mean, it's -- it's
9 updating the rules to make sure that they are in line
10 with State statute and they are referencing the proper
11 statutes relevant to --

12 MS. FLORES: Okay.

13 MS. O'NEILL: -- this work.

14 So the other thing I just wanted to say is
15 that this is entirely up to you, Board, in terms of how
16 long you want this process to go. We have provided you
17 with all of the information about the feedback we've
18 gotten from stakeholders. We've provided you with an
19 exceptions report, so you don't have to go through the
20 300-page document, if you don't want to, and you can see
21 exactly where we have made changes. But it's totally up
22 to you if you want to have a vote on -- in December, or
23 if you would like to push that vote to January, or
24 February. That's up to you around how much feedback you
25 want to hear; how many hearings you would like to have.



1 That's -- that's your prerogative. So you can make that
2 choice once you hear some of the feedback today.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Further
4 questions?

5 Yes, Ms. Goff.

6 MS. GOFF: (Indiscernible) that I would
7 be -- I would need to ask you -- you two, how does that
8 work with timing issues? I mean, if we're talking about
9 trying to get things set for interpreters, or speech and
10 language work -- employees in general, how does this work
11 with timelines. We've got -- we're at December coming up
12 here. Hiring needs to start processing pretty soon.
13 We've got educators, prospective, or current, who are
14 very -- have very much at stake in whatever these
15 decisions are.

16 I guess, you know, appreciate, and -- and
17 I -- I do truly appreciate the extension of -- extension
18 opportunity, but I think we need to be pretty concerned
19 about how it works on the ground, and how does this
20 affect districts that are trying to straighten out this
21 type of information.

22 And then I would just ask -- and this does
23 not require an answer right now, in fact, is this an
24 appropriate time in presentation to talk maybe a little
25 specifically about the interpreter job description,



1 because I -- I think -- you know, I'll just give
2 you -- and you can ponder this, and think about it later,
3 but is there a difference between this position -- I know
4 the answer -- I'm sorry, but is there a difference this
5 position, as we're speaking about -- about licensure, and
6 American sign language teachers? What are -- what are
7 some of the differences in criteria, requirement,
8 background needed, that sort of thing? I think those are
9 the kinds of -- perhaps occasionally, if not more, people
10 will ask us, how do we know what -- where is the focus
11 here, and what is the actual purpose of this change, and
12 why. That -- that would be my type of question.

13 If it's not appropriate at this part, if
14 you're not finished with your process yet, I completely
15 understand. Thank you. Just I appreciate the timeline
16 about this so I don't think we need to be doing this into
17 May. Thank you.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, and I agree. And I'm not
20 trying to slow it down unnecessarily. All I'm saying is,
21 there's a lot of language here. And I think it strikes
22 me as more substantive than just alignment and
23 universities sit with this language in rooms papering the
24 walls and developing courses against this language, and I
25 just think there's some rich discussions to have to find



1 out are we over burdening universities by saying need to
2 have a program in whatever, and have this many credit
3 hours, because that's the only way to reach, you know, a
4 proficiency for students on all this language. And I
5 don't know the answer, because I need to look at it
6 critically, but I'm just saying I -- I hate to rush
7 through it, because it has huge implications for those
8 that must align with this language to have approved
9 programs in the State of Colorado.

10 MS. FLORES: That's right. I mean, earlier
11 we were talking about -- we were talking about
12 interpreters just interpreters in other languages, and
13 the question was asked do we have -- does somebody
14 certify them here. And the question was, well, I don't
15 know -- I don't think anybody knew, but, you know,
16 they -- I know Arizona and New Mexico have. They have a
17 certification program. And I mean, if we're doing it for
18 sign, wouldn't we do it for just regular languages?

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

20 Does anyone want to answer that?

21 MS. O'NEILL: No, sir.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No. Okay.

23 MS. O'NEILL: No -- no, don't want to answer
24 that want that.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.



1 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you very much. We'll
2 take into consideration, and take a look at the -- the
3 rules and alignment with that. Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

5 MS. RANKIN: When we're -- when you -- we
6 use the term alignment, what does that mean? Aligned
7 with standards, or aligned with what?

8 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, me too.

10 MS. O'NEILL: I -- I think that's a good
11 question, as well, because what we did is we aligned with
12 current best practices, which could be standards at -- at
13 a national level. And we aligned with current state
14 statutes that we did not have alignment before. So my
15 best example of that alignment really is Senate Bill 191,
16 where we have teacher, principal, and special service
17 quality standards, and those were not articulated in our
18 rules at all. As a matter of fact, they were a
19 completely different set of standards.

20 Some of them very closely matched, but they
21 were not in alignment, so we had our educator preparation
22 entities over here preparing our teachers to do this, but
23 the expectations of an evaluation system that really help
24 support and coach teachers over here. So that was really
25 part of the alignment was simply a literally we take it



1 out, and we replace it with the -- with a standard to the
2 expectations of today.

3 MS. RANKIN: So I understand the
4 accountability and -- and 191, but if this was done a
5 couple of years ago, or started a year ago, what about
6 the standards that we have in place now that the students
7 are being tested on?

8 MS. O'NEILL: The --

9 MS. RANKIN: Is this aligned with them,
10 and -- and I'm specifically thinking the technology
11 that's involved in these, and -- and the teachers not
12 being able to use it, or being able to use it when they
13 come out of school. I'm -- I'm sure you have thoroughly
14 exhausted that.

15 MS. O'NEILL: We -- we have indeed aligned
16 the standards to our Colorado academic standards. And
17 that was one of the reasons that we -- we took at some of
18 our others that were not part of Colorado academic
19 standards, so we did an alignment with those. And then
20 we've also taken a look at some of our national
21 standards, and ISTE happens to be one of them, which is
22 the International Society of Technology Education. So
23 that actually has to be -- that's one of them for us to
24 be able to align our standards for our teacher prep
25 programs.



