



Colorado State Board of Education

---

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

June 9, 2016, ESSA CONT, Part 3

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on June 9, 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: A work session of some kind.  
2 Because I think it's very important that we respond.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: What do you guys think?

4 MR. CHAPMAN: I -- I -- certainly, once we  
5 develop our draft, we can get it your way. And I -- I think we'll  
6 be looking at it, the rules from a variety of perspectives and  
7 really. So if you would like a session specific to the rules that  
8 would be wonderful at the timing. You know, I'm kind of creating  
9 some heady timelines for us. But I do think that we can have an  
10 initial sweep of the rules by late June. So it's the exciting  
11 read. There are a lot of rules that are putting in place or  
12 proposing to put in place that weren't there, the number of years  
13 ago.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we need you to flag  
15 some of that for us.

16 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. And so one of the things  
17 that we are doing right now is pulling out examples of all the  
18 unnecessary rules, rules that have no basis. And so kind of  
19 categorizing them on that day.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And plus those rules that  
21 align with our legislation.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Uh-huh.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. That would quite be  
24 the really helpful.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I mean, oftentimes the federal  
2 agencies pay no attention to comments. Do you expect this to be  
3 any different?

4                   MR. CHAPMAN: Not. What I guess, I think that  
5 there is value in us bending together with other states that have  
6 similar concerns. And I do think that there's a possibility that  
7 we can write 'em and make a really good case for why these rules  
8 are unnecessary and it's ignored. So I think that when we speak  
9 we need to speak with a loud voice and a united voice.

10                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we are going to that  
11 conference.

12                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah. And do you think one  
13 thing that would be particularly helpful is any of these rules  
14 that you believe require legislation? Somehow requires to change  
15 statutes? And then secondarily, requires to change our own rules?  
16 Meaning in theory, if you buy the hype behind this there shouldn't  
17 be any of those because we should be having more flexibility which  
18 would allow us to keep current standards and rules and add to them  
19 or subtract from them as we or the General Assembly deem  
20 appropriate. So I think flagging those would be particularly  
21 important and that information should probably be shared with the  
22 relevant education committees in the House and the Senate as it  
23 becomes available. So they may perhaps make their own comments.  
24 I'm sorry not hearing. Okay, I apologies.

25                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're talking too quietly.



1                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Too quietly. Okay. It's  
2 unusual for me. Please. Please, proceed.

3                   MR. CHAPMAN: And do you think there are  
4 instances where so they in developing the rules they have to give  
5 a reason why they're developing the rules, and a number of cases  
6 they've specified that they wanna ensure that we have the  
7 flexibility that was promised to us or that they wanna provide  
8 support to states. And it also comes from a perspective that  
9 states don't currently have an accountability system and so that  
10 we'd be building our system to the model that they've specified in  
11 law. And I think that that's in contrast to some of what's in the  
12 statute that really limits the authority of the U.S. Department  
13 of Education or limits the authority of the secretary to say no to  
14 certain things. And so it's pretty frustrating, but I -- I  
15 promise that I wouldn't get too worked out.

16                  CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Right. No problem. I need you  
17 just provide that information so that we can all make judgments  
18 about roughly where we're going, where we are. And I think may  
19 once that information is available we can think about a work  
20 session or study session at that time.

21                  MR. CHAPMAN: One of the things that I know that  
22 Senator Lamar Alexander was one of the chief architects of the  
23 statute and there are I think one or two letters written by states  
24 that have CC'ed Senator Alexander, and I'm really hoping. I think  
25 that Congress has reacted pretty strongly to some of the proposed



1 rules under the supplement versus a plan. And I'm hoping that  
2 that's the case here. One of the --

3 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

4 MR. CHAPMAN: Oh. I'm sorry.

5 MS. GOFF: And tell me, I -- I think before we go  
6 to our committee, our sub-committee's discussion, this is more on  
7 the federal level. The FY17 budget, allocation proposals were  
8 released either yesterday morning or today. And the Senate Health  
9 Committee was meeting to discuss those. Apparently the full bill  
10 doesn't come out until tomorrow, I guess, the end of the week.  
11 But does the budget discussion? And there's been some proposals  
12 of increasing parts of the education budget, Title I for one  
13 thing, and some other adjustments in other things. But does that  
14 have any bearing on what we, it will of course have bearing on the  
15 money available, but as we talk about rules, comment on rules,  
16 does it help to keep that in mind or not?

