



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
May 11, 2016, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on May 11, 2016, 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: Board of Education will  
2 please come to order. Ms. Burdsall, if you would call the  
3 roll, please.

4 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores?

5 MS. FLORES: Here.

6 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff.

7 MS. GOFF: Here.

8 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

10 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin.

11 MS. RANKIN: Here.

12 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Board Member Schroeder.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Here.

16 MS. BURDSALL: Chairman Durham.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Here. The quorum is  
18 present. We'll all remain in the gallery and stand for the  
19 Pledge of Allegiance and Ms. Mazanec will lead us in the  
20 Pledge.

21 ALL: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the  
22 United States of America and to the republic for which it  
23 stands, one nation under God, indivisible with liberty and  
24 justice for all.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Okay. We now  
2 move to item four. Is there a motion to approve the agenda  
3 as published?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: So moved.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Schroeder moves  
6 to adapt the agenda as published. Is there a second? Yes,  
7 Dr. Scheffel.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: We need a second first I got  
9 an addition to the agenda.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, did you second on Ms.  
11 Rankin?

12 MS. RANKIN: Sure. I did.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure. Okay. Great.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Could we have a discussion  
15 item this afternoon on the immunization issue?

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is there objection to  
17 having a discussion item on the immunization issue  
18 following the Executive Session? Seeing none --

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Following the Executive  
20 Session?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: This afternoon.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In the afternoon.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, roughly 1:00 p.m.

25 We'll fit it in.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. I thought we had  
2 something timed at 1:00 p.m.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have a recognition  
4 and I wanna talk to maybe after.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: After that.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We'll have to follow that.  
8 We'll try to get out of Executive Session in timely  
9 fashion.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay? All right. So any  
12 other --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I guess you need  
14 another motion.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, we did this one and  
16 then yeah, we'll --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a motion to  
18 approve the agenda as amended.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. Is your motion to  
20 approve the agenda as amended, Dr. Schroeder?

21 MS. SCHROEDER: (Inaudible).

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry. Yes.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Is that after we approve?

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think that's after.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The consent agenda, we'll  
2 do that next. Okay. So is there objection in approval on  
3 agenda as amended? Seeing none, that motion is declared  
4 adopted. We now move to the consent agenda, Dr. Schroeder.

5                   MS. SCHROEDER: I move to place the  
6 following matters on the consent agenda, 11.02, approval of  
7 the payments to the administrative units and the  
8 exceptional Children's Education Act for reimbursement to  
9 payments for students from high cost, in the administrative  
10 unit and out of district placements of programs as set  
11 forth in the published agenda.

12                   11.03, approval waiver for the additional  
13 \$20 dollar out of state application fee for military  
14 personnel and their spouses.

15                   14.03, regarding disciplinary proceedings  
16 concerning a license charge number 2014 EC 1228, direct  
17 department staff and the State Attorney General's Office to  
18 prepare the documents necessary to request a formal hearing  
19 for the revocation of the holder's license pursuant to  
20 Section 22-60.5-108 CRS.

21                   14.04, regarding disciplinary proceedings  
22 concerning license charge number 2015 EC 1070, direct  
23 department staff in the State Attorney General's Office to  
24 prepare the documents necessary to request a formal hearing



1 for the relocation license holders professional -- get your  
2 license pursuant to Section 24-4-104 CRS.

3 14.05, regarding disciplinary proceedings  
4 concerning a license charge number 2015 EC 1224. Direct  
5 Department staff and the State attorney General's Office to  
6 prepare the documents necessary to request a formal hearing  
7 for the revocation of license holders professional teaching  
8 license pursuant to 24-4-104 CRS.

9 14.06, regarding disciplinary proceedings  
10 concerning an application, charge number 2015 EC 1694.  
11 Direct Department staff to issue a Notice of Denial and  
12 Appeal Rights to the applicant pursuant to Section 24-4-104  
13 CRS.

14 14.07, approve one initial emergency  
15 authorization request as set forth in the published agenda.

16 14.08, approve University of Northern  
17 Colorado's request for World Languages endorsement program  
18 as set forth in the published agenda.

19 16.02, approved Denver Public Schools'  
20 request for additional waivers from specific state statutes  
21 on behalf of Collegiate Academy, Compassion Road Academy,  
22 DCIS for Denver Montessori, Martin Luther King Early  
23 College, Summit Academy, Valdez and as set forth in the  
24 published agenda.

25 MS. FLORES: May I?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores?

2 MS. FLORES: Can I put a hold on that?

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let her finish and then as  
4 soon as that's done, then you just list the items you'd  
5 like removed. Okay? Go ahead.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: 16.03, approve the Charter  
7 School Institute's request for waivers on behalf of  
8 Mountain Village Montessori as set forth in the published  
9 agenda.

10 16.04, approve Douglas County's REs requests  
11 for waivers on behalf of Aspen View Academy as set forth in  
12 the published agenda.

13 And 16.05, approve the recommendations for  
14 the 2016 School Counselor Corp grant recipients, an amount  
15 of grant awards as set forth in the published agenda. This  
16 is the end of the consent agenda.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. You've heard the  
18 motion, is there a second to that motion? Yes, Pam has  
19 seconded the motion. Dr. Flores, you'd like something  
20 removed from the agenda with -- do you remember the number  
21 of it?

22 MS. FLORES: I don't remember the number but  
23 it's the Denver Public Schools. And I would just like an  
24 explanation, 16.02.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So 16.02 would be removed  
2 there's objection.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Wait a minute. She just  
4 said she wants an explanation.

5 MS. FLORES: Just an explanation.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Now?

7 MS. FLORES: No, not right now. When --

8 MS. SCHROEDER: You want both separately  
9 now?

10 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. Okay, 16.02 will  
12 be put on a move to the regular agenda. Yes, Ms. Goff.

13 MS. GOFF: I'd like probably the same  
14 nature, to get explanation for 14.08.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. We'll remove 14.08,  
16 Ms. Burdsall. Yes, Ms. Rankin?

17 MS. RANKIN: I'd like 11.02 removed from the  
18 consent agenda and I also want 11.08.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 11.02 and 11.08 will be  
20 removed from the consent agenda.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Wait a minute, 11.08?

22 MS. RANKIN: I'm sorry, 14.08. I'm sorry.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: 11.02 and 14.08?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 11.02 and 14.08 those are  
25 all proper requests. Is there objection to the approval of





1 the remainder of the consent agenda requires unanimous  
2 consent? Seeing no objection, the balance of the consent  
3 agenda is approved. So Ms. Burdsall, if you would -- hold  
4 on a second -- proceed with your report to the Board,  
5 please.

6 MS. BURDSALL: Absolutely. Good morning,  
7 Chairman Durham, Board Members and Commissioner Crandall.  
8 As always, please remember to speak clearly into your  
9 microphones. Be sure that they are on.

10 We have new -- I don't know what they're  
11 called but they sure will have your voices better than the  
12 rest. For those needing to connect to CDE's wireless, you  
13 need to locate CDE hotspot and the password is Silver,  
14 capital S.

15 In your Board packets, you have the  
16 following materials. You have your equipment expansive  
17 Board and that's the calendar. Also in your Board packets  
18 or, and/or available on Board docs are the following  
19 materials.

20 Your item 10.01 have a memo regarding  
21 educator a bunch of just metrics reporting options and then  
22 I have you paired with evaluations on power point. For  
23 item.

24 11.02, you have a memo regarding the special  
25 education fiscal advisory kitty.



1 Allocation for item 11.03, for the memo  
2 regarding military personnel educator messenger decrees.

3 For item 14.08, you have a memo regarding  
4 the University of Northern Colorado for authorization of  
5 proposed role bandages educator's preparation program.

6 For item 14.09, you have a memo regarding  
7 the Colorado universities requesting for the re-  
8 authorization of teaching corporation programs.

9 For item 15.01, you have a memo regarding  
10 the bowling convention education grant program rules, a  
11 copy of the grant rules, a line by line comparison of rules  
12 and statutes, a joint letter submitted by CASB, CRSA pace,  
13 a response to written comments document and the title 22  
14 Section 93 document.

15 For item 16.01, you have a memo regarding  
16 rural public schools innovation zone application request,  
17 supporting material within that request.

18 For item 16.02, you have a memo regarding  
19 DBS' additional waiver request 22-52.5-107(3)(a) CRS  
20 against foreign materials, you can find that on Board tops.

21 For item 16.03 and 16.04, you have memos  
22 regarding charter schools waiver requests against foreign  
23 materials, maybe caught that on Board tops.



1                   For item 16.05, you have a memo regarding  
2 the school council of works grant program and innovations,  
3 again support materials are available on Board tops.

4                   For item 17.01, you have a memo regarding  
5 the notice of rulemaking for the rules of the  
6 administration of the healthy beverages policy,  
7 (inaudible).

8                   For item 18.01, you have a memo regarding  
9 the content exams for the demonstration of con technology  
10 competency for educator preparation and messenger  
11 endorsements.

12                   For Thursday, item 3.01, we have a memo  
13 regarding school and district performance frameworks,  
14 waiting for plan types as well as the school's and  
15 district's performance power point, we have for you --  
16 which I sent to you yesterday a memo regarding the ESSA  
17 listening tour and the ESSA listening tour learnings  
18 PowerPoint.

19                   For item 4.01, you have a memo regarding the  
20 2016 CLDB Academy student tests and that's available on the  
21 Board.

22                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions for Ms.  
23 Burdsall. I have only one comment. You did mention that  
24 the expense report is included into the Member's packet,  
25 and I think money's been transferred from one Member's



1 account to the other. It's my opinion that if you all  
2 think the meeting is important, it's up to you to make that  
3 judgment and as long as the funds are available, you should  
4 plan on attending and we'll transfer money so long as they  
5 remain -- I don't like to pass judgment or anyone else's to  
6 get involved in that.

7                   So we do have funds available and if you  
8 believe they're meetings you should attend and will help  
9 you, we can make further adjustments as the year goes on.  
10 So just to encourage all of you to participate in those  
11 meetings to the extent possible. Any other questions?  
12 Okay. Next we have, I believe, yes we have. Excuse me.  
13 Ms. Mello, the legislative update. Guess I haven't seen  
14 you since about 11:00. I think Ms. Mello, I've really --  
15 I've -- I've really missed you.

16                   MS. MELLO: Don't go there.

17                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Welcome to the State Board  
18 of Education. What legislative day is this, Ms. Mello?

19                   MS. MELLO: It would be the 120th  
20 legislative day.

21                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's the best day of the  
22 entire registry of agenda. Yes.

23                   MS. MELLO: Is this working, can you all  
24 hear me? Okay. Well, good morning, thank you Mr. Chair.  
25 Yes lovely to see you again. It's nice to see you.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I don't think it is working.  
2 We can hear you but not because it's working.

3 MS. MELLO: Better now?

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: No.

5 MS. MELLO: Better now? Okay, I'll project  
6 unless that is going to mess you up.

7 (Overlapping)

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Speak louder.

9 MS. MELLO: All right. So yes, it is the  
10 120th day of the legislative session which means it is the  
11 last day of the legislative session. For most of us that's  
12 cause for celebration. There has been a lot happening in  
13 the last week to 10 days. That is not unusual. I  
14 personally think the pace of large issues with the  
15 legislature has chosen to wait to deal with until this last  
16 week has been particularly rigorous this year. And lots of  
17 things that have nothing to do with K-12, liquor and oil  
18 and gas and all kinds of other important policy issues, but  
19 ones that don't directly impact you all over here.

20 In terms of K-12, I'll just try -- what I  
21 thought I would do today is just highlight the things that  
22 have moved or changed recently. We will have an end of  
23 session report prepared for you. Our goal is to get that  
24 to you by Friday at the latest. That will be a



1 comprehensive look at all of bills, what happened to them.  
2 Summaries of some of the more important topics --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Winners and losers.

4 MS. MELLO: Yes, yes absolutely. So that is  
5 coming and I'm also happy to try to answer any questions  
6 about individual bills to the extent I can. In terms of  
7 bills that have been hot topics in the last week. So the  
8 School Finance Act was interesting this year. The original  
9 plan of the School Finance Act was it was going to be  
10 strictly a School Finance Act. They were not going to do  
11 anything but school financing in the School Finance Act.

12 Well that changed. Last week in the Senate,  
13 some language was added to the School Finance Act. It has  
14 to do with charter schools, particularly streamlining the  
15 audit process for charters, requirements on district to  
16 notify charters about vacant district buildings, some more  
17 detailed requirements around accounting of District  
18 Services to charters and expenses. That language got added  
19 onto school finance. That language had been included in  
20 another bill that had passed the Senate and was still  
21 waiting for House action.

22 I think it is and I will observe that  
23 perhaps the Senate added that language because they were  
24 tired of waiting for the House to take action on that bill  
25 over there. So they put that language on and drama ensued,



1 lots of running around and shouting and arguing and such.  
2 The other thing the Senate added was, there are about eight  
3 or nine school districts who have seen a decrease in their  
4 tax revenue, that previously were fully local funding. So  
5 they had enough revenue at the local level to fully fund  
6 their program. They didn't have any state money coming in.

7           And as a result of that, they have not seen  
8 the impact of a negative factor, the way that other school  
9 districts across the state have. So there was an amendment  
10 out in the Senate that would have for a year essentially  
11 softened that blow for those districts. Right. So that  
12 they didn't have to absorb the full impact of the negative  
13 factor in one year. So that's what happened in the Senate.  
14 As the process works, that had to go back to the House.  
15 The House asked for a conference committee.

16           That conference committee met yesterday  
17 afternoon. The charter language stayed on the bill, so the  
18 -- the language I just described to you is now part of  
19 school finance which is now passed, and is done. And they  
20 made a modification to the language around these rural  
21 school districts, where essentially they agreed to kind of  
22 a 25 percent grant to help them. It's about a million  
23 total. It will soften the blow somewhat for those  
24 districts, not entirely and I don't know how satisfied  
25 those districts are with that solution, but they didn't get



1 everything that they had hoped for, they got something. So  
2 that is the version of the school finance act that has  
3 passed the legislature and I'll just pause there because it  
4 looks like there's questions.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores.

6 MS. FLORES: One million was for those  
7 school districts that were being wholly paid by their own  
8 district or was it for others? I didn't --

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please proceed.

10 MS. ANTHES: Mr. Chair, Dr. Flores. Yes.  
11 That one million is just for those districts who are in the  
12 situation where they were for the first time being in a  
13 position to absorb the negative factor.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Rankin. Excuse  
15 me.

16 MS. RANKIN: Mrs. Mello, who makes that  
17 decision on that million dollars?

18 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, Board Member Rankin.  
19 I don't know. I don't know, perhaps look, look my friend  
20 Leanne is going to come save me as she often does when it  
21 comes to school finance matters.

22 MS. EMM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am  
23 Leanne Emm, Associate Commissioner for School Finance and  
24 Operations. The contingency reserve fund has that you all  
25 approve, request for spending out of. If the District were





1 to request the funds through the State Board then you  
2 already have that discretion in order to grant those  
3 Districts up to the 25 percent of funding that they would  
4 be eligible for. So it would come to the state Board as a  
5 request.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Emm, do you know --  
7 off the top of your head what -- which are the data of  
8 districts, many of them can give us a flavor of where they  
9 are, who they are.

10 MS. EMM: Sure. Thank you Mr. Chair. It's  
11 predominantly the districts that have high oil and gas  
12 property taxes and this would fall into the districts that  
13 were refusing to pay the categorical buyout that you all  
14 were kept apprised of test throughout the year. So this  
15 was a compromised way to help those districts in order to  
16 soften the blow for them as their assessed value may  
17 decrease and therefore they might have more negative factor  
18 applied to them as their state share, you know, it gets a  
19 little bit --

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So Cripple Creek for  
21 example with the declining price of gold.

22 MS. EMM: You know you go some of those  
23 districts with a high willed county districts.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: From the Eastern Plains.

25 MS. EMM: Yes.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Alright. Any other  
2 questions for Ms. Emm on that? Thank you very much.

