



Colorado State Board of Education

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

August 17, 2017 Meeting Transcript - PART 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on August 17, 2017, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board Members:

Angelika Schroeder (D), Chairman
Joyce Rankin (R), Vice-Chairman
Steven Durham (R)
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Rebecca McClellan (D)



1 MADAM CHAIR: Good morning, folks. I'd like
2 to bring the meeting back to order. We're a little late, I
3 apologize. Miss. Cordial, would you be kind enough to read
4 the role.

5 MS. CORDIAL: Board member, Durham?

6 MR. DURHAM: Here.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Board member, Flores?

8 MS. FLORES: Here.

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, McClellan?

14 MS. MCCLELLAN: Here.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board member, Rankin?

16 MS. RANKIN: Here.

17 MS. CORDIAL: And board member, Schroeder.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Here. So, we have quite a few
19 items to take action on this morning, that were laid over
20 from yesterday's meeting.

21 The first three items on our agenda were
22 related to School Health Professional Grant Program,
23 emergency rules, and notice of rulemaking, and recommended
24 grant recipients. As a reminder for the purpose of emergency
25 rules, staff found circumstances that require adoption of



1 the rules on the emergency basis for reasons decided by the
2 department. Commissioner and staff prepared to provide an
3 overview.

4 MS. ANTHERS: Yes. Thank you. And I'm just
5 going to say a few things. We- we needed to do a little
6 catch up last night on this process, an- and the history of
7 the rules, and all of that stuff. So we- we think we've
8 brought some of that to you. I think Misty, has some
9 information on the instructions that go to the school, and
10 what the parents get, and all that stuff.

11 So, we pulled back together for you last
12 night. And just wanted you guys to know that the- the
13 previous rules that we are amending, were passed in 2014 by
14 this board. So you guys were asking about the- the specific
15 element in there on the Healthy Kids Survey. I'm just wanted
16 you to know that, we- that was done in 2014. So, it's done
17 several years ago. So, if you want to change that?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Will you prove that's in
19 2014.

20 MS. ANTHERS: Well, I don't think you were on
21 the board? Oh, you were on the board.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As I understand, in 2014
23 I was, right?

24 MS. ANTHERS: Yes.

25 MR. DURHAM: I don't think I was.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You were not.

2 MS. ANTHERS: So, that was approved. Those-
3 that was the last time the rules were approved. It was
4 approved by a unanimous vote. Pam Mazanec, (Indiscernible)
5 and Angelika Schroeder were on the board at that time. So,
6 we're happy to make amendments to those rules. We just --
7 because we were doing the emergency rules and making the
8 change. The statutory change.

9 That was the part of the rules we focused on.
10 It was the statutory change on the grant. So, I just wanted
11 to give that feedback. We also have that items she requested
12 yesterday. And with that, I can turn it over to Misty, for
13 any further discussion.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please.

15 MS. ANTHERS: Madam Chair. Thank you.

16 MS. MISTY: Thank you. Good morning, all. And
17 thank you for bearing with us as I get up to speed and we
18 help provide information that you've requested. So, as
19 Commissioner Anthes mentioned, this emergency rule change is
20 prompted by a statutory change from the last legislative
21 session.

22 We're bringing this forward to today, as a
23 result of that legislative change. And the emergency rules
24 are contingent's- are not good. So, the emergency rules
25 would enable us to get dollars out of the door to districts



1 for the School Health Professional Grant, for this upcoming
2 school year is starting right now, as we speak.

3 The legislative change date was effe- that
4 was effective date was last week. Which is why these are
5 coming to you during the August, board meeting. So, if I may
6 turn to the specific questions that board member Durham, had
7 asked yesterday, to have additional clarification.

8 So, I think I'll start with the second
9 question that you'd asked, Board Member Durham, which is
10 about 2.013A. Double checking, we did- we- we did double
11 check that.

12 The demonstration, school health
13 professionals, the local community, and community data,
14 regarding marijuana, and the number of marijuana
15 establishments. That is lifted directly from the statute. I
16 also did clarify with our competitive grants office, that we
17 do ask the question in a- in a- in the way that it's
18 outlined in statute.

19 However, the key is that, districts are
20 really asked to address, is their need in their community
21 associated with marijuana- the impact of marijuana. So, that
22 what- one of the things that might be helpful to know is the
23 potential grantees that will come forward to offer approval,
24 a few items later, and 30 percent of those- it appears, do
25 not have marijuana dispensaries in their counties.



1 So, I don't know what the portion is
2 statewide, but- but that is reflective in those branches.
3 Yes. Mr. Durham?

4 MR. DURHAM: Sorry. It's- since I don't have
5 the statute in front of me, the- the -the number of
6 marijuana establishments is a specific grant criteria,
7 that's listed in statute. That's one of the things that you
8 are required to consider when making a grant. Is that
9 correct? And I would like to see the statute on that.

10 MS. MISTY: Sure. We can- we can pull that
11 for you. Yes. This is a direct lift from statute. I- it can
12 tell you in request for proposal process. That's- the
13 question is- does ask about dispensaries, however, it also
14 does ask for the need more broadly, which we talked about
15 yesterday.

16 MR. DURHAM: Indeed, what I'm saying.

17 MS. MISTY: Then it need bro- more broadly
18 about in- what is the need of those school districts or
19 school, to be able to take advantage of these funds, and
20 resources, and can they show a need?

21 MS. ANTHES: And Miss. Julie and Miss.
22 Tolleson, do you have that statute for him, if you want to
23 ask?

24 MS. JULIE: I- I do. Thank you. The past
25 precise language, the -- the relevant tracks says that, and



1 reviewing applications, and making recommendations to the
2 department shall prioritize based on. And then, that list
3 includes the provider's need for additional help
4 professionals in schools, demonstrated by local school and
5 community data regarding marijuana, and the number of
6 marijuana establishments located within the boundaries of
7 the district. So, it- it is right there in the statute.

8 MR. DURHAM: So, it reminds me of the -- of
9 the child who murders both his parents and throws himself on
10 the mercy of the court because he is an orphan. That -- you
11 know, you allow the facilities in and then you want money
12 because it creates problems for you. So -- so, unfortunate,
13 but I think it belongs in the rule.

14 MS. ANTHERS: So, may I ask a question of you.

15 MR. DURHAM: Totally.

16 MS. ANTHERS: So, you feel that in -- that
17 other districts should be compensated as well? Or that they
18 shouldn't provide that moneys for -- for those districts
19 where marijuana is ground?

20 MR. DURHAM: I think it's a self-inflicted
21 one. And whether the -- whether we ought to be compensating
22 people for their own bad decisions is something that the
23 legislature took choice away from us. But-

24 MR. DURHAM: But I don't think there's any
25 question that it's a criteria that hopefully we don't -- we



1 minimized to the extent we can because I don't know that --
2 maybe that is a -- let me put it this way. If in fact the
3 number of establishments indicates a need, then it is a
4 clear demonstration that this product should not be allowed
5 in schools or near schools.

6 That's a clear demonstration that if the
7 legislature reach that conclusion then perhaps back up and
8 do some other things. So, but I think under the law it has
9 to be there, so, move on.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just to be clear just
11 for the record, we don't -- schools don't allow the product.

12 MR. DURHAM: No, I understand.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, okay. I just-

14 MR. DURHAM: In theory they do.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, if I may move on to
16 the second question that was asked yesterday. So the second
17 question was in regard to 2.012i around the survey. I
18 believe that Mrs. Cordial has, and she'll be passing around
19 the specific information that you all had requested
20 yesterday. And Board member Mazanec, I believe this is your
21 reque -- request as well.

22 The Healthy Kids survey instructions. So,
23 what you have in front of you is the parent information
24 letter followed by the instructions on the survey itself to
25 students. And then the third letter is the initial letter to



1 superintendents regarding the survey. So, as you see that
2 the voluntary nature of the survey is mentioned in all
3 three, which was I believe a specific question from
4 yesterday.

5 The other question, and I'm happy to take
6 additional questions on that but I want to be sure to also
7 address the other question that was asked re -- regarding
8 this which is, what is the explicit statutory authority
9 regarding Healthy Kids survey and the requirement to be in
10 these schools?

11 So, thank you for the opportunity to look a
12 little bit deeper on that. There is not explicit statutory
13 authority regarding healthy kids in relation to the school
14 health professional grant. As commissioner Anthes had
15 mentioned, that something that was the -- at the discretion
16 of this body in 2014 when the rules were initially adopted.
17 So, I'd love to, I'd like the turn to Miss Tolleson about
18 the emergency rule making piece of that and if there's
19 something unique regarding current rules versus the change.

20 MS. TOLLESON: Sure. I know that the
21 secondary question that had come up regarding the
22 requirement that's in the rules that doesn't track the
23 statute, could we change it now in the emergency rules. And
24 generally, the emergency rule making is -- it runs counter
25 to the -- the general idea of public participation and



1 advanced notice in all of those things.

2 So, it's very tightly constrained to not just
3 that we've got a change in state law but the change in state
4 law creates half of an emergency health and welfare to
5 require faster action. And here in particular, the concern
6 is that these schools that are now the legislature has said
7 are eligible elementary and middle schools to be able to get
8 them their money timely and emergency amendments required
9 now and that's -- that's why the current proposed revisions
10 address only that question. But remember, it'll trigger a
11 permanent rule making with it.

12 So, within the next 10 or 20 days, we can
13 take that item and if the Board's desire is to strike it,
14 absolutely. But in terms of the emergency rule making, it
15 really needs to be tied to the emergency finding that the
16 Board makes in connection with ad -- adopting emergency
17 rules.

18 MR. DURHAM: Thank you Madam Chair. I think
19 it's fine. We can revisit it then but I would like to make
20 just one statement because I think this highlighted an issue
21 that is of importance to me and that is, I don't know how
22 many times during the rather acrimonious debates we had over
23 Healthy Kids survey, this Board was assured and I believe by
24 staff and I'm not casting aspersions on anyone in
25 particular, that there were no requirements for any district



1 to participate in the Healthy Kids survey.

2 Also, in this one, there's absolutely no
3 requirement that this be entered by statute. So, this is
4 there, as I think a rather obscure provision that was put in
5 by staff and -- and the Board at the time probably did not
6 un -- understand the effect of what they were voting on.
7 And, so now we have something that I have two problems with.
8 One is this is an invention of staff not required by survey.
9 They're not required by statute.

10 And two, it has been misrepresented to the
11 Board that there are no penalties to a district for failure
12 to participate if they are one of those selected at random
13 in this survey. So, I will continue to raise this issue and
14 I think as a matter of frankly good faith on the part of
15 those who have defended this survey, they ought to at least
16 live up to the assurances this Board has that it's not a
17 requirement that no district is under any pressure to
18 participate in the survey. So, I'll let it go at that.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, Board member
20 Mazanec.

21 MS. MAZANEC: I'm assuming that this Board
22 approved to the Healthy Kids survey being included in that
23 because we weren't aware of what the Healthy Kids -- it's a
24 very, it's a very sweet name.

25 MR. DURHAM: Yes.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Healthy Kids survey. But
2 actually, has very intrusive questions. Can we change that
3 or is it the fact that we put it in 14, is that now -- can
4 it be changed?

5 MS. TOLLESON: In 120 days, when we go back
6 and go to the rules.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Right.

8 MS. TOLLESON: After the emergency then.

9 MS. MAZANEC: I just want to clarify that.

10 MS. TOLLESON: Right.

11 MS. MAZANEC: Also, what -- what is school
12 health profiles? It says that they will require
13 participation or commitment to participate in the Healthy
14 Kids survey and school health profiles.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't know but we can
16 follow up. I apologize.

17 MS. TOLLESON: We've had a lot of transition
18 of staff within the last several years. We just need to get
19 up to speed on what the discussion was in 2014. I mean I
20 know, what I know is that it was a heated discussion.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was in 2015.

22 MS. MAZANEC: I was going to say that was
23 after that. Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This has not had the
25 backlash that it has had since 2015.



1 MS. TOLLESON: So, I just don't know about
2 these particular rules whether wasn't seeing this either at
3 that point. So, we just need to do some digging around the
4 history of this and if the Board-

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, I'm sorry. If the,
6 you know, what the Board knew that and then what the
7 profiles are. So well but now is the time that we can dig
8 into that, make sure we have all those answers for your 120-
9 day process and, you know, we can go through that process
10 then.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, I would be grateful
12 if when that occurs, the part that says that we have to
13 provide information on the effectiveness of this. What does
14 this law say? It doesn't say Healthy Kids survey. But what
15 does it say? And what are some recommended ways for
16 districts to be able to fulfill that expectation that the
17 legislature said so. Please.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, how we would
19 measure.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's how will we
21 measure.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can certainly prepare
23 to address that.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any other comments or
25 questions? Do I have a motion, please?



1 MR. DURHAM: I have one other question.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Durham.

3 MR. DURHAM: Now, these -- these counselors
4 have had a constituent question raised as to whether they
5 going to be dealing without parental pre-approval for
6 behavioral health issues of particularly young children. Do
7 we know the answer to that question? Are these confined to
8 drug and alcohol counseling?

9 What are the general duties of these, of
10 these professionals and qualified to provide support
11 services I think in the definition to children and
12 adolescents. So, are they -- what is the range of services
13 they're providing?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Certainly, Madam Chair.

15 MS. TOLLESON: So, the purpose of this whole
16 professional grant is for substance abuse education and
17 prevention. So there's four roles that are eligible of
18 professionals and schools that are eligible to be hired,
19 school nurses, school counselors, school psychologists and
20 school nurses.

21 And of those, their -- the statute says
22 evidence-based practices and so there's specific curriculum
23 that districts certainly have flexibility to decide which
24 evidence-based curriculum they would like to select and
25 implement on the variety of levels that they might -- of



1 schools, that they might be receiving dollars to support
2 those professionals.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, the districts in --
4 this is a question has come up in the past in other not
5 specific to this grant, districts all have policies that
6 outline the nature of when a parent is brought in in a
7 specific conversation with students and the district policy
8 outlines a variety of scenarios in which parents are
9 notified and brought in in sensitive situations. Do you want
10 to follow up, sir?

11 MR. DURHAM: So, as I read these rules,
12 there's nothing in any of these rules that provides any or
13 requires any parental consent for this counseling that -- so
14 that this can be kind of freewheeling or are there other
15 statutes or you think district policies that involved
16 parents in these activities?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We -- we can certainly
18 be prepared to address the examples of district policies
19 that you're referring to that would be addressed in other
20 areas and statutes. Certainly, this could also be an area
21 that if the -- if the board went into expands authority of
22 rulemaking, I'll turn to Ms. Tolleson for your authority and
23 peace but.

24 Mr. DURHAM: Well, I think -- I think when we
25 go to full rulemaking, that would be helpful. If there are



1 policies in place or other statutes that provide some --
2 some protection for parents, that we'd be made aware of
3 those. And that if not, that we'd be given some draft
4 language that would incorporate parental consent into this -
5 - into this policy.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Durham, would it be helpful
7 at all to look at some of the -- I think it's called model
8 policy that school boards get so that at the district -- I
9 mean, we're -- we need to be thinking about what's local and
10 what's statewide, what -- what is recommended that districts
11 adopt as policy?

12 Mr. DURHAM: Yeah. I think that's -- I think
13 that would be helpful. And -- but I do think as long as this
14 is, you know, as I've -- as I've said on several occasions,
15 when it comes to grants, this is not a local control
16 question.

17 There's -- these grants are contingent on all
18 kinds of things. And in terms of grants, I think we can
19 dictate substantially more -- more policy than we could
20 under the general conduct of local -- of local schools.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Board member McClellan.

22 MS. MCCLELLAN: Thank you, Madam Chair. I --
23 I have taken the time to talk with officials at the Public
24 Health Department about this ongoing discussion. I think if
25 we get into this very substantially, I would like to have



1 testimony of -- from some of the stakeholders, including
2 folks who are experts in the area of drug rehabilitation.

3 When I took my leadership course at the
4 Harvard Kennedy School in July, this was the overarching
5 issue that came up again and again from law enforcement,
6 from state representatives, and from local leaders. And
7 several of the people in our class across the socioeconomic
8 spectrum were experiencing drug addiction and --
9 experiencing drug addiction through their loved ones and
10 community members.

11 It's rampant in America right now, and my
12 worry is that if this grant is contingent on parental
13 consent that it will mean that at least some children, who
14 are suffering from addiction, will not get help because they
15 are afraid to let their parents know. So, this is an issue
16 we need to have, that uncomfortable discussion about, and we
17 need to have it across the socioeconomic spectrum.

18 Yes, including schools like Cherry Creek High
19 School. I'm the mother of a 15-year-old and a 19-year --
20 old, and I hear the stories, and this is real, across the
21 socioeconomic spectrum, and I would like to hear from
22 officials at the Public Health Department, maybe someone
23 like Dr. Volk, and I would like to hear from experts.

24 Perhaps if the state has an umbrella
25 organization for school counselors or social workers, that



1 might be an appropriate party to hear from. With respect to
2 whether or not such a policy change would result in
3 children, who should be getting this counseling or access to
4 this counseling, then not getting it. That's a concern for
5 me. It's a life-threatening issue.

6 We heard from a law enforcement officer in
7 Boston, who had a policy that was incredibly effective,
8 whereby people suffering from addiction could come in and
9 bring the substance with them, no questions asked, and get
10 into rehab. And their rate of success was far higher than
11 folks who are compelled to go to rehab and then threatened
12 with punishment.

13 So, we have a lot to discuss on this issue
14 and on other issues, and my serious concern is that however
15 well-intended, I know Mr. Durham is, my worry is that there
16 will be children who simply don't get the help that they
17 need if they have to face their parents and they can't get
18 the help discreetly. So, I think we need to hear from
19 experts in the field about how that will impact real kids
20 today on this life-threatening issue because getting them
21 the help that they need should be the number 1 concern. So,
22 thank you.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Flores. Sorry. You
24 guys-

25 MS. FLORES: I just shift.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Taking meds. I'm sorry.

2 MS. MAZANEC: I'm sorry that I asked.

3 MS. FLORES: No. I have worked in another
4 state that -- that had gambling, and gambling was not in
5 every city in Nevada, but it was in some cities. But yet,
6 the rate of suicide among kids and their relation with -- I
7 mean, they did correlate suicide and gambling and other bad
8 things that went along with -- with gambling. And I think
9 you need to provide some kind of education, and not just for
10 the cities where, you know, Marijuana is -- is sold, but
11 throughout the state because it -- it does touch all,
12 everybody.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you.