17 MR. CHAPMAN: I do think that some of the rules  
18 create an additional administrative burden for the state and  
19 school districts. So how much money we receive to carry out those  
20 requirements makes a difference. And there's also some concern  
21 about the changing allocation formula to States. So yeah. Where  
22 we would want to monitor that carefully and I don't know that the  
23 increases that they're proposing to Title I necessarily make up  
24 for that decreases that we might receive under other programs.



1 MS. GOFF: That's right. From what I've seen, I  
2 haven't done the math, the inner math on that, but at first blush  
3 the increase in Title I is significant. It looks good --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I'm not sitting on it,  
5 so.

6 MS. GOFF: -- not sitting on a piece of paper.  
7 The other quick question, it feels like, tell me if I'm wrong, but  
8 are themes that came out of the tour pillars whatever that was  
9 appear to be the big four. Was there any thing brought up about  
10 some of the other sub-big items such as early childhood? Did  
11 people mention that and they're not just free floating but they  
12 are a part of ESSA language to a large degree. So some of those  
13 things, and then the well rounded education concept and what that  
14 might look like. And I assume we'll have a lot of chances to  
15 bring all of that in to these other big groups but --

16 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. And so --

17 MS. GOFF: -- just curious as to what people are  
18 tuned into on us.

19 MR. CHAPMAN: There was a lot of discussion and  
20 there was a good presence of their Early Childhood Community and I  
21 guess you could call the Health and Wellness Community as part of  
22 the tour. And that's one of those things that where there are  
23 some new requirements related to early childhood but there are  
24 also some new opportunities. And I think that's the same as true  
25 for health and wellness and prevention activities. We didn't go



1 real deep into those areas as part of the Listening Tour, but we  
2 have met with those constituency groups or will soon meet with  
3 some of those constituency groups as kind of that we begin  
4 pivoting from listening to more diving, a little bit more deeply  
5 into what exactly does ESSA entail, or what opportunities does it  
6 create related to early childhood. So we did, we presented an  
7 overview to that Early Childhood Leadership Commission I believe  
8 they're called. And then also have a plan to follow up with them  
9 and to explore those opportunities a little bit more deeply.

10 MS. GOFF: Great. Thank you.

11 MR. CHAPMAN: So to began to pivot from the sort  
12 of beginning conversations from the ESSA and sort of getting a  
13 higher level view of what people are thinking out there. We were  
14 gonna pivot to the actual state plan development and the committee  
15 work that will support it. As part of the proposed rules that  
16 USDE released last week. They did begin to outline the  
17 requirements for state plans. And that outline is there, that  
18 there's a requirement that we engage in stakeholder consultation  
19 and we coordinate with other similar programs like adult ed, Head  
20 Start in the development of our plan.

21 There are number of reassurances that we will  
22 have to provide in a number of specific title program requirements  
23 that we'll have to address. But the basic structure of the plan  
24 is similar to how we organized our Listening Tour with a  
25 requirement that we describe our challenging state standards, and



1 our aligned assessments, and our accountability system, and our  
2 plans for supporting school improvement and educator  
3 effectiveness. That's very similar to what we've had, the plan  
4 that we had to develop for a waiver or waivers over the last three  
5 or four years, I think we're on version four of it. And so we  
6 have a lot of descriptions of our standards and our assessment  
7 system, and our accountability system already in place. And  
8 hoping that that might kind of get us a little bit of a head start  
9 on what we'll have to submit for our ESSA state plan.

10 Oh, yeah. Please.

11 MS. MAZANEC: I think one thing that came up in  
12 the Listening Tour that we just want to clarify, our state plan is  
13 a stone forever. You can go back to the U.S. Department of Ed in  
14 amend. So when we put in our assessment the plan, which is what  
15 we currently have for assessments in state right now, that can  
16 change in the future. So if we decided the state we want, if an  
17 assessment system become part of the pilot. Whatever happens we  
18 can go back in a minute. So I just don't want you all feeling  
19 like this is the one and only chance to be able to get what we  
20 want. Assessments and accountability that look like done and  
21 final, we can always go back to them and update that and make  
22 changes state launching, just as we change policy as things move  
23 ahead.

