



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
October 13, 2016, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on October 13, 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. SCHROEDER: Biz, Biz, Bizy. Are you  
2 ready. Are you ready? Good morning ladies and gentlemen.  
3 I'd like to call the meeting back -- of the State Board of  
4 Education back to order. Ms. Cordial, would you please  
5 read the roll, call the roll.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Happy to. Okay. Board Member  
7 Flores.

8 MS. FLORES: Present.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

10 MS. GOFF: Here.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

14 MS. RANKIN: Here.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Here. First item this  
19 morning is an information item, quality instruction, and  
20 leadership. This Denver public schools submission and the  
21 annual report on the -- their alternative preparation  
22 programs. Madam Chair try to introduce our presenter.

23 MS. ANTHERS: Sure. Thank you. I'm just  
24 gonna turn this over to Dr. Colleen O'Neill to introduce  
25 our speaker.



1 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. Good morning,  
2 Members of the Board. I'm Colleen O'Neill, I'm the  
3 Executive Director of Educator Preparation, licensing and  
4 educator effectiveness. Today with me is Sarah Almy with  
5 the Denver Public Schools. Sarah represents the executive  
6 -- she is the Executive Director of Talent Management for  
7 DPS. Today we bring forward to you an information item  
8 only, with regard to Denver Public Schools and the Colorado  
9 Department of Education memorandum of understanding, with  
10 regard to alternative Educator Preparation. In your board  
11 packet materials, you have a little bit of a cover letter  
12 that explains what the MOU allows DPS to do which is really  
13 an alternative educator pathway that they do in conjunction  
14 with different universities and educator preparation  
15 programs. You also have an annual report to the Colorado  
16 Department of Education State Board presented by the DPS  
17 Staff. Today Sarah and I are here really just to help  
18 answer any questions that you may have around that MOU or  
19 the subsequent report as the information item. So we stand  
20 at the ready to answer any questions you may have.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Colleagues, have you any  
22 questions?

23 MS. FLORES: I have a question.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Dr. Flores.



1 MS. FLORES: Oh, sorry. And the question  
2 is, you know, yesterday we saw some of the -- not  
3 alternative but innovation schools, and you know they  
4 conform to law and all. But the gist is that we didn't see  
5 anything that was innovative. It wasn't spelled out what -  
6 - what you were gonna do that was different than that we're  
7 had been done before, and so will this address this?

8 MS. O'NEILL: I think Dr. Flores, I think in  
9 some ways I'm gonna answer for Sarah and then I'll  
10 certainly let her jump in. I think in some ways they're an  
11 alternative pathway to help fill all of their Educator  
12 Preparation needs. I think you have some upwards of like  
13 900 positions that you fill in a year with Denver Public  
14 Schools. The innovative side of the alternative Educator  
15 Preparation Program and the development of that is -- is  
16 kind of where that starts to intersect with the innovation  
17 schools. So this is really about the educator talent  
18 pipeline for them, and this is one of the -- the few  
19 districts in our state that really takes that always on  
20 themselves and collaborates very specifically with filling  
21 that pipeline. So that's part of I think if we were trying  
22 to attach that innovation piece that would be kind of where  
23 -- where we would attach the educator talent pipeline.

24 MS. FLORES: All right.



1 MS. ALMY: Yeah I would, I mean, I think  
2 exactly that the programs that -- that are outlined here  
3 and -- and the information that you have are really  
4 designed to meet some of our highest need, hardest to fail  
5 subject areas across all of our schools, and so working in  
6 partnership with some of those schools that have it  
7 innovation status as well as, as you know, any other school  
8 in our -- in our district, and I think as Colleen said  
9 really just around working to make sure that -- that we are  
10 being innovative in thinking about how we get the best  
11 prepared and most qualified teachers to all of our  
12 students.

13 MS. FLORES: I know you have some internship  
14 programs, and I also notice that on a list that we've got,  
15 that I guess my area it doesn't have as many, I guess, cold  
16 programs with universities in training as does say the --  
17 the west side, and are we working towards you know some  
18 internships with maybe industry and is that kind of part of  
19 it?

20 MS. ALMY: Yeah I mean I think we're looking  
21 at a lot of different partnership opportunities, and -- and  
22 these two programs are in partnership with -- with a couple  
23 of universities. We certainly have partnerships with, you  
24 know, many other universities. We are -- we're also  
25 looking at some, you know, route to teaching programs for



1 our own students and thinking about that, and so I think  
2 thinking about industry, partnerships relating to that, and  
3 different opportunities, so I think these are two -- two  
4 pathways that we're taking.

5                   But as, you know, as was mentioned every  
6 year we're filling upwards of 900 vacancies and so  
7 certainly exploring a lot of different opportunities to  
8 partner and I think trying to make sure that -- that we are  
9 identifying opportunities across the city and for schools  
10 across the city. I think that's something that  
11 historically the partnerships have tended to happen more,  
12 you know, potentially between a University and a specific  
13 school, and we're trying to make sure we're being really  
14 strategic about ensuring opportunity across that district.

15                   MS. FLORES: Okay. When you say vacancies,  
16 you mean vacancies for kids within those schools within  
17 those industries?

18                   MS. ALMY: Sorry that was -- those are  
19 teacher vacancies.

20                   MS. FLORES: Oh teachers too work with  
21 (inaudible) with these special kids.

22                   MS. O'NEILL: And Dr. Flores there are quite  
23 a few pathways and I know that DPS right now is also  
24 focusing on kind of the Grow Your Own program, as well as  
25 how do we bring some of our own kids along as we graduate



1 from high school and teacher cadet programs grow your own  
2 into those pathways. International recruitment associates  
3 with DPS. They do international recruitment and work with  
4 Spain, I think as well as a couple of other international  
5 components. So quite a few different pathways that DPS is  
6 working on and then has just developed a fellowship with  
7 Harvard University as well to bring student teachers and so  
8 multiple Colorado institutions as well as some other ones.

9 MS. FLORES: Just the two internship, aren't  
10 they? Just two internships are with Harvard?

11 MS. O'NEILL: Just -- yeah, just two interns  
12 right now, yes. So it's really - it's really a pilot that  
13 we're doing this year and we'll assess it that kind of the  
14 midpoint of the year to determine if we may want to -- to  
15 expand that partnership.

16 MS. FLORES: There was another program that  
17 you got rid of for training teachers. Can you explain a  
18 little bit about that training. I mean it seems that you  
19 hire 900 teachers per year so that's a lot of teachers and  
20 so tell me a little bit of it.

21 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah, so that was our Denver  
22 Teach Today program, and that was our alternate route  
23 program that -- that really was an accelerated route into  
24 the classroom, and so teachers went through a very  
25 intensive preparation. The summer prior to them becoming



1 the teacher of record. There -- there were a lot of things  
2 to celebrate about that program including the number of  
3 teachers that we were able to bring in for some of our  
4 highest need subject areas, and the biggest challenge there  
5 was -- was the sustainability of the program and the costs  
6 of the program, and when we launched that program in I  
7 believe it was 2013. You know, the opportunities and sort  
8 of the other routes into teaching and alternative pathways  
9 for -- for individuals who hadn't gone through the  
10 traditional four-year preparation route, were much more  
11 limited than they are now.

12                   So I think in partnership with our  
13 universities and universities on their own have -- have  
14 launched a lot of other ways for -- for individuals to come  
15 in through alternate routes, and so due primarily to the --  
16 to the issues of sustainability that we had as a district,  
17 to be able to sustain that program, as well as just the --  
18 the reality of the landscape now as there become more  
19 programs, led us to the decision to -- to phase out that  
20 program.

21                   MS. FLORES: Thank you. Any other  
22 questions? So I have, actually maybe not a couple, when  
23 you said the cost sum of that program that you've  
24 eliminated, I was trying to think what were the cost.

25                   MS. O'NEILL: Yeah.



1 MS. FLORES: What was the structure that  
2 made it expensive?

3 MS. O'NEILL: So -- So I think staffing  
4 could be because that we -- we really we're in that program  
5 providing the -- the coursework, so -- the field support to  
6 those teachers-

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, you were providing  
8 everything?

9 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. The mentors, the  
10 stipends --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Go it.

12 MS. O'NEILL: We -- we, yeah. We had fully  
13 absorbed the cost of that.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So I -- I do have a  
15 question about your residency program. Only that you  
16 didn't say much about your mentor teachers, how do you go  
17 about choosing them? What are the training opportunities  
18 or, I don't want to say promotional but additional teacher  
19 responsibility, opportunities for that piece of your  
20 residency program? I think it has great potential.

21 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. Thanks for asking about  
22 that, because that is a really important component of it.  
23 So -- so we do carefully select all of our mentors. We  
24 work in partnership with -- with school leaders to identify  
25 mentors. We do use, you know, information that we have



1 available through our leading effective academic practice  
2 or our growth and performance system to identify those  
3 mentors and then, we do provide ongoing training and  
4 support. So the field managers who work with our residents  
5 and support residents also work closely with our mentors  
6 out in the buildings to -- to ensure that, you know,  
7 they're both the mentors are developing and growing in  
8 their leadership capabilities but also that they're  
9 providing the kind of support that residents need. We also  
10 have monthly trainings that we do with the mentors. So we  
11 -- we really do place an important value on that to ensure  
12 that those -- those teachers are developing both themselves  
13 but also, you know, supporting the rest of them.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: So you're sort of creating  
15 teacher leaders at the same time that you are --

16 MS. O'NEILL: It's -- it's -- Yeah. It's  
17 very much part of our teacher --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: -- preparing new teachers.

19 MS. O'NEILL: -- yeah, as we built out as a  
20 district, a more distinct teacher career pathway and  
21 teacher leadership opportunities. It's -- it's very much  
22 part of that -- that opportunity to work one to one and to  
23 have a resident in the classroom.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: That's -- that's a great  
2 model. Thank you very much. Did you have another  
3 question?

4 MS. FLORES: I did. I noticed that you work  
5 with DU and I know that that's an expensive program. Why  
6 not include UC -- UC Denver, Metro. I -- I mean, I think  
7 those are -- we need teachers. They we're hiring 900  
8 teachers a year, that I can't imagine that DU could fill  
9 all of that for you.

10 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah and they --  
11 and they don't and we do have partnerships with them with -  
12 - with UCD and with Metro as well to -- to bring teachers  
13 and we have some work that we're doing around student  
14 teacher residents and -- and partnering really closely with  
15 them and student teachers. So -- so very much, yes, deeply  
16 engaged in partnership with both of those universities.  
17 And with the -- the DEO, there are some- some costs and so  
18 I think, you know, that's something we're really looking at  
19 as we think about how we -- how we expand some of the  
20 really great work that's happening with the residency but  
21 increase the access. We do have, in partnership with DEO,  
22 tuition reimbursement, opportunities, and so, for -- for  
23 residents who continue with the district. They do have the  
24 opportunity essentially to, you know, to -- to pay back or  
25 for us to pay back to reimburse the costs of the program.



1 MS. FLORES: Right. Have you ever thought  
2 about, maybe that a paid internship like a- a fifth year,  
3 where you would take these students from CU and Metro and  
4 do a fifth year really close internship with a -- a group  
5 of students? I mean, I -- I know that that's worked in  
6 other states where I've -- where I've worked.

7 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. I think we're -- we're  
8 open to exploring a lot of things that -- that's a little  
9 bit like what the student teacher residency experience is,  
10 that we're doing with Metro and with UCD, where they really  
11 -- the student teachers in their fourth year actually spend  
12 their -- almost the entire year in the classroom alongside  
13 a mentor teacher and then have kind of one day of  
14 coursework that they're doing. And so -- so I think it is  
15 similar to that model but, you know, as we are really  
16 looking at the pipelines and how do we really, you know,  
17 work closely with our partners but also ensure that we're  
18 getting, you know, the -- the teachers -- the caliber of  
19 teachers, all of that, that we need and want for our kids,  
20 that we're open to exploring a lot of different things. So  
21 I think that would be an interesting model to look at.

22 MS. FLORES: And the one I was talking about  
23 was a -- a fifth -- a fifth year would be -- would be a  
24 paid year working closely within the classroom of a -- of  
25 another teacher where the student gets to get almost most



1 of the Master's program, I mean, a Master's program. So  
2 it's a Master's program but working closely in the  
3 classroom with another really great teacher.

4 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Other questions folks?

6 Thank you very much, Ms. (Inaudible), it's a very good  
7 report. Next time, tell me also about the mentors because  
8 I think -- I think that kind of -- expansion at --

9 MS. O'NEILL: At the Colorado associate with  
10 that looking so much deeper.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: -- the Colorado associate  
13 with enriches. It shows how you've enriched your program.

14 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. We will definitely do  
15 that. Thank you very much.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much. Thank  
17 you Ms. O'Neill and don't move.

18 MS. O'NEILL: Many go ahead and hang around  
19 for a little while, like most of the day, I think.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Most of the day?

21 MS. O'NEILL: Here, we'll trade this out and  
22 I'll just put this over here and we'll just put this one  
23 out then.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So our next -- our next item  
2 is culturally and linguistically diverse needs and  
3 strategies.

4 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you Madam Vice  
5 Chair. This is a follow up to the information item we  
6 presented last month and this is in some -- some respects  
7 in response to our Department of Justice and Inquiry, as  
8 well as just a lot of feedback and needs from across the  
9 state. So I'm going to turn it over to Dr. O'Neill again.

10 MS. O'NEILL: Hello. Nice to see you.  
11 Colleen O'Neil, Executive Director Educator Preparation  
12 Licensing and Educator Effectiveness. With me today is our  
13 Associate Commissioner, Barbara Hickman, as well -- and our  
14 director of English Language Acquisition for Aurora Public  
15 Schools, Jean Burke and so --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Welcome.

17 MS. O'NEILL: -- I'd like to welcome them  
18 for joining us. Based of the conversation that we had at  
19 our last meeting, we were talking a little bit about our  
20 Colorado culturally and linguistically diverse educator  
21 pathway, and there were some critical questions that came  
22 from the Board of Education. We wanted to come back, spend  
23 some time being able to answer some of those critical  
24 questions and also, be able to engage a little bit deeper  
25 about pathways needs district level. So we have invited



1 Jean to help join us today, to talk a little bit about  
2 strategies in your Board packet.

3                   You will also -- were giving them a little  
4 bit of a memorandum that helped address some very specific  
5 questions around our culturally and linguistically diverse  
6 and, or our ELL population. And so we wanted to be  
7 prepared today and we stand pretty much at the ready today,  
8 as well, to answer any questions that you have around that  
9 memorandum of understanding, or to be able to really  
10 further elicit insight into the need at the district level,  
11 the strategies that we talk about when we talk about an  
12 English language learners and all educators and, or any of  
13 the data around the specific ELL outcomes as it stands  
14 today. So for the most part, we are here to engage in a  
15 conversation and help answer any questions that may have  
16 come forward from that memorandum of understanding.

17                   MS. SCHROEDER: Colleagues. I think there  
18 were concerns about the proposal. Maybe, can -- can --  
19 could we put up some of the basics?

