



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
May 12, 2016, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on May 12, 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: If you would please call the
2 roll.
3 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores?
4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Excused.
5 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff.
6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She was --
7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She was --
8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She's here.
9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She's here.
10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Just rotate around here. You
11 can call her name again.
12 MS. BURDSALL: We'll do those two later.
13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Pass.
14 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec.
15 MS. MAZANEC: Pass. Here. Here.
16 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin?
17 MS. RANKIN: Here.
18 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel?
19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.
20 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Schroeder?
21 MS. SCHROEDER: Here.
22 MS. BURDSALL: Chairman Durham.
23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Present and just keep the roll
24 call open.
25 MS. BURDSALL: Keep that roll open.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We'll pretend we're in the
2 Senate for a minute. You know what they call a Member of the
3 Senate who's on time?

4 MS. BURDSALL: What?

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Lonely. Yes, would you care to
6 answer present?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just say, yes.

8 MS. GOFF: Present.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perfect. Okay. Quorum is
10 present. We proceed this morning with the first item 3.01,
11 Content exams for educational license educational licensure
12 endorsements and --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's not 3.01.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Commissioner who's gonna handle
15 --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You have the wrong -- you
17 have the wrong agenda.

18 MS. BURDSALL: It is.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Really?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you change? Oh, you
21 changed the agenda sheet?

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, we've moved things
23 around, I'm sorry.

24 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, revised? You wouldn't has
25 anticipated this.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. One moment. One
2 moment folks.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 3.01.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. The content exams.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So who's going to --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Dr. O'Neill and Dr. Anthes.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perfect.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There are all kinds of
9 information in this.

10 MS. O'NEILL: We'll share all kinds. So good
11 morning. This is Colleen O'Neill. I'm the Executive Director of
12 educator preparation licensing and educator effectiveness. And
13 I'm here today to just give you an informational item around
14 content assessments. If you think back, okay 20 years but really
15 two and the last couple of years I came forward to --

16 MS. FLORES: I was a baby then.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores is present.

18 MS. O'NEILL: I -- I yes. I mean everybody
19 started when they were five. So it worked out. But yes, two
20 years ago I came to the Board of Education and I talked about a
21 couple of things that the stakeholders across Colorado were asking
22 for. One they were asking for a rule alignment with our Colorado
23 Educator Preparation and licensing standards to ensure that they
24 were aligned with the current initiatives including things like SB
25 191 in educator effectiveness and our Colorado academic standards.



1 The Board of Education approved that rule of alignment in January
2 of this year. At the same time that folks were asking us about
3 ensuring that those rule alignments were there, they were also
4 asking us to review our content assessments that identify
5 competency in all of our endorsement areas for our license. So
6 Math competency, Social Studies competency, English, Elementary,
7 all of these competencies. And we said we will absolutely begin
8 that because that is an immediate need as soon as the rules were
9 approved.

10 So we did that. The rules went live on the
11 Secretary of State's website at the end of March. Literally the
12 next week we had announced a stakeholder group from across
13 Colorado to start to review the content assessments. And so that
14 is what I just wanted to give you an update on today. We have
15 fast tracked it based off of folks requests in the field. Right
16 now we have two content assessments that are approved by the
17 Board. They are the PLACE which is administered by Pearson and
18 there are some Educational Testing Service ETS or Praxis (II)
19 assessments that are also approved by the Board of Education.

20 Our stakeholder group has asked us to come
21 forward to the Board with a recommendation for a revamp of those
22 assessments. The primary reasons for that are: one, PLACES
23 offered right now pencil and paper still three times across the
24 state of Colorado. That is really onerous for educators to get to
25 and participate in. So we are fast tracking it to try to



1 alleviate some of that. The second one is to ensure of course
2 that our content assessments are fully aligned with our educator
3 preparation and licensing rules and our Colorado academic
4 standards. Within that we need to ensure that they are reliable,
5 they are valid, and that they are an appropriate measure of what
6 we expect our teachers to know and be able to do in a classroom
7 for our kids with regard to content.

8 In order to do that we fast tracked it with the
9 stakeholder group. We have a Co-chair, we have Co-chairs, I guess
10 you don't have a Co-chair you have a Co-chairs and one is an
11 educator preparation institute representative, the other one is a
12 human resource representative from the district. They are
13 chairing those. That stakeholder group has come together three
14 times now under what we did was a response for information to the
15 two largest content assessment testing agencies. The first one of
16 course was Pearson and the national evaluation system. The second
17 one is the Educational Testing Services.

18 We sent out in early April, as soon as those
19 rules were approved, we sent out a request for information from
20 those two entities. A master of stakeholder groups had those
21 testing agencies conduct basically every reliability and crosswalk
22 measure of what our standards and our productivity standards and
23 our licensing standards set, identify where all of those
24 connections were between their assessments over 40 assessments,
25 content assessments for us. And the stakeholders are now involved



1 in reviewing that, being presented with that information and
2 digging in very deeply asking critical questions. Their task and
3 they chose this task, within two months time frame in June to
4 basically be able to come back to the Board of Education with a
5 recommendation from that stakeholder group as to how to proceed
6 with our content assessments.

7 In June we are anticipating that it could be an
8 adoption moment or it could just be an informational moment for
9 the Board. Meaning the stakeholder group is gonna come back and
10 say we have reviewed all 40 common areas, we have dug in deeply to
11 identify the crosswalk between those content areas, we have
12 identified a single provider for potentially multiple providers
13 that can ensure that we have valid and reliable assessments that
14 meet the needs of our Colorado educators, that are available
15 Nationally and Internationally in an online format so they are not
16 taking a pen and paper, pencil and paper, assessment in the state
17 of Colorado and that they are aligned with the expectations of
18 rigor set forth by the Board of Education and the educator
19 preparation and licensing standards. That was a lot of
20 information and that we have wanted you to know that we have fast
21 tracked it purposefully so that we did not have to sit for another
22 year with just the reassessments windows, for our teachers to come
23 in and take content assessments.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me, did you say one of those
2 tests is only available by pencil and paper three times a year?

3 MS. O'NEILL: So I don't really love to answer
4 this question but I'm going to because right now that is actually
5 how our PLACE assessments are administered, pencil and paper,
6 three times each year. The vast majority of them. That said,
7 several of them are also administered through test windows online
8 through the educational testing service or Praxis (II) but almost
9 all of our PLACE right this second are with Mr. pencil and paper.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But are you saying it's not
11 available online? Or it's just most? Is that because they only
12 offer the testing?

13 MS. O'NEILL: That PLACE test right now as it
14 stands without the adoption of a new assessment is only available
15 in paper and pencil. Hence the reason we're fast tracking it
16 after the rules became available. It is a I- when I say it is
17 onerous for our educators, it is onerous for our educators. So
18 yes, that is what they're dealing with today. And hence the
19 reason as soon as the rules were adopted and we knew that we had a
20 streamline event, we were like, how quickly can we move on that
21 and still be credible with it.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: So how many tests are there weekly
24 online? Is it on dozen? A lot of them?



1 MS. O'NEILL: There are approximately -- It's
2 about 40.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, okay.

4 MS. O'NEILL: It's about 40 and they, again we
5 have the testing companies do a crosswalk of those to ensure that
6 their standards and when they were testing were hitting our
7 standards and what we expect our teachers to know. So it is
8 approximately 40 today. And there are some that are not on the
9 plate today. And my example is culturally and linguistically
10 diverse because that is by program endorsement only. There is not
11 a content assessment today that actually aligns with that. So to
12 --

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: And are they aligning with student
14 standards or which standards?

15 MS. O'NEILL: We've actually asked them to
16 crosswalk both of them. So the Colorado Academic Standards in
17 addition to our teacher preparation and licensing standards and
18 ensure that crosswalk exists. And again these are content only,
19 this is not a pedagogical test and I think that's important to
20 know so we are testing the depth of content knowledge in these
21 assessments.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, and who's on the committee
23 that will bring the recommendations?

24 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely and I'm -- I apologize
25 that I didn't bring but I will forward to you the exact committee



1 list. Right now we have approximately 15 Members and they range
2 from educators, teachers in the classroom to Deans of Education
3 for educator preparation entities. We have H.R. Representation.
4 We have the Colorado Association of School personnel
5 administration representation and we have representation from the
6 Colorado consortium of Deans. So there is a pretty strong
7 crosswalk there on the stakeholder group. We also have very clear
8 individuals that have assessments backgrounds, deep assessment
9 backgrounds either institute of higher education level.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I would only just say as
11 you're advising this group, are you going to these meeting or?

12 MS. O'NEILL: So I will leave here and head to
13 the next one. It's happening today.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I would just say, as you've
15 guide their work, I would just ask for options because this is a
16 high stakes assessment and some students struggle to get through
17 this test. Most don't. But there are some students that do and
18 they only have one test, one game, they must pass to get their
19 license and you know, there need to be options, so I think, for
20 those kinds of students having a place to practice is and options
21 it's really helpful. You can't leave one option. Sometimes it's
22 difficult because of the format of the test.

23 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Schroeder.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So correct me if I'm wrong, but
2 seems to me there's been some controversy about the science
3 assessments because they are so broad. And in fact especially for
4 secondary teachers they actually tend to specialize and so they're
5 being tested in areas that they had back in junior high.

6 MS. O'NEILL: I see. Dr. Schroeder that's a
7 great question and it's something that's bubbling up more and more
8 and I think you'll see me in front of you next fall or early
9 spring asking for, potentially, a variation in our endorsement
10 models again. And so --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

12 MS. O'NEILL: Several years ago we had individual
13 endorsements in Biology, individual endorsements in middle school,
14 individual you know all of those from a rural perspective that was
15 very difficult for folks to really say, "Okay, I just need a
16 Biology teacher at a rural. I don't need a seven through 12 or
17 six through 12 Science teacher." So I need that endorsement
18 ability. And so we collapsed those endorsements and I apologize
19 for not knowing there year I wanna say, it's in the mid -- early
20 mid 2000's like 2003, 2004?

21 We collapsed those endorsements, got away from
22 individualized endorsements, really pulled away from middle school
23 endorsements as well, and so in the last year we have definitely
24 heard folks coming back and saying you know what we actually
25 really do want to see a better school endorsement in science or we



1 there's been some conversation, lots more digging to do, but some
2 conversation around Early Childhood and the overlap of Early
3 Childhood in elementary and whether that is truly the best way to
4 help our kids from a teaching endorsement standpoint and a
5 professional standpoint. So I -- I think those are probably our
6 biggest areas.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: So this creates the challenge for
8 rural districts. Well, actually for all districts and schools, in
9 moving teachers, keeping a teacher or having them teach at a
10 different level. First grader or kindergarten versus fifth grade.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Specializations could prevent
12 them.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: That -- that. So finding some
14 ways to speed up those differences. Or the -- no, what are those,
15 what are the pieces that are significantly different between the -
16 - the levels in order to help schools be able to have that
17 flexibility because kids don't come in. Numbers, certain numbers,
18 set numbers, one year you're going to have three rounds first
19 grade and another year you gonna have two. Those -- those kinds
20 of things. So then you've gotta have some flexibility in where
21 you place your teachers. If it's just Grade one and two that's
22 not a big deal but it -- it can sometimes be kind of dramatic
23 because of economic, well whatever reasons, that the kids numbers
24 really change.