3 MS. MELLO: I will always defer to Ms. Emm  
4 on questions of school finance. The other bill I wanted to  
5 highlight for you is a bill that you all as a State Board  
6 of supporting its House Bill 12-22 which deals with  
7 supplemental unblended online learning. Just as a reminder  
8 of what this Bill, when it was introduced, the goal of the  
9 Bill then and it still remains to expand on the existing  
10 blended online learning program that we have here in  
11 Colorado, ensure kind of greater availability of course  
12 content through that so that for example this is an example  
13 only, maybe they already have a physics class I don't know,  
14 but physics might be the kind of thing we would want a high  
15 quality online course available for either because if  
16 you're in a rural school district and you have a kid who  
17 wants to take physics you know you don't have a teacher or  
18 if you're in a suburban district you've got an eighth  
19 grader who wants to take physics and it works better to  
20 have that work through an effective online mechanism.

21 Another part of that bill has to do with  
22 some I think more effective strategic planning for blended  
23 and online learning throughout the state and some better  
24 marketing of that so that all districts are aware and can  
25 take advantage of those services. It has been one of the I



1 describe to you a relatively complex process of school  
2 finance. This one was even more complex because this bill  
3 was actually dead for about 24 hours in committee. We were  
4 able to resurrect it and that was an interesting process.  
5 There was a bit emotional actually on all sides. So  
6 nonetheless the bill did die, the next day one of the  
7 Members who'd voted to kill the bill went public and said,  
8 "I made a mistake. That's not what I intend to do. I got  
9 confused with another bill. Voted to move to reconsider  
10 that decision."

11                   The committee reconsidered it. The bill  
12 passed out of committee. The Senate did make two changes  
13 to the bill, one had to do with the legislative declaration  
14 language. So I think it's important to keep in mind the  
15 legislative declaration language has no force of law. It  
16 gets put into a bill often to explain why a bill is coming  
17 or what the intent is but it doesn't actually end up in the  
18 statute books. But there was some language that people  
19 were concerned that somehow might be interpreted as  
20 requiring either district or student participation in this  
21 wanted online learning.

22                   So they edited that language. They amended  
23 it to make it very clear that this is a choice that both  
24 the districts understood part. So that bill got  
25 resurrected and the Senate passed the Senate with these



1 changes, we're back to the House where they concurred with  
2 these changes last night and it is now done with its  
3 legislative journey. We're at the point in session where  
4 the Governor has 30 days to play his part in this process  
5 for any bill, any bill, I'm not being specific to these  
6 Bills.

7                   He has three choices. He can veto the bill,  
8 he can let it become law without a signature or he can sign  
9 the bill. I have. Every reason to think he'll sign School  
10 Finance because that's important defending our schools.  
11 And I've no indication that there's any problems in the  
12 Governor's office with 12-22 the other bill I just  
13 described to you. The other Bill I thought I would  
14 highlight real quickly because it relates directly to an  
15 action that you would like is House Bill 14-46 which was  
16 the K-3 English learner bill that was its title of the  
17 Capital. This bill was introduced as a response to a  
18 decision you all made as a Board with the READ Act and with  
19 requiring that one of the annual assessments as part of the  
20 READ Act to be done in English.

21                   This bill would have made it, say that's a  
22 district choice to whether they do have an English or  
23 Spanish or what that combination is. Fell past the house,  
24 it died in the Senate at the request of the Senate sponsor.  
25 They killed it in its first committee. So that bill is



1 gone. So those are the ones I just wanted to highlight for  
2 you that there's been some action on again happy to answer  
3 any questions. I'll do my best to answer questions.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

5 MS. GOFF: Thank you. Who was the Senate's  
6 sponsor through the READ Act and the READ Act question  
7 Bill?

8 MS. ANTHES: Mr. Chair, Board Member Goff,  
9 it was Senator Vicki Marble from Brimfield.

10 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Going back to House Bill 12-  
13 22, so you're saying that it did pass last night through  
14 the Senate? I mean is it as with the Governor's office  
15 now?

16 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair and Dr. Scheffel, yes  
17 that bill is on its way to the Governor's office as we  
18 speak and that change was made to that legislative  
19 declaration language to soften it and make it clear that  
20 it's not a requirement at any level.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: And do you know what online  
22 program the course is supposed to be, this is about on the  
23 surface getting more access to high quality educators in  
24 rural areas and areas where they have a hard time  
25 attracting certain types of teachers, like physics or



1 whatever breakthrough opening up online but I'm concerned  
2 that I haven't looked back then at the language after the  
3 amendments, but in terms of the curriculum and what  
4 curriculum is BOCES trying to -- and the only reason it's  
5 there is an association with a certain curriculum? Do you  
6 know?

7 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, Board Member  
8 Scheffel, so I again, this is an existing program it's  
9 building on that and I don't believe that -- my  
10 understanding is it's some kind of demand driven right? So  
11 what online courses do districts want to be available and  
12 that there's some responsiveness to that. That's  
13 admittedly a partial answer to your question and I know  
14 there are experts in compartment who may be jumping up  
15 behind me too. I don't know. I can't see behind me. I  
16 don't have eyes in the back of my head.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is that an actual school  
18 fault?

19 MS. MELLO: Mr. Chair, Dr. Scheffel, Katy  
20 says she doesn't think so. What I was, let me just point  
21 out and another thing that we will have for you all soon it  
22 won't be this week, it'll probably be at your, you guys get  
23 to decide in your schedule perhaps that your June Board  
24 meeting. We -- however put together this implementation  
25 document or we take all the bills that have passed and we



1 very specifically outlined the different steps that the  
2 department or the Board is responsible for doing, I'm just  
3 another place an opportunity to perhaps explore some of the  
4 specifics. I don't know any more detailed answers to your  
5 questions. Happy to keep trying to dig around if you'd  
6 like us to.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin.

9 MS. RANKIN: I know a little bit about this  
10 bill and one of the things that I have found in my district  
11 that there might be a little confusion on is some districts  
12 are Members of BOCES -- some are not. But this particular  
13 bill opens it up to every district. You don't have to be a  
14 Member. I look at it as a library. There will be some  
15 info there, or you can request some and then your district  
16 wouldn't have to put out the money that everybody likes it.  
17 Every district would have to pay out of their own budget.  
18 This one allows them to go through BOCES to get some of  
19 that software. That's the way I understand.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: There is no -- any other -  
21 - anything else to report.

22 MS. MELLO: Anything else I can confuse you  
23 on further? I apologize. Tiring times. No, I'm done.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Rankin.



1 MS. RANKIN: I just want to add thank you so  
2 much for the work you've done and the work you've done in  
3 the last two days for me when I've called you on the phone  
4 and asked you questions too and if you could continue when  
5 you get your final report to put in how the Board voted  
6 because I think gets very confusing to me after I get away  
7 from it for a while, I think we do, what did we do. And  
8 that was extremely helpful to us. Thanks for your work.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much, Ms.  
10 Mello. We're a little early for the next agenda item so if  
11 we could proceed out of order to Commissioner Crandall for  
12 your update, item nine.

13 MR. CRANDALL: Wonderful. Thank you, Mr.  
14 Chair. It's a pleasure personally to be with you today as  
15 we talked about the great work happening at the Colorado  
16 Department of Education. There are several things a lot of  
17 the work we've been doing is actually part of the agenda of  
18 the next day and a half. And so you will see that but I  
19 want to touch on some highlights as we go through what  
20 everybody has been doing.

21 The first one -- one of the biggest things  
22 is the ESSA Listening Tour that kicked off last week.  
23 You'll get a nice -- there's a very short PowerPoint that  
24 Alyssa and Patrick are gonna be doing with you on that.  
25 But I do want to thank Pat Chapman and the Federal Programs





1 and Alyssa Pearson in accountability, the communications  
2 team. And there was one more -- oh. Lynne Banberry and  
3 really all the federal programs folks.

4                   Got off to a good start, we've learned some  
5 things that we'll tweak before the next ones and that's  
6 actually the last slide that I'll show today is the little  
7 tweaks were made with that very, very well received, very  
8 well attended, we have been very nice in a moment and  
9 remaining ones we have will be adding a couple of more  
10 specific areas and we'll learn more about that today. I  
11 want to bring you up to date on the filling of the  
12 associate commissioner of accountability assessment  
13 position.

14                   We have made an offer. I won't go public  
15 with it yet until we get the final confirmation of 20  
16 applicants from all over the country for this position.  
17 When all was said and done we didn't end up going local  
18 with the end and it would be very clear we didn't go local  
19 because they were local. We went with this individual  
20 because they were most qualified of the 20 applicants which  
21 was very, very positive for us.

22                   I'm excited to share the name and everything  
23 with you over the next few days as we get the letter back  
24 for me that this is someone who brings a lot of



1 qualifications, entrepreneurialism, as we talked about the  
2 exciting things in accountability and assessment.

3                   One item. We've been advertising for our  
4 chief communications -- chief communications officer. We  
5 have numerous applications it closes on the 17th. We are  
6 not waiting for it to close to start interviews we're kind  
7 of its a just in time process if there's a very high  
8 quality application resume that comes in. We have a full  
9 interview with that person immediately just to evaluate if  
10 we want to bring them forward. We've got three that we are  
11 talking to right now that are very highly qualified. It'll  
12 close the close on the 17th, and then we'll -- we'll  
13 probably make an offer within a week of that closing. So  
14 by the time with the next meeting we'll know who that is,  
15 actually you'll know well before that but we'll let you  
16 meet them in the next meeting.

17                   It's been a busy week for me and several  
18 Members of CDE getting out into the field in the premier of  
19 the Denver metro area for now. Next week a little bit  
20 different but the last three weeks have had tours to  
21 Sheridan, Will Reach high school in JeffCo, Silver Creek  
22 and St. Brain, Fort Lupton, well already eight up there,  
23 In the Wood and Adams 14 Commerce City.

24                   So we're really getting out of the field  
25 with our people to listen to what the Districts need from



1 us what their expectations are. I don't want to call out a  
2 few of our departments here who have been very, very busy  
3 for those who we should have seen this coming. I guarantee  
4 you Colleen saw it coming, but I didn't. If -- if west  
5 (inaudible) fees were going to rise on March 1st what do  
6 you think would happen in February? And again, the entire  
7 world the entire world said, "Ooh. I wanna renew my  
8 license in February before fees go up."

9                   And so our licensure department had doubled  
10 the volume in February, had to work their tails off late  
11 nights to make the process truth and efficient and it  
12 worked and it worked so well I'd say that we doubled the  
13 workload for them every month. They just continued down  
14 the path of course, Colleen, is she in the room? She left  
15 the room. Too bad.

16                   MS. MELLO: She's listening.

17                   MR. CRANDALL: Okay. Truly fabulous  
18 customer service. It took a lot to get through that much  
19 volume and I know they put in some extra time to make that  
20 happen. So they have got to a great shout out to that  
21 group. Another group that deserves tremendous shout out is  
22 our assessment team and as we look at other states I've  
23 gotta tell you, Tennessee's commissioner was out here on  
24 business for something in Denver, I just called up, "My



1 name is Crandall." She said, "Can I come by for an hour  
2 just to visit?".

3                   Katy and I sat down with her and talked  
4 about Tennessee a great state for education. I don't know  
5 if you're aware of what happened to them two weeks ago.  
6 Their state assessment blew up. It was going to be online.  
7 It was a first year contract, a new vendor to the state, it  
8 literally didn't work. They couldn't go online. So once  
9 they couldn't go online, the state said we'll find -- send  
10 hard copies to every district. The hard copies didn't  
11 arrive in time and finally candidates had to pull the plug  
12 and say, "Apparently we're not doing a state assessment  
13 this year."

14                   The exact same thing happened in Alaska and  
15 the half of Georgia. We were always hesitant to use the  
16 word flawless, is Joyce in the room or she had another  
17 meeting also? We know there's some technical advisory  
18 meeting that's going on right now. For our PAC  
19 administration are virtually flawless. We didn't have any  
20 big computer glitz or anything that had to take care of.  
21 We had a little bit of a problem on the assessment site for  
22 special needs because a backhoe at the University of Kansas  
23 cut their internet connection.

24                   That's not PAC, it's a different assessment  
25 out of the University of Kansas and literally cut their



1 line out to the rest of the world so 14 states have a  
2 couple of days where they had to redo that piece of  
3 assessment. We will battle backhoe work in the U.S. during  
4 next year's window of testing. Very, very pleased with  
5 Joyce and our entire team the work. Now, now, it comes to  
6 the -- the heavy lift getting the results out to those who  
7 can do something with it. Please, Madam Chair.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Do you know what percentage  
9 of the districts or schools requested paper?

10 MR. CRANDALL: I -- you know, I ask that  
11 question. It was -- it was less than 10 percent and I wish  
12 some more here.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

14 MR. CRANDALL: I want to say five or six  
15 percent. I -- It -- it was a much smaller number than  
16 previous years.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: It was even smaller than  
18 previous years. Okay.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: As for what?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Paper.

21 (Overlapping)

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Paper version because I  
23 think there's a -- If I -- if I remember my reading, it  
24 takes longer to do the paper grading and that's one of the  
25 things that holds up getting the results, am I right?



1 MR. CRANDALL: I -- It does. It does.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So we're we be able  
3 to -- the last we have of that maybe decision --

4 MR. CRANDALL: And the window --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: -- getting our results.

6 MR. CRANDALL: -- the window is short and  
7 for getting a results back, the -- the challenge with being  
8 in a -- in a public education system still under agrarian  
9 calendar. It doesn't matter if we get the results back  
10 June 7th or August 15th.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Seventh.

12 MR. CRANDALL: The kids are still gone. So  
13 that's -- that's a little bit of a challenge for every  
14 single state who does testing in May, March, April.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

16 MR. CRANDALL: There are -- there are  
17 handful of states who do fall administrations. I'm not an  
18 expert on how that works because are you reviewing for  
19 September, October, and then, assessing -- there are hand -  
20 -

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All of the assessments?

22 MR. CRANDALL: -- handful. A high exec.  
23 They have their stage assessment in the fall. Very  
24 interesting option there. I want to talk a of couple  
25 things that are -- If heard me in my Thursday Thoughts talk



1 about code.org, computer science education. We know that  
2 Colorado is not in the front of the pack in computer  
3 science education as a state in aggregate. We have some  
4 high schools that truly and so sorry from ignoring the left  
5 side of the room.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Oh, it's okay. We have all  
7 the follow up of question --

8 MR. CRANDALL: Please.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- on the test. Where are we  
10 with the MOU with the Park.

11 MR. CRANDALL: It's -- it -- For this year,  
12 it's been signed and delivered to the them. We had  
13 approved by attorneys, got the language fix that we need  
14 and -- and that was signed and delivered about two weeks  
15 ago.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: And how long is that MOU in  
17 place?

18 MR. CRANDALL: Just -- just for this -- this  
19 --

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: It's a one year.

21 MR. CRANDALL: It's a one year contract.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: When do we consider another  
23 contract?

24 MR. DURHAM: For -- for -- and for year, you  
25 mean this school year is just ending or the --



1 MR. CRANDALL: Correct, right.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- next school ends.

3 MR. CRANDALL: We were last state to  
4 actually sign it so for the one that's ending.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

6 MR. CRANDALL: We'll have -- they will make  
7 a decision in the next year. Our contract with Pearson  
8 which the test administrator is for one more year that --

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: So when are those up for  
10 review? Is that thought we were gonna talk about before we  
11 signed it in.

12 MR. CRANDALL: The -- the Pearson contract  
13 is not for review until -- I mean, we had one more year  
14 with them. They're the ones who -- who administer the park  
15 assessment.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: So what date do we  
17 reconsidering these MOU's?

18 MR. CRANDALL: We can -- It really starts  
19 any -- any time -- at any time we have a conversation about  
20 a different direction you may want to go, the pros and the  
21 cons. We're prepared to bring information -- on that at --  
22 whenever the Board would like to have that conversation.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. So I would ask the  
24 Chair that we could set a date for that, Mr. Chair.





1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It will take a look --  
2 Elizabeth, let's examine the possibilities of the June  
3 meeting and we'll see if it can be done by then, if not  
4 August, okay.