24 MR. CHAPMAN: And I think, also in addition to  
25 that that in some cases what we'll be submitting is sort of a plan





1 to get to make decisions or a timeline for doing so. And so if  
2 that's indeed the case then we would wanna go back once those  
3 changes have been made. So anything that might require  
4 legislative change, that might take some time. So we might say in  
5 our plan that we plan to work with our state legislature or  
6 whatever. I don't know that everything will be done by the time  
7 we're submitting our plan. I don't know. Yeah but -- They've  
8 offered two windows for state plans --

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think Dr. Schroeder has  
10 questions.

11 MR. CHAPMAN: Okay.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: It aligns with what you're  
13 saying, but when the plan is draft as ready we're gonna bring it  
14 out to the community and share it and get their input. And that's  
15 gonna feel like a promise to some? So I think we have to be very  
16 careful about the manner in which we make modifications. And the  
17 other thing that I'm a little concerned about, it's not deadly at  
18 this point but certainly little after the draft, I would like to  
19 see significant more opportunities for our business community to  
20 be participating in this. They've been a really strong voice  
21 since 2008 in our education system, the chambers the larger  
22 corporations etc. And I think it's very important to re-engage  
23 them with the invitation to again re-engage when we start doing  
24 our standard revisions. Because I think that's when we're talking



1 about college and career ready we need to hear from the folks that  
2 are gonna hire our kids. So that would be my recommendations.

3 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Should we hold questions and let  
6 you finish or settle?

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Fill me up. Okay. Go ahead  
8 and finish, and we'll get to the end.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're moving if we're moving  
10 into a different kind of section so if it's on the state plan or  
11 the Listening Tour it might be a good spot to break for questions.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Dr. Scheffel.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: I was just gonna say as I just was  
14 looking at the -- the entities that are gonna feed into writing  
15 the state plan. It just seemed like there wasn't enough  
16 representation for parents. And that's just one group --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that's exactly where  
18 we're headed right now. Because I think that's what -- what has  
19 gonna talk about next is how that process is going to work.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: Great. Thank you.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Joyce?

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. I'm sorry, Ms. Rankin.

23 MS. RANKIN: My initial reaction is that we were  
24 told this was going to be more flexible. We have a tour that has  
25 gone on, behalf of CDE in the public sector that this is a more



1 flexible plan, but what I'm hearing here is much more federal  
2 control in a local control state. I see a big conflict here. I  
3 kind of feel it from YouTube and I --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Trying to get them worked  
5 up?

6 MS. RANKIN: I'm not trying to get you worked up.  
7 No. I -- I'm concerned.

8 MR. CHAPMAN: I'm disappointed. And I think that  
9 I was personally was a little bit disappointed by how prescriptive  
10 the new law was itself. But that's just me. And I -- I'm  
11 disappointed in the rules, that I don't think it is necessarily  
12 the rules are necessarily consistent with the intent of the  
13 legislation which I really believe was to provide greater state  
14 and local flexibility, especially given that states have developed  
15 legislation in support of accountability, educator evaluation and  
16 those kinds of things. So we've developed a lot of those things  
17 for Colorado ourselves and I don't know that that's the  
18 prescriptive nature of the rules or that that's the options that  
19 they create to do anything to enhance good things for children.

20 MS. RANKIN: Just one more comment. Mr. Chapman,  
21 I realize this is difficult, but I want to tell you that I will  
22 volunteer if there is an opportunity to sit in the back of the  
23 room and just watch the tearing apart of this 192 page document.  
24 And I would be more than happy to help in any way and sit in on  
25 any kind of meetings. This is extremely important and concerning



1 to me, and Mr. Dill what if we do not, I mean, I know you don't  
2 have any answer today but my question is, what if we get through  
3 this and we do not agree? We need to be looking at not just  
4 consequences but options. Options is the word I'm looking for. I  
5 have a hard time seeing how we're gonna come together with total  
6 agreement on this.

7 MR. DILL: Mr. Rankin, I'm in agreement with  
8 that. One path that we could do now is perhaps through NASBE is  
9 to see other states are identifying similar issues --

10 MS. RANKIN: They are.

11 MR. DILL: -- and trying as hard as we can to  
12 oppose any overreach in the rules as hey have been drafted now.

13 MS. RANKIN: Mr. Dill. Are these states also  
14 local control states?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Every states next to local  
16 control.

17 MR. DILL: Several of them are. Although you're  
18 correct, there is a list of local control states and perhaps we  
19 should start with contacting them and seeing if they're having  
20 similar questions.