25 MS. O'NEILL: Makes so much sense. Thank you.



1 MS. FLORES: May I ask a question?

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes Dr. Flores -- Oh, I'm
3 sorry, Ms. Rankin was next and then Dr. Flores.

4 MS. FLORES: Oh, sorry.

5 MS. RANKIN: Thank you for the report. You did
6 have a lot of information but it sure answered a lot of questions
7 that I had. Could you answer another one? Praxis is put out by
8 ETS, is that correct?

9 MS. O'NEILL: Correct.

10 MS. RANKIN: So PLACE is put out by Pearson.

11 MS. O'NEILL: And -- and PLACE just to clarify,
12 PLACE was made for Colorado only. It was a -- it was an RFP, it's
13 Colorado only, we are not headed down that path today. That was a
14 large chunk of money that went to the development of that. But
15 Pearson also works with a National evaluation system and services.
16 That's really would be Pearson but it's really NES which moves to
17 the online format, moves to more kind of National with some hint
18 of Colorado as needed in alignment.

19 MS. RANKIN: I really like the idea of aligning
20 the content, the students content, with what the teachers are
21 doing and the fact that there even is a pencil and paper test is
22 shocking.

23 MS. FLORES: It's a good option to some.

24 MS. RANKIN: I would like to have more of the,
25 since the students have to take the technology based tests, I



1 would and I'm sure the stakeholders are looking into the -- the
2 test for the teachers are being awarded or whatever, aligned with
3 the way the students, so they are really understanding A, what the
4 students are being tested but B, hopefully unless they have
5 computer backgrounds which I think they're going to have to have
6 in order to do that incremental learning and outcome. Are the
7 stakeholders talking about that?

8 MS. O'NEILL: They are. We actually are. Carol
9 Gates from -- from our teaching learning unit is actually doing a
10 crosswalk of what we expect our students to be able to do and then
11 if with regard to how, when, why and the content as well as what
12 these exams are, so we'll have that information whether it's a 100
13 percent match, probably not but it will be within acceptable
14 bandwidth of that. So we are.

15 MS. RANKIN: And it's ongoing. And it has to be
16 flexible. But thank you for that presentation. Thank you very
17 much.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

19 MS. FLORES: So are these people, they go into
20 Science, are they Science majors? I mean are they Biology,
21 Chemistry or is that what they are making them?

22 MS. O'NEILL: It depends. Our educators come out
23 it depends on what program they entered. Some of them actually
24 enter an educational program from the very beginning and if so
25 they end up with the general science background. Most of them



1 enter into a very specific background and then they do education
2 on the back side of that. So a lot of them are coming up with a
3 Biology degree.

4 MS. FLORES: Yeah, they come out with a
5 Bachelor's in a very specific science area and then the assessment
6 they get goes back to subjects that they haven't looked at since
7 freshmen in high school, kind of thing.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Goff.

9 MS. GOFF: Either of you including Dr. Scheffel,
10 is there -- have the course requirements changed at all? Is there
11 a move toward more at least some certain number of hours of
12 experience with technology for example, you know, are all teachers
13 coming out expected to have some tech teaching not teaching it but
14 --

15 MS. FLORES: Skills.

16 MS. GOFF: -- skills to be able to do anything
17 these days?

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: Do I think so. Yeah. That mean
19 we, the courses are aligned to the standards. So the question is
20 how do you divide it up. So you -- you know, you look at all
21 standards and map up all -- all the courses learning out comes the
22 program learning out, comes and figure out which courses are gonna
23 have which content.

24 MS. GOFF: Okay.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So most schools have, most
2 universities have a course dedicated to technology. Some have
3 more than one, other some lace it through the curriculum in more
4 threaded way but it's -- it has to be there and it has to be there
5 in the down notes.

6 MS. GOFF: Okay.

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Not just once.

8 MS. GOFF: Well, you know, the -- I don't
9 remember the Bill number. But the Bill that passed that -- that
10 put such upon us to include technology, It -- it's, I think it's
11 in their unless it's written down I can't say that for sure. But
12 so we'll be adding that to the student standards as well. Just
13 it's another thing to add on. Then there's the computer science
14 component. How -- how far that goes into that's, if the intention
15 right now is we're -- we're going to make sure it's in a high
16 school, in the high school courses, how does that filter in and
17 permeate throughout and just thought I'd check on them because --

18 MS. O'NEILL: And I do think you'll see us back
19 here with the bill of computer science endorsement. So --

20 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

21 MS. O'NEILL: -- you'll probably see. Okay
22 you'll see a lot of me anyway but you'll see a lot of the ball
23 because there's several opportunities.

24 MS. FLORES: Is that computer science
25 endorsement?



1 MS. O'NEILL: It' not in the way that it is
2 listed in the new bill that has come forward. Not in such a deep
3 way, it has more technology and we -- the programming aspect
4 around that is not nearly as deep as I think most folks would like
5 to see it. And that's been the key fact that we've received from
6 stakeholders just in the last couple of months and especially as
7 that computer science opportunity has arisen.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any further questions? I have
9 just one. This is likely to come back in June or that your
10 preference?

11 MS. O'NEILL: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And when it comes back there
13 will be decision items on selection of vendor or vendors and what
14 other decisions might be required of the Board.

15 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. So at that point in
16 time when we'll come back is a recommendation for a vendor and
17 then probably cut scores that are associated with that. And right
18 now the bottom conversation around that we can either do
19 individual cut scores for the state of Colorado or we can do
20 national benchmark cut scores that are already established and
21 then monitor for a year. So the committee is wrestling with that
22 too, as to what that is if we were to Colorado specific cut
23 scores, then that -- that is another probably six to seven, eight
24 month process for us then to be able to implement them. If we
25 went with a -- with the national benchmark cut score initially



1 with research and articulation aligned for the next year, we could
2 implement a lot quicker but all of this will come forward from
3 that stakeholder group and it will be a presentation by one of the
4 co-chairs with some support from the other side because this is
5 completely stakeholder driven at this moment.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

7 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can you speak about that? You're
8 saying that they're going to come back with a suggest for one
9 vendor, was the vendor perspective?

10 MS. O'NEILL: We're really not sure yet. Right
11 now, they -- that's what they're wrestling with. So they are
12 charged with ensuring that we have content assessments that meet
13 the rigors associated with our -- our expectations that the Board
14 set forward and then ensuring that we have a valid reliable
15 assessments. And however that meets the needs so they may come
16 back and make recommendation based on these presentations that
17 say, "Actually we think we should accept all of them, " or they
18 may come back and say, "We think in multiple areas similar to the
19 way it is today, that we accept the PLACE in one area and the
20 process in one area or the PLACE and process in one area".

21 So that's, those are the things, they're
22 wrestling with a lot of things in a very short period time. But
23 all of those recommendations will come back and they'll be able to
24 say "We're recommending one vendor because of this. Or we're



1 recommending two vendors or we're not recommending any vendor
2 right now because we want to do more research" and then --

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'd like this Board to do the
4 research on that because there is a difference between Pearson
5 which is a for profit company and ETS which is not. And so the
6 way they price the test and the way they do item developments. So
7 I mean, I'm just saying, this group may come back with a
8 recommendation and I think sometimes we haven't patient to accept
9 the recommendation and put in 100 hours on it maybe whatever. And
10 there is a lot of new ones underneath these test. And again,
11 having options for people who would have -- have to take them and
12 they can get the license once they pass it, we need options. So I
13 hope your guide will work that way.

14 MS. O'NEILL: I -- I think there's two things.
15 One, I would be happy to meet with any -- any Board Member and
16 dive a little bit more deeply into the response information that
17 helps as outlined that and answer any questions in the next June
18 meeting as well that might come up. I also, and not really
19 anticipating necessarily an adoption in June, it can go on the
20 table for that but it can also be extended to August, so that we
21 have more time. We have a month in there or so to be able to dig
22 a little bit more deeply and or ask more questions about that
23 recommendation. So we're prepared either way to be able to do
24 that and I'm happy to meet individually with folks as well. If
25 you have individual questions or please send them forward to me so



1 that I can help make sure and guide in the right way. That are
2 all credibly valid points.

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Miss Goff.

4 MS. GOFF: You know, apologies in advance if
5 you've mentioned this, PLACE. How -- what's the -- to what degree
6 are we still using it and has it been -- has it been looked at,
7 modified, revised, updated and in what content areas. And I know
8 that the stakeholders have the discretion and the right to be
9 talking about that. I'm just curious. It's been, for year after
10 year, we've talked about that, yes we love PLACE because it's
11 Colorado's test but it hasn't been able to keep up with -- with
12 everything that -- that's going on including team changes in
13 teacher, prep programs and the direction forward, not to mention
14 the student content standards. So --

15 MS. O'NEILL: My very quick easy answer to that
16 is no. PLACE has not necessarily kept up with that. PLACE, we
17 have not revamped those assessments in multiple years. This is
18 that opportunity for us to do that. And again we're not really
19 envisioning, dumping a bunch of money into the bringing up of
20 Colorado specific that is not one of the budget items we have on
21 the plate today. If at the boards will they want to look at that,
22 I'll be more than happy to and identify funding streams for it.
23 But it really has not been. And I think that's an important
24 aspect to why we are pushing so quickly with the stakeholder group
25 and why there's a sense of urgency in the field.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you. Thank you
2 Dr. O'Neill, you've given us something to look forward to you know
3 how we love setting cut scores.

4 MS. O'NEILL: That we do. Thank you.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That was a joke. Okay. Next -
6 -

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're starting to relax not
8 good.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Probably, let's see. The next
10 item would be item 4.01 which is a carryover from yesterday on the
11 Bullying Prevention Education Grant Programs. And I think let's
12 see, hold on --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm pretty sure we have a motion.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We have a --

15 MS. SCHROEDER: We have a motion and a second --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We ran out of time.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: We ran out of time.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. So Dr. Goldman, Dr.
19 Ross are present and so, I don't know exactly where we left off.
20 I hope you remember?

21 MS. GOLDMAN: I do.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perfect. You're on.

23 MS. GOLDMAN: Good morning Mr. Chairman, Mr.
24 Commissioner, members of the Board. Would it be useful to quickly
25 review what actions the Board took yesterday kindly?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think so.

