



**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 4

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: Why don't we go ahead and  
2 start. We'll proceed with accountability pilots, and  
3 it's item 8 -- item 8. It's the last item on the agenda.  
4 Then the discussion of future business.

5                   So we may well start this with a motion, and  
6 we'll work from the motion backwards. You have it.  
7 Yeah?

8                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Full mouth. Yep.

9                   I'd like to make a motion to direct the  
10 commissioner to develop a draft waiver proposal to be  
11 presented to the U.S. Department of Education, and to  
12 enter into negotiations regarding permission to implement  
13 the assessment pilot, as described in the attached draft.

14                  Once the final proposal has been accepted by  
15 the USDE, then we should be voting to approve or not  
16 approve the final version of the proposal.

17                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there a second to that  
18 motion?

19                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

20                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Motion has been moved into  
21 second. We will now enter it into the information phase,  
22 commissioner.

23                  MR. ASP: Yes.

24                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Would you like to  
25 introduce the staff responsible?



1 MR. ASP: Yes, I would. Thank you, Mr.  
2 Chair.

3 We have talked to you about this idea on  
4 a -- on a couple of different occasions, somewhat at our  
5 last meeting. Basically, we have some districts -- and  
6 Ms. Morgan will -- will take you back through some  
7 slides, remind you of the context here -- we have some  
8 districts that are interested at looking at ways that  
9 they could -- we could develop an assessment system that  
10 doesn't require students to be tested every year in  
11 certain grades with the state tests, and rather that we  
12 could depend on teacher judgment to make a determination  
13 of whether kids are meeting, or exceeding -- I'll use the  
14 language used -- are they meeting or exceeding  
15 expectations, based on some common assessments that they  
16 might use, local assessments, and -- and classroom  
17 assessments that they've put together. And the state  
18 tests would be used in a different way than it is now.

19 We've been working on that idea  
20 at -- with -- with some districts around how that might  
21 play out. We've included some information in a couple of  
22 different levels for you: one is a -- an overall memo  
23 from Gretchen Morgan just talking about this; then there  
24 is a -- a kind of a one pager that just outlines the  
25 components of it; and then a more detailed about ten-page



1 piece that we provided for you.

2 So I want to turn it over to -- to Gretchen,  
3 who is also here with Joyce Zurkowski, and Alyssa  
4 Pearson. These pieces all overlap. To take you through  
5 the -- how this pilot might look.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

7 MS. MORGAN: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed, Gretchen.

9 One second. Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: So in terms of the feds  
11 approving this, is that -- in other words, with the  
12 waiver, do they still need to approve this, because I  
13 thought that there were some features in there that would  
14 suggest there's flexibility (indiscernible) --

15 MR. ASP: I'm sorry. That's a great  
16 question, Dr. Scheffel. What this is really about is, we  
17 would need the feds permission to not double test: do  
18 the state test for everybody, as well as have these  
19 teacher determinations, but if we can show comparability  
20 within a year or two, we can move away from having to --

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Having then review it?

22 MR. ASP: Yeah -- yeah. We wouldn't  
23 have -- we wouldn't have to abide by the regulations that  
24 now come from no child left behind that we have to test  
25 every student in third through eighth grade, math and



1 language arts, and so on.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

3 MS. MORGAN: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

5 MS. MORGAN: Today's goals, as you can see  
6 here, are first to provide a brief context, largely  
7 because you all were here last month when we went through  
8 a lot of the background here, but there may be people,  
9 who either will access Board docs, or who weren't  
10 listening last time, and so I wanted to give a brief bit  
11 of context about where this fits in, but I'm going to go  
12 fast through that part, because we've all had that  
13 discussion before. Present some key components of the  
14 potential assessment pilot. And then in the end  
15 determine whether the Board would like CDE to move  
16 forward in line with that motion.

17 And I do just want to clarify again that  
18 what we're talking about today and -- and even the most  
19 detailed document presented to you in your packet prior  
20 to the meeting is -- is, you know, a ten-page document  
21 providing an overview at sort of conceptual level of how  
22 this would work. Trying to give you enough information  
23 to know if you like the concept enough for us to begin  
24 these conversations and negotiations with U.S. Department  
25 of Education.



1                   We did not bring to you, like, a full  
2                   technical proposal or anything, because we're going to  
3                   have to make a lot of changes I'm sure to that, as we  
4                   negotiate with Department of Education. They've given  
5                   some permission, as you know, to New Hampshire to try  
6                   something very similar. New Hampshire has learned some  
7                   things already, and those, I'm sure, will be part of what  
8                   the Department considers when negotiating with us.

9                   They've learned, for example, that their  
10                  teacher comparability was very strong in their first  
11                  year. And so there might be things about their process  
12                  for peer review, and for, you know, getting aligned with  
13                  one another that they would like us to replicate, for  
14                  example. So there's some detail that we're not going to  
15                  talk about today, just because it -- it's not a -- a good  
16                  idea to spend a ton of time on that detail when we don't  
17                  know yet what direction we'll get from the Department  
18                  about it.

19                 So your asked today is just to think about  
20                 this in a conceptual way; do you like the concept enough  
21                 for us to begin. Once we go about actual negotiations  
22                 with the Department, we'd come back with something much  
23                 more specific and detailed about how those processes  
24                 would look; exactly what period you would look like, for  
25                 example; and -- and you would have the chance to then



1 determine whether you liked that plan or not. So just to  
2 be super clear about the outcomes.

3 MS. FLORES: Could -- may I ask a question  
4 before you start?

5 MS. MORGAN: Do you want me to back up?

6 MS. FLORES: Is it -- so -- okay. So we  
7 have PARCC that really is based on accountability, and I  
8 don't know, we -- we -- I think to get those -- those  
9 students that are not performing well, I think we -- we  
10 really need to double down on teaching and learning. And  
11 it may be a third proposal, you know, but some -- some  
12 districts who really want to make a difference with their  
13 students who are not performing want to do, but is this  
14 the one with the rural alternative?

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think this is where it  
16 started with the rural alliance requesting some  
17 possibility of work in this direction. And  
18 it -- it -- I -- I think these pilots won't work if they  
19 have to double test. If they have to do PARCC and  
20 whatever --

21 MS. FLORES: Sure.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- set of assessments they  
23 have.

24 MS. FLORES: In fact, I don't think --

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So this would eliminate



1 the -- the objective would be to eliminate the PARCC test  
2 in some piloted, probably smaller districts, see if there  
3 can be a comparable -- see if they can develop something  
4 that might be comparable, but wouldn't be a PARCC test,  
5 and work through it. Something that fits those districts  
6 more.

7 MS. FLORES: But it would be only one?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Be only one.

9 MS. FLORES: Not maybe --

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Not --

11 MS. FLORES: -- the -- the opposite of  
12 Common Core and PARCC, which would be really working on  
13 teaching and learning, which is something that we did  
14 during the -- the '90s, and --

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I -- I take that back.  
16 It -- it could be more than one. It could be -- could be  
17 daily assessments. It could be -- I mean, that -- that's  
18 what we don't know.

19 MS. FLORES: And -- and maybe -- okay.

20 MS. MORGAN: I -- I think we'll come to some  
21 of these things later in the presentation actually.  
22 Maybe we should get there and --

23 MS. FLORES: Thank you -- thank you.

24 MS. MORGAN: Okay.

25 MS. FLORES: Forgive me.



1 MS. MORGAN: It's okay.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Indiscernible).

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I just clarify? I  
4 don't think this is the rural superintendent's proposal;  
5 am I wrong? It's a very different thing, because I've  
6 compared the two. This is not the one --

7 MR. ASP: The -- the rural superintendent's  
8 one -- and we're talking about the same one, and come  
9 back and show you their progress -- theirs is focused on  
10 accountability --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

12 MR. ASP: -- not assessment. They're trying  
13 to say --

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

15 MR. ASP: -- what do we add to the  
16 accountability system that makes it more relevant for us.

17 MS. FLORES: That's the other -- that's the  
18 other piece somewhere.

19 MS. MORGAN: Yeah.

20 MR. ASP: Yeah. We'll -- we'll mention it  
21 in here --

22 MS. MORGAN: We'll -- we'll come to that  
23 too.

24 MR. ASP: -- today.

25 MS. FLORES: Yeah.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because --

2 MR. ASP: Because we -- we work -- we're  
3 working with them pretty closely, so thank you for the  
4 clarification.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah -- yeah, thank  
6 you.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. All right.