5                   MR. CRANDALL: And -- and -- and to the  
6 point, I -- I'd -- I'd -- Sorry. I need to make something  
7 very clear. The Chair met with me about two weeks ago  
8 maybe and -- and brought me a list of some things for  
9 future consideration. That was one of them to be on there.  
10 I'm gonna talk about one -- another one here in just a  
11 second. But to start on the path, we have made numerous  
12 photos to individuals. Were not prepared to -- to talk  
13 about that today because they don't want scare the world a  
14 -- as we have just general conversations over started to  
15 gather information to meet your needs.

16                  MS. SCHEFFEL: We have still remains a very  
17 contentious issue out their -- of their respective part and  
18 I as we are continuing our relationship with park. The  
19 nature of the test, the language issues in the tests, the  
20 nature of the content and the test. There's a lot of  
21 issues like I guess, I don't want us to just keep renewing  
22 the contract. It must be deliberately agreeing that's what  
23 we want and that's what our constituents want. That's what  
24 serves Colorado best and questions of people.



1 MR. CRANDALL: Thank you, Board Member  
2 Scheffel. I appreciate that. Did I mention we due our --  
3 our -- really our -- our contract in this June 30th, 2017  
4 and that would be a very critical juncture. Also the RFI  
5 with Park with the RFP would have got out as far as their -  
6 - what their governance structures were look like. Like  
7 going forward, so we'll have a lot of answers.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's what I'm trying to  
9 figure out is when is the date by which we would have an  
10 actual leverage pointed so close to after defend.

11 MR. CRANDALL: To that end, the conversation  
12 probably should start --

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Soon.

14 MR. CRANDALL: -- soon.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, that's what I'm --

16 MR. CRANDALL: You -- you don't wanna wait  
17 till March, April for --

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, because I guess I didn't  
19 know that we had just signed it again. So I'd love set a  
20 date.

21 MR. CRANDALL: Well -- just to be fair.  
22 What -- what we signed was for the contract that began July  
23 1st, 2015.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right.



1 MR. CRANDALL: You know, it's -- it's almost  
2 that we signed a contract 10 months into the 12 months.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Retroactive.

4 MR. CRANDALL: I -- it -- it really was.  
5 Because -- because we -- we have some strong opinions, the  
6 Board did about -- about language we wanted in there. So  
7 we were the last of all the 18 states to sign. We have,  
8 you know, all kinds of time for the next one --

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Good. Thank you.

10 MR. CRANDALL: -- to talk their -- Thank  
11 you, Mr. Chair that --

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please proceed.

13 MR. CRANDALL: No, I'm computer science  
14 education for just a minute. We talked about -- you've --  
15 you've seen me talk about code.org, where we are as a  
16 state. There was some legislation trying to kind of kick  
17 starts that. The governor did sign on to the code.org  
18 pledge with Congress to make computer science education a  
19 higher priority not just in Colorado. Literally, across  
20 United States. It a -- it is a fact that we trail some of  
21 the high performing countries of computer science and we  
22 know who those countries are.

23 So for our future economic competitiveness,  
24 we need to look at that. I've asked Rosa Hood (ph) in  
25 close conjunction with the state library. We have a -- we



1 have a very strong state library department that is very  
2 tech savvy. I've asked them to take the next 30 days to do  
3 a complete evaluation of literally, what would it take for  
4 Colorado to be number one in computer science education in  
5 two years? What would it take? Resources, what's already  
6 being done. I know they're making a tour,.

7                   St. Vrain is one of our top computer  
8 science districts as far as what they do K5, 6, 7, 8 and  
9 high school. We're gonna be visiting some of those top  
10 performing and -- and there are school districts. It's  
11 unfortunate we're keyboarding, keyboarding and Microsoft  
12 Word or as far as they go in computer science education.  
13 That's not gonna lead us to where we need to be.

14                   So I -- I bring that to you because we're  
15 excited to report back. This is -- this will be a long  
16 process. The beauty of -- the beauty of this is that the  
17 race, we're behind, but the race started about a year and a  
18 half ago. So we -- we -- it's not like the race started 30  
19 years ago. It would not be hard for us to be number one in  
20 the country in two years with the rights -- right pieces in  
21 place. Think about -- we talk about teacher pipeline quite  
22 a bit.

23                   Met yesterday with the president of Metro  
24 State to talk about what our methodologies we can do to  
25 start increasing the teacher pipeline at all of our teacher



1 prep institutions or things we could do in the department.  
2 What can we do with the high school level perhaps with  
3 educators rising in the former Future Educators of America  
4 organization. In states where educated -- educators rising  
5 has a strong presence in high schools. They have a -- a  
6 significantly higher number of students work straight into  
7 the teacher prep straight from high school. So we're  
8 learning more about that. We're talking with Metro State  
9 about what a -- a partnership might look like. Could they  
10 sponsor some of the high school organizations, we'll get  
11 back to on that -- that piece.

12 MS. FLORES: Excuse me.

13 MR. CRANDALL: Please.

14 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question? Is  
15 future educators rising part of future teachers of America?

16 MR. CRANDALL: It -- it used -- that's the  
17 name. They rebranded themselves, Board Member Flores, and  
18 if you go to our website educators rising, I think they're  
19 headquartered in Indiana.

20 MS. FLORES: Is it future educators rising?

21 MR. CRANDALL: No, it -- it's -- just  
22 educators rising there and their executive director Dave  
23 reach out to us and was willing to come out to visit with  
24 us and talk about what will gonna do it. Pretty cool. I -  
25 - it's interesting I think -- I think that went just some



1 struggles a little bit about energy and branding and -- and  
2 it kind of tapered off and now, they're making a strong  
3 comeback. It -- it's unfortunate but the two biggest  
4 critics of the teaching profession -- let me -- let me  
5 rephrase it differently. The -- when a student is  
6 considering whether or not to go into teaching, the two  
7 people who dissuade them the most, the two groups are  
8 current teachers and parents.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Parents, you know. So we  
10 did our girls pretty -- didn't do any good.

11 MR. CRANDALL: Very good. I'm glad it  
12 didn't. Very -- very unfortunate there. I -- I was  
13 pleased I had the opportunity to go to and I'll -- a little  
14 bit about this nice -- Thursday thoughts tomorrow. As I  
15 went to Silver Creek, their leadership academy and they --  
16 there's a young -- they -- it was their capstone projects.  
17 A young lady there had put on a special needs prom, and  
18 she's going to Arizona State University to major in special  
19 education and I made her sign a pledge right then and there  
20 that she will come right back to Colorado upon graduation  
21 for (inaudible).

22 It is a constant conversation we -- we've  
23 been having. A tremendous amount of the work is taking  
24 place at CDE you're aware of because in -- you're gonna be  
25 part of it for the next 12 to 18 months. And that is the -



1 - around the -- the on the clock, those schools that are on  
2 the fifth year of the clock. So I want make sure to  
3 recognize that group play. You're going to get to hear  
4 from them shortly but I -- I -- just every at least that  
5 Peter, Brenda, everyone that you've met with. I think  
6 you've met Dr. Bizy with several of them as we start  
7 talking about different school districts. So I want to  
8 thank them for their effort.

9 I'm going to plant a -- a seed about a  
10 conversation we need to have. Board Member Scheffel was as  
11 long as we're talking about things we need to be looking  
12 forward in the future. I -- as I -- as I get to visit --  
13 as Kay and I visit with Candice from Tennessee and the  
14 couple of the other chiefs, very few states require every  
15 single one of their standards to be reviewed in the same  
16 year. It's typically a cascade will do, you know, three  
17 standards this year. Three of the next -- three of the  
18 next as opposed to all nine or 10 in a single year. It is  
19 -- it is a tremendous workload to have to review all the  
20 standards right away. When they have that conversation,  
21 there are some standards that are very critical that we  
22 want to review right away and make sure they're Colorado  
23 specific and those are definitely ELA and math the ones  
24 that were tested for and Park. Let's make sure that those



1 standards are our standards and -- and fit the needs of  
2 Colorado.

3 I -- I don't have a strong recommendation as  
4 far as I'm not prepared to -- when we have to have a  
5 legislative change on this. I'm not prepared for that but  
6 it be very nice if we had the Math, English language arts,  
7 and perhaps, one other subject next year and then based on  
8 your priorities go 333. Just to -- I want to throw that  
9 out there because to have to do all nine or 10 in a single  
10 12 month period is -- in the same period where you're  
11 working on the clock and things like might -- might be a  
12 little tough so.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: So as we talk about that, I  
15 would -- I'd be interested in knowing what the process is.  
16 Does the feedback that we're getting from teachers is a lot  
17 different than the feed than what we hear. People who are  
18 not in the classroom. So I want to make sure that we have  
19 some sense what the pro -- the process took forever when we  
20 did our standards back in 2000, what eight nine?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yep.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: I don't know that the -- the  
23 capacities here to do that which -- which supports your  
24 notion but I -- I'm really concerned about being able to  
25 hear because I constantly hear that they need more support





1 for the standards. They need to have textbooks that are  
2 aligned. Professional development et cetera. You  
3 everything again. You don't hear that they're dying to  
4 have a start changing again.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Exactly.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: So I -- I want -- I want to  
7 make sure we have -- they have an opportunity not just  
8 through their association, but in some broader way to  
9 provide feedback. Where are the problem areas support  
10 them? Is it just that or are there particular standards  
11 that are problematic that are inappropriate at the level  
12 those kinds of opinions from our experts?

13 MR. CRANDALL: And if I can explain it just  
14 briefly because that is the most important question. So  
15 Alyssa Pearson, we -- we actually sat the room and kinda  
16 whiteboard down out some ideas. We also contacting every -  
17 - there are so many states that are doing -- that are  
18 constantly of standards for review. But there's a --  
19 there's quite a few different models out there and we'd  
20 love to bring a few of them before the Board and ask for  
21 you to give provide guidance on what you think is an ideal  
22 way.

23 I -- I'm of the mindset that I -- the  
24 standards should not be so prescriptive that a local school  
25 districts, teacher doesn't have the flexibility to teach



1 the way they want, some things to that. I'd -- I'd do  
2 subscribe to this little bit broader to allow some- some  
3 movement within those as opposed to here's exactly what  
4 you're teaching this day on this time, but the reviews will  
5 be -- we've have been before you to hear your opinions on  
6 those.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: And I don't think we hear  
8 enough that they are a floor. If there is a district that  
9 does not think this -- our standards are high enough, they  
10 can add -- those -- those words can add and make any  
11 changes they want to. That is just simply the four --

12 MR. CRANDALL: It was Governor --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: -- for our institution.

14 MR. CRANDALL: -- Matt Mead's favorite  
15 education saying. He said the (inaudible) travel the State  
16 of Wyoming. The standards are (inaudible).

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.

19 MS. GOFF: All right. Thank you. Along  
20 with the suggestion in yours about other states examples,  
21 right now, today, I would say we should stay away from the  
22 states that have flip flopped their sets of standards about  
23 three or four times in the last few years. You know, I --  
24 something we can talk about but I don't wanna -- There are  
25 several --



1 MR. CRANDALL: Yeah.

2 MS. GOFF: -- in their -- in their pay and  
3 the ramifications right now. But, you know, in- in any  
4 reference to the past round when do actually, that's  
5 different than this time. This time we're reviewing and  
6 remolding if you want to call it that. Last time, we were  
7 starting from scratch on two levels. It was complicated  
8 work and any reference to the meetings, and the gatherings,  
9 and the outreach of those years, which started in early  
10 2008 really, I just think we need to kinda keep that --  
11 keep that separate although, don't forget it -- it 's been  
12 portrayed as a lot more negative than it really was. And I  
13 think we need to be honest with people about what that  
14 involved in and how much of Colorado was covered and had  
15 the opportunity to learn about it and take part and I've  
16 been a little bit disconcerted in the last few months about  
17 how that's been portrayed mostly by people that weren't  
18 around.

19 MR. CRANDALL: Think we -- point -- point  
20 well taken.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Just make one comment. I  
22 think the public expects us to finally eliminate common  
23 core standards from our vocabulary and from practical  
24 standpoint from the implementation and as I will get  
25 particularly the math standards I believe in common core



1 completely and appropriate and I think the -- the -- we  
2 need a -- a more knowledge based set of standards and so I  
3 for one, I know it's a -- a large workload but the sooner  
4 we eliminate this from the lexicon, the better.

5           And I think we should be moving vigorously  
6 in that direction. And I would suggest we start with math  
7 standards which at least with most people particularly  
8 engineers and those with whom I speak literally believe  
9 these standards are preparing kids at all to be successful  
10 in mathematics, and I suspect that's a whirlwind when we're  
11 gonna reach here. Gonna rip pretty quickly when we have  
12 kids in college and capable of doing -- of doing high level  
13 of math. So I think that's a good place to start, Dr.  
14 Scheffel.

15           MS. SCHEFFEL: And that's why our  
16 relationship with Park is on court because they really  
17 linked these terms of how we're probably measuring the  
18 standards, the common core standards in Colorado. If we  
19 know 15 percent are the distinctives but the rest of the  
20 common core standards and the -- and the Park defines how  
21 that gets measured. So as our -- our relationship, they're  
22 so essential, but we look at the MOU and we decide. I  
23 mean, I meet with school leadership and the one thing they  
24 would hope to be relieved from this Park. You know, and I  
25 think when we look at the language and the standards, there



1 is so much language and so much complexity in that. I --  
2 I'd like to see our standards be guardrails in a sense, and  
3 -- and allow teachers to be professional and yet,  
4 accountability is great.

5                   But when -- when at the content of the  
6 standards, I -- I think that you're right Jane. We don't  
7 want to now follow the sudden do a flip flop and now we  
8 have to do twice the work and the teachers are confused of  
9 what they're teaching. We don't wanna do that either. You  
10 know, they've -- there's been a lot of angst around this  
11 but certainly, the whole common core piece was at the front  
12 end of that and looking at our relationship with the  
13 assessment would be a wonderful leverage point.

14                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I agree. We don't  
15 wanna term things upside down.

16                   MR. CRANDALL: Just because, I just want to  
17 -- I just want to plant a seed. That's all that I was  
18 doing.

19                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

20                   MR. CRANDALL: No, I appreciate the  
21 conversation, the comments, it's -- it's fantastic  
22 feedback.

23                   MS. SCHEFFEL: It started with a nice little  
24 bump there.



1 MR. CRANDALL: I would love to hear from you  
2 as -- as -- as you feel so inclined about how you would  
3 feel if we were to kind of cascade over three years. Even  
4 -- even as I was busy with you -- you should talk and  
5 finance me into two subjects over five years. And we have  
6 a literally concept because by statute, it's every five  
7 years that we give you standards, or do we just set every  
8 six. So do we always have two sets of standards to review.  
9 There was a bill that passed -- I think Jennifer has left -  
10 - that require some voluntary computer science standards.  
11 I think that need to start looking at. So that's going to  
12 be added to the mix also.

13 Finally -- actually my final point is we're  
14 waiting for today to end just like just about everybody  
15 else across the street because it will dictate a lot of the  
16 work we do over the next three four five months as we see  
17 what passed, what new -- what new what their  
18 responsibilities are placed on the Board, and the  
19 departments that we know of have all noticed. So with  
20 that, Mr. Chairman, thanks so much for a time to present  
21 to the Board.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Commissioner.  
23 Any further questions to the Commissioner? Seeing none, we  
24 will proceed to item 8 to public comment for those that  
25 have signed up, Ms. Burdsall will be the timekeeper for



1 three minutes. So we would ask you to be respectful of  
2 that limit when you speak. And I think there's a little  
3 ways that we think we get that capital yesterday to  
4 testify. It's not a bad idea. So let's start with Debra  
5 Cole who's calling. I did. Congratulations on your  
6 recognition and the good that local newspaper Clover  
7 Springs because that was a very interesting article  
8 including a number of your accomplishments and I did  
9 forward that I think to all Members.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: You didn't say what it was  
11 for. It wasn't clear what it was for.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So anyway, congratulations  
13 and please proceed.