2 MS. GOLDMAN: Okay.

3 MS. FLORES: Yes.

4 MS. GOLDMAN: So we'll try to do this
5 sequentially. Yesterday, section 1.01 the definition of bullying.
6 The board voted to replace deny with infringe returning back to
7 the original language in statute. In Section 3.0, 3.3 the Board
8 voted to adopt the language which was in the handout that had some
9 optional considerations. So that was 3.0, 3.3 and a corresponding
10 language in 5.0, 1.3. In the same in terms of the optional
11 language that we provided the Board, rule of 3.0, 3.4 was also
12 adopted.

13 And finally to section 3.0, 3.61 regarding the
14 survey, this was not a -- a written change that we had drafted in
15 advance. There were two changes there, that the language would
16 adhere to what's in statute around the two elements that would be
17 part of the required survey. So we were returned to what is
18 precisely in the statute on that and we'll add language related to
19 a paper pencil option for -- for students. I believe that covers
20 all of the adopted changes that the Board requested yesterday.
21 Where we ended was, I believe that there were some questions from
22 Dr. Scheffel regarding the requirement for designation of the team
23 of persons at each school. And I believe that this is section
24 3.0, 3.5, 3.3. I wanted to just make sure that, perhaps it would



1 be good to reiterate what the question is so that we can begin at
2 that point. Dr. Scheffel did I get the right section?

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think so. I think the idea is
4 that this adviser and team advises not that they are -- not that
5 the schools are required to take their advice or something like
6 that. I mean, I think this, again, language and statute. They
7 are an advisory committee, right?

8 MS. GOLDMAN: Right.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think that's what that says.
10 Unless there is another place that language exist. Does it?

11 MS. GOLDMAN: So --

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think 3.03 is --

13 MS. GOLDMAN: So in the -- in the authorizing
14 statute in Section in 22-93-104 (1)(b) as part of the criteria
15 that the Department of Education is used for reviewing the
16 applications is that -- the grant recipients would be required to
17 have a team of persons that each school who advise the school
18 administration concerning the severity and frequency of bullying.
19 So it is a requirement to the grant program to have that. So this
20 language that does reflect that.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's great.

22 MS. GOLDMAN: Okay.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Excuse me.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Miss Mazanec.

25 MS. MAZANEC: Just before I forget.



1 MS. GOLDMAN: Yes.

2 MS. MAZANEC: We noticed a little mistake here on
3 one of the options. The option change for 5.01.3.

4 MS. GOLDMAN: Yes.

5 MS. MAZANEC: You have facility schools twice.

6 MS. GOLDMAN: We will fix that. Thank you for
7 noticing.

8 MS. MAZANEC: I just really enjoy being able to
9 correct you.

10 MS. GOLDMAN: Well, and we always appreciate the
11 better eye and quick thinking.

12 MS. MAZANEC: I could do a red pen thing on it.

13 MS. GOLDMAN: That -- that would make me feel
14 more comfortable actually.

15 MS. MAZANEC: Make you feel right at home?

16 MS. GOLDMAN: Right at home.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, any other issues or
18 questions? Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: I noticed opted in. And then is
20 that language somewhere?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Currently that language, the
22 -- the specifics of the opt-in procedures are not in there and
23 this maybe a question for Tony. But the -- there is a -- a
24 typical procedure that's used for any surveys for students where



1 parents need to opt-in. We can -- we can go back and see where
2 else in statute that language exists.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm just thinking, if it says
4 voluntary then that's not a very clear word.

5 MR. DILL: Yeah that -- that language.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: It should say opted in. I think.

7 MR. DILL: That language tracks the language of
8 the statute. Procedures to ensure the confidentiality of
9 students' answers to the survey and clarify that the taking of the
10 survey shall be voluntary and shall not require the student. So
11 and I -- I think that would be --

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean that doesn't, in other word
13 voluntary could be opt-in or opt-out?

14 MR. DILL: I bet that's correct. I -- I think it
15 will -- would be within your rule making authority and to
16 indicating in some manner that that you get off in.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's what I'm thinking. So I
18 guess, I don't know whether that goal is right, when you say it's
19 voluntary, it should say opt-in.

20 MS. GOLDMAN: So Dr. Scheffel, that language is
21 in 3.0, 3.6, it's towards the end of that particular paragraph.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right. I see it.

23 MS. GOLDMAN: It says, "The survey shall be
24 voluntary and shall not be required of the student" Would you



1 think an option would be that, "Students shall voluntarily opt-
2 in?"

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

4 MS. GOLDMAN: Would that be --

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Or do the parents opt-in or the
6 student opt-in or are they?

7 MS. GOLDMAN: Yeah. I think that's.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Typically both.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Legally?

10 MS. GOLDMAN: Yeah.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Typically both.

12 MS. GOLDMAN: So it can be that, both parents and
13 students would voluntarily opt-in is that it?

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think that's the intention.

15 Isn't it? It's an opt-in. That's what I -- that's what I
16 understood. So I think if that's --

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Miss Mazanec.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- what is mentioned, it should
19 just be stated in the option.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's right. Miss Mazanec.

21 MS. MAZANEC: Along those lines, I was just
22 wondering if that's something we should consider as standard
23 language for all programs like this. You know, we've talk --
24 we've talked about that with the Healthy Kids survey, you know,



1 certain sensitive subjects, perhaps we have a standard opt-in
2 language. Would that be appropriate?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. In terms of putting
4 in the rules?

5 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I think that would.
7 One thing with, to keep in mind here is, what -- what you're
8 asking -- what you're asking the districts to do in terms of their
9 applications is to show how they're going to demonstrate this,
10 right?

11 MS. MAZANEC: Right.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think, you know, in a
13 case like this you should say, you know, whatever you're showing
14 us, it has to show an opt-in with both parents and students.

15 MS. MAZANEC: It should be an active opt-in, you
16 know, not just passive voluntary or whatever. Because the -- the
17 whole deal was survey, right? There's power differential between
18 the people giving survey and people taking the survey. This opt-
19 in it, then I should be able, if I have opt-in, there should be
20 procedures for that. The parents know about, the students know
21 about. That's the way research works in gathering data.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. Ms. Rankin.

23 MS. RANKIN: So I'd like to have that clarified
24 as to how we're going to do that. I mean, does that at before the
25 whole Bullying Prevention Program is accepted, will every student



1 have a paper that goes home, that explains the program and then
2 the parent signs it and opts-in. I mean, is -- is that how that
3 would work?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not -- not on the front yet,
5 no. Because what you're looking here again is criteria for
6 somebody lying for the grant. If they -- if -- if they received
7 the grant --

8 MS. RANKIN: Then it's okay.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- I -- I think what you
10 want to see is a the procedure. Presumably it would be something
11 like with the Healthy Kids Colorado Survey where a letter would be
12 sent home or, you know, something would be asked in return saying
13 yes, my kid can take this survey.

14 MS. RANKIN: Would that be optional for each
15 district or would that be part of the program?

16 MS. MAZANEC: It's part of the grant. It should
17 be part of the grant.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, I think what you're
19 contemplating doing here is- is making some type of procedure like
20 that a condition of receiving the grant.

21 MS. MAZANEC: As the grant.

22 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

23 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah.

24 MS. RANKIN: Okay. It will probably make it
25 work.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Opt to it. Active opting.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

3 MS. GOFF: Just, the districts who choose to
4 participate in the grant have a list of programs to choose from,
5 right. That's the whole idea. So in your -- in your awareness of
6 this list, do all of them require some sort of surveying? If
7 there is a -- if there's a survey involved of kids on all of these
8 lists available programs to use, if there's a survey involved,
9 that's one thing. I -- I'm -- this is probably one of the least
10 critical points of the rulemaking that we have to think about but
11 maybe not. But I'm thinking that if -- if we -- if we don't put
12 it in the right place, the opt-in, if we don't put it in the right
13 place, it could be a little confusing as to whether or not it's
14 assumed that every single one of these programs is going to
15 require a survey. If they don't, then this is sort of -- it's a
16 good point in a way.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. As of right now, what
18 is required are the two questions that were adopted yesterday, so
19 every student -- well, every student in the grant program will be
20 opt-in to answering questions about those two items.

21 MS. GOFF: Right.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So regardless of the program
23 they select, at least those very two will require an opt-in, as
24 far as I understand so far as what we're discussing.

25 MS. GOFF: Right.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For those two questions, we
2 require an opt-in. Now, if a school -- if there's a program that
3 includes other surveys --

4 MS. GOFF: That also has to be opt-in, right?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That would be --

6 MS. MAZANEC: Well, they basically already opt-in
7 to the bullying program, right?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: No. In other words, the survey
9 has two questions as required by statute, then the program they
10 choose, you're saying, may have additional surveys and I would
11 like -- the parents need to -- I mean, if you look at -- what is
12 it? What's the website? Familypolicy.ed.gov/PPRA? I mean, those
13 -- so clear to say that parents need notification. You can't
14 just, by virtue of the fact, the school gets -- gets the grant and
15 the kids opt-in answering two questions. Now, they're subject to
16 all kinds of surveys of whatever program they adopt-in. I mean,
17 that's not transparent to parents or kids, so I think they need to
18 opt-in.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think probably -- probably
20 the way to resolve this is, I suspect when these grant
21 applications come back and you select some for rewards, I wouldn't
22 put it on the consent agenda. I would probably circulate those
23 applications to the members for them to read because I think we're
24 gonna be very curious about how well those comply with the intent



1 of the Board, and -- and at least I for one will take the time to
2 read the grant applications.

3 MS. GOFF: I like to see the RFP and see how they
4 works.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. We'll see the RFP, we'll
6 see how much it matches, and -- and I just -- I think this is a
7 difficult enough issue. It's not that we don't trust you, but I
8 think we want to see -- we really want to see what's out there and
9 what's being proposed. Yes, Ms. Mazanec?

10 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. But along those lines, I
11 mean, as far as the -- the rulemaking process goes, I'm wondering
12 if you have the opt-in for the survey, the two-question survey,
13 that the opt-in also includes opting in to whatever surveys may be
14 included in the bullying program the school chooses. So it seems
15 like for rulemaking purposes, if we want to make sure that that is
16 happening, we need to make sure that that's part of the rules, not
17 only for the two questions required by the -- the grant program,
18 but for any surveys also included within a program the district
19 will choose.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If -- if I may?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Perhaps -- perhaps if you
23 change the language in 3.1 and 3.6 to indicate, you know, ensure
24 the description of procedures, blah, blah, blah for, you know, any
25 survey given pursuant -- pursuant to this program. They did



1 indicate that it's -- and I think that's going to be the case. I
2 think what's you're going to do is select a program, get a canned
3 survey that will include these areas that are required. But I
4 think that would just clarify that, you know, the opt-in is to any
5 survey and stuff in this program.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Given that language, does that
8 provide the opportunity then for the staff to add the two
9 questions that are part of this to whatever survey the kids are
10 gonna get anyway so we don't have double surveying being?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, there might be a more
12 practical question about how, you know, how these -- how these
13 work in terms of these programs.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: But I mean that does it allow for
15 that?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I -- I think it would.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I think it would. It
19 would -- it would clarify that whatever surveys you're getting,
20 there has to be an opt-in.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. And in that way, they
22 just add that onto surveys so kids are not answering questions
23 twice. That might -- that might be, as you said, practical.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.