8 MS. MORGAN: So yeah. Just as a reminder,  
9 in terms of background, we talked last time about this  
10 idea of piloting things, and on this Venn diagram you can  
11 see these two blue arrows, right. And -- and when we  
12 started these conversations, you know, with broad groups  
13 of people about the future of accountability, and  
14 assessment, one of the things that everything agreed to  
15 pretty quickly was that this is complex, and that making  
16 sweeping changes across a whole system at once feels a  
17 little risky.

18 And so this idea emerged of being able to  
19 pilot things, as a way to try on some small scale and  
20 evaluate the impact of things to determine whether  
21 there's some ideas that should make it out of the middle  
22 part of that Venn diagram, and into some future system  
23 that would be full scale. But we're really talking right  
24 now about just staying in that center, and trying to get  
25 permission to try something different with a small



1 portion of schools and districts affecting a small  
2 portion of students, and families to learn, and see if we  
3 have some ideas that might make it going forward.

4 And so again, this is the part where I'm  
5 going to go quickly. I'll try not to talk so fast I'm  
6 not understandable, as you know is sometimes my habit,  
7 but I'm going to go fast.

8 So this is a slide reminding you about why  
9 we began these conversations. And what I really want to  
10 highlight here is just the four themes that have come out  
11 of -- of feedback pretty consistently: first, that  
12 accountability and comparability are important to a lot  
13 of people, to families, to educators, and to members of  
14 the broader community; second, that growth is still a  
15 highly valued component of understanding school  
16 performance; third, that the current system relies too  
17 heavily on one assessment, and I think this conversation,  
18 among the rural superintendents about this is largely  
19 focused on that point, which is that they'd like to see a  
20 broader set of -- of measures considered; and then the  
21 fourth ones is this idea that right now for the amount of  
22 time spent for certain sets of users -- those users being  
23 students, teachers, and parents -- the data isn't useful  
24 enough. It's not adequately useful, which has a lot to  
25 do with timing, and being able to get that data in time



1 to do something meaningful with it in the classroom. And  
2 so as we go forward today, really is that last bullet  
3 that this pilot is designed to sort of respond to and  
4 help us learn about.

5 How we did this, just as a quick reminder,  
6 was to facilitate some conversations, and try and bring  
7 some expertise to bear. Raise up some themes and  
8 strategies so that we could have some ideas to put  
9 forward and test. And that led us to two categories of  
10 ideas. This one that we're not talking about so much  
11 today, and again, is much more where the rural  
12 superintendents have an interest is about other kinds of  
13 system quality measures, things like, school quality  
14 reviews, or including some locally determined measures  
15 that are aligned to their local goals, for example.

16 Today we're not going to talk about those  
17 because right now we wouldn't need permission from the  
18 Department of Education to try some of these things. If  
19 at some point, we wanted to really incorporate them in  
20 our framework in a way that affected the points,  
21 and -- and the proportion of points, then we would have  
22 to talk to the Department, but we're, you know, two,  
23 three years away from having learned some things to put  
24 us in that kind of position.

25 So instead today, what we're focusing on is



1 this idea of an assessment pilot. And as you recall from  
2 last time, the -- the basics of this are, that we would  
3 work together with a set of schools and districts in the  
4 pilot to either identify, or build a set of performance  
5 tasks that would be aligned to the Colorado academic  
6 standards, and would be aligned to -- so those grade  
7 level expectations in those areas of just language arts  
8 and math, at this point. And that these tasks would be  
9 given locally by teachers. They would be assessed  
10 locally by teachers using these common scoring rubrics,  
11 that again, are created and vetted.

12 And there's some good work going on already  
13 in our state around performance tasks. I think somebody  
14 actually was talking about this, this morning at the PBC  
15 breakfast. And so there are many districts actually  
16 who've been doing this work, so there's some folks with  
17 capacity.

18 But the idea would be that -- that those are  
19 locally administered. They are locally scored. And that  
20 those teachers determine, based on that performance, as  
21 well as classroom assessment, as well as any other  
22 district assessments, for each student each year is the  
23 kid meeting expectations, or above, or below that line.  
24 And they would report that to us, and we would use two  
25 different processes to validate those local



1 determinations of progress.

2           We would use the State assessment, and we  
3 would use a -- a direct auditor review, right, where we  
4 take some small number of them. We have some outside  
5 scorers, who -- who do some scoring. And the idea of  
6 this really is that, you know, it changes the role of the  
7 State assessment, and really of the State in this game  
8 that, you know, our job becomes to use that State  
9 assessment to give feedback about those local  
10 determinations and to use those audits, or reviews to  
11 give feedback about this sort of rigor of those local  
12 determinations, and their alignment with the standards.

13           And that we -- we would do that to try and  
14 help people understand whether what they are doing is  
15 comparably rigorous. And I think again, given this  
16 shared value of comparability, we would have, you know,  
17 comparability in those tasks, and those scores that we  
18 could ensure, through these processes. We still would  
19 have PARCC data in certain grade levels, and we could  
20 compare that PARCC data across places.

21           And to the conversation this morning, if  
22 there is an interest, and I think there's maybe mixed  
23 interest in this, but if there is an interest in national  
24 comparability, having PARCC data still coming out of  
25 certain grade levels would allow us to make some of those



1 comparisons, as well. So the idea here is to ensure that  
2 we maintain the value of being able to have some  
3 comparable information about schools, but we try to  
4 better meet that fourth piece of feedback that we  
5 received about usability of this data for teachers, and  
6 students, and parents.

7           This slide I need to just preface very  
8 strongly by saying this is an illustration, an example.  
9 This would be one of those things where we would not only  
10 need to engage deeply with the districts and schools who  
11 are part of this pilot, but I'm certain that we're going  
12 to have some in-depth conversations with the U.S.  
13 Department of Education about where we would select to  
14 keep the State assessment versus where we would not.

15           And so this is, you know, our first  
16 illustration of what it might look like, but I want to be  
17 clear in saying this is not a promise to anyone that this  
18 is exactly what it would look like. And that we would  
19 have, you know, some learning to know with New Hampshire  
20 about this, and we certainly would have some discussions  
21 with the Department of Education, but we provided it to  
22 you here, and also in the more in-depth documents we gave  
23 you prior to the meeting just to show you sort of what we  
24 mean. I think when you talk about this in a theoretical  
25 sense, and you don't actually show some example, it's a



1 little hard to get the idea, and so this is provided to  
2 you for that reason.

3 Also, provided in the overview is a little  
4 bit more description about the process of this pilot.  
5 One of the things identified in the process is that we  
6 would try and identify tier 1 schools and districts, and  
7 also tier 2, or -- and then maybe in subsequent years  
8 tiers 3 or 4. The general idea here is that ultimately,  
9 for this pilot to be useful, in terms of us being able to  
10 adequately learn about its viability for statewide use,  
11 it's going to have to have a very representative group of  
12 schools and districts participating.

13 It may not be that those who are ready and  
14 interested right now are really representative, and so we  
15 want to have the ability to bring folks in who are ready  
16 and interested, and to have to other folks, who are  
17 working with us, they are interested, they're a little  
18 bit ready, but maybe they're not all the way ready. And  
19 they could keep working with us and get some investment  
20 in their capacity, so they would become ready. And you  
21 could imagine sort of concentric circles of bringing  
22 schools and districts into this until we got to the scale  
23 that we think we need to have, so we have a really  
24 representative group from the State. So I just wanted to  
25 flag that topic of these tiers, which is just really



1 about the timing with which they would come into the  
2 pilot. When they are ready really to be doing this  
3 versus when they're ready to be learning about it and  
4 getting prepared to do this.

5 Also, described in the longer document are  
6 two sort of categories of readiness: one of them is  
7 commitment, and one of them is capacity. And one of the  
8 things that we've learned from New Hampshire is that  
9 figuring out who really has broad community commitment to  
10 this is really important, because you don't want to have  
11 people start participating in this, and then a year or  
12 two in decide they're not interested anymore. That would  
13 again, make it very hard for us to ensure that we got a  
14 representative group of folks participating, so that we  
15 could evaluate sort of viability of this for potential  
16 statewide use.

17 And so we've discussed these as a sort of  
18 starter list of commitments. And I would say from the  
19 Board if there are other commitments that you think are  
20 important, or useful that you want us to have with us, if  
21 we go forward in discussions with the Department, today  
22 would be a great time to share those. But essentially  
23 we've talked about the local school board needs to pass a  
24 resolution agreeing to participate in the pilot, and to  
25 give the teachers, and leaders in the pilot time to do



1 the work required to be in the pilot. And so that would  
2 be something that we'd want to work with those districts  
3 on and help them understand. And again, I'm so thankful  
4 that we would have New Hampshire to follow in this,  
5 because we can learn in very tangible ways actually about  
6 what was required for teachers to get into this and be  
7 successful.

