



**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

---

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

April 25, 2014

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on April 25, 2014, the  
above-entitled special meeting was conducted at the  
Colorado Department of Education, before the following  
Board Members:

Paul Lundeen (R), Chairman  
Marcia Neal (R), Vice Chairman  
Elaine Gantz Berman (D)  
Jane Goff (D)  
Pam Mazanec (R)  
Debora Scheffel (R)  
Angelika Schroeder (D)



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We've lost a  
2 semblance of a meeting.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Should I call the  
4 roll?

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Indiscernible) get  
6 started, we are not going to get started. Okay, why  
7 don't I use my big voice to command control of the  
8 speaker phone and bring us to order. If staff would call  
9 roll. My sense is that the seven board members are all  
10 telephonic; is that accurate?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICES: Yes.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so go ahead and  
13 call the roll if you would, Carey.

14 MS. MARKEL: Elaine Gantz Berman?

15 MS. BERMAN: Here.

16 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff?

17 MS. MARKEL: Paul Lundeen?

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I thought I heard Jane  
19 come in, maybe I didn't. I'm here, obviously.

20 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec?

21 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

22 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal?

23 MS. NEAL: Here.

24 MS. MARKEL: Debora Scheffel?

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.



1 MS. MARKEL: Angelika Schroeder?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Here.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And Jane, when you get  
4 a chance, if you happen to be muted, if you are with us  
5 and we are just not hearing you, please speak up.

6 Well, let's go ahead and proceed and Jane  
7 will join us in process -- in progress. So Elaine,  
8 Marcia, did you have an order you wanted to proceed, or  
9 should we just give it to Jennifer and let her walk down  
10 the list?

11 MS. BERMAN: Yeah we -- go ahead, Marcia.

12 MS. NEAL: Go ahead, Elaine, because  
13 (indiscernible).

14 MS. BERMAN: Marcia and I -- we had our  
15 legislative meeting and came up with the agenda and I the  
16 letter was sent out, so I think Jennifer can take it from  
17 here.

18 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so I see that the  
19 most recent agenda starts with 13.81 and ends with 13.84,  
20 is that correct?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so fire away,  
24 Jennifer.

25 MS. MELLO: Okay. 13.81, I think we'll



1 just take a minute here. This is a new bill that was  
2 introduced. It basically says that if a school district  
3 or the State Charter School Institute closes or school,  
4 or directed by you all, to close a school due to low  
5 academic performance -- so this is, as you all know, one  
6 of the options at the end of the clock. You can request,  
7 order -- I'm not sure what the right verb is there, but  
8 whatever. You can work to have a school closed. If that  
9 happens, then you have -- the school (indiscernible)  
10 school closure plan. So they have to plan for how  
11 they're going to communicate about the closure, the  
12 timeline for closing the school, and the plan for  
13 reassigning the kids to other schools.

14 The bill is flying through; I believe it's  
15 already through the House. And will be working it's way  
16 -- yeah, it's done in the House and will be in Senate  
17 Education probably this week. And I think that your  
18 Board contact did not necessarily recommend a position on  
19 this, but they just wanted to bring it to your attention  
20 so -- in case you were hearing something about it in the  
21 field, or if you had any questions about it, we can  
22 discuss it.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: This is Angelika, I do  
24 have a question. Does this apply to all school closures,  
25 or only school closures that relate to the accountability



1 clock?

2 MS. MELLO: Only school closings that  
3 relate to the accountability clock.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jennifer, the way I'm  
5 reading it, I would say that it applies -- the way it  
6 reads here is if -- if a school district or a charter  
7 school wants to - decides or as directed. So the way I'm  
8 reading it is, if they decide locally to close the  
9 school, they are going to have to follow the  
10 (indiscernible)--

11 MS. SCHROEDER: But doesn't it say "due to  
12 low academic performance"?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, it says: Or as  
14 directed by the State Board of Education to close the  
15 public school. But since the beginning, a bill requires  
16 a school district, or the state charter -- if it decides  
17 -- so even if a local school wants to close a school that  
18 they deem as low performing, I -- I'm not sure it's just  
19 within the -- the confines of the State Board.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, so fair enough. So  
21 it may not be directly connected to the -- the clock and  
22 the State Board, but it is directly connected to low  
23 performance. It's not like if you're going to close a  
24 school because of a decline in attendance.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) I'm



1 just wondering a little bit if we've had any feedback  
2 from CASBE folks.

3 MS. MELLO: I have not spoken to CASBE  
4 about this directly. I'm not aware that they have a  
5 problem with it.

6 MS. BERMAN: Angelika, my sense is that  
7 this really is directed to the clock and maybe the way it  
8 was written does include local school districts, but I  
9 don't think that's a (indiscernible).