14 MS. COLE: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr.  
15 Chairman, Members and Board, good morning. Last month,  
16 Commissioner Randall recommended replacing textbooks with  
17 Wickett Student Engagement. I googled Wickett problem  
18 solving, and here's a portion of what I found. Wickett  
19 problems have no definitive formulation.

20 Two, solutions to Wickett problems can only  
21 be good or bad. Not true or false. There is no template  
22 to follow what's happening with it. Although history may  
23 be provided guide. Teams that approach Wickett problems  
24 must literally make things up as they go along.



1                               Three, there was always a more than one  
2 explanation for the appropriateness of the explanation  
3 depending greatly on the individual perspective of the  
4 design. Most social problems, such as, inequality,  
5 political instability, death, disease, famine are Wickett.  
6 Due to the system qualities of these large problems,  
7 knowledge of science, economics, statistics, technology,  
8 medicine, politics, and more are necessary for effective  
9 change. The material I've mentioned, mentions a knowledge  
10 of history, science, economics, and a number of other  
11 disciplines, is necessary for tackling Wickett problems.

12                               I would suggest that our students are better  
13 served using their schooling to acquire that broad base of  
14 knowledge, rather than proposing naive solutions to  
15 complicated problems, solutions rooted in ignorance.  
16 Projects that deal with social problems, put students at  
17 risk for being manipulated into accepting approaches whose  
18 biases they may not be able to detect, because they don't  
19 have the information to do so.

20                               Example, how to meet the challenge of  
21 persistent high unemployment in the United States? A naive  
22 student could uncritically accept the premise that if the  
23 government puts a lot of money into circulation while  
24 hiring all the unemployed and shovel ready jobs, it will  
25 spur economic recovery and full employment. Well, those of





1 us with some background know that there is a precedent for  
2 this approach that was a monumental failure, the Great  
3 Depression. After a decade or so of such policies,  
4 unemployment was as high as ever. But you have to have  
5 done the reading to know that there are common counter  
6 arguments to the assumptions presented to the unsuspecting  
7 student.

8                   It's a popular, although little examined,  
9 does show that learning facts is not important today  
10 because you can always look everything up online. But all  
11 the research skills in the world are useless to the student  
12 who's never heard of the great depression or know so little  
13 that he never suspects he could be relevant to the wicked  
14 problem he's working on. Juvenile bull sessions, even if  
15 they take place in a classroom under the direction of a  
16 teacher, may be more fun than textbooks, but there are far  
17 less useful for addressing social problems than acquiring  
18 the wisdom necessary to do so by becoming truly well-read  
19 and broadly informed. That's what we used to call becoming  
20 well-educated.

21                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much, Ms.  
22 Cole.

23                   MR. CRANDALL: Mr. Chair, can I just make a  
24 good certification? I have a whole bunch of teenagers, as  
25 you know it. We could just have slang for awesome, great,



1 it has nothing to do with textbooks, it has nothing to do  
2 with iPod. Maybe some what that came from kind of caught  
3 by surprise. I was about to increase awesome students  
4 engagement. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Cheryl Musher.

6 MS. MUSHER: Mr. Chairman and Members of  
7 the Board, good morning. My name is Cheryl Musher. I am a  
8 science teacher in Jefferson County. First of all, I would  
9 like to say thank you to Mrs. Goff for her support and  
10 willingness to listen to the science teachers especially.  
11 Thank you to all of you as well for finally allowing  
12 aggregated data to be released for science and math. I  
13 have taught Earth Science in Colorado for over 20 years and  
14 was honored to receive the Presidential word of excellence  
15 in mathematics and science teaching in 2007. Due to this  
16 prestigious award I have had many opportunities to be  
17 involved in a variety of school district and state  
18 committees.

19 Today its contents are related to the work  
20 that I have been involved with around the Colorado academic  
21 standards and science assessment. I'm one of the rare  
22 earth science teachers who has earned a degree in science  
23 education. I was a Member of the committee that revised  
24 the science standards and fought hard to have for science  
25 as its own content strand which was later validated by the



1 release of the next generation science standards. There  
2 were a number of comments during last month's meeting that  
3 indicate that some Board Members believe the science math  
4 tests to be lacking in content that the cuts were are wrong  
5 and that the tests are seriously flawed. I know I've been  
6 involved with every component of the test development  
7 process so intimately familiar with the assessment process.

8 I am here today to assure you that the test  
9 does measure the standards but you might also want to  
10 remember that this test is given only in fifth eighth and  
11 high school. So we are attempting to assess multiple years  
12 of science content with one three hour test. Assessing  
13 critical thinking creativity and other 21st century skills  
14 can't be done with only multiple posturing which should  
15 only determine if a student has memorized a laundry list of  
16 content. To today I took time away from my students who  
17 are diligently preparing for their finals to let you know  
18 that I for one am watching and listening to your  
19 discussions comments on decision it is a difficult task at  
20 times to hear things that undermine my passion of work for  
21 Colorado today. I have earned my awards recognition and  
22 support of my students and parents. I am not a random  
23 person out of the book. I have a master's degree.

24 Over 20 years of classroom experience deeply  
25 about my students success after school. Please keep me in



1 mind the next time you question the work, commitment,  
2 dedication and passion of all teachers in Colorado. I have  
3 prepared a short summary of the work of each component of  
4 the test development process and offering myself as an  
5 expert for any questions you may have about seamount us or  
6 standard I would also like to submit letters from a few of  
7 my colleagues who were able to speak today. Thank you Mr.  
8 Chairman and Members of the Board for your time and  
9 consideration today.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Theresa  
11 Wrangham, hoping I didn't get that too far off.

12 MS. WRANGHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
13 Can you hear me okay?

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

15 MS. WRANGHAM: It's Wrangham. It's very  
16 difficult pronounce for newbies. My name is Theresa  
17 Wrangham and I'm the Executive Director for the National  
18 Vaccine Information Center as well as a Colorado resident.  
19 NVIC's mission since 1982 has been to prevent injuries and  
20 death, vaccine injuries and deaths to public education and  
21 to defend the informed consent ethic and vaccine laws and  
22 policies. I appreciate the opportunity to provide the  
23 Board with her public comment today. Last week Senator  
24 Lautenberg convened a hearing on vaccine exemptions. And  
25 during that hearing Dr. Wolke admitted that CDPHE had put



1 out inaccurate information about vaccine exemptions to  
2 parents.

3                   Unfortunately parents are still confused by  
4 recent letters they've received from their schools that  
5 direct them to a CDPHE's website. This website implies  
6 that parents should submit their vaccine exemption  
7 information directly to CDPHE to meet school entry  
8 requirements and does not disclose the loss of further  
9 protections in the submission of this data the CDPHE. MBIC  
10 notes that during last week's hearing Senator Lumberg also  
11 pointed out that parents are under no legal obligation to  
12 use exemption forms created by the state. In addition  
13 Colorado school entry vaccine statutes require schools to  
14 number one inform parents of their exemption rights number  
15 to distribute vaccine information to parents and number  
16 three collect vaccine exemption statements from parents to  
17 be clear. MBIC is unaware of any statute that allows  
18 schools to defer these statutory obligations by directing  
19 parents to CDPHE's website for vaccine exemption  
20 information and forms.

21                   Earlier this week, NBIC submitted these  
22 concerns in more detail to the Board on behalf of our  
23 Colorado donors supporters. We reiterate with respect our  
24 request for the Board to issue a written clarification to  
25 all parents who have children in school that accurately



1 informs them of the right to take a medical religious or  
2 personal belief exemption and their statutory obligation to  
3 submit exemption statements for school entry to their  
4 schools as well as clarification to all school staff that  
5 guides compliance with the law in order to uphold the  
6 public's trust as outlined in Article 29 of Colorado's  
7 constitution.

8                   We additionally request that parents also be  
9 informed that they are under no statutory obligation to  
10 submit exemption information to CDPHE for school entry and  
11 that they should and should they choose to do so they will  
12 in fact lose their further protections and their child's  
13 information will be shared with third parties by CDPHE  
14 without parental consent. This act of transparency will  
15 end confusion and began to restore parental trust. In  
16 closing we respectfully request a copy of the joint policy  
17 on data collection ensuring that was developed by CDPHE and  
18 CDE as required by HP1288. We appreciate your  
19 consideration of our concerns from requests today and urge  
20 the Board to take action to correct misinformation parents  
21 have received from schools prior to the end of this  
22 academic year. Thank you so much.

23                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Pam Lang?

24                   MS. LANG: My name is Kim Lang. Last month  
25 at the Board meeting. I brought to your attention the



1 issue of the Colorado Department of Public Health directing  
2 school nurses that the vaccine exemption process had  
3 changed when in fact the Colorado vaccine exemption statute  
4 has not changed. It only requires that a parent submit a  
5 statement of exemption to the school or a letter from a  
6 doctor for a medical exemption to the school. Contrary to  
7 the information from CDPHE, the law does not require a new  
8 form loaded with personally identifying information  
9 submitted on line directly to an authorized state database.  
10 I have sent the Board several e-mails with leads with the  
11 Denver news story on this illegal fishing by CPG and also  
12 the hour long deposition of Dr. Wolke head of CDPHE by  
13 Senator Lumberg's committee. Just last week Dr. Wolke  
14 stated on public record that he plans to continue  
15 soliciting person personally identifying information from  
16 parents through the schools in the schools are bound to  
17 protect that information by FERPA .

18                   So yesterday my district in Douglas County  
19 sent out a mass e-mail telling parents that the vaccine  
20 process had changed and how unfortunate that I will have to  
21 inform them as a respected Member of the accountability  
22 committee that they just sent out mass misinformation that  
23 they will need to retract. Last month you said the AGs  
24 office would resolve this and to which I provided a stack  
25 of information. AG has not responded to an e-mail or my



1 information. So my question today is respectfully will you  
2 collude with CDPHE and allow them to fish for this  
3 information or will you protect parents personally  
4 identifying information. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Lang. This  
6 point of reference, you weren't here earlier. That item  
7 has been added to our agenda 4, probably around 1:30 p.m.  
8 Chelsea Henkel? Chelsea, I know I saw you here.

9 MS. HENKEL: Morning, Members of the Board.  
10 My name is Chelsea Henkel. I am the Policy Manager at  
11 Stand for Children Colorado. And Stand for Children is an  
12 organization whose mission is to ensure that all students  
13 regardless of their background, graduate from high school  
14 and are prepared for, and have access to college, or career  
15 training. I'm speaking to you today about an issue that is  
16 part of the SPF DPF agenda item on tomorrow's schedule, so  
17 you won't hear about it today, but it will come out  
18 tomorrow. And will also be an action item, I believe, for  
19 you at next month's meeting.

20 And I'm here to present a letter that was  
21 delivered to the Board earlier this week. And with -- I  
22 have mine going off already -- and was signed by a broad  
23 coalition of 22 organizations all of which for one or for  
24 many of the reasons on the letter are concerned with the  
25 proposed changes to the accountability system. Before I





1 speak to the issue itself, I just want to note our  
2 appreciation for the department and the hard work that  
3 they've done on this issue in particular, Alyssa Pearson  
4 and the Accountability and Data Analysis Unit have done  
5 really hard work on this. They've been very transparent  
6 about their work and the issues that have been brought to  
7 them. They've been really willing to meet with us in the  
8 coalition and hear our feedback.

9                   So although we don't ultimately agree with  
10 their proposal, we just want to acknowledge all the work  
11 that they've done and their willingness just to work with  
12 us. So back to the issue, I would like to start by giving  
13 a little context to this and allow some of the other  
14 individuals who are here today to speak to the details.  
15 Under our current accountability system, we recognize the  
16 importance of monitoring the achievement of historically  
17 under-served student populations. An example of this  
18 student population, maybe are students who qualify for free  
19 reduced lunch, or who are English learners. Our current  
20 system also recognizes that schools and districts should be  
21 held accountable for the progress of these different groups  
22 of students. And if an individual student happens to fall  
23 into more than one of these groups, the students  
24 achievement is naturally counted in each of the groups.



1                                   Unfortunately, the new proposal would lump  
2 the achievement of all of these sub-groups and students  
3 into one large category called the combined sub-group. And  
4 it would only count that group once towards the school  
5 district rating. We believe that this is highly  
6 problematic for many reasons. They're outlined in the  
7 letter in detail for you. I'll just tell you that  
8 generally we feel that the distinctions between the  
9 subgroups are really meaningful. I think it's very strange  
10 to assume that a student with an IP would have the same  
11 needs or would be served in the same way as a student whose  
12 an English learner.

13                                   So we think that these distinctions are very  
14 critical in understanding how our system is working. We  
15 want to note that schools receive funding for these  
16 different groups of students, and not in aggregate for each  
17 of these different groups of students. So a student who  
18 qualifies for free and reduced lunch will also, will  
19 receive funding for that and will also receive funding if  
20 they have been English learner. We also believe that  
21 decisions about the changes in the accountability system  
22 should be made in consultation with representatives, where  
23 the most impacted by the changes. And we would like to see  
24 that happen a little bit more on this proposal.



1                   So like I said, I'll let others speak to the  
2 real details behind each of these concerns. But I just  
3 want to highlight that we appreciate the department's  
4 willingness to put the ratings for each individual sub-  
5 group on the reports. But we believe that just presenting  
6 the ratings is not enough and is not actually increasing  
7 accountability. And in fact, accountability without any  
8 sort of consequence of rewards, as in, counting it in the  
9 actual ratings is really no accountability at all. So we  
10 look forward to engaging in this conversation going  
11 forward. I welcome any questions you may have. Thank you  
12 for your time.

13                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Henkel,  
14 appreciate it. Ross Izard.

15                   MR. IZARD: Well, Mr. Chair, Members of the  
16 Board, my name is Ross Izard. I am the Senior Education  
17 Policy Analyst at the Independence Institute. Independence  
18 Institute is a nonprofit, nonpartisan think tank here in  
19 Denver. We work on a lot of different issues. My world is  
20 very specific in education. And I'm here to talk to you  
21 about the same defined subgroup issue that Chelsea just  
22 mentioned here a couple of minutes ago. So sort of a  
23 background on Independence Institute, there are a couple of  
24 main areas of focus. We talk a lot about school choice.  
25 We also deal with school finance and most importantly I



1 think in a lot of cases we deal with accountability for  
2 schools.

3                   What people don't know, we were the first in  
4 the state back in 1995 to put out report cards on  
5 individual schools. This is something that we've been  
6 doing for a long time and something we care very much  
7 about. But one of the biggest things that we work on not  
8 only in education but in all of the areas that our think  
9 tank covers is accountability to taxpayers. And I think  
10 that when it comes to education, it's important to remember  
11 that education is arguably the most important area for  
12 accountability to taxpayers. It's about 40 percent of the  
13 state's general fund, it is the largest slice of state  
14 government that we have in the state, spends about 6.2  
15 billion dollars on it other than school finance for this  
16 year.

17                   If you look back in 2013-2014, and take all  
18 the complete data in the last year for which we have  
19 complete data, they spend about nine and a half billion  
20 dollars. This is a hard challenge to change. And I think  
21 Chelsea mentioned this briefly but I would just like to  
22 highlight it. In the context of these combined subgroups,  
23 we think it's very important that the real accountability  
24 for its own sake support. But number two, given the amount  
25 of money that we spent on education, and given the amount



1 of money that we spent on these groups specifically, and  
2 very specifically to raise their levels of achievement,  
3 accountability becomes even more important.

4                   Just to give you a few examples, Chelsea  
5 mentioned at risk funding. That's something that's  
6 allocated as a factor in finance worth. That gives  
7 students between 12 percent and 30 percent extra money,  
8 just based on the fact that they're low income, so that we  
9 could help them do better. For English language learner  
10 students this year, that was more than \$40 million that we  
11 allocated to help them. For SPED students in special  
12 needs, we spent \$160 million. We're talking about an awful  
13 lot of money that is targeted very directly to these  
14 students to help them achieve better, to help them get what  
15 they need to be, and help schools reach the goals.