8 The second one is the school leaders engaged  
9 within the district. We think needed -- indicate  
10 support. That might be a letter of support that they  
11 would submit with their -- with their application or  
12 letter of interest to the pilot. But, you know, this  
13 again, is something where you would hate to have a  
14 district decide this important, choose some number of  
15 schools to participate, and have that leader not be  
16 ready, and willing to support their teachers in this  
17 effort.

18 Third, we'd like the teachers who  
19 would -- are involved to have some voice in this as well  
20 to say yeah, I'm interested in doing this work. And I  
21 think to your question before, Dr. Flores, part of what  
22 has been interesting for teachers in New Hampshire, who  
23 have been part of this, is that they have been very  
24 interested in the use they can make from the performance  
25 assessments themselves. And also, when we've talked to



1       them they've talked a lot about what they have learned  
2       about being able to really evaluate student work and plan  
3       for next steps of instruction, because they are doing  
4       this work of looking so closely collaboratively with  
5       their colleagues at work.

6                       And so they've really aligned their PLC  
7       structure to doing this work, so they are attending to  
8       the instructional response to this information, and in a  
9       way that they didn't feel they could with the other data.  
10      And so we think there's opportunity for that, but we'd  
11      like to have the teachers involved in this to say I am  
12      interested in doing that, and spending that time, and  
13      being part of those processes.

14                      And then finally, we're interested in  
15      parents having the same sort of input. You know, I don't  
16      know how exactly schools would do this, whether they  
17      would have a sort of meeting of parents, or if they'd  
18      have, you know, the staff for the school determine  
19      something, and write a letter. We'll leave that up to  
20      them, but -- but, you know, there may be parents out  
21      there who are really not interested in their kid not  
22      taking the state assessment. And if that is true, you'd  
23      want them to have the opportunity to say that. And so we  
24      think that commitments at all of these levels are really  
25      important, and at minimum it ensures that everybody at



1 all these levels really does understand, and is given  
2 adequate communication about what would be going on,  
3 which feels like an important priority for all of us.

4 Second, in terms of capacity -- do you want  
5 to ask a question? I'm sorry.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Did you have a question,  
7 Ms. Mazanec?

8 MS. MAZANEC: Just -- just a comment. It  
9 seems to me that it looks that we'd have to have all  
10 kinds of (indiscernible) -- all kinds of buy in from all  
11 kinds of levels for a pilot project, as opposed to the  
12 mandated accountability that we have otherwise. We don't  
13 have all that buy in, do we? Right?

14 MS. MORGAN: I am not in the legislature  
15 when they determine those things.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Right, but --

17 MS. MORGAN: But -- but we're trying to say  
18 we like that (indiscernible) --

19 MS. MAZANEC: -- it's just a -- it's just a  
20 comment. I mean, does that sound crazy to -- it seems to  
21 me like we're requiring all kinds of buy in from all  
22 kinds of corners for a pilot to try and give ourselves a  
23 little -- a little alternative accountability system.  
24 That's just a comment.

25 MS. MORGAN: Thank you.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Seems like a lot of work.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

3 MS. MORGAN: Uh-huh.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: (Indiscernible).

6 MS. MORGAN: Yeah.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Should we wait until  
8 you're -- are you almost finished, or should --

9 MS. MORGAN: I am --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- we wait?

11 MS. MORGAN: -- almost done.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. I will let you --

13 MS. MORGAN: Do you want me just to --

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- finish.

15 MS. MORGAN: -- move through? Thank you.

16 So in terms of capacity -- and this I think  
17 we've learned a lot from districts here, who are already  
18 doing this work, right -- again, people who are already  
19 doing work on performance tasks, or started to do a lot  
20 of work on other kinds of assessments because they were  
21 building their own under educator effectiveness, or  
22 there's been a group of people who have started piloting  
23 some performance tasks created by Stanford in the state,  
24 and -- and they've been learning a lot about that.  
25 And -- and from all of them we've learned that there are



1 some very specific capacities that teachers need to have  
2 to be ready to do this.

3 One of them is, some experience with  
4 I'm -- we've called them here standards-based grading  
5 practices, but essentially, it's -- it's the practice  
6 that a teacher could know what the objective is for the  
7 student, right. They know the standard. And they know  
8 today this is the part of that that we're working on, and  
9 I -- and I'm teaching, and we are assessing. And they  
10 could look at a student's work, and determine, you know,  
11 yes, this is evidence of that standard, or no, this is  
12 not yet evidence of that standard.

13 It's different than just assigning points to  
14 a set of questions and a test, and then saying you got 75  
15 percent of the points. It asks for you to really examine  
16 evidence against a specific learning -- intended  
17 learning.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Asp.

19 MR. ASP: Thank you.

20 This -- I'll make one comment for an example  
21 here. The -- the middle schools in Douglas County have a  
22 standards-based grading system in the sense that they  
23 give a student a grade for what they've learned, a grade  
24 for work habits, and those are separate. And so they're  
25 able to distinguish sometimes teachers will fall into a



1 trap where they might give a student who knows the  
2 material real well, less than an A, because of some  
3 behaviors that get in the way in the classroom, or  
4 there's extra credit that folks give to encourage; you  
5 bring Kleenex in, in elementary school, and they give you  
6 some extra points, and that's all fine. We're not  
7 criticizing that. It's just we want folks like these  
8 Douglas County middle school teachers, who are used to  
9 making determinations about whether kids have met the  
10 standards are not, and -- and they're able to do that  
11 well. And there's -- it's just -- I'm just using Douglas  
12 County as an example, because I'm familiar with it, but  
13 there's a number of --

14 MS. MORGAN: There's several.

15 MR. ASP: -- districts across the state  
16 who -- who are either working on that, or put those kinds  
17 of things in place, who -- who know how to do this pretty  
18 well, because ultimately, we're depending on teacher  
19 judgment here at the local level to say whether or not  
20 kids are meeting expectations.

21 Thank you.

22 MS. MORGAN: Yeah. And I would say there  
23 actually are a number of charter schools who have been  
24 working on this as well, and so I think there is strength  
25 in -- in both of those sectors -- in that first capacity.



1                   The second one is experience with  
2 professional learning communities. This is one of those  
3 tasks where teachers are going to be asked to be very  
4 collaborative about talking about the qualities of their  
5 student's work, and that requires that you already know  
6 how to work together, and look closely at things, and  
7 have honest, professional discussions with one another.  
8 And frankly, that you have some structure in place that  
9 would give you the time to do such a thing, and so that's  
10 another capacity that we think is really important.

11                   And the third one is, some use of  
12 performance assessments integrated with formative  
13 assessment practices, which is to say, if -- if the only  
14 kind of assessment a teacher is comfortable using in  
15 their room right now is sort of short response quiz kind  
16 of thing, and they aren't doing, like, essay questions  
17 with rubrics associated, or performance tasks with  
18 rubrics associated. If they're unfamiliar with the  
19 practice of using rubrics and criteria to evaluate work,  
20 that this is a pretty big step up to get ready for that.

21                   So these are the three sort of big pieces of  
22 capacity that we've identified as being important things  
23 for folks to have to be ready. And again, if there are  
24 districts who are interested in this, but not quite  
25 ready, then we're interested in working with them to help



1       them build those capacities and be ready.

2                       The next slide you should not even attempt  
3       to read from the wall. I'm very sorry. It's small text.  
4       Thank goodness you have copies in front of you. Even  
5       then, frankly, it might be a challenge, but -- but wanted  
6       to just give you a high level timeline here. There's  
7       more of this in the lengthier document, but trying just  
8       to describe what would be the sort of basic components of  
9       work that would be happening in the first few years of  
10      this. And I want to remind you too, that we don't know  
11      exactly when year 1 would be, right. We would have to go  
12      through this process, be given flexibility, and then to  
13      reevaluate where we're at to determine when this would  
14      start.

15                      But whenever it starts, which is why it  
16      doesn't say some specific year here, there would be a  
17      year 1. And in year 1, there are some important  
18      activities that would have to happen certainly around  
19      bringing in schools and districts, and -- and figuring  
20      out who's ready and interested; figuring our criteria for  
21      evaluating what they're doing locally, so that they  
22      understand whether they're practices locally are good  
23      practices. We would help them with those determinations.  
24      Figuring out parameters for how you determine  
25      proficiency, and there's, like, technical work to be done



1 on that. Looking at tasks, practicing use of tasks, all  
2 that sort of thing. And you can read on from there. I'm  
3 not going to go into the detail here.