20                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21                   MS. O'NEILL: I think let's go -- let's go  
22 ahead and open up that memo that sits there and let's go  
23 ahead and walk through it just a little bit. So last month  
24 and -- and you have another memorandum I think in front of  
25 you.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Some of us.

2 MS. FLORES: Oh, some of us? I don't have

3 it.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: No, I don't think we have

5 anything.

6 MS. O'NEILL: We don't have that any?

7 MS. MAZANEC: We only have the memo --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have the first page.

9 MS. MAZANEC: -- presentation of the data.

10 MS. O'NEILL: Well, that's just not going to

11 work out. Okay. I apologize because I thought you have

12 the memo.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Morgan can send that.

14 MS. O'NEILL: Okay, perfect.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Do you want it posted?

16 MS. O'NEILL: Yes, please.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Can I have a hard copy?

18 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah. I'll put it right.

19 MS. O'NEILL: Can you get additional copies?

20 Here's one.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Okay.

22 MS. O'NEILL: So small delay. Hold on,

23 small delay.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: But I think while --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm try -- I'm trying to log  
2 on to.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- we're doing that maybe --  
4 One of the questions that the Board specifically asked last  
5 time that I think we're prepared to answer here without a -  
6 - a PowerPoint is about these strategies that are different  
7 in -- in -- in a classroom of Yale students as opposed to a  
8 classroom of non Yale students. I think we can answer that  
9 right now without number data because that was a specific  
10 issue the Board had, was how would that look different and  
11 what would take place in a specific training if teachers  
12 were to go through those hours of trainings?

13 I think we can address that I -- without a -  
14 - a PowerPoint which is why we have our highly skilled  
15 guest from Aurora Public Schools who can talk about that a  
16 little bit. What would it look like if you were a teacher  
17 with 15 years experience and you were to take a class in  
18 this? What would it look like? What would be different  
19 and what are the strategies? So maybe we can move to that  
20 and -- and get this other data to you as quickly as we can.

21 MS. FLORES: Just to be specific, it would  
22 be teaching English to second language learners.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think we need to make sure  
24 we define the differences. This is not necessarily  
25 teaching specifically only English. This, I believe, we're



1 talking about more probably academic content in a mixed  
2 classroom. So in other words, many -- many -- many of our  
3 classrooms have students who are English learners in an  
4 inclusionary setting with students who are already English  
5 speakers and this is really what those strategies look  
6 like. That's- that's what I --

7 MS. FLORES: Academic.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. I think that's what  
9 we're talking about right now is what that would look like  
10 not what specifically teaching English to second language  
11 students.

12 MS. FLORES: That would be like (inaudible)  
13 and academic learning -- academic.

14 MS. O'NEILL: So we have articulated that a  
15 few -- I'll go back and just kind of refresh our memories a  
16 little bit --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we need to.

18 MS. O'NEILL: -- as we wait for the  
19 documentation. We had articulated a couple of different  
20 pathways around culturally and linguistically diverse  
21 education for our teachers. One of those pathways was kind  
22 of a six hour or six semester hour, which is important to  
23 know, six semester hour pathway that really focuses in on  
24 every teacher, every student in their classroom, which was  
25 what Ms. Hickman was talking about here just a minute ago.



1 So making sure that we were able to really target all of  
2 our students in our classrooms from all of our teachers not  
3 necessarily pull out program but very much in -- in every -  
4 -

5 MS. FLORES: I wasn't talking about  
6 (inaudible).

7 MS. O'NEILL: Yep. So and not -- and not  
8 necessarily around, just linguistic. It was learning --  
9 learning acquisition and language acquisition for all  
10 teachers. So again, I'll go back to kind of the example,  
11 Colleen O'Neill, the English teacher -- high school English  
12 teacher being able to really understand how my -- my  
13 students who come from ELL background and, or a culturally  
14 different background. Again, I think I gave a -- an  
15 example of Somalian refugees coming to the United States,  
16 but Colleen O'Neil is the English teacher really  
17 understanding how students acquire language, understanding  
18 the strategies that I can use to differentiate instruction  
19 around that in a six kind of semester credit hour class,  
20 and a certification.

21 And then also really identifying some of my  
22 cultural competence, and or cultural biases as I go into  
23 that classroom really being able to focus on that. So when  
24 we left our meeting last time, that was one of the  
25 pathways. And I think some of the questions that came



1 forward from that is really, what were those strategies?  
2 Tell me the difference to what that would look like. So I  
3 think that's, if we can address that first and really dig  
4 in which is what Ms. Burke could really help us understand  
5 from a district level. What does that look like for the --  
6 the content teacher in the classroom that is not an ELL  
7 teacher every day. So with that, I will turn it over to  
8 Ms. Burke and put her on the spot --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great (inaudible).

10 MS. O'NEILL: -- for some -- some pretty  
11 specific strategies around what we work with.

12 MS. BURKE: So feel free to interrupt me and  
13 ask me questions because I realize we're both meeting each  
14 other for the first time so --

15 MS. FLORES: So I do -- I want a question  
16 and the question is --

17 MS. BURKE: Can she start?

18 MS. FLORES: -- will everybody take these --  
19 every student who goes through our system takes these too?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is for teachers.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Teachers.

22 MS. FLORES: For teachers, they will all  
23 teachers take this course?

24 MS. BURKE: That -- that is -- that is a  
25 part of this conversation. That is the end result of this



1 conversation with the state Board. We're not asking for  
2 that decision today. That's -- that's --

3 MS. FLORES: That can be done in one course  
4 but, for everybody.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could she continue,  
6 please?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

8 MS. BURKE: Thank you. So let me just tell  
9 you a little bit about my context. I don't mean to speak  
10 for everybody in the State of Colorado but I think I have a  
11 pretty broad context. When, Aurora Public Schools  
12 currently has about 38, almost 40 percent of our students  
13 come to us with a first language other than English, that  
14 has grown dramatically over the past few years, it's kind  
15 of settled out. In layman, in kind of a layman's terms, in  
16 an elementary school, about one out of every two students,  
17 first language isn't English. In our middle schools its  
18 about one out of every three, and in our high school is  
19 about one out of every four.

20 That doesn't mean there aren't also students  
21 in a high school, for example, whose first language isn't  
22 English but who have come to a more fluent stage of  
23 English. But one thing to remember about being a language  
24 learner is you're always a language learner, that never  
25 goes away, right? You're always learning language. Even



1 adults today who've studied languages for many years will  
2 tell you it's all -- it's an ongoing process. So that's  
3 the context of the work. And one of the things nine years  
4 ago when I started and my colleagues with me today when the  
5 two of us started. We really realized that you cannot just  
6 retrofit a program and fit students. If you can't have a  
7 program for English speakers and then just hope you can fit  
8 in the language learners. That you really have to think  
9 differently about the day for a language learner, and all  
10 those changes we make benefit everybody. They're not just  
11 good for language learners, they benefit everybody.

12                   So one of the things that, it's not a matter  
13 of a few simple strategies that I can teach a teacher in a  
14 couple of hours and put up a few pictures in a classroom.  
15 First and foremost, you really have to think about how  
16 you're gonna differentiate for students and those  
17 approaches to literacy and teacher understanding are very  
18 specific strategies. And it takes time for me to teach  
19 them to you, for you to try them on, and then for you to  
20 practice in your classroom. You know, there's also a  
21 difference when we acquire language in your proficiency  
22 level, so you're new at the learning the language, some  
23 people are learning it in more of a level two or three,  
24 some become more proficient with levels fours or fives.  
25 Currently, in the state of Colorado we use the WIDA



1 standards, right? To help guide that. And so you also  
2 have to think about differentiating based on your student's  
3 level of understanding of English.

4                   So cognitively, students have the same  
5 understanding. They come in, Colleen was saying as English  
6 teacher, she's teaching 10th grade English, she's got a 15  
7 year-old student in there. Well, he can't speak English,  
8 his cognitive ability is still there, but how do we tap  
9 into that? And those -- those are, those take a long time  
10 for us to help a teacher understand how to differentiate  
11 for that. One of the other things someone asked is that we  
12 realize too is that language learning isn't just the  
13 responsibility of an ESL teacher anymore. I can't think,  
14 maybe, there are maybe a few districts in the state, but  
15 really, it's got to be everybody's responsibility and we  
16 realize that -- we realize that as well. So --

17                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Can I just stop for one  
18 second and ask you to define ESL verse what -- what we're  
19 talking about so people are clear about the difference in  
20 those --

21                   MS. BURKE: Okay.

22                   MS. SCHEFFEL: -- in those acronyms?

23                   MS. BURKE: ESL is a little more antiquated.  
24 We don't utilize it quite so much but I try to use it  
25 because a lot of my own friends don't understand the



1 vernacular very well anymore. So ESL, English as a second  
2 language, I think a -- a previous model would have been one  
3 teacher who was the ESL teacher in the building. She would  
4 take those kids, pull them, teach them a little English,  
5 and they go back to class. And we thought that was okay.  
6 And I suppose if you only had a couple of students in your  
7 building whose language wasn't, first language wasn't  
8 English it probably worked.

9                   But nowadays, that's not enough, and  
10 certainly not with Common Core standards you cannot help  
11 students access the content knowledge they need to have to  
12 be successful. So you have to have a lot more robust  
13 understandings. So the other reason Aurora, so nine years  
14 ago, we realized our teachers were nowhere near well  
15 prepared. They may have read a chapter in a book, in some  
16 class around diverse learners but none of them had the kind  
17 of background we needed to really support language  
18 learners.

19                   And so we began a condition of employment.  
20 We do have an agreement with the Office for Civil Rights  
21 and with them we came up with a common plan together, an  
22 agreement and those teachers now take courses and we  
23 provide that coursework via Regis University. We've also  
24 worked with Colorado -- University of Colorado Denver to  
25 help provide that coursework.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Questions?

2 MS. CORDIAL: Any questions around that?

3 Deb.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Do you have -- how long have  
5 you been doing it again?

6 MS. BURKE: We've been providing -- we've  
7 been providing as well as supporting teachers to get that  
8 coursework for eight years and it is exorbitantly,  
9 astronomically become expensive and so --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Do you have a sense of -- of  
11 if it is helping?

12 MS. BURKE: I think it makes a difference in  
13 -- at the very beginning especially for teachers to  
14 understand who the students are in their classroom. Many  
15 of them don't even have any, they come to us with  
16 university degrees and they're -- they're qualified people  
17 but they don't have any experience with language learners.  
18 They don't understand when I'm a new learner of this, a  
19 speaker of the language as opposed to someone who's been,  
20 has more, and then I have to make changes in my instruction  
21 to be able to meet the needs of all the kids.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

23 MS. FLORES: Well, there is a program that's  
24 been out there for years. It's called CALLA, it's a  
25 Cognitive Academic Language Learning Acquisition. I don't



1 believe I'm pull out as well. It just takes up too much  
2 time. And the, what we did in Nevada was actually design a  
3 course so that it was, we had kids from all over. It  
4 wasn't just Spanish-speaking kids, they -- they were coming  
5 from Russia, they were coming from everywhere. So it -- it  
6 was to teach English for the teacher to -- to know and take  
7 them at every level. I mean, to teach a specific academic  
8 language that they needed to know, and there are psychology  
9 and cognition has come a long way as far as language  
10 acquisition. So it really homed in on those methods and  
11 strategies, very much strategic for learners --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Val, we need to let people  
13 ask questions, do you mind?

14 MS. FLORES: No, but I'm saying that this is  
15 from --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: We're -- we're addressing a  
17 proposal and I think we need to focus. And I -- I think it  
18 be really helpful if we get that proposal back up because -  
19 -

20 MS. MAZANEC: I agree.

21 MS. BURKE: So there's two things that just  
22 got handed to you.

23 MS. MAZANEC: We won't be able to read this  
24 while we are talking.



1 MS. BURKE: No, I totally agree. It's the  
2 proposal and then also the memorandum that I was addressing  
3 that I was incorrectly said that you had in your hand. So  
4 there's those two things. I will go ahead, and would you  
5 like the proposal or the PowerPoint? Because the  
6 PowerPoint was the summary from the last time.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Folks --

8 MS. BURKE: Do you want --

9 MS. SCHROEDER: -- what would be, what do  
10 you think would be?

11 MS. BURKE: What would be most beneficial  
12 because the PowerPoint had this -- a short summary of what  
13 we were talking about.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry, we're just --

15 MS. BURKE: You're great. No, it's great.  
16 So it would be the PowerPoint from the last time.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Pam, you had some questions?

18 MS. MAZANEC: I do. Thank you for coming  
19 today.

20 MS. BURKE: Sure.

21 MS. MAZANEC: One of my -- my overarching  
22 question and concern is the effectiveness of a cultural --  
23 cultural and linguistically diverse certification. Just  
24 recently we, you know, how is it working for you for nine  
25 years in Aurora doing what you're doing? Because we just



1 recently saw the news that Denver public schools again, did  
2 not meet the mark for the English language learners. And  
3 I'm, that's what I'm most concerned about is what works?  
4 We -- we need to make sure that our, if we call them ESL or  
5 we call them ELL's. Clearly, learning our language would  
6 be absolutely necessary for academic success. So what I  
7 want to know is, does this work?

8 MS. BURKE: That's -- that's a great  
9 question. And I would say we have pockets of some great  
10 success in specific places. I would say we have a couple  
11 of things that have been challenging. Teacher turnover, so  
12 they go through the program and then we lose them for a  
13 variety of reasons. I would say another challenge is not  
14 all of our administrators are CLD-trained and I think  
15 that's something we are trying to rectify now.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Are you referring to  
17 principals?

18 MS. BURKE: That's right.

19 MS. MAZANEC: I just want to clarify.

20 MS. BURKE: Administrators or anyone who  
21 would have a role of overseeing and supervising these  
22 teachers. It wasn't part of our initial agreement, and I  
23 think it was an oversight on our part, and I, we realized  
24 that we really need. So you need an administrator who can



1 support folks, as well as then the teacher training so that  
2 we're all talking the same understandings.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Go ahead.

4 MS. MAZANEC: And so -- so you, are you  
5 telling me that if you have a teacher who is trained and  
6 stays and hopefully you have an administrator that is  
7 trained and stays, you really, that's the secret? Or are  
8 you saying that --

9 MS. BURKE: I don't think it's the only  
10 secret. I think it's an important part of it. I think  
11 you've also got to look at a strong curriculum, an aligned  
12 -- an aligned program and an entire district. There's so  
13 many pieces of that. But in terms of the educator  
14 effectiveness, we -- we can no longer retrofit students  
15 into our English speaking program anymore. We've really  
16 got to look at the holistic piece of it, and what do we  
17 need to be doing more better differently for everybody in  
18 front of us. And I -- I believe many of the teachers we  
19 have, who have come out of the program are stronger for it,  
20 better for it and they're, just their voice of advocacy for  
21 students and families is impressive.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Final question. What is the  
23 biggest challenge? I mean, assuming you have all those  
24 pieces that you'd like. What is the biggest challenge to  
25 success for these -- these learners?