1 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

2 MS. O'NEILL: We tried -- I -- I do want to
3 say, just as a short aside, we tried very hard not to
4 make these large scale changes that would drastically
5 impact if we did not need to. And I don't think there
6 was any area that we could go down that said this a
7 completely -- a whole -- a whole new program that was not
8 part of the case. Again, that kind of sits in that
9 second bucket, as we go forward.

10 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Where does a -- which
11 bucket does it exist that if teachers need to be trained
12 in a certain way -- some of these things that we're doing
13 now cannot be done Wednesday afternoon during teacher
14 development, and was that taken into consideration?

15 MS. O'NEILL: So the -- the rules that we
16 have today are really around our educator preparation
17 programs, and how we license a teacher. And there was no
18 conversation, because it sits in statute -- no
19 conversation really about professional development, or
20 anything that runs along that line. And that -- you
21 know, some of that is -- is such a local control
22 decision, and so many districts have that choice how the
23 professional development in-service day to make that
24 decision. There was really no conversation at a State
25 level around that.



1 I do think there was plenty of feedback that
2 we heard from folks talking about renewal of licenses.
3 It is not sitting on the table today. And about how do
4 we renew licenses, or what kind of levers; and I will
5 always say that we have a strong lever to renew a license
6 for our professional development, what it means really in
7 today's world to have professional development. That is
8 not something on the table today, but we have heard
9 feedback about it. Yes.

10 MS. RANKIN: And I just have one more
11 question.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, proceed.

13 MS. RANKIN: How many different, alternate,
14 or teacher's licenses -- I've asked this before -- what
15 are the numbers on that? How many different ones do we
16 have in our state?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Alternate --

18 MS. O'NEILL: Clarify your question. How
19 many different programs do we have for that?

20 MS. RANKIN: Uh-huh. Like, if I --

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Endorsements are you --

22 MS. RANKIN: Endorsements. Thank you.
23 That's the word.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Endorsements or
25 alternative prep?



1 MS. RANKIN: That's the word.

2 MS. O'NEILL: Number of endorsements. I'm
3 going to turn around for a second.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's
5 endorsements she wants.

6 MS. RANKIN: You're right -- you're right.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You want alternative.

8 MS. O'NEILL: I was going to say just
9 alternative high 40s. Thank you. Approximately in the
10 high 40s. Number of endorsements. Now, the -- the
11 variation associated with that could be pretty -- pretty
12 large.

13 MS. RANKIN: And -- and those come up
14 as -- as needed -- as necessary, specifically from the
15 districts?

16 MS. O'NEILL: Individual endorsements, yes.

17 MS. RANKIN: Okay. So -- so there's, like,
18 40 endorsements. Is that -- and then, of course, the
19 alternate license is different?

20 MS. O'NEILL: Alternative license is the
21 same. It's just the pathway in which you get to the end,
22 so our current -- our four-year -- what you might
23 consider a traditional program, really is a four-year
24 program in the grand scheme of things. Some of them are
25 actually three, some are four --



1 MS. RANKIN: Yeah.

2 MS. O'NEILL: -- some are five --

3 MS. RANKIN: Sure.

4 MS. O'NEILL: -- but when we look at our
5 alternative programs there are two types of alternative
6 programs. One is a pathway that is a one-year pathway,
7 which means I am on the job. I am already teaching in my
8 classroom. I am the teacher of record. And I am getting
9 the pedagogical training behind that.

10 MS. RANKIN: That one year is going to give
11 it -- give me that background.

12 MS. O'NEILL: One year is going to give me
13 that background.

14 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

15 MS. O'NEILL: And then there is a -- a two-
16 year program that also does that --

17 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

18 MS. O'NEILL: -- that's more of a teacher-
19 in-residence model.

20 MS. RANKIN: How many of those do we have in
21 our state?

22 MS. O'NEILL: In alternative in general, I
23 believe there is 24 right now.

24 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

25 MS. O'NEILL: Everyday people are asking for



1 more, and more, and more. We have at least three sitting
2 on the counter right now with folks asking can we become
3 an alternative agency.

4 MS. RANKIN: Okay. Thank you.

5 MS. FLORES: And does that include the six
6 weekend administrator certifications?

7 MS. O'NEILL: That it -- it is inclusive in
8 that, and it depends. Some of them are cohort based
9 educational administration programs from our institutes
10 of higher -- higher education that may be, like I said, a
11 year, or year-and-a-half program, so some are
12 traditional, and some are alternative.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perhaps, the easiest way
14 to clarify this for the -- the -- the members, because
15 this is extensive would be if you would take areas where
16 there have been a change made that would require -- and
17 let's just use the interpreter as the example.

18 MS. O'NEILL: Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: If there's a change that
20 affects the interpreters -- and I presume that's an
21 endorsement -- that you would list interpreters -- the
22 interpreter endorsement, and the consequences. Current
23 licensees would have to do X to maintain that
24 endorsement. Future endorsements that we increase the
25 requirements in this fashion. There's more -- more



1 coursework, more something.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Higher score.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Higher score. So that we
4 could -- I think the only way we're ever going to be able
5 to evaluate it is on that basis. And if you take -- I
6 don't know how many of the 40 endorsements are affected
7 by this --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do they have a test?