14 MS. FLORES: It's important to do that. And
15 one question I wanted to ask is, I know the Legacy
16 Foundation, the Education Initiative or Colorado Education
17 Initiative Foundation put some moneys towards this and
18 wasn't that, the healthy kids, weren't they involved?

19 MADAM CHAIR: I have no idea what. How is
20 that relevant?

21 MS. FLORES: I'm sorry.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Well-

23 MS. FLORES: The state worked on -- on not
24 only health, what people eat, but just having healthy kids.
25 And well, I think that's good that they saw that the money



1 was -- was placed there, but somebody has to wake up and
2 say, "Hey, we have a problem here and we need to -- we need
3 to have either programs and support people that can help
4 kids."

5 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Board member
6 Mazanec.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Well, first of all, I don't
8 think that we need to help the kids surveyed to know that we
9 have a drug problem, or we have kids that have -- or not
10 eating healthy or what, open your eyes. Everybody in every
11 school district, staff, teachers, they know what's going on
12 with kids around. They can see it. We don't need this survey
13 to tell us that.

14 Second of all, the survey is anonymous. It's
15 not as if a child is suicidal and he puts that down on a
16 survey and then -- and then schools and staff are then able
17 to go identify that child and help that child. This is
18 information that doesn't directly help children, but what it
19 does is create programs that adults run. This is helping
20 adults have a job that yes, it may be a very -- very
21 honorable cause, but there is no direct link that we can put
22 between a child that needs help and this survey.

23 Mostly, it's keeping adults in -- in business
24 to tell us about things we need to do for children. So, and
25 my other question is actually along the grants that are



1 being awarded, are those -- right now, are those for the
2 three years and have they already committed to this then if
3 this was what the rules were in 14th?

4 MADAM CHAIR: I'll have to ask Ms. Ruthvin to
5 ask -- answer that.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, yes. They have
7 signed this assurance that the rules change, we can
8 certainly prompts the updates of the insure -- assurances
9 and ask district to sign an update.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Durham.

11 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. I think -- I think if
12 Ms. McClellan is lamenting the state of American society, I
13 think that would be an enjoyable debate because -- and
14 certainly to look at cause and effect but also to look at,
15 you know, we've been -- we've been pouring money at this
16 problem and the testimony you want to receive, we had oodles
17 of it and it comes from people who financially benefit from
18 being able to tap resources based on a survey showing
19 problems.

20 And guess what? With all that money and all
21 that information, it seems to be getting worse. So if I were
22 to look at cause and effect, I could draw a rather
23 preposterous conclusion but one which certainly would pass
24 the initial test. So, what we're doing isn't working and we
25 can continue down this road, and -- and now, I guess, we can



1 presume that it's that the last people we can rely on are
2 the parents, that they can't be trusted to raise their
3 children.

4 Well, the children don't yet belong to the
5 state in this country, although I know there are those who
6 would like to move in that direction, but parents have a
7 right. If their kids are to have a drug problem, parents
8 have a right to know about it and see if they can't do
9 something to assist in solving the problem. And so, I'm
10 looking forward to that debate because you're going to have
11 to take the position that parents have to be excluded from
12 the most important decisions about their children's welfare.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Any other comments? Do I have a
14 motion, please for the emergency rules? Board member
15 McClellan.

16 MS. MCCLELLAN: I move to approve the
17 emergency rules for the administration of School Health
18 Professional Grant Program 1 CCR 301-97.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Do you want to second?

20 MS. FLORES: I second.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Would you called the vote,
22 please? Note this is just for the emergency rules. We've had
23 a discussion I believe in order to help prepare staff for
24 the upcoming hearing.

25 MS. RANKIN: And that will be approved next.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Resolved much for today other
2 than, so changes will be.

3 MS. MAZANEC: There will still be a hearing
4 where the details still be discussed.

5 MADAM CHAIR: There will still. But in fact,
6 we're going to have a motion on that shortly.

7 MS. MAZANEC: Right.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Would you be good enough to
9 call the roll, please?

10 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Durham?

11 Mr. DURHAM: No.

12 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Flores?

13 MS. FLORES: Yes.

14 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff?

15 MS. GOFF: Yes.

16 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec?

17 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

18 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan?

19 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

20 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin?

21 MS. RANKIN: No.

22 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Schroeder?

23 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Next item is the notice
25 of rule-making, for the rules for the administration of the



1 School Health Professional Grant Program. 1CCR301-97. Is
2 there a motion on it? Board member McClellan.

3 MS. MCCLELLAN: I move -- move to approve the
4 notice of rule-making for the administration of School
5 Health Professional Grant Program 1CCR301-97.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's a proper motion,
7 do you have a second?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second. Notice of rule-
10 making. But could you please call the role.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Durham.

12 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Flores.

14 MS. FLORES: Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Goff.

16 MS. GOFF: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Mazanec.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Yes. Which is what I thought I
19 was voting on last time by the way.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member McClellan.

21 MS. MCCLELLAN: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Rankin.

23 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Schroeder.

25 MADAM CHAIR: Yes



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The next item is the
2 recommended 2017, 18th School Health Professional Grant
3 recipients. So and we have a -- oops, we have a table I
4 believe that shows the recommended grants.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

6 MR. DURHAM: Thank you Madam Chair. I have
7 one quick question. So this, this law or perhaps it's just
8 the additional funding for this program that was approved or
9 was there st -- were there statutory changes that were
10 approved in this last legislative session?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great -- great question.

12 MR. DURHAM: So the -- there were some and
13 will obviously had to be statutory changes attached to the
14 appropriation; is that correct?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that's a great
16 question. There wasn't additional appropriation granted by
17 the JBC to \$9 million and change which prompted a new grant
18 competition. Un -- unrelated but coincidentally, there was
19 also a bill that passed separately expanding the school --
20 school types and districts and charter schools that could
21 apply. So that's what prompted the rule change. So two
22 things happening in -- in parallel.

23 MR. DURHAM: So -- so -- so rather quickly
24 and then all of these districts were, were some of these
25 repeat grants or were all the -- are all these people who



1 got an application ready between the German legislative
2 session and today?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. So the RFP for
4 this funding was sent out I believe in late April or early
5 May. Just right around but a little before the conclusion of
6 the legislative session in anticipation what was looking
7 like this funding might actually come through, certainly but
8 contingent upon additional funding.

9 So it was highly competitive. 66 applications
10 were received. What you see in front of you is 42 funded
11 applications and this represents, you know, the -- the vast
12 majority of areas for our states. I don't know exactly how
13 many of them might be repeats grantees but presumably that's
14 a fairly small number since we just had a few -- a few
15 million dollars in prior years for this. So the increase in
16 funding is significant and I can tell -- I can't tell you
17 off the top of my head but the vast majority are new.

18 MR. DURHAM: And, and then as I -- as I went
19 through these that you could identify by at least obvious
20 notation about \$720,000 of the 9.2 million went to charter
21 schools. Is that or if -- if I missed some charters in that
22 -- in that number?

23 MS. MCCLELLAN: I -- I can get that number
24 for you. I apologize. I -- I don't have the exact breakdown.
25 It looks like there's one, two, three, four, five, six-



1 MR. DURHAM: I counted five words, were you
2 getting six?

3 MS. MCCLELLAN: So the Classical Academy?

4 MR. DURHAM: Yes, I got that.

5 MS. MCCLELLAN: And then, five additional
6 charter school institutes.

7 MR. DURHAM: All right. Okay. I'm sorry I
8 have six too, okay.

9 MS. MCCLELLAN: And then the Vi -- Vision
10 Charter Academy and Delta, it would be seven.

11 MR. DURHAM: And Delta you say.

12 MS. MCCLELLAN: It says Delta County on the
13 front page.

14 MR. DURHAM: Okay, so that would be 800,000.

15 MS. MCCLELLAN: It's academy-

16 MR. DURHAM: Yes, that I'm using round
17 numbers.

18 MS. MCCLELLAN: It's academy for-

19 MR. DURHAM: No total, total.

20 MS. MCCLELLAN: So I -- I can give you the --
21 the exact dollar amount, I apologize I -- I don't have that
22 in front of you at this moment.

23 MR. DURHAM: Okay, so about eight percent of
24 the money give or take?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There is a charter



1 schools with -- I would and maybe, maybe thought of this I
2 would suggest that there was probably a possibility that
3 there is a charter school within the general district name
4 on -- on this entire list.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I see-

7 MR. DURHAM: So some of them are -- some of
8 them are district and some of them are school specific?

9 MS. MCCLELLAN: They're -- they can be
10 charter schools who are within districts and all you're
11 going to see is the district.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

13 MS. MCCLELLAN: It was not a question that
14 we-

15 MR. DURHAM: Well, but Academy District 20
16 classical Academy I believe that's a charter school and that
17 looks like there is a specific grant to a specific school?

18 MS. RANKIN: Well, and -- and actually we, we
19 can't assume that, you know, because they're using, their
20 using-

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But I've seen your head-
22 nod, some of the district funds, the large district funds
23 those districts include-

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Charters.

25 MS. MCCLELLAN: -distributions to charter



1 schools.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

3 MS. MCCLELLAN: In other words, instead of
4 coming one by one, they're -- they're both -- they're both
5 together to the district. For example, some of the really
6 big ones.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jefferson, Denver.

8 MS. MCCLELLAN: Boulder may include that.
9 Where is Denver? Denver's 871. We don't know.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I understand that they
11 made but we don't know.

12 MS. MCCLELLAN: We -- that's exactly right.
13 We don't know. If I may Madam Chair, we -- we can -- we can
14 get that to you.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That would be good.

16 MR. DURHAM: Okay. All right, thank you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. Board member
18 Flores.

19 MS. FLORES: And the question that I wanted
20 to ask was this the \$9 million that the governor wanted to
21 use? Is that the -- what we heard about the nine million
22 that you wanted to give expand. So this is what you went to?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

25 MS. FLORES: Okay. So do we expect since



1 almost every year, there's about 10 million that the
2 governor says will give to this to nurses or we'll give to
3 this, can we expect 10 million?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would not say.

5 MS. FLORES: And -- and maybe we could
6 suggest what area, you know, in education he can give it to?
7 Be -- be already prepared to suggest to him, this is a great
8 need.

9 MS. MCCLELLAN: So the next item that was
10 pulled yesterday and I believe this was Mr. Durham?

11 MR. DURHAM: I don't think we've voted.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. We still need to
13 vote on that item.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We step to vote, my
15 apologies. Board member McClellan.

16 MS. MCCLELLAN: I move to approve the 2017-
17 2018 School Health Professional Grant recipients an amount
18 of grant awards as proposed in the recommendations list.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A proper motion and
20 second?

21 MS. GOFF: I'll second.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you Ms. Goff. Any
23 more discussion? Any objections to these grants?

24 MS. MCCLELLAN: All right. So we can try to
25 go ahead.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yesterday's item Public
2 School Finance Act of 1994 state share payments I believe it
3 was a consent item, but it was pulled. We discussed it a
4 little bit yesterday. Mr. Durham.

5 MR. DURHAM: Thank you Madam Chair, I asked
6 to have it pulled simply because it's \$320 million item and
7 I think we had a vote on it. Just a matter of course.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

9 MR. DURHAM: Just so we all are recognizing
10 and-

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: okay.

12 MR. DURHAM: -- call some attention to how
13 much money we are spending on this. So I'll move the
14 approval of the state chair payments.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 362 million.

16 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On and on and on.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I second.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Call the role
21 please.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's hard to be.

23 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Durham.

24 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

25 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Flores.



1 MS. FLORES: Yes.

2 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Goff.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Goff.

4 MS. GOFF: Vote.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Put your vote.

6 MS. GOFF: Aye.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Mazanec.

8 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Board member McClellan.

10 MS. MCCLELLAN: Aye.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Rankin.

12 MS. RANKIN: Yes.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board member Schroeder.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

15 MS. GOFF: Can I ask a-

16 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

17 MS. GOFF: -- question?

18 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Goff.

19 MS. GOFF: Thank you. So, if we are in --

20 interested in staying consistent, should we be pulling --

21 having this not be on the consent agenda every, every time

22 it comes up?

23 MR. DURHAM: I think so.

24 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

25 MR. DURHAM: I think it's a good thing to



1 vote on with that much money, and we treat it kind of
2 cavalierly if it's on this consent agenda.

3 MS. GOFF: That's fine. Okay.

4 MS. MAZANEC: And people will know -- people
5 will know.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Next action I am laid over from
7 yesterday is the consideration of Alternative Education
8 Campus applications for 2017-18 school year. Colleagues, do
9 you have questions for Ms. Pearson in regard?

10 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Durham?

12 MR. DURHAM: I do. That we have -- we have
13 this list which I believe is renewals, is that correct?

14 MS. PEARSON: That list has the comprehensive
15 list of all the schools in the state that qualify as
16 Alternative Education Campuses. Schools have to apply every
17 year. It's an annual process to be as (indiscernible) as an
18 AEC.

19 MR. DURHAM: When then, then you say you have
20 them going to th -- to this page. There are new -- two new
21 applications you say?

22 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

23 MR. DURHAM: Las Animas Re-1, which I believe
24 we app -- approved at the Pueblo meeting a year ago, so why
25 is that a new application?



1 MS. PEARSON: You when at that Pueblo meeting
2 you approved them as a multi-district online school?

3 MS. GOFF: Um-hum.

4 MS. PEARSON: This is for that status as an
5 Alternative Education Campus. So, it's a different process
6 for those two pieces. You didn't approve them for that kind
7 of flexibility they got as an Alternative Education Campus.

8 MR. DURHAM: Can they be both?

9 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

10 MR. DURHAM: So, you could be both an online
11 and alternative?

12 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, yeah.

13 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. We've got multiple
14 schools like that.

15 MR. DURHAM: Okay.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. We have precedent for
17 that.

18 MR. DURHAM: Okay.

19 MS. PEARSON: So, we just wanted it to be
20 clear for you all, so you could see which two new schools
21 were coming this time compared to all that we're going to
22 get in there.

23 MR. DURHAM: Right. Okay. What's the name of
24 this school, in Las Animas?

25 MS. PEARSON: It's AIM Global. There's two



1 schools I believe you all approved one as an Alternative
2 Education Campus, one is not.

3 MR. DURHAM: All right. Thank you.

4 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Durham would you like to
5 make a motion?

6 MR. DURHAM: Yes. I'll move we approve-

7 MADAM CHAIR: I'm sorry. Board member Goff?

8 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

9 MS. MAZANEC: I have a question too.

10 MS. GOFF: It could be here, and I apologize
11 ahead of time if it is -- any further developments on the
12 request from Jeffco-

13 MS. PEARSON: Yes, they're-

14 MS. GOFF: -- for that particular school?

15 MS. PEARSON: -- they're pulling things
16 together. They're getting their budget situation sorted out.
17 It appears that they are two separate schools. They just
18 have -- haven't been clear on their budgets. But they were
19 two separate.

20 So, they're working on that. That's just a
21 component of the requirement is that the schools have a
22 standalone budget, to make sure that the school are not part
23 of another school. So, I think it's all - -- that we were in
24 communication with them and they're following up on it.

25 MS. GOFF: So, the criteria is in place



1 already, it's just a matter of straightening out?

2 MS. PEARSON: I think they needed to
3 straighten out their budgeting and how these budgets for
4 these schools actually work. That they actually are two
5 separate budgets. So, they're working on it and planning
6 what they need to do.

7 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Mazanec.

9 MS. MAZANEC: So do we -- do we know from
10 this whether there were schools that applied, but were
11 rejected or not approved?

12 MS. PEARSON: There were-

13 MADAM CHAIR: There's an incoming. You want
14 to answer? Then you can come and talk.

15 MS. PEERS: Hi. Okay. I won't creep over-

16 MS. PEARSON: Y'all this is-

17 MS. SANDERS: Hi, I don't have a name tag. It
18 wasn't made for me.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Introduce yourself please.

20 MS. SANDERS: My name is P. Sanders, I'm an
21 analyst in the Accountability Data Analysis Unit. There were
22 two schools that applied, Pikes Peak Online and Jeffco 21st
23 Central -- Century Virtual Academy, they withdrew their ver
24 -- their application. So they applied, but then they didn't
25 follow through with the application process. So, they



1 weren't formally denied, they just didn't-

2 MS. PEARSON: They just didn't complete the
3 process.

4 MS. SANDERS: They just didn't complete the
5 process, yeah. We didn't have any-

6 MS. PEARSON: So, is that it?

7 MS. SANDERS: Yeah. We didn't have any
8 denials.

9 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Now, can we have a motion?

11 MR. DURHAM: It's our move, we approve the
12 list of Alternative Education Campuses contained in the
13 published agenda.

14 MS. MAZANEC: I second.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Any objection,
16 colleagues?

17 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair?

18 MADAM CHAIR: Sir?

19 MR. DURHAM: I'll move 3.06 that we, we
20 approve the five-renewal emergency authoration --
21 authorization request. I ask that to come off consent agenda
22 because I, I saw a school nurse there and I -- it seemed to
23 me that a nursing license should've been sufficient and then
24 I didn't know why we were in that approval process. But it
25 is -- it is required by statute. So, I'll move that item-



1 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Can we try that motion
2 again? Just so we know what your-

3 MR. DURHAM: Yes, I'll move the item 20.13
4 from yesterday's agenda 3.06, which is the approval of five
5 -- the renewal of five emergency authorization request.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Have a second?

7 MS. MAZANEC: Second.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Any objections? Thank you.
9 Anything else from yesterday's consent item withdrawals? Did
10 I miss one?

