



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO

June 8, 2016, SDPF Weightings, Part 4

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 8, 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 MS. FLORES: But if we had 50 achievement and  
2 then --

3 MS. SCHROEDER: In other words, we're putting  
4 a lot...

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: To -- you do -- you do have  
6 the -- the SAT test in the Post Workforce Readiness site?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Exactly, yes.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: At least in my mind is an  
9 achievement major.

10 MS. FLORES: Me too.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Not a pokes(ph) .

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Why is it in there?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: ACT is in June. I mean,  
15 it's always -- we've always had the ACT results in  
16 Postsecondary Workforce Readiness, as it was really an  
17 indicator of college readiness, and the cut points were set  
18 around the college readiness indicators.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: And of the four metrics in Post  
20 Workforce Readiness, how much does ACT count?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's been four points. So  
22 grad rate's been four, disaggregated grad has been four.  
23 Right, four?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can pull it up. Let me  
25 pull it up before I tell you the wrong thing.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's together weighs .

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Weigh as much four, right?

3 Dropout is four, and then ACT's been four. And then the  
4 matriculation, the recommendation was to have that come in  
5 at two instead of four, just as it's a new measure, and  
6 there's all the concerns that we've heard about it.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It just seems odd to have  
8 achievement as either 20 percent or 30 percent, and then  
9 Post Workforce is 40 percent and 30 percent. Does that mean  
10 that they're not really learn -- and we're not focusing on  
11 learning, but somehow they're still ready for the workforce?  
12 I mean, it just seems like an odd dissociation.

13 MS. FLORES: But -- but they're learning in --  
14 in NWR. They're learning, and you -- and you could be  
15 achievement too, because they do achieve. They do get  
16 certificates. They do get work, so I think that the growth  
17 should be less, and the achievement should be -- the  
18 achievement should be more.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can't hear you.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The microphone.

21 MS. FLORES: Oh sorry.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So you -- just so you --

23 MS. FLORES: Maybe -- maybe 50 -- 50, 30, 20,  
24 with growth being 20 and PWR being 30 --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So your --



1 MS. FLORES: It is learning. I mean, you are  
2 learning.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So your current Board  
4 rules state that the greatest emphasis is placed on the  
5 longitudinal growth in Postsecondary Workforce Readiness  
6 performance indicators, so that's where we were working off  
7 from. You can change your Board rules, but I know that's a  
8 process, but right now that's -- that's --

9 MS. FLORES: Can we think about it?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- what's set in there.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Yes.

12 MS. MAZANEC: If we just have two -- option  
13 one and option two to -- to look at, and you're saying what  
14 we are currently counting for achievement is 15 percent,  
15 then we are doubling the amount of achievement. If we go  
16 much higher than that, it seems to me we aren't going to be  
17 able -- it's going to be very skewed from what we've had in  
18 the past. I think this is a quantum leap as it is, even if  
19 we individually want to pick out their numbers out of the  
20 air.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have a lot of kids this  
22 semester.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay let's --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Are we talking option two?



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So is there preference then  
2 for either one or two?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We would go from 20.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. How many -- how  
5 many for number one? We'll start there. Okay. All right.

6 MS. FLORES: Do we have some right now?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: It's lonely. Yes, we do.  
8 Unfortunately, we do. All right. Option two?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm for -- I'm for one.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: You're for one, okay.  
11 That's two, all right. For option two.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Option two, if we have  
13 two.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: One, two, three, four. So  
15 it looks like it's option two. Okay. All right. And then,  
16 we're down into the ratings, which don't appear to require  
17 any decisions here.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I think we just wanted  
19 to confirm what we've heard from you all previously in terms  
20 of how we would set those cut points for -- for districts,  
21 for distinction, for performance, for improvement, for  
22 priority improvement, for turnarounds, and for schools. We  
23 don't have the distinction rating. We've got the  
24 performance improvement -- priority improvement turnaround.  
25 So again, it's the overall rating that we're talking about



1 the cut points, and what we've heard from you all is that  
2 you thought it made sense to keep those distributions about  
3 what they were in 2014. We wanna make sure we look at the  
4 data when we see that and just kind of check trends and make  
5 sure somebody who's moved up a ton isn't getting thrown back  
6 just because of the distribution, but that the guiding point  
7 would be to keep it similar to 2014. And if that -- if  
8 that's still how you all feel, that's -- we just need a  
9 thumbs up.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Is there a dollar amount with  
11 that, too? Wasn't that the one that the -- the amount for  
12 each area? How much did we spend on that?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that was for that  
14 disaggregated groups. This is just for the overall ratings,  
15 but I think having some of that finance data along with --  
16 the funding data along with the ratings it's helpful  
17 information for people to see, too.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay, yes.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: I think what I'm hearing is  
20 that we not change a whole lot of things drastically this  
21 coming year, but I for one certainly want to revisit. I  
22 want to be able to look -- I would like to be able to look  
23 at what happens this year and then start thinking about  
24 opportunities to either raise the bar or change the  
25 allocation's base, what's included in them. Like Steve, I



1 struggle a little bit between the college readiness  
2 assessment being in PW --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: ACT.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: And not being -- and not being  
6 achievement.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah, I think we oughtta  
8 look at changing that.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we absolutely can  
10 talk about that, and then thinking about where PSAT goes to,  
11 and part of the question is -- is that -- an achievement  
12 measure.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: And PSAT, yeah. Because we  
14 are not getting -- we're getting that -- we're not getting -  
15 - it doesn't seem as though we're going to be telling  
16 families much about high school achievement with the few  
17 things that are in it.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that's very true.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. All right.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: So any other questions?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You guys are good with the  
24 2014 distribution?

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think we -- yeah. I think  
3 we made that decision in previous meetings.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Further  
6 discussion? I think that's it. Have a safe trip.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right, and --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're letting them go?  
10 Really?

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: We're letting them go. So  
12 now Ms. Bertzel(ph) if you would like to announce the  
13 executive session, please. And then will -- I will ask the  
14 audience to leave except those who are by law allowed to  
15 stay. And we will reconvene not later -- well, let's just  
16 set a firm time. We'll reconvene at 1:30. Okay? So Ms.  
17 Bertzel(ph).

18 MS. CORDIAL: An executive session has been  
19 noticed for today's State Board meeting in conformance with  
20 24-6-402(3)(a) CRS to receive legal advice on specific legal  
21 questions pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(II) CRS in matters  
22 required to be kept confidential by Federal Law, rules, or  
23 State statutes pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(III) CRS.

24 (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