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- but, you know, which
10 are the ones that are affected; what's -- how -- what's
11 the -- what's the consequence of the change, both to the
12 education institution that is providing the training, and
13 to the applicant. And I think if we get it in that -- in
14 that framework, it'll be a lot simpler for us to judge is
15 this too onerous. And -- and if that change is required
16 by statute to make it more onerous, that's one thing. If
17 it's a gratuitous change being brought about by aligning
18 with -- and -- and I'm not a great fan of national --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exams.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- well, not exams, but
21 probably the best example is you always have the response
22 time for fire fighters that the appropriate response time
23 guess who sets that. That's a group made up of insurance
24 company and firemen. They don't necessarily share the
25 same interests as the taxpayer.



1 So we need to -- if we're going to align
2 with some in -- some national norm, I'd like to know
3 that's the reason. If it's statutorily required, that's
4 entirely different reason. We have to do that. But
5 anything that's gratuitous should be noted. If we don't
6 have to do it, we should take a look -- a hard look at
7 whether or not we do it.

8 So I think if you can put it in that frame
9 way. This document, because it doesn't name -- it just
10 doesn't get to those specifics, so I think when
11 you're -- when you're ready -- when you have that, we'll
12 put this back on the agenda for approval, and assuming
13 we've had an adequate time to look at that particular
14 thing.

15 In the meantime, are there further
16 questions, before we take testimony?

17 Is there anyone present who would like to
18 testify? And apparently we have a list, Ms. Burdsall.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Leilani Johnson.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Leilani.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Did I miss -- I apologize
22 if I mispronounced.

23 MS. JOHNSON: It's close enough.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Close enough for
25 government work. Okay.



1 MS. JOHNSON: Thank you. Well, good
2 afternoon, Mr. Chair, and Members of the Board. I really
3 appreciate this opportunity to address the issue of
4 educational interpreter qualifications. My name is Dr.
5 Leilani Johnson, and I'm the director of the Department
6 of American Sign Language and Interpreting Studies at the
7 University of Northern Colorado.

8 Since 1993 I have been engaged in developing
9 and technologically delivering educational opportunities
10 for individuals who want to be highly qualified
11 educational interpreters working with students who are
12 deaf and hard of hearing. I have managed contracts with
13 22 state education agencies. We have solicited and
14 administered almost \$20 million in federal and state
15 funds that paid for the education of those individuals.
16 And so this is something that I feel very passionate
17 about.

18 In 1997 Colorado had much to be proud of,
19 because we were the third state in the nation to set a
20 standard for educational interpreters. But today we
21 can't celebrate that achievement, because we have two
22 decades of research that shows the barriers that these
23 children face from the standards that are currently in
24 place.

25 The research is so overwhelming that our



1 professional origination requires a bachelor's degree in
2 order to sit for a national exam. Our accrediting body
3 will no longer accredit two-year interpreter preparation
4 programs. And the U.S. Department of Education will not
5 award personnel preparation funds, unless the institution
6 has a four-year interpreter education program. So times
7 have changed since 1997.

8 An educational interpreter is classified in
9 IDEA as related service personnel. In Colorado it's
10 known as a specialized service provider. Other services
11 in this category include: the school nurse; the school
12 counselor; occupational therapist; right. And all of
13 these require a minimum of a rigorous pre-service
14 baccalaureate program in the discipline, an internship in
15 an educational setting, documentation of their
16 professional competence, an induction experience in the
17 school system, and then continuing professional
18 development. They're also held accountable for the
19 quality of their services through some kind of
20 established standardized evaluation system.

21 Educational interpreters must be
22 required -- must be recognized as the special services
23 providers that the law identifies them as; and as such,
24 they need to be held accountable to these same five
25 minimum standards. This matter can't be postponed any



1 longer, and I respectfully request that the Board task
2 CDE Licensing under Dr. Colleen O'Neil to facilitate
3 stakeholder meetings at the earliest possible time in
4 order to align the requirements for educational
5 interpreters, just as they have with all the rest of the
6 disciplines that support children.

7 Colorado students, who are deaf and hard of
8 hearing, deserve a highly qualified educational
9 interpreter. Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

11 Next, Sara -- Sara Kennedy.

12 MS. KENNEDY: Hello. Thank you for the
13 opportunity to talk with you today. I'm wearing two hats
14 today. I'm the mom of a deaf child making her way
15 through a Colorado Springs School District and I'm the
16 director of a parent resource group called Hands and
17 Voices that represents families raising deaf and hard of
18 hearing children all over the State of Colorado.

19 For our kids, who are deaf or hard of
20 hearing, and use sign language, the interpreter is the
21 main connection, not only to the school community, and
22 the people, but the written materials that a child must
23 learn to master. They're learning two languages:
24 American Sign Language and English. And the complexity
25 comes when 95 percent of those children are born to



1 hearing parents, like myself, who've never met a deaf
2 person, who never used sign language before. I taught
3 myself a little braille in high school, but I was really
4 on the wrong track.

5 Hearing loss is this amazing, complex
6 journey of language development. And when I think about
7 folks with AA degrees, it reminds me of the skill and
8 level of a receptionist in front of all the people that
9 person must meet in a medical office. You know, we put
10 people in the public with the least training, and the
11 least preparation in the most important tasks sometimes.
12 And that -- that just reminds me of that role of the
13 interpreter.

14 Sometimes a child develops understandable
15 speech, but they still, because there's no hearing aid or
16 equipment that has yet been invented that takes account
17 for the fan noise sitting next to the exhaust system on
18 the projector in a classroom, or the noise and the echo
19 from the hard surfaces. They just can't receive all the
20 information from a teacher auditorily. You know, why ask
21 kids to use their most difficult sense to get their
22 information.

23 Even more damaging, I think, is the
24 assumption that if we give a child an interpreter, we've
25 given them good access.