1 MS. BURKE: I do believe there has to be a  
2 systematic, you train teachers, train administrators, and  
3 aligned curriculum, and aligned process for how students  
4 are gonna move through the system and meet the standards.  
5 I think that that's critical. And places and schools that  
6 have that have shown a lot more success than those that  
7 don't. So just to train a teacher and a principal isn't  
8 enough. Then, are there resources in place? Do we have a  
9 plan for how we're gonna work with the variety of  
10 proficiency levels in the building? Those, all of those  
11 pieces have to be there as well. But this is an important  
12 -- an important foundational step. The, when people come  
13 to us without the training, it's just they don't know what  
14 they don't know and it's astounding to me. When we first  
15 start to have conversations around cultural competency and  
16 what it's like to learn through a second language. It's  
17 incredibly eye opening for them. You know, ELL's like you  
18 said they're doing double the work, but teachers sometimes  
19 don't see that at least not at the beginning.

20 MS. MAZANEC: One last question that is  
21 still not clear to me. That, I would -- I would like, I  
22 guess, a little more detail on what the -- the program  
23 teaches. Do we hear that --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Pam.

25 MS. MAZANEC: Is that inappropriate?



1 MS. SCHROEDER: No, I think -- I think, this  
2 is what I was gonna say. I'm wondering if you can give us  
3 an example. We are a citizen Board [OVERLAPPING] tuned in.  
4 But I think in terms [OVERLAPPING].

5 You wanna know what a teacher would learn.  
6 What are they learning that will be really translate to  
7 success in teaching these students?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Thanks, Pam. That's good.

9 MS. MAZANEC: I'm looking for return on  
10 investment.

11 MS. BURKE: Okay. Fair enough. So one  
12 example they would learn is, I alluded to it before.  
13 Students come, when you're learning English, therefore, you  
14 are at a continuum of place where you have to learn the  
15 language. Correct? You may be brand new to the country  
16 and you don't have very much English. You may have lived  
17 here most of your life but you've grown up in a Spanish-  
18 speaking or a different language families so you don't get  
19 access or you've been in the country. So you've got a  
20 variety of levels. Teachers often just read all of those  
21 students or provide the same for all of those kids, and  
22 yet, it's very different what each of them need.

23 And so one of the very first things we do is  
24 talk about what is the difference when you are -- you are a  
25 new or a level one or two, as opposed to what the needs are



1 if your four or fives. How do I -- how do I grade a level  
2 one or two? Had it been my literacy class, he's been here.  
3 How do I -- how do I create something for him to read?  
4 Well, he's not cognitively delayed but he's learning the  
5 language. So what's a fair assignment to give them. And  
6 we talk about those different levels and what do I need to  
7 do to target and differentiate. Teaching is hard work and  
8 teaching with EL's in your classroom is very hard work.

9 MS. MAZANEC: And I suppose we don't -- you  
10 probably don't put them into groups like we did in first  
11 grade in reading groups --

12 MS. BURKE: Well, that's one option.

13 MS. MAZANEC: -- you know, putting into the  
14 level.

15 MS. BURKE: Grouping is one option during  
16 their -- during their English when they are doing their  
17 dedicated time to learn English. There is a time in Aurora  
18 public schools where students have a dedicated time just to  
19 learn English. We do put you by your proficiency level.  
20 You're more comfortable, we can target the instruction, and  
21 we can really help you. That's -- that's a small part of  
22 the day about 40 minutes or a course for a high school  
23 student. But then the rest of the day, I've still gotta  
24 find ways to engage you and help you understand the  
25 content. So yes, we do put kids by proficiency level for



1 part of the day, and then there are other parts of the day  
2 where they -- they are with their English speaking peers as  
3 well as other language learners.

4 MS. MAZANEC: I -- I apologize but it's  
5 still not clear to me.

6 MS. O'NEILL: Madam Chair, can I just make a  
7 quick response to that as well?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Please, yeah.

9 MS. O'NEILL: I -- I think one of the  
10 examples that might work there, and this will sound almost  
11 low level, but we were talking about grading. For a second  
12 language students in a class, they might use there, their  
13 or they're incorrectly. If you were working with strictly  
14 an English speaking student you might grade that  
15 differently because they would, you would expect them to  
16 know the differences in there, their or they're. If you  
17 were working with a student learning English that might be  
18 a slightly different thing if they had contextual knowledge  
19 of what you were asking.

20 Another example I think, because I -- I  
21 still think we need to probably get a little bit more  
22 specific about what happens in the classroom and this again  
23 will sound kind of low but it's a teaching skill. When  
24 you're trying to teach in science for example, where  
25 there's a lot of vocabulary. There is a very specific



1 skill in defining the words that you use, particularly when  
2 you have English learners in class. So that you want to  
3 learn how to use a vocabulary word, define it and use it  
4 again if you have a high number of English learners. And  
5 it's a scaffolding technique that teachers would  
6 specifically learn how to do to make sure that they were  
7 bringing academic content along with English learners.  
8 There are a bunch more that I'm sure that you can  
9 demonstrate. I think we just need a couple more really  
10 specific strategies that teachers would be using in EL  
11 classrooms or mixed classrooms.

12 MS. BURKE: And can I -- one more thing. I  
13 don't think I did a very good job of level setting the --  
14 or framing this conversation today. So I'm gonna go back  
15 just a little tiny bit for a minute, and level set just a  
16 little bit more. We have not as a stakeholder group dug  
17 into the exact content of each one of these six hours.  
18 When we came to you in October. It was really about a very  
19 high level plan of can we continue down this pathway as a  
20 stakeholder group to meet the need that we had talked about  
21 with regard to the fact that we really need to be talking  
22 about how to ensure that all of our kids have an equal  
23 opportunity around education, and we see this as one of  
24 those opportunities for us.



1                   So when we came in October, you will notice  
2 that the plan was definitely not flashed out in great  
3 detail, and the strategies that we were talking about and  
4 the specific course requirements or anything along that  
5 line was not flashed out. It was more along the lines of  
6 is this the pathway that we can continue to investigate and  
7 what some thinking that we really should be keeping in our  
8 thinking caps, because there's -- there's lots more that  
9 actually goes with this planning process. It was more a  
10 high level conversation around, can we continue down this  
11 path with the stakeholders, flashed it out in greater  
12 detail, keeping in mind your concerns and some of the  
13 really clear artifacts that we need to bring back, and have  
14 our plan as we go forward. From that, it's there were just  
15 a lot of questions which were incredibly wonderful  
16 questions for us to kind of go back and think about. We  
17 are still to be perfectly honest in that phase of we don't  
18 have the detail. So I think what -- what -- when we talk  
19 about the strategies, I think we have not dug down so  
20 deeply for the six, you know, credit hours of a  
21 certification to say, "This would be exactly what it is.  
22 We have a whole list of standards that are endorsement  
23 outlines, and the criteria and the strategies around  
24 that."



1                   But this would be something very different  
2 that we haven't done, and I think where we were really  
3 headed was is it something that the Board can support us to  
4 at least continue to investigate, knowing that we would  
5 have to come back with stakeholder recommendations. Very  
6 deeply ingrained into the exact things that Gene was  
7 talking about with regard to the strategies. So I didn't  
8 do a very good job. I'm gonna try not to hit my  
9 microphone, knock it off on the table. I didn't do a very  
10 good job of setting that up at the very beginning.

11                   So really today, part of the outcome is  
12 taking all of the critical questions that we have. Taking  
13 them back to the stakeholders. If this is a pathway that  
14 we want to continue down. If we are really concerned as a  
15 Board about the pathway as a whole, I think that's -- is --  
16 then we really want to know that and then we really want to  
17 shift directions very quickly. And so I apologize for not  
18 doing a little bit more level setting and certainly not  
19 having the memo in front of you that you needed to make an  
20 informed decision. So with that I'll go back answering any  
21 question.

22                   MS. SCHEFFEL: Do you have any question too,  
23 Joyce? Joyce was next.

24                   MS. RANKIN: Thanks for being here, Mrs.  
25 Burke.



1 MS. BURKE: Sure.

2 MS. RANKIN: I have a concern about -- you  
3 are extremely experienced in this, and you say that when  
4 the administrators and the teachers are all in line the  
5 children succeed exceptionally well. Do we have some tests  
6 or some evaluations or assessments as to prove that?

7 MS. BURKE: For the kids or for the adults?

8 MS. RANKIN: For the -- the -- for the  
9 students that are being taught by those adults that have  
10 been through this type of program.

11 MS. BURKE: So one of the things you want to  
12 look at would be your growth on access, that would be one.  
13 One place to look, are we making growth with students  
14 academically and for their actual language acquisition?  
15 That would be one piece. Their achievement data would come  
16 through a variety of places part being one, one of those.  
17 One thing to remember that achievement tests aren't  
18 necessarily written for language marks, that's not their  
19 purpose. So we take a -- we take a look at that at the  
20 access data to see where that is overall and our students  
21 making growth, but it's not in isolation, right? It's --  
22 it's complicated, and I'm not trying to evade your question  
23 it is complicated. But you've got to take a look at all of  
24 those pieces together.



1 MS. RANKIN: And -- and I -- I hear you and  
2 I -- it seems extremely complicated especially with  
3 multiple language.

4 MS. BURKE: Exactly.

5 MS. RANKIN: But when it's so expensive, we  
6 have to weigh the benefits and -- and a- since money is so  
7 tight it -- it's a critical issue as to the success of  
8 programs that are doing this.

9 MS. BURKE: I -- I don't think giving  
10 teachers better information and tools, I think that is good  
11 use of our dollars.

12 MS. RANKIN: I've seen. I believe.

13 MS. BURKE: I do believe that's a good use  
14 of our dollars and I believe that it's a hard job, and they  
15 come out of a four-year program with the degree and they're  
16 eager and enthusiastic, but it's quite honestly not enough.

17 MS. RANKIN: But it would be the same  
18 program for the teachers regardless of the languages that  
19 are in their classroom, is that correct?

20 MS. BURKE: That's correct, but we would  
21 beef it up with these -- with this other licensing  
22 requirement.

23 MS. O'NEILL: And I will jump in for just a  
24 moment. The strategies that we have are all evidence based  
25 strategies that we used. I'm happy to invite Morgan



1 (inaudible) to give us more or we can certainly answer  
2 later as well.

3 MS. RANKIN: Are we that far along?

4 MS. O'NEILL: We're that far along in the  
5 State of Colorado with our culturally and linguistically  
6 diverse. So we definitely this is not something that is  
7 new to us at all. We have had a CLD department for a  
8 number of years that really focuses on those strategies and  
9 under ALPA and the funding methods that support that, and  
10 then the work that the CLD team does. There are  
11 significant research based, evidence based strategies that we  
12 search, but evidence based strategies that we utilize that  
13 would be part of this that our departments of higher or  
14 institute higher education also used. So we can do quite a  
15 bit more education around that, and those strategies and  
16 demonstrate the evidence that supports the strategies.

17 MS. RANKIN: Those would be the ones?

18 MS. O'NEILL: I think that's maybe the  
19 questions at hand, what's the evidence that supports the  
20 strategies? Certainly again, we can have that -- would you  
21 like to have that conversation now or would you like us to  
22 kind of we want to bring it back with some information.

23 MS. RANKIN: Specific questions.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, I -- I -- you answer.

25 MS. BURKE: What we're looking for. Okay.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Just stay here.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, don't go away.

3 MS. BURKE: Takes a whole team to help  
4 answer.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for coming and talking  
6 about this issue. Yes.

7 MS. O'NEILL: We have right now an ELL  
8 endorsement, correct colleague?

9 MS. BURKE: Correct. It's CLD. I'm sorry.  
10 I'm gonna say it's CLD.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: CLD endorsement. So this  
12 discussion is about requiring some of those courses or some  
13 of that content for current teachers getting their first  
14 license, is that right?

15 MS. BURKE: It's that -- yes -- yes, and all  
16 current renewal teachers. So it's really about all  
17 teachers demonstrating that that evidence, the sixth  
18 semester hours is kind of one way if we read through the,  
19 the pathways document. You can also do it in other ways.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: So the court the -- the  
21 content in the sense exists already through the standards.

22 MS. BURKE: Yes.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then universities take  
24 those standards and create courses. So this is about



1 saying that if you're getting your initial license or upon  
2 renewal, you have to take courses that address 10 whatever.

3 MS. BURKE: Yes.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: So okay.

5 MS. BURKE: Yes.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: So -- so that's helpful. So  
7 in terms of your question Pam and others when you're asking  
8 specifically what it is, we can look at specifics by  
9 looking at those standards, because they already exist.  
10 And the question is what kind of courses do universities  
11 develop to -- to impart that information that knowledge  
12 skills and the dispositions associated with it, right?

13 MS. BURKE: That is correct.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. So what we're trying  
15 to decide here is are we going forth on the right path to  
16 require that new teachers or renewing teachers take X  
17 number of hours in order to get some distinction.

18 MS. BURKE: Or demonstrate that.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right.

20 MS. BURKE: Yes. Correct.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, good. So the good news  
22 is we have the content, and it's in the standards. And so  
23 we really just have to decide what we want to require of  
24 new or renewing teachers.

25 MS. BURKE: That is correct.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then some of your  
2 questions about are around what -- what specifics would  
3 universities tie to that, and truthfully we wouldn't say  
4 that, because universities will take that information and,  
5 you know, of course at Denver would look a little different  
6 than the one that the viewed but they'd be aligned with the  
7 same language in the standards, right?

8 MS. BURKE: You just did a wonderful job of  
9 -- I'm like -- So Dr. Scheffel, I'm gonna trade you, no,  
10 I'm so not trading your spot. But I'll sit over there and  
11 -- no, thank you very much for outlining. You are correct.  
12 That is where we're trying to go, yes.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so in terms of the voting  
14 on this we're not doing that as information item, but you  
15 need kind of marching orders as of what?

16 MS. BURKE: I would -- today would be great.  
17 And we've been working with this for about a year and a  
18 half now, and actually since 2011. So if we kind of go  
19 back to that timeline, we've been having the conversation  
20 around, how do we better support our -- our yields  
21 holistically. So we've been having that conversation. So  
22 it was really -- in October and today, it was really can we  
23 continue down this path to engage more stakeholders larger,  
24 bigger, stronger conversations to be able to gather the  
25 information to come back to the board with more collective



1 thought around it, and the blessing of kind of, yeah, talk  
2 about these pathways and comeback.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so the real issues, I  
4 just want one more con, would be for the universities. Do  
5 we have room in our curriculum to add these additional  
6 courses?

7 MS. BURKE: I think there's a couple of  
8 issues there. One is absolutely that one is how do we  
9 create that room, and that's a conversation that we need to  
10 have with our institutes higher education. The other one  
11 is at the district level where we already have professional  
12 development that's happening there, around our culturally  
13 and linguistically diverse in conjunction with the exact  
14 standards that we already have. So that's another one. So  
15 where we would wrestle with the institutes a higher ed,  
16 we'd be wrestling a little bit with that conversation at  
17 the district level, and then the other one is how does the  
18 Colorado Department of Education and specifically our  
19 Office of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse help  
20 support this initiative as well. How does that happen?  
21 Because we've already talked about the cost burdens, so  
22 yes.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: But wouldn't the cost burden  
24 be borne by the universities, less by the district except  
25 and really be by the teachers renewing.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 1: Yeah. I mean, that's  
2 what all teachers are.