4 But we did want to share with you that  
5 there's some thoughtful discussion with districts about  
6 what would they need to kind of move through a process  
7 like this, and also, it's important to note that there's  
8 a set of things that would have to happen before we  
9 imagine we would get to the point of comparability. And  
10 as was discussed before, we think we can get to  
11 comparability, but we don't want to do anything  
12 that -- that -- and we're unlikely to get permission to  
13 do anything from the U.S. Department of Education that  
14 would have us give up double testing before we had some  
15 view of comparability, right. The idea is do this work.  
16 Find out that it's comparable. Then start to peel back  
17 that assessment.

18 And I did want too that we've looked at  
19 1323. We raised this with you last time, as the thing  
20 that we, like, it might give room to allow us to do this.  
21 We think it does actually give room under those criteria,  
22 which is to say, if -- if we were able to go, and we were  
23 able to negotiate some flexibility with the federal  
24 government, and in that flexibility we determined that  
25 there would be a point at which when comparability was



1 identified, some peeling back of assessments would  
2 happen, that there's room under 1323 to implement such a  
3 thing, pending permission from the U.S. Department of  
4 Education. And so if you have a ton of questions about  
5 that, I will defer absolutely to Tony, who sits down  
6 there and answers legal questions, but he and I have  
7 discussed it, and he is pretty confident that that is  
8 true.

9                   So just lastly here, what would be next  
10 steps. So if today you were to indicate to us that you  
11 wanted us to go forward, we would begin work on a  
12 conceptual overview that includes more technical detail,  
13 and we'd continue to gather stakeholder input against  
14 that before engaging with the Department of Education.  
15 We'd begin some informal inquiries with them to sort of  
16 figure out the best pathway to do this.

17                   Unlike the waiver that you discussed before,  
18 this is a little bit more of a out-of-process process  
19 with them. And so we have a little bit of work to do to  
20 figure out exactly how would we bring it to them, and  
21 what processes would we be seeking. Obviously, we can  
22 follow a little bit in the process that -- that New  
23 Hampshire followed, but there also have been changes in  
24 the Department, and so we anticipate needing to -- to  
25 investigate that a little bit.



1                   Eventually, we would submit a formal request  
2                   asking for this flexibility. We'd begin negotiations.  
3                   When we got to an informal agreement with them, we'd  
4                   bring that back to you again, for your final  
5                   consideration about whether you were interested in  
6                   supporting whatever we're able to get in those  
7                   negotiations with the Department.

8                   So that is the sum of what we wanted to  
9                   present to you today. Would love to hear questions and  
10                  also again, if -- if it seems as though you're going to  
11                  move forward with this, I also would love to gather up  
12                  feedback from you about if there are specific notes in  
13                  here -- again, this is high level and it is probably  
14                  going to change, but if there are things that are  
15                  important to you that you want us to pay attention to in  
16                  those conversations with the Department, want to make  
17                  sure that we also get a chance to hear those today.

18                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

19                  MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

20                  Great -- I'm glad that, you know, we're  
21                  trying to think of options. Here's my concern. Tell me  
22                  if I'm off base here. It seems like this pilot is  
23                  designed to try to address what the public and educators  
24                  find problematic with PARCC, so it's a pilot to try to  
25                  take a little different approach. And sometimes I think



1 we identify a problem, rightfully so, but then we propose  
2 a fix that actually could make it worse. And I feel like  
3 this entangles us with the feds quite a bit on a very  
4 detailed level.

5           And then when I look at what it really  
6 means, we're convened a group of educators. The group  
7 consensus around strong statement of commitment to post-  
8 workforce readiness, and emerging shared view of what it  
9 really means, join the Council of Chief State School  
10 Officers Innovation Lab Network, which I'm somewhat  
11 familiar with, and other not -- the other nine states  
12 that are in PARCC. I mean, in a way, what we're saying  
13 is, well, PARCC has issues. Let's go further and try to  
14 make PARCC work by working with these other states and  
15 getting entangled then in a -- in -- in -- in generating  
16 a lot of detailed data that actually can make the whole  
17 situation worse, because in -- in linking us with the  
18 feds, in terms of how that's interpreted.

19           So I think on the face of it it's, it sounds  
20 good, let's have an option. Underneath the -- underneath  
21 it, I feel like it actually can work -- we can actually  
22 end up doing work that the feds want done anyway, but  
23 just to try to uncover what's wrong with PARCC and try to  
24 pilot how we can adjust it, and actually we end up giving  
25 them more data on a very detailed level about these



1 specific projects. And entangling us with the Innovation  
2 Lab Network, I -- I feel like it -- it puts it in deeper  
3 with PARCC.

4 We're trying to figure out how to uncouple  
5 from this assessment, and look our data today. You know,  
6 trying to figure out how to return local control, and  
7 stop centralizing. Now, this pilot allows us to  
8 centralize on even a greater detailed level. I think it  
9 opens the door for so much incursion from the feds on  
10 what we're doing in Colorado. Though, on the surface of  
11 it, it -- it -- I understand that it -- it can sound  
12 good, but I really feel -- I'm -- I'm not supportive of  
13 it. Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion?

15 Yes. Dr. Schroeder.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: So I do happen to believe in  
17 collaborating with other states when it serves us well.  
18 Two things. One, do we have resources to share with our  
19 pilot districts, because this isn't -- this isn't free to  
20 them? I mean, it's a lot of work that they are  
21 interested in engaging in. What are the resources that  
22 we have at this -- at our level, or grants, or --

23 MS. MORGAN: Yeah.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: -- what can scrape up  
25 to -- for the extra work that teachers, et cetera, are



1 going to need?

2 The second thing that --

3 MS. MORGAN: Are you asking how it's funded?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Can they answer?

6 MS. SCHROEDER: She'd going to get an answer  
7 when she has one.

8 MS. MORGAN: (Indiscernible).

9 MS. SCHROEDER: The second concern I have  
10 that I -- that I don't understand is that one of the  
11 things that parents are most interest in is did my kid  
12 make adequate growth this year, or more. My kid's  
13 behind, it's more. If my kid is a super star, maybe I  
14 want it to be more than one year. In other words, do we  
15 have an acceptable measure of individual student growth  
16 in this schedule that you have where sometimes you have  
17 one assessment, and sometimes you have another one. How  
18 do you tie them together? Sort of the same thing that we  
19 couldn't use TCAP to go to this year's assessments; do we  
20 run into that problem, so that we can tell a parent, one,  
21 you're on track to graduate, college, and career ready,  
22 but also that you made a certain amount of growth?

23 And I'd like that to be part of the --

24 MS. MORGAN: So I'll start with the resource  
25 question, and then you guys can chime in on the other, if



1 you like.

2 MS. FLORES: But I mean, this is committing  
3 us more into -- into PARCC, and Common Core.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Can they answer the  
5 question, please?

6 MS. FLORES: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought --

7 MS. MORGAN: Thanks.

8 So quickly, on -- on the question that was  
9 raised over here. We actually were careful in our drafts  
10 to not refer to our state assessment under the PARCC  
11 name, but to say there would be a state assessment, and  
12 that state assessment would be used in this function.  
13 And so I think, you know, in --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: But it's -- it's --

15 MS. MORGAN: -- in the foreseeable future  
16 right now it would be very hard for us to imagine not  
17 having a state assessment, but this would be a way for us  
18 to have a state assessment used in a specific way that is  
19 directly measuring only a subset of students, instead of  
20 all students.

21 And then the second thing I would say is  
22 that the audit component that is there is something which  
23 is independent totally of those expectations.

24 Then in terms of resources, there -- there  
25 are several streams of work already going on in the state



1 that are building capacity for this that I think are  
2 worth mentioning. There's been a lot of work done again,  
3 under educator effectiveness and trying to build measures  
4 of student learning in local systems that turns out to be  
5 very transferable here, especially for those folks who  
6 went the performance task route, right. But there's some  
7 existing capacity there, and some resources here to help  
8 people with -- with development and performance tasks.  
9 There's also been some work done in the assessment unit  
10 to help people with formative assessment practices,  
11 development of performance tasks, and rubrics in  
12 particular with some existing --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

14 MS. MORGAN: -- processes of validation of  
15 those that have been happening for a couple of years.  
16 And I mentioned the Stanford work before.

17 There's also a small amount of money that  
18 was actually set aside under 1323 to support the pilot,  
19 that is there. And -- and then I think under the gifts  
20 grants and donation policy that you all have passed,  
21 there probably is room with you endorsing this,  
22 right -- without you endorsing this, it wouldn't be, but  
23 with you endorsing this, there'd be room for the  
24 Department to try and work with districts to raise  
25 additional funds to support them with some of that



1 capacity building as well.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Is there any kind of  
3 an estimate of the kinds of resources that will be  
4 necessary?