1 Placed with an interpreter, who has an AA
2 degree, and an average of a 3.1 score on the assessment,
3 this child is believed to have access, but in reality,
4 research shows they get less than 65 percent of the
5 message from the certified teacher in the classroom. Let
6 alone, from the ability to overhear everyone else in the
7 classroom discuss a text, or even talk about what are you
8 doing this weekend, can you come to my birthday party,
9 all of that.

10 I could tell you more stories. I can point
11 to other states, like our neighbors in Nebraska, who are
12 raising their standards right now, as we speak. I could
13 talk about the perfect storm coming with the Americans
14 with Disabilities Act that in December released an
15 opinion guidance paper that says our kids deserve equal
16 access to their hearing peers. That's different than the
17 IDEA that asks for a basic level of opportunity. Equal
18 access. Think about that. Think if there was a deaf
19 person in this room. It's not just placing an
20 interpreter here, but the quality of the audiovisuals,
21 and the ability of that interpreter to prepare the
22 message with this very complex task.

23 I see I'm out of time, but I want to say
24 this is a good chance to make a legacy for the Board.
25 You can make a difference here in one measurable part of



1 deaf education. Thank you so much.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

3 Donna Trujillo.

4 MS. TRUJILLO: Thank you, Mr. Chair,
5 Commissioner Asp, and State Board Members for the
6 opportunity to provide testimony today. My name is Donna
7 Trujillo, and I am a director of personalized learning
8 with Douglas County School District.

9 I am here to represent the -- I am testing
10 on behalf of the consortium of Special Education
11 Directors formed in 2004 to help policy makers understand
12 issues related to children with disabilities. Our
13 membership consists of 100 percent of the districts and
14 administrative units in Colorado.

15 This testimony also represents CASE, CASB,
16 CEA, the Colorado BOCES Association, and the Colorado
17 Rural Schools Alliance. Each of our organizations
18 appreciates the opportunity to give feedback to CDE
19 staff, and the current proposed language reflects
20 consideration of some of the concerns we raised. We also
21 recognize the work of many stakeholders that has gone
22 into the proposed rules.

23 Each of our organizations has a strong
24 support for quality services for students are deaf and
25 hard of hearing -- or hard of hearing. In no way, should



1 our concerns be construed as lacking support for these
2 students. As stated in our two letters, we have serious
3 concerns about considering raising the standards for
4 educational interpreters and transliterators.

5 Over the years, there has been a significant
6 state-wide shortage in this area. Increasing the
7 requirements for certification from the current 3.5
8 minimum score to 4.0, and from an associate's degree to a
9 bachelor's will create an even greater shortage in
10 qualified staff than currently exists.

11 Even with the current standards, the issues
12 facing districts and are used to solve the shortage are
13 complex. This month the consortium completed a state-
14 wide survey of districts and found, with 85 percent of
15 districts responding, that this -- at the start of the
16 school year, there were 56 interpreter vacancies state
17 wide. And there are still 46 positions vacant, both in
18 rural and urban areas. These vacancies exist, despite
19 exhaustive efforts to recruit and retain interpreters to
20 hire from private agencies, and to reassign staff with
21 signing skills.

22 According to the -- to a preliminary special
23 education physical advisory committee analysis of CDE
24 data, there's a \$520 million gap in funding necessary to
25 meet current requirements. Increased qualifications for



1 interpreters will also have the unintended consequence of
2 requiring local districts N.A. used to fund the widening
3 gap.

4 Currently, many districts report spending
5 tens of thousands of dollars beyond their budgets since
6 the start of the school year to bring in private agency
7 staff, some of whom, don't meet the current State
8 qualifications, including from hiring from an agency all
9 the way in Nebraska. Others report having to send
10 students to the Colorado School for the Deaf and Blind,
11 because there are no educational interpreters in this
12 area.

13 One director reminds us all that the highest
14 cost is more than financial: it's that children are
15 separated from their families and communities. Districts
16 in rural areas report a common theme of no applicants or
17 private agency staff available for contracting at any
18 cost, and they often have to use paraprofessionals with
19 limited signing skills. Despite active recruitment, and
20 advertising, these vacancies are ongoing from year-to-
21 year.

22 We request -- we respect the intent of
23 increasing the quality of interpreter performance, but
24 increasing requirements will only increase the current
25 critical shortage. We urge that the current requirements



1 remain in place.

2 We support continued, ongoing, and intensive
3 professional developments, effort -- efforts,
4 differentiated by region to build existing capacity. We
5 also urge continued partnerships with CDE, higher
6 education, and local districts, and AUs to implement
7 creative practices for recruitment, and retention of
8 interpreters.

9 Shifting gears a little bit. In a second
10 area of significant concern for the consortium, we
11 appreciate that CDE recognized the need to revise and
12 correct the proposed rules for the director of gifted
13 education endorsement. This entailed correcting proposed
14 changes to the director of special education endorsement
15 Section 10.05; however, we noted that the proposed
16 language in Section 10.05 subparagraph 2 includes a
17 requirement to have completed a minimum of two years'
18 experience working with students with exceptional
19 academic and talented aptitude.

20 To many in the special education field, this
21 would mean students who are gifted and talented. This is
22 also the same language proposed as the requirement for
23 the director of gifted education endorsement in Section
24 10.06, subparagraph 2.

25 We strongly oppose the proposed language



1 change, and urge that it remain as it is currently
2 written requiring directors of special education to have
3 a minimum of two years working with students with
4 disabilities.

5 All of us represented in this testimony
6 retain committed -- remain committed to work with CDE
7 staff around solutions to these important issues. Thank
8 you for your time and your consideration.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Trujillo.
10 Appreciate your -- your comments.

11 All right. I think, at this point, we will
12 take this off this table. We will ask staff to prepare
13 the document in the form that I -- that I requested, and
14 make sure to flag areas where there are, not only change,
15 but additionally, where there's clearly controversy where
16 we received conflicting comments.