3 MS. BURKE: It would be --

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then the university.

5 MS. BURKE: -- twofold writing. It could be  
6 the university bearing costs. It also is because the  
7 applicant pays for, our educator pays for those university  
8 courses, and our districts pay for the renewing credits  
9 that they offer in many cases. So there is -- there is a  
10 cost burden that we would want to have a conversation  
11 about.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Wouldn't -- Wouldn't --  
13 Wouldn't it be the same cost burden though because people  
14 have to take X number of credit hours to get renewed. So  
15 the question is in what? Now, we would be doing is saying  
16 we're requiring you to take X number of hours in this  
17 content.

18 MS. BURKE: It is a shift. That is correct.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: So it's really a shift in  
20 what our direction, not in the cost.

21 MS. BURKE: Not necessarily the cost and  
22 you're correct. Today, that we all incur those costs as  
23 educators to renew, and or to get our initial license. So  
24 that is true. Thank you.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So but we wouldn't get rid of  
2 the ESL endorsement.

3 MS. BURKE: That the CLD. Absolutely not.  
4 So the pathways that we had articulated was a six credit  
5 hour that's a certificate level for all educators, which I  
6 will also tell you many of them already meet because of the  
7 professional development that's happening at the district  
8 level, and the support that the cultural and linguistic --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 1: So the district --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: The districts can -- can get  
11 certificate? May I continue?

12 MS. BURKE: It would be at the district  
13 level that they could help support that. So the six hours  
14 and then we have the 12 hour pathway as well as a  
15 certificate. The certificate would still come from the  
16 department, so that it is on their license so that we don't  
17 have the problem of gene has trained them in APS, and then  
18 they moved to Burlington. And there's no, you know,  
19 there's not really a demonstration for the teacher. This  
20 is we want to make sure that they're very clearly.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. So it's -- it's going  
22 to be at the University because Gene is one person in  
23 Aurora. And so everybody's going to take the six hours.  
24 And I guess my issue is will it take away from those people  
25 who are really trying to be specialist and not someone who,



1 you know. I mean, I- I believe that everybody every  
2 teacher should be able to teach to ESL students because our  
3 state is -- is how it is. I mean, we have so many students  
4 all over the state that need this help but --

5 MS. BURKE: Thank you -- Thank you for the  
6 question. It will not take away from our CLD endorsement  
7 specifically. We still have a very clear criteria  
8 associated with the need for our CLD and endorsed,  
9 specifically endorse. This absolutely is what you said  
10 about your last comment is that all teachers really need to  
11 be able to teach our ESL students, and hone in on those  
12 strategies that support. So yes.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: And the pull out program in  
14 our state is not an answer. So let me just see if I -- if  
15 we can clarify this. There will be some districts that  
16 will provide six credit hours --

17 MS. BURKE: They will have --

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- in this area?

19 MS. BURKE: They were absolutely have an  
20 option --

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: They already do, and they'll  
22 have the option and we will certify for their license. But  
23 other districts that are -- particularly those districts  
24 that are smaller, what opportunities do we have to help



1 those teachers because they have that challenge? I think  
2 anyway they can do to -- at a realistic cost.

3 MS. BURKE: I think that's where we're  
4 continuing to explore what the Colorado Department of  
5 Education can do. In conjunction with our CLD that we  
6 already kind of offered for our Elba funding. And I  
7 apologize English Language Proficiency Act Funding. So  
8 that's -- that's part of the conversation as well. Gene  
9 just pointed out that on page five of the document, the  
10 CLD. Culturally -- Colorado's Culture and Linguistically  
11 Diverse Education path. If you look at page five, the very  
12 bottom of that document. I apologize it is not on our  
13 PowerPoint, kind of talks about the hierarchical structure  
14 of the pathways, and how you could reach some of those.

15 So it could be either through art  
16 demonstration of competency that you already have, because  
17 many of our veteran teachers have already taken this, they  
18 already have it. It could be through the districts,  
19 because they provide an extensive amount, could be through  
20 the Colorado Department of Education. And there is a very  
21 strong call from our stakeholders right now to articulate  
22 some online supports especially for our rural districts and  
23 how would we do that. It could be partnering with an  
24 institute of higher education. It could be partnering with  
25 both these or it could be holistically supported by the



1 Colorado Department of Education. We're coming at it from  
2 a very -- and the stakeholders have been incredibly vocal  
3 about the needs to come out it from a multitude of  
4 pathways, because you're right. The small districts simply  
5 cannot meet those needs at that level.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: I have another question.

7 MS. BURKE: Sure.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Question. The question is,  
9 do you have a stakeholder group that is -- I'm -- I'm not  
10 talking about people who work with ESL. You mentioned that  
11 there are administrators who don't have any ESL background,  
12 but who are teachers who work in ESL, who are working with  
13 students in ESL. Because, I mean you need those teachers  
14 in there. We don't need administrators who hackwork with  
15 teachers who teach ESL.

16 MS. BURKE: We need the teachers.

17 MS. FLORES: But we need teachers. ESL  
18 trained teachers. And -- and would you say the majority of  
19 those teachers are in your group or?

20 MS. BURKE: I would say right now because we  
21 are still in a draft development phase, we have, yes we  
22 have the voice of those teachers, again this is part of the  
23 process as a whole of being able to really, if we go down  
24 this path, there's -- there's a lot more communication and  
25 feedback that we would wanna have from a multitude of



1 stakeholders, including those folks. This actually would  
2 be a rule change eventually that would have to come to the  
3 Board of Education for some rule adoption. So it would go  
4 through the very formal rule making process as well, which  
5 would garner us some more feedback. So right now I would  
6 say yes we have the voice, do we have enough? No.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Commissioner.

8 MS. FLORES: And my other question had to do  
9 with the -- the institutions. If the institutions are  
10 certainly doing a CL -- LD of and I'm talking about the  
11 University of Colorado, Boulder, Denver, all the other  
12 universities around the state, they would then take two of  
13 the courses, which I mean, I'm thinking of a couple of  
14 courses like Acquisition, Methodology and Teaching ESL that  
15 they would have everybody take those courses. Yeah, I'm  
16 not talking about, you know, I can see these institutions  
17 saying well, we'll do this over here in this class, we'll  
18 do a little bit in this class but actually teach those  
19 courses to all teachers.

20 MS. BURKE: That would be indeed part of  
21 that and our Institutes of Higher Education would have the  
22 opportunity to define how that looks, they would absolutely  
23 be held accountable for meeting those standards for every  
24 single teacher. And I do think that's important. That was  
25 a question the Board asked last time, are we talking every



1 single teacher? And our answer was we believe this is  
2 important for every single teacher in the State of  
3 Colorado. That's, that has been the philosophical belief  
4 to today. Again is, that's a conversation piece with the  
5 Board and with more folks as we continue forward down this  
6 bill.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Madam Chair.

8 MS. FLORES: And now I'm gonna ask another  
9 question.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Can -- can somebody else ask  
11 the question for just, can you just hold the question?

12 MS. FLORES: Well, this is a corollary  
13 question. Yesterday the Department of Education, the US  
14 Department of Education came down with rules and said that  
15 they were going to be grading institutions of higher  
16 education on how their teachers did. Now, if they train  
17 the teachers but let's say right now they have to take it  
18 from her, from you I'm sorry Jean, they have to take it  
19 from you and they have to take it from you know other  
20 people, other districts and such, would the university then  
21 be called down if they're not doing, if four years from  
22 now, the Department of Education came down and said to  
23 Colorado, "Hey you're not doing a good job on that, even  
24 though you said you were going to work on it and you did  
25 put something in place but it's not working."



1 MS. BURKE: Well. So I'll be honest, we  
2 have not engaged in that conversation since the rules just  
3 came out yesterday. We haven't gotten very deep into that  
4 with the Department of Higher Education because we  
5 authorized, co-authorized that, so the next steps will be a  
6 stakeholder group meeting and more conversation around what  
7 does that mean for us, and for our -- our opportunities for  
8 authorization and re-authorization of by AGs.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Commissioner.

10 MS. ANTHES: Yes, Madam Chair. I -- I just  
11 have a suggestion for progressing forward on this. First  
12 of all apologies that you did not have this sort of lengthy  
13 memo in front of you that has the data and the strategies  
14 in front of you. My recommendation would be for us to end  
15 this presentation at this point, let you all read that  
16 memo, digest some of that and then we schedule some follow  
17 up questions, you know answer any questions, we also reread  
18 the, re-listen to the tape that Dr. Scheffel. So  
19 eloquently summarized this conversation and -- and make it  
20 really clear the outcomes we're looking from you. I  
21 realize this -- this wasn't as clear today so that would be  
22 my recommendation for moving forward.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: I think the other challenge  
24 was that because there was a lack of specificity in what  
25 this actually is for those of us who are not, who don't



1 really know what this means. It made it a little bit  
2 harder for us to wrap our arms. So I think we're getting  
3 there to the extent, I ask this all the time, to the extent  
4 that you can give examples, I think it helps all of us to  
5 understand better.

6 MS. FLORES: And I think we understand  
7 strategies. So if you could detail the strategies, we  
8 would appreciate it.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Jane. Do you have -- do you  
10 have a technical problem? Sorry.

11 MS. GOFF: I was just gonna say, I think  
12 what you're saying is detail strategies but I think really  
13 if the standards are robust, this -- this decision is  
14 really about, can we require newly licensing teachers and  
15 currently license who are renewing to take specific types  
16 of courses? If you look at the nature of the courses or  
17 the credit hours, what they can get credit for right now is  
18 fairly general. What this does is insert inside of that  
19 specificity for yes, while you're getting renewed or  
20 initially licensed, you have to take this content at least  
21 six hours of it or whatever.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: And how soon. For example.

23 MS. GOFF: And that's really where our  
24 decision point comes, it's up to the universities and the  
25 students and the people offering these courses such as in



1 Aurora, to look at those standards and develop great robust  
2 professional development. And -- so I think if your issue  
3 is well we don't have strong contents, we can -- we can  
4 look at the standards. Right. Well that would be  
5 interesting but I'm just saying our -- our role is - this  
6 is our role.

7 MS. MAZANEC: That's not the issue right  
8 there but can we give her -- how many hours you have to do  
9 for renewal?

10 (Overlapping)

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So it is only six.

12 MS. BURKE: It is only six.

13 MS. MAZANEC: So basically we're totally  
14 renewing teachers?

15 MS. BURKE: Some renewing teachers, and --  
16 and we've actually asked for multiple years that this would  
17 be part of their curriculum, so that it wouldn't have to be  
18 just in a five year span. We actually have a 10 year time  
19 line, associated with that. And so, lots of conversation  
20 around that because we heard exactly the same thing Pam is,  
21 are you kidding me? I have to do just that? And how soon  
22 because I just renewed my license two months ago. And so,  
23 you know, where do I -- where do I get on or I renewed it  
24 three years ago, how do I get onto that track and right  
25 now?



1 MS. SCHROEDER: But Doctor how many teachers  
2 do you see renewals for that have a whole lot more than six  
3 hours?

4 MS. BURKE: A significant number.

5 (Overlapping)

6 MS. BURKE: I would say they take more.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Professionally I think my  
8 limited experience is the majority of teachers are always  
9 learning new stuff and they're gonna be engaged in  
10 coursework that follows their own passion, as well as  
11 probably being willing to -- to learn this. Jane. Sorry.

12 MS. GOFF: Thought questions mostly and I  
13 think as the conversation continues either among ourselves  
14 or among the higher ed people that will be working on this,  
15 we have our division on this just culturally and  
16 linguistically diverse. I am not hearing the cultural part  
17 of this. I think this has an awful lot to do with language  
18 acquisition, and a recognition of how key that is to having  
19 that be successful.

20 Some general questions and I -- I would add  
21 this to our list of last time. Do we have any idea or can  
22 we get an estimate without a lot of -- a lot of trouble, of  
23 the number of EL teachers are already CLD certified people  
24 whatever data we might have that have had the actual  
25 personal experience of learning another language. And



1 whether or not, that has come up yet in the conversations  
2 about what would be thoughts among -- among higher ed about  
3 making that part of a six hour credit program, or some part  
4 of a course that is -- is dealt with addressed in teacher  
5 prep or in professional development for renewal. I -- I  
6 think I should be able to, I -- I -- I haven't had to do  
7 this for a while, illustrate and I will not do it today,  
8 there's -- there's just so much complexity involved in  
9 learning another language.

10                   And what, when we're talking about adding on  
11 the layer of academic vocabulary, on the other level of  
12 another language when the -- the -- the cultural life, the  
13 life of the person which is always reflected in language  
14 and vice versa, is not established to be something that is  
15 innately familiar to the person. So until -- until I can  
16 here that there has been something to address the cultural  
17 development needs of teachers. Now we have had, we've had  
18 some success in various districts across the state about  
19 Culturally Competent Techniques, and ways classroom  
20 teachers can address some of these on a -- on a higher  
21 level surface -- surface starting level.

22                   But I -- I just, I'm -- I'm an -- I'm an  
23 experienced person in this and I have a strong belief and  
24 conviction that unless a person lives in that culture, or  
25 has some really good idea about what goes on in life, it's



1 going to be very difficult to tune into young kids who are  
2 living that life. And this could be done in -- in a lot of  
3 different ways. I'm -- I'm thinking that at some point,  
4 not now, we'll get into how this impacts licensure, and  
5 what qualifies for licensure, and whether or not we're  
6 going to -- to look at a new way of -- of granting  
7 qualifications to people to teach school. It may not be  
8 our standard, our traditional route. We may be looking at  
9 the 1991 teacher licensure act a little bit differently.

10                   Eventually, I think we're gonna be looking  
11 at that. But I'm just, I'm concerned that we are not --  
12 we're not focusing in on the true human part of this, and  
13 that that makes an awful lot of difference in how people  
14 are gonna acquire the technical part of life which is the  
15 language and the words that we use. Because without the  
16 feeling and the human beingness that comes with the whole  
17 thing of education, we're not gonna make the strides we  
18 need to, and that, that's all I will say on that. So I'm  
19 looking forward to continuing this topic.

20                   MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

21                   MS. GOFF: I just think it's so encompassing  
22 of everything, and, you know, how are we gonna, how are we  
23 gonna successfully teach and help -- and help kids achieve  
24 and meet high standards and expectations in science while  
25 we're skipping a big step there.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Ms. Flores, do you have any  
2 comments on this engagement piece?