5 MS. MORGAN: We've talked with New Hampshire  
6 about their training initially, and their first sort of  
7 round of training with larger group of districts than are  
8 participating in this pilot, right, so many more  
9 than -- than are now included --

10 MS. SCHROEDER: But they're all -- they're  
11 all pretty little, aren't they?

12 MS. MORGAN: Mostly pretty little. There's  
13 one that's not, and it is participating in the pilot  
14 actually Manchester. And --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

16 MS. MORGAN: -- and they were part of this  
17 training too. They spend a few hundred thousand dollars  
18 on training and capacity building to have people be  
19 ready. We would have to figure out, I think, cost of  
20 other things, technical things. I think we have a little  
21 bit of work to do to get to that.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

23 MS. MORGAN: Uh-huh. Do you guys want to  
24 speak to the --

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Scheffel.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: To your question about growth  
2 and --

3 MS. MORGAN: Growth. Uh-huh.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- the part of that. So I  
5 think we've talked a lot about that. I think we may need  
6 to think about growth differently, and we -- we've gotten  
7 really used to our Colorado growth model, and how that's  
8 calculated, and how, you know, it's ideal if you have two  
9 consecutive years of -- of the same assessment. And  
10 we -- we've looked and investigated, you could probably  
11 skip a year, and have some number that you would -- you  
12 want to be interpret -- interpret with caution. So I  
13 think we may want to think about growth differently than  
14 we've thought about it and different ways of calculating  
15 it.

16 I think the -- having a pilot would allow us  
17 the time to do some of that technical exploration --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- of how could you measure  
20 growth in this way. I think there's ways to do it. New  
21 Hampshire, who's a little further down this path, they've  
22 been working with some measurement experts and think it  
23 can happen. So I think there's just -- I think there's a  
24 lot that we need to think about, and I think balancing,  
25 like, Gretchen said at the beginning, knowing that growth



1 is something that people value in the system, how do  
2 we --

3 MS. MORGAN: Yep.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- how do we include it, or  
5 that might be a criteria for evaluating the pilot at the  
6 end.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: So I think that reflects my  
10 point of view that I -- I don't want us to lose some of  
11 that particular piece. Thanks very much.

12 MS. MORGAN: Yep.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.

14 MS. GOFF: Just going back to the genesis of  
15 this a little bit, just some of the high points. HB 1323  
16 was a fairly major driving factor in -- impetus for doing  
17 this, right? Would you say that? And/or did the  
18 beginning push come from the -- the groups -- the  
19 superintendents, the -- our -- our groups, our -- you  
20 know, family groups here?

21 I -- I'm kind of thinking they happened  
22 concurrently. One being a result of the other, and vice  
23 versa on any given day, so keeping that in mind, I think  
24 it's important. So the -- I think we have to take pretty  
25 seriously any decision about: A, go ahead with this; or



1 B, not, because whatever kind of message are we sending  
2 if we say no, we're not going to -- we're not going to  
3 put the stamp of approval on going ahead with this. Who  
4 are we telling something to?

5 The other part of it is, the discussion  
6 around whatever the state assessment was is, will be, as  
7 you said, it really wasn't test product specific. We  
8 were having this conversation during the legislative  
9 session when there was just general discussion about the  
10 state system. So it wasn't necessarily what I heard. It  
11 wasn't specifically PARCC centric, but that -- but yes,  
12 in a way it was, because at the time, and still is, PARCC  
13 is our state assessment. But I -- I heard the -- I -- I  
14 heard the message being, as it's state assessment system  
15 in general is something that people really wanted us all  
16 to be looking at in a different way of  
17 just -- that's -- that point.

18 And then does this have anything -- I will  
19 ask you, because I think I need clarity, is -- is this  
20 related, in any way, to the waiver?

21 MS. MORGAN: Okay.

22 MS. GOFF: We have every flexibility we  
23 want, as far as a state to design -- to figure out a new  
24 accountability system and take a look at it, but we also  
25 have basically just signed on to -- maybe it could be



1 perceived as a different aspect of that, or something,  
2 and it's got a one-year timeline. So if -- if we're  
3 looking at relating any of this to the waiver discussion  
4 in our -- and work around that, carrying that out, we  
5 have a -- we have a timeline deal here that would  
6 probably do -- do well to keep in mind whether or not we  
7 go with this or not.

8 So if this is not a one-year, you know,  
9 strictly in-the-box definition can -- is -- is this  
10 something that's feasible in -- in a one-year time frame  
11 if we're connecting it, in anyway, to the waiver  
12 obligation sort of assurances --

13 MS. MORGAN: So let me -- I'll take your  
14 questions in order.

15 MS. GOFF: -- so those thoughts.

16 MS. MORGAN: So first question about the  
17 impetus for this. I think it began before 1323, in terms  
18 of the Department receiving, either informally or because  
19 we were trying to facilitate discussions, feedback about  
20 the current system. And I think that feedback was also  
21 heard by legislators, right. And so they were trying to  
22 figure out something to do and 1323 last session  
23 was -- was a result of that in the legislature. So I do  
24 think there is a -- there's a bigger conversation going  
25 on, and for us it's been districts coming to us for



1 different reasons.

2           There's this real group of districts we've  
3 talked about. There's also a group of districts who are  
4 interested in competency-based learning, and be able to  
5 do pacing things a little bit differently, who promote  
6 conversations with us about this. There are others who  
7 just have come straight from the perspective of return on  
8 investment, right. So there's a lot of different reasons  
9 people have come, but there's, I think, a broad group of  
10 folks across the state having this conversation, and I  
11 think 1323 was the legislature's way to try and hear  
12 that, and respond to that, so it's sort of both in answer  
13 to your first question.

14           In terms of relationship to the big waiver,  
15 I think -- I'm just making general statement, and then  
16 let me know if you want to respond to this -- we would  
17 consider them to ask -- we would ask them to consider  
18 these two things separately, right. Yes, the waiver is a  
19 thing. You have determined we can send that one. That  
20 is one process.

21           This other process of seeking flexibility  
22 for this project would be something considered  
23 separately, and would be something where we ask for a  
24 certain number of years of agreement from them that we  
25 could be pursuing it. I think New Hampshire was a



1 given -- originally given two years once they got to the  
2 point of not double testing, so essentially they had  
3 three years given to them; and so we would be seeking  
4 that separately from this. So I -- I think we can manage  
5 the two things with the Department without getting them  
6 conflated. Although, I will acknowledge the language  
7 around this is somewhat confusing when we talk about it.

8 Is there anything else you want to add to  
9 that.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I just -- I think  
11 the flexibility that we need for this waiver -- I don't  
12 know if you remember when Pat Chapman walked through the  
13 waiver package what we could ask for. This is something  
14 beyond separate from that, because it's really you're on  
15 a waiver for a single statewide assessment. So it's  
16 something separate from that.

17 In terms of what's in our ESCA waiver, we  
18 had language in there kind of laid out for them the  
19 process that we're going through with the frameworks, and  
20 the accountability system, and that we're going to have  
21 revisions to it. So I think the one-year timeline is  
22 actually really helpful, because we were going to have to  
23 go back to them with updates anyway, so I think it all  
24 fits, and I think we're okay with (indiscernible).

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think I appreciate



1 the -- the presentation. I think I'm going to take this  
2 item off the table for the moment. Just I -- I think, if  
3 I remember the legislative history of the waiver  
4 insertion to 1323, if my memory is correct, it really was  
5 done at the behest of the rural alliance. And they did  
6 not get what they wanted, and they made it clear that  
7 they didn't think this would work. And for some reason  
8 I've been confused about the idea of -- of this waiver  
9 request out of context with what the rural alliance  
10 thinks works for them. And I think we're going to have  
11 to think about this, because what -- what I had hoped,  
12 and envisioned is we would -- would, at least, be able to  
13 apply for a waiver that gave us significant flexibility  
14 to judge a limited number of programs, and let -- let  
15 them -- let local districts try them, develop our own  
16 comparability, and maybe that's a waiver that can't be  
17 received.

18 But I think the problem that we all face  
19 with PARCC, and with -- and -- and with Common Core is  
20 that -- is that it is the ultimate one size fits all, and  
21 I don't know if anybody ever in Washington ever sits  
22 around and thinks what about if they're wrong. And we've  
23 been on this education reform for a decade with precious  
24 little to show for it, in terms of -- of education  
25 results. I mean, modest by, I think -- the only way I've



1 ever described -- seen anyone describe the improvements,  
2 if any, have been, you know, in terms of modest, or very  
3 little, in terms of gain of student achievement.