11 MS. PEARSON: No. Just the only other item as
12 Dillsburg after.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Right. But that's not, that was
14 not consent? I'm just trying to get those taken care of. And
15 by virtue of my question, I do not want to suggest that,
16 that I would want discourage questions from consent because
17 I think it's really important that if there's something that
18 you think should just be a voting item or you have questions
19 about, please be sure to bring that up.

20 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Okay, thank you. So, the next
22 item on the agenda is an update from staff on the feedback
23 received from the US Department of Education on the
24 Colorado.

25 MS. PEARSON: Yes, it's a plan.



1 MS. MAZANEC: Madam Chair, can I request a
2 really short recess? I have to make a quick phone call.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Sure. We'll just take break,
4 just a wee bit early. Next item on our agenda is an update
5 from staff, feedback received from the department.
6 Commissioner.

7 MS. ANTHES: Yes, thank you. Yes. Apologies
8 that this had to be added at the last minute, but we weren't
9 exactly sure of the timing of our feedback. We got our
10 feedback after all the board materials were due to you.

11 So, you're sort of getting all this hot off-
12 the-presses as we've been analyzing our feedback and
13 understanding it. So, I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Pat
14 Chapman, who I'm sure you've missed over the last, I don't
15 know one month or two months?

16 MR. CHAPMAN: Two months.

17 MS. RANKIN: When you miss talking about
18 ESSA, so we get to do that again. And since most of our
19 feedback is around the accountability section of ESSA, we
20 have Alyssa Pearson here to address the accountability
21 aspects of it. So, Mr. Chapman.

22 MR. CHAPMAN: Great. So the goal for today is
23 to provide you guys some information regarding the USDE's
24 feedback on our -- our Colorado ESSA plan, and the -- the
25 state plan approval process that the USDE has set up. I



1 mean, to gather any feedback or directives that you may have
2 in relation to the above information.

3 As Commissioner Anthes said, most of the
4 pretty much all of the feedback relates to accountability,
5 so I'm just going to be teeing it up for Alyssa. Just a
6 recap a little bit to -- to provide some grounding, we
7 submitted our plan on May 9th, that's the date that we
8 submitted our complete plan. The USDE has 120 days to
9 provide us a written determination of our plan from that
10 date of May 9th, that's September 6th.

11 They provided us feedback on -- on during a
12 phone call on August 9th, and then we received the -- the
13 written feedback on August 11th. We have until 20 -- August
14 24th to provide them a red lined version of our plan that
15 addresses the issues that they have raised. If we need more
16 than 50 days past August 24th to get that information to
17 them, that may extend their 120-day timeline for providing
18 us a written determination.

19 The feedback that we received in most cases,
20 it just really necessitates that we provide additional
21 information, clarity, and context on those issues that
22 they've raised. And then, so I'm going to turn it over to
23 Alyssa to walk us through the areas where further
24 clarification is needed.

25 MS. PEARSON: All right. Good morning



1 everyone. So, we're going to talk through kind -- a little
2 bit more detail about the feedback we received and a letter
3 from them. They also gave us some information over the phone
4 about areas that would be helpful to clarify too, but we're
5 going to really focus on what they put in the letter to us.

6 So these three big buckets on the side, I'll
7 walk through, are really around, they need more
8 clarification. So the first ones are on the academic
9 achievement indicator and long-term goals. And what they
10 said is that we need to provide more information regarding
11 how our mean scale scores equate to proficiency levels.

12 So, they -- there's been an ongoing
13 conversation about whether our -- how we use mean scale
14 score as our achievement measure meets the stat -- statutory
15 criteria for proficiency level for ESSA. From decisions that
16 we've been watching with other states, I think they have
17 moved to the place where the-they feel comfortable with that
18 as long as we provide some additional data and explanation
19 about how it all works.

20 So, we've been working with other states on
21 that, getting more context, I think we're -- I think we'll
22 be okay with that piece of things. Then there were some
23 comments around the progress in achieving English language
24 proficiency indicator and long-term goals. Based on where we
25 were at the time of submission and the data, we had



1 available to us then, we did not create the interim targets
2 and long-term goals for students' progress over time because
3 we wanted to use our new data.

4 So we need to provide that information to
5 them, we have more data now that we've received on the
6 access assessment, so we're working on -- putting in some
7 targets for them with that.

8 MS. GOFF: Targets that we know about or? I
9 mean, I thought this was some of the things that we were
10 going to have a discussion about.

11 MS. PEARSON: Yes, and I think we will figure
12 out how to word that, that is good direction from you. If
13 you all would like us to say, we will fill this in after the
14 board has time to discuss, we can do that. I think we were
15 also thinking about putting some numbers in historical and
16 kind of placeholders and say these will be revised through
17 this process with our stakeholders. So, whatever you all
18 would prefer, we're happy to do on that.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Feedback? Guys?

20 MS. GOFF: No.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Board member Goff?

22 MS. GOFF: You said art? Is that related to
23 the part about the number of years' worth.

24 MS. MCCLELLAN: That's it.

25 MS. GOFF: It's.



1 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Yes, exactly.

2 MADAM CHAIR: So, it's the discussion that
3 Mr. Durham I've asked-

4 MS. PEARSON: Not that.

5 MADAM CHAIR: -for during the Hub meetings
6 that -- that-

7 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

8 MADAM CHAIR: -we actually have either a work
9 session or something to get a deeper understanding-

10 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

11 MADAM CHAIR: -of the whole scenario-

12 MS. GOFF: Well-

13 MADAM CHAIR: -around. Go -- go ahead Ms.
14 Goff.

15 MS. GOFF: Did you -- did Hub Committee
16 actually have a work session?

17 MADAM CHAIR: No, no, this was for a board --
18 a board-

19 MS. GOFF: Board.

20 MADAM CHAIR: -work session which was to
21 occur after the new asse -- the -- the revised.

22 MS. GOFF: Access? Acc-

23 MS. PEARSON: Access.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Access feedback comes back so
25 that we're talking about the current-



1 MS. PEARSON: Attain.

2 MADAM CHAIR: -assessment relating to
3 expectations and et cetera.

4 MS. GOFF: So, if the 120-day date is
5 September 6th, and we are going to try to work in a work
6 discussion session about that topic-

7 MS. PEARSON: No.

8 MS. GOFF: -how is that

9 MADAM CHAIR: No, no, no.

10 MS. GOFF: I thought we were going to do that
11 during -- during our retreat? You said-

12 MADAM CHAIR: No, no, no.

13 MS. PEARSON: So -- so we can give you.

14 MS. GOFF: I'm wai -- wai -- wai -- waiting
15 for staff to tell us-

16 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

17 MS. GOFF: -when we can have that. Now, the
18 question today is what do we put in the red line-

19 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

20 MS. GOFF: -graph?

21 MS. PEARSON: So-

22 MS. GOFF: So, do we take some historical
23 goals because they're concerned that we don't have goals
24 around this area? Do we use temporary some prior goals --

25 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.



1 MS. GOFF: -or do we say to be TBD, to be
2 determined?

3 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, and basically, we said
4 TBD, and they said, fill it in. So -- so what-

5 MS. GOFF: We can guess it is.

6 MS. PEARSON: -we can say is TBD again, and
7 then they'll come back and say fill it again.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, that's awesome.

9 MS. PEARSON: Or we could put in our
10 historical and right language right along there with it
11 saying this is based on our his -- historical and what we're
12 seeing in the initial data. We will be talking about this
13 with our board. We may come forward with amendments to our
14 state plan as a result of that -- of -- of those
15 conversations.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that makes some
17 sense. What -- what do you all think? To go ahead and put in
18 something, so they don't keep sending it back.

19 MS. GOFF: But I think we do need to have
20 that discussion.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Absolutely. That's exactly what
22 we're saying. We're going to have it but we're not going to
23 have it in the next 30 days.

24 MS. PEARSON: Not before the 24th.

25 MR. CHAPMAN: Yeah, my understanding was that



1 we are going to come in September, October with that.

2 MS. PEARSON: Yes.

3 MADAM CHAIR: And hopefully, in September.

4 MS. RANKIN: Well, earlier is better than
5 later.

6 MADAM CHAIR: We'll talk about that. We've
7 already got a special session for September. I think we need
8 to pace ours -- we need to have staff-

9 MR. CHAPMAN: Yes.

10 MADAM CHAIR: -help us pace ourselves. So,
11 we're not here every day. But that's another -- that's a
12 whole another, that's a scheduling issue. But we need to
13 know that you're ready to make that presentation to us.

14 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

15 MS. GOFF: One more.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Yes please, Ms. Goff?

17 MS. GAF: Is the -- is the -- a power point
18 and the phone call?

19 MS. RANKIN: Turn on your mic.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. Really sorry.
21 Thank you. Is th -- is the PowerPoint we have now.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the phone call, the
24 phone conversation that you had is, is all integrated.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So that the PowerPoint



1 is integrated with the letter that they sent us.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well. Oh yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, it's everything from
4 the letter. There is other topics and things that they ask
5 for clarification on our questions about in the phone call.
6 So, we're working on how most of that was really just
7 clarification. Just like explain what you mean by this word,
8 and this word and how does this work.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some of that we resolved
10 during the phone call and other issues were, were -- we've
11 been asked to provide additional information, but it didn't
12 rise to the level of concern to include in the letter.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And sort of a PR
14 question, I guess. Was -- was the letter, the interim letter
15 available publicly immediately? I mean, I don't think --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, it (indiscernible).

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When, when, we received
18 the copy of the interim let -- letter, was that already on
19 the CDE Web site?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now, you received it
21 first, I believe now it is posted, and it's also posted on
22 the U.S. Department of Ed Web site.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. I know, but I just
24 cared. Just-

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is out there right



1 now.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have questions. How
3 soon after?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We got the letter Friday
5 I believe, and then the U.S. Department of Ed posted it on
6 Monday.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that's when we got
8 it to you, I believe on Monday when this was posted I
9 believe on Tuesday.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thanks.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores.

12 So then, because we don't have the latest
13 data, we're not going to discuss it today or as soon as we
14 get that data, well, we have, well, I can see in September
15 as possibly adding maybe a half a day so that we can discuss
16 that. Because it needs to be discussed. I think that there
17 are people out there, and people right here who want this
18 discussion board member floors.

19 We just figure out when staff is ready, when
20 the data is here, and when the board and staff can schedule
21 it. I don't, I don't want to talk right now about figuring
22 out September agenda.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I guess you said
24 well, that's something we can talk about tomorrow. So, but
25 you're saying now that we can't talk about it.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But this is -- this is
2 like a half day. This isn't a quickie.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, board member Goff. I
4 mean.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I do believe it's
6 half a day, I don't.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry. Board member
8 Flores, we are trying to put together a complete study
9 session for you. We were targeting October, but this is
10 because you all have had many more questions about this than
11 just the data. And so, we're actually doing some work on our
12 own behalf to make sure that we are integrated and clear,
13 and that we can give you a clear presentation.

14 And that actually takes a fair amount of work
15 because it includes our accountability office, our
16 assessment office, our READ Act office, our literacy office,
17 our special Ed office, and so where -- we are targeting that
18 for October.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I understand that it
20 takes a lot of work.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But there are the public
23 out there is wanting us to, you know, come to some decision
24 on this and want to feel this way.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Absolutely. And then the



1 only other thing I want to say was just in terms of what we
2 said we were going to talk about today, we haven't quite
3 gotten to that because we think these are some of the ones
4 that we can address probably a little more easier, and what
5 we talked about yesterday that for in and digging through
6 the participation question. And so, we're going to get to
7 that in a minute.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So, there is
10 actually one part of the few, but it was not attendability.
11 There was actually a few more than that. This is really on
12 the assessment policy and we've got assessment staff here if
13 you all have questions and want to go deeper. You know that
14 we've had a policy where eighth graders that are taking
15 advanced math coursework can take the assessment that aligns
16 with that.

17 So, the -- the way that works with the U.S.
18 Department of Ed and, and with their policy and the
19 regulations is that students can do that as long as we are
20 giving end of course assessments in high school. Algebra
21 one, geometry one, and integrated one. Because our high
22 school tests are moving to the PSAT in Grade nine and 10,
23 and SAT in Grade 11. The U.S. Department of Ed said we're no
24 longer eligible for that flexibility. So that those eighth
25 grade, met -- seventh and eighth graders taking their



1 advanced coursework are not eligible for taking those tests.

2 So, I think that's something we knew was
3 coming as the U.S. Department of Ed's been very clear about
4 that policy for a long time, about how you're eligible for
5 this. So, we're working on figuring out transition plan for
6 that.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What does that mean?
8 Transition Plan.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Christina do you want to
10 come and chat?

11 CHRISTINA: No. I'll let the experts talk
12 about it.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Basically, I'm trying to
14 understand their reasoning. Their reasoning is you can't
15 have it both ways at different levels. You can't have end of
16 course assessments, and the middle school level and then
17 have a comprehensive exam. In other words, pick one.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, so they are supposed
19 to only be available to the, the seventh and eighth graders
20 if they are available in high school. So, since we are
21 transitioning to PSAT for ninth grade next year, then they
22 are telling us that we're no longer eligible for that.
23 They're also saying that whatever math is taken in the high
24 school area, it should be more advanced than what it's taken
25 in the middle school arena.



1 And so, the algebra two assessments, the
2 integrated three assessments that are currently available
3 under the CMAC assessments are quite advanced. And so, it
4 would be difficult to say perhaps that the assessment they
5 would be taking in high school at that point then would be
6 more advanced than what they were taking in middle school.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And so, what is your --
8 what is the transition?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So naturally, that's as
10 much of a transition plan as that. We know that there are
11 people around the state who are interested in having those
12 assessments available to accelerate Ed students. So, we have
13 been told, I wasn't part of the conversation with the
14 Department of Education, but I think we were told clearly
15 that we no longer are eligible.

16 So, we are removing this from our plan here.
17 However, we do expect to I believe, submit a waiver where we
18 make a request to see if there's anything that we can do. If
19 not the transition plan, I guess would mainly be that this
20 year we would offer the high school assessments to students
21 in grade seven and grade eight as we have in previous years.
22 However, moving forward, students in high school would be
23 taking the PSAT or the SAT assessment.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are there -- can you
25 describe some benefits to the students and their parents for



1 taking the end of course assessments rather than.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I think --

3 MADAM CHAIR: Does it encourage them, does it
4 change --

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that the benefit
6 would be right now for seventh and eighth grade students and
7 their parents. What they're seeing is of course content that
8 is really closely aligned to what they're taking
9 instructionally. So when they're taking those assessments,
10 they get more information really about, what -- if I'm
11 taking algebra one in seventh grade than this math
12 assessment is particularly aligned to that, that class that
13 I'm taking instructionally, whereas when they take the high
14 school assessments, they are a little bit more of a mixed
15 bag. And so, everybody's taking the same assessment at that
16 point in time.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In middle school -- in
18 the middle school, grade eight math CNS. Does -- are the
19 questions challenging enough or are there enough questions
20 that are challenging enough that you're actually measuring
21 some of the kind of work that our advanced kids are?

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think that what I see
23 is that the 8th grade math assessment does include a lot,
24 I'm not a content person so I can't speak specifically to
25 what you'll see in the standards, and I do know that there



1 is the math assessment is aligned well to the standards in
2 the eighth grade, but I do think we'll definitely see
3 students who are accelerated still do well on those eight
4 grade math assessments as well.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And not feel that it's
6 just kind of a waste because it's way below that. I mean one
7 of the challenges that I think we've seen with the
8 standardized assessments, is it feels like there's sometimes
9 a ceiling on the questions to the extent that more advanced,
10 you don't have the breadth of competency that you in fact
11 have in your student base.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I think over the
13 last several years as we, as we've transitioned to CMAC
14 assessments, there has been a much more of an intentional
15 goal of measuring the tails I suppose to measuring just--

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Than you. That's put
17 more clearly.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, I think that that is
19 a direction that we've moved to with Eighth grade, the --
20 the content more aligned as closely to what they're getting
21 instructionally as, as it does now when they're able to take
22 advanced courses, but will still be able to see I think
23 accelerated students probably having pretty high performance
24 there.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. The math in



1 me just got away, myself.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do they take Algebra one
3 in seventh grade and algebra two in eighth grade?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, there are two
5 pathways for math in Colorado. Typically, within our
6 districts, there's the what we call the traditional pathway
7 which is algebra one, geometry, algebra two. There are a few
8 districts that kind of mix the order of those, in some other
9 districts, they are on what we call the integrated
10 international map one, two and three course.

11 For seventh grade, they have been able to
12 take over the past few years algebra one or the integrated
13 assessments, in eighth grade they've been able to take all
14 of the assessments.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much for
17 that update.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So now, the moment
20 you've all been waiting for. Let's talk about participation.
21 So, the feedback that we got from the U.S. department of Ed
22 around participation is most specific in the letter to the
23 academic achievement indicator. How we calculate achievement
24 for students.

25 And what they told us is that states are not



1 permitted to exclude parent refusals or excuses from the
2 denominator when calculating performance in academic
3 achievement indicator. It's pretty clear in statute. So, we
4 wanted to take a little step back and talk to you about the
5 different participation policies that we have, that because
6 there's a lot of different moving pieces and kind of give
7 you that overview. So-

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I ask an information
9 question? Can you, can you ex -- when you're, when you're
10 excluding, you say you cannot exclude parental refuse --
11 refusals from the denominator and that's not in terms of the
12 -- it doesn't change the average score of the tests it's
13 taken for those who do change. But, but it does -- so it
14 doesn't mean to do with score.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It does.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It doesn't do with the
17 score on the test or does it?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It does.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: One. Can you kind of
20 show me how that works.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I need a math for that.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know, I know. I need
24 that white board.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would you get the



1 whiteboard? Would you mind?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Can--

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please go on.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm holding it for a
5 minute and then there's a slide that has all the language in
6 the calculations. Let me give you the overview and then
7 we'll, we'll do the math because it's a lot of different
8 math and it means scales score, how that connects to this
9 and where. So it's just a little complicated. No, it's,
10 it's, it's a little bit messy. Yeah. Okay.