1 MS. GOLDMAN: So it sounds to me that -- that the
2 idea is that parents and students shall voluntarily opt-in to any
3 surveys used as part of this school's grant program. That's kind
4 of what the Board is discussing right now. Did I summarize that
5 accurately?

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: It will be -- it would be and to
7 say the district, if they receive the grant from the school, will
8 develop active opt-in procedures for students to take the survey,
9 right?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: You can take any survey.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Any survey.

12 MS. GOLDMAN: To the grant program.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Attached to this grant.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think that make sense. Any
15 objection to that delineation? Okay. All right. Any other
16 questions?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I think I -- I think I need
18 to make a different motion.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well, before we do that, could
20 you run through the due process requirements? I couldn't find
21 them. Doesn't mean they're not there, just means I couldn't find
22 them. Where were in the -- in this particular version's rules?

23 MS. GOLDMAN: So Mr. Chairman, it's in the page 3
24 and at section 3.03.5.4 and that is that, "Each school, as part of
25 their bullying education and prevention policy, would include



1 provisions for adequate due processes and safeguards for students
2 accused of engaging in bullying behaviors."

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. So that then, when we
4 review the application, we'll see how robust that -- their attempt
5 to meet that requirement is?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's correct.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perfect. Anything else from
8 members of Board. Yes, Dr. Scheffel?

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'll just have one little
10 question. Could you just check this research. Obviously, I tried
11 to look, I couldn't find it, and I'll just read this language to
12 stopbullying.gov. "Several states have anti-bullying laws allow
13 their departments of education offer funding to public schools to
14 train their staff in detecting and preventing bullying. Colorado
15 created the Colorado Trust to support youth programs about
16 bullying and violence prevention. Several other states use
17 public-private partnerships to fund their initiative. Contact
18 your state's department of education, health and so forth." So it
19 seems like there's some initiative that links this stuff. But I
20 don't -- I can't seem to find if this is like sort of a leveraged
21 initiative across entities, public-private partnerships, one of
22 which is this grant. I just like to get a sense of the universe
23 of what's going on in Colorado because I don't know.

24 MS. GOLDMAN: So Dr. Scheffel, we can absolutely
25 look into what -- what Colorado Trust is -- is doing around that.



1 Scott's office -- right. Scott's office would be the office that
2 would be leading any of the work on bullying prevention so that he
3 -- but he is not aware of that. I think he's perhaps he might be
4 doing an independent program or -- and I just don't even know how
5 current that information is because you know how sometimes there
6 can be programs that exist for a few years, and by the time a
7 report comes out, it's defunct. But we will absolutely get to
8 that and get back to you.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sorry. Any other questions?
11 Let me just make one comment before we vote. The -- as I
12 understand it, the statutes that the enabling legislation for this
13 passed in 2010, is that correct?

14 MS. GOLDMAN: '11.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 2011. So it's not unusual the
16 legislature they passed something takes some five years to fund
17 it. That was in a response, as I remember, the statute passing
18 within response to particular specific incident. So schools have
19 been working on this problem for five years. And in my
20 conversations with Dr. Ross and -- and with you, it would appear
21 that a lot of districts have programs in place that seem to be
22 pretty effective that they have done that somehow miraculously on
23 their own without grants, and that substantial progress based on
24 some of the reading I've done appears to have been made in this area.



1 And I would like to be in a position to say that,
2 you know, at least in this instance, this government program will
3 not become a monument to eternal life and that we -- we have \$2
4 million this year in grants, we have a million next year. The
5 legislature I think cut that in half with their budget
6 constraints. That absent -- I think one of the things I'd like to
7 see your office do is that, you know, to have a recommendation for
8 the legislature when they go into their budget cycle in -- in
9 August -- no, actually, it'd be in -- this year, it'll be in
10 November, December that we have a recommendations whether or not
11 this program ought to be continued based on how many districts
12 have done things on their own, based on number of applicants for
13 the grant, and things like that so that if we reach the conclusion
14 that -- that government has done what it can to solve this
15 problem, that additional grants may not be required and that there
16 might be better use for this particular million or \$2 million.

17 So and I think that trying to -- trying last
18 night to think why we're so troubled by this program, it's simply
19 -- it's simply now five years out of date. The legislation is
20 five years old, lots has happened. The legislation really doesn't
21 contemplate -- didn't contemplate what happened over the last five
22 years. And I think we have an obligation to determine if this is
23 still a legitimate need vis-a-vis all the other needs in public
24 education. So yes, Dr. Scheffel?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. I just like to echo that in
2 the sense that this is the kind of work that every school ought to
3 be doing in terms of civility, respect of respecting each other,
4 you know? And just -- I mean, if -- if any school isn't doing it,
5 I don't know what they're doing. Sorry, I would hope that it
6 wouldn't need grants to incentivize schools to put programs in
7 place. They have a basic human civility and respect built-in to
8 how we interface with each other to school all day. I hope
9 everybody is doing that, and I would feel sad that we need grants
10 towards that.

11 MS. FLORES: That's because we have the
12 technology in the means of communicating and that kids have taken
13 on, you know, onto these areas then, you know, you -- you have
14 bullying -- a different kind of bullying taking place that -- and
15 -- and we are aware that people -- that that people are -- and we
16 are aware that some districts, you know, don't know what to do
17 with it. And so it's -- bullying is gonna go and to take place in
18 -- in -- in different kinds of medium. And then -- and right now,
19 I think it's really taking hold on Facebook and all these other
20 computer outlets. And I think that's what's different and
21 probably more deadly because it's in private, and I think it's --
22 it's just a different kind of bullying that's -- that's around.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Did you have a comment, Ms.
24 Goff?



1 MS. GOFF: Sure. Am I right or not? The funding
2 for this specifically has been cut for the next fiscal year, is
3 that true? It's cut by half, anyway?

4 MS. GOLDMAN: That's correct because we -- we
5 received 2 million in January. I believe what the legislature was
6 doing was kind of looking ahead and understanding that we would
7 unlikely be able to promulgate rules and get grants out during
8 this fiscal year. We are able to carry this over, so I think they
9 anticipated that and saw this as an opportunity to -- to look at
10 next year's funding.

11 MS. GOFF: That might give us all a chance to do
12 a little forecasting. And if this specific type of program is
13 really not -- I don't wanna say favored because it's the wrong
14 word. If -- if it's not most efficient, most productive to think
15 of using this money, specifically for bullying -- anti-bullying
16 programs, maybe we -- and maybe we can talk about doing it
17 integrated into some of the other more all encompassing culture,
18 culture building or character or something else, I -- I don't
19 know. I suppose I would take legislation.

20 MS. FLORES: I think we talked about that when I
21 -- when I spoke with -- with him about that.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Because that might end up being -
23 - when we talk about it, we'll know. But it might end up being
24 our nonacademic indicator for accountability, whether it's in our
25 state plan or if we look more towards the ESSA level on that. But



1 I hate to see the whole idea be set over here and forgotten, but I
2 think, you know, we can be creative about this, but also more
3 efficient because I agree there are incredible things happening
4 all over the place, and there are not -- there is not the capacity
5 right now to do some incredible things in some places. So we
6 don't wanna forget the whole thing, we just wanna be smart about
7 it.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Dr. Schroeder, would you
9 like to withdraw your earlier motion to make a second motion?

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. So I'd like to withdraw my
11 earlier motion and replace it with a motion to approve the rules
12 for the school bullying prevention and education grant program as
13 amended.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. That's a proper motion,
15 is there a second?

16 MS. MAZANEC: I second.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Seconded by Ms. Mazanec and Dr.
18 Flores. Is there -- for discussion, would you care to call the
19 roll please, Ms. Burdsall?

20 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Flores?

21 MS. FLORES: Aye.

22 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Goff?

23 MS. GOFF: Aye.

24 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Mazanec?

25 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.



1 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Rankin?

2 MS. RANKIN: Aye.

3 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Scheffel?

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

5 MS. BURDSALL: Board Member Schroeder?

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

7 MS. BURDSALL: And Chairman Durham?

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. That motion is adopted by
9 a vote of seven to nothing. Thank you very much. I appreciate
10 it, and let's see. We're now at -- where are we here?

11 MS. FLORES: And thank you for your patience.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: 5.0. Let's see. We're ahead
13 of schedule for that. So could we -- is it possible we could deal
14 with the -- what do I see there? The update on the listening
15 tour. Any chance we can pull that out of order?

16 MS. BURDSALL: Yes, absolutely.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Perfect. Let's do that. I can
18 find my listening tour notes, probably not. All right. So
19 excellent. Okay.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. The rest of
21 today is the Allyson Pearson show.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry, you're so sick of
23 me.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Brought to you by Allyson
25 Pearson.



1 MR. DILL: Thank you.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It will be in a wrap with
3 commercial message.

4 MS. PEARSON: I think it's something to
5 entertain.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Everyone's all popping, just
7 say if you hear a different voice.

8 MS. PEARSON: We've got some recognition.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, please.

10 MS. PEARSON: Okay, hold on. I'm just getting
11 the PowerPoint up. That's okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You did a PowerPoint? I
13 thought you were -- came for debate?

14 MS. PEARSON: That's for leaner. That's --
15 that's for leaner. Don't do that. We've got PowerPoint --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry.

17 MS. PEARSON: -- whiteboards, we've got
18 recognition, it's all fun.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. We're waiting. I'm
20 sorry.

21 MS. PEARSON: I apologize that you all got this
22 just a few days ago. We were gathering from last week about
23 listening tours. But Wednesday last week, we're traveling back
24 and we're gathering the information from both sites, and trying to
25 condense that, and put -- put together for you. So it took us a



1 few days to get back. We wanna make sure you got the most recent
2 information from what we had heard being out on the road. Okay.
3 They said these -- these are the scheduled, as of this moment and
4 ESSA listening to our events. Last Wednesday we did two. There
5 was one in Pueblo and one in Grand Junction. I was in Grand
6 Junction, Pat Chapman and another team were in Pueblo. Pat is not
7 here today because the third listening tour is today in Durango.
8 So he is down there with a team of people.

9 So we traded and we're trading back and forth.
10 We have Greeley on Monday, and the Commissioner will be there, and
11 I'll be there, and a bunch of other staff. We have Buenavista
12 this done Wednesday. We have Thornton in the following Monday.
13 We have one Limon on the Friday the 20th. We have our webinars
14 scheduled on June 1st and then we're in the process of scheduling
15 some additional ones, and Boulder, Loveland, and the Denver area.
16 An, in addition we have a lot of requests that have come in, from
17 different groups that meet regularly, different stakeholder
18 groups, that have asked for staff to come out and talk about the
19 ESSA. So we've been -- we've been getting those scheduled on as
20 well.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

22 MS. PEARSON: And if you are of the other --
23 other events, please let us know. So we gonna play a little game.
24 Which of these didn't happen at the first listening tour event?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm gonna guess they all
2 happened.