4 So there is a body of an evidence out there  
5 that says they could be wrong, and you won't know how  
6 wrong they are, unless you have alternative programs that  
7 you can judge against the standard, but it sounds like to  
8 me this is simply creating -- however has the potential  
9 to create a standard that's about or worse  
10 than -- than -- than what we have. And I just don't see  
11 any point -- I mean, I -- I -- if -- if we're not -- we  
12 can't get meaningful flexibility, and I mean, meaningful  
13 flexibility where we can try a lot of different things to  
14 give districts the opportunity to prove something works  
15 better for them, then I don't think it's worth the -- the  
16 resource investment. And it's -- and the resource  
17 investment in just the paperwork, and planning, and staff  
18 time is -- is significant.

19 So let us think about this for a month, and  
20 we'll -- we'll put it back on the -- on the agenda in  
21 December.

22 Dr. Scheffel.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: I never got a clear answer on  
24 how it's funded. How is this work funded?

25 MS. MORGAN: So the specific question



1 that -- that Dr. Schroeder had asked was about what sort  
2 of supported resource would be available to help people  
3 with the capacity they would need to participate, and so  
4 I answered that.

5 The question of what funding we have  
6 available to support what would need be maybe technical  
7 work against it would be -- there is some annual funding  
8 again, under 1323. It's about \$100,000 a year given to  
9 us already there, to be able to support those processes.  
10 I don't think that would be sufficient to support  
11 capacity building in the field, which is why I spoke to  
12 the other areas.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, and I -- I could be  
14 wrong, but it feels a little unclear when we  
15 were -- Colorado, according to the website, has already  
16 joined the Innovation Lab Network. We're already one of  
17 the states. We're already going to their meetings. We  
18 already pull up a document that this us all mapped out.  
19 And then we're coming to this group saying should we do  
20 this. I mean, it looks like we're already doing it.  
21 We're already in this network. We're already talking to  
22 them. CCSSO is already right in the middle of it. I  
23 mean it -- this isn't like a -- I mean, I think it's sort  
24 of framed as though this is a -- a new and great thing  
25 that we can do to kind of depart from the restrictions of



1 PARCC. In reality, this is just a deeper approach, based  
2 on more specific student work products, but it's aligned  
3 with all the same -- it's aligned with all the same  
4 initiatives. It just strikes me looking at their  
5 website: Innovation Lab Network.

6 MS. MORGAN: I will just say that our  
7 membership in the Lab Network doesn't commit us to  
8 anything. It's -- it is a place where we can learn about  
9 things, and so --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: And have you been to meeting  
11 with these folks? You've already mapped this out, or  
12 (indiscernible) --

13 MS. MORGAN: We've been to meeting with  
14 folks, who have offered us insight, and learning, and  
15 research about their work. We don't have any commitment  
16 to do anything besides learn with that group.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, when we look at this  
18 document accountability and decision tree portrait, it's  
19 quite the report. I mean, it's a -- that's clearly --

20 MS. MORGAN: Yeah, a tool that they produce.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- mapped out --

22 MS. MORGAN: That's a tool they produce.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- as far as how this would  
24 look. Yeah.

25 MS. MORGAN: That's a tool they produce to



1 try and help people interested in these conversations at  
2 whatever level. Identify the kinds of decisions they  
3 would have to make, if they wanted to try and do  
4 something differently. So it doesn't dictate which  
5 decisions anyone would make. It just tried to identify  
6 what are the kinds of choices you would have to make if  
7 trying to create something that was different.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Uh-huh. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Ms. Rankin.

10 MS. RANKIN: I just have a couple of -- a  
11 couple of quick questions, and you don't have to answer  
12 them now, if you don't want, but did any of this come out  
13 of educator effectiveness? I mean, was that any impetus  
14 to do this?

15 And also, the percentage of -- of parents  
16 opting their students or students opting their parents,  
17 however, that went, out of -- out of that testing, I can  
18 see where that might -- but yet, if there's 10 percent  
19 over here, and 30 percent, the buses are too far away to  
20 get the kids together to be in this new innovative  
21 program. So is there a impetus from either one of those  
22 programs for this type of program?

23 MS. MORGAN: So I -- I don't -- I don't know  
24 if it's accurate to say that ed effectiveness created the  
25 impetus for this. I think it has created a lot of the



1 capacity for it. And I do think that there are a number  
2 of school districts who've indicated to us that they have  
3 either a pathway, where they believe there's significant  
4 interest, and I think you're right there is some  
5 relationship between parent opt out and interest, but I  
6 do think that there would be some districts who would  
7 show up both interested and ready.

8 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

9 MS. MORGAN: Uh-huh.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further discussion on this  
11 topic?

12 Thank you very much. I appreciate the  
13 effort and the presentation. I just -- I -- I don't know  
14 if we're -- we can get far enough to really effect  
15 change, and we probably need to judge the expenditure  
16 resources on that basis, so -- all right.

17 We're now down to the last item, which  
18 is -- yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just wanted to make  
20 sure you were going to touch on the last item that's on  
21 the agenda, but --

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: What's the last --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Distribution of state  
24 expenditure budget.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The Department's budget



1 request report.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, the budget request  
3 report.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She's going to  
5 distribute that --

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, okay.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- those materials.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. You want to  
9 distribute those, and then I'll -- I'll distribute these.  
10 These are from the Education Commission of the State,  
11 their report on school assessments.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What agenda item is it?

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's not on the agenda.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not on the agenda.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: This is an extra item. I  
16 forgot. This is our -- this is the budget that will be  
17 working with on January 5th when we make that  
18 presentation.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Correct. January 5th.  
21 Okay.

22 Did you have some comments on the budget  
23 that you would like to make at this point?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
25 I don't have any extensive comments. I just wanted to



1 introduce you to the document, and then you guys can take  
2 this, formulate questions. If you have questions today,  
3 I'm happy to field those, but really it's just to show  
4 you what you got here, and then you can take it, and do  
5 with it what you will.

6 What -- what this is, is the -- the  
7 reconciliation to the budget submission. So it's not the  
8 entire 800-page binder that we submit, but it encompassed  
9 everything that is in that request. It starts with our  
10 current year budget, and then if you wouldn't mind  
11 turning to the -- there's a -- an informational page, if  
12 you'd just flip past that to the first fully white page  
13 there. This is a summary of the total request. So as  
14 you have questions about just what is the Department's  
15 total budget, and what types of funding do we have. You  
16 have the general cash, re-appropriated, and federal  
17 funds. That gives you a feel for where the sources of  
18 funding come for the Department big picture.

19 It's broken down by each section of our long  
20 bill. We have four sections. Three of them are CDE's,  
21 and the last one is the Colorado School for the Deaf and  
22 the Blind. So again, that just gives you an overview of  
23 the total requests by fund source.

24 Then, if you wouldn't mind, flipping a  
25 couple of more pages, just a couple of comments on how



1 to -- how to read, or interpret the document.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So he flipped to the  
3 tab labeled, "Management and administration," and is  
4 right behind that page.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, and it'll  
6 be -- sorry -- it'll be the first black and white page  
7 behind that one. That is your line item: the State  
8 Board, so I thought we'd start there, and then just  
9 highlight a couple of other things. As I mentioned, that  
10 first line there, the Senate Bill 15234, that is the long  
11 bill from this past session. That's our beginning budget  
12 for the request that we're making for the upcoming year.  
13 And then the additional lines kind of summarize any  
14 changes to that line that are going to occur. And where  
15 you have staff, salary, things like that, you will see  
16 these two TA items in all cases, which are the -- the  
17 salary survey, which is similar to a cost of living  
18 increase, and merit pay, which is the pay for performance  
19 piece, and those are called base building items that will  
20 bill to the requests that we're making for '16-'17.

21 You'll see multiple items. The TAs  
22 are -- they're technical adjustments. They're things  
23 that are just built into the budget by virtue of again,  
24 salary increase, things like that.

25 If you would now flip to the assistant's



1 section, and go to the first set of black and white  
2 pages. You've got -- you've got school finances. The  
3 first line here, the administration, which is the staff,  
4 and you know, state-level expenditures to pay for  
5 the -- the support of the -- the state chair is the first  
6 item. And I just wanted to draw your attention to again,  
7 in reading the document, those technical assistants are  
8 base building, so they're -- they're -- they're -- where  
9 you see that bold FY16-17 base request, those technical  
10 adjustments build up to that.

11 And then the tax check off is one of the  
12 change requests that we brought before you in May, where  
13 you'll see any requests, sometimes changes to the budget  
14 due to a piece of legislation that passed, and  
15 that -- that funding is going away, or it's changing.  
16 You'll see those adjustments in -- in the line below the  
17 base request just like that tax check off. So when  
18 you're -- when you're looking at it, you have base  
19 building, and then you've got items that are changing due  
20 to other things, like our requests, or annualizations.