11 So this slide kind of shows over time what
12 the different policies have been at a high level in our
13 state around participation. So previously, federal law, No
14 Child Left Behind, required testing for all students and 95
15 percent in all student groups -- on the segregated groups.
16 Back in the day when we had adequate yearly progress, AYP,
17 if you if one group of students did not make that 95
18 percent, the school didn't make AYP, so it was very, very
19 definite there. Through the waiver that they got from "No
20 Child Left Behind" participation needed to be included in
21 the system, but it, it was kind of up to us to decide how
22 that -- how that occurred.

23 With the ESSA, things have changed a bit but
24 let me talk through the state pieces that are in the middle
25 first. So state law historically had required all students



1 in tester grades to take the state assessment. It was very
2 clear language in state law that said everybody will test,
3 you will test all students. So, that was in place for a
4 while.

5 In February of 2015, we got to change that
6 green up there. It's darker -- it's darker on here, you guys
7 have no handouts of the actual print -- slides. But in
8 February of 2015, the board made a motion that said
9 districts and schools would not be held liable for parents'
10 decisions to excuse their students to test or parent
11 refusals and directed that at CDE and said CDE will not hold
12 these districts liable for this decision.

13 Then after that board mas -- motion at the
14 end of the -- that legislative session in May, House Bill
15 151323 passed. And what happened in that -- in that bill, it
16 removed that language that required our students to test,
17 that language is no longer in state law. That came out then.
18 It required district policies for parents to excuse children
19 from testing, so it required "Hey district, you've got to
20 tell our parents what the -- what the assessments are over
21 the course of the year, and you need to tell parents what
22 the policy in your district is for -- if they want to choose
23 to have the child not test".

24 It also prohibited schools and districts for
25 penalizing parents or students for not testing. So it



1 couldn't count as an unexcused absence, they couldn't be
2 excluded from after school activities. That was very clear
3 in the law. It also prohibited the schools or districts from
4 encouraging parents to opt their students out to excuse them
5 from testing or to making it an undue burden for students to
6 be able to test.

7 So, to say as a student, for example, a
8 student needed to take all the ELA and math tests in a
9 single day -- in a single setting, that would probably be
10 considered an undue burden. So all of that was in that law.

11 MR. DURHAM: Just one observation, Madam
12 Chair. I think when you talk about the Paren B of the state
13 law, it says if a parent excuses his or her student from
14 participating, then it goes or shall not impose negative
15 consequences including, I don't think you need to have the
16 words but not limited to that's implied --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

18 MR. DURHAM: - -- by the way this is worded.
19 So, negative consequences means not just those enumerated
20 but negative consequences.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

22 MR. DURHAM: So we are agreed on -- on -- on
23 that.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I am not the expert
25 interpreting -- interpreting the law.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We agree.

2 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. Okay.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But you said you were
4 going to talk about national law.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Yes. You got it,
6 thank you, You're right there. Okay. So then you know when
7 every student succeeds Art test, in that, it says 95 percent
8 of students must be assessed. And I've got -- we've got the
9 slides to show you the actual language. Opt out laws are
10 recognized by states and these guys can explain how that
11 works way better than I can. I'm getting a good lesson in
12 reading legal language.

13 States design how to participation factors
14 into accountability. So, we have that decision like we had
15 in the waiver, how do we use participation in the -- and the
16 differentiation of schools. But it's pretty clear that
17 nonparticipants below 95 percent are considered non-
18 proficient. So I'll -- I'll show you how that works. So
19 again, this is -- this was the state board language from
20 February 2015. This is the language in state law around the
21 written procedures and the policy that districts need to
22 have for parents excusing students from participating in the
23 assessment, the negative consequences, and the unreasonable
24 burden.

25 So just for your reference, you've got that



1 all right there. And here -- here is the parts of ESSA. So,
2 ESSA has the section that says, "When we annually measure
3 the achievement of not less than 95 percent of students, and
4 95 percent of students from all the segregated groups that
5 are enrolled in public schools, when we measure, calculate
6 and report this achievement indicator, this is how the
7 denominator needs to work." So let me try and try this arcs.

8 MR. DURHAM: When it -- when it says
9 "report", it's report to whom?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Publicly.

11 MR. DURHAM: Publicly.

12 MS. PEARSON: Excuse me.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Alyssa.

14 MS. PEARSON: But we -- there was a law
15 before ESSA and we voted. We voted on this when there was a
16 law in national-

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: NCLB.

18 MS. PEARSON: Yes. And the NCLB had a law
19 that students -- parents could decide that students need --
20 need not be tested if they so desired. So, our law, when
21 we've decided this, it was during NCLB, it was not ESSA.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In 2015.

23 MS. PEARSON: That's right.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, and I don't
25 remember that part of the NCLB. I know it's in ESSA, there's



1 language in there.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We were under that
3 waiver. So we had waived a lot of requirements at that point
4 in 2015. So we were operating with a lot of those
5 requirements we were operating on.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But I remember that it
7 was a large number of parents pointed to us that this was
8 NCLB law and so it was before that state law. And, well,
9 it's relevant, because we were -- when we voted on this, we
10 were under compliance under national laws.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's -- how do you
12 know? We're trying to figure out how they comply with this
13 law.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, but to say -- no
15 my case -- my case is that we were under law when we -- when
16 we decided this. Now we have this something else but and
17 then, we had a state law that followed our statement.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

19 MADAM CHAIR: I don't mean to be critical --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So, let me try and
21 explain. Stop me when it doesn't make sense. The law is
22 assuming that we're calculating -- we're measuring
23 achievement with a -- a proficiency rate, a percentage. We,
24 as a state, are moving to that means scale score which is a
25 little bit different but we're just going to talk about it



1 the way that -- the -- it -- it was written here.

2 So, if you're calculating proficiency, the
3 way we do it in Colorado is you've got the number of
4 students proficient, and I know we have different language
5 now but I'm just going to -- it's all our own language. The
6 number of students proficient, divided by the number with
7 scores, where we actually have scores because it's out of
8 the ones that we have results for, this is the percent of
9 those that are proficient. In Colorado, what we've been
10 doing is making sure right next to this, we report the
11 participation rate.

12 So, you can see that you've got 75 percent of
13 kids proficient and the participation -- participation rate
14 is 85 percent or whatever it is. So, you've got those two
15 pieces of information together. What this part of federal
16 law is saying, is saying that when you calculate, you have
17 the number of proficient and then either you have the number
18 with scores, if that's at or above 95 percent or if it's
19 not, if it's below 95 percent, this needs to be 95 percent
20 of your students.

21 So, basically, you get and it's totally
22 confusing and it's written very technically in there.
23 Basically, you've got a 5 percent of student allowance but
24 then you've got to put in here, you know, how -- how many
25 kids under the 95 percent didn't test but they're not going



1 to have a proficiency score, right? There's no chance of us
2 knowing whether or not they're proficient because they
3 didn't test. But this is what the -- what the US Department
4 of Ed gave us feedback on and said we have to do our
5 calculation this way.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could you take 100 kids?
7 Can you go through that?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. So, let's say we
9 have a 50 percent participation rate, okay? Cause that'll --
10 that'll make math a little bit easier. And we've got 100
11 kids in the school. So, we've got 100 kids, 50 percent
12 participation, we've got 50 kids. I should've done this
13 first. Now, I'll have to do math in the fly. Here's my
14 perfor -- my performance test today. Out of those 50, how
15 many are profi -- how many should we say are proficient?

16 MR. DURHAM: Fifty.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Fifty. You want all of
18 them?

19 MR. DURHAM: Sure.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Awesome. That -- thank
21 you Steve. This kind of helps me. So, then we've got 100
22 percent of kids proficient, okay? In that calculation. If we
23 now go over here to do it, the USDE wants us to do, 100
24 percent of kids or -- so because we're below the 95 percent
25 participation rate, we've got to use this method.



1 So, now, we've got 95 kids in our
2 denominator, right? We get the 5 percent allowance. We still
3 have 50 kids in the numerator. That gives us -- who's got a
4 calculator? A little bit more than what?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Fifty-two point six.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. I was like
7 it's a little more than 50. So, then -- so then now we're
8 saying, this school that over here, granted we know only 50
9 percent of the kids participate, and we know we don't have
10 the whole picture performance. But we're saying, instead of
11 this, we don't have the whole picture of performance that
12 the half that did participate were all proficient, we're
13 saying the school has 52 percent -- 52.6 percent
14 proficiency.

15 So, this worries me in that and it feels
16 pretty misleading and unclear publicly to report. I mean, I
17 think what the USDE said is that you can do both. You can
18 report this and you can report this and you can report this.
19 But you have to use this in your calculations.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So -- so it doesn't
21 matter-

22 MR. DURHAM: A new calculation of what?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Of achievement -- of the
24 achievement indicator.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For accountability.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For accountability. This
2 is where-

3 MR. DURHAM: Ranking schools from one to the
4 top, let's say. Or are you using that number to determine
5 schools around the clock, for example?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, we are -- we've been
7 trying to keep the federal requirements for identifying
8 schools separate from the state because we knew some of this
9 stuff might come up and so we did not write our plan with
10 our state system all tied into it. So, we have discretion
11 still over our state system.

12 For the purposes of federal identification of
13 schools, that's what they're saying we have to use this
14 number there. We think we're going to talk with them more
15 'cause we want to get really, really clear with them on what
16 the actual requirement is. Can we just report this and then
17 do our calculations this way? We're trying to get clear with
18 them about what the options are and how we can think through
19 it.

20 So, for today, we kind of want to lay out our
21 understanding of this, we're still working with them, so we
22 can get a very solid understanding of what it is they are
23 expecting us or the minimum requirements of what we would
24 need to do.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That brings a little bit



1 of this back to yesterday. On the left-hand side, where
2 you've got 85 percent participation and you've got a large
3 number of students. I'm not uncomfortable with coming to
4 some statistical conclusions on -- based on the scores on
5 how well those students are doing. 'Cause you got 85 percent
6 participation in a large group of numbers.

7 When you've got 20 percent participation and
8 not a whole lot of numbers, I don't -- or a lot of numbers,
9 either one, it's really hard to conclude whether those kids
10 are meeting standards or aren't meeting -- whether they're
11 achieving or not achieving. So, I wish that there were a way
12 to look at it in that manner or for staff to be able to look
13 at it in that manner.

14 So, that if you've got a large, a statis --
15 statistically significant number of kids participating, and
16 that -- that probably does have to go down to the subgroups.
17 We can take some comfort that we've got a good guess on how
18 things are going and the whole objective here is to figure
19 out whether kids are succeeding or whether they're appro --
20 whether we should identify some interventions.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The problem is, I mean,
23 I don't know this, but the statisticians do, and I don't
24 know we're -- that we're necessarily working on that either.
25 Nor am I sure we could convince the Feds that this is a



1 reasonable alternative to consider when you do have the opt-
2 out issue.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's the number
4 is also, like you said, the representation of which-

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -students are testing
7 and which-

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -ones are not.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's more of a -- it
11 turns into a sort of a sampling thing, you hope. I mean, you
12 hope it's a sampling thing as opposed to specifically
13 identify kids who are kept out. But that's another
14 discussion.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Were saying that they
17 would like us to do either or I think I'm not become clear
18 whether there was an either or-

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They want us to do this.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So just-

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what they want us
22 to do.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Over the-

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: For what exact purposes
25 and how and what else we might be able to use, that's what



1 we're trying to tease out with them, if there are some ways
2 to put things around that and figure things out. But the
3 clear reading the law says you calculate it like this. It
4 then gets more complicated when we're talking about mean
5 scale scores 'cause we're not -- we don't have a numerator
6 and a denominator when we're looking at mean scale scores.

7 But the idea would be similar, I think, in
8 their interpretation would be that kids below, you know,
9 this 95 percent you would still need that number of
10 students, those kids we count as non-proficient. But it's
11 just not as clear because it's a different kind of metric.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member Durham, you
13 have a question?

14 MR. DURHAM: Yes. So, I -- let's presume that
15 we have this circumstance and we have to report, in some
16 fashion, the 52.6 percent proficient, which-

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is probably higher than
18 some.

19 MR. DURHAM: -may or may not be accurate but
20 so we have to -- we have to -- we have to report that to --
21 and we have to -- we have -- that information has to be
22 available somewhere on our website or in whatever documents
23 we publish. But it's certainly not exclusive that -- that
24 information is not the only information we're allowed to
25 publish.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. We can pu -- we
2 can publish whatever we want to publish. That's what we're
3 using for accountability.

4 MR. DURHAM: So, i -- is there a way, and --
5 and, you know, if we come do a, you know, if we go back to
6 the old method of calculating, let's say what? We had 50-50
7 and it was 100 percent, is there a way to emphasize that
8 number in the way we did it before by showing the
9 participation rate of 50 percent so that -- that federal
10 number is available but we label it as a federal number and
11 by -- via commentary can label it in some pejorative fashion
12 and it may or may not be relevant. So-

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's very relevant.

14 MR. DURHAM: So, is there -- is there a way
15 to do that?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I -- I think so and I
17 think that's what we want to talk to-

18 MR. DURHAM: So that's what-

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -not in those words but
20 talk about that with the US Department about the-

21 MR. DURHAM: You're going to be much nicer.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think-

23 MR. DURHAM: Yes.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm going to try. But I
25 think we need to understand, so that -- that takes care of



1 the reporting but the calculating and the using for
2 accountability, that's where we need the clarification from
3 them of what is the minimum and how can we-

4 MR. DURHAM: Well, in terms of the
5 accountability, then would that affect schools on the clock
6 or could we find-

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We-

8 MR. DURHAM: -could we -- could we base this,
9 could we determine the lowest 5 percent based on our
10 calculations as opposed to their federal calculation?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what we would
12 like to find out.

13 MR. DURHAM: That's what we don't know.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

15 MR. DURHAM: Okay.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

17 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And if they say we --
19 you have to do this for our -- for our federal
20 identification, I think we can still do what we want to do
21 for our state. It's just that we're going to get these
22 different datasets and messages out there. But with that,
23 let -- we'll just figure out what those consequences are.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You mean 163 where we
25 have all these different things that we tell parents about



1 their schools and that serves as a real challenge.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because we -- in my
4 community, we had schools that were -- I forgot about all
5 the different terminologies, but they were the best and the
6 worst at the same time. The parents were saying, "What are -
7 - what -- what are you talking about?"

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

9 MR. DURHAM: I think -I think, you know,
10 Federal, because I understand the history of -- of this
11 concept. It was to prevent schools from gaming the system by
12 not testing poor performing students.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

14 MR. DURHAM: I think in Colorado, we've
15 actually had the opposite where the higher performing
16 students have disproportionately opted out. So -- so, the
17 federal law certainly hasn't accomplished. Certainly --
18 certainly hasn't.

19 MS. PEARSON: It's not that they were being
20 tested Mr. Durham it's that the results were not being
21 reported. They were definitely being tested but when you had
22 a very high achieving school district and you only had 20
23 percent or less students who were not successful, it got
24 buried in the numbers and it was only when we were required
25 to dis-aggregate that-



1 MS. PEARSON: So, it's the dis-aggregation is
2 a different question.

3 MS. PEARSON: It's the disaggregation.

4 MR. DURHAM: But -- but I think when we put-

5 MS. PEARSON: They were all tested.

6 MR. DURHAM: -when we put a school on the
7 clock, it's -- it's not on dis-aggregated numbers but it is
8 on aggregated.

9 MS. PEARSON: A little both now.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's both.

11 MR. DURHAM: So now it's not going to be
12 both.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's going to be both

14 MS. PEARSON: We have both. We've had both,
15 we've had the growth dis-aggregated since 2010, right. And
16 it's in the framework, and then the last -- last year we
17 hadn't dis-aggregated achievement. We will again this year.

18 MS. PEARSON: If ESSA decides.

19 MR. DURHAM: So we've -- we've had it. And
20 how has that played in? Is that one of the calculations that
21 ends up determining the bottom 5 percent I -- I thought the
22 bottom 5 percent was based on overall average.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So it's based on -- I
24 probably used the wrong term yesterday. It's based on like
25 the overall all the points in the framework which look at



1 overall performance and dis-aggregated performance. So it's
2 looking at this kind of comprehensive picture.

3 There's other identifications under asset
4 that say just how are your students with disabilities doing.
5 And if they are struggling, it doesn't matter to the rest of
6 your performance you're identified for this targeted
7 identification.

8 MR. DURHAM: You -- you're identified, but
9 not as a failing school.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not as low as 5 percent
11 but for the targeted improvement which is the language on
12 there. Yes exactly.

13 MR. DURHAM: So the way we've rated our
14 schools has -- I guess what I want to get back to is -- is
15 on the aggregated maybe on the total now. But let me ask,
16 let me rephrase the question, if when -- when it comes to
17 how we would wait various things to determine who's in the
18 bottom 5 percent, we still have -- have we made commitments
19 to the federal government on how we're going to wait those
20 things?

21 MS. PEARSON: Wait what things Steve?

22 MR. DURHAM: The-

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Indicators

24 MR. DURHAM: Say wait performance of dis-
25 aggregated groups or wait -- or you know what are some of



1 the other, forget the majors we're talking about putting in
2 like attendance and that's a factor, right. We're not
3 bringing that. So -- so we get actually -- we can actually,
4 are we obligated to keep whatever it is we have now, or can
5 we change the waiting in some fashion?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is up to you as a
7 board. We even spent June, up through June last year talking
8 about the weightings of the different indicators and that's
9 something you all can revisit. You remember all those
10 painful months of that conversation. So that is definitely
11 something you all can think about.

12 Federal law requires that achievement,
13 growth, English language proficiency growth and graduation
14 rate have to weigh more together have substantially more
15 weight than that other indicator.

16 MR. DURHAM: Right, so but within those four
17 we could weigh each of those four differently.

18 MS. PEARSON: Yes, yes.

19 MR. DURHAM: So we could -- we could find a
20 way to emphasize the aggregated number rather than the dis-
21 aggregated

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: However, you all want to
23 do that there's different ways to do that.