16                   Taking all of them and lumping them into a  
17 single group, I think it screws that in a lot of ways, not  
18 only does it obscure it from an academic standpoint for  
19 people like me who live in the nerdy side of education, but  
20 I think it screws the taxpayers, I think it decouples an  
21 awful lot of money in the system from the accountability  
22 mechanisms have been built. On top of that, I also want to  
23 point out that we have a lot of federal funding that flows  
24 into the state. And I know that we probably all have some



1 mixed feelings about that federal funding, and what it buys  
2 us and the strings attached to it.

3                   But I also think it's important to remember  
4 that in 2013, 14, that was about \$700 million. A good  
5 chunk of that flows into Title 1 funding, that goes to low  
6 income kids. Another chunk goes into Title 3, pretty to  
7 English learners, and another chunk goes into the IDEA  
8 program, which is for students with disabilities. There  
9 are hundreds of hundreds of millions of dollars attached to  
10 these programs, and these subgroups. And I think that  
11 decoupling subgroups from the accountability mechanisms  
12 that we have that are very specifically for them is very,  
13 very dangerous idea. So we would like to have you  
14 reconsider. Thank you very much.

15                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much.  
16 Alexandria Alonso?

17                   MS. ALONSO: Good morning, Mr. Chair and  
18 Members of the State Board. My name is Alexandra Alonso, I  
19 am here representing the Colorado Latino Leadership  
20 Advocacy and Research Organization also known as CLLARO.  
21 And CLLARO is a non-profit that conducts and publishes  
22 research focused on Latinos in Colorado. It also provides  
23 leadership training to increase minority engagement in the  
24 public policy process, and also seeks to amplify the voice  
25 of Latino and minority communities in Colorado.



1 I'm also here today to comment on something  
2 related to tomorrow's accountability and assessment agenda  
3 item which is that CDE has proposed to use of a combined  
4 subgroup in the school and district accountability systems.  
5 As a signatory to the letter, that was submitted to the  
6 Board, I do believe strongly, that CDE must maintain a  
7 system of accountability that takes into account the  
8 performance of students in various subgroups. We know the  
9 strategies for addressing the needs of an African-American  
10 student are quite different from addressing the needs of an  
11 English learner. We have a low income student with a  
12 disability.

13 Lumping together these four groups in  
14 question, all of them have different reasons for being  
15 under served historically, and all of whom also require  
16 different interventions to be successful. Further, the  
17 destructive narrative that these students can't succeed.  
18 None of us should allow that story to be told and yet we  
19 feel that is what CDE is proposing. Truly, our greatest  
20 concern is that less accountability for ensuring no  
21 students fall through the cracks. Less attention will also  
22 be paid to the unique supports that different students need  
23 to improve. It truly is not enough just to report data for  
24 the fourth subgroups. Schools and districts must also be  
25 held accountable to that data. We call on CDE to ensure



1 that there is no room for hiding certain groups of students  
2 within combined subgroups and accountability.

3                   Further we believe that decisions about  
4 changes to accountability should be made in consultation  
5 with representatives from impacted communities. We ask  
6 that CDE undertake a more comprehensive stakeholder process  
7 to consider changes to accountability. That would include  
8 representatives both living and working with students and  
9 families of color, from low income, special education and  
10 English learner communities. To our knowledge, this plan  
11 has not been communicated and input has not been solicited  
12 widely among those who would be most impacted by the  
13 changes. Thank you for your time and consideration.

14                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you very much. Van  
15 Schoales?

16                   MR. SCHOALES: Good morning, Mr. Chairman  
17 and Members of the Board. I'm Van Schoales. I'm the CEO  
18 of A Plus Colorado. We're a research and advocacy  
19 organization that's committed to understanding what works  
20 in school districts and supporting them to dramatically  
21 improve student achievement. I'm here today to actually  
22 build on what was just shared about the subgroup to super  
23 group. I'm about to share our perspective on improving our  
24 state's lowest performing schools. We've been working on  
25 school turnaround since we started a decade ago. We've





1 produced a number of reports on school turnaround and on  
2 innovation schools with the universities of Colorado and  
3 universities of Washington as well as the Colorado  
4 Education Association over a number of years.

5           As I'm sure you know, there are about 13,000  
6 kids that are in schools that are in the fifth year of  
7 their accountability clock. And a vast majority of these  
8 students are very far from meeting the state standards.  
9 Not only that, but they're losing ground relative to their  
10 peers. For example, Aurora Central High School, which is  
11 one of those schools that you're going to be taking a look  
12 at, had only 2 percent of their students reaching the state  
13 standards for Park's math one assessment. Only about 42  
14 percent of their kids graduate. And this is after \$1.7  
15 million that's been invested in over 10 years of work at  
16 improving the school.

17           I urge you to reflect on this as you review  
18 their innovation waivers proposed by Aurora Public Schools.  
19 The Innovation School Act can provide a powerful tool to  
20 schools and districts with effective leadership and a  
21 strong -- a strong plan to cut through regulations to focus  
22 on what needs to be done. We feel that it's critical that  
23 you all not confuse an innovation plan with the school  
24 turnaround plan. Our research shows that the mere presence  
25 of site based flexibility in a school is neither necessary



1 nor sufficient to ensure success. Innovation status isn't  
2 a substitute for a quality school turnaround planning  
3 process, which includes an effective, strong principal, a  
4 solid school design, and a committed staff.

5           You know, Royal Central frankly has none of  
6 these. It will likely get worse over time if you let  
7 things continue as they've been. On the state of Colorado  
8 has already spent over \$50 million with very little to show  
9 on school improvement. It's imperative that you use all  
10 the means necessary in order to ensure that these 13,000  
11 kids have a fighting chance at a decent education. I want  
12 to thank you all for your commitment and your work on this,  
13 Board. And I'm happy to share our reviews of the  
14 innovation proposals as well as all of the background  
15 materials around innovation schools that we've been engaged  
16 with. Thank you very much.

17           CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Mr. Schoales,  
18 and I apologize for mispronouncing your name. If you have  
19 the materials you'd like to leave, you can give them to Ms.  
20 Burdsall. She'll sit and get a chance to look at them. Is  
21 your contact information included with those?

22           MR. SCHOALES: Yes, it is.

23           CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Anyone else  
24 would like to engage in the public comment period? Seeing  
25 none, public comment is closed. We will proceed to our



1 next agenda item which is -- we are a little ahead of  
2 schedule. Let's try and stay that way. That's item 10,  
3 Majoring Education -- or Education Effectiveness Mentor  
4 Reporting.

5 (Pause)

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. For this, we  
7 will have Dr. Anthes and Ms. Wick.

8 (Overlapping)

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Thank you.

10 MR. CRANDALL: Ms. Shepherd is the data  
11 research person that's doing quite a bit with educator  
12 effectiveness. So as they're here, they are experts in the  
13 Department of this topic. So we have to hear what they  
14 say.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you Mr. Chair,  
17 Commissioner, and Members of the Board. We're gonna look  
18 for you today is sort of a follow up to conversation we've  
19 been having with you over the past several months. You may  
20 remember in February we gave you a presentation on the  
21 public reporting requirements related to the educator  
22 effectiveness metrics. You know we use metrics as a bit of  
23 applying as the educator effectiveness data, like comes in  
24 school districts on how educators are rated. Get them  
25 their evaluations system.



1                   So we talked with you about those metrics  
2 and we also shared with you that there is some anxiety in  
3 the field about these metrics. And I think some of you  
4 have heard about that anxiety as well. Your Board rules  
5 are quite explicit about what should be shared. So what  
6 Brett has been trying to do along with the whole team of  
7 educator, if I understand it, has been trying to share  
8 around the state sort of what does would look like, what  
9 that would mean. And we've gathered a lot of feedback and  
10 referred up to a point now where we like your feedback on  
11 the direction you'd like us to go with that.

12                   So Brett's just going to share a little more  
13 of the detail on what those metrics are. We've proposed a  
14 sort of compromise approach, one that would meet your  
15 rules, would meet the requirements in your rules but might  
16 not go as detailed as the rules allow for. So we're going  
17 to share with you that recommendation today.

18                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

19                   MS. SCHROEDER: Before for you start, have  
20 we done any reporting up to now or is this just beginning?  
21 Even on our statewide basis, have we done any reporting?  
22 Total aggregate statewide?

23                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, Board Member  
24 Schroeder. We have only done public reporting of the  
25 pilots. We have not named any districts.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Okay. So why did --  
2 can you at least --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Anything I add on that  
4 is we did share the data with the districts so the  
5 districts have this data so we call it sort of semi  
6 private. Districts that can get into our system can see  
7 each other's data but it only district level and those have  
8 a certain --

9 MS. SCHROEDER: And they have a choice to  
10 share it with their communities if they wished?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think so we  
12 suggested they until we've --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

14 MS. ANTHES: Until we can get (inaudible).

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you, sorry. I just  
16 wanted that background.

17 MS. ANTHES: So at this point, I'm going to  
18 turn it over to Dr. (inaudible) Well.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.

20 MS. WELL: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Members  
21 of the Board. Thank you for having me here again to  
22 continue this conversation about the Educator Effectiveness  
23 Metrics. Just a reminder that metrics are a series of  
24 reports which is really just counseling for tables and  
25 graphs. That are used to review and monitor the



1 implementation of the state's new educator evaluation  
2 systems. The metrics fulfill multiple purposes providing  
3 useful information to districts about their systems as well  
4 as being transparent with the public about those systems  
5 enabling CDE to identify districts that may need additional  
6 support fulfilling CDE's monitoring reporting requirements,  
7 her statute and State Board of Education rules. We have  
8 discussed this.

9 I just want to dig into it again because  
10 some of the. Options for reporting do involve changes to  
11 the State Board of Education rules. So we want to just lay  
12 out what those requirements are. First a brand new statute  
13 that CB must monitor shall monitor school districts and  
14 oversees implementation of their requirements. And then  
15 second that CD shall report and these three reporting  
16 categories increases the effectiveness of educators  
17 correlations between educators performance evaluation  
18 ratings and student performance outcomes and the equitable  
19 distribution of effective and highly effective so based on  
20 these requirements and extensive input from districts and  
21 other education and advocacy organizations we've come up  
22 with a list of possible actions to take with reference to  
23 public reporting. I believe you have this document that  
24 has the table.



1 Educator Effectiveness Metric Public  
2 Reporting. Actions are summarized here, and we'll just go  
3 -- we'll just go through them. So the first option is to  
4 continue to report to district's semi privately, and  
5 postpone public reporting until 2018. Per State Board of  
6 Education rules, we were to start publicly reporting in  
7 September of 2015, we believe that reporting to districts  
8 as of November of 2015, was kind of making a step towards  
9 that effort, but we are -- we are kind of behind in terms  
10 of that public reporting, Katy mentioned -- Dr. Anthes  
11 mentioned that we could continue to report semi privately  
12 to districts for kind of -- for a couple of years, we did  
13 survey the superintendents, they felt more comfortable with  
14 delayed reporting a little bit, this would relieve a lot of  
15 the pressure that districts are feeling, and we give the  
16 districts more time to understand the metrics, as well as  
17 kind of fine tuning their evaluation systems.

18 However, it does not feel the need for  
19 public accountability, and we already know that some  
20 legislators, and advocacy groups would not be satisfied  
21 with this approach. And finally, this would require a  
22 change to the State Board of rules. The second possible  
23 action is to start publicly reporting all metrics starting  
24 in 2016, so sometime maybe in the fall, but only release  
25 data at the district and state level. According to State



1 Board rules, we currently need to rule these at State,  
2 District, and school level.

3                   So districts that have some apprehension  
4 about this. So this would relieve some of the pressure in  
5 terms of not releasing school level data, would fulfill the  
6 need for public accountability. However, we feel like this  
7 not -- might not be very satisfying for districts,  
8 particularly rural districts, where they are just as  
9 nervous about the district level data, as the school level  
10 data. Because small -- some small districts are the same  
11 size as some schools in some of our large districts. So it  
12 doesn't -- that doesn't ease their apprehension.

13                   Similarly, we could publicly report the  
14 metric again in 2016 but increase the number of educators  
15 that are required for reporting. Right now the number of  
16 educators is five in each category, so, we could increase  
17 that number, and that -- that might meet the needs of rural  
18 and urban districts. Again, this would relieve some of the  
19 pressure, and fulfill the need for public accountability.

20                   MS. FLORES: May I ask a question?

21                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

22                   MS. FLORES: So if -- if superintendents are  
23 concerned about this, and you keep saying the public needs  
24 to -- what is the term that you used? Is the public?

25                   MS. WELL: Public accountability.





1 MS. FLORES: Well, the public accountability  
2 but it just doesn't seem that the public really wants to  
3 hear that and we have to be responsive to the needs of the  
4 public and what the public wants and it seems to me as if,  
5 I haven't heard that the public, you know, is really  
6 anxious to hear this reporting. I mean, you're reporting  
7 to me that they are anxious but I'm out and about, and I  
8 just don't hear them. So I'm just wondering where -- and -  
9 - and if superintendents are not worried about it, where is  
10 this coming from? Is this coming from the Department or do  
11 you think this is coming from --

12 MS. WELL: Mr. Chair.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

14 MS. ANTHES: Dr. Flores, we have heard it  
15 from a number of legislators, and also a number of advocacy  
16 groups that feel that it's important for -- and maybe the  
17 word you were talking about was public transparency --

18 MS. FLORES: -- yeah.

19 MS. ANTHES: -- around sort of how Senate  
20 Bill 191 is rolling out, how it's -- how the districts are  
21 doing around that. Well, that's --

22 MS. FLORES: But -- but did 191 actually say  
23 that -- that the State Board would have this? I mean,  
24 would -- would publicly state this? I don't think they



1 asked that the -- that -- that we report this. I don't  
2 think they asked for that.

3 MS. ANTHES: Correct. Statute actually is  
4 relatively is silent on the public reporting of it, but it  
5 does allow -- we had this conversation before when this  
6 question came up. It does allow and contemplates the State  
7 Board making rules around this. And in the State Board  
8 rules, it was put in very explicitly about the public  
9 reporting.

10 MS. FLORES: And when was that put in place?

11 MS. ANTHES: That was 2011.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.

13 MS. WELL: Okay. So the fourth option that  
14 we've come up with is to publicly report metrics in 2016,  
15 but only release one metric per each shower reporting  
16 category. So as Katy mentioned, there are pretty specific  
17 requirements in State Board of education rules, including  
18 the three reporting categories that I've read through. We  
19 have -- we do have a suite of over 100 metrics, because it  
20 covers teachers, and principals, and kind of digs down in  
21 different ways what we can do is pair back those metrics  
22 and just pick one for each category so that we are meeting  
23 the intent of the rules and -- and not doing --  
24 overstepping at all.



1                   We feel that this does fulfill the basic  
2 requirements for public accountability, and would not  
3 require opening the State Board of that rules but we do  
4 feel like it might leave both districts and the public  
5 somewhat dissatisfied. So what we've done based on these  
6 options and again, based on feedback from -- from  
7 Superintendents and -- and other constituents of interest,  
8 we've come up with a compromise option.

9                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: May I interrupt for just a  
10 moment. When you say you have a 100 different metrics, do  
11 those ultimately compile into a rating?

12                  MS. WELL: It's -- Mr. Chair? They -- yes.  
13 All of the metrics and I'll all show you some of them I  
14 apologize.

15                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So --

16                  MS. FLORES: Give me one rating.

17                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You know, into -- well,  
18 how many categories of ratings do you have?

19                  MS. WELL: It's -- right now we are mostly  
20 reporting on just the overall effectiveness ratings.

21                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So eventually, it actually  
22 correlates to an A rating?

23                  MS. WELL: That we correlate teacher ratings  
24 with student outcomes. So I feel like maybe I'm not  
25 understanding the question.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well then, that is the  
2 question.

3 MS. WELL: Okay.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The student outcomes are a  
5 -- at least a component, or a significant component of the  
6 rating. And the student outcomes are based on growth and -  
7 -

8 MS. WELL: Yes.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So -- so when you say you  
10 have a 100 different metrics, it sounds like it's a little  
11 overly complicated, if the ratings are really based on a  
12 relatively few -- students' results. Is that -- am I  
13 missing something here?