21 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Mr. Chairman?

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes. Dr. Scheffel?

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: Actually, when we read ESSA when  
25 it was first passed and actually looked at what was in it as



1 opposed to the way it was marketed by the feds we could very  
2 easily predict this. When you look at the rules, we have the same  
3 feeling that's as huge overreach. And I think we need to look  
4 carefully at the legal requirements and how we can push back  
5 because some states are doing that. I don't think we've pushed  
6 back enough in Colorado, and we are a local control state. I  
7 don't think we're living that out.

8 I quoted from the Atlantic last month and read an  
9 article into the record, a portion of it saying, this is not a law  
10 that will serve Coloradans well in terms of local control and it  
11 doesn't. And so I hope that we can be very aggressive in how we  
12 respond to the rules and how we write the state plan to be  
13 consistent with our local control position which is written into  
14 our constitution. So I appreciate the opportunity to discuss this  
15 and dive deeply into the documents. Would echo Joyce Rankin's  
16 suggestion. I'd like to be heavily part of the process of looking  
17 at the language.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec?

19 MS. MAZANEC: So you've said there are other  
20 states. Can you tell us some of these other states that are  
21 taking action as well?

22 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah. The only two and I do  
23 believe there are more, I know that the states of Kentucky and  
24 Illinois have submitted or sent a letter expressing their  
25 displeasure and I think the Kentucky letter is similar to how we



1 might feel where we were thinking them and knowing, you know  
2 that's we're skeptical, I can't what. But assuming and believing  
3 based on the language of the statute that we would have greater  
4 discretion and greater control, Kentucky was, ton of their letter  
5 was, hey, we just finished our Listening Tour, and they reached a  
6 lot of people and felt and get back to their office to find that,  
7 you know, these roles are in place and really, it puts them in a  
8 bad place where they were going out to their -- their field and  
9 saying, hey, I think we have more flexibility here and then they  
10 get back and then they have to go back on that sort of promise to  
11 their constituents. So those are the two that I know about but I  
12 believe there are others.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Goff.

15 MS. GOFF: Yeah. As perhaps a little consolation  
16 and comfort in that we are not the only ones who are in a little  
17 bit consternation about this. NASBE has been talking for several  
18 months from the perspective of State Boards which means their  
19 states. At each phase of this development including that, before  
20 the guidance even came out. We started talking about what -- what  
21 we might expect, what we might watch for and watch for, as good  
22 signs. And in addition to that both of the education related  
23 committees in Congress, have held hearings and they behead John  
24 King, The Secretary in front of them. They have had direct



1 conversations with him quite a bit, and in both of -- them both of  
2 those instances.

3                   High -- high caution to I guess, I would term to  
4 him and to the department about really being extremely consistent  
5 with what the law says. So he was -- he -- Representative Klein  
6 particularly was, was real firm and adamant about you need to  
7 follow what that, what the law says, as much as possible, and the  
8 law is the law. We all have every state. We all react  
9 differently to that ESSA say the act itself, and interpreted as  
10 they choose, but it is pretty clear on most things. So the  
11 admonition to The Secretary was really, you got to make every  
12 effort to keep it in line with that.

13                   This was before the guidance came out even since  
14 -- since the rules have showed up there's been quite a lot of  
15 paying attention and reaction and we are not the only state. It  
16 runs the gamut from coast to coast, Illinois and Kentucky,  
17 Tennessee to some extent is starting to perk up about it. But I  
18 think keeping that in mind we do have a good start so many areas,  
19 and we have commitment to pay attention to what our own statutes  
20 are with this. So I think we should be firm in, moving ahead in  
21 the way that we've already started and it needed adjustments that  
22 aren't going to give us unintended consequences that we can't deal  
23 with. So we're not alone and -- and we have every right and  
24 opportunity to keep putting the input into it as we go along.



1                               So I'm gonna kind of go out on a limb, and I'm  
2 going to say through -- through the eyes and words of other state  
3 needs on this especially state board members. That though the  
4 rules will not look the same when this is done, and if they do for  
5 some reason then we keep on we commit to what we believe is the  
6 right thing to do. But I know that it's a ways off as well and  
7 be. The end of the year the other thing too is that the  
8 prediction that both either rules or any connection to the next  
9 year's budget. Not much firm action is going to happen on either  
10 of those really until after the election.