17 MS. O'NEILL: Feedback.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

19 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you.

21 All right. We'll proceed to -- where was I?
22 There we are. We'll proceed to item 7, postsecondary and
23 workforce readiness discussion.

24 So all right. Mr. Commissioner, would you
25 like to introduce this particular program?



1 MR. ASP: You'll hear from Gretchen Morgan
2 and Misti Ruthven. In the process, you heard it from
3 Lieutenant Governor today, process of revising the
4 current definition of postsecondary workforce and
5 workforce readiness. The Colorado Commission on Higher
6 Education has been working on that process parallel to
7 you, and I'll turn it over to Gretchen Morgan to get us
8 started, and to --

9 MS. MORGAN: Thank you.

10 So hello again. Gretchen Morgan --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Welcome back.

12 MS. MORGAN: -- from the Department. And
13 today this is just an information item for you. We'll be
14 bringing you a decision in December, but didn't want to
15 do that without having some time just for you to get a
16 little bit of background. So today is just brief
17 background.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you say you'll be
19 coming back with a decision?

20 MS. MORGAN: A decision item for you in
21 December.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, decision item.

23 MS. MORGAN: I, unfortunately, am not the
24 person with the authority to make the decision. That
25 will be fun if I had all of those.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

2 MS. MORGAN: Yes, it is you has that
3 authority. It is you.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go for it.

5 MS. MORGAN: So quick background. As the
6 lieutenant governor referenced this morning, every six
7 years statute requires that this definition is revisited,
8 and this is the definition, which is mutually determined
9 actually by this Board and the Colorado Commission on
10 Higher Education. So we have begun this process really
11 last spring of trying to revisit the current definition
12 so that we're ready to have a new one on time, based on
13 statutory requirements.

14 The definition up here is the one that is
15 current, which was created in 2009. And I'm going to
16 start to talk to you now a little bit about the process
17 we've gone through to update that.

18 So the process really has had two
19 components. One of which is convening and one of which
20 is surveying. And so this first slide is about the
21 convening portion of things. We have had two different
22 face-to-face convenings with groups of over 200
23 stakeholders, including people in all of these
24 categories. And I'm excited to say that two of the
25 elected officials were Dr. Schroeder and Dr. Flores, who



1 joined us for the second of these two convenings, so
2 thank you very much for spending time with us on that.
3 Very much appreciated.

4 But the goal was to try and make sure that
5 we had a really well rounded group of people contributing
6 to this conversation. There had been some memories from
7 some people of the last process feeling like that maybe
8 was a little too focused on education and didn't have
9 some of these other people participating, and so we tried
10 to just be very representative in who we had at the
11 table. And I'm pleased to say that we really did get
12 strong participation from all of these different
13 stakeholder groups. In fact, I think some of them may
14 want to come and talk to you in December when you have
15 this as a decision, because they were deeply involved.

16 So as I said before, in addition to those
17 convenings, we had a series of surveys. So the first
18 survey we did was prior to any of the convenings, and it
19 was asking people to just give feedback about components
20 from the existing definition that they really felt
21 strongly about; that they would like this group, as they
22 convened to consider, and take seriously as they sort of
23 looked forward. We shared that information with the
24 stakeholder group the first time we convened them.

25 And then after that, as the groups are sort



1 of started raising up ideas about definitions, we had a
2 second survey. This was after the second convening, so
3 we had maybe eight or so groups that each had generated a
4 proposed definition in the second convening. We put that
5 out in a broad survey to people. We had -- we sent it to
6 around 2,000 people. We got about 500 back, which I
7 actually felt pretty great about actually. That's pretty
8 good return on a survey.

9 And in that survey we had these two things
10 come out as the -- the, you know, most popular, I guess,
11 of the options among the different definitions generated
12 by these working groups. And so these two definitions,
13 which I'm not going to read to you, because you have them
14 in front of you, and everyone else has them in the Board
15 docs, were the two most strongly recommended, and they
16 were equally recommended. So this is -- these two
17 together represent 69 percent of all votes, and they were
18 both, you know, 34 percent and a little bit of change to
19 get to that 69, so they were very evenly liked from
20 people, which of course puts us in a conundrum, because
21 then it's, like, well, which one is best.

22 So we did what people often in this
23 situation try to do, which is to combine them, or at
24 least to combine the key components of them without
25 creating something which is monstrously long. You can



1 decide how well you think we did with that. So we have
2 here at the top of this slide our best effort to try and
3 pull together the key components of these definitions.
4 And when we shared this with CCHE some people who I
5 presume are language arts and English professors -- I'm
6 just going to say that's who that was -- came up to us
7 and enthusiastically offered us some further edits. And
8 so what you have --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Enthusiastically.

10 MS. MORGAN: They did. They were excited
11 for a chance to do some editing. I think it's fun for
12 them.

13 So they suggested some changes, and this
14 bottom one that's here is -- is what came back from that
15 discussion with those folks from CCHE.

16 So what we've done now is, prior to meeting
17 with CCHE, we had put out, you know, the two first front
18 runners, and this combined possibility for a final
19 survey, which you all also have received the link to, and
20 we're hoping that we get great response to that one just
21 like we did the last time. And we anticipate we come
22 back to you in December we'll have two pieces of
23 information for you: one will be the result of that
24 final survey; and the second will be what CCHE decided to
25 do with this because they're going to take it on for a



1 decision at their December meeting, which comes just days
2 before your December meeting.