24 MR. DURHAM: Okay, thank you.

25 MS. PEARSON: Board member Flores.



1 MS. FLORES: But I think one of the things we
2 need to do is we need to find out if English language
3 learners are -- are achieving or learning? In-fact that's
4 some of the measures.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You've got that in
6 there.

7 MS. FLORES: Minority kids, you know black
8 kids-

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

10 MS. FLORES: -are learning and we have to not
11 aggregate that with everybody else but segregate it so that
12 we know-

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You got it.

14 MS. FLORES: -How they are doing

15 MS. PEARSON: It is disaggregated.

16 MS. FLORES: Yes.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's how the framework
18 says.

19 MS. FLORES: And it is reported. It's just
20 that in the final accountability number there is an
21 aggregation.

22 MS. PEARSON: Okay.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Because what we said as
24 a state kind of the philosophy if I can sum it up is you
25 know with all -- have all these different indicators that we



1 care about. We want to identify the schools and districts
2 where we're struggling with most of them where it's an
3 overall system challenge and how do we help those and put
4 our attention there as opposed to in terms of the state
5 accountability.

6 There's lots of people in the department and
7 state doing much focus on individual groups. The state
8 accountability itself is not focused on schools or districts
9 that are just struggling in one or two -- the two areas.

10 MS. FLORES: Yeah, and no longer are we doing
11 what no child left behind was doing and that was focusing on
12 kids that were just above and -- and not really working with
13 kids that were very low. They were working with average kids
14 but not working with very low kids. I think that's where we
15 are today. I mean because I -- I don't think many of these
16 schools have -- have really changed.

17 They continued on working on the average and
18 not working on helping very low or kids who are at, you
19 know, the lowest level academically.

20 MS. PEARSON: Board member Rankin.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I jump in on one
22 thing on that just to add to that. And that's exactly why
23 we've been -- why the states move to the mean scale score
24 instead of this calculation because with this calculation it
25 incentivize looking at those kids just that are right above



1 that around that line of proficiency where mean scales score
2 is looking at kids all over the spectrum of performance
3 ensuring they get attention. So -- so I -- I just want to
4 fit that in.

5 MS. PEARSON: Board member Rankin.

6 MS. RANKIN: Ms. Pearson if -- if we are
7 trying to confuse parents and taxpayers, I think we're
8 pretty close to.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I worry about that too.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm wondering are there
11 other states that have the opt out the same as our state or
12 we hanging out there by ourselves? And I know not all of the
13 ESSA plans have been turned in yet. So I'm kind of wondering
14 what someone else that might be in our situation is thinking
15 about.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we've been looking
17 around and Joe also did a lot of research looking at what
18 other states are out there. There's no other state that's
19 really in our exact situation with our same participation
20 rate and staying and state positive states with parent opt
21 out laws but they don't actually have participation
22 challenges.

23 There's a few other states that have
24 participation challenges and they have not turned in their
25 plans yet to know exactly how they're going to handle all of



1 this. Do you want to--

2 MR. DURHAM: What was our participation right
3 now.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What was our parti --
5 that's the next -- the next item were about to take we're
6 about to take as soon we through this, right. Well that's up
7 next.

8 MS. PEARSON: Be patient.

9 MS. FLORES: But -- but this is -- this, this
10 particular way of -- of figuring this out is set and we do
11 have to abide by this for the feds.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we need to
13 understand exactly Mr. John's point or question where what
14 that what it constitutes in law as the requirement for
15 meeting it. Is it -- can we report it and be done at that
16 point or what are those lines about their minimum
17 requirements for their use on this?

18 MS. PEARSON: Board member Goff.

19 MS. GOFF: And maybe tell me if this is
20 coming up later too. First of all, I knew yesterday. Thank
21 you, the reminder was worthwhile about the danger, of us
22 going back to our multi accountability system mess. When we
23 escaped from that a few years ago it was because of the
24 development of the growth model in a big added part that
25 should be your share you should go to the growth model.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I can't hear you.

2 MS. GOFF: How can -- how can grow -- the
3 measure of growth. How could we use our growth here whether
4 it's just for reporting on the state system? How could that
5 play into -- I still I kind of stay optimistic. I tend to
6 think in terms of what are the incentives for not only
7 improving the participation rates but making that actually
8 worthwhile at the end of it.

9 How -- how do you include growth rates among
10 which ever measurement in order to boost the -- the message
11 that -- that we're progressing. Maybe that's very vague I'm
12 sorry if it is. I just think that as long as it looks like
13 we're going to at least have a transition period, we're
14 going to have to explain our state place in relation to how
15 the feds are moving through it a little bit. How could that
16 be included. Also, as far as mean scale scores you guys
17 probably know this. Connecticut's plan was just approved
18 and-

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yup they share their
20 language with us and we've been working with them and so
21 getting super helpful. So I think that I'm optimistic
22 because of that.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So -- so you've had that
24 communication since we got this letter?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, I've been.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What's been busy in the
2 last couple of days?

3 MS. FLORES: Yeah.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay may I say
5 something.

6 MS. PEARSON: Board member Flores.

7 MS. FLORES: I -- you know I hear you about
8 growth and I maybe I misunderstood you because I didn't hear
9 you at the beginning and I think that growth is important,
10 but if you're growing at a point zero five percent and we
11 know a big large district one that I represent has been
12 growing at something at a snail's pace like that especially
13 for second language learners. And it's very hard to make one
14 point in 10 years.

15 You know if you grow it point zero five. And
16 so we need to -- we need to have greater expectations for
17 kids to come to proficiency for all kids. Kids that are
18 poor, kids that are black, kids that are brown, for
19 everybody. We need to have them expectations that they are
20 going to be proficient, so they will be able to compete in
21 the workplace in schools and such. We have to have those
22 expectations. We can't -- we can't no longer have low
23 expectations for this population of kids.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, so to move us
25 along because I know we're a little bit behind.



1 MS. PEARSON: Please proceed.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm just going to leave
3 these slides in for you as references other parts Ether and
4 let you know next steps is like we've talked about we're
5 working with the U.S. Department of Education to fully
6 understand what the approval criteria is so we can figure
7 out what those minimum and what pieces really mean.

8 We need to try and meet them in our plan by
9 August 24th, which is a week from today. There may be things
10 that we will just say this, you know, placeholder at least
11 it sounds like from you all that you're okay with English
12 language proficiency growth. We kind of put in where we've
13 been historically and then know that we'll be talking about
14 it. But in terms of these areas where there's bigger policy,
15 I think we'll -- we'll leave it to in the plan that we will
16 be coming back to the board and having further conversations
17 about where we go.

18 MS. PEARSON: So they'll -- they'll just red-
19 line it again and send it back. I mean they'll just send it
20 back again if we-

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what we're trying
22 to figure out from them where -- where what they would put
23 to us in September 6 if we don't address some of these
24 things now. Or if we just say we're going to continue
25 talking to the board about these topics.



1 MS. PEARSON: It's like it's a vehicle to buy
2 time to some extent.

3 MR. DURHAM: They indicated if we kind of
4 provided information about where we're going forward looking
5 information that they might be able to find it in themselves
6 to-

7 MS. PEARSON: Tell them we are very, very
8 intelligent but we are kind of slow in processing because we
9 want to be deliberate.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

11 MS. PEARSON: Board member Rankin.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do you know if any other
13 states have turned in their plans yet and have any been
14 accepted?

15 MR. JAMES: Five -- now, I think-

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Cause Connecticut with
17 just yesterday-

18 MR. JAMES: And 16 turned it in.

19 MADAM CHAIR: But keep in mind folks that
20 once we get to implementation in these States, we don't
21 really know how that's going to -- I mean -- I don't -- I
22 think this is going to be something that's going to roll
23 around for a while even for the ones that have been
24 approved, if what I heard is correct which is that, they've
25 been approved by the department but they're not necessarily



1 been shared with the school districts and teachers and--

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I know that these policy
3 cannot -- these plans can evolve too so as we implement, and
4 we learn, and we figure out what's working and what's not,
5 we can go back and amend our plan to the U.S. Department of
6 Ed and change it-

7 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah. And that was something
8 that I clarified with this gentleman who signed the letter
9 to us. Because it really felt in a lot of the feedback that
10 the states got, that it's a yes or no and et cetera. And I
11 clarified with him that we are free to file amendments as we
12 proceed, as we have more discussions in our communities and
13 with our legislators et cetera and he did say yes.

14 So I think we had been -- Steve and I had
15 been thinking -- this is the first person, with time we
16 would make some changes we would look at a different
17 indicator. We had all sorts of things that we talked about
18 changing and then the way they were speaking about it, it's
19 -- it's like it was in stone, and I, I think we probably
20 need to push -- continue to push that. These things evolve
21 as you try them out.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we've got clear
23 language in our plan around the other indicator that we have
24 a short-term indicator and we're developing conversation for
25 long term. One thing you will see in the red line version,



1 science the way they read the statute it's pretty clear in
2 their science can't be an academic achievement indicator. So
3 we're moving science to the other indicator category because
4 we can st --

5 MADAM CHAIR: Still keep our science.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And there we just need
7 to categorize it and name it differently. So--

8 MADAM CHAIR: And that's because it's not
9 every year?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, it's because it's
11 not English Language Arts or math becau --

12 MR. JAMES: Because it's pretty specific and
13 the law says reading law and math that -- that academic
14 achievement indicator will be based only on reading--

15 MADAM CHAIR: And the other one was
16 different? The earlier legislation was different?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: On NCLB, NCLB--

18 MADAM CHAIR: Because it's required, right?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would but for AYP it
20 was not, it was English language, arts and math that wasn't
21 science, but they require testing and science, but it wasn't
22 an academic achievement indicator and so --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Do they still require? They do
24 --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They still require



1 testing. We're still allowed to use it, like we used it in
2 the waiver under academic achievement. But they didn't want
3 it categorized as another indicator of student success not
4 as academic achievement.

5 MR. JAMES: So last waiting attached to it.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're not going to do
7 anything with our state system, we're just -- how we rate it
8 for them as we're just moving it down there and showing the
9 points separately.

10 MADAM CHAIR: And we can't have more than one
11 other indicator.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. Connecticut, I
13 think actually put in like 10, they've got a lot maybe not
14 quite 10 but yeah.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Durham.

16 MR. DURHAM: Thank Madam Chair. Let's just
17 presume that we were to commit to using their, their 95
18 percent requirement in the denominator and -- we're -- and
19 reporting that debt, would that get our plan approved if we
20 didn't, because I wouldn't want to make any commitments we
21 were going to use it to penalize anyone in any fashion that
22 they would be on or off the clock because of that, because
23 we'd want to be able to do our other calculations would --
24 would that get us approved? Or will they come back and say
25 well that's half a loaf, now you have to commit to X Y and



1 Z?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what we will ask
3 them and find out from them.

4 MR. DURHAM: And -- so you don't want to do
5 it. You don't want to do that now I take it.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't want to ask them
7 that now.

8 MR. DURHAM: No, you don't want to smit the
9 plan with that end, without any commitment to use it. I mean
10 where -- where--

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I see what you are
12 saying.

13 MR. DURHAM: Where in the plan do you -- I
14 mean it -- it looked like if I read.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We could--

16 MR. DURHAM: I had meant that--

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We could do that

18 MR. DURHAM: Let's make this summary but
19 where's the federal comments. I can't find anything.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Is it this?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If you all wanted if I'm
22 understanding correctly, we could submit a plan that says we
23 will do this for reporting achievement. And just leave it
24 like that and see what happens.

25 MR. DURHAM: Would that help you or not?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would be a step
2 forward and -- we're -- I'm going to talk with them tomorrow
3 when we spend the afternoon together tomorrow when-

4 MR. DURHAM: Obviously not meetings so-

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

6 MR. DURHAM: Add up stock if you--

7 MADAM CHAIR: We can have phone call.

8 MR. DURHAM: No --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mean -- I think what --
10 what maybe would be helpful for me from you all is do you
11 want us to put in that we will continue to talk with you all
12 about how to meet this requirement and put in language about
13 that, or we can just not address it at all, that's kind of
14 what I was thinking our options are for now and we told us
15 Department of Ed when we were on the phone with them that
16 this was going to be a big board conversation and it was
17 something that -- it was not something we could resolve and
18 that with the timing and the board meeting you all were not
19 going to vote on anything this -- this month that it would
20 take at least September if not till October to -- for you to
21 really decide on what you wanted.

22 So, they know that this me -- is not -- we're
23 not planning on wrapping it up with them, but what we can do
24 if you are comfortable with it is indicate that we are going
25 to continue conversations with you all about how to make the



1 required -- or about the policies and requirements.

2 MR. JAMES: You bet.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. So then we'll
4 just put language and we'll put in like the September and
5 October board meeting date and say we will continue to
6 discuss it and provide an update to the U.S. Department of
7 Ed and the board which is conclusion.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Unless you come back tomorrow.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: With something solid.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Something that you feel we
11 hadn't heard about-

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, I mean if we get
13 to a point where it's -- you can report it and you can
14 calculate for accountability the way you calc -- calculate
15 then I will send that out to you all and see if you want to
16 just move forward with that.

17 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Thank you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

19 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That was fun. Board
21 Member Goff.

22 MS. GOFF: Is mostly for the chair is there -
23 - is -- I guess I just want to know in general what entities
24 what bodies are involved in actively present or involved in
25 that phone call. Can you tell me that information in general



1 summary who was involved in the phone call?

2 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: The phone call was
3 solely CDE staff and US Department of Education staff. There
4 was about, I would say eight US. Department of Education
5 staff on the phone and there was probably eight of us.

6 All of the different people that oversee the
7 different title programs in case there were specific
8 questions. So, that's who was is on the call. No external
9 entities.

10 MS. GOFF: So, Dr. Schroeder you mentioned
11 that you would have some communication with someone from the
12 U.S. Department Ed.

13 MADAM CHAIR: No, I attended a presentation
14 and so I of course asked questions as we all did. So-

15 MS. GOFF: And where was-

16 MADAM CHAIR: That's the-

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Alliance for equity and
18 education.

19 MADAM CHAIR: I'm trying to remember with The
20 Alliance and NASB and one other organization sponsored it --
21 it was paid for by an H Foundation, I can't remember which
22 foundation it was and it was the one that was on lessons
23 learned and the last day Jason Botel came, and after he made
24 his limited presentation he was open to questions and that's
25 when I said like it's having -- having listened to states



1 for two days, I got the impression that they were getting
2 the message that this was getting -- being cut in stone,
3 once their plan was adopted and I said we were under the
4 impression that this was something going to be an ongoing
5 effort on our part in our -- in our state with all our
6 stakeholders. And he committed to yes, you can file
7 amendments at any time.

8 MS. GOFF: Now i think-

9 MADAM CHAIR: And that's how-

10 MS. GOFF: I think would speak for myself I
11 was aware of that before we even sent in our plan. I was
12 just curious as to the details of some of this communication
13 that's occurred.

14 MADAM CHAIR: I think that's what everybody
15 thought when they file their plan and then they started
16 sounding so rigid. I think that's the word as concerned.

17 MS. GOFF: The recent announcement of some
18 changes that the U.S. Department of Ed, you know the -- I --
19 I have an interest in I think it's something -- not today.
20 We are not going to talk today. Jason Botel is no longer
21 with the Department of Ed, and I had asked our commissioner
22 to indicate whether or not our staff -- or -- or she thought
23 that was going to have any kind of an impact on the move --
24 smooth movement or you know that flow from here on out with
25 -- she does not believe so, I don't know that there's any



1 way to know that whatever happens.

2 But the communication is still of prime
3 importance about who and where -- who's going where and when
4 and what are the results of some of these conversations,
5 were appropriate and applicable and I appreciate the answer
6 to the question. Thank you

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Flores.

8 MS. FLORES: Just you people who are kind of
9 in the know as to the individuals that have been hired at
10 the Department of Education, are they knowledge --
11 knowledgeable people? I mean, are they, are they experts? Or
12 are they a Bible salesman?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I will, I will tell you
14 what I do know, by sources, by trust, by people who are
15 familiar. Jason Botel who is know -- who has been the sort
16 of well I guess you would call him a state regional contact
17 policy, contact. He has recently left the U.S. Department of
18 Ed.

19 There has been a gentleman appointed not so
20 much, I can't, I don't think you can call him a direct match
21 replacement, but he is well respected, well known. He is
22 the, he's called, no -- no he's called the Secretary for
23 Congressional and Legislative Policy in the office. So it,
24 working with the whole ESSA policy end of it, I would think
25 would be an expected part of his job.



1 His name is Peter Oppenheim. I will say that
2 are, are NASB Government Affairs Committee contacts on the
3 hill and throughout the various agencies in D.C. are
4 familiar with him as they were with Mr. Botel and only
5 solid, verifiable, credible, good reputation has come forth
6 from NASB's viewpoint. So I can tell you that.

7 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it's just things are
9 changing, as we know everywhere. Sometimes not as fast as we
10 like but they are still in flux and so far I believe it's
11 the opinion of commissioners, in addition to Dr. Anthes that
12 have said that, "There's always been a sense of comfort and,
13 and stability within the, the staff people that, that work
14 at the U.S. Department and that things are expected to
15 maintain a pretty even keel through this very important work
16 with all of us out here." So, so I think that's, it's where,
17 it's what I know right now.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Welcome.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you folks. There's
21 no free time for the next seven days. Next item on our
22 agenda is action item laid over from Wednesday. This is a
23 continued conversation on the reconsideration of the
24 Julesburg district accreditation rating.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, would it be



1 since we are running behind. Would it be okay if we took the
2 CMAS item first?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It would be fine with
4 me.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We'll just play like we
7 did yesterday.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So should I start that
10 again? The next item on the agenda is presentation on the
11 CMAS, PSA, TSA to state level results. And this is item
12 6.01. If you're, if you haven't given up trying to keep up
13 with our order.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I got it, this is an
15 information item measure.

16 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair,
17 members of the board. Today we have had Christina Wirth-
18 Hawkins here, Joyce wanted to be here with us but she's
19 dealing with some family issues so we're happy to have
20 Christina here and both Christina and Alyssa Pearson will
21 give us a briefing on the state level results.