11                              UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's true.

12                              CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Mazanec?

13                              MS. RANKIN: We have time but we don't.

14                              CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I'm sorry, Ms. Rankin.

15                              MS. RANKIN: I'm still quite concerned about the  
16 discussion about feds I'm looking at local school districts. I'm  
17 looking at small school districts, that are on a pathway and now  
18 are hearing that they may have more administrative  
19 responsibilities and possibly questionable money. I'm quite  
20 concerned about this for Colorado and for rural Colorado and for  
21 small and remote school districts. This is a huge impact, and I  
22 just, I think you have a tough job Mr. Chapman, and I -- I applaud  
23 you for going at it in a sensitive way you are. I appreciate it.

24                              MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you.

25                              CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Flores.





1 MS. FLORES: We have two Senators and I think we  
2 need to contact them and -- and I think Mr. Chair. I think we  
3 need a letter from the Chair, from the Commissioner, and possibly  
4 from The Governor on this. I think they will listen to you guys,  
5 and I think this is very important that we do this.

6 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Dr. Anthes.

7 MS. ANTHES: Yes, thank you. You are taking the  
8 notes right out of my mouth, Dr. Flores. I was saying thinking  
9 that we could. Once we get through the rules a little bit more we  
10 could draft, draft letter for your review, and that could be sent  
11 from the State Board of Education your pleasure. If you want and  
12 then we can, we do have on our list of things to do to once we  
13 understand the rules a little bit better, and understand where the  
14 flags are to, connect with our State Senators to also connect with  
15 The Council of Chief State School Officers who are doing, some  
16 work on this to make sure that our, voice is in all of the  
17 different avenues that we have.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. That's good -- good  
19 advice. Okay. Go ahead and proceed, please.

20 MR. CHAPMAN: So the this sort of pivoting to  
21 state plan development and structure that might support the  
22 development of that plan. This is sort of the latest iteration of  
23 The Hub Spoke Graphic that we took out on the tour up until the  
24 most recent edition. I think it was always said draft because it,  
25 it does continue to evolve we've left draft off of that. That



1 this most recent version of The Hub Spoke Committee, sort of  
2 changes those spokes to reflect the requirements that our state  
3 plan when it's not hugely different, but it is slightly different.

4                   So the Spokes that we're identifying are the  
5 assessment, standards, accountability, those sections of the state  
6 plan that we will be drafting. The idea is to convene a Central  
7 Hub Committee, and that committee would provide oversight of state  
8 plan development and the drafting of the state plan and submission  
9 of a state plan to, you the State Board of Education. Sometime in  
10 early 2017, it's ultimately up to you guys what plan we submit and  
11 whether, whether we submit it. So they would be sort of acting  
12 on, on your behalf. We did have proposed membership of the pop  
13 committee and we kind of we're dividing it up into, sort of three  
14 groups.

15                   The first group are representatives from the  
16 Board and the Legislature. Those that are asked to. Sorry, thank  
17 you. To develop policy and legislation rules related to ESSA. So  
18 thinking that two, two board members, two state legislators would  
19 make sense, also wanting to include representatives of those who  
20 have to establish state and local policies, plans to implement  
21 ESSA. So Representatives of Districts, Representatives of  
22 Teachers, Representatives of the BOCES. There's also a  
23 requirement in the ESSA that we convene our committee of  
24 practitioners and that's been true under the last couple versions  
25 of the ESEA. So we have a standing committee of practitioners



1 that includes Board members, teachers, private schools, charter  
2 schools representatives from, a whole host of constituency groups  
3 or perspectives.

4                   So we would want to include a member of committee  
5 of practitioners as part of that Hub Committee as well. We'll  
6 also be going back to our committee of practitioners regularly, to  
7 enable them to back what we've done today. Also proposing  
8 representative of Higher Ed. I think there are implications for  
9 Higher Ed in the law, and feeling that it would be helpful to have  
10 a representative of CDE as part of that group. Somebody who's  
11 pretty familiar with how all this works and can provide that input  
12 to the larger up committee, and then also a representative of the  
13 Rural Council. I do think that this -- a lot of this federal  
14 legislation hits the rurals particularly hard and in many cases  
15 for not a lot of money. They're held to the same requirements,  
16 the same expectations and -- and receive only a fraction of the  
17 funds that some of the larger districts receive.