21 And that was all I was going to cover today.  
22 And then we were going to see if -- if you guys had  
23 questions, and wanted to look at it a little more in  
24 detail next month, or in the future.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just want to point



1 out one other thing. That on each of the little tabs  
2 there's just a very brief summary about what's behind  
3 each of those tabs, so they might answer a couple of  
4 questions also.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Yes, Dr.  
6 Scheffel.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Could you speak to the FTE  
8 issue? Are we proposing 16 new FTE -- no, what is the  
9 FTE request?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I'm sorry, what  
11 page are you on?

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, I was just at the first  
13 page of the PowerPoint. I'm just asking about F  
14 (indiscernible) time equivalent positions. How many new  
15 are proposed?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't -- we aren't  
17 requesting any new FTE, so as far as the 16.2, that  
18 is -- that's just to pull out the Charter School  
19 Institute, and the Colorado School for the Deaf and the  
20 Blind. Even though they're separate agencies, they're  
21 included in our budget request. So there's  
22 no -- we're -- we're not saying we're requesting any more  
23 there. That's just to kind of give you a feel for the  
24 breakdown between CSI, which has 16. The -- the School  
25 for the Deaf and the Blind has almost 200. It's about



1 180. And then sort of the rest of the FTE are ours, so  
2 we've got a little over 400.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: So we're not requesting any  
4 new FTEs?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not any new change  
7 requests this year, no.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: So when we just voted the  
9 other day for two -- three new FTE for licensing, is that  
10 included here? Is that -- is that depicted as three new  
11 FTEs?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, the licensure is  
13 kind of a special case. It's continuously appropriated.  
14 It's not subject to appropriation. And since it's fee  
15 driven, we would make adjustments to the information that  
16 we present; those are informational lines -- the -- the  
17 licensure budget information, since it's not legally  
18 appropriated as informational, we can over or under spend  
19 it with no consequences, provided we have the cash  
20 available. So we would not, strictly speaking, request  
21 those, but if -- if, and when, they're hired, we'll work  
22 with our analyst to build them into those informational  
23 lines. So licensure is a little different than most of  
24 the legal appropriations.

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: Are there other Departments



1 that are outside these totals then? I guess I'm asking  
2 what the total FTE at CDE. Are you saying that it  
3 does -- these numbers don't include licensure, or they're  
4 just funded differently?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The -- the numbers do  
6 include licensure, but the request to you all to increase  
7 the fees, and therefore, that FTE is -- is subsequent to  
8 the preparation of this document. So if -- when we do  
9 hire those folks, we'll include it, but that'll be next  
10 cycle.

11 And -- and to your larger question, this  
12 does include the rest of the FTE that you're asking  
13 about. Licensure is in there. It's just not those three  
14 people that we've added since that was after the -- the  
15 budget cycle was concluded.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, Dr. Scheffel, if  
17 you looked at the white page right behind the -- right  
18 behind the page that you're looking at with the 16.2,  
19 there is the total amount of budgeted FTE for the  
20 Department at 603.3 for '16-'17 and then you can see the  
21 breakout there for the FTE between management and  
22 administrative assistants, and all of those areas. And  
23 there was an increase between the '15-'16 and the '16-'17  
24 of about three FTE there, and those were legislative  
25 bills that authorized the Department through the fiscal



1 note process to have additional FTE there.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. It just comes to mind  
3 that this Department has increased exponentially on FTE,  
4 right, in the last ten years? Be interesting to look at  
5 that trend line. I think when I was working here ten  
6 years ago it was, like, 200 plus employees. Now, we're  
7 up to 600, and I think that's related to all the  
8 assessment, and all the additional federal monies, and  
9 all the additional initiatives, so I don't know if  
10 there's ever any way to look at efficiencies, or does  
11 anybody ever -- do ever reduce staff, based on sun  
12 setting of certain initiatives. That is it always a  
13 growth mentality. I just think that the regulatory  
14 oversight in education is becoming very substantial, and  
15 is reflected in the FTE.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any other questions about  
17 the budget?

18 I think on January 5th, if you want to -- I  
19 believe that's the date to put on your calendar  
20 for -- I'm not sure what time.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I believe it's 1:30 to  
22 5.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The afternoon, right. I'd  
24 get that on your calendars if you want to attend the  
25 Joint Budget Committee Hearing. I know Ms. Rankin



1 doesn't get to do that very often, but --

2 MS. RANKIN: Really excited.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- you get -- yeah, bring  
4 your --

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Could I ask one more  
6 question?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: This is a question for the  
9 Board. Is there every any critical analysis of the  
10 budget? I mean, it seems like in the past we look at  
11 this document. We make a few comments, and we pass it.  
12 I mean, is there any return on investment analysis,  
13 efficiencies with FTE, linkages to grants? I mean, I  
14 don't know. I just having worked in the private sector  
15 some, there's always an extensive budgeting process that  
16 goes on, and it never happens that the budget that is  
17 proposed as the budget that is passed. And yet, having  
18 been on this board for five years, I -- I think we've  
19 never done anything but just passed it, and I wanted to  
20 ask for feedback on that.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

22 MS. FLORES: I wanted to ask a question,  
23 just a corollary to that. When you -- at the end of the  
24 week, you know, when you're kind of doing up your hours,  
25 do you charge these program -- this program, and that



1 program; is that done to find out how money is expended  
2 by everybody? Do you have --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, ma'am.

4 We -- people do it differently. It's -- it's based on  
5 each individual. Some people are charging just one  
6 source of funds, so they don't have to quite put as much  
7 thought into it, but yes, the majority of staff are  
8 funded through federal grants in the Department, and they  
9 have to go through exactly what you're talking about.  
10 Weekly is a good practice. Some people wait until the  
11 end of the month, but they do have to divide their time  
12 up across the programs they work on, based on the actual  
13 time they spent on those programs.

14 MS. FLORES: Because I remember doing that  
15 when I worked, you know, and so there were several --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And -- and it continues  
17 here.

18 MS. FLORES: -- programs, and so I worked  
19 two hours, three hours on this, and -- and at the end of  
20 the year do you have, like, how many hours, and such were  
21 for this program, and --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Indeed we have -- we  
23 have all that information. It's not in this document I'm  
24 sorry to say, but we do. That's not -- that's not part  
25 of the budget submission, but we certainly collect and



1 have all of that information.

2 MS. FLORES: And is it pretty true? I mean,  
3 you just don't bunch up oh, I have some time over here,  
4 and I'm just going to put it in this budget?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is all absolutely  
6 true, ma'am.

7 MS. FLORES: Okay. Because I'd like  
8 to -- I'd like to how many -- how much time is spent say  
9 on special, you know, kids; how much time is -- they  
10 spent on limited English proficient; on really poor kids;  
11 and to see if, you know, we really are putting the  
12 emphasis on getting those kids who really needed the most  
13 help, and want the most --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And -- and we --

15 MS. FLORES: -- help that we -- that we  
16 can -- can muster.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and we certainly  
18 have that information, if the -- the Board would like to  
19 see it. Yes.

20 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So counting the School for  
22 the Deaf and Blind, and the cash funding, and all units,  
23 what are the total number of FTE we're responsible for  
24 in -- in the stated budget?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And you're including



1 CSDDE?

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, and CSI, School for  
3 the Deaf and Blind, all --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The -- the appropriated  
5 amount is at 603.3. As you might imagine, there are  
6 vacancies and things like that --

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- so that number  
9 fluctuates throughout the year, but that would be the  
10 total.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So if you take out CSI,  
12 and the School for the Deaf and Blind, you're at about  
13 400 give or take --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, sir.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- Department employees.  
16 And if you take out the cash funded, you're down another  
17 20, right? How -- and then --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, I think it's --

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- of the balance, how many  
20 are federally funded would you guess, and how many are  
21 general fund, or cash funds?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, we -- I can give  
23 you a percentage breakdown. I apologize I don't have the  
24 numbers.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Percentage.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But federal funded  
2 employees are about 57 percent of staff, and state funded  
3 employees, now that would include your -- your cash, and  
4 your --

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: (Indiscernible) --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- appropriated in  
7 there, but about 43 percent of our staff are state  
8 funded.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right.

10 Any further questions? Going once. Going  
11 twice.

12 Thank you very much.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And then I think future  
15 Board items.

16 Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think there might be  
18 some interest in public comment. Are you willing to add  
19 that (indiscernible) --

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, do we have  
21 it -- I -- do we have it on the agenda?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It was Wednesday's  
23 agenda.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The two public



1 comments.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Then make some available  
3 if somebody wants to take a few minutes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Our rural districts  
9 that are working on this alternative accountability piece  
10 would like to come and share their progress with you.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They would prefer to  
13 come on the first day.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that okay with you  
16 (indiscernible).