22 I will just note, just on behalf of my staff
23 I just want to thank them for the amazing amount of work
24 this takes every year to get the results, process the
25 results, make sure the results are clean, validated and



1 accurate. That's a huge lift on our staff's part, and so I
2 just want to thank the team for getting that ready for
3 today.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we thank you as
5 well.

6 MS. ANTHES: I believe I'll turn it over to
7 Miss Wirth-Hawkins.

8 MS. WIRTH-HAWKINS: Thank you. As
9 Commissioner Anthes mentioned, I am attempting to fill
10 Joyce's shoes today, so I thank in advance for bearing with
11 me as I attempt to present all of these results to you. This
12 morning we're going to talk briefly about the achievement
13 results that we're going to look specifically from an
14 achievement and participation perspective, I will provide a
15 little bit of background on the assessments.

16 I know that many of you are familiar with
17 them but I will provide a little bit of information just so
18 that you can kind of have it at the top of your mind as we
19 go through them and we will be looking at the results from a
20 participation and achievement perspective for the CMAS
21 assessments as well as for the PSAT, NSAT assessments from
22 this last spring 2017.

23 We will go quickly if there is time through
24 just some high-level information about what is available on
25 the individual student reports for both CMAS and PSAT and



1 NSAT. And then talk briefly about resources and then I'll, I
2 will turn it over to Alyssa to discuss growth. She will talk
3 about background related to growth as well as providing
4 summaries of state level data by this aggregated group and
5 then she'll talk about what information is available
6 particularly in relation to public reports and parent and
7 student reports. Yes. Is this better? All right.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm not finding this
9 presentation. That, is it not on-board docs?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I just posted it on
11 board docs and then -- it was what we -- the PowerPoint we
12 handed out yesterday.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

14 MS. FLORES: At the end of the meeting
15 yesterday.

16 MS. WIRTH-HAWKINS: The data, were embargoed
17 until 10:00 am this morning so they weren't posted.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we're already
19 getting e-mails from the various schools-

20 MS. WIRTH-HAWKINS: I'm sure-

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -sharing their
22 excitement.

23 MS. WIRTH-HAWKINS: I'm sure it is very, very
24 exciting time. So from an achievement perspective, when we
25 think about the state assessments, they are designed to



1 serve as an indicator of student mastery over the grade
2 level standards by the end of the year, so they are designed
3 specifically to measure the academic standards that are used
4 instructionally throughout Colorado schools and classrooms.

5 They provide information on how students are
6 performing in a relation to those standards and they provide
7 information that will allow parents and students, district
8 schools, and teachers to compare to the results of those
9 students across school levels, across districts, and across
10 the state as well. In addition to achievement information,
11 they also provide an opportunity to look at growth and
12 yearly growth.

13 So as you were discussing before we can look
14 at student results not only from the perspective of did,
15 they meet the standards, did they meet the expectations of
16 the standards, but also how well have they improved in
17 relation to their peers from the previous year. They also
18 allow teachers, schools, districts to look at how well their
19 students are performing against the standards and then to
20 identify areas of potential strength, areas of potential
21 weaknesses.

22 And with that information, they can look to
23 see if there's an area in which they are excelling and other
24 areas where they might need to target specifically for areas
25 of improvement or instructional adjustments and then they



1 also provide schools, districts and communities with
2 comparison information and accountability information. When
3 we look at which assessments were administered this year,
4 when we look at which assessments were administered this
5 year, we had the English language arts and math assessments
6 administered across the state in grades three through nine.

7 The Science assessments were administered in
8 grades 5, 8, and 11, the social studies assessments were
9 administered in grades four and seven and those were
10 administered on a sampling basis. So about a third of
11 schools took those assessments this year. The Colorado PSAT
12 was administered for the second time in Colorado to 10th
13 graders and the SAT was administered for the first time to
14 11th graders.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board Member Durham.

16 MR. DURHAM: Is there any difference between
17 the PSAT and SAT test administered Colorado in any other
18 state?

19 MS. WIRTH-HAWKINS: No.

20 MR. DURHAM: May I request that we not refer
21 to them as The Colorado PSAT or Colorado SAT, I think that
22 is misleading.

23 MS. WIRTH-HAWKINS: Noted. Thank you. So,
24 first let's, talk a little bit about participation in
25 relation to the results. It's helpful to consider



1 participation so that we can really look at helping to
2 contextualize what we're seeing. Where we see cases of
3 really high participation, we can have a little bit more
4 confidence or more competence in the results, where
5 participation lags that is a little bit more difficult to
6 see if we're really getting a full picture of what we're
7 seeing across the state.

8 The next few slides show three different
9 colors. They indicate in lavender, participation rates, in
10 red, parent excusal rates, and very slightly in green across
11 the top, other reasons for nonparticipants such as the
12 medical exemption or students are absent something like
13 that. These slides also show three years' worth of
14 information, so we do now have three years' worth of
15 information, so we can start looking at trends across the
16 state and across the years.

17 What we tend to see is that our first talk
18 about parent excusals between 2015 and 2016, we saw those
19 rates increase. Between last year and this year, we have
20 seen that those rates are pretty similar to what we saw last
21 year.

22 On a side note over the last few years some
23 districts did have some confusion surrounding how to code
24 for parent excusals, and we did work very intentionally with
25 them this year to try to make sure that they did know



1 exactly how to code parent excusals when. We look at
2 participation, what we have seen with CMAS over the past few
3 years is that participation rates seem to be highest in the
4 lower grade levels, and they tend to drop as we go through
5 their grade levels.

6 When we're looking at grades three through
7 five over the past three years, we see that we're right
8 about 95 percent participation across the board. We have
9 increased slightly in this past year. When we look at grade
10 six, we're right about 92.3 percent, and again we have
11 increased slightly from the previous year.

12 So, we're approaching 95, we're not quite
13 there but still pretty high participation rates there. When
14 we look at 2015, 2016 and 2017, for grade seven, we are
15 right about 90 percent, a little below, but right about 90
16 percent. And over the past three years, for grade eight, we
17 are pretty stable at 85 percent. When we look at grade nine,
18 that's where we start to see the lower participation rates.

19 So, again, we're quite a bit lower than where
20 we would prefer to see as around 95 percent, we're at about
21 76 percent this year. Notably when we look over the last two
22 years, that is an increase. In 2015, we are at 70 percent,
23 this year we were at 76 percent. So, we are all seeing a
24 gradual increase in participation there, and we do expect
25 that to increase next year even more as we transition away



1 from the C mass assessments to the PSAT and ninth grade. We
2 did see that happen in 10th grade in 2016 when we transition
3 from C mass in 10th grade to the PSAT in 10th grade, we
4 moved from about a 60 percent participation rate to nearly
5 90 percent, and this year we increased participation even
6 more with PSAT up to 91.3 percent for 10th graders.

7 So, again we accept -- we expect to see that
8 happen with ninth graders as we believe that parents and
9 students will hopefully see an opportunity to re-engage with
10 this say assessment system, and hopefully see the relevance
11 and taking an assessment that aligns to what they'll take in
12 10th grade, and to the SAT that they'll take an 11th grade
13 as well. When we're looking at participation, we also look
14 at how well our numbers, our demographics for demographic
15 distribution characteristics matched to the actual
16 population, and what we expected based on, so our tested
17 population in reference to the actual population.

18 And so, with that we're looking at
19 demographic distribution characteristics between genders, so
20 how many males and females are less than a proportion of
21 males and females in our population? How closely does that
22 match? We also look at the race ethnicity, breakouts, we
23 look at the proportion of students who are eligible for free
24 and reduced lunch versus the proportion of students who are
25 not eligible for free and reduce -- reduced lunch. We look



1 at students who have an individualized education plan versus
2 students who did not have an individualized education plan,
3 and we look at English learners versus non-English learners.

4 So, I won't go through all of the percentages
5 here, but what we do see in grades three through five is
6 that we're very close, we're very close match from our
7 expected to our actual, we're within about 1 percent point
8 difference across the board there. When we look at the--

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could you, could you
10 entertain a couple of questions please?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Board member right here.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How do you get an
14 expected, just take one for example, ho-how do you know what
15 to expect?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, we're looking at the
17 actual population of students across the states, and then
18 we're looking at the actual would be who is actually in our
19 tested population.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, we expected 48.7,
21 but we got 48. So, we actually had more than what we
22 expected.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Slightly, but we're
24 really close right there. So, that's a very, very minor
25 difference.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How do you come up with
2 the expected number? It's not just the number available.
3 Right?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, the expected as
5 we're looking at the actual population. So, for example
6 third graders, we're looking at the actual population of our
7 Colorado third graders, and we're looking at the proportion
8 of male students to female students within that actual
9 population. So, the distribution difference there is we have
10 48.7 percent females within that as opposed to 51.3 percent
11 males.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It could just be a
13 difference between what they reported to us in the last
14 year, and how many female students they have in my class?
15 Right?

16 So, they may have one more female student
17 than they, than they did last year. We're just using past
18 data.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, that's what I'm
20 trying to draw out. Where does the expected number come
21 from? So --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: From the past data. I
23 thought maybe you were, you were making some estimates.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Of what you knew. And



1 is it based on actual --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some actual - -- it's
3 actual enrolled students.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jasmine Carey does the
6 actual calculation. So, she can tackle more into it.

7 MS. CAREY: Forgive me I'm a little sick. So,
8 so what we actually used --, so when we, when we sent, when we
9 start protesting, data goes into the vendor system based on
10 our October account data.

11 So, based on the number of students that are
12 reported as being enrolled students in a particular grade in
13 the whole state of Colorado. So, that's what the expected
14 numbers are based on. The actual numbers are based on
15 students who received valid test scores at the end.

16 So, there's some large number of students - -
17 - well, larger as we get - -- as we go up the grades, but
18 there's some number of students who in the end did not
19 receive a valid score. And so, they are not counted in
20 actual. And the question that we're trying to answer here
21 is, which students in the end did not receive the ballots
22 for, and it is it slightly different from the population we
23 were expecting to see had all of our students tested?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Use trying to figure out
25 whether there are some subgroups that disproportionately--



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do or don't?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. Exactly

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, again when we're
6 looking at grades three through five, we're very close, and
7 match within about 1 percent. When we look percentage like
8 differences, when we look at grade six to eight, we are also
9 very close, so we're within about 2 percent point
10 differences between expected and actual.

11 Now, when we get up to grade nine, we start
12 to see a few more differences, that we start to see more
13 variance between expected and actual. We see that
14 particularly in white students, we have fewer white students
15 in the actual and more Hispanic students in the actual. We
16 see more or fewer Native English speakers than we would
17 expect, have expected to see.

18 And we see fewer students who are not
19 eligible for free and reduced lunch. Now within grade nine,
20 that is about within 3.5 percent point differences. So, in
21 many cases, we're right on within those categories that I
22 just spoke to, those are where we see in the biggest
23 differences. And when we get to high school, science
24 specifically, that's where we start to see the biggest
25 differences. We have struggled with participation in high



1 school science, we're at about 60 percent participation rate
2 there.

3 And so, in those same categories that I just
4 spoke to, we are at about 6.6 differences in percentage
5 points between those expected and actual values. So, again,
6 what we are tending to see here is where we do have variance
7 in the expected versus actual population. Non-participants
8 tend to be disproportionately white, economically better off
9 and Native English speakers.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What are the conclusions
11 can we draw from a participation level?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can say that with
13 grades three through eight, our participation is pretty
14 high, and so we also have very close match between those
15 expected and actual numbers. So, we have with, we believe
16 that the results can be interpreted with a pretty high
17 reasonable level of confidence at the state level. When we
18 get to those high school levels so, as we're looking at
19 grade nine, and even more so as we're looking at high school
20 because of that variance between expected and actual for,
21 for high school science because of that low participation
22 rate, results need to be interpreted a little bit more
23 cautiously.

24 MS. MAZANEC: Can I ask?

25 MADAM CHAIR: Sure. Board Member Mazanec?



1 MS. MAZANEC: How did you come, how did you
2 come to that conclusion that non-participants were
3 disproportionately white economically better off than native
4 English speakers, was that true there?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, it was. So, it was
6 that's, the, the free and reduced lunch. Yes. Free and
7 reduced lunch eligible versus non-free and reduced lunch
8 status. When we look back at these slides here, that's where
9 we see the biggest variance in our expected numbers versus
10 our actual proportion of students.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, that is from a state
13 level when, when we're looking, we're only talking about
14 state level results today, but if you're looking at results
15 from a district or school perspective, then they do
16 participation rates do vary widely across districts and
17 schools, so as you're looking at those results, as a
18 community is looking at those results, they'll need to kind
19 of take us participation rates into consideration, low
20 participation rates for some schools in some districts, in
21 some county areas, in some grade levels across the state
22 will make interpretation results more difficult.

23 So I'm going to jump into results for the
24 CMAS assessments, this is a review for many of you. But
25 again, I want you to have it top of mind. When we talk about



1 performance levels, or when we talk about results from a
2 CMAS perspective, we typically describe results in terms of
3 performance levels and the percentage of students meeting
4 the two performance levels at the top, which are met
5 expectations and exceeded expectations. In CMAS, ELA and
6 Math, there are five performance levels.

7 In CMAS, Science, and Social Studies, there
8 are four performance levels. But across all of the content
9 areas, it is those top two levels that indicate that a
10 student is on track or ready for the next grade level within
11 that content area.

12 So, most of what we'll be looking at today
13 for CMAS, we'll be focusing on the distribution of students
14 within those top two levels. When we look at CMAS, English
15 Language Arts, again, we have three years' worth of data
16 now, so we can start to look at the tran -- information.
17 When we look at this slide, and this is a little bit
18 difficult to take, and so I'll try to give you some
19 information as we're going through it.

20 But what we're looking at here are those top
21 two levels. This slide includes all of the categories, all
22 of the performance levels. We're looking at the peachy color
23 and the blue color on top, and what you want to see is you
24 look across the years is, especially in 2017, what I'll call
25 a stair step down, which indicates in the peach that more



1 students are included in those top two levels than were
2 included in the previous years.

3 When you look across ELA, from grades three
4 through eight, we have seen an improvement across all of
5 those grade levels from the beginning of the ELA
6 administration of the assessments. And those range from 0 --
7 an increase of 1.5 percent in grades six to 5.8 percent in
8 grade five. And we see that there're also ranges in terms of
9 the percentage of students actually in those levels, it's
10 ranging from 36.2 percent in grade nine to 44.2 percent in
11 grade seven.

12 We did see a gr -- an incr -- a decrease from
13 2015 in grade nine of 1.6 percent. When we look at Math in
14 grades three through eight, we see some areas in which we've
15 increased over the last two years in terms of the number or
16 the percentage of students in those top two levels and some
17 grade levels in which we've decreased. When we look at
18 grades three through five from 2015 to 2017, we see that
19 we've increased by 3.3 percent in grade three and increased
20 by 3.8 percent in grade four.

21 In grade six and seven, we did go down from
22 2015 in this past year, so we went down by 0.8 percent in
23 grade six, and by 1.6 percent in grade seven and grade
24 eight, the percentage of students in those top two levels
25 increased in this year in comparison to 2015 by 2.1 percent.



1 The range of percentage of students in those top two levels
2 for grades three through eight in Math are ranging from 21
3 percent in grade eight to 40 percent in grade three.

4 And again, to go back to the conversation, we
5 spoke to earlier, it is important when you think about grade
6 seven and grade eight, that doesn't include all of the grade
7 seven and grade eight students. Many of those accelerated
8 students took the high school Math courses, so the grade
9 seven and grade eight Math is really focusing on the
10 students in grade seven and grade eight who took the
11 seventh-grade test and the eighth-grade test.

12 When we look at high school Math, again, this
13 includes grade seven through nine, we see the scores or the
14 percentage of students scoring those top two levels ranging
15 from 37, excuse me, 32.7 percent Algebra One to more than 70
16 percent -- 76 percent in Integrated Three and Algebra Two.

17 So, we see that these students are scoring
18 pretty high here, and we don't have a 2015 comparison point
19 here because in 2015, 10th to 12th graders we're taking the
20 assessments as well, so it wasn't an equal comparison, so we
21 took that out. But what we do see is that, we are seeing
22 some pretty high performance here and this -- this graphic
23 breaks it out by just looking at those top two levels here.

24 When you break it out even more and look
25 specifically at which students within those assessments



1 which grade levels what they were scoring, we see that the
2 seventh graders are scoring at the top across Algebra One
3 and Math One, they are scoring at a rate of 84.9 percent and
4 92.4 percent for Algebra One and Math -- Math One. And then,
5 as we go down in the grade levels, those drop a little bit,
6 so the accelerated eighth graders are also outperforming the
7 ninth graders across all of the assessments.

8 So, what we see is those students who are
9 inclined to -- to do well in Math who excel in Math, early
10 on, they are outperforming their peers even after their
11 peers have had two additional years of instruction in some
12 cases.

13 MR. DURHAM: Okay. Can you-

14 MS. GOFF: Yeah.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Board Member Durham?

16 MR. DURHAM: Just quickly again -- thank you,
17 Madam Chair. What percentage of the students are taking
18 grades seven through nine or taking the basic test and then
19 what percentage would be in one of these accelerated Algebra
20 One, Geometry, so?

21 MADAM CHAIR: Are you calling that Integrated
22 One basic? I'm tr--

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're talking about the
24 eighth-grade test. Which percentage of students are taking
25 the eighth-grade test versus which percentage of eighth



1 graders are taking an accelerated course?

2 MR. DURHAM: Correct. Yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay, I don't have that
4 at my fingers. However, I believe it is being pulled, so--

5 MR. DURHAM: Okay

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -we can circle back to
7 that.

8 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When we look at Science
10 and Social Studies, we see across the years now. With
11 Science and Social Studies, we do have actually an
12 additional year of data to look at also, so we're lo --
13 actually looking at 2014 as the start of the program all the
14 way to 2017.