3 ALL: Which one's Grand Junction? Number one.

4 MS. PEARSON: More than 100 people were invited
5 yesterday and provided feedback.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Who said in Grand Junction.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Total, in total.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay.

9 MS. PEARSON: 16 CDE staff members were on site
10 to present, answer questions, with a video camera, register staff
11 and handle media. Power went out for five minutes. Two
12 television interviews were conducted. One national newspaper with
13 an attendance. Before the evening session in Grand Junction, the
14 library went on shelter in place, due to a person of interest in
15 the area. Attendees couldn't get into the library for the second
16 session. After waiting 30 minutes to seek shelter in place was
17 lifted, the event was moved down the street, to the district's
18 offices. No comments were shared about assessment, and parents
19 charter schools higher education, district staff teachers, early
20 childhood educators, English learner directors, advocates for
21 students with disabilities, and retired educators, were in
22 attendance. So anybody have any guesses, what didn't happen?

23 MS. RANKIN: I'm hoping it is the five minute
24 power out.

25 MS. PEARSON: Opening into that.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No comments were shared about
2 assessment.

3 MS. PEARSON: You guys got it. Power did not
4 actually go out. Power stayed on the whole time. And we've got
5 lots of comment. But everything else happened including the whole
6 shelter in place. In my 13 years CDE never -- I have had this
7 training happen before.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What interview was the
9 person (inaudible)?

10 MS. PEARSON: There were a few CDE staff outside
11 the building pretending to be anyone that -- could have been
12 anyone of them.

13 MS. RANKIN: So no comments were made about
14 assessments?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh yeah. We got lots of
16 comments.

17 MS. PEARSON: The sheltered place was
18 interesting. We -- we could get out of the library but they
19 wouldn't let us back in and we had people on either side. So for
20 a while we were passing notes back and forth and then the police -
21 - security outside the door wouldn't let us do that anymore. So
22 then eventually we just thought, "Okay, we're just gonna go out."
23 And we got out there and there was somebody from the district
24 office from District 51 said, "Hey, I can let you in down the



1 street." So we moved down the road to the district offices and
2 set up there.

3 MS. RANKIN: Did they talk to you guys like ISIS
4 people? So I was told that the afternoon meeting in Grand
5 Junction was limited to education staff and that it was not open
6 to the public. That was the perception that --

7 MS. PEARSON: That was the perception? Okay.

8 MS. RANKIN: Yeah. And so --

9 MS. PEARSON: Okay. We'll work on that messaging
10 on that. Because I don't think there was anything in messaging
11 for that.

12 MS. RANKIN: Well, you know, no matter how much
13 you communicate --

14 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

15 MS. RANKIN: -- this is why they were people
16 there at night who actually would prefer to be there in the
17 daytime.

18 MS. PEARSON: Oh, interesting. Okay. We will
19 work on getting them messaging therefore important.

20 MS. PEARSON: We have --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wonder if somebody on the
22 other side may have told people that or we if you just said, I
23 mean, our office was real very clear.



1 MS RANKIN: What I'm gonna guess is what was said
2 is that the afternoon session is for staff education staff and the
3 evening session is for the public.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

5 MS. RANKIN: We had assume to that liberty.

6 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. We had a retired educator
7 there during the afternoon who was just like a community member
8 who used to be in education with a parent there in the afternoon
9 who was really vocal and really insightful and some things. We
10 had -- we had the Peak Advocacy Group for students with
11 disabilities was there in the afternoon. We had some non district
12 staff there but there were a lot of district staff. And they were
13 there but in the evening session, it was -- it was half and half.
14 And only five people that ended up staying and coming down the
15 road with us. So we'll work on that messaging for sure.

16 So here's a little bit more of a breakdown. We
17 had 77 people total in Pueblo. And then we had 36 total, in Grand
18 Junction. We had really -- I can't speak as well to Pueblo, Dina
19 was down in Pueblo so she can chime in if she wants to. But Grand
20 Junction people were really focused, they were really interested
21 in the conversation. There was a lot of -- there was a lot of
22 identifying problems within a lot of solution oriented where we
23 could we do this and we do that, that came out of the
24 conversation. Right now we have more than 450 participants
25 registered for all of them. Those are just the listening to our



1 events these aren't the other meetings that we're going to that
2 people have asked us to come to. So we're getting into a lot of
3 people I think.

4 Dina and Jamie and the communications team has
5 done a tremendous amount of work on community outreach and popping
6 support have been listening to us to. They've had advertisements
7 in the local newspapers, there's been news releases in each
8 community, opinion articles coauthored by the Commissioner and the
9 local Superintendent, to let people know about the event. Working
10 with District staff, Facebook and Twitter posts, Lin Banbury, who
11 works in Patch Hoffman's office, she and her team are making phone
12 calls to local organizations to let people know that it's
13 happening and invite them.

14 We have had template letters for you all to send
15 out to any constituents that you want. I mean we've been reaching
16 out to the legislators in the area as well, you know, it was
17 probably hard last week for people still in session. And just on
18 regular communication channels, we've really been trying to get
19 the word out.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Mazanec.

21 MS. MAZANEC: You mentioned other -- other
22 meetings you're going to, by like groups that have asked you.
23 Like who's been asking you to?

24 MS. PEARSON: So like this morning Brad is at the
25 early childhood council because they asked him to come and talk



1 about how the ESSA interacts with early childhood and what's
2 mentioned. So calling Dina, do you know Dina, I'm trying think
3 about the other groups that have called.

4 MS. DINA: Yeah. And we've also had a lot of our
5 go sees regional meetings ask us to come and take out, you know, a
6 few hours out of their meeting agenda. We've also had all the
7 superintendent Council meetings that we've scheduled on there.
8 And then a lot, you know, that we're working with the advocacy
9 groups to, you know, join their meetings when possible. So we
10 have -- we have over -- I think over 20 additional meetings that
11 we're going to -- per invitation.

12 MS. PEARSON: And as you all have a group of
13 people, you know people with like many from city to city, they
14 come talk about ESSA and start getting outreach, we'd be happy to
15 do that just let us know.

16 MS. MAZANEC: I would just like to get a list of
17 all the groups --

18 MS. PEARSON: Sure.

19 MS. MAZANEC: -- they're talking to.

20 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely.

21 MS. MAZANEC: That would be good.

22 MS. FLORES: Well, some of the stuff isn't
23 scheduled districts. There's some stuff just not yet scheduled.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: When will you have it
25 scheduled?



1 MS. PEARSON: We all keep a comprehensive list
2 because part of what the U.S. Department asked for in the state
3 plan is how you consulted with stakeholders. So we'll make sure
4 we have that all documented and every meeting and group we put
5 together to include the plan. So we can share that with you and
6 we'll just keep a running list to that.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin, do you have a --

8 MS. RANKIN: I have a question. Can you register
9 on your home page, for one of the online sessions. Because I know
10 that the first one is -- is June 1st and I just -- if I put it out
11 there, that they can find it on your home page. If it's easy for
12 them to find, and then they can get --

13 MS. PEARSON: If we can get on that page.

14 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

16 MS. GOFF: Any business, in the sense of -- of
17 all categories. Chamber -- chambers of commerce or associations?

18 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I think Lynne has been
19 making those phone calls, to people doing them, they've been
20 calling Rotary clubs just trying to get every Community
21 organizations to know about the event.

22 MS. RANKIN: The others are thinking about a lot
23 of them, but popping into mind was also the media.

24 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

25 MS. RANKIN: Has there been any --



1 MS. PEARSON: There's been some great letters
2 from education to letters, over viewers. Yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you wanna talk about this
4 a little bit? Thank you.

5 MS. RANKIN: They can help us.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Can we take a few seconds?
7 Yes, please.

8 MS. DINA: I think that there's been a pretty
9 good coverage of the listening tours themselves in the local
10 press. They really have been quite interested. They've sent
11 reporters from their local papers and TV and we've done TV
12 interviews both in Grand Junction and Pueblo. So they have -- you
13 know, they have tried to cover the events themselves. In terms of
14 like really digging in and covering. I don't think the local
15 press like in Pueblo and Grand Junction have been able to do that.
16 But they have covered the fact that we've been there and we've
17 talked to folks and they interviewed superintendents from the area
18 and other folks who were in -- in attendance at the meetings. So
19 I think there has been a lot of exposure in the media of this
20 tour.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I saw one summary, I don't -
22 - I don't think it was the Pueblo Chieftain. But is there another
23 paper? But I -- I read an article -- a coverage of it -- some
24 coverage of it. It was pretty good. But what I was looking for
25 and frankly I do not remember if it was included at the bottom.



1 But there were something I read recently had the links to the ESSA
2 blog page. And something else we have. It's nice to have on
3 there. I -- I -- I was -- I felt good seeing three distinct
4 totally relevant law links back to our pages and I appreciated
5 that. So any -- any outlet who's able to do that would be great.

6 MS. MAZANEC: And if you can get it out so that I
7 can put it on my Facebook. Deb?

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I was wondering were there
9 other or just looking at the themes and questions and so forth.
10 Where there other hand outs that accompany this then? Is this
11 really what people got?

12 MS. PEARSON: We had e-mailed to you the draft
13 power queen of the listening tour and I can't remember if we sent
14 the updated version. That we can we just were cleaning it up
15 based on that first tour so we'll get it to you. There was about
16 35 that we went into which of the content that we were doing with
17 them, it's the draft we'll get you the revised one. Now so you
18 can take the detailed content.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you. So here's my question.
20 Can I just read a quick look it are we okay on time?

21 MS. RANKIN: I think we're fine.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here's q quote, "I don't think a
23 parent is going to notice any difference when they take their
24 child to school next year that the schools some are operating
25 under a new federal law. So it's all a policy adviser for



1 education." The only thing they're likely to notice is if their
2 state or district may spend time reducing the number of tests they
3 have been layering on over the past few years probably the country
4 to believe wasn't really a federal one to begin with."

5 Question. As you're having these tours, is that
6 a focus of the conversation? And I see one of the themes here but
7 then I see another question that is, in addition holding a license
8 should teachers required to demonstrate competency in a subject
9 area? Where did that come from? Teachers do demonstrate
10 competency in the 800 hours they have to spend in schools. And
11 they have master teachers observing them, looking at their
12 competency, filling out all kinds of paperwork because that's what
13 the universities require. So I mean, I'd like to know these
14 listening tours are really about taking advantage of whatever
15 little flexibility exists in the ESSA and is also an opportunity
16 to say, "And what else can we require?" You know, Help me
17 understand.