18                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Mr. Chair.

19                   CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

20                   MS. SCHEFFEL: So here's my question as you lay  
21 out the potential plan for writing the state plan. I guess I'd  
22 like to take a different approach and I don't know what other  
23 members of the board would think. But I -- I'd like to have a  
24 much more hands on approach to writing this report as opposed to  
25 turning it over to these entities, and looking at drafts where



1 we're tweaking it. I mean, I think this is a huge overreach in  
2 terms of federal intrusion, and I would like to be much more on  
3 the front end of actually outlining a draft, looking carefully at  
4 the language with advice from Counsel, what are our options as far  
5 as, you know legally, and I guess I feel like if we embrace this  
6 approach we really lose the ball. Where we have two Board Members  
7 sitting there, all these entities and all the documents they  
8 bring. I mean we're swamped in a context like that, I think as  
9 far as having a true impact on the document.

10 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you. And then finally  
11 representatives of those who have a vested interest in the  
12 success, the outcomes tied to the implementation of this law. So  
13 a group that represents parents, a group that represent students,  
14 taxpayers, business community and child advocacy groups. That's a  
15 lot of the voice that we believe that we heard as part of the  
16 Listening Tour and wanting to make sure that they're at the table,  
17 and having opportunity to react to the draft as it's developed.  
18 And I think this gets to sort of Dr. Scheffel's concern, is how  
19 best to do that in a way that, that you guys have an ongoing  
20 opportunity to provide input and a real chance to influence the  
21 plan and to know what's in it.

22 The recommendation is that we convene Spoke  
23 Committees consistent with the sections of the law, that we'll  
24 have to see. No, thank you. The Spoke Committees would be  
25 responsible for drafting these associated sections of Colorado's



1 ESSA plan. The hope is that we'd be able to utilize existing  
2 committees to the extent possible, we have standing committees in  
3 a number of these areas. But we would booster their membership as  
4 needed, and one of their requirements of those Spoke Committees is  
5 that they really thoroughly that. The plan with all the  
6 constituency groups who have an interest in the plan, and then  
7 also identify requirements of the proposed plan that might  
8 necessitate a change in rule or legislation. And then on a  
9 regular basis provide updates to new plans with the ESSA Hub  
10 Committee beginning in August.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Dr. Scheffel.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean. Is it true that during  
13 the Listening Tours these entities were able to provide feedback  
14 on the front end or was that not really the purpose for Listening  
15 Tours?

16 MR. CHAPMAN: The Listening Tour, I think was a  
17 really higher level in a broad perspective standards assessments  
18 accountability. So I think that there is an opportunity for them  
19 to provide comments. We certainly want to look back with all  
20 those that provided comments as part of that Listening Tour. I  
21 really feel behold onto them and I appreciate, their time and  
22 their thoughts. And so, the idea is that once we do have a draft,  
23 sort of an initial draft of the plans that we go back out and say.  
24 We came and we listened, we drafted and did we get it right?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Until when does this Hub approach  
2 begin in?

3 MR. CHAPMAN: So with I mean look, kind of at the  
4 end I understand it seems like kind of a lot of structure. The  
5 idea of what it's noted in the PowerPoint a few slides is to begin  
6 to convene, the leads of the Spoke Committees in the next couple  
7 of weeks and after a plan and timely.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: It's pretty quick. So again I  
9 would just ask that before we agree to this we think carefully  
10 about the process that you've proposed I think. I just think  
11 there are some flaws in this process but I appreciate the  
12 presentation.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, Ms. Mazanec.

14 MS. MAZANEC: This recommendations for these Hub  
15 Spoke this is CDE's ready recommendation, your recommendations as  
16 opposed to the feds?

17 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah, it's a proposal and it's  
18 trying to think. Okay, how do we move this forward in a  
19 relatively quick manner. But at the same time thoroughly vet it  
20 with all -- all perspectives and particularly some perspectives  
21 that I think haven't been heard in the past five years.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As far as we know, the  
23 federal government has not defined its stakeholders as  
24 specifically as -- as Mr. Sherman just did -- Mr. Chavez, sorry.



1 You got me. I was worried about a school approval, so we can  
2 (inaudible).

3 MR. CHAPMAN: So I totally understand that I  
4 think that what we're proposing leaves some questions unanswered  
5 and some structures left unaddressed and would welcome -- really,  
6 I -- I mean my --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Have these letters gone out  
8 to invite people into this process?