14 MS. WELL: Mr. Chair, I'm probably not  
15 explaining very well. So what it is --

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I don't know how to --  
17 you're explaining fine. I don't --

18 MS. WELL: The reason --

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- I'm just really not  
20 getting it.

21 MS. WELL: No. That's okay. So the way  
22 that our system works is that teachers receive overall  
23 ratings, but then there are sub-components of those. We  
24 are currently only -- only reporting overall ratings and



1 looking at relationships between overall ratings and  
2 student outcomes and such.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: How many sub-components  
4 are there?

5 MS. WELL: There -- for teachers, there are  
6 six standards and then underneath those there are 27  
7 elements. We are not currently reporting on all of those  
8 because that is a lot of information. But the way that we  
9 get to 100 metrics is so we have referred -- so everything  
10 we report will work for teachers and principals. So that  
11 doubles everything. And then for instance, when we look at  
12 the relationship between ratings and student demographics,  
13 we look at it based on student minority, English language  
14 learner, receiving free and reduced price lunch, so some of  
15 those, you kind of multiply it. It's -- it's the same  
16 metric, but you look at it in five different ways. So  
17 that's -- that's how it gets to be a large list, I can get  
18 you a list of those metrics that might help make  
19 (inaudible).

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The major growth of -- in  
21 fact, in campus a number of those if you start with the --  
22 with the child that has a number of disadvantages and make  
23 significant progress it would appear that teacher would end  
24 up with a high rating whether you numerated the categories  
25 that caused the -- that the teacher was able to overcome,



1 you're really looking to see educator effectiveness, do  
2 they make progress, given the difficulties that they  
3 encounter in their student population.

4                   So you -- you -- we -- one of the problems I  
5 see is that, you have a great potential to provide so much  
6 information. I liken it to a real estate closing. No one  
7 ever reads the documents, because they've become  
8 legislatures deemed 40 or 50 of them to be important when  
9 you make them anything is important, none of them are  
10 important. So are we focusing in on what's really  
11 important which is outcomes? Or are we?

12                   MS. WELL: Yeah. Mr. Chair, one -- one  
13 thing that we try to do is since districts have some  
14 choices about how they comprise the rating on the student  
15 growth, there may be some differences in how districts have  
16 put that together, and so these metrics try to correlate to  
17 some more standard metrics, to see that's one of the ways  
18 we would monitor it, to make sure like, "Oh, okay. I will  
19 see that all of your educators are rated highly effective"  
20 but in -- and -- you know, the student growth seems to be,  
21 you know, flat, or going down in that district. So it's  
22 different ways of looking at it based on different measures  
23 we have.

24                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So you're trying to test  
25 the data in some ways?



1 MS. WELL: Yeah. We're trying to kind of  
2 test it and look at it in different ways because it tells  
3 us different information.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And ultimately, the  
5 reporting would be less -- and would contain less  
6 information than you're actually analyzing?

7 MS. WELL: Correct. (Inaudible) about it.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: So I try to keep in mind the  
10 fact that the purpose of 191 -- the reporting part is not  
11 the critical part. The critical part is the process and  
12 the feedback for the teachers and the growth in  
13 effectiveness and the growth in student outcomes. So I  
14 don't want to worry too much about reporting a ton of the  
15 detail because I don't know that that actually helps. I  
16 think what we'll report out, are the big questions.

17 Are we aligning experience to teachers with  
18 kids in needs do we have the growth et cetera but the fact  
19 that we've got a system that has more than one purpose and  
20 the -- the sole purpose is not the reporting at all, makes  
21 it get a little confusing. And that's why there are some -  
22 - that's another reason there are so many data points  
23 because a lot of that really probably ought to be feedback  
24 within the school district or actually within the school to  
25 help -- help those discussions.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff and then Dr.  
2 Flores.

3                   MS. GOFF: Thank you. Not to muddy the  
4 waters only, was there not -- and I think Dr. Schroeder  
5 would remember this. Because if I recall, there was a  
6 piece of legislation that was generated in part by what  
7 used to be the Alliance for quality teaching and it -- it  
8 pertained to the release of data and somewhat related to  
9 the n number but the overall point of the bill was do we  
10 release data or not? And I think that legislation is in  
11 place. I don't remember the year, it would have been since  
12 we've both been on the Board but I would -- I'm willing to  
13 look it up and -- and check on that. But I do believe we  
14 have legislation that speaks directly, I the -- I don't  
15 think it's gone away directly to the release of data where  
16 public release of its --

17                   MS. WELL: Board Member Goff --

18                   MS. GOFF: -- it has a -- it's got some  
19 specific language in there about doing it at all, and we  
20 remember it on that.

21                   MS. WELL: So I believe you are talking  
22 about the educator data privacy bill that occurred several  
23 years ago.

24                   MS. GOFF: Right.





1 MS. WELL: We have looked carefully at that  
2 and that really pertains to the individual release of the  
3 educator data. You know, I mean --

4 MS. GOFF: The -- the California issue.

5 MS. WELL: Yeah. So you know, making sure  
6 that educators data is personally identifiable information  
7 as well so making sure that any public reporting is sort of  
8 an aggregate is not able to be personally identifiable. So  
9 that's the piece of that legislation.

10 MS. GOFF: Okay. Now, just listeners if  
11 needed clarity is this different in the sense that there  
12 are not the -- not that it's totally revealed about the  
13 individual but is it possible -- well, yes. Of course it  
14 is. But the conversation around the n number that also  
15 came up again another bill this year about our release of  
16 metrics and such is that and was taken out by those but --  
17 so that the educated privacy issue is -- is that the same  
18 thing we're talking here or is this just a matter of we  
19 have rules that say we need to release something publicly  
20 and what the decision is what? Is that where we are with  
21 this, rather than anything we --

22 MS. WELL: That is I believe where you are  
23 right because use some language within this year's --  
24 legislative session, changed a little over time, and first



1 it was actually -- it -- it would have put a hold on all  
2 this not publicly reporting at all --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

4 MS. WELL: -- then it was changed because of  
5 some different feedback to say we would still publicly  
6 report but we would publicly report in a way to ensure that  
7 no educators could be identified. To be honest, that's --  
8 it's pretty general language, but it will say that that the  
9 Department challenge shall ensure that no educator can be  
10 identified. And so we would need to go back and look very  
11 closely at any school level any district level for any --  
12 for any smaller districts. That -- that -- you know, where  
13 it will be working on sort of what we call suppression  
14 rules.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Do our rules allow us to  
16 suppress? Do -- do we include that in there so we can  
17 protect?

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Primary required.

19 MS. WELL: Dr. Schroeder there are not  
20 explicitly in the rules, but we have done that already.

21 MS. GOFF: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores and Dr.  
23 Scheffel.

24 MS. FLORES: Okay. Yesterday there was a  
25 ruling by the New York Supreme Court, dealing with the --



1 the metrics are used to evaluate teachers. Basically,  
2 value added modeling which is VAM and they found that --  
3 that it -- it was just a faulty way and -- of -- of  
4 measuring teachers. So I think we're gonna hear a lot of  
5 other States where they're going to be ruling on them. I  
6 mean, we already we've heard from the American Association  
7 of Statisticians that said that it was faulty.

8           The use of this metric on evaluating  
9 teachers it is a very data-driven evaluation. And it was  
10 found to be at fault by the -- the New York Supreme Court.  
11 So I think there's a case in Washington State and there  
12 will be cases that are going to be heard all over the  
13 country. So -- and this is what our system is based on.  
14 And -- you know, we've been talking about this for a long  
15 time. Senator Michael Merrifield, presented a -- a -- a  
16 bill of this matter. Now, the other -- it wasn't -- it  
17 didn't pass, but we have to kind of think about it, that we  
18 are basing our evaluation of teachers on a faulty matter.  
19 A lot of people have fought this and now the Supreme Court  
20 in New York has ruled on it and we're going to hear more  
21 rulings like this. So we may have even in the State some  
22 court cases against our evaluation of teachers.

23           CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Dr. Scheffel.

24           MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes. I appreciate the -- the  
25 presentation. I know you're still -- but it just strikes



1 me that we want to have good data, clear and clean data  
2 that can help but we don't want to be releasing data that  
3 gives the wrong impression. And I think that because all  
4 these evaluation systems aren't the same or rated the same  
5 when we release this seemingly high stakes data and the  
6 media takes it and -- and uses it to create impressions  
7 that's really not fair to those that are being assessed.

8                   So I think that you've been very sensitive  
9 in meeting with the superintendents and trying to work out  
10 something that would, you know, be true to the intent of  
11 selling the 191 in a positive way but not -- not releasing  
12 information that really gives the wrong impression. So I  
13 think as we look at these options, some are much better  
14 than others. I know you're marching through the thick of  
15 it. I like the idea of being really clear on what this  
16 data represents and what it doesn't represent. Thank you.

17                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec.

18                   MS MAZANEC: I think I've done my questions  
19 answered in the course of reading.

20                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I apologize, I'm not  
21 getting too excited.

22                   MS MAZANEC: Well actually, one question.  
23 So when we talk about these 100 metrics, so do we -- is the  
24 history or the progression that we started where we were  
25 gonna release all of that and now were -- because of



1 feedback and now we're down to the -- the options you put  
2 in front of us. I mean, all those metrics released to the  
3 public?

4 MS. WELL: Yes, Board Member Mazanec.

5 MS. MAZANEC: State Board of Education rule  
6 says that we shall report with three reporting categories  
7 and then within each category that we may report a number  
8 of things. So we were trying to honor what we felt like  
9 the -- the Board wanted to be covered at the time. So  
10 there is a lot in there and then there also, if we have  
11 time we can get into it there are multiple ways of showing  
12 each requirement. You know, some people are only  
13 interested in looking at percentages of effective or hired  
14 teachers. But some want to look at the percentages in  
15 every category. So there are a lot of -- a lot of  
16 requirements that we wanted to kind of meet the intended  
17 that's, so yes. So we -- there are a lot of metrics that  
18 we were planning to publicly report initially before we  
19 received a lot of feedback those metrics.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Dr. (Inaudible), go  
21 ahead and proceed. I think you were to recommend a  
22 compromise action.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Thank you, Mr.  
24 Chair. So we have come up with a compromise option that we  
25 feel like pull some of the positive ones from the different



1 options which is basically to continue to report all of the  
2 metrics to districts semi-privately so they still have all  
3 the information that they need and then begin to publicly  
4 report just three of the metrics one per each reporting  
5 category in mid to late 2016 but you know, we're flexible  
6 on the date. We feel like this both relieve some of the  
7 pressure on districts and also fulfill some of the basic  
8 requirements for public transparency and our own reporting  
9 requirements. It would have --

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Could you list the three  
11 metrics that you intend to report on?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have some examples.  
13 So what is -- what is complicated about this option Mr.  
14 Chair, is that for each reporting category you could -- we  
15 could choose a bunch of metrics. So this would require, we  
16 will need to engage the field and other interested parties  
17 to choose which metrics per category.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you like to check  
19 into one of those?

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, one of the three  
21 categories.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead and list them  
24 off.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. (Inaudible).



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're getting ahead of --  
2 if I'm getting ahead (inaudible) --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, that's okay. No,  
4 no. No problem. On the bottom there, that's what -- what  
5 is from State Board of Education rule. So we're talking  
6 about reporting on one metric that looks at increases in  
7 the effectiveness of educators. Another metric that looks  
8 at the correlations between educator performance and  
9 student performance, and then a third metric that looks at  
10 the equitable -- equitable distribution of effective or  
11 higher.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. I'm sorry, go  
13 ahead and proceed.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. So one of  
15 the process that this would not require a rule change. It  
16 would, however, we would need to come to a consensus on  
17 which three metrics are shared. So I just wanted to dig  
18 into the complexity there. The first reporting category  
19 that we just went over is the reporting on increases in the  
20 effectiveness of educators. Here's an example of two of  
21 our educator effectiveness metrics. These both report on  
22 increases in the effectiveness of educators, but in  
23 different ways. So if you look at the graph on the left,  
24 these are state distributions, real -- real statewide data.



1                   So you can basically see the -- the  
2 percentage of teachers in each performance category over  
3 three school years, 13-14 school years the last year for  
4 which we have ratings. We collect ratings on a lagged  
5 basis, which we can talk about another time, but so here on  
6 that aggregate, you can look at increases in effectiveness.  
7 For instance, if you look at the highly effective on the  
8 far right, if you look at the difference from the yellow  
9 bar to the green bar, that means from the 2012-13 school  
10 year to the 2013-14 school year, we had a big bump in the  
11 percentage of highly effective teachers.

12                   So there you are looking at increases in the  
13 effectiveness of educators on average in the aggregate. So  
14 that's one way to accomplish the requirement of this  
15 reporting category. If you look at the graph next to it,  
16 this is a little bit different. It looks similar, the  
17 distributions are similar but really this metric focuses on  
18 individual growth. So if you look in the bottom right  
19 corner you'll see it says from effective. That means  
20 considering only teachers who received an effective rating  
21 in the 2012-13 school year.

22                   These are their ratings in the next school  
23 year. So for teachers who received an effective rating in  
24 2012-13 over 60 percent of them received an effective  
25 rating in the subsequent school year. A large chunk of





1 them almost 30 percent increased the rating, actually  
2 received a highly effective rating. So here again, we're  
3 looking at increases in the effectiveness of educators.  
4 But this is really focusing on individual growth rather  
5 than growth on the aggregate. Questions.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Questions. Go ahead and  
7 proceed. Did you have a question?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: I just have a worry on this  
9 one. So help me with this, Katy. In terms of  
10 effectiveness, some of the data is showing us that the  
11 tails are somewhat stable but that between years the middle  
12 80-85 percent are pretty shaky and variable. Is there any  
13 new data on that -- that causes us to worry a little bit  
14 about what districts are finding?

15 MS. ANTHERS: I would turn that over to Brit  
16 in case she knows of any new information. But there is  
17 some -- some reasons to suggest that there's kind of a big  
18 group in the middle, and there's actually not a lot of  
19 differentiation there, but I would like Dr. Rankin to  
20 clarify on that.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Is there anything new? I  
22 think it came out of Washington D.C. data but there is only  
23 one study that I've seen because I haven't been able to  
24 keep up with that.



1 MS. ANTHES: Right from about a year ago.  
2 I'm familiar with this since I have not seen an additional  
3 national work on that. As for the state of Colorado mostly  
4 what we see is that educators tend to either maintain the  
5 same rating or move up to the next rating category.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Okay. Yeah, I think  
7 it's more important to look at Colorado, right?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And there's more  
9 nuance, you know, I said there's the overall rating and the  
10 standard and elements, there's more, a lot more nuance down  
11 there which we feel comfortable with because that's where -  
12 - that's where they get the feedback, that's where the  
13 really specific feedback. So that's -- you're going to see  
14 more change year to year at the element level which were  
15 not reporting on.

16 MS. FLORES: But do you -- do you see that I  
17 mean, I'm -- I'm also thinking of new teachers who were,  
18 you know, just naturally the suppressing it go from  
19 partially effective to the second year more effective to  
20 effective to maybe third. Sometimes it takes five years  
21 for teachers to, you know, make that to highly effective  
22 and sometimes more. I mean some research says in maybe  
23 even seven years, so.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: So that's all. I want to  
25 continue but that does sort of address what I want to



1 continue next. Is there any -- any information about the  
2 churn? Within the fact that this isn't all that critical  
3 probably in a large district, but in a smaller district to  
4 the extent that you've had experienced teachers move on,  
5 and you're bringing in new teachers that might give a  
6 measure that at least ought to have the parameters  
7 identified. I'm not saying you shouldn't give the  
8 measures, but that should -- that should be really clear  
9 that this is in part because we have a younger staff or  
10 something to that effect.

11 MS. ANTHES: Dr. Schroeder, we have this  
12 first graph here. That just is looking at overall.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: All teachers.

14 MS. ANTHES: Right. And then, if you look  
15 in the bottom left corner it says all teachers. Currently,  
16 superintendents are the only ones you can access it, they  
17 can click on that dropdown right there and it says, new or  
18 experienced or new versus experienced.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Fantastic.