18 MS. PEARSON: Sure. If you don't mind we'll just
19 work -- work through that things and get into it right now. Is
20 that right?

21 MS. RANKIN: But while -- while we just on the
22 spotlight, I have a question.

23 MS. PEARSON: Sure.

24 MS. RANKIN: And that is do you have you
25 identified a radius around, I'm sorry. A distance, area that you



1 want to capture when you pick a look. I mean, as we were looking
2 at CD2.

3 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

4 MS. RANKIN: Discussion that I had with some
5 school board members is, where's the best place to have the
6 seniority capture four or five school districts?

7 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

8 MS RANKIN: But the reality is that CD2 I of 14.

9 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

10 MS. RANKIN: And so I'm trying to figure out as
11 you sort of map to opportunities for attendance. Have you looked
12 at whether- what radius you're capturing?

13 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I know what you're talking
14 about. We can do that. I think the other thing we can do when we
15 look at best location for you is to look at the registration for
16 Thornton for that as well then, to see which districts staff, and
17 which community members are coming from there, to figure out. If
18 we're getting a lot of older people from there and then we could
19 figure out maybe going further north.

20 MS. RANKIN: Right. And actually the Boulder-
21 the Board members did not suggest Boulder.

22 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

23 MS. RANKIN: So in order to capture Saint Grain
24 and Loveland and Estus.

25 MS. PEARSON: Okay. Where should we be?



1 MS. RANKIN: Where should we be? That's where
2 the Loveland. So there's never -- I don't think there's been a
3 discussion about having it in Boulder.

4 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

5 MS. RANKIN: And you're right. They could either
6 go to the one in Loveland or they could go to the one in Thornton.
7 Thornton's actually close. Its your boulder.

8 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, absolutely.

9 MS. RANKIN: If you -- do you have a criteria
10 that you've set for a certain radius --

11 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

12 MS. RANKIN: -- that helps.

13 MS. PEARSON: I don't think we have a set
14 criteria but I think we know kind of generally where people end up
15 going to and showing up from. Just all different training staff
16 do it at CDE so we can look through that. Get some feedback on
17 where do we know that people usually feel comfortable going to.

18 MS. RANKIN: Thank you. Go ahead. Finish your -
19 -

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Alright. Please
21 proceed. Oh, Jane, I'm sorry, sorry.

22 MS. GOFF: Thank you very much. It's okay. Same
23 goes for Jefferson County. It's a -- its a distance of somewhere
24 between Thornton and Morrison.

25 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.



1 MS. GOFF: But more importantly, the -- the
2 number -- the population loops in to that part of JeffCo. We
3 could cover some Denver, could cover some Littleton, Eagle Word,
4 Sheridan. And that Southern portion down there, not to mention
5 that the mountain area, the foothills of JeffCo. So we have the -
6 -

7 MS. RANKIN: It's another part of my district
8 park. It's outside of JeffCo County.

9 MS. GOFF: I would just in the hopper. Let's not
10 forget that park.

11 MS. PEARSON: Sure.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's a lot of ground and
13 it's a sizable distance from the Loveland, or Boulder or Thornton.
14 So I --

15 MS RANKIN: But then you could catch a clear
16 peak.

17 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: They can do a lot of --

19 MS. RANKIN: That's why I thinking some -- some
20 about something great. You're laughing.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: It can't be later.

22 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

23 (Pause)

24 MS. PEARSON: So you guys have a request for the
25 presentations. We will work on them getting scheduled.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did the Conoco station at
2 the intersection of (inaudible)? And Mr. Chair, can I?

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're going to want to get
5 back to the room because she just opened the door. It's funny
6 because my Thursday thought is what Board Member Scheffel just
7 brought out. We were at district not too long ago and all the
8 leaderships in the room talking about assessment, and performance
9 framework, and accountability, and the same district has one
10 fourth of the students who live in their district boundaries leave
11 every day to go to neighboring districts. And I bet the adults
12 are arguing a little, not arguing this is too strong a word. But
13 we're talking about growth versus measurement, versus assessment,
14 and frameworks labels on everything.

15 And you realized I finally said, "Hey, time up.
16 Can we change the conversation?" We have over 750 kids who wake
17 up every morning, and say, "I'm not gonna come to school here, I'm
18 going somewhere else. " What's the last time we asked those kids,
19 what they want at their school? Because the quote you just read
20 is so accurate. And -- and I don't blame anybody in this room,
21 definitely but I -- I blame the NCLB. It said, "This is how we
22 gonna operate." And somewhere we forgot the conversation about
23 kids, and actually engaging kids, and so by the time the time my
24 (inaudible), the water's not getting to the end of the road.



1 And it was interesting as I leaned over the
2 superintendent said, "Does -- does individual student have a
3 vision of what he or she personally can accomplish at your
4 district?" And I promise you they don't care about your label.
5 And this is the student, not the parent. They don't care about
6 the label, your performance cycle, your assessment, body which
7 evaluation system. They don't care, doesn't mean -- doesn't mean
8 we shouldn't. But they don't and they truly are the customer at
9 the end and so on.

10 Under ESSA, I would hope that we can kind of get
11 the shift just a little bit focused back on the student, what they
12 need, and there's some great stuff happening in Colorado around
13 this area. It's fun -- It's fun to see in place, we have -- we
14 have big teams today -- I was gonna say (inaudible) what computer
15 science is being done today, so we help to clear that across the
16 state. Anyway. Soapbox is over. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Wait
17 a second.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.

19 MS. PEARSON: So here are some of the general
20 things again. You know, we've just been in two locations so far.
21 There's another one going on today. But generally, what we heard
22 was a lot about local control for determining use of funds and the
23 -- you know desire for that appreciation from wider options for
24 use of federal funds because that's a lot of what's in ESSA. It's
25 not at the -- the allowable uses for different programs have



1 expanded. So there's a lot more options and a lot of this options
2 are really focused on whole child. So there's just kind of a
3 broader opportunity.

4 On the flip side, it's not like -- right now, it
5 doesn't look like we're gonna get more money under this program,
6 so there's more options for how to spend it but it's not like we
7 got more money to use for all those things. But people appreciate
8 that there's wider options and more flexibility for the use of the
9 funds. And then, we had some really good conversations around the
10 interplay between state and federal policy because it's really --
11 and one of our first slides in the PowerPoint just to illustrate,
12 you know, got the school in the center and district policy are
13 kind of at the core but then you've got state and federal policy
14 going on around the outside and sometimes state policy is more
15 prescriptive and sometimes federal policy is more prescriptive.

16 Sometimes -- now, we're have more flexibility
17 with federal policy but we still have criteria in our state. Our
18 state laws that don't have that same flexibility that's are in --
19 that are in federal. So it's -- it's not an easy clear cut
20 conversation. I think it's really important for people to
21 understand that there's these two things that are really playing
22 back and forth and some of that and especially around assessment
23 and teacher qualification. That's where we spend a lot of time
24 talking because, you know, those are -- the concerns people have
25 and there's this real -- not complicated but there's an interplay



1 between state and federal law there so to get into more of those
2 details.

3 In terms of assessments, some of the questions we
4 were asking were, how should we measure student progress toward
5 meeting the standards? There's -- you know, options in ESSA that
6 some of them were also in No Child Left Behind. You know, in some
7 ways it's more like financially efficient to do assessments the
8 way we do right there. One time a year, they scored like that.
9 It's more straightforward but -- and until the ESSA allow for
10 multiple measures over different times of the year with more
11 deeper kind of questions and non-performance tests that's allowed
12 in there. We just have to think about the financial implications
13 of that and the time implication of that.

14 We have some really good conversations with
15 people about what those assessments should or could look like and
16 then about how the state should consider the 95 percent
17 participation requirement because that's left to states to
18 determine how that is in the -- in most cases, it's left to the
19 state. And probably, the best quote that I heard from during the
20 session was, "If we get the first vote right" meaning how to
21 measure student progress, "then we shouldn't have to worry about
22 the second one" and then second shouldn't be a problem. People
23 wanna participate.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's true.



1 MS. PEARSON: So I think that was like summed it
2 up very concisely and was the good theme for thinking going
3 forward how we handle things. It was very clear that assessment
4 should provide timely, useful the information. We both want that
5 data back quickly, so they can use it for instruction at least a
6 part of it and districts are really feeling caught between state
7 and federal participation policies. Put it out there. They're
8 not sure where to go. They will feel like they're walking this
9 tightrope about. Parents who won't excuse their kids but worrying
10 about what the federal implications are. You know, I tried to
11 clarify where we are right now with federal implications but it's
12 a harder thing and they're struggling with that. So we definitely
13 heard that there.

14 Ms. FLORES: May I ask a question --

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

16 Ms. FLORES: -- if that's possible? When we get
17 these monies and we, of course, want to get the monies to the best
18 teachers, you know. And under No Child Left Behind, monies were
19 given to two schools who had, you know, the best teachers. But
20 that didn't necessarily mean that those teachers were teaching the
21 kids, that needed really the best, that needed the money. Because
22 sometimes it's hard to serve schools with that some money but they
23 didn't get walk away.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm trying to figure out what you

25 -- I know --



1 Ms. FLORES: There was a bill that was passed. I
2 think it was Dr. -- Mr. Johnston, Senator Johnston passed that
3 bill about giving teachers, you know, rewarding teachers for doing
4 good -- good work. And in Denver, I don't know maybe some
5 districts allotted the money differently. But in Denver, the
6 money was allotted to teachers whose schools did really well.
7 Okay, and so --

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: You need to help, tell me what
9 bill because this is the first time I've ever heard this.

10 MS. FLORES: Okay. Think about the idea, don't
11 think about the bill. Well, I don't know if that's not real.

12 (Pause)

13 Ms. FLORES: No, no, I'm talking about monies
14 here and the people out there that I've heard from Denver are very
15 concerned that the money is spent with -- spent on schools that
16 are -- where you have a large number of kids who are poor, kids
17 who are second language speakers, kids who are black, who don't --
18 you know, who are usually lumped together in that pool of poor
19 kids. And they want the money to be spent with those kids so that
20 they can do better. So and according to the feds, the feds want
21 it to be spent in that way, and we don't want to spend the money
22 in schools where kids are doing it the 99 percentile. They're --
23 there -- they don't have free and reduced lunch. So --

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Let -- let somebody tell me what
25 bill you're describing because this is --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think it's -- it sounds like
2 the Denver has its own merit pay system.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Merit pay system.

4 (Pause)

5 MS. FLORES: Here we have a large number of kids
6 that are poor. They're not getting, you know, the monies that --

7 MS. PEARSON: So the majority of the ESEA
8 programs that -- at least the dollars that come into the state
9 because the U.S. Department does have some grants, they are
10 kicked directly to districts. But for the state programs that's
11 really around Title I, Title II, and Title III in the path.
12 There's a Title IV now.