9 MR. CHAPMAN: No.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not yet.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, you guys have  
13 already gone out. And CDE has already out. I'm sorry, CDE has  
14 already gone out. They've provided input in this Listening Tour.  
15 So the process now should be for the Board, the CDE, to write this  
16 plan. And as you just said, go back to them after we do this.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: This is not a representative  
18 group. This is actually not even finished because CASB and those  
19 folks are having a thing tomorrow.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They've been there.

21 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah, we're sort of an initial ask.  
22 I do think there is a real need to dive more deeply into it with  
23 Constituents Groups

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think -- I think we the  
25 Board, the CDE need to write this and go back to them.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go home and write.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I will, as soon as we see  
3 this.

4 MR. CHAPMAN: So --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I -- real quick. Page  
6 number -- it's 15 whatever. What role does the Parent Advisory,  
7 the State Advisory Council on Parent Involvements, the SACPI  
8 group, are they -- are they really an overarching Hub Group in and  
9 of themselves, because that's another part of ESSA, that is the  
10 whole idea of parent engagement is huge in that.

11 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I'm wondering if we've  
13 had time to think about.

14 MR. CHAPMAN: We did meet with and presented the  
15 overview that, that was part of the Listening Tour to SACPI and  
16 address the fact that there are, parent engagement and parent  
17 involvement requirement sort of scattered throughout, the  
18 legislation and also that we really want to hear the perspective  
19 of parents on these large topics of standards assessments  
20 accountability. So what was said to them is that I'm sure we'll  
21 be meeting again and there'll be an opportunity for us to dive  
22 more deeply, into the implications and the concerns of parents and  
23 parent groups. But we just had the initial meeting with them and  
24 that's, that's the case in a number with a number of groups where  
25 we had sort of the initial meeting, and I pledged to come back and





1 dive more deeply into the implications and the opportunities  
2 afforded by ESSA. So there's it's a --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So the PTOs and --

4 MR. CHAPMAN: Because the parents stuff cuts all  
5 across all these areas, in a way it doesn't, we'd really need to  
6 vet those areas from the perspective of parents. So what a  
7 parents think with regard to our assessment plan and those kinds  
8 of things.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thanks.

10 MR. CHAPMAN: Okay. So the idea is that we would  
11 have Spoke's devoted to these various parts of the plan including  
12 stakeholder consultation and one of the roles of the Stakeholder  
13 Consultation Group is to ensure that the plan is vetted  
14 thoroughly, from a variety of perspectives and with a variety of  
15 groups and individuals. The standards committee, that would be  
16 pretty much describing the standards that we have in place our  
17 plan to review those in Colorado. Same thing with accountability  
18 and school improvement, and so forth.

19 As I noted earlier there is a requirement that --  
20 that we do coordinate this plan with other similar programs like  
21 Adult at, IDEA, Head Start and to make sure that our plan is  
22 consistent with activities in those other areas. So next steps.  
23 We currently so you've know that Listening Tour is winding down.  
24 We are, we have a number of meetings on the books with a number of  
25 groups and individuals. We will continue to -- to meet with those



1 folks. We're hoping by late June that we will complete the  
2 Listening Tour reports. And again it's going to be pretty much  
3 raw data and pulling out some, some of the themes of what we  
4 heard.

5                   There is the possibility of maybe because it's  
6 really a pretty good data set, I mean, 731 folks, that we might  
7 want to use utilize that information and really analyze that  
8 report more thoroughly than as opposed to just compiling the  
9 comments that we heard. By late June we do hope to be able to  
10 invite nominations for the ESSA Hub Committee Membership mid-July,  
11 and I think we'll have an initial draft by late June. But by mid-  
12 July, hope to be able to have reviewed and, and composed our  
13 comments regarding the proposed rules, and I noticed that I said  
14 by mid-July twice in that one.

15                   Late June convene the -- I have an initial  
16 convening of the Spoke Committee Leads to talk about how best to -  
17 - to pull together the plan and to vet it, with all those who need  
18 to understand what's in there and I realized that I felt that with  
19 the waiver, we were handing you to 300 page document without  
20 adequately informing you along the way of what was in that plan  
21 and, felt your frustration, and don't want to repeat that. So the  
22 idea is that you really know what we're --

23                   (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