3 And I want to say in terms of process, plan
4 A of process is, you each consider this separately, and
5 then maybe there is a awesome governmental process
6 miracle in which you agree to the same definition, which
7 would be lovely. We're trying that because the logistics
8 of getting you all together actually as a joint meeting
9 are just very difficult, and so we thought we would try
10 it as a plan A. If that doesn't work, of course -- and
11 if you have strong feelings about what they bring
12 forward, and you want to suggest some changes, we will
13 pull you together, and convene you as a full group to be
14 able to sort that out, and come to some agreement. But
15 we thought we would just start with this method, and see
16 if that worked just in the interest of everyone's time.

17 So that's what we have right now. And CCHE
18 maybe will be the only one I read out because it seems
19 like the leading contender right now; although, it'll be
20 exciting to find out when I come back in December, but
21 currently this is what they've generated.

22 "In partnerships with families,
23 communities, schools, and businesses, Colorado high
24 school graduates demonstrate the competencies (knowledge
25 and skills) needed to succeed in postsecondary settings



1 and to advance in economically viable career pathways
2 both as lifelong learners and contributing citizens." So
3 there you have it.

4 So today, if you want to ask questions about
5 this -- about the process, or what's in here, you're
6 welcome to do that, but as I said, mostly, I just wanted
7 to make sure today I could give you some brief background
8 on this, so this isn't coming to you for a decision in
9 December without you having had some background.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions on this issue?

11 Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, I'll pass on the
13 questions, but I'll comment --

14 MS. MORGAN: Great.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: -- having participated in
16 this. That I certainly sensed a change in the comments
17 from the higher ed folks. I think there's actually been
18 a shift in many of the members of the higher education
19 community who've come forward to be -- to be able to
20 speak to something beyond college. And I found that to
21 be extremely positive, because there, for such a long
22 time, we just talked about getting our kids to and
23 through college, and not beyond. And the conversation,
24 at least at my table, was this definition has got to talk
25 about the fact that there is life -- we hope -- for our



1 kids past college.

2 MS. MORGAN: Right.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: And that they -- and -- and
4 how they move on in their careers, et cetera. So I just
5 thought that was a -- it was -- to me, it was pretty
6 dramatic having participated in all this kind of stuff
7 since forever -- since the '90s when we were doing
8 standards. I think that's very, very helpful.

9 MS. MORGAN: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you talk about
12 what -- where this definition shows up, and the work that
13 it impinges on?

14 MS. MORGAN: Oh, sure.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: So obviously, in our
16 standards it's woven throughout. There are a number of
17 documents that will align with this, and interpret these
18 words in very specific ways --

19 MS. MORGAN: Yeah, so --

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- (indiscernible) tentacles.

21 MS. MORGAN: Uh-huh. That's a great
22 question. The tentacles of this, in terms of K-12, are
23 mostly in connections to standards; although, that is
24 currently, there's a set of terms that are called 21st
25 century skills in the standards, and there's something



1 that relates to this definition to those skills. So it's
2 not exactly in the standards, but I think there is meant
3 to be some relationship between the two.

4 The second one is actually in the graduation
5 guidelines. This is one of the definitions referenced in
6 that statute, as a thing that local boards should
7 consider in -- in coming up with their graduation
8 requirements.

9 There are ideas out there from CCHE about
10 ways they might use this too.

11 I don't know, you could speak to those.

12 But we just had some conversations with them
13 about, you know, as they look at entrance requirements
14 and processes like that in the future, like, no specific
15 commitment, or interest in anything in the very short
16 term, but in the longer term looking at how this might
17 impact how institutions would think about entrance
18 requirements for students. Largely, trying to be
19 accommodating also of things that did come up in the
20 graduation guidelines conversations about competencies,
21 and wanting to have ways to recognize those for
22 graduates, and for entrance for them.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. So may I follow up?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please.

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: So you're saying the two ways



1 this definition shows up in our specific work in K-12
2 are -- are standards, and also high school graduation
3 rights -- right now?

4 MS. MORGAN: Uh-huh. Right now.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right? And so would
6 we -- would the standards have to be rewritten, based on
7 this language, as they align with the 21st century
8 skills? I know they're not the same, but they are
9 aligned?

10 MS. MORGAN: Uh-huh. I think -- and this
11 is -- I'm talking a little bit out of turn. You can
12 correct me if I'm wrong on this, but standards revision
13 has its own required timeline in statute, so when we get
14 to that timeline, and there is that opportunity for
15 revision, one thing that process could do is, to consider
16 this, an alignment with this.

17 Is that accurate?

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: And -- and as far as the
19 meaning of the words, like when we say economically
20 viable career paths, I mean, on the face of it, who
21 wouldn't want that?

22 MS. MORGAN: Uh-huh.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: But underneath it then, you
24 know, you're pushing certain careers, and not always
25 looking at some of the statistics behind STEM and



1 engineering. That's been such a big issue; that we need
2 more students who are engineers, and yet, when you look
3 at the jobs out there in the -- the - really the market
4 being flooded with folks with engineering, from what this
5 article was saying, I mean, I just wonder what are the
6 unintended consequences of this more specific language.

7 I mean, there's a part of me that feels like
8 leave it as broad as possible, and let the districts
9 define it, but when you put economically viable, somebody
10 has got to define that. Somebody has got to track that;
11 and how long is this career economically viable; under
12 what conditions is it viable; and then that drives what
13 schools are doing, and what high school graduation
14 requirements are looking like. So I mean, inside this
15 language are, you know, consequences because of the
16 definitions.

17 Are there other words that jump out, in
18 terms of how people are wanting to define these? I mean,
19 in that respect, I'd like to -- to have that language
20 excised, only because it's -- it's -- it's -- the way
21 it's defined will drive behaviors that are -- are hard to
22 track in a sense, you know, as far as how effective that
23 language is.

24 MS. FLORES: May I just say --

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.