3 MS. FLORES: The cultural piece?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: The cultural piece.

5 MS. O'NEILL: I certainly resonate with what  
6 she's asking, I -- I think some of the questions before  
7 were really specific about strategies. You can't divorce  
8 your language from your culture, right? The -- the  
9 language of my home is the language of my heart. That's  
10 who I am. We can't leave that kid out in the hallway while  
11 we teach them English. And certainly that's a huge part of  
12 what we're working very hard in Aurora to do, thinking  
13 about all of our equity work, thinking about kids as -- as  
14 whole. So, I resonate with that. I think you'll see  
15 echoes of that in some of the work the committee's done,  
16 but like Colleen said we've just barely kind of started to  
17 scratch the surface about what we -- what we believe  
18 teachers need to be more prepared for when they -- when  
19 they come out of school, and that's what we're asking.  
20 We're asking that there's some kind of an expectation for  
21 that.

22 MS. GOFF: No I -- I am very grateful,  
23 appreciate everything that's -- that's being proposed here.  
24 I'm just looking down the road a little bit. So as we --  
25 as we look at long term success of these kids, it's -- it's



1 -- it's just innate to what they are as people, and a lot  
2 of that requires a knowledge some -- some awareness, some  
3 developing awareness on the part of those of us who teach  
4 kids to have a pretty -- a pretty good beginning handle on  
5 how literally what their lives are about, and that's why I,  
6 the my initial question is pretty basic. You know, do we  
7 have any information about how many EL teachers or -- or  
8 administrators to have, literally have the experience of  
9 living in or working inside another culture for some  
10 (inaudible).

11 MS. BURKE: It will be an, I'll answer that  
12 just briefly. It would be very difficult for us because we  
13 do not ask those questions of individuals. It would be  
14 more qualitative than it would quantitative at this point  
15 in time. So we can get a kind of a high level estimate of  
16 folks from like healthy groups or EL groups, but it would  
17 be a very qualitative piece, yeah.

18 MS. GOFF: No, I understand, you know, I  
19 just wondered if, sometimes --

20 MS. BURKE: But it's a good question I  
21 appreciate it.

22 MS. GOFF: Anecdotally, things come out when  
23 people talk about their experience.

24 MS. FLORES: Dr. O'Neill, would looking at  
25 the standards help us? I me, I think we're expressing an



1 interest to get a little bit into the weeds which is not  
2 usually what we wanna do but in order to understand better.

3 MS. O'NEILL: Sure.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Am wondering if that  
5 wouldn't help us?

6 MS. O'NEILL: I think it would. They do  
7 appear in the document on page nine,.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: That we -- that we can read.

9 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. The document, the one  
10 actually from last Board of Education meeting, they appear  
11 in that document on page nine, which is the Colorado  
12 Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Educator Development  
13 action plan. The actual standards taken out of the rules,  
14 the Educator Preparation and Licensing Rules begin to  
15 appear on page nine. What, my disclaimer around that  
16 though please know is that is 24 credit hours, semester  
17 hours of content that individuals need to have. As Dr.  
18 Shuffle had indicated earlier the six credit hours would be  
19 usurped, basically directly from that, some individual  
20 pieces that are, you know, basically the -- the best  
21 practices that we can give to all teachers to really fine  
22 tune that. But that would be exactly yes exactly what we  
23 would be looking at.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Other comments or questions  
25 folks? Thank you very much.



1 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you very much for the  
2 patience as we worked our way through.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: I believe we should be  
4 taking a short break until 10:30 a.m., we have a hearing.  
5 Thank you. The Board of Education will now conduct a  
6 public rulemaking hearing for the rules of the  
7 administration of accountability for alternative campuses,  
8 1 CCR-301-57. The State Board voted to approve the notice  
9 of rulemaking in its August 10th, 2016 Board meeting. A  
10 hearing to promulgate get these rules was made known during  
11 publication of a public notice on August 25th, 2016 through  
12 the Colorado register and by State Board notice on October  
13 5th, 2016. Commissioner's staff prepared to provide an  
14 overview of these.

15 MS. FLORES: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair,  
16 I'll turn this over to Allyson Pearson to take us through.

17 MS. PEARSON: Thanks. Good morning  
18 everybody. I'm here with Jessica Nevels who needs  
19 Alternative Education Campus Accountability work at CDE.  
20 So the notice today or the rulemaking hearing today is  
21 around accountability rules for alternative education  
22 campuses. Alternative education campuses are defined in  
23 statute very specifically in that statute changed actually  
24 last spring, which is why we're doing this change to  
25 rulemaking.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So just for the benefit of  
2 the audience --

3 MS. PEARSON: Yep.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: -- what's alternative campus  
5 just in terms of general?

6 MS. PEARSON: Now, alternative campus is a  
7 school with now 90 percent, used to be 95 percent but now  
8 with 95, 90 percent of students that meet high risk  
9 categories, and those are defined very specifically and  
10 statute it, maybe students who have lost a parent, students  
11 who have been in an abusive situation, students who have  
12 struggled with drug use or their parents have, students  
13 that have been through a lot of challenging experiences.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. Thank you.

15 MS. PEARSON: Thank you. And so, we have a  
16 different accountability system, where we've adjusted  
17 accountability framework for those schools -- those schools  
18 that serve a high population of high risk students. So  
19 what we're talking about today is really just around  
20 aligning the rules with the statutory changes. What we did  
21 decide to do, we talked about this in August, because the  
22 language in the rules was duplicative of what was in the  
23 statute. So we were cleaning up, and we decided that  
24 instead of repeating it all again, just like we were giving



1 the US Department of Education a hard time for that, we  
2 would take that out and just reference statute, there.

3                   One other thing we wanted to talk about  
4 today, you all last December heard from the accountability  
5 work group that was focusing on the alternative education  
6 campuses, and they had some recommendations that were  
7 specific to the Board rules. And you'll hear from some of  
8 them today, that some of them submitted comments as well  
9 about changes they'd like to see there. CDE is supportive  
10 of those changes. The reason why we didn't put them in the  
11 framework's right now is one, we were in the rules right  
12 now, is one that we were focusing on the statutory changes  
13 and two, in order to implement the changes that the work  
14 group came to, we need resources to be able to do that. So  
15 if we put forward and added that to the frame and to the  
16 rules, we wouldn't have the ability to actually implement  
17 them because we don't have the resources here. Jessica  
18 will talk more in more detail about that.

19                   MS. FLORES: Right.

20                   MS. PEARSON: So what we are putting forward  
21 is just really the cleaning, just cleaning up to align with  
22 legislative changes.

23                   MS. FLORES: Jessica?

24                   MS. NEVELS: Hi. Good morning.

25                   MS. FLORES: Morning.



1 MS. NEVELS: I'll talk just a little bit  
2 through some of the comments that we got, you see on the  
3 handout that I've listed all the comments that we got  
4 verbatim from the co-mentors. They submitted them to us  
5 from the EAC community as well as our CDE response. For  
6 the first two comments that came in, most of the comments  
7 could be covered within current statute and Board roles.  
8 The comments were broad enough. There were few specifics  
9 that we can't cover in the current rules, and those are  
10 listed out in those first two comments. And then, for the  
11 third comment, which Allyson introduced was from  
12 stakeholders from the EAC community that are again here,  
13 that are going to speak during public comment, just around  
14 the addition of qualitative measures, as well as a  
15 qualitative evaluation for alternative education campuses.  
16 On the final page of the written comments, I just included  
17 the summary from the Alternative Education Campus  
18 Accountability work group that was held last fall, just  
19 around what additional resources CDE would need to put  
20 forward the qualitative metrics as well as the qualitative  
21 evaluation, and you'll see the specific resources. I can  
22 mention them here. Just be one FTE for the qualitative  
23 metrics development, and then an additional one FTE for  
24 conducting qualitative evaluations of the alternative



1 education campuses, plus a fairly significant amount of  
2 funding going to our side.

3 MS. FLORES: So they need to go to the  
4 legislature for that?

5 MS. NEVELS: Yeah.

6 MS. FLORES: Money.

7 MS. NEVELS: Okay, great.

8 MS. FLORES: Anything else?

9 MS. NEVELS: I (inaudible) none.

10 MS. FLORES: Okay, great. Thank you. Thank  
11 you. Is there anyone here present to testify? And I -- I  
12 do have two names. And then if there's anyone else please  
13 speak up. Michael Epke.

14 MR. EPKE: Good morning. My name is Michael  
15 Epke, I'm a Principal with the New America School campus  
16 located in Colorado. And, regarding these qualitative  
17 inclusions that we are looking for, you know, really I  
18 wanna speak from a personal experience. As a school, we've  
19 long struggled with some of the performance metrics that  
20 are in place even with the optional measures. For the last  
21 two years, however, I brought in an external team to  
22 provide a review of our school and in particular looking at  
23 what we went through last fall and having the same team  
24 come back literally last week.



1                   The learning that happens and the value that  
2 comes by having an -- an external group come in and  
3 communicate with objectivity and with clarity what they are  
4 looking for, what we are putting forward by providing data  
5 on the front end. In particular associated with some of  
6 the opportunity measures that many alternative schools  
7 really push for. The -- the team was able to see a process  
8 unfold that began last fall and this is not through, but is  
9 still in the midst of improvement and that's really what I  
10 believe we're looking for in all schools. Is improvement  
11 so that students have more opportunity at the end of their  
12 career in school than they did when they joined that AEC  
13 community, and in the case of my particular school, most of  
14 our students have struggled prior to coming and it's the  
15 provision of that opportunity be it night school, credit  
16 recovery, additional supports for social and emotional  
17 needs that really make AEC stand out. Unfortunately,  
18 there's not a clean way to measure that right now.

19                   But an objective team in coming in with a  
20 clear set of guidelines is able to provide at least a  
21 narrative response that I believe we can find value in  
22 within our accountability framework.

23                   MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Martin  
24 Schneider, is that right?



1 MR. SCHNEIDER: Morning, Board Members.  
2 Thanks for the opportunity to be here. Let us have three  
3 good minutes together. Martin Schneider, I'm the Director  
4 at Community Prep school, downtown Colorado Springs, and  
5 will serve approximately 400 high risk youth over the  
6 course of this year in the Springs. CBS is the school that  
7 fulfills the bottom of the safety net in our community.  
8 When students have tried multiple other options, they tend  
9 to end up with us. Consequently, we try to do school in a  
10 little different way to try to reengage them and capture  
11 their motivation and help them to hit the restart button.  
12 It is -- it is daunting and sometimes seemingly impossible  
13 work. If I could cite a study commissioned by West Ed in  
14 California. A few years ago, they looked at the rate of  
15 graduation among kids that have been recovered from  
16 dropping out.

17 And so, the study in summary looked at all  
18 the kids that they studied that have dropped out of high  
19 school. 30 percent of those kids were able to get in a  
20 recovery dropout recovery or an alternative program. 70  
21 percent state dropped out. Of the 30 percent that dropped  
22 out, only 20 percent of them only made it to high school  
23 graduation in -- in a national study. So what's that mean  
24 in real numbers? Every thousand students that drop out, 60  
25 of them will graduate, and that's what the data shows us.



1 So this work that AEC is doing cross the country and in  
2 Colorado particular is very much an uphill climb, which was  
3 the impetus to try and promote qualitative measures for  
4 alternative schools. The working group that met for six  
5 months in 2015 which I was part of, came out with a twofold  
6 recommendation for qualitative measures.

7                   Phase 1 or Part 1 was to adjust the school  
8 framework for alternative campuses to reflect 20 percent of  
9 the measure being qualitative for alternative education  
10 campuses. Phase 2 was what Mike spoke to a qualitative  
11 review system that rotates through schools and gives them  
12 external input and it's part of the accountability system.  
13 I'm here today particularly to promote and push and cajole  
14 for part one, the changes to the -- the FCPA. And so, I --  
15 I fully understand where the department is coming from on a  
16 resource perspective. I want to push for the import of  
17 what these measures can mean to alternative schools. Not  
18 only will they more greatly reflect the reality of the work  
19 of AECs across the state, they will also lead to innovation  
20 and a new set of best practices that AECs are trying all  
21 the time to support that, promote that, and to measure that  
22 can make a world of difference across the states. We  
23 can learn from each other.

24                   And so with that to include just a small  
25 part one out of five, 20 percent. In our measurement



1 system to me is not only fair and appropriate but it's also  
2 something that can make a difference for these 94 percent  
3 of kids that drop out, that never make it, that we can  
4 capture more them by strengthening AECs. I can't say this  
5 strongly enough, how important this is for those kids.  
6 Thank you all for your time.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you, and thank you to  
8 both of you for the comment you've made. Are there any  
9 other people who wanna speak to us? Great. So that  
10 concludes the hearing. Is there any further discussion,  
11 colleagues and or is there motion please? Pam.

12 MS. MAZANEC: I just want to say thank you  
13 very much for coming. And I -- I would just like us to  
14 direct staff to be as flexible as possible with these AECs.  
15 I think that he made a very good point. We have a  
16 population of students that what -- what we can do to help  
17 them succeed in the -- the numbers are daunting. And I  
18 think we need to do everything we can to move in the right  
19 direction. We need flexibility for this demographic or  
20 this population of students, so.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Jane? Oh, go ahead and make  
22 a motion. Oh sorry, you have a question?

23 MS. GOFF: On the crosswalk and a part B on  
24 the right, it says, "Has dropped out of school for excused  
25 or unexcused absences from public school." Sorry, it is



1 on, and -- and they have, you have a paragraph there. Are  
2 there any exceptions to that? Or is that exactly the way  
3 it, I, when we're dealing with these kinds of students,  
4 there's always exceptions to some of these rules here and  
5 yet I don't see any flexibility at all there.

6 MS. PEARSON: So that's the language that  
7 comes straight from the statute about how it's defined.  
8 Are you thinking flexibility in terms of a student may have  
9 of less than four excused or unexcused absences in a month  
10 or 10 in the year and just --

11 MS. GOFF: Yeah. It's still small, you  
12 know, and it's -- you know, not consistent month after  
13 month. I just, that -- that was a little bit of a concern  
14 to me. But if it's in statute what --

15 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

16 MS. GOFF: And then on G below that, it says  
17 has a documented history of mental or behavioral health  
18 issue or has experienced significant trauma or is there  
19 some supposed to be after that?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I can respond to  
21 that. That's just on. There is another letter after that.  
22 I guess that would be N. But that there is no change  
23 required for that. So the order just kind of hangs out.

24 MS. PEARSON: It just is hanging chair, the  
25 -- THE capitals are what changed in the -- from 2016



1 legislation. And so we just put that in the other pieces  
2 that remain the same.

3 MS. MAZANEC: And then on the responses to  
4 written comments a new assessment. Maybe you can just  
5 clarify for me. I thought that a student, we were  
6 responsible for education before their 21st birthday. But  
7 it's something about if they turn 21 before October, how do  
8 we get to that odd date or is that student count? Is that  
9 something that has to do with that? I'm a little confused  
10 on how old they can be when we have to teach them.

11 MS. PEARSON: I mean I don't know all the  
12 school finance pieces, but I do know that it goes up to 21.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. So if they're 21 in  
14 February, then that's all they get up there in February of  
15 their high school senior year or something like. I --

16 Kick them out. They may have to get back to  
17 you on that question. Yeah. There's a living thing talks  
18 planned October. Here it is October 1st on the right under  
19 age 21 on October 1st.