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, I know, but as you  
11 probably know, Elaine, when school closures occur in a  
12 school district for any number of reasons, which may -- I  
13 mean, low enrollment is often related to low support.  
14 Right? So there is (indiscernible) potential tie there.  
15 And I'm kind of wondering how convoluted that's going to  
16 get. I haven't thought about it enough to think it  
17 should apply to all school closures, but it's very --  
18 very, very difficult (indiscernible).

19 MS. MELLO: And I think the intention is  
20 to make that process -- it is a very difficult process.  
21 I think people acknowledge that. I think the intention  
22 is to make sure that there is good communication plans in  
23 place and that there is good plans for the students. So  
24 I think it's intended to help in what is a difficult  
25 situation.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)  
2 closing schools?

3 MS. MELLO: No.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That must be Jane.

5 MS. GOFF: Sorry, I was having a hard time  
6 getting off of another call.

7 MS. NEAL: Here you are.

8 MS. GOFF: Here I am; I'm very sorry.

9 MS. NEAL: It's okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Angelika, when we  
11 discussed this on Wednesday, I think our feeling was that  
12 we're not entirely sure whether this bill was necessary.  
13 I think that the Department is already requiring a bunch  
14 of (indiscernible) bills. Therefore, (indiscernible)  
15 went through -- therefore, that's why we decided to  
16 recommend the monitor position (indiscernible).

17 MS. GOFF: Okay, okay. Yeah, I would love  
18 to hear from (indiscernible).

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: 1381.

20 MS. GOFF: Okay, thanks.

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And we're just  
22 discussing a monitor position. If there's not further  
23 conversation, is the consensus is that monitoring this  
24 makes sense?

25 MS. NEAL: Yeah, I agree, and particularly



1 this time of the year, things are sailing through and  
2 changing them so quickly, I think it's a mistake to do  
3 anything else but monitor. They change -- you know, it  
4 could be changed by this afternoon.

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, so it's a monitor  
6 is where we're at. Any other questions necessary on  
7 this? Next item, Jennifer.

8 MS. MELLO: Okay, so the next one -- the  
9 next three, actually, are just updates on bills we've  
10 talked about several different times. (Indiscernible)  
11 12.94 is the Carol Murray, (indiscernible) Student Data  
12 Privacy Act. That bill has passed the House, is out of  
13 the Senate Education Committee, and the Senate  
14 Appropriations Committee as of this morning. So it will  
15 be on the floor probably early next week. There have not  
16 been any (indiscernible) or changes to the bill since it  
17 came out of the House. There is some talk about people  
18 offering amendments on the Senate floor, but I haven't  
19 seen any. I mean, no one has said, "Here's an amendment,  
20 what do you guys think?" So I don't have any specifics.

21 I will tell you, I feel really blessed;  
22 the sponsorship on this bill has been really strong.  
23 Carol Murray was great in the House and she understood  
24 the issue, she was able to handle things as they came up  
25 on the floor. I feel like Senator Stedman was the same.





1 So I feel like we have -- it's always nice to have a good  
2 sponsor, because -- and this is another thing, as you may  
3 learn soon, (indiscernible) but lobbyists can't go on the  
4 floor. And so we can't actually control everything that  
5 happens on the floor. It makes us very nervous, because  
6 our (indiscernible) sometimes aren't long enough. So  
7 it's just really nice. It's just -- I feel really  
8 blessed on this bill to have some really good sponsors.

9 But I really feel confident can handle  
10 issues on the floor. That they understand the substance  
11 of the bill. And I don't believe that they would agree  
12 to anything that would be a problem to the Department. I  
13 think they would try to talk to us and had they not had  
14 time to talk to us, they wouldn't agree to it. So I feel  
15 pretty confident that it will come out of the Senate in  
16 good shape.

17 The Student Success Act -- dear God, what  
18 a week. So let's see -- last Thursday --

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Hang on, Jennifer. I  
20 want to back you up a step.

21 MS. MELLO: Of course.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: On SB 14.2.04,  
23 (indiscernible) data privacy bill, does that have any  
24 potential life, or does it have any impact on the  
25 existing 12.94? How do those two interact? Or do they



1 interact?

2 MS. MELLO: They -- let's see -- that's a  
3 good question. So the bill that the Chairman is  
4 referring to is Senate Bill 204, it is in the Judiciary  
5 Committee in the Senate for a hearing on Monday. And now  
6 that the districts have a lot of concerns with it, other  
7 state agencies I think are planning to testify against  
8 it. So I don't -- I mean, I'm not (indiscernible) on the  
9 bill, so I don't know for a fact what the outcome will  
10 be. It sounds like there is a lot of people with  
11 concerns.