20 MS. ANTHES: And you can look at how ratings  
21 distribution change.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, that's really helpful.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I need to revisit the  
25 rules on this area may you can correct me but. Do you know



1 it seems like this slide -- slide alone is kind of helpful  
2 to the public, big picture. Prepare Senate Bill 191 was a  
3 bipartisan effort, getting data users, teachers are  
4 responding aggregately and we get what the district to  
5 decide how they're going to look inside the state and say  
6 and in our district, here's how it looks. Really, do we  
7 have an option to, as a project, there's a statewide  
8 initiative? That's what we see right now, and then let the  
9 districts use the data in the best way that serves their  
10 constituents. I mean, do we have any options like that? I  
11 meant we'd have to have a rule change to do that.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Will you not share it, with  
13 the public?

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, share that slide.

15 MS. ANTHERS: Sure.

16 (Overlapping)

17 MS. SCHROEDER: You know, you want the  
18 statewide numbers and not the district numbers?

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right. District take their  
20 own data and use it how they want to.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Because it's not going to be  
22 the same.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: They're going to use it  
24 anyway for personal, you know, for individual improvement.  
25 But let them talk about which metrics are meaningful to



1 their constituents, and how they want depicted on all of  
2 that.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Anthes.

4 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Dr. Scheffel, we could do  
5 that if we -- if we kept it at this level right now at the  
6 same level that would require a rule change. You guys  
7 would need to take out district and school level from  
8 public reporting in your rules.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: But that would be forever as  
10 opposed to what I thought we heard from the superintends  
11 which is, they just need some time to digest this and to  
12 also inform.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

14 MS GOFF: They should be up to here.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, is the next part of  
16 that is there a requirement on the part of districts to  
17 share it?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There wouldn't be  
20 another one. If they're going to pick which of those  
21 metrics are what focusing on here. But then what does that  
22 do to the accountability of the release of data? Who has  
23 it? Is -- is it left? And -- and whether it's changing  
24 our rules? I'm not sure if that would require statutory  
25 twitch either, but if it's just changing our rules, and we



1 say we -- we will go ahead and follow our obligation to  
2 release some state level data. But does that mean that the  
3 assumption, I got this rate on everything that involves  
4 legislation these days? Because this -- this just implies  
5 that there has to be some obligation on the part of who's  
6 not doing the other obligation. In this case, districts  
7 because if we got some districts regardless of size who are  
8 not releasing any data at all where do people go if they  
9 want some data at their local level?

10 MS. ANTHES: And Board Member Goff, the  
11 rules suggested since the state would be releasing data at  
12 the district and school level, the districts would not have  
13 to really say that, "We would be taking that burden on  
14 essentially for them." So I believe there's nowhere I can  
15 double check this, but I believe there's nowhere in  
16 district requirements in -- in any statutes or rule that  
17 they would have to release this data. It was more assumed,  
18 I think, but because of the State Board rules, we would be  
19 doing this, we would be doing the release for them.

20 MS GOFF: On school view?

21 MS. ANTHES: On school view.

22 MS GOFF: Okay. Well, yes but if we the  
23 state would put it on school view, we'd have it somewhere.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right.



1 MS GOFF: I'm just saying where do we  
2 guarantee or fall through whatever the word is on data  
3 available for local communities? And if we have the  
4 statewide data, does mean we have aggregate district data?

5 MS. ANTHES: We have that correct.

6 MS GOFF: So --

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry, you say that we  
8 do not have to publicly report that, that would, there  
9 would be a gap because districts do not have to publicly  
10 report it either. Does that make sense?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

12 MS GOFF: I don't think they want to.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's has nothing to do with  
15 my question. My question is depending on how this rule is  
16 changed or if a part of the statute down the road happens  
17 to be changed. Where does the responsibility start in the  
18 end? With which metrics are released? I assume that will  
19 have a prerogative, we have an obligation to choose some  
20 metrics, right? We choose.

21 MS. ANTHES: Yes. That's what this is  
22 about.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Then, whether districts  
24 release it or not, it's still available from our viewpoint



1 but not from theirs. If it's on school view we have a  
2 statewide obligation fulfilled.

3 MS. MAZANEC: We need to report, correct?

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes, we need to report.

5 MS. MAZANEC: Districts do not need to  
6 report.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: But that's where the --

8 MS. MAZANEC: So my question is, how much  
9 are you reporting, right?

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm thinking and I will get  
11 more questions from constituents out there about -- so  
12 where is it? Whether they want it or not, the people are  
13 going to want to know where is it and what -- what -- can  
14 we see on our most accessible venue.

15 MS. ANTHERS: That's the exact debate  
16 happening right now. Like how --

17 (Overlapping).

18 MS. ANTHERS: -- publicly released. How much  
19 do you want us to publicly release it, and if you don't  
20 publicly release it, might you might get some questions  
21 about why -- why is it not out there. If you do publicly  
22 release it, you might get some questions about, you know,  
23 why did you publicly release it. So that's the question.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Dr. Scheffel. Now,  
25 we are gonna try move along to finish this presentation.





1 MS. SCHEFFEL: My only point will be, you  
2 know, data is all about assumptions and to the extent that  
3 we become very granular about this data -- this data we're  
4 assuming that the data points are comparable because  
5 they're really not and that we know they're not, and the  
6 districts know they're not. Then we're releasing data,  
7 creating buckets where we're creating perceptions that  
8 really are inaccurate.

9 So that's -- that's why I'm saying, you  
10 know, statewide we adopted this initiative the statute was  
11 passed. Statewide we need to know generally, is it working  
12 or our teachers becoming more highly effective? What goes  
13 into that algorithm and metrics to say that, but when we  
14 get down to granularity at the district level with all  
15 these metrics 100 plus for teachers and then, I mean, this  
16 is a credible number of data points.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We just want three.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Then we have lack of  
19 comparability, I know we're doing --

20 MS GOFF: We just want three.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: And that's what the Supreme  
22 Court --

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I think that's the  
24 problem. The assumptions don't hold.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: -- in New York decided that  
2 they were capricious and irresponsible. So if -- if -- if  
3 -- you can't compare this and if they're different, they're  
4 not same -- then they are capricious and irresponsible.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. (Inaudible), would you  
6 got over the graph on the right again for some reason.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry, I'm having trouble  
8 with that one.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I know, of  
10 course.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Please.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the -- if you look  
13 at the bottom corner where it says from effective, that  
14 dropped down --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: There it is.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- yeah, if you click  
17 on that little arrow, it will say from ineffective, from  
18 partially effective, from effective or from highly  
19 effective, and that's the rating in the previous year. So,  
20 you can say, "I wanna just look at educators who were  
21 ineffective last year, and you click that, and then it will  
22 pop up their distribution of those subsequent years'  
23 ratings. So that's what allows you to then look at, for  
24 the most part growth in the ratings.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: That's right. This one is -  
2 - this one probably is more aggregated than this one over  
3 here, and that it's a very general impression, right?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I feel like they both  
5 give general impressions they just give different  
6 impressions --

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Different ones.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- so that's -- yeah.  
9 This is just -- this is just an example to show if we go  
10 forward with reporting on one metric per category. These  
11 are the conversations that we're going to probably need to  
12 have state wide --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- so that will be  
15 involved.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: And so you're gonna ask  
17 Sups.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Yeah.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Once you present, let's  
21 finish this -- these graphs here.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.  
23 Maybe we will just go over one more reporting category  
24 cause this is the one that people feel very strongly about.  
25 So the second reporting category, parts of the report on



1 the correlations between educator performance ratings and  
2 student outcomes. In these two examples here, we're  
3 looking at the relationship between teachers effectiveness  
4 ratings and the school performance framework. Okay.

5           So the graph on the left looks at the actual  
6 categories, the SPF categories, and then within each  
7 category, it's the percentage of teachers who receive that  
8 rating. So this graph, it -- is all the information,  
9 right? So it's all of the performance plans. It's all of  
10 the teachers regardless of the ratings, so this gives you  
11 of all the information that you need. This is a stacked  
12 bar graph, which is not always that easy to read. Right?

13           So it's all the information but, you know,  
14 to some of your points, is it too much information, what  
15 are we getting from it? So -- so then, there's another way  
16 to look at it, which is the graph on the right. And here,  
17 we're looking at the percentage of effective or higher  
18 teachers and linking back to the percentage of points  
19 earned on the SPF. Okay. So then, you just have this the  
20 scatter part that usually, you know, enables you to kind of  
21 easily look at the relationship between two measures. This  
22 -- now the one -- the point about this graph is that, then  
23 you're not reporting on the educators who received below  
24 effective ratings. So there's -- so some information is  
25 lost.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: That's right. I would never  
2 figure this out. On the right, sort of leaves me, "Huh?"  
3 Whereas one on the left, sort of gives the whole picture.  
4 Am I wrong?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, Dr. Schroeder.  
6 That's right. All of the information is the one on the  
7 left. So -- so both -- both require -- some of the  
8 feedback we heard from superintendents is to your point  
9 like I don't really understand what this means. When my  
10 parents come to talk to me about it I'm not going to be  
11 able to explain it. And so part of our compromise in terms  
12 of coming you are just picking three metrics 'cause then we  
13 can really work with them on those three metrics so they  
14 understand what's in there. That again might take more  
15 time than just the next few months so that we can have a  
16 conversation about rolling out. But still it's just three  
17 metrics to focus on instead of all them.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Mr. Crandall.

19 MR. CRANDALL: Dr. Wilkenfeld (ph), as we  
20 put things out, do we put out some FAQs? I mean we know  
21 that the film is going to look at these charts and some  
22 instant questions are going to pop up. One from the left  
23 for me is, why are 18 percent of teachers not being  
24 evaluated in our schools? How do we -- how do you answer  
25 those questions so the public doesn't have to send us an e-



1 mail asking those questions? Do we assume what questions  
2 might give answers at the time?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Commissioner  
4 Crandall. We do -- so all of this is in school view. And  
5 the way school view works is if you're looking at it, the  
6 graph will be on this side and then there's an overview  
7 section on this side, which gives a lot of text to answer  
8 all those kinds of questions. Typically in school view,  
9 there's not a ton of text for these metrics. There's a lot  
10 in there which is how the feedback we've heard that we're  
11 like, "Hey, we're trying to give you all the information."

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I just -- he thinks  
13 something is missing from this graph from the bottom left.  
14 What about districts that are rated -- highly rated?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that's the  
16 bottom.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On the right-hand side.  
18 Look at the very bottom. The top performance. These are  
19 the top performers and it goes down to the turnaround  
20 folks. So these are the aggregation of all the districts  
21 that are doing well on the right and then you keep going to  
22 the left there are more ratings.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So performance plan,  
24 improvement plan. But there's no way we -- those are not -  
25 - those are different names -- different names in the for -



1 - of credit -- in credit with distinction. Why -- why we  
2 just always try and use the same names? The rest should be  
3 in credit with distinction, accredited priority improvement  
4 -- priority improvement. Wouldn't that help clear up some  
5 of this -- cause I'm confused.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is -- thank you  
7 for asking. Sorry, I didn't clarify. These are school  
8 performance frameworks. The categories that you're talking  
9 about are the district's performance frameworks --

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That was a better  
11 question.

12 (Overlapping)

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let's get to one. There's  
14 no reason to have districts different than schools. All of  
15 this is a prescription for confusion. So we go through and  
16 change all of our school ratings to the same ratings that  
17 we're using for districts. I intend to decipher which  
18 world of the nomenclature and then when we have a single  
19 set of nomenclature let's use it.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: I don't know where that is.  
21 Is that in the law?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I believe so but I am  
23 noting that just as a follow up.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I mean this is -- on  
25 necessary.



1 MR. CRANDALL: Which to that point -- how  
2 would you know if it was a school or a district?

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Because -- it because when  
4 it's in the bottom.

5 MR. CRANDALL: No, no, no. It says all  
6 teachers. How would you know if it was a school or a  
7 district that you were looking at on this chart?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: There's no -- there's no  
9 category here for distinction.

10 MR. CRANDALL: I'm talking about just the  
11 general public because we're saying --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: That is exactly Steve's  
13 point.

14 MR. CRANDALL: I know -- I know, I'm  
15 disappointing that point is this chart --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Because we've got two  
17 different.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Wait. That's one thing if  
19 we -- if we're using when available for using the same  
20 nomenclature for districts and schools. I can't for the  
21 life and they see why you'd have different nomenclature.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: But for now, since we're  
23 talking only about reporting for districts. This would  
24 look different because you're right, there would be one





1 more category because districts are the ones that have the  
2 distinction.

3 MS. ANTHERS: And this would be on the text  
4 which is to give screenshots of two example, so all of the  
5 text and explanations if not here.

6 MR. CRANDALL: Good point.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I understand but I --

8 MS. SCHROEDER: You're right. It's  
9 confusing.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. We'll see.

11 (Inaudible), and the clock's the same way. Yeah.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, we'll skip the  
13 next reporting category. One is really -- one has kind of  
14 cover the three categories. You know there's a nuance  
15 within each and (inaudible) Chairman the right if he'd like  
16 to. So we're gonna -- so just as what did -- you know,  
17 being from the discussion, it's pretty clear that there are  
18 implications of the reporting policy that we select  
19 including rule changes and also including really deep  
20 engagement strategy with the field if that's what's  
21 necessary. So we've been talking about this for 6-8  
22 months. We have had conversations with you guys about it  
23 since about January or February. We've gathered feedback  
24 from today. I think we want to see if there's any



1 additional feedback or any additional guidance that you  
2 want to provide for us in selecting a concrete path.

3                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Give me just a second here  
4 and I'll see if I can guide this discussion well done. We  
5 have in -- on page six, you have the four options. So I  
6 think it would be -- I think what you're asking us is would  
7 -- would your -- or you're asking for directions to which  
8 of these four options the Board would prefer and try and  
9 guide you toward those options that would -- okay. When  
10 you start down with this man and they can see do you have a  
11 preference between anybody on the comments first of all the  
12 process. Yes, Dr. Schroeder.

13                   MS. SCHROEDER: I would appreciate seeing an  
14 example of a small district. The folks that are having the  
15 most concerns of some real data. Do we need to have a  
16 conversation about any size for those?