20 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. And I think that what  
21 was in there students under the age of 20 years. That's  
22 what the statute currently.

23 MS. GOFF: So we wanna change the statute  
24 there correct.



1 MS. PEARSON: Somebody -- somebody might  
2 wanna do that to align with the funding. Yeah, I think  
3 (inaudible).

4 MS. GOFF: And then on that left side it  
5 says, "And his parent is a parenting student a pregnant  
6 student or the partner of a pregnant student?" Can you  
7 define partner there?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 4: Father or mother.  
9 Father.

10 MS. GOFF: I'm sorry.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE2: Father.

12 MS. PEARSON: I think that's what -- that  
13 what the, how much it was intending.

14 MS. GOFF: That -- that would be the intent.

15 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, because a mother can't  
16 do it.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 3: Mother is the one  
18 that's pregnant.

19 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 9: Usually.

21 MS. PEARSON: And that -- that was, you  
22 know, we're, in statute defines parent. It says parent and  
23 doesn't, it says pregnant as well but it also says parent.  
24 So we thought that you could understand parent, the parent  
25 of a child that has been born or has not yet been born and



1 incorporate this request or concern into that definition to  
2 that point about looking flexibly.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE2: (Inaudible) parent or  
4 a partner?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 1: A parent would be the  
6 father, correct?

7 MS. PEARSON: Exactly. Exactly.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 1: This seems to be  
9 LGBTQ inclusive?

10 MS. PEARSON: And I don't know what the  
11 intention was from that person who submitted that.

12 MS. GOFF: Anyway, those were the thing, the  
13 questions I had.

14 MS. MAZANEC: And that's what it says, more  
15 gender inclusive.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE2: So as a bit of an  
17 aside, I think we wanna remember that under ESSA, we are  
18 going to be looking at another variable in our  
19 accountability system. However, I believe it's one that  
20 needs to be quantified in some way. Quantified but also  
21 can be a qualitative measure. So when we're working on  
22 that in our ESSA plan, let's be remembering this request in  
23 the, with the possibility there are some, that it's helpful  
24 to have the overlap for both regular schools and  
25 alternative schools.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm just kind of thinking  
2 it's possible that that might, it might -- might move  
3 forward in that direction rather than needing to go to the  
4 legislature to change the accountability rules for  
5 alternative schools. Jane.

6 MS. GOFF: Well, I mean I need -- I need to  
7 get some clarity on what you mean by overlap because we're  
8 talking. As I'm hearing, a lot of different circumstances  
9 with AECs and accountability than we are with regular  
10 schools and I think our fourth, fifth option for our  
11 indicator needs to be something that's scalable statewide.  
12 So whether that's interpreted as all AEC you see state by  
13 which this does or rather it means something unique to AECs  
14 that we're trying to scale statewide. I'm not sure how  
15 that would go. So I just wanna know what the overlaps are.

16 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I think that's a good  
17 consideration for that work group to think about of when  
18 they're looking at the other indicator, how would that  
19 play, plays. We already have some additional indicators  
20 for AECs in terms of attendance and truancy and engagement  
21 measures and other optional measures they can submit to.  
22 There is more flexibility in that framework right now than  
23 we currently have.

24 MS. GOFF: Is that in rules, it not in  
25 statute?



1 MS. PEARSON: It's in the rules.

2 MS. GOFF: Oh, good.

3 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

4 MS. GOFF: Okay. So that does give us --

5 MS. PEARSON: You guys have that  
6 flexibility. We have the conundrum of whether or not.  
7 Federally, they're gonna look at our AEC framework as well  
8 because it is different than our traditional framework, and  
9 interpretation of the ESSA is not totally clear on whether  
10 we're gonna be able to continue federally not because it's  
11 in our state law clearly.

12 MS. GOFF: Okay.

13 MS. PEARSON: But we're just gonna have to  
14 do some work there.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Yes.

16 MS. FLORES: And 20 percent that you talk,  
17 excuse me and the 20 percent that you spoke about. You  
18 said a new set of practices of 20 percent induction by  
19 strengthening. Do you mean that there is a curricular that  
20 would be, that all would have to use that's 20 percent? I  
21 didn't understand that part.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE2: May I? We're not  
23 supposed to interact with those (inaudible).

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Recommendations from  
25 their AEC workgroup that 20 percent of the revised school



1 performance framework for AEC is our recommendation out of  
2 that workgroup were qualitative measures. And that's a  
3 reflection of innovative practices that AECs are currently  
4 doing.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, thank you. Thank you  
6 very much.

7 MS. GOFF: We're looking at the responses to  
8 written comments in that table, current and proposed. So  
9 that's not written into the rules though, right? I mean  
10 where does this go? The percent for academic achievement,  
11 for growth, for engagement and so forth?

12 MS. PEARSON: You're looking at that table  
13 at the end, right?

14 MS. GOFF: Yes.

15 MS. PEARSON: So that -- that's just an  
16 addendum we put to the written comments. That came out.  
17 You all saw that last December. It came from the  
18 accountability Alternative Education Campus, a kind of  
19 workgroup and their recommendations. We wanted to give it  
20 to you in contact since it related to some of the comments.  
21 So those are things that could be changed. But like we  
22 said, those are things we didn't put them forward into the  
23 rules 'cause we don't have the resources and capacity right  
24 now to implement that fully.



1 MS. GOFF: And so, can you say how that  
2 works with implementation and capacity 'cause doesn't that  
3 table just say that the -- the metrics, the algorithm sort  
4 of to determine how the schools are -- are assessed  
5 changes? But does that -- does that take resources because  
6 --

7 MS. PEARSON: So because they added. If we  
8 looked at opportunity measures at the bottom is added as  
9 new additional indicator.

10 MS. GOFF: What is an -- what is an  
11 opportunity like a qualitative measure?

12 MS. PEARSON: Do you wanna talk about that  
13 (inaudible).

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 1: Yeah, the additional  
15 resources would be required through creation of those  
16 metrics of the opportunity measures. There are about five  
17 opportunely measures that were suggested as part of the  
18 workgroup where AECs could select which ones which were  
19 most appropriate for their school. So in order to develop  
20 those measures, we would need some more resources at CDE,  
21 and then to test them out and obviously put in roles and  
22 talk with the (inaudible).

23 MS. GOFF: Are there opportunity measures  
24 that already exist, so you don't have to develop them? I'm



1 just thinking to make these shifts doesn't strike me as  
2 resource intensive, unless you have to develop measures.

3 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I think there's some  
4 existing measures in the country that you could pull from  
5 and how those roll out in Colorado, and how they're  
6 implemented from school to school, and our schools are  
7 using them. I think there just needs to be some research.  
8 Before we put anything in accountability, we wanna make  
9 sure we're doing some research and understanding of what  
10 those measures are and how they used and the burden on  
11 schools and districts to include or if it's an optional  
12 piece. Something as we have staff time we can start slowly  
13 implementing, but it's nothing that we can commit to right  
14 now because we just don't have the staff resources to be  
15 able to do that.

16 MS. GOFF: But does that mean the rest of  
17 the table stays the way it is. Academic achievement is 15  
18 not five. Growth is 35 not 25. Is right?

19 MS. PEARSON: We're at right now.

20 MS. GOFF: So what do we think of that? I  
21 mean because I think what you're saying is this workgroup  
22 suggested these changes. So shouldn't we be thinking about  
23 whether or not are good suggestions and leave the  
24 opportunity to measure peace alone for the moment?



1 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Absolutely, I think  
2 that was part of that conversation last December about this  
3 was what the workgroup was, and if we wanted to have any  
4 changes to the system.

5 MS. GOFF: But it looks like they're not in  
6 the rules, so we're not voting on these responses we're  
7 voting on the rules.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. We're just voting on  
9 the changes. At this time, we are not prohibited from  
10 coming back to this with further discussion. In fact, we  
11 are, I think we're all open.

12 MS. GOFF: Would it be unusual that these  
13 metrics are not in the rules? Or wouldn't -- would it --  
14 would it, wouldn't these metrics saying, in other words  
15 when we do post workforce readiness or whatever we're  
16 saying what percent is growth? Well, or just achievement.  
17 What percent is growth? What percent is achievement? Is  
18 that in our rules or where is that? And so by analogy for  
19 this, where is, where are these metrics? It's not in the  
20 rules then just in our procedures or something? Okay. So  
21 they're not in the rules anyway?

22 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. If you all would like  
23 to come talk about the alternative campus more plus  
24 frameworks more, we could have that conversation.

25 MS. GOFF: Yeah.



1 MS. PEARSON: We're getting a lot of the  
2 AC's, we're getting NC and what the AC frameworks and that  
3 we've got the regular frameworks that we're working on,  
4 it's more of a hand process cause they do have optional  
5 measures. So we could talk about those percentages and  
6 weightings probably for the 2017 frameworks, because the  
7 timing would be really hard to do it for 2016.

8 MS. GOFF: I just think they're really  
9 suggesting some fairly dramatic shifts.

10 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

11 MS. GOFF: I mean to say achievement is 15  
12 and to propose five means that the nature of the population  
13 is really maybe more needy than we thought or maybe it's  
14 just, I don't know, but there's got to be a reason for that  
15 big of a suggestion.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. I think it's an  
17 important discussion that --

18 MS. GOFF: Right. I think so.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: -- we have to dig into.

20 MS. GOFF: I mean, they're just, you know,  
21 these folks --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: And right now, what we're  
23 trying to do is align the rules with the change in  
24 legislation.

25 MS. GOFF: Right.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: And we're acknowledging that  
2 this needs to come forward --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: -- along with 3,000 other  
5 things that are on our agenda for the next six months.

6 MS. GOFF: Okay.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Unfortunately (inaudible).

8 MS. GOFF: Yeah, that sounds good.

9 MS. PEARSON: But I think.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay --

11 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, and to --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: -- not to be forgotten.

13 MS. PEARSON: -- having that conversation.

14 No, and having that along with the ESSA, once we are  
15 getting a little more clear about how we can go forward  
16 with ESSA and REEC, as is in how that all fits together, I  
17 think it will be a really important to have that  
18 conversation.

19 MS. GOFF: So currently, the current  
20 framework will go for this academic year '16, '17, and then  
21 changes could kick in for the next year. And what's the  
22 date by which we'd have to decide so that we could actually  
23 make a change?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: It makes sense for us to  
25 hear what --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: -- from the feds what we can  
3 do before we --

4 MS. GOFF: Make a shift. What would do that  
5 date be like? Fall?

6 MS. PEARSON: No.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: We have a good plan.

8 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. That will be  
10 adoption of the plan.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So is that (inaudible).

12 MS. PEARSON: We want to think about how  
13 much of the detail we want to put into our ESSA plan, but I  
14 think we could have the conversation at the same time, and  
15 I think it's hard for schools and districts for us to wait  
16 until the end of a school year of which they're being held  
17 accountable to make those decisions, but that's what we've  
18 done for the '16. So I think, you know, come this spring,  
19 we'd want to have that decision made in the spring if we  
20 want to change it. If you're going to align it more with  
21 the work group recommendations, I think there's a lot of  
22 support and buy-in for that already since that stakeholder  
23 work was done there.

24 MS. GOFF: So if we could just put it on the  
25 calendar sometimes so that we don't, you know, so for '17,



1 '18, we are able to catch it soon enough to at least think  
2 about these suggestions.

3 MS. PEARSON: Sure.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Folks, I'm ready for a  
5 motion.

6 MS. FLORES: No, excuse me. I'd like to  
7 just ask.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Sure.

9 MS. FLORES: May I have a hard copy of that,  
10 of the indicators? Because I have the rules, I don't have  
11 the indicator responses to comments on new assessment  
12 provisions. Are you sure it's not in the back?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You have it. It's in  
14 your packet.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We all got it. We all  
16 got it in our packet.

17 MS. FLORES: I'm sorry, I don't have it, and  
18 I've really looked.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd be happy to share  
20 mine with you.

21 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She's got it in her  
23 hand. Never mind.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I don't have it.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Folks, can I have a motion,  
2 please? Thank you.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I move to approve the rules  
4 for the Administration of Accountability for Alternative  
5 Campuses, 1 CCR 301-57.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Is there a second?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we ready to vote?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Should we read  
10 the next one about the unanimous vote? Yeah.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: If vote is not unanimous, the  
13 Board will consider approval of these rules at the  
14 September State Board meeting. Does that mean unanimous,  
15 you know, September doesn't work very well. Let's go  
16 November.

17 How about November? Yeah. How about  
18 November?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then we can deal  
20 with the second.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My question is -- is  
22 unanimous what we have here right now?

23 MS. CORDIAL: Yes, yes, yes.

24 MS. FLORES: Did I vote?



1 MS. CORDIAL: No, we haven't called the roll  
2 yet.

3 MS. FLORES: Oh, good because I was looking  
4 over this material that I didn't have.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We did that.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Are we ready to vote, folks?  
8 Any more comments?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we're voting on?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A motion --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we need a  
12 second.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To approve.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes, we had a second.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you, Jane.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jane wants a second.

18 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores?

19 MS. FLORES: I guess so.

20 MS. CORDIAL: Okay. Board Member Goff?

21 MS. GOFF: Aye.

22 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec?

23 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

24 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin?

25 MS. RANKIN: Yes.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel?  
2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.  
3 MS. CORDIAL: And Board Member Schroeder?  
4 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.  
5 MS. CORDIAL: Thank you.  
6 MS. FLORES: I just wanna say that I need to  
7 have all this material.  
8 MS. CORDIAL: We'll make sure you have all  
9 of your materials next time, Board Member Flores. Thank  
10 you.  
11 MS. FLORES: Thank you very much.  
12 MS. SCHROEDER: Our next item. So notice of  
13 rulemaking for the roles for the administration of School  
14 Turnaround Leaders Development Program 1 CCR 301-95.  
15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can start later.  
16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.  
17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We just came so early.  
18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So go ahead.  
19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can be really quick  
20 if you want to be really quick on this because there's been  
21 11:00 a.m. actual time.  
22 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah, another rulemaking  
23 hearing at 11:00 a.m. But we have a minute so we can.  
24 MS. SCHROEDER: I thought we could be late  
25 for rulemaking just not early.



1 MS. CORDIAL: We can.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Am I wrong?

3 MS. CORDIAL: No, you are correct.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Sorry, Madam Chair,  
5 but we are -- not for Madam Chair, me -- I'm the Madam  
6 Chair. Next item on the agenda is the consideration of a  
7 notice of rulemaking for the rules for the administration  
8 of the School Turnaround Leaders Development Program 1 CCR  
9 301-95. So a motion on the table, please?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I make a motion to  
11 approve the notice of rulemaking for the rules of the  
12 administration of the School Turnaround Leaders Development  
13 Program 1 CCR 301-95.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: It's the proper motion. Is  
15 there a second, please?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Commissioner,  
18 the staff prepared to provide a quick overview.