1 MS. FLORES: Yes. I think you're missing
2 a -- a big part of -- well, you're missing individuals.
3 You -- I mean, you have individuals -- this is the -- the
4 whole thing about life is about an individual searching
5 for meaning. And -- and families have -- have their
6 meaning, and they want to indoctrinate, as to
7 communities, and schools, and businesses, and such.

8 Can I use the word indoctrinate, because,
9 you know, they do? They have --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

11 MS. FLORES: -- but an individual is a
12 person who really wants to look for something that is,
13 you know, theirs, and so I think you need to add an
14 individually there. And I think -- I mean, when you look
15 back on, you know, curricula, and you look at what is
16 education for. Some people would say, first of all, come
17 see individual, society, or you have knowledge. I mean,
18 you're looking for knowledge. At least, that's how I
19 studied it. And -- and so you -- the individual is just
20 big -- it's missing from here. And you -- we need to put
21 it in there.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: I was just looking at an
24 excerpt from a -- a screenshot from the United States
25 Department of Labor talking about enabling workforce data



1 to be matched with education data to ultimately create
2 longitudinal data systems with individual level
3 information beginning in kindergarten through
4 postsecondary schooling all the way through entry and
5 sustained participation in the workforce in employment
6 services system. And that's from the U.S. Department of
7 Labor's -- Labor's own website.

8 And so that -- this language, I think,
9 drives that longitudinal data system and the linkage
10 between K-12 and the workforce, and following a child
11 from kindergarten into the workforce, so I guess I -- as
12 I look at the language, it seems innocuous enough, except
13 that underneath it is this whole initiative to link
14 education with workforce data. And I just think the way
15 we define that, we have to be wise about the
16 implications. And I'm wrestling with this.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Further -- yes, Ms.
18 Rankin.

19 MS. RANKIN: Beat this horse a little more.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You're going to keep it
21 up, I'm going to tell my jokes.

22 MS. RANKIN: I'll stop. I was just
23 wondering is it in statute that we have to change the
24 definition we already have? Is that what we're going for
25 here?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We just have to review
2 it.

3 MS. MORGAN: It's in statute that we need to
4 review it. When we engage people --

5 MS. RANKIN: So --

6 MS. MORGAN: -- and ask them about
7 reviewing, this is what they suggested.

8 MS. RANKIN: And then we can decide to stay
9 with the old one if we wanted to?

10 MS. MORGAN: If you wanted to, you could
11 choose to do that.

12 MS. RANKIN: Okay. I -- I just wanted to
13 make sure that was clear, because it
14 just -- it -- it -- it -- we're at a high level -- we're
15 30,000 feet in 2009 seems to be just fine, but --

16 MS. MORGAN: And that's up to you and CCHE
17 to determine --

18 MS. RANKIN: -- (indiscernible).

19 MS. MORGAN: -- mutually.

20 MS. RANKIN: Yeah.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, I will tell my joke.

22 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, I'm just kidding.

24 Just (indiscernible).

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll let you --



1 MS. RANKIN: I'm done.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- as soon as we're
3 done.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, right after you're
5 finished.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No problem.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

8 MS. GOFF: I think this may be redundant,
9 which makes me a joke, I suppose, but how does this six
10 years from now, let's say, no matter decision we make,
11 leave alone or move ahead with something different, we
12 have -- is 2022, and we will have -- we have graduation
13 guidelines, and a whole kind of new cycle of, like,
14 starting in 2021 with the graduating class of -- so -- so
15 there will have been a switch to, at least, the
16 graduation guideline picture.

17 I'm -- I mean, I don't think -- because I
18 don't -- I don't tend to go down those little
19 troughs -- I don't think this has any impact on that.
20 I -- I -- to me, they're -- they're high level enough
21 that every -- each of them can afford to have them go on.
22 But I'm just curious as to how -- and I know you will do
23 this -- I'm curious as to how this is communicated to
24 districts, to parents, to kids, to those who are involved
25 in ICAP implementation and delivery, and to other



1 interested and -- and important entities in all of this
2 work, and especially students?

3 So you know, trying to -- this is what
4 we're -- we're -- our state says it's the way it ought to
5 be for your -- what it means to be ready for life
6 (indiscernible). Just -- just trying to keep the
7 timelines in place.

8 MS. MORGAN: Right.

9 MS. GOFF: I don't know whether that's, you
10 know, a convenient, whether that's the most efficient
11 human friendly way to go about winding up, make sure
12 everything is organized, and -- or not. I mean, you
13 know, but -- but to me, it's not an issue. I just wanted
14 to emphasize a point, and I'm really not doing it well I
15 feel like.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think you're doing
17 great.

18 MS. GOFF: Just make sure that they are
19 together, and that the messaging, and the communication
20 is -- makes sense to people. That's (indiscernible) --

21 MS. MORGAN: Yeah. And I would say --

22 MS. GOFF: Actually, that sounded a like
23 (indiscernible) --

24 MS. MORGAN: That's okay. I just
25 once -- once you all adopt a definition, our work with it



1 would be to support people in understanding it,
2 and -- and determining what they want to do with it in
3 their local graduation requirements. That would be the
4 most pressing process associated with this. And our job
5 would be to just inform them about this and be a resource
6 to them, as they consider these things, but obviously,
7 those are totally local decisions about how they would go
8 about making use of this.

9 MS. GOFF: And I -- I will say really
10 quickly, that the only -- well, I got a few -- a handful
11 of comments, or just comments back after this went out
12 for public participation, and the only one -- the really
13 most substantial one had to do with where in there can we
14 put it's a partnership is part of it -- very important,
15 but how do we work in the idea of collaboration. To
16 continue to push the idea that this is a joint effort
17 among -- among the community, and the -- and educators,
18 and students, and business people, and that's all.