17                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Dr.  
18 Schroeder. The reason that I have shown state examples  
19 instead of district examples is because for the small  
20 districts, you often don't have any data. So what -- I  
21 feel like I need to be more clear with the feel on this  
22 that -- so we currently have a minimum end of five. We  
23 have used a really generous interpretation of that which is  
24 it's -- it's not just five teachers in the school, it's  
25 five teachers in each reporting category. So you have to



1 have at least five highly effective teachers, five  
2 effective teachers, five person effective and five  
3 ineffective for -- for your graph to populate. So that's a  
4 higher bar than most people realize and many of them don't  
5 reach it. That's why we haven't -- that's why I'm showing  
6 state level. So you can see the full graph certainly I  
7 could --

8 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm wondering -- that's  
9 making me wonder if the high anxiety is for those districts  
10 that would not be reporting anyway.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's sure that is  
12 feedback that we have provided as well. I feel like I  
13 think there is an overall sense. First of -- that because  
14 there's so much anxiety. They're not sure. And many --  
15 all of the districts have access to their metrics right  
16 now. Because of workloads and confusing in other things,  
17 not all of them have had a chance to dig in and see where  
18 their data will and will not be displayed. Perhaps if  
19 there was more of an opportunity to do that that would ease  
20 some of the anxiety.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: How can we help that happen?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we have been  
23 continuing --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: I mean in a positive way. I  
25 don't mean that in a nasty way. I just mean, let's hear



1 from folks -- let's have -- have a look at their data and  
2 hear from them and have them share with us what they see,  
3 what their concerns are and what kind of help they would  
4 need in communicating with their communities. I get really  
5 nervous about the Los Angeles example. What I don't want  
6 to see is to have that kind of a demand surface yet again,  
7 where we have a list of teachers and a list of test scores,  
8 right. We are trying to have an evaluation system that  
9 most importantly supports the field and helps teachers have  
10 some real strong conversations about what can they do to  
11 improve outcomes for their kids. And this is a part --  
12 this is the part that had all the public support in terms  
13 do we need to find out who are top performers and who are  
14 the folks that need to be cleaned the field. And I worry  
15 about that tension getting back into the legislature and  
16 having them -- having them tell us what we need to report.  
17 Because I think it was a pretty tough battle back in 191 to  
18 make sure that it was about improving teacher effectiveness  
19 and improving outcomes for kids not about identifying and  
20 punishing teachers and I don't want to -- I don't want us  
21 to back off so much that we get back into that battle.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

23 MS. FLORES: And so if we want that, why  
24 couldn't we report that those first two -- I'm gonna agree  
25 with you. I mean -- and that's all we need to do. I mean



1 we don't need -- they want it reporting. We report that,  
2 you know, those first two graphs that are out there. And I  
3 think that I am -- what we're hearing from staff that  
4 that's -- there are -- superintends are still nervous about  
5 it. If -- if they're still nervous without actually having  
6 seen what it looks like for them, well for the state, just  
7 for the state, I don't think it work for just for the state  
8 though. I really don't think the public will allow that.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Dr. Schroeder, let me  
10 just clarify. They have seen they all have a link. They  
11 have all seen what it looks like for their particular  
12 district and we've given sort of the last, I don't know, 4-  
13 5 months. And right has sent consistent reminders out  
14 saying, "Hi, look at this. And here is a survey, you can  
15 take for that -- take your best feedback on what you would  
16 like to see, what you wouldn't." So that is the  
17 combination of where we are today. Which from all that  
18 feedback, we're still -- we're still presenting here that  
19 they're still anxiety.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Even if we just do the  
21 three?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well -- but yes, their  
23 recommendation right on the top of this page, you'll see  
24 that 79 percent of superintendents wanted to postpone  
25 public release until 2018, 21 percent on the -- you know,



1 correspondents of 2017. But then we got feedback from  
2 other constituents that suggested we should have weekly  
3 reports at the state district and school levels. So what  
4 our team did was try to bring our compromise view which  
5 we'd option for.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. I think let's move  
7 through this, maybe let's try it this way to start. Is  
8 there anyone here that would like to delay the reporting  
9 done until 2018 and they think that's a good idea?

10 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores is one. Any  
12 others? Okay. All right. So I think the 2018 option is  
13 off the table. Anybody wanna delay till 2017? Dr. Flores  
14 I presume.

15 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Anyone else? Going once,  
17 going twice. Okay. So it looks like we're at item two,  
18 report metrics, some metrics in 2016. So now --

19 MS. FLORES: We are out of caveats.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. They are -- yeah,  
21 we're really -- we're going to get now into those caveats.  
22 So in 2016, does the balance -- let's see. I'll just go  
23 ahead. All right. Reporting all metrics will increase the  
24 end size, this is option three required for a data display.  
25 And it requires a rule change because --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, the current  
2 end size -- minimum end is set to five. So in rule. So if  
3 we want to change it to 8 or 10 or different number, we'd  
4 have to change the rules.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: How many districts would  
6 be excluded if you get it up to that size? I mean when  
7 you're talking about --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Chair, I don't  
9 actually have those numbers in front of me. The analyses  
10 that I've done I believe show that if you go up to an end  
11 of limit 10, you still get like 85 percent of districts. I  
12 can give you the exact numbers. I don't have them right in  
13 front of me but beyond 10 a lot of district start to drop  
14 off and that's just for teachers, for principals obviously  
15 they drop off from --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could you please  
17 explain that, what (inaudible)?

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I mean -- principals are  
19 paid to take the right profile people. They're paid to  
20 take risks. I don't -- I'm not as quite as sympathetic  
21 there. Yes, I'm sorry. Who was -- Yes, Ms. Mazanec?

22 MS. MAZANEC: Could you explain the -- the -  
23 - the significance of the n number? You said that they  
24 need to have at least five teachers in each category? So  
25 essentially, if you have a small school and they have 10



1 teachers, they're not gonna qualify. They're -- they're  
2 not gonna make that in cut.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So thank you, Chairman.  
4 Not Chairman, Board Member Mazanec.

5 MS. MAZANEC: I'm the Chairman.

6 (Overlapping)

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So in the State Board,  
8 all it says is there must be a minimum n of five, it  
9 doesn't clarify. My interpretation has been five per  
10 category. So if you look at the graph on the right, the --  
11 the four blue bars, each one of those has to have at least  
12 five teachers in it for it to be shown. For a school that  
13 has 10 teachers, if they're all in -- if they're all  
14 effective, that will be shown because that category has met  
15 the minimum at five. If they're distributed, if they're  
16 are three, three and four, it will not be shown, we'll show  
17 that they -- that they don't meet the minimum n. So, you  
18 wouldn't -- you would know that there were educators in  
19 multiple categories, you wouldn't know how many, you  
20 wouldn't be able to identify which ones were safe for  
21 training.

22 MR. CRANDALL: What if it's a nine and one?  
23 Do you show the one category and not the other?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you, Commissioner  
25 Crandall, and actually my example was not a good one





1 because any time anyone in the public or any other teacher  
2 in the school could identify the ratings of a teacher, will  
3 have to suppress it. So if it -- for a nine and one we  
4 would have to suppress it because the one would know the  
5 ratings of the other nine, and my example was not a great  
6 one if there are all 10 in the same category we would have  
7 to suppress it because everyone would know the ratings of  
8 everyone in the school because they're all in one category.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, I don't quite  
10 understand it, if you're not doing personally identifiable  
11 information, so you've got nine and one. You know, you  
12 might guess but I don't know how you know.

13 MR. CRANDALL: She said the one who is in-  
14 effected would know the other nine.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well -- well, but --

16 MS. GOFF: That's informative, isn't it?

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No I know -- I'm sorry I'm  
18 -- I'm missing that.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So if you have a nine -  
20 -

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: In one teacher has been  
22 informed that they're ineffective, the other nine have been  
23 informed they're effective, right? Think about the nine  
24 don't know which one of the other nine is ineffective.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct. But  
2 technically the one who got ineffective is not supposed to  
3 know the other teachers ratings even though they are  
4 effective ratings.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So you're gonna get into  
6 such large schools if you hold to that category that --

7 MS. FLORES: We went to schools, we went to  
8 districts.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- or districts.

10 MS. FLORES: What if we just don't have  
11 districts and just do the state.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: I agree, they definitely do.

13 MS. FLORES: Or by congressional districts.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Sorry to community Members.

15 (Overlapping)

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. So --  
17 so yes Dr. Scheffel, did you have a comment?

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, I just had a question.  
19 Is it possible because we know that the evaluations are not  
20 -- they are not -- we know that because we have a one size  
21 fits all system, the smaller districts have issues with  
22 this data and they should question, can we release the data  
23 on the state level, not do it at the district level?  
24 Districts get their data and I know this would require rule



1 change but I'm just trying to think of why we want these  
2 data.

3                   You know, as a state which has this law the  
4 public would like to know if generally speaking it's  
5 working. We've only been doing it a couple years so why  
6 don't we have statewide data that shows broadly some trends  
7 that we can think through.

8                   And then at the district level, they have  
9 their own data privately and then they work with their  
10 constituents based on their local course to figure out how  
11 to use these data for continuous improvement. I know it  
12 requires a little change but I -- I think when we do this  
13 one size fits all approach at the state level, we  
14 disadvantage the smaller districts and we really can't fix  
15 it. And it's especially problematic because the data  
16 points are not comparable. So we are creating a perception  
17 that really isn't accurate.

18                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I would agree that the  
19 fact we have different data points and it is going to be  
20 difficult to compare and I think that is a problem. Yes  
21 Doctor.

22                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Here's what I worry about,  
23 having served on a school Board knowing in a district where  
24 you have both privileged children and at-risk children.  
25 For a Board Member, for -- for the community to know



1 whether we are distributing effective teachers in a fair  
2 way and there are some that, some that will actually say  
3 that a fairer way would be to have most of the effective  
4 teachers with your at-risk kid. To not have that kind of a  
5 public conversation is very problematic for me. I'm all  
6 for the aggregating.

7 I mean, I appreciate the three categories  
8 but those three categories at a district level would tell  
9 the Board and the public would put some pressure on the  
10 Board to be looking more carefully at how we're serving all  
11 kids. And we mask that when we just do it at state level  
12 because at the state level we already know what's in these  
13 three. We know what's in these three graphs. And to look  
14 at a district level, I mean, I just remember being on the  
15 Board and looking at the experience of the teachers in the  
16 district that I represented, and it gave me a great sense  
17 of confidence to know that the experience level in our most  
18 at-risk schools was the same or more than it was in all  
19 schools.

20 And I thought you know our Superintendent  
21 really is trying to -- to do a thoughtful distribution of  
22 teachers, encouraging teachers who are experienced to work  
23 in those at -- risk schools. That's -- that was important  
24 given the goals that we had of improving outcomes for kids.  
25 If we can't have those discussions at the district level in



1 a public way, it ain't gonna happen because of different  
2 pressures the school Board Members come under.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel and then Dr.  
4 Flores.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm just saying, they can --  
6 they can have those discussions because the districts have  
7 the data that they see.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But they are not  
9 public. My point is, the public. It has -- it has to be  
10 publicly discussed.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: But their Board is -- is like  
12 a ward. So their Board would respond to the public outcry  
13 for we want to see data particularly in these areas. I  
14 mean that's the local issue. That's where the public  
15 creates pressure on their local boards and say, "We care  
16 about this issue." Statewide, we can answer the question.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin. I'm sorry,  
18 Dr. Flores and then Ms. Rankin.

19 MS. FLORES: You know, I -- I don't think  
20 that most districts feel the same way that your district  
21 does. In fact nationally, that's one of the things that I  
22 think is being fought over whether -- whether -- whether  
23 states or districts can really say to teachers, "Well, you  
24 go over and you really effective teachers, why don't we get  
25 you to go over to the hardship schools", and I don't think



1 nationally. That's one of the things that legislators, I  
2 mean, Congress has been fighting over it. And I don't  
3 think that Congress has said, "Yes do that." I think it  
4 should be left at the local level and that's great that at  
5 your district they're doing that. And I think we should  
6 allow districts to -- to handle this if they want to. I  
7 think we should report it at the state level. And it is  
8 difficult for districts, and they need to deal with it in  
9 their way and I think we should leave it to them.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Ms. Rankin.

11 MS. RANKIN: You know first of all, I want  
12 to say thank you for the work you've done. Also I was  
13 concerned about this weeks ago and what -- and what, when I  
14 met with both of them because I asked a lot of the same  
15 questions. I think they have made a recommendation of  
16 combining number 1 and number 4.

17 I think if you look at the cons, everything  
18 about the cons it's a bad idea don't do anything. I don't  
19 like the idea of waiting too long but I like the idea of  
20 six to eight months to let them get used to one item in  
21 each category. I think this is the best offer we have as  
22 combining those two. I also hope that if we find a year or  
23 two from now there are changes that have to be made. We  
24 can maybe make some changes. Your recommendation also says  
25 that there will be no intent to release the rest of the



1 metrics, but along with Dr. Scheffel's recommendation, you  
2 know, the local district may want to do some of those.  
3 Just to point out things where they need to help or their  
4 local school boards may have questions.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Or where they're doing great.

6 MS. RANKIN: Or where they doing great. But  
7 I -- I applaud you for this work and the work you've done  
8 here because I was very skeptical at the beginning. I'm  
9 not really, really happy, but I think we do have to move  
10 forward because of 191. And I think your recommendation is  
11 right and correct.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So how many -- how many  
13 Members believe that some combination of -- of proven  
14 recommendation one and four is appropriate to move forward  
15 and would you like to have any caveats on that . Yes, Dr.  
16 Schroeder.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Well I -- I do think the  
18 compromise, recommended compromise is a reasonable one. I  
19 would love to have districts have an opportunity to look at  
20 their options. Just keep in mind the fact that I know I'm  
21 not that smart, but the fact that is confusing to me,  
22 somewhat less confusing than others I guess I should say  
23 should be an important one. So I want them to -- the  
24 feedback to include which ones they think are best but also  
25 which ones they think are best in terms of the



1 understanding of their, not just their parents, their  
2 taxpayers.

3 I think this is a broader -- if we're doing  
4 a good job, we're gonna be informing the larger  
5 constituents and we'll get some confidence of our public  
6 that this is a system that has merit. If we don't give  
7 enough information, I'm afraid they are going to see that  
8 just wasn't any good at all. We need to do a new 191  
9 that's a whole lot more prescriptive than we've tried to  
10 keep it.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. So one and four,  
12 it's like you're comfortable Ms. Goff, Ms. Rankin, Emm, Dr.  
13 Scheffel?

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: What are you --

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The staff recommendation  
16 one and four.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Let me see it, because I've  
18 not seen it.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Is it a general rule, or  
20 one and four with caveats, or one of the others, or --

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: If we're gonna look at rule  
22 change without delay unsubstantial, right? Is that a good  
23 deal? Then if we're gonna do something different than  
24 these recommendations, our options are limited to open the  
25 rules.





1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It will be a two in one  
2 with the least delay, I think, or perhaps three. So -- so  
3 generally speaking -- generally speaking, number -- Dr.  
4 Flores do you generally speaking agree with --

5 MS. FLORES: Number one and four?

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, one and four  
7 combination?

8 MS. FLORES: The combo is that we have  
9 combined it for you in the very bottom in the summary  
10 recommendation.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: I need to find somewhere  
12 privately.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Meaning that districts  
14 have access to their data and they also can see other  
15 districts' data. So because it's a log in to our system we  
16 -- we don't you know, they can see other districts but the  
17 public can't see it.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right. So I'd  
19 say I'm personally not in favor of that but looks like I'm  
20 out voted. So, does that give you enough guidance to  
21 persuade me?

22 MS. FLORES: What are you in favor of?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well I think it -- it will  
24 be a problem down the road that the districts can log in  
25 and see some things the public can't and may not be the



1 problem early on but I would guess that after a year or two  
2 after this we may wish to revisit it because if -- if I'm  
3 in the public and all those launched organizations would  
4 like to publish data on school effectiveness, I would  
5 eventually want to see that public. At some point in time  
6 I'm going to guess that you know, if we're gonna pressure  
7 the districts for it if they don't get it there are allowed  
8 to pressure us for it. So but it is not a bad thing. So I  
9 get used to a lot.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can I ask a question about  
11 that? So the semi private data is all 100 items right?  
12 Yeah. Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. That might be in  
14 the confusing category.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: That'd be in the confusing  
16 category and I'll be in the category of -- of, that's  
17 important information for the district to have, but not  
18 necessarily, and school Board to have but not necessarily  
19 the public. It would just sort of add to people would pick  
20 out different things and make some really silly conclusions  
21 I'm afraid.

22 MS. FLORES: Excuse me. So --

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.



1 MS. FLORES: The -- the public reporting at  
2 three is available to the public right? But it's the whole  
3 100 that only districts can see?

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Correct.

5 MS. FLORES: So I'm looking at this as  
6 taking one baby step towards this and then we can revisit  
7 this and how we do it in the future. But I personally  
8 think that the public has a right to know something. I  
9 mean, when we pass this law, we wanna make sure that we  
10 know how our educators are being evaluated and perfect as  
11 it may be, but it was the public some sort of information  
12 so it is important that we not delay this hopefully in  
13 future we can if not for the fact that make it better.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. We only have to  
15 work firmly and then notify the districts and see how they  
16 react, and if we need additional guidance of how to do  
17 something please let us know. Thank you.

18 MS. FLORES: Again, thank you, this was all  
19 --

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: This is the kind of  
21 discussion that lead towards, should be engaged, in which  
22 the Board should be engaged and certain things would  
23 actually make a difference so hopefully we're long around  
24 for improving education in Colorado so, thank you. Next  
25 item is, why don't we take a five minute break and then we



---

1 come back at a quarter till. See if we -- we'll -- we'll  
2 be a little bit behind schedule by that point, but we'll  
3 look --  
4 (Meeting adjourned)



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 25th day of October, 2018.

/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