13 Those are formula dollars that go to districts
14 Title I is allocated based on poverty rates from the Census stated
15 to districts, so it really goes to the districts based on their
16 concentration and amount of students in poverty. Title II is not
17 -- it's moving towards being based on poverty, but it was more
18 based on population previously. And Title III is for English
19 language learners, and based on that population, so there weren't
20 -- And those are all formula dollars for each student, per teacher
21 professional development but there is no reward system in those.
22 So you know, and this is where all that state and federal gets
23 confusing. So in terms of school improvement that is another area
24 we spent some time.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Can we just move on?



1 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, sure.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Could you just give me a little
3 bit of additional information on the 95 percent assessment? We
4 have a policy in there so what's the -- what's the issue?

5 MS. PEARSON: I think districts are concerned
6 because they've spent so much time under No Child Left Behind and
7 they've seen some of the letters the U.S. Department of Education
8 has put out about what could happen if you don't meet your 95
9 percent. So we've said, you know, this is how we're handling in
10 the state and when the U.S. Department of Ed has said to us but
11 they've got a lot of concerns of, "Okay, we get that," you know,
12 this is where you're at, then the Board has said, but we're still
13 really worried, especially with how much the reliance on those
14 federal dollars that they -- their federal dollars could be taken
15 at some point, if they're not getting participation requirements.
16 So they're just feeling like a little confused -- not confused, a
17 little, like, they're walking this fine line trying to figure out
18 their role between state and federal policy.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Those monies flow to the State,
20 correct?

21 MS. PEARSON: The money -- so money flows to the
22 State, the State can retain a little bit for administration, and
23 the rest just flows out to the districts through that -- through
24 the ESEA custody.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: How can they possibly feel
2 threatened because our policies are not penalized?

3 MS. PEARSON: People are worried about money,
4 right?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

6 MS. PEARSON: They always worry about money. So
7 yes, our policy has been clear and we put that out there. But I
8 think they -- the -- the letter -- that January letter, I think it
9 was U.S. Department sent out not the one specific to Colorado.
10 They sent -- after they sent a specific Colorado letter, they sent
11 a general one to everybody that was like, "These are all the
12 things that we could do" and that scared people. We didn't
13 distribute that. I don't believe if that we put that out anywhere
14 that people see those things and if they are worried that their
15 money is at risk then we than we could be concerned.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Let me ask for a clear succinct
17 one pager. I don't think I got it. Did I get it? I mean, we
18 asked you about that do to one you were working on.

19 MS. PEARSON: About the participation? Yeah, we
20 sent that out.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Two weeks ago?

22 MS. PEARSON: I'm trying to remember.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sent to the districts.

24 MS. PEARSON: But we have to send it to the
25 board.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: The last couple of weeks.

2 MS. PEARSON: Yes, it was after that last.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board meeting?

4 (Pause)

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: And do you think it would be good
6 to take that letter to those meetings? Because I think there is
7 so much confusion around this issue. So I think you are afraid
8 that it's because they don't understand how the money flows.

9 MS. PEARSON: I think that --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: We need to be --

11 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Extremely clear.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I just wonder if the theories
14 are manufactured deliberately.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: It could be.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's about what I'm
17 concluding is that we get people in positions of authority who are
18 having a hard time reading English.

19 MS. O'NEILL: I hear of cases where people feel
20 threatened in the district. They feel the district's threatening
21 them because they'll be -- you know, somehow disadvantaged if they
22 don't opt their kids in there. I just think they need to revisit
23 that document but if it's really crystal clear that ought to be
24 handed out was pushed through at that point.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I ran into or after that, it
2 occupied. I don't know how much of my time, and I'm really tired
3 of it.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: I still don't get it.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm really tired of it.

6 MS. FLORES: I come from a community where
7 there's a high level of opt-out. And from a community perspective
8 there's huge pushback. So the taxpayers are saying, "You know, we
9 really do believe in some sort of assessment. If you've got the
10 wrong assessment, fix it but don't opt-out." And so, every
11 community is different.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right.

13 MS. FLORES: And Denver sends out letters that
14 are intimidating to parents.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Every district is different. But
16 I don't think the issue is just letting people know that they
17 can't opt-out. I think we've got about 20 to 25 percent of our
18 voting public that are parents and have kids in school. And then,
19 we have a lot of taxpayers who just pay their taxes and they're
20 saying, "Wait a minute, this kid can't take a test" one test, it's
21 that bad? There is -- there is -- well, I know. And I think -- I
22 think that is -- I just -- I'm suggesting that the discussion is
23 broader just than telling everybody it's okay to opt-out. Because
24 it's not okay for some of our taxpayers who are saying, "You know,



1 we wanna know what's happening. We wanna know that kids are
2 learning. We wanna know that our tax dollars are getting there."

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I don't mean to be difficult
4 about this issue but I think it's really pretty simple. If you
5 get any of those people who think somehow they have a right to
6 manage other children, let me talk to them, just give them my
7 phone number. I'll be more than happy to disabuse them the
8 knowledge that they're not their children.

9 MS. FLORES: That's not the point. The point is
10 the district is gonna come to them to ask for some more money and
11 they're not gonna provide it in the tax measures. I mean, this is
12 how you lose -- this is -- this is a broader issue than just my
13 kid.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: But the children cannot be
15 compelled to take tests.

16 MS. FLORES: I totally agree. That's not the
17 point.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's not.

19 MS. FLORES: That's not the point. You're kind
20 of missing the point.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, no, I understand the point but
22 the bottom line is the answer is always but it is up to the
23 parents of those children to decide that nobody should be trying
24 to pressure those parents --

25 MS. FLORES: Agreed.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- in -- in order to -- they have
2 a -- I don't know --

3 MS. FLORES: And it's your --

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- you think you're right that
5 every district is dealing with this in a different way. I know
6 that Douglas County does, I think pretty good job of explaining to
7 parents, "Yes, you can opt-out if you so choose. You can do
8 that." But then, they also explain to them that there is a 95
9 percent consideration, et cetera, et cetera. So it's an important
10 --

11 MS. FLORES: And Angelika --

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- (inaudible) they get about it,
13 so some districts --

14 MS. FLORES: (Inaudible).

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- are frankly making parents feel
16 a little threatened.

17 (Pause)

18 MS. RANKIN: We can lead them to water, but we
19 can't make them drink.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores and then Ms. Goff.

21 MS. FLORES: Angelika, you have one of the
22 districts, Boulder, who has the most count. That's my point --
23 that's my point, it's creating a real dilemma in our community, a
24 real dilemma because we have a high opt-out rate and there are
25 folks that are pushing back who are not in the classroom who don't



1 understand what's happening. Their kids took assessments. I
2 mean, the assessments have been going on for a long time. They
3 weren't the kind of assessments that are going out today, and
4 there is a perception that it is the district's decision to have
5 the kids opt-out, and so it's a very difficult thing. Our
6 position probably ought to be just to look at whether we can come
7 up with some better test that kids believe in, for example, or the
8 parents believe -- agree with it. That's a better solution than
9 this argument.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff and then Ms. Rankin.

11 MS. GOFF: Yeah, I -- is there any -- anything
12 coming in to -- to you all yet around the UIP? And some statement
13 about how districts are choosing to try to address a less than 95
14 percent participation rate, and I got mixed feelings about that.
15 Because on the one hand, that comes across as -- that's kind of
16 wishy washy. You know, do we either have a problem here or not?
17 Are we -- are we in -- we meeting every layer of the system? Are
18 we intent on trying to rationalize the good, the bad, and the ugly
19 about that 95 percent participation rates?

20 It's just really rhetorical question in my mind
21 right now but I just be curious and I think it might help to hope
22 -- help to think that districts are going to talk about that. So
23 if Bolder, any of parts of Cherry Creek and other -- other areas
24 that had a rather high opt-out rate or spots within these
25 districts, I don't know. There were some girls that had some high



1 rates considering the small size but there were some that did not
2 have a problem at all. So it doesn't matter where you talk about
3 it. But just start -- start looking at it more from the umbrella
4 picture, what causes this? Where is the misconception, the
5 miscommunication, the -- the incorrect things that are getting
6 spread around down out there.

7 But I -- I just wonder if anybody is inched that
8 in yet to discussions whether it might be something to kind of
9 bring out what we need to at this ESSA tour meetings? At the
10 right moment or in the right connection to something else, it's
11 just -- it's -- it's upsetting because everybody's right and
12 nobody's really all right, you know? And I -- I'm really
13 concerned about it. We know right in the middle of not knowing
14 anything about how we did this year. Who knows after the results
15 actually come back. There will be another mood of the --

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Rankin?

17 MS. RANKIN: I'd like to go back to what Dr.
18 Scheffel said. You know, we only know what we know, and if we get
19 that paper that has the facts on it, I think that is something we
20 can pass out. I think that's an excellent example. And I also
21 would like to have some bullet points not of your whole
22 presentation but as you go, you're gonna find more and more things
23 are coming out that you had thought about that you may be
24 addressing.



1 And the bullet points might be in the term -- in
2 the format of questions. Would you like to learn about, and just
3 maybe four things, that we can promote in our town halls. And
4 then I'll list the online site where they can go and register if
5 they want to, you know, if they're busy and can't come in one of
6 the meetings, and also say on the site, you can go to meetings
7 that are listed. I -- I think we need to promote people being
8 educated about what we're talking about, and it sounds like we
9 aren't even there yet, so --

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

11 MS. FLORES: I think one of the things in Denver
12 that people are talking about in teachers and parents is that the
13 inordinate amount of time that is spent practicing for these tests
14 and time away from -- from subject areas such as Science and
15 Social Studies, Civics Social Science, all the other courses other
16 than English, Language Arts and Math. They're just not getting
17 Science, they're not getting History, they're not getting Social
18 Studies and that taking away the test time, taking away to
19 practice on these, and that may not be the case in -- in -- in
20 every.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So the purpose of this is to
22 listen. We do listen to our constituents and share that here.
23 But the purpose of this is to listen to some folks who often don't
24 come to us. So I wanna hear when you have a session in Denver.
25 That that is the predominant conversation as opposed to just only



1 what we hear, because our constituents sometimes pick who they
2 speak to or don't speak to us, but are much more comfortable
3 coming into --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let her finish.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: So I -- I just think this is --
6 this is about process, and this process is about opening this --
7 opening up the schools. We want the concerns we have to the
8 broader community. And I'm anxious to hear what the differences
9 are between the various regions, which is kind of one of the
10 reasons I was talking about the where is -- what is coming out of
11 Denver? What is coming out of some of the other communities?
12 They're very, very different.