19 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you. This is just  
20 a notice of rulemaking, very quick overview and I'll turn  
21 it over to Alyssa Pearson and Peter Sherman.

22 MS. PEARSON: Hello again. So this is  
23 really we'll just do those quick and dirty of this notice.  
24 The Office of Legislative Legal Services, OLLS reviews our  
25 rules every year that there's a change. And reviewing the



1 rules, they had a question about the RFP, the Request for  
2 Providers, for the Providers for the School Turnaround  
3 Leadership Development Program, and they wanted to make  
4 sure that there was a differentiation in the rules around  
5 Providers applying just to be Providers and Providers that  
6 were applying for funds.

7                   We had that differentiation in our RFP, but  
8 they wanted to see it in the actual rules. So we've added  
9 in language to the actual rules that mirrors what we're  
10 doing in the RFP. You all saw that draft RFP that got  
11 emailed to you a little bit ago, probably a month ago, I  
12 think now. So this is just cleaning up and putting those  
13 details into the rules that OLLS asked for. In addition,  
14 we changed one of the dates in the rules just to work on  
15 timing that works better with Providers and all that.

16                   MS. SCHROEDER: Give folks more time.

17                   MS. PEARSON: To give folks more time to do  
18 it. So that's what this notice is about.

19                   MS. SCHROEDER: Colleagues, do we need to go  
20 through the PowerPoint that staff prepared? I'm sure we've  
21 all read it. Are there any questions about this?

22                   MS. PEARSON: The other thing we thought  
23 we'd offer if you all want more details on the program  
24 itself and kind of putting both of those things together in  
25 this PowerPoint, where we could spend some time in a future



1 board meeting, really talking about the Turnaround Leaders  
2 Development Program and who's been participating in what  
3 we're seeing out of it. If you guys would like that in the  
4 future, we can have that conversation.

5 MS. FLORES: And this is for leader to the  
6 Charter Schools?

7 MS. PEARSON: This is for all leaders in  
8 Colorado of Priority Improvement Turnaround Schools.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there a program at  
10 the university for this, at the universities?

11 MR. SHERMAN: This is a Grant Program that  
12 as Alyssa said, supports providers. And then there's a  
13 latter part of the Grant Program that where we issue awards  
14 to districts and to Charter School Leaders to attend the  
15 identified programs.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Questions, Jane?

17 MS. GOFF: Just remind your technical, the  
18 request to change the date, the grants are still effective  
19 for the following school year, right? So they're still set  
20 up on a traditional school year start cohort groupings.

21 MR. SHERMAN: Correct.

22 MS. GOFF: And then is there a particular  
23 time of year when we get a report, an annual update? I  
24 know we've had one recently, I can't remember if you all  
25 have a regular expected date.



1 MR. SHERMAN: We're just finalizing that  
2 report and as Alyssa said, we'd be glad to share that with  
3 you in a future meeting. Or just get it to you.

4 MS. GOFF: Just trying to keep mine, yeah.

5 MS. PEARSON: No, I know. There's so many.

6 MS. GOFF: So this would be Peter for the  
7 results of it from last school year. So in other words,  
8 this '15, '16 school year would be --

9 MR. SHERMAN: That's correct.

10 MS. GOFF: -- what we hear about?

11 MR. SHERMAN: That's correct.

12 MS. GOFF: Okay. Thanks.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Any other questions?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And who are the  
15 providers? And will the universities be able to provide?

16 MR. SHERMAN: Currently, we have six  
17 identified providers that have been approved by the State  
18 Board over the last two years.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who are they?

20 MR. SHERMAN: They are University of Denver,  
21 Catapult Learning Generation Schools, the Consortium of  
22 Promethean and the University of Florida, the University of  
23 Virginia and the Relay Graduate School. We currently have  
24 an RFP out for potentially new providers. We expect that  
25 RFP is open right now. It's due on November 7th. We



1 expect to have a number of applicants. We held a webinar  
2 this morning, and there were seven or eight different  
3 organizations that attended that webinar.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And would again  
5 universities be able to apply?

6 MR. SHERMAN: Absolutely. And there were a  
7 number of universities on the webinar this morning.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. And  
9 Colorado universities?

10 MR. SHERMAN: Correct.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Nobody.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Any other questions, folks?  
13 Colorado State Board -- go ahead.

14 MS. CORDIAL: That's for the next rulemaking  
15 hearing.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This one is? Okay.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So I think we have a motion  
19 on the table, do we not? This one. In a second. Does  
20 anyone object? Bingo. Thank you.

21 MS. PEARSON: Thank you.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: So now, we move to the  
23 rulemaking hearing. The rules for the Administration  
24 Waiver of Statute and Rule 1 CCR 301-35. Colorado State  
25 Board of Education will now conduct a public rulemaking



1 hearing for the rules for the administration of the Waiver  
2 Statute and Rule 1 CCR 301-35. The State Board voted to  
3 approve the notice of rulemaking in its August 10, 2016  
4 Board Meeting. A hearing to promulgate these rules was  
5 made known through the publication of a public notice on  
6 August 25, 2016 through the Colorado Register and by State  
7 Board notice on October 5th, 2016. The State Board has  
8 authorized to promulgate these rules pursuant to 22-2-  
9 104(1)(c) CRS. Commissioner of staff prepared to provide  
10 an overview, please.

11 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair.  
12 Actually I will be providing the overview and Melissa Bloom  
13 and -- and Kelly Rosensuite are in the audience to answer  
14 any detailed questions if needed. These are rules that  
15 come before you as technical cleanups again as a part of  
16 our OLLS Office of Legal Services Review. They point out  
17 small technical changes for us to adjust. So one of the  
18 issues around, correction around which State Statutes can  
19 waive or not waive is one of the issues. In addition, we  
20 had a new law passed, House Bill 16-14-22. And so we just  
21 were aligning to that new law. No substantive changes.  
22 The third issue was actually just changing the 90-day time  
23 frame for which staff can provide feedback to districts on  
24 any waivers or plans that come forward to 120 days. We're  
25 just seeing a higher influx in volume of these plans and so



1 allowing more back and forth time between us and the  
2 District would be helpful. We have not received any  
3 comments to date on these changes, and it doesn't look like  
4 anyone's on the hearing.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. Is there anyone in  
6 the audience who wanted to speak to this? All right. So  
7 is there further discussion among colleagues?

8 MS. MAZANEC: What is this 2.06 where it  
9 says, "Limits and requirements for school districts  
10 conducting educational programs outside of its territorial  
11 boundaries," does that mean online? Or what does that  
12 mean?

13 MS. BLOOM: This is Melissa Bloom. I don't  
14 know if you have had the pleasure of meeting her. Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have not.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Deb, would you repeat  
17 that question?

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: I was just looking at 2.06 I  
19 -- and it's in blue. I think it's an addition, and I just  
20 wondered what it was referring to outside its territorial  
21 boundaries.

22 MS. BLOOM: So that part of Statute refers  
23 to, if it can be that but it can also be if district is  
24 running a program in another district's boundaries or it  
25 isn't just limited to online.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So would the rules then have  
2 these limitations and requirements then? Or is it just --  
3 what does this sentence mean?

4 MS. BLOOM: So this part of the rules is  
5 simply mirroring as Dr. Anthes suggested. It's mirroring a  
6 change to State Law that occurred- or excuse me. This  
7 portion of it actually was pointed out by LSS, we had  
8 accidentally in the last revision of these rules left that  
9 Statute off the list of things that were ineligible for  
10 waivers. So LSS pointed that out to us, and we've now just  
11 added it back into the list of things that districts cannot  
12 waive.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

14 MS. BLOOM: Yeah.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: May I have a motion, please?

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: I moved to approve the rules  
17 for the administration of the Waiver of Statute and Rule 1  
18 CCR 301-35.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: That's a proper motion, is  
20 there a second?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. And again, if a vote  
23 is unanimous, we will finish this today, otherwise, we'll  
24 bring it over to the November meeting. Are there any



1 objections to this motion? I'm trying to learn it from  
2 Steve how to do this quick (inaudible). Thank you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

4 MS. BLOOM: Thank you.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much. 7.0  
6 says lunch.

7 MS. CORDIAL: So we have --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Nice.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Bizy?

10 MS. CORDIAL: You have an option to do  
11 either take a 30 or so minute lunch break or take 15  
12 minutes into a working lunch and have that ESSA  
13 presentation happen while you're --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Colleagues?

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Joyce is ready.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, okay.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: We need to see if Joyce --  
18 let me know.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So how about we get  
20 our --

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'd like to move ahead if we  
22 can. Whatever we can do.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. I still -- do we  
24 still have to wait until 1:00 p.m. --



1 MS. CORDIAL: Yes, we do have to wait until  
2 1:00 p.m. and 1:15 p.m. or 1:15 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. for the  
3 rulemaking hearings.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry.

5 MS. CORDIAL: But those two --

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, actually these things  
7 like 10:00 a.m. instead of 1:00 p.m.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Shall we get our lunch and  
9 then if staff, starve -- starve our staff and let them come  
10 and talk to us about ESSA?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is our lunch here?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: All right. Let's go have  
16 lunch.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, your call?

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. Please, go have lunch.  
19 Get your lunch, bring it back, I guess is what I'm saying.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we need to get your  
21 lunch, bring it back? (Inaudible).

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Was I suppose to say  
23 adjourned?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think so.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think so.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I know.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

3 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah, I just got it.

4 (Overlapping)

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, folks. My alter ego  
6 is going to gavel in the meeting. Thank you. So the next  
7 item on the agenda is an update on the Every Student  
8 Succeeds Act State Plan Development. Commissioner?

9 MS. ANTHERS: Yes.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: It's all yours.

11 MS. ANTHERS: Thank you, Madam Chair. We  
12 have a variety of staff here today to give you an update on  
13 all of the workings of the Every Student Succeeds Act.  
14 We're gonna -- I'm gonna turn it over to Pat just to frame  
15 the full conversation, but I wanted to let you know that  
16 Joyce Zurkowski has come back down. We did have a request  
17 from a Board member yesterday, so that's why you did not  
18 get this material prior to just now. We had a request from  
19 a Board member yesterday to provide some information on  
20 first year US English learners. And so Joyce has to catch  
21 a plane a little bit later, so she'll be first on the  
22 agenda. And this is just to give you some initial  
23 information about it, and then we can keep processing it  
24 through out the upcoming weeks. So with that, I'll turn it  
25 to Pat, and then Pat will turn it over to Joyce.



1 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Commissioner  
2 Anthes. So for today, we're gonna do a few things, we're  
3 gonna provide you some updated information regarding some  
4 of the proposed rules that -- some of the rules that have  
5 been proposed by the US Department of Education related to  
6 supplement not supplant and reporting. We're gonna do a  
7 deeper dive into the effect of quality instruction and  
8 leadership, Spoke Committees work related to ESSA. And  
9 then hopefully at the end, if there is time and if there's  
10 not, it's not that big of a deal because it's really at the  
11 end we had proposed to walk you through some of the  
12 physical information and some of the programmatic  
13 information with regard to the new -- the new law in  
14 anticipation of a deeper dive coming back to you in  
15 November with much more detailed information wanting to  
16 kind of get your -- your direction as to what you would  
17 like to hear most about.

18 So if we don't get to those very end slides,  
19 that's okay because we'll be coming back to you in  
20 November. But right now, I'd like to turn your attention  
21 to this, particular the first year in US English learners  
22 slide, and Joyce is gonna walk us through that.

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So as Katy indicated, there  
24 was a request yesterday for us to introduce this topic.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: It was -- it was mine. It  
2 was my request.

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: It was your request?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: It was my request because I  
5 was hoping that this -- because it's an area in which the  
6 state has to make a decision, I would -- and we've been  
7 talking about it. I wanted to give you guys an opportunity  
8 to kind of think about it over the next month to see if the  
9 Board already has a strong opinion one way or the other so  
10 that we communicate with the Hub as well as the Hub  
11 communicating with us, trying to figure out how we continue  
12 to communicate so there are no surprises when the plan  
13 comes forward to us. That's my intent, and I made extra  
14 work for you guys and I thank you.

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: You are most welcome. So a  
16 little bit of background. Historically, Colorado had  
17 different rules regarding participation in English Language  
18 Arts for our first year in US students. Colorado required  
19 all of those students to test and to take the English  
20 language arts test. The federal law did not require those  
21 students to test in their first year. With 15-1323,  
22 Colorado introduced the concept of not requiring those  
23 first year in US English learners to take the English  
24 language arts test in their first year. So for starting  
25 with last year and for this year, districts were given



1 flexibility in terms of whether or not they chose to test  
2 their students. Depending on which path they chose,  
3 different things were intended to happen with  
4 accountability. So I'm gonna run through that first and  
5 then I'm gonna talk about what occurred with ESSA.

6                   So love to bring you a chart. So what you  
7 have here is a chart that basically talks about those two  
8 different pathways. And so you have one of the pathways  
9 that is in very light peach color and another pathway  
10 that's in a light blue color, and it all starts up with the  
11 question of, will students' test in English language arts -  
12 - we're limited to that right now, in their first year? If  
13 students do test in that first year, they are counted for  
14 participation. They obviously do not have a score from the  
15 prior year, so there cannot be a growth calculation. They  
16 are not included in achievement for that first year. When  
17 we look at the students who did not test in their first  
18 year, they are still included in the participation  
19 calculations and they count as a participant as long as  
20 they take the English language proficiency test, Access.

21                   Obviously, there's not a growth score  
22 because they didn't test in the prior year, and obviously  
23 they cannot be included in the achievement calculations  
24 because they did not test this year, right? So the  
25 difference between the two groups in year number 1 is



1 basically whether or not the child sits for that English  
2 language arts test. When we go into year two, the students  
3 who tested in year one, they're still testing. They are  
4 included in participation calculations in that second year  
5 because there's a score from the first year. They are  
6 included in the growth calculation. They are not, however,  
7 included in achievement. And the rationale for this  
8 pathway is -- is that English learners, as they demonstrate  
9 their knowledge of English language arts proficiency, what  
10 we expect to see is a great deal of growth between year one  
11 and year two.

12                   But we fairly do not expect them necessarily  
13 to be proficient, right? Because they're still working on  
14 English language proficiency. For year number 2 -- I'm  
15 sorry, in year number 2, if the student did not test in  
16 year number 1, they need to start testing, right? So by  
17 year number 2, all English learners are testing, they are  
18 again included in participation calculations, they cannot  
19 be included in growth calculations because there's not a  
20 score from the preceding year. Therefore, to be included  
21 in the performance calculations for accountability, they  
22 are included in the achievement calculation, the mean scale  
23 score.

24                   By year number 3, everyone is testing still,  
25 everyone is still included in participation, and now



1 everyone is included in the growth calculations, and  
2 everyone is included in the achievement calculations. So  
3 the biggest difference, again, is first year does a student  
4 test or not test. In the second year, students who tested  
5 in the first year will be included in growth calculations.  
6 Students who didn't test in the first year would be  
7 included in the achievement calculations, and I have those  
8 where those differences are in purple to try to help. So  
9 again, last year and for this year, districts were given  
10 flexibility in terms of which pathway they chose.