19 I'm -- I'm not (indiscernible) one way or
20 another right now, but that word comes up a lot.
21 (Indiscernible) this one thing. Some people see them the
22 same. Some people don't.

23 MS. MORGAN: As you might imagine, in this
24 process there was a lot of discussion about settled
25 perceptions of differences among words, right. This is



1 always how this goes when you're defining things, so
2 there was some discussion about that.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: So I wanted to try to answer
5 your question about why would we change it. And I think
6 it is in those first words. Rather than just than just
7 saying, this is what a graduate demonstrates, and not
8 indicating, Joyce, who does that, there wasn't -- there
9 was a desire to say that this is not just the
10 school -- the high school, for example, that's going to
11 come up with this college and career ready kid, but that
12 it's going to be in partnership with the family, the
13 community, business, et cetera. That -- I think that's
14 why it's been --

15 MS. RANKIN: That's how it originated?

16 MS. SCHROEDER: I mean, I think
17 that's -- that's the substantive change between what we
18 have, and there were folks that felt pretty strongly --

19 MS. MORGAN: There were.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: -- that it's not just the
21 responsibility of the high school to ensure that our kids
22 are college and career ready, but that it's a broader
23 responsibility and a part of the process.

24 MS. RANKIN: So you're saying that's the
25 reason why we're changing it is because --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: That's the reason for the
2 change that you see, not the reason --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: -- why we're changing it.
5 That was somebody else that decided that, but in looking
6 at the original definition there was a desire to express
7 that this is not just the responsibility of our high
8 schools, but that it is the -- that it is a broader
9 responsibility to prepare our kids.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. And I haven't searched
12 the CDE website on this, but if I were to look at the
13 website under this initiative, would there be white
14 papers and documents that would inform this discussion,
15 because people didn't come into a room and just tweak
16 this language to say hey, we should engage parents, and
17 families. I mean, look at the Office of Career,
18 Technical, and Adult Education, some of their
19 publications. I mean, there's a lot out there that
20 really is underneath this work, and so I think it kind of
21 leaves us a little bit out of step if we're just thinking
22 this is all we're doing. Really, it's more than that.
23 And I just wondered if you have those papers on your
24 website linked, or -- and I think that would give us
25 context for the meaning of this change, beyond just hey,



1 absolutely let's pull families, and communities into it.

2 MS. MORGAN: Yeah, so I'm sorry. I was just
3 conferring on the side here. But I don't know that those
4 are posted on our website right now, but it's very easy
5 to provide to you all of the materials that were provided
6 to the group before their first meeting, and during their
7 first meeting, which was just like there were people from
8 these various backgrounds. There also was information
9 and research from a whole bunch of different backgrounds
10 as the group considered. And so that was definitely part
11 of the process, and very happy to share with you links to
12 all of those resources.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. I think that's helpful
14 to us as we look at this --

15 MS. MORGAN: Sure.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- kind of information,
17 because it appears one thing, and is that one level, but
18 actually, what's behind it is a fairly intense process
19 with a lot of research, position papers, white papers
20 that others have considered in adjusting this language.
21 And I think we need to be privy to that, as we look at
22 the changes.

23 MS. MORGAN: Fair.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Further discussion?

25 MS. FLORES: Oh, one thing.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores.

2 MS. FLORES: It's language, and I -- I don't
3 know why we would put competencies in there to
4 demonstrate knowledge and skills. I think there probably
5 is something more there, but why put it in parenthesis
6 when that's what we mean?

7 MS. MORGAN: I -- I'm going to dangerously
8 try to speak on behalf of the professors who spoke with
9 us at our last meeting, so I don't want to misrepresent
10 them, but I believe what they were saying was, the
11 term -- the term competency -- the group that produced
12 this talked a lot about what competency means, and they
13 said they would like some parenthetical reference to
14 these things, as sort of components of that, so that the
15 word competency was understood more clearly in the
16 definition.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Maybe they could just
18 take out the parenthesis.

19 MS. FLORES: See. And -- and I -- I
20 think -- I think common people --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: More parents would --

22 MS. FLORES: -- I think the common person
23 would say take out competencies, because, you know,
24 they're not going to understand that; and so when we know
25 that -- that this is what -- this is what is me -- is



1 meant knowledge and skills. Competencies is just, to me,
2 it's a word that kind of can be measured, but I don't
3 like that. I don't like things that humans --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm not telling her.

5 MS. FLORES: -- so I mean, it -- it goes
6 back to something that is not positive. So demonstrates
7 knowledge and skills, and there should be something else,
8 but --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You write it.

10 MS. FLORES: -- sold.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Any -- any further
12 discussion on this topic? No, okay. Good.

13 All right.

14 MS. MORGAN: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let's move on to -- and
16 you'll bring us back -- what are you bringing back to us
17 exactly?

18 MS. MORGAN: We are going to bring back to
19 you what CCHE determines, which may be just like what
20 they already determined, or maybe different. We'll share
21 with them your feedback, although, you didn't, like,
22 agree as a group to that feedback, so --

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So if we just disagreed --

24 MS. MORGAN: -- I'll have to decide what to
25 do with that.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- for the hell of it, we
2 can create a crisis.

3 MS. MORGAN: And you --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perfect.

5 MS. MORGAN: -- you could do that.

6 And then we'll also bring with you the
7 survey results from the --

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, we can.

9 MS. MORGAN: -- final survey, where we put
10 that final definition --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can take that hammer
12 away from you --

13 MS. MORGAN: -- out to people.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Why?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- pretty soon.

16 MS. MORGAN: In December.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Let's -- let's
18 take a five-minute break, if we can. Thank you.

19 (Meeting adjourned)

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