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Make it work.

18 MS. FLORES: First day of December?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Would anybody like to  
21 engage in public comment? Anita, you want to come on up.  
22 Take three minutes.

23 MS. STAPLETON: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Board  
24 Members, and Interim Commissioner for your service today.  
25 I am Anita Stapleton from Pueblo.



1 I am a parent, taxpayer, and activist here  
2 today to bring my request that this Colorado State Board  
3 of Education take action to reclaim Colorado education.  
4 First, I submit 77 letters of opposition to the Common  
5 Core and all its mandates. This is the loud and clear  
6 voice of Colorado. Most have lost hope that there will  
7 be real legislation that will benefit the classrooms, as  
8 Colorado remains entangled in the special interests  
9 stakeholders.

10 Governor Hickenlooper stands as acting chair  
11 of the NGA, which is not a government body. And Colorado  
12 remains a member of the CCSSO, which also is not a  
13 government body. Both own the copyright on the Common  
14 Core standards. I demand that Colorado pull its  
15 membership in the CCSSO, and reallocate the membership  
16 dues that my taxpayer dollars provide back to the  
17 classrooms of Colorado.

18 I also, call for an audit of the \$5 million  
19 that were budgeted out of the 17.9 raised to the top  
20 funds. These funds should have been funneled to the  
21 districts to improve education, not towards compliance of  
22 the federal mandates. Administrative positions, expense  
23 accounts, travel accounts, technology, et cetera, should  
24 be eliminated, and those dollars refunded to the  
25 districts.



1 I also ask that the State Board reconsider  
2 its decision to file its no child left behind waiver.  
3 The Board has rushed yet another vote. That is  
4 not -- that if it's not reversed, will prove very  
5 detrimental to the Colorado classrooms. We already have  
6 handed over local control by caving to the federal  
7 government's agenda.

8 Currently, there is too much uncertainty  
9 regarding the reauthorization of ESSA. Attached you'll  
10 find a letter submitted to the National -- submitted by  
11 the national grassroots organizations that support the  
12 rejection of the reauthorization of ESSA. Listed in  
13 detail, with evidence-based research, are many reasons  
14 why the omnibus bill should die.

15 This 1,400-page bill, which is going to  
16 Conference Committee to bloat even further, will  
17 absolutely strip state sovereignty. And I need to say  
18 that one more time. It will absolutely strip state  
19 sovereignty over education unlike that we've ever seen  
20 before.

21 State with our -- with -- with the other  
22 states that are not playing games with the federal  
23 government. The children are being exploited, especially  
24 ELL students, and low-income students.

25 Finally, I urge this Board to push your



1 authority, and put a stop to the further implementation  
2 of PARCC. Let me restate that PARCC MOU has been  
3 breached. It should be deemed null and void. The  
4 federal requirements, as we know, state that there must  
5 be 15 members of states to be a consortium minimum. We  
6 all know that there are only seven left.

7 Allie is also supposed to prove financial  
8 sustainability, not only to implement PARCC, but to  
9 continue its implementation and maintain it. What is  
10 Colorado paying for PARCC? We know as each state pulls  
11 out, that price tag increases. Is this the rationale, as  
12 to why House Bill 1323, I call the compromise bill,  
13 legislated funding for statewide assessments through the  
14 general budget?

15 I must also ask, why are parents reporting  
16 out of Doug Co. that they have to pay an assessment fee  
17 this year? If the general fund is paying for it, is this  
18 to recoup losses that Doug Co. incurred?

19 PARCC smarter balanced air all the others,  
20 they do not measure academic growth. These assessments  
21 are designed to collect and measure non-cognitive data,  
22 with focus on student behavior, attitudes, and responses.  
23 Please refer to the U.S. Department of Report Expanding  
24 Evidence Approaches for Learning in a Digital World. I  
25 provided you this document several months ago. It is all



1 telling, and it spells out the priorities of the U.S.  
2 Department of Education, the goals, and the intended use  
3 of the psychosocial data.

4 It lays out the tools developed to gather  
5 this non-cognitive data, such as the classroom video  
6 cameras that we're talking about with T.S. Gold, the  
7 expression cameras, the pressure mice, et cetera. It's  
8 all in the report. It is not made up. It is not  
9 conspiracy theory. It's in black and white in front of  
10 you.

11 In closing, I will continue to promote  
12 refuse to test, and continue to demand that the local  
13 boards, this State Board, and our legislators take a  
14 stand against the unconstitutional and illegal practices.  
15 If the law has already been broken, then why are we  
16 continuing to enforce it? Thank you.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much.

18 The -- the -- the -- I think the last item  
19 of business is the next meeting, which will be I think  
20 largely executive session, will be Thursday, November  
21 19th, which -- yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) can we  
23 confirm that that's (indiscernible).

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It is not.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or is part of it?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Part --  
2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Executive session.  
3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's a public -- it -- it  
4 will begin as a public meeting, because the -- the bulk  
5 of it, however, will take place in executive session,  
6 because it will be discussing the specific qualifications  
7 of -- of applicants.  
8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Has it been noticed  
9 publicly?  
10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not yet.  
11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.  
12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it will be.  
13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it will be, so that  
14 needs to be very clear, that this is not --  
15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I will --  
16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- this is not an all-  
17 day public meeting -- coming down here for really no  
18 reason.  
19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The first -- the first  
20 agenda --  
21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I plan to work with  
22 Tony on that.  
23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- item will be to move  
24 into executive session, and there will be no other agenda  
25 items, so hopefully that'll be clear, but -- because it



1 will be --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It really needs to be  
3 clear.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- be considering personnel  
5 matters. So I think that's the next order.

6 Anything on the -- comments, future issues?  
7 Going once.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Twice. Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would -- I'll give  
11 you a little heads up, and I think the Commissioner, and  
12 I know Bizy, we've chatted about it. It -- it's been  
13 mentioned surface wise, I would like to have -- bring  
14 some people -- introduce a few people a certain amount of  
15 time, not excessive, but enough time to justify talking  
16 about the Seal of Biliteracy, which has come up, and  
17 it's -- in terms of language -- second language study,  
18 and possibilities around that for kids in districts.

19 We have -- we have, at least,  
20 three -- actually, might three and parts of other  
21 districts that are in the process of carrying out such a  
22 program, and it's -- it's all local  
23 voluntary -- voluntary. Local boards, and districts have  
24 determined that this would be something they want to  
25 pilot, and try for basically a -- a way to acknowledge,



1 and credit -- I -- I want to say credit, but  
2 that's -- that's not necessarily the most accurate word  
3 these days, but to acknowledge, and -- and have kids be  
4 recognized, and given some credit, points, acknowledgment  
5 toward graduation, and other certifying types of  
6 activities for accomplishment, and -- and completion of a  
7 language, other than English, in addition to English.

8 So English is automatically, absolutely is  
9 part of our core requirement anyway, but in another  
10 language to -- it -- it's -- it's an foreign one.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a new -- it's  
12 a -- it's a -- it's a way of looking at developing  
13 literacy on a broad scale. It also just gives credit for  
14 things that kids are studying, and that they bring, as  
15 far as their language skills in two languages really to  
16 the mix, so --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it would be --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: January --

19 MS. FLORES: So it would be, like, the flat  
20 foreign language.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- is what we're  
22 thinking in light of everything else we've got going on  
23 in December, and --

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So you're looking for  
25 what, half an hour, or an hour?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would say between  
2 half hour, hour tops. I -- I think the highlight of  
3 that --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And you have -- you have  
5 some experts you want to bring in to --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- highlight  
7 will -- will be district 2 --

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Non-action item?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Possibly.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Probably.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll let you know way  
12 in advance.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible).

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. We'll -- yeah.  
16 I'm always happy to accommodate --

17 MS. FLORES: Flag develops --

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- a Board member that  
19 wants an issue -- wants to have discussion, so we'll  
20 make --

21 MS. FLORES: -- it's like FLAS, foreign  
22 language --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, not exactly.

24 -- MS. FLORES: -- in the elementary  
25 schools?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is -- this is  
2 pretty much secondary --

3 MS. FLORES: Oh.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- but built on the  
5 base of what really all through school.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. We'll -- we'll make  
7 time.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I think  
9 it's -- it's something it'll be -- it'll be -- you'll  
10 like it.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We'll like it.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It'll be interesting.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, good.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You'll be interested.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. We'll stand  
16 adjourned until 9:00 a.m., Thursday, the 19th of  
17 November. Thank you.

18 (Meeting adjourned)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 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