11                   ESSA essentially requires the state to come  
12 up with a consistent statewide policy in terms of how we  
13 treat our students, who are first year in US English  
14 language learners. And so there are essentially three  
15 different options for us. Colorado could require all first  
16 year US English learners to take the English language arts  
17 assessment, as we had done historically prior to 15-1323.  
18 Or we could exempt all of our first year in US English  
19 learners from taking the English language arts assessment.  
20 And that would mean that starting in year two, they would  
21 be included in that achievement calculation, that means  
22 scale score, and then they would be added in for growth in  
23 year three. Or we could develop some consistent guidelines  
24 that would be utilized across the state regarding which of  
25 our first year in US English learners would take the



1 English language arts assessment and which of those first  
2 year and English language learners would not.

3 MS. FLORES: Example?

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: An example. I was right  
5 with you. So as an example, we could look at, like, we  
6 have students who are first year in US English learners,  
7 some of whom walk in never having heard a word of English  
8 before, never having necessarily even entered a classroom  
9 before. We have other first year in US English language  
10 learners who are coming with some background in English.  
11 Again, it's not their first language and they're not  
12 completely proficient, but they have some background in  
13 English and they have been in schooling throughout their  
14 past three, four, five, six years.

15 Can we treat those two groups of students  
16 that I'm oversimplifying differently and say that if you  
17 are walking into a US school for the first time and you  
18 cannot understand a word of English, spoken, written,  
19 either way, say those students are exempt from having to  
20 take that English language arts test? But if you have a  
21 certain level of English language proficiency and  
22 educational background, you will take the English language  
23 arts test. If we would go the route -- that route, the  
24 work of the spoke groups would be coming up with exactly  
25 what those guidelines would be. But essentially, we would



1 be acknowledging that not all of our first year in US  
2 English learners are the same.

3 MS. FLORES: Excuse me, you're talking about  
4 two things. You're talking about an English language  
5 proficiency test and then you're talking about English  
6 language arts PARCC test.

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Correct. So all of our  
8 English language learners must take the English language  
9 proficiency test. That's a given. If you are an English  
10 learner, you will take that English language proficiency  
11 test.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: How soon after you walk in  
13 the door?

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Your very first year. So  
15 you actually get screened --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: First year?

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yeah. You get screened when  
18 you walk into the building. Actually, I think you have 30  
19 days.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Thirty days, okay. Thank  
21 you.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: You get screened and then  
23 you participate in Access the very first year that you're  
24 here, and that is a measure of how much English do you  
25 know. What we're talking about here is at what point do



1 those students need to take the English language arts test.  
2 Starting in their first year or starting in their second  
3 year, or do we treat some English language learners  
4 differently than other English language learners when  
5 they're first year in US? I think what you were hoping for  
6 was to start the conversation with your fellow Board  
7 members.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, or at least to have  
9 you think about whether we, as a Board, have a strong --  
10 strong commitment to which of those three. Now on the  
11 third alternative, then each of those different -- the  
12 students will be in two different groups and their results  
13 would be handled then differently in year two and year  
14 three on the accountability. So the rules are the same --  
15 you're right, year two. Correct.

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Thank you.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

18 MS. FLORES: So they wouldn't take it, they  
19 would take it the second year?

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So by the second year,  
21 everyone is taking the English language arts test, yes.  
22 That is required regardless of which of the three pathways  
23 you choose to go. Second year, all English language  
24 learners are participating.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Joyce, talk about the  
2 criteria that districts have used in their decisions to go  
3 either one or two or three that you know of?

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So I will share with you  
5 some of the rationales that have been shared with me. And  
6 again, when the flexibility came through with 15-1323, we  
7 had conversations within our department, we had  
8 conversations with districts about, "All right. Which way  
9 do you think you wanna go?" And what we found is that  
10 there's -- there's a divide in across our districts in  
11 terms of what they saw as most appropriate. So there were  
12 some districts that really valued that growth metric and  
13 did not see the harm in having students sit down in their  
14 first year and said we will do what I refer to as  
15 empathetic testing, which is we would have all students sit  
16 down for the English language arts assessment.

17 But if you have a student who sits down,  
18 opens up the test, and starts to look at it or starts to go  
19 through the screen and clearly is having a challenging time  
20 engaging with it, you can end the testing and say, "We are  
21 done." For other students, you have students who -- they  
22 are able to engage with that test in a more meaningful way.  
23 Again, they may not have enough English language to be able  
24 to effectively answer the question of how well do they  
25 perform in language arts, but they are able to engage in



1 the test in a meaningful way and you can get an answer in  
2 terms of how well are they engaging with English language  
3 arts. And so those districts made a decision to say we  
4 will test in year number 1, and then from an accountability  
5 point of view, we will count growth in our accountability  
6 system in year number 2, then year number 3. Remember,  
7 fully participating. There were other students --

8 MS. SCHROEDER: If a student put his head  
9 down or her head down and did not -- was unable to answer  
10 any question, that's the starting point for growth, which  
11 would be a zero.

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So it's a little bit more  
13 complicated than that.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: That's why I asked.

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So it depends about how much  
16 of the test they actually engage with. Right. So there's  
17 multiple sessions of the test and things like that and  
18 there's a criteria in order to (inaudible). In order to  
19 qualify for growth the student ends up having to at least  
20 get a score. Right. So they have to engage with it enough  
21 to get a score. What districts -- who were saying, we're  
22 going to start with the assumption that all of our kids are  
23 starting -- are going to test, is saying that they had an  
24 oath for those students that they were most concerned about



1 with their ability to engage and that was a, if it's not  
2 working, we'll pull 'em out of there.

3                   For districts who made the decision not to  
4 have them participate in year number one, they again, I  
5 would suggest, were most concerns -- concerned about those  
6 students at the lower end of English proficiency and they  
7 were making a construct argument essentially saying that  
8 their English language proficiency is so low we can't get a  
9 measure of their English language arts proficiency and so  
10 therefore it is not a valuable use of that student's time.  
11 We're not going to have them set. Again, I would encourage  
12 you to talk to, you know, your own districts to get their  
13 point of view. It is -- the people are very strong in  
14 their opinions. And like I said, across our districts, we  
15 had clearly folks who went in this direction and clearly  
16 folks who went in this direction. An then --

17                   MS. SCHROEDER: So this is why it matters?

18                   MS. ZURKOWSKI: Right. And I think frankly  
19 even for both sides who thought that they were going to  
20 make a unilateral decision. What they found out in the end  
21 is, well, actually you know what, I do have this new  
22 student who's a first year in US, English language learner,  
23 but they have an English language proficiency level of  
24 four. I am gonna have them test. I didn't think I would  
25 do that. I -- though it's not the population that I was



1 thinking about. Right, I was thinking about a different  
2 population when I made this decision. And there were, like  
3 I said the other districts who said we will start to test,  
4 they did have some kiddos that they ended up not testing  
5 cause they saw it. You know what, the student just arrived  
6 a week ago, has not had any exposure to English, has not  
7 had exposure to a classroom. We're gonna put that aside.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Hasn't held a -- hasn't held  
9 a pencil.

10 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Got it. So --

11 MS. FLORES: But there's also --

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

13 MS. FLORES: There's also the -- the point  
14 where they may not be proficient with a computer. Where a  
15 paper and pencil would be better for those students than --  
16 than, say, get them in front of a computer. And that would  
17 make a difference.

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So important to note that,  
19 in addition to having accommodations for our students with  
20 disabilities, we also have accommodations for our English  
21 language learners. So we have versions of the assessment  
22 in math and science that are in Spanish. So if you have a  
23 student who has come from an educational system that has  
24 been based in Spanish and that's where they've been  
25 receiving their mathematics instruction and their science



1 instruction, they can take our mathematics assessment or  
2 our science assessment in Spanish. We have the use of  
3 glossaries, we have in Colorado also a Spanish language  
4 arts test. They can also make the decision to say I have a  
5 student who has a certain level of English language  
6 proficiency but they don't have the technology background.  
7 I am gonna have them take the paper based version and  
8 that's an option in our state.

9 MS. FLORES: Okay. So that districts who  
10 don't -- who may not understand that the paper should be  
11 first before the computer even if --

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Well -- well and I would  
13 suggest that that's not always the case, but that is an  
14 option. Right. We -- we're in an interesting spot with a  
15 lot of our kiddos and you can go into even kindergarten  
16 classrooms and see whether or not kids are more comfortable  
17 with the iPhones or if they're more comfortable with paper  
18 and pencil. And you can watch even your new students to  
19 the country and see how quickly do they, kind of, get used  
20 to the computer versus how quickly do they get used to  
21 paper and pencil. And I would suggest that the decision is  
22 different for different kids. And schools and districts  
23 can make the decision based on the individual child. That  
24 does not need to be a universal decision.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So thoughts. Joyce. That  
2 Joyce.

3 MS. RANKIN: Do we have to -- do we have to  
4 decide one two or three? I mean, could it be a local  
5 control thing or do we have to be consistent across the  
6 state even when we're dealing with the --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 4: Quit shaking your  
8 head. Yes.

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I was shocked in that.  
10 Right. We're trying to get to know so let me see what I  
11 can do. So I -- I -- I believe that we are looking at  
12 number three as a potential way to try to get to know. It  
13 is kind of a compromised position that would say we would  
14 have consistent guidelines across the state but different  
15 English learners would still be being treated differently  
16 but it would be consistent, right? It wouldn't matter  
17 whether that student happened to be enrolled in Aurora or  
18 Denver or Boulder. Whether or not the student tested would  
19 be based on that student and the guidelines as opposed to  
20 district preference.

21 MS. RANKIN: And those guidelines are  
22 proficiency guidelines or not?

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So again, as we were having  
24 our conversation about, so how would you go about number  
25 three. I referenced proficiency as a possibility. There



1 may be some other avenues for us to look at. And again,  
2 you could suggest two years spokes and I would suggest that  
3 your spokes are gonna think about this even if you don't  
4 suggest. What are those guidelines that we might be able  
5 to develop? I think it is fair to say that what we are  
6 looking for, in the end, is what is right for the child,  
7 meaning compliance requirements, but there is some  
8 consistency so that, again, what happens to a child does  
9 not radically shift based on the school that the child  
10 enters. It's a child based decision within guidelines as  
11 opposed to a district decision.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So what I'm thinking is,  
13 number three, there's some flexibility there but there's  
14 gonna be a cut score. Kind of, so that there is  
15 consistency across the state and that's a requirement that  
16 we do that. Okay.

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: There needs to be  
18 consistency across the state.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I got it.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just one moment,  
21 please.

22 MS. MAZANEC: So we have to choose one. We  
23 -- we don't have the option anymore. I'm saying, choose  
24 one or two?

25 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Correct.



1 MS. MAZANEC: It seems to me that,  
2 particularly for those districts who would find some value  
3 in knowing where the child stands in the first year, almost  
4 leaves us with number one. Well there's districts who like  
5 to know and they go ahead and do the assessment in year  
6 one. If we did year two, then we effectively take away  
7 that information from those districts who wanted to have  
8 it.

9 MS. FLORES: Are you finished, Pam?

10 MS. MAZANEC: I am.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So go ahead Val. Val?

12 MS. FLORES: Yes I'm -- I'm listening. I'm  
13 just thinking.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: You have a question? Deb,  
15 go ahead.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Just in response to Pam your  
17 comment. Wouldn't they have that information anyway. In  
18 other words if they're interested in what the English level  
19 of proficiency is they would have that through the access  
20 test, right? This is a question of how we use that  
21 information to determine whether or not they take PARCC.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So there is -- there --  
23 there's a difference between the information that you get  
24 off of, or from the access test, from the information that  
25 you would get from an English language arts test. The



1 access test essentially provides an indication of whether  
2 or not the student has enough English language proficiency  
3 to engage in a meaningful way in an academic classroom. So  
4 it really looks at, do I know enough math words to now  
5 participate in a math classroom? It doesn't answer the  
6 question of do I know how to fully read or fully write.  
7 Yes. There's a nuance there and there's definitely a  
8 relationship, I'll give you that, there's definitely a  
9 relationship but they don't answer the same question.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I was just thinking is  
11 this what you said that you're saying some people, some  
12 schools or districts, want to know how their students are  
13 doing as far as proficiency in English so that they would  
14 know when they would -- when it would make sense for them  
15 to take that test. And I'm saying I think they have that  
16 information.

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So regardless of which of  
18 these pathways you take they always get that English  
19 language proficiency indicator. They won't always get an  
20 English language arts proficiency indicator.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I just think that because  
22 of the heterogeneity of ELL students, we -- as you pointed  
23 out, we've got some kids who've been there three  
24 generations and yet they still are struggling with English?  
25 And others that just got here from a country that doesn't



1 have a written language at all and they're struggling with  
2 the concept of written language.

3                   So I -- I -- I guess I think it would be  
4 difficult for us not to choose three given that we're  
5 forced to do so. Ideally it would be great if the  
6 districts could make this -- if to configure this out but  
7 if their -- if the requirement is that we can't do that.  
8 I'd hate to see us have a one size fits all because some  
9 kids, I've just watched them try to take this test when  
10 they have such language issues and it's miserable. I mean,  
11 you get a lot of drama and then you have a negative  
12 experience with testing. So I -- I guess I would -- I  
13 would feel like three makes the most sense.

14                   MS. FLORES: I think, also, back to your  
15 spoke committee, because of phone calls I got, and because  
16 you did ask if there were any ESL teachers in that group  
17 and there were no ESL teachers.

18                   MS. ZURKOWSKI: I just wanna correct that.  
19 So the assessment spoke committee does have English learner  
20 educators on it sitting in the room that day.

21                   MS. FLORES: Not teachers though.

22                   MS. ZURKOWSKI: Sitting in the room that  
23 day, there was not. But the spoke committee does have  
24 English learner (inaudible).



1 MS. FLORES: And we do need teachers on that  
2 spoke committee.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I agree with -- with I think  
4 three, it seems the best, most balanced, most probably  
5 receptive approach. I can't help but ask though, how --  
6 does any of this relate to the READ act, as far as -- I'm  
7 sorry. But what -- but what happens. I'm sorry, I'm truly  
8 am sorry. But we have a -- we have a first or third grade,  
9 we have Pre-K (inaudible). All of these -- all of these --  
10 other -- other grade levels besides those starting in first  
11 grade. Don't worry about that specific question. It's  
12 just I'm trying to just see how -- how districts and  
13 schools districts can have as much flexibility as is  
14 workable for them, address the varying groups and needs  
15 among those little kids and yet -- how -- how can we --  
16 we're gonna have to help everybody keep all this straight.  
17 Because when you're talking about a readiness -- readiness  
18 test or readiness measure and then we're talking about can  
19 they -- can they be allowed -- can we measure their reading  
20 skills only in English? Are we gonna really find out about  
21 reading only by an English test or do we merely need to  
22 open up the flexibility doors to allow for them to be  
23 tested in their own language?

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