15 And we see Science scores ranging from the 24
16 percent of students scoring in those top two levels to 34
17 percent scoring in those top two levels in grade five. And
18 in Social Studies, we're seeing 18.7 percent scoring in
19 grade seven and 24.8 percent scoring in grade four.

20 So we did see increases in grade five from
21 the first year of the administration of 1.3 percent of
22 students scoring those top levels, and we did see a decrease
23 in grade eight of tw -- by 2.3 percent. For Social Studies,
24 although those values do look pretty low in terms of the
25 percentages of students scoring in those top two levels,



1 when you look at where we've come from the beginning of the
2 administration, we did see an increase of 2.1 percent for
3 grade seven and 7.8 percent in grade four.

4 Now, I'm going to quickly just run through
5 some breakouts by demographics, so we can kind of look at
6 the gaps that we have between students. What we have seen is
7 that, although we do see some improvement and we do see
8 students moving along with the rest of the state in many
9 areas, the gaps have persisted across the years, and so
10 we're not seeing huge decreases in gaps, discouragingly,
11 that is what we're seeing.

12 So, when one group of students who has
13 historically been performing lower than another group of
14 student moves up, they are moving up, but the reference
15 group is also moving up so we're seeing a shifting gaps as
16 oppo -- or -- or movement gaps of but not a narrowing of the
17 gaps. When we look at gender for ELA, what we see is that
18 across the board, females are outperforming males.

19 That is something that we have seen
20 historically even before this program and it's not something
21 that is unique to Colorado either. But what we do see
22 interestingly, is that when we look from grades three
23 through grades eight -- to grade eight, we see an increase
24 in the size of the gap, so it seems that us -- our students
25 are going up in grade level, females seem to be widening



1 that gap even more.

2 So we're looking at 9.1 percent gap for grade
3 three that moves all the way up to a 19.3 percent gap in
4 grade eight. In grade nine, that comes down slightly to
5 17.1. When we look at Math, it flips a little bit between
6 genders so it's not one gender dominating the content area
7 here, we -- and we see much smaller gaps for Math as well.
8 So we're looking at -- when we look between grades three
9 through five, males are on top by about 1.5 to 2.4 percent.

10 And then that switches, and females take the
11 lead in grade seven -- or excuse me, in grade six, and they
12 take that up through Algebra One. And then, they go back and
13 forth in the higher Math levels for the high school Math
14 tests, and that gap goes all the way up to 8.8 percent for
15 females in Integrated Three. Yes?

16 MS. GOFF: Since you've stopped here, may I
17 ask the questions? What has -- have you found that possibly
18 there is a difference between kids being more sophisticated
19 or have learned more to deal with the test on a computer
20 versus -- or how many kids took the test written by pencil
21 and paper, and how many kids took it on computers? Or was
22 there any variation in -- in tha -- in those areas?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've seen pretty low
24 percentage of -- of students across this state taking the
25 test on paper, they are offered to any school or district



1 that would prefer to take the tests on paper versus online.
2 However, even when we did make that shift because originally
3 paper was only available as an accommodation, even with that
4 shift where we did offer it to anyone, we're still seeing
5 very low rates of paper usage across the state.

6 MS. GOFF: Any special group or any district
7 doing it, say rural versus urban?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think we're
9 seeing trends like that. There are some schools or districts
10 that prefer paper for a variety of reasons, but I don't
11 think we're seeing the large pattern that it's -- it's
12 rurals who prefer or urbans or -- or anything like that.

13 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I do recall my own
15 district where one of our elementary schools sought to close
16 the gender gap in language arts, and so they use some very
17 different strategies, and they were extremely successful in
18 terms of improving scores with the gap. So, what they were
19 doing everybody liked.

20 MS. GOFF: Okay.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the gaps remained,
22 the scores went a whole lot higher, and that's why I do -- I
23 don't know that we know yet how to address the differences.
24 We know strategies that improve things for-

25 MS. GOFF: Yeah.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -for everybody. That's
2 been going on forever.

3 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we do have the
5 distribution, if you want to go back to the distribution of
6 students taking in each grade level. So, in seventh grade
7 about four four -- 4.4 percent of students took the algebra
8 one assessment, 95.4 percent -- so the vast majority of
9 students took the 7th grade assessment, and 0.2 percent of
10 students took the integrated math two assessment. In eighth
11 grade, the vast majority of students -- so -- but a smaller
12 percentage, 75.7 percent took the eighth-grade assessment,
13 17.4 percent took the algebra one assessment, 4.4 percent
14 took the geometry assessment, 2.3 percent took the
15 integrated math -- math one assessment, and 0.3 percent took
16 the integrated math two assessment.

17 And then in ninth grade; 59.4 percent took
18 the algebra one assessment, 5 percent took the algebra two
19 assessment, 18 percent took the geometry assessment, 14.4
20 percent took the integrated math one assessment, 2.8 percent
21 took the integrated math two assessment, and 0.4 percent
22 took the integrated math three assessment.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we get those
24 numbers.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure. We can get, we can



1 get those numbers, so you can actually have them.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To the extent but that's
3 -- there's some consistency, it seems to me -- it sounds
4 like by eighth grade about 20 percent of the kids are at
5 algebra one.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, I think it was
7 about 15 percent, in eighth grade.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, it would be
9 helpful I think for schools to get a sense for that in terms
10 of their planning for options for kids and whether they want
11 to change that. I did sit on a school board with a colleague
12 who insisted that all eighth graders should be taking
13 algebra one.

14 That was his -- and use math. He was a math
15 expert, so be interesting to, sort of -- if we could look at
16 that data consistently over time what we're seeing in the
17 state. Is it also true that we no longer have remedial math
18 courses in schools?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Have integrated? That's
20 up to district.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No that's not integrated
22 -- integrated something else.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Most likely that would
24 be up to the districts.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: In the districts.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Whether they want
2 to add a course like that.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. In my time they
4 were eliminating those courses, but that probably also be
5 interesting. Board member Durham.

6 MR. DURHAM: I think Madam Chair; the reason
7 I asked the question and I think the information is helpful
8 was that your -- your very high percentage of a very small
9 sample that ends up with the exceeds and meets expectations.

10 And so, if you would have fold those in, I
11 think it would, you know, almost should be better if -- I
12 mean, I understand that you have several results but you
13 could do a calculation of all eighth graders and the percent
14 that meet expectations and so on and it would -- I think
15 would be a little bit more accurate.

16 Because if somebody's just looks at this
17 accelerate do you think -- what do you think are rosy but
18 when you recognize fin - -- only 5 percent of grade seven
19 we're taking and it makes it look a little less
20 (indiscernible).

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I think with the
23 change coming up we will have an eighth-grade math as
24 opposed to the break out.

25 MR. DURHAM: Yeah. It sounds -- it sounds



1 like that. So-

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's what we would
3 see.

4 MR. DURHAM: So yeah, thank you. Good
5 observation.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Hey, sorry for the
7 interruption.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No problem. So, going
9 back to looking at gender we have one more to look at
10 through the lens of the gender gap between science and
11 social studies. And with that, in science we see a range of
12 the gap that ranges between zero and grade five to 2.2
13 percent in high school.

14 But we have seen as we look over the past few
15 years is that in grade five -- that is the one place or one
16 of the only places that we see that the gap is actually
17 closed between females and males. Females-

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, there was one
19 previously?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There was -- there was
21 one previously and now we see that males and females this
22 year performed at exactly the same rate in terms of those
23 top two levels. In grade eight, that flipped between males
24 and females.

25 So this year there is a gap of 2.3 percent



1 where females are on top but originally males -- so when our
2 first administration, our -- two years ago males were on top
3 and in the last two years females have been on top, and high
4 school males have been on the top for the past two years.
5 When we look at social studies, in grade four there is a 0.4
6 percent gap.

7 So they're very, very close to each other
8 there. And this is the first year where males have actually
9 in slightly ahead. In the past, it was female who are on
10 top. And in grade seven, females are on top at 2.2 percent
11 and that has been the same what we have seen over the years.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So strategies to have
13 more girls interested in science -- in the sciences may --
14 may well be reflected in these changes over time.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, we're going to move
16 on now to look at race ethnicity break outs. When we're
17 looking at ELA specifically, Asian students performed at the
18 top for all of the grade levels for English language arts.
19 What we -- we typically use white students as the reference
20 group when we're looking at gaps because there are more
21 white students than the rest of the population.

22 So when we look at the gap between White and
23 Asian students, again, with Asian students being in the top
24 we see a range going from a 3 percent gap in grade three to
25 a 9.7 percent gap in grade eight. When we look at the White-



1 Black gap, we see a range of 23.4 percent in grade nine to
2 26.1 percent in both grades five and six. And when we look
3 at the White-Hispanic gap, we see a gap of six, excuse me,
4 23.9 percent in grade nine to 26.5 percent in grade seven.
5 So again, we are seeing these gaps that we have seen
6 historically.

7 Unfortunately, at this point in time we're
8 not seeing them decrease even as we see students move up
9 across the groups. When we look at math again, Asian
10 students are on the top across all of the grade levels --
11 across all of the tests here. When we look at the White-
12 Asian gap we have Asian students on top ranging from 3.2
13 percent, an integrated one to 15.5 percent for Algebra one.

14 When we look at the White-Black gap, we see a
15 gap ranging from 16 percent in grade eight to 29.7 percent
16 in geometry. And then when we look at the White Hispanic
17 gap, we see a gap of 13.4 percent in math one to 26.9
18 percent in math six.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we ever break out the
20 Hispanic scores between students who are native English
21 speakers and non-native English speakers in that particular-

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't have those-

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -because that's one most
24 likely to have some language influence in the assessments.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We don't have those



1 broken out at this level here but it's something that could
2 be done. When we look at science and social studies, we see
3 for science and Asian-White gap of 9 percent for grade five
4 with Asian students on top and 9.7 percent or excuse me, 0.2
5 percent in grade 11.

6 White students were on top for grade eight.
7 When we look at the White-Black gap for science, we see a
8 gap ranging from 26.3 percent to 33.5 percent in grade five.
9 And when we look at the White-Hispanic gap, we see a gap
10 ranging from 24.7 percent in grade 11 to 31 percent in grade
11 five. And in social studies we see similar trends. The next
12 category that we're going to look at is the disadvantage
13 that is based on free and reduced lunch eligibility status.

14 Again, we do see gaps that we have seen
15 historically in these groups as well. And we see gaps
16 ranging from 25.2 percent in grade nine to 31.9 percent in
17 grade five ELA. For math, we see gaps ranging from 16.2
18 percent in integrated math three to 31.5 percent in grades
19 six. For science and social studies -- in science, we see a
20 gap ranging from 21.7 percent to 33.6 percent in grade five
21 and in grade four we have 27.9 percent gap, and 22.6 percent
22 gap in grade seven for social studies.

23 When we look at disability status of students
24 with an individualized education plan versus students
25 without an individualized education plan, we again see a



1 large gap there which is consistent with what we've seen
2 over the years and this gap for ELA ranges from 35 percent
3 in grade nine to 42.7 percent in grade five. In math, we see
4 a range of 13 percent in integrated two to 31.9 percent in
5 grade three. And in science, we see a range of 22.6 percent
6 gap to in grad -- in high school to 31.8 percent gap in
7 grade five, and for social studies we see 18.5 percent gap
8 in grade seven and a 21.7 percent gap in grade four.

9 The last subgroup breakout that we have here
10 for simmers is the English learner status breakout. And so,
11 we're looking at students who are considered English
12 learners. This has a further break out but we're looking at
13 English learners so not -- are not and this profession
14 students and limited English profession students in
15 comparison to other students.

16 And when we look at that for ELA, we see a
17 range of 31.7 percent in grades three to 42.5 percent gap in
18 grade eight. For math, we see a range of 20.2 percent gap in
19 grade eight to 39.1 percent gap in integrated math two. And
20 in science and social studies, we see similar trends, as
21 well with the English learners scoring much fewer percentage
22 of students in those top two levels than their non-English
23 learner counterparts.

24 Now we're going to transition to looking at
25 results for Colorado PSAT and SAT. When we look at Colorado



1 PSAT and SAT result, we tend to describe the results in
2 terms of scale scores as opposed to performance levels. So,
3 for simmers we do provide performance levels as well as
4 skill scores but here we're going to transition to looking
5 specifically at average mean scale scores.

6 When we look at petition for- --
7 participation for PSAT, what we do see is what we discussed
8 earlier which is that we have seen an increase in
9 participation for 10th graders even from last year where we
10 were near 90 percent all the way to 91.9 percent this year
11 for SAT. In our first administration of SAT, we see a
12 participation rate of 93 percent.

13 For both PSAT and SAT, there are two
14 components, there's an evidence-based reading and writing
15 component and there is a math component, and those are
16 combined to create the overall mean scale score. If you look
17 at last year in comparison to this year for PSAT, EDC their
18 students increased by 3.9 points in that total scores, so
19 there has been improvement in just the two years that we've
20 been giving the test. And when you compare the Colorado
21 scores to the national scores--

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Where are you? Oh, I'm
23 sorry.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, it's okay.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Yeah, I just did -



1 - I did. I'm, I miss, I was looking for 16 and 17, I suppose
2 to that.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Differential. Perfectly
5 fine, thank you.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When you compare the
7 Colorado scores for the PSAT this year in comparison to the
8 national users, we see that, for evidence-based reading and
9 writing, Colorado students scored slightly higher and for
10 math, Colorado students scored slightly higher as well.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would you say that would
12 be -- could be determined because just they took the test
13 last year and they took it this year and they had more
14 experience this year than, than last year?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, the 10th grader
16 this -- this year wouldn't have taken the test last year
17 they were taken the simmers test last year so it is actually
18 a new group of students taking the test.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay so, that's right.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the other one ICT
21 versus--

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, it will be next year
24 that you would say that.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Next year.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The phenomenon of
2 familiarity, yeah, does it? Thank you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When we look at the
4 actual disaggregated group breakouts here, what we see when
5 we're looking at gender comparisons is that in evidence-
6 based reading and writing, females outperformed males and
7 males performed higher than females in math.

8 When we're looking at the race ethnicity
9 categories, we do see that Asians scored higher than all
10 other groups for both evidence-based reading and writing as
11 well as for math which is consistent with what we actually
12 saw for this semester assessments as well. And then here we
13 do have the scale scores list for both categories for free
14 and reduced lunch eligible students, students with IPEs and
15 students who are English learners.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You know and I'm just
17 wondering if students -- Hispanic students, Latino students,
18 were taught in English whether, you know, their scores would
19 be higher?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When we look at SAT
21 results, this is again is our first year of the SAT
22 statewide administration and for these we have a 2018
23 national cohort comparison. So, the 2018 national cohort
24 consists of all students who have taken the SAT thus far who
25 are expected to graduate in 2018.



1 So that reference point will change as more
2 students who are expected to graduate in 2018 take the test.
3 What we see when we're comparing Colorado scores to those is
4 that, for evidence-based reading and writing, we are lower
5 than the national cohort at 513.4 and for math, we are lower
6 at 500.9.

7 One thing to keep in mind when you're looking
8 at those, math for comparisons is that those groups across
9 other states, they're not necessarily including all -- all
10 students as we are in Colorado. Those comparison groups tend
11 to be the students who are intending to go to college so
12 it's in other states it's not a statewide administration,
13 it's students who are expecting to go to college. So, it's
14 not necessarily an apples to apples comparison, but it is a
15 good comparison considering this -- this the cohort of
16 students going this year.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we keeping track of
18 how many states have all students?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How many? Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's. So, I actually
24 don't work on the PSAT and SAT but is it, two? How many
25 states are giving the PSA -- PSAT state right?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, there are about four
2 but we will-we will-

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Some are just coming on.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Many--

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Going on board. Okay.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: SAT is fairly new to the
7 statewide administration.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. Was SAT?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How many how many states
11 are only in including students that plan to go to college?

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So-so SAT is not giving
13 it statewide as we are. Would just be--

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All but four states?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. So -- so in this
16 national compare-cohort-comparison group it is just really
17 all of those students across the country who are taking it.
18 Because they want to get college entrance scores. So, that's
19 why we do see--

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Higher.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. We would expect
22 them to be higher. When we look at this aggregated group
23 break out here for SAT. What we see is that, females
24 outperform males and evidence-based reading and writing
25 males scored slightly higher in math. Asians were the top



1 performers for math and white students were the top
2 performers for evidence-based reading and writing.

3 We also have the scores listed here for both
4 categories for free and reduced lunch eligible students-
5 students with IPS and English learners. I don't want to
6 spend very much time on the sample reports but I just want
7 to give you a quick high level information about what is out
8 there and what is available to parents when they receive the
9 individual student performance reports first the mass they
10 receive reports that provide performance indicators based on
11 performance levels they receive a scale score and they also
12 receive a Colorado percentile ranking no that that was
13 something that this board has been very interested in
14 historically in looking at making sure that we have a kind
15 of a normative reference point for-for students.

16 They also have comparative information, so
17 they can see how well their student performed in relation to
18 other schools. The state average. And they can also look at
19 the distribution of students across all of the performance
20 levels as well. They also get some sub level or lower level
21 information so they don't only get information about how
22 well their student performed overall in math or science or
23 English language arts but, also some additional information
24 so they can see in particular areas sub areas within those
25 overarching content areas, how while their student performed



1 or where they might need a little bit of targeted
2 instruction or improvement.

3 MR. DURHAM: May I ask a question here.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Durham.

5 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. So, in this
6 particular looks in the background -- I'm on--doesn't have a
7 page of the background.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It should.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's just hard to see.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's the big the one
11 with the whole-whole report.

12 MR. DURHAM: With the whole.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

15 MR. DURHAM: So, the score assume is kind of
16 an actual, correct? So, score 702 which is the 60 first
17 percentile. That would mean that the students scored better
18 than 61 percent people.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct. And this is
20 just a markup so, it's not based on actual data.

21 MR. DURHAM: But--

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, that is the correct
23 interpretation of what the percentile.

24 MR. DURHAM: Well, I-I guess what I'm trying
25 to get to is, understand some Markup but, do in fact have



1 this-could we have an example of how many-what percentage of
2 students are in level one, or what percent of students are
3 in level two?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes. And that is
5 included. If you look at the bottom of that again this is a
6 markup so, we can-if you are interested, we can give you the
7 actual information.