13 MS. FLORES: Well, I was just telling you --

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

15 MS. FLORES: I was just telling you that I do go
16 to these meetings where there are teachers who are very upset,
17 there are parents who are very upset, and they are town hall
18 meetings. There are meetings, it's not just all the volume of e-
19 mails that I get or just talk, you know, one on one but there are
20 lots of --

21 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm -- I'm gonna question that --
22 just -- our topic is this particular process. So that's what we
23 want to be hearing, is what folks are telling us.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: But I -- I agree. I agree Dr.
25 Schroeder but I -- I would say on this particular issue, if it



1 comes up again, can we do everything we can to make sure that
2 state policy is understood and say out loud there are no penalties
3 that's going to accrue to anyone for not meeting 95 percent. And
4 if we upset 10 times during a meeting let's say 10 times during
5 the meeting because the message is not getting through and -- and
6 we get -- we get peppered with this stuff. I mean, I spent a
7 whole week dealing with it. It's annoying because it isn't as if
8 -- as if we've left any gray in this and -- and this forced worked
9 very hard not to leave any gray in this.

10 And yet we have -- and I have one charter school
11 in Colorado Springs that was deliberately threatening parents for
12 what I considered to be unsavory reasons. And you know, I know it
13 probably was less pleasant than usual with some of the
14 administrators in that school. I just got tired of it. Don't --
15 don't make my phone ring, you know, on something that we have
16 acted on. We've done the best we can and -- and it's if -- and
17 it's if a charter school administrators creating problems. That's
18 -- that needs to stop.

19 MS. FLORES: And that -- that's a frustration
20 that we deal.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: And so I think that these
22 meetings are few -- you know, the first thing that comes up is
23 just kill it.

24 MS. PEARSON: And I think I think I may have not
25 presenting this exactly right. I don't think people are confused



1 about the policy. I think they understand what the policy is. I
2 have --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: If they are still concerned
4 they are gonna be penalized they don't understand the policy.

5 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Please proceed.

7 MS. PEARSON: Okay. So we talked about school
8 improvement as well. There are some options in the ESSA that we
9 have -- that are different from how NCLB works in terms of how
10 school improvement funds are allocated to states and then how we
11 can award them to districts. So there is a big question about at
12 one thing -- one of the major thing that -- is that -- is that --
13 that is different is that with the ESSA seven percent of our
14 title, one allocation of the state, is set aside for school
15 improvement activities.

16 And now, instead of doing that as competitive
17 grants which we've done in the past week and we can award that in
18 a formula basis based on schools that are identified under the
19 accountability system. So we were asking people would they rather
20 have formula, would they rather have competitive as we've done.
21 And then we also asked what supports and services, can CDE provide
22 to help schools on improvement that have been identified.

23 So we've heard a lot when we were in smaller --
24 in areas with smaller size districts for the most part. That
25 there's a lot of feedback on having formula instead of competitive



1 because of resources to do grant -- grant writing. There is not a
2 lot of positive support for doing it that way. They really liked
3 an idea of having Steve provided menu of options that they could
4 kind of opt-in to those support and they also see a role for the
5 state in terms of connecting promising practices in schools and
6 districts. Injunction, we heard a lot about how the small
7 districts go to the -- the larger districts out there which is
8 grand injunction, which they were like. And then we go to and
9 take stuff from JeffCo in Denver and how they get things from each
10 other and if the state could help with that facilitation of less
11 practices as a resource. They'd really appreciate it because all
12 the little ones are going to a junction, Junction is going to
13 JeffCo or Denver to get things and if we could help with that --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: So how can we help?

15 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, I think that's something
16 we'll have to think about how we can make sure in terms of working
17 with the districts and sharing best practices and connecting them
18 with each other in areas that they're struggling. Doing that --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: And I keep asking the question
20 about why -- why don't we have a -- a BOCES system that provides
21 that opportunity and then I get -- the feedback that I get is that
22 they're just so dramatically different and there are districts
23 that don't belong, but maybe there's an opportunity there that we
24 haven't -- they wish to find out why they don't belong or why they



1 are so significantly different is it about money or is it about
2 services or what is it about?

3 MS. PEARSON: My understanding of how the BOCES
4 are -- are organize, it tends to be some of the smaller districts
5 all coming together and that worked together and something but
6 they may not have connections to the larger districts because
7 they're not in that BOCES. So if we can help facilitate the BOCES
8 connections with each other and getting that work going that might
9 be a good way to be able to do it.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay any other questions?
11 Going once --

12 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Go ahead.

14 MS. PEARSON: So then another big area of
15 conversation is around teacher qualifications and support. And
16 you correct me -- Polly is not in the room she would come and save
17 me there on this one, but there is a question because highly
18 qualified is not in ESSA that requirement for the match between
19 the teachers content area that they're instructing and that they
20 have constant knowledge in there. It's not in the ESSA and it
21 reverts back to state laws is what ESSA says, that we go through
22 state law to plan it. And my understanding through the most of
23 the part, state law requires a license but not -- and you need to
24 have content when you get your license.



1 But you could have a secondary Science license
2 but that would because you had a license you could teach
3 elementary school and you wouldn't necessarily have the content.
4 So there was a lot of conversation about, we still need to report
5 to the Feds and to our public about teachers that are in and out
6 of fields and their experience levels and all of that. But how do
7 we define that in fields to that competency in Colorado and do we
8 want that? This is a bigger question because it has to do with
9 state legislature too. There is a lot of different opinions about
10 how to define competency. Is it 24 hours, is it an endorsement,
11 is it a license licenses is it all of those things? But there is
12 also a very robust conversation about the challenge between
13 teacher shortages and then wanting high quality teachers.

14 So people are really the district spoke very
15 personally about their recruiting efforts and what they're trying
16 to -- how they're trying -- how hard it is for them to recruit
17 some staff especially in key -- key areas like special ed. I
18 heard about so many special education openings when we were out,
19 but then wanting to make sure that there's still a level of
20 quality teachers. And just because we can't fill a position that
21 we just lower expectations for what we have in the classroom.
22 There is a tension there.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: So we heard.

24 MS. PEARSON: But it was a -- it was a really
25 good conversation to hear and people are being really thoughtful



1 about it. And then we also were asking questions about how should
2 CDE provide help to provide effective instruction Title I and
3 Title III, especially about effective instruction for students
4 that are most at risk. Title II to help support teachers helping
5 students with those needs and so what -- what can CDE do in those
6 areas. And we heard a lot from teachers, cause we had a lot of
7 teachers there, about more time for professional development that
8 really if we wanna have our teachers be able to do all these
9 things they need some time to work together and do it. And
10 they're just not finding that time during the day. It's not that
11 they don't want to, it's just the structure of the day. And we
12 also heard about how important --

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Scheffel, did you have a
14 question?

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. So I'm just saying -- so
16 when we talk about this issue who is saying that, you know, what's
17 the problem for this, actually?

18 MS. PEARSON: It's I can show you the side.
19 We'll send that out to you. But it's talking about how --

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: And we can't believe teachers are
21 showing up saying if only we could show competency or something.
22 And again when parents are showing up saying the teachers are
23 competent I -- I wish there were more test I could look at. Are
24 you saying --



1 MS. PEARSON: It's not about -- Yeah. It's not
2 about that it's really about what the -- the highly qualified
3 requirement going away without having that in place anymore which
4 has had that check for you know very well if you checked your
5 literature and competency. The people felt from level of
6 reassurance, is what we heard when we were out, is that they liked
7 knowing that -- and there's cases that we also heard about where
8 it's hard to fill positions and then if you've got challenges
9 there and that's why it's looking at different ways of showing
10 competency. But what I heard from people I've been listening to,
11 I was really we like to know that there is a -- a content check as
12 well as just having a basic level of license. And so not to see
13 that we need something new, it's saying without highly qualified
14 we want to ensure that there's still some level of match between
15 teacher, content knowledge and the subject the way they're
16 teaching.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'm just going with the
18 principal's job to make sure that the person, I mean, given that
19 they're held accountable whether to be their best interest to find
20 teachers that are prepared to teach the courses that they
21 teaching?

22 MS. PEARSON: Absolutely and that came up as
23 well.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- I need to create more
25 bureaucracy --



1 MS. PEARSON: And so I could easily -- and nobody
2 was saying this has to be state law or state Board policy or
3 anything like that. They were just saying we -- we -- we value
4 this, we value that teachers have that expertise in the content
5 area that they're teaching in. How we go about doing that where
6 that is in policy or where it's not if it's left up to the
7 district or to the school on its own that we didn't get to that
8 point it was just really this conversation of we value competency
9 and quality in teachers. We know we have a teacher shortage. We
10 know these two things are going to be hard to work through at the
11 same time.

12 MS. FLORES: I have a question on that. So does
13 that mean that highly qualified, where a teacher was responsible
14 to have 36 hours in the content area. Has that gone away?

15 MS. PEARSON: The 24 hours or the degree or the
16 endorsement. Yes, that's not in ESSA when that gets implemented
17 for 17, 18 is the first full year of implementation we don't have
18 that highly qualified requirement you -- you -- you follow your
19 state law requirements.

20 MS. FLORES: You know, I mean I thought we were
21 progressing in this area. I really do think that teachers should
22 have a specialty. I mean, I don't think that 54 -- 54 hours of
23 elementary or of education really does make a person competent. I
24 mean, you have to not -- you know, I can see having a lots of
25 hours when you're out in the schools and -- and maybe you get six



1 hours for being out there all day long. But I think you need to
2 have a degree of the areas that you're going to teach English --
3 English and Math or Science. You need to have those 36 hours or
4 whatever in those areas to be confident. And I don't think
5 sufficing it with some of these courses in education which is 54
6 hours unless again they're out in the field. That means something
7 but not -- I -- I don't see how they could take that away.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think, Doctor Flores, they --
9 I think a point has been made that there is no longer a federal
10 requirement and it's strictly the purview of the state legislature
11 and if we think there are changes to be made they should be seen -
12 - they should be suggested to the legislature and -- but absent
13 that the Board has no authority over this whatsoever. Please
14 proceed.

15 MS. FLORES: I think that's something, we should
16 work on that.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So just to let you know,
18 adjustments that we made for a future dates. We found that making
19 these small group discussion time before hearing individual
20 comments really helped elicit conversation in the room. We tried
21 a few different formats but people felt much more comfortable
22 after kind of did a round of presentation than we had them talk
23 small group and then we had them come up for comments. We were
24 videotaping the comments so that we can have a kind of a archival
25 record of it all and really make sure we capture all of the



1 comments and not just summarize like this. And so they called --
2 they had a really good robust conversation at the table and they
3 were willing to share out as a group and then we had time so that
4 they could share it with individuals too if they had additional
5 points they wanted to bring up that were not necessarily common to
6 the group or that they just wanted to share. We made some
7 adjustments to the PowerPoint and the feedback forms, writing the
8 future dates and if you all have additional ones please you can e-
9 mail me or actually if you e-mail Bizy and then we'll get her in
10 and Pat Chapman's office, we'll work on that. And we're going to
11 avoid shelter in place. That was enough of adventure.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Thank you very much.
13 We're going to take a brief recess and reconvene promptly at 11:00
14 a.m. for the presentation of some awards.

15 (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