12 The bill is -- there is some components of  
13 the bill that actually are in direct conflict with what  
14 is in 12.94. So if it does move forward on judiciary, I  
15 think we would just need to get engaged in the -- somehow  
16 you've got to chew that stuff up, right? You can't tell  
17 us to do it one way in one bill and then a different way  
18 in a different bill, and have them both pass. My advice  
19 would be to just see -- in terms of any strategy, is to  
20 wait and see what happens on Monday, and then if it's  
21 still moving through the process we can engage in that.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: And since judiciary is  
23 going to get heard on Monday, then there is no  
24 (indiscernible) on it at all at this point. Has it been  
25 assigned or -- this is the (indiscernible - talking over)



1 MS. MELLO: Right, right, it was just  
2 introduced. So yeah, and it's in the Senate. So -- and  
3 that's another reason why candidly, you know, we're  
4 running out of time here. I mean there are --

5 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Kind of late in the  
6 game.

7 MS. MELLO: Eight and a half days left in  
8 the legislative calendar. Yes, I'm counting. And it's  
9 not even in its first committee hearing until Monday.  
10 It's got a long way. It would have a very long way to go  
11 in a very short period of time.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, and I just wanted  
13 to hear exactly that and (indiscernible) doesn't have an  
14 immediate or direct effect on 12.94, but could if it  
15 moves down the Senate Judiciary, come to life and gained  
16 a head of steam fairly quickly?

17 MS. MELLO: Yes, and I think if it does  
18 come out of judiciary, we might need to continue some  
19 conversations probably with alleged contacts. Initially  
20 obviously involve their full board as we need to, to talk  
21 through some of those issues.

22 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Okay, thank you. You  
23 were moving onto 12.92, please proceed.

24 MS. MELLO: Great, thanks. I was just  
25 waving goodbye to (indiscernible). (Indiscernible) Act,



1 12.92. So it was in the Senate Education Committee last  
2 Thursday. There were several amended (indiscernible) but  
3 I think the most substantive issue was Senator Nancy  
4 Todd, who is a Democrat -- teamed up with all three of  
5 the Republicans on the committee and got an amendment on  
6 the bill and essentially stripped out all the financial  
7 transparency requirements.

8 The bill was then sent to the Senate  
9 Finance Committee. There was some controversy about  
10 whether that was fair, whether that was what should have  
11 happened. You know, I can't speak to any of that. It's  
12 what happened.

13 They voted on it in Senate Finance  
14 yesterday; they amended it to put -- I mean, I'm glossing  
15 over the details here, but they amended it to put fiscal  
16 transparency back in. The bill was then on the Senate --  
17 excuse me, Senate Appropriations Committee this morning,  
18 where they stripped off the financial transparency  
19 language yet again, and directed the Department to  
20 conduct a -- an RFI.

21 One of the concerns that some of the  
22 legislatures who don't like the fiscal transparency  
23 portions of the bill raised, is we don't really know how  
24 much this would cost. Like, we have -- I mean, you know,  
25 through our fiscal process, the Department does it's best



1 estimate, but we admit it's an estimate. And I've been  
2 in meetings with Leanne and folks over at the capital on  
3 this topic. Because we don't know for sure how much it  
4 would cost. I mean, we can do our best guess, which is  
5 what we do. So that's how it sits right now. I don't  
6 know, frankly, what will happen.

7 It's -- I would -- my best prediction is  
8 that it comes out of the Senate without any substantive  
9 fiscal transparency, they go to conference committee and  
10 they try to figure something out. At the moment though,  
11 they have 17 Republicans and Nancy Todd, so that makes 18  
12 votes in the Senate, which is the magic number in the  
13 Senate, to keep off any fiscal transparency stuff that  
14 that that (indiscernible) doesn't like. So that is where  
15 that stands.

16 MS. NEAL: Jennifer?

17 MS. MELLO: Yes, Marcia?

18 MS. BERMAN: Is Nancy Cobb the only  
19 Democrat that wants to get rid of financial transparency?

20 MS. MELLO: You know, Elaine, that's a  
21 really good question. I don't know the answer to that.  
22 I just know that they only need one Democrat to join with  
23 the Republicans in terms of (indiscernible).

24 MS. BERMAN: Sure, sure.

25 MS. MELLO: Marcia?



1 MS. NEAL: And my -- my question,  
2 Jennifer; did I read correctly they had to increase the  
3 negative impacts money to 120 million, and then they  
4 knocked it back down to 110?

5 MS. MELLO: Yes.

6 MS. NEAL: And the Finance