8 MR. DURHAM: So, this is factual?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, yes, the
10 distribution. So, when school, parents receives this report
11 that lower corner there that lower right corner does include
12 the actual distribution of students across each performance
13 level.

14 So, in this case they would like to see that
15 their student was in a performance level two and 20 percent
16 of the students taking Math test across Colorado performed
17 at that level.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But that's just made up
19 again.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is just a markup.
21 This is just a markup. Thank you for that. Again, I
22 reiterate. This is just a markup, but the actual data is
23 included. The students they these are already in the hands
24 of districts they have.

25 MR. DURHAM: But not individuals?



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

2 MR. DURHAM: Okay.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well. So, districts have
4 been-they were technically embargoed until today. However,
5 districts can distribute them as they like.

6 MR. DURHAM: Let me rephrase this, could be-
7 could I get an actual for each of this tests. What -- what
8 percentage are in level one, what percentage are in level
9 two Colorado wide. So, that want to do is be able to compare
10 the percentile rank of a student that is and the average
11 student in level three with -- with the -- with percentage
12 of students in other words, is cut off.

13 If a kid-if a kid is fact in level two which
14 is, partially met expectations and that's 60 first
15 percentile then -- then, we have-we're back to-we're back to
16 having what I consider to be fairly skewed scores. So, Is
17 that actual or not?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is not actual. What
19 would you like would it be helpful if you like basically
20 what the 50th percentile score would be for each grade level
21 and content area. So, you could see on average the 50th
22 percentile students is a level three, or level four, or a
23 level five. Okay.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can get that. We can
25 get that for you.



1 MR. DURHAM: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then, I'm not going
3 to go into detail for the PSAT and SAT report. I know that,
4 at least for the PSAT reports you've been walk through this
5 before. But students are provided with this -- with this
6 reports that do provide information about how well they
7 performed in each evidence-based reading and writing
8 category as well as the math category. And they are provided
9 with some additional information for PSAT about, how well
10 they're doing, how well they would have done if they were
11 taking the SAT because PSAT and SAT are on the same scale.
12 And then, if they would like some targeted support there's
13 also free resources available for them on Khan Academy.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, as of today, the
15 districts all have this, and parents can ask for them or are
16 they just given to them?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, we encourage
18 districts to provide these to the parents as soon as
19 possible. Each district make local decisions about when they
20 provide those. However, they do have them in their hands.
21 They have hard copies. They have had the electronic copies,
22 so they could see what was happening for a while, but they
23 do have the hard copies.

24 So, as soon as they are able to meet with
25 those parents or send them out or whatever their



1 distribution method is, we encourage them to do so.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then the students
3 that opted out, there are no scores for them. So, it's only
4 for the students that do take the test. So, the parents of
5 the students who did take.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, ISOs are not
7 available for students or individual student. Reports are
8 not available for students who don't who did opt out because
9 there are no scores for them. And then, there are a few
10 resources there and I won't go into those but, we do have
11 resources for parents as well as for schools and districts
12 so that they can make sense of the results and the various
13 reports that are available to them. And with that I will
14 turn it over to Alyssa to speak about growth.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's okay. Keep going
16 a little bit longer. So, we just want to remind-give you a
17 little refresher on growth and how growth is calculated at a
18 high level. We won't get too technical for you today. Why we
19 value this information alongside the achievement information
20 and what it tells us and then just do some high-level
21 summaries of the state level data and then decide to get in
22 groups and talk about what data we have available publicly
23 that ain't so.

24 So, growth is really a measure that shows how
25 much progress individual students make between last year and



1 this year as measured on the same math assessments and
2 English language arts the math? Requires that students take
3 the test both years for us to be able to have that
4 information. But it starts at a student level measure, and
5 it's really determined by the change in their scores
6 compared to other students like them.

7 So, other students that scored in a similar
8 scale score on the test in 2016 compared to those other
9 students and what they did in 2017. How -- how much did they
10 grow or how little did they grow relative to each other? So,
11 it's a really, it's kind of relative normative measure that
12 way. We can summarize the growth data, the student level
13 growth data by specific groups of students. We can look at
14 grade. We can look at student groups.

15 We can look at the school as a whole, as the
16 district as a whole, as the state as a whole. We look at
17 growth data because it provides another dimension to
18 understanding the performance of a school. So, we've got the
19 performance of the achievement measure. How well students
20 are meeting the standards? The growth really shows us how
21 schools are doing and -- and helping students progress
22 relative to other students like them. It's important to note
23 that even students that are high achieving and have been
24 historically high achieving can show high growth.

25 We're not measuring that change in scale



1 square, we're really looking at how did they change compared
2 to other students like them. So, high achieving kids. Will
3 have high growth and they will have low growth as well. Will
4 be the same distribution as low achieving students. But I
5 know that's a -- that's a challenging idea it doesn't always
6 intuitively make sense.

7 The growth data is integral to our
8 accountability determinations. You all on your board policy
9 when we talked in that June month for all those, months
10 leading up to that June decision, landed on 60 percent of
11 elementary and middle school frameworks are based on growth,
12 and high school 40 percent of the rating is based on growth.

13 So, this is really a key part of our
14 accountability system. And the growth data can really give
15 us a sense of where we want to put attention as well,
16 because we may know and may look at schools and see a school
17 that is struggling with achievement. One school may have
18 really high growth and the other school has really low
19 growth. We may want to if we want to target where the
20 greatest area of need is -- is look at those schools with
21 the low achievement and the low growth because it is a high
22 growth school is starting to move kids along.

23 So, it's good other dimensions indicator for
24 us. So, how do we look at growth? At student level, these
25 are these are percentile rank. So like we were just talking



1 about or like when you went took your kids or grandkids to
2 the doctor and got a height percentile or weight percentile,
3 that's between one and 99, and shows where they fall into
4 just distribution compared to other students like them or
5 their kids like them.

6 When we take that from a student level to go
7 to a school, or a district, or a grade level, or a
8 desegregated group leader, level we use median. So, we find
9 the middle number, when we rank the numbers of the
10 percentiles. We find that number in the middle and find the
11 median growth percentile. That's how we talk about growth.
12 Those usually fall between 20 and 80, kind of more clumped
13 in the 50s, but they could fall, fall anywhere in there.

14 State -- when we talk about state data, again
15 it's between one and 99. We take this median growth percent
16 -- student growth percentiles, find the median. State data
17 tends to fall between 40 and 60 for the desegregated groups.
18 Clearly, the state doesn't as a whole is always right about
19 it 50. Because that some median's work. So, I have some
20 slides for you, just to show that I created groups that we
21 didn't pull out the state overall because you know it's at
22 50. So, we've got the line drawn at 50.

23 So you can see that comparison. It's
24 interesting again to look at this data in comparison to what
25 you just heard about the achievement data because what you



1 see the achievement gap said. But then we want to look at
2 growth too and the growth if there's gaps in growth in the
3 same areas in ways that there are an achievement. We know
4 we're going to have a harder time moving achievement up and
5 closing those gaps.

6 Where we start to see growth increasing our
7 overtime or being higher in the medium than we know that --
8 that's an early indicator that the achievement gap may be
9 closing. So, it's good to put those to be -- to keep those
10 two pieces of information in your head. So, on these slides,
11 the green is the 2016 state level median growth percentile
12 for the desegregated group, and then that purple blue color
13 is the 2017.

14 So, you can see that change in the air than a
15 scale from 40 to 60 on here. So you can see what the gender
16 gap closed slightly for male students we're catching up a
17 little bit more in growth and English Language Arts from
18 2016 to 2017. But there's a pretty significant growth gap
19 between males and females in English Language Arts.

20 In math, last year there was a slight gap
21 between in 2016, but this year females and males were both
22 right 50 for their math growth percentiles state different
23 than English language arts. Some make sense? This slide
24 shows the -- the English language arts median growth
25 percentiles for students of different race and ethnicity



1 backgrounds. And you can see for the most part.

2 What we saw in achievement? In terms of
3 achievement gaps, we're seeing mirrored in growth. The one
4 thing that's a little different is the Hawaiian Pacific
5 Islander group and we see changes with that group from 2016
6 to 2017, where the median growth percentile is about 50
7 there.

8 That group has a much smaller in size and
9 number of students in our state than some of those other
10 groups. So, it's important to note that as you look at the
11 data. But I think it's interesting that might be an area, we
12 want to dig into and see what's been going on there. Then
13 you see the same thing for math.

14 The patterns are a little bit different.
15 There's more declines here from 2016-2017 except for
16 Hispanic students the stunning increase in Hispanic media
17 and growth percentiles from 2016 to 2017. This slide shows
18 the growth for English language learners.

19 So, let me orient you a little bit a little
20 bit different way of looking at it. So, the first half of
21 the slide is English language arts, content area in the
22 second half is math. This group English learners "No," means
23 students that are not English learners are native English
24 speakers. English learners "Yes" non-English proficient
25 students eliminating English proficient students and fully



1 English fiction students as well.

2 You can say that, English learners this year
3 -- last year were 50 for English language arts and this year
4 went above it. I think that's at 51 for their medium growth
5 percentile. And then for math, English learners increase
6 their growth percentile this year too compared to last year.
7 This slide is similar, but for students who are eligible for
8 free reduced lunch.

9 So, it's again the F-R-L eligible "No" mean
10 students who are not eligible for free reduced lunch for all
11 "Yes" that's students that are eligible. You see gaps
12 between those groups of students for both content areas and
13 both years. But in 2017 for English Language Arts free
14 reduced lunch eligible students the median growth percentile
15 increased.

16 For students with disabilities, this is where
17 we have our largest growth gap. Really mirrors what we saw
18 an achievement but it's the largest achievement gaps. The
19 laughter your students with and without an IEP, that are not
20 don't have an individualized education plan. And then you
21 have students that are in IP right there. So, you can see
22 those gaps. While those gaps are large.

23 The median growth percentile both in English
24 language arts and in math increased for students with
25 disabilities in the past year. This slide go -- just gives



1 you an overview of not all of our disaggregated groups that
2 may look like, but a -- a good number of them across the
3 year for this is 2017 only, and you can see that our gifted
4 students had the highest growth of other groups that are
5 disaggregated here with a me -- median growth percentile of
6 58.

7 Again, we're struggling for our students with
8 disabilities, their median growth percentile overall in
9 English Language Arts was 41. And this is the same slide,
10 but for mathematics, again gifted students are up at 58,
11 students with an IAP at 43. And this gives you kinda a big
12 picture there. To some of the notable trends that we've
13 pulled out, is there similar trends between subjects for
14 most groups of students?

15 Male students though showed much lower growth
16 than female students in English language arts. Gifted chil -
17 - students showed the highest growth in both English
18 language arts, and math. English language learners showed
19 slightly less growth in math compared to English language
20 arts, but the increase in both content areas from 2016.

21 Again, students with an IAP showed the lowest
22 growth of all the student groups that we looked at, but they
23 increased from 2016 on both content areas. And then we see
24 most of those historic achievement gaps for racial and
25 ethnic groups reflected in those growth gaps too. I'm going



1 to just give you a quick overview of what's available right
2 now.

3 So, on our website, we have Excel files with
4 all the state district and school level information in the
5 state for their -- with their median growth percentiles. We
6 have it overall and by the disaggregated groups that we
7 talked about today and -- and referenced groups as well. We
8 also have individual school on district summary reports
9 which I'll show you in a minute what those look like.

10 Soon, like those achievement, individual
11 student reports that Christina showed, we've got that for
12 growth as well and those will soon go to districts. We --
13 you know, our team is really busy this time of year, and so
14 we -- we get growth done as quickly as we can, move over to
15 the framework's and then we go back to getting those
16 individual student reports done so that we can get the
17 accountability frameworks out first.

18 So, we're just -- we're just juggling things
19 back and forth, but those will go out to districts soon.
20 Again, just for students that have tested for both years,
21 we'll have that data growth on them, but we -- we do have
22 that available. We are also calculating PSA, the, AST
23 growth, that was run for the first time this year, so we
24 didn't have it ready for this board presentation today ahead
25 of time. We will have it soon. Districts will have it soon,



1 and it will be in the accountability framework this year.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Would you be able to
3 have it by congressional district?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, we will get it to
5 you by congressional district.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is a screenshot of
8 what the student -- what the school and district summary
9 growth reports look like. This are up -- up on our website
10 live now. This is a district one, you'll see English
11 language arts in the left and math on the right, and then a
12 whole bunch of just aggregate groups. We have over all and
13 then we break it down by grade level and then by different
14 disaggregating group.

15 So, English learners and those are -- and
16 then compare to those that are non-English learners are on
17 there. And it shows that 2016 and 2017 data for -- on the
18 school reports for the school, all the district in the
19 state, on the district reports that compares the district
20 and the state to each other.

21 We affectionately call these the Bronco
22 reports because we're blue and orange. They used to be the
23 green and white, we changed them to the Bronco reports. We
24 thought we needed a little updating to them. So, anybody can
25 go access these on the website now and look up any school



1 they want, any school that has growth results that they want
2 or district that they want, so it's on public.

3 We do not right now have available the
4 adequate growth calculations, we are working on what those
5 expectations should be and how to make sense out of them.
6 Now, with -- we have a few more years of consistent data on
7 the same assessment which is needed to calculate the
8 language in the law on the performance levels that the law
9 uses to describe how adequate growth should be calculated or
10 different than what we have in our state assessments now.

11 So, we were just working to make sense in
12 between that. So, we are -- we're working to figure out how
13 to do that going forward. We are working on the best ways to
14 do this, some of the visualization of it so that old four
15 quadrant on the website we're working -- we're doing
16 redesign on that. And as you heard from Marcia that some of
17 that maintenance and building out of reporting that we need.

18 So we're working to figure out resources to
19 get all that going. And then just to be clear about data
20 suppression if there's a student group with less than 20
21 students that is not reported, that's the minimum and we use
22 for growth. Back when we first were developing the growth
23 model, there was a lot of statistical analysis that Marie
24 and others did looking out what that number is where we feel
25 more confident in looking at the growth percentile and



1 without those analysis, that really landed at 20.

2 So, that's why we use 20 for that. Those are
3 some more resources I think it's actually probably most of
4 the same ones, but you get them again because you're lucky.
5 And then if you have any questions, we're here to try and
6 answer them.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I do. The district CMAS
8 growth report on page 73, I guess the number is not actually
9 there, but it's right after 72.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's an overwhelming
12 table.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It is.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, it's especially
16 overwhelming because this -- this is the annotated version,
17 so it's got all the explanatory language on it.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right. I get that. But
19 even without that-

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, I'm reflecting on
22 the financial, what's that called? You were working on the -
23 -

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Transparency --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: - -- financial



1 transparency, we can dig deeper.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What are the chances of
4 being able to go deeper on some of these things so that --
5 there's a concept called information overload.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. This is
8 information overload if somebody -- even though somebody
9 wants this information. Is there a way to build this out
10 after the -- after Marsha gets resources?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, after Marsha gets
12 resources.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right. To make this
14 so that you could kinda drill down on things. And you --
15 when you drill down, then you can have a detailed
16 explanation of what it is.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: As opposed to hear
19 footnote after footnote. It's not -- I mean.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think this is
22 information that somebody would like to have at a district
23 or a school level, but it has to be--

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is this new?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I've gone back and



1 looked at stuff and it's kind of like this.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We had this last year,
3 but last year only had one year of data on there, last year
4 it just had 16.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But it still, there's --
6 there's a-

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. There's a lot of
8 information on that.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Fear factor in looking
10 at that many numbers. It's not -- it's not something that
11 the brain really wants to do in -- in terms of focusing on
12 certain questions that we each have. And they're going to be
13 very different questions.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We would be happy to get
15 feedback on how to -- how you all see it.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that was going to be
17 my second question. What kind of feedback mechanism do we
18 have for folks who are using this so that they can come back
19 to the folks who are monitoring our data to say, it would
20 help if I could get this, this and this. In order to get
21 some guidance from the users. Because -- just because I want
22 it to be a certain way doesn't mean somebody --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All of this notes aren't
24 on it, right? This is just --

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct. This is just



1 the annotated.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It probably doesn't look
3 so bad without all of that.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It still looks pretty
5 bad. To me it's li-it's just overwhelming and I'd like to
6 be able to drill down sometimes.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We got all-

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I drill down then have
9 some of these explanations actually reveal what's new I'm
10 looking at it. But there may be other feedback that be more
11 useful.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. We've got a lot of
13 positive feedback about it last year. It's the change and
14 the update from the green and whites, and having that
15 information back that people haven't seen with the two years
16 of data. So, we've been -- you know, we have a lot of
17 training's where we get feedback, where we show people
18 information and what's out there, but we can do formal
19 feedback loops if we want to do that. As Marsha's ready for
20 us to put in requests for reporting enhancements and all
21 that, we will do more formal focus groups and feedback to
22 develop that work. But I -- I don't want to overwhelm her at
23 the moment until we know that they're ready to be able to
24 handle some of that.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I get that. Work in



1 progress. Thank you very much. Questions, comments. See TFI.

2 Too much information.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's our strategy.

4 Just kidding.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. So, it is
6 12:20. So, I think we should go ahead with exec session and
7 then --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, could I have a
10 motion please to convene to executive session?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So moved.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Any objection? Okay

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: An executive session has
16 been noticed for today's state board meeting in conformance
17 with 24-6-402(3)(a) to receive legal advice on specific
18 legal questions pursuant to 24-6-403(3)(a)(II) CRS, and
19 matters required to be kept confidential by federal law or
20 rules or state statutes pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(III) CRS
21 and specialized details of security arrangements pursuant to
22 24-6-402(3)(a)(IV) CRS.

23 (Executive Session)

24

25 C E R T I F I C A T E



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

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

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

11

12 /s/ Kimberly C. McCright

13 Kimberly C. McCright

14 Certified Vendor and Notary Public

15

16 Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

17 1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

18 Houston, Texas 77058

19 281.724.8600

20

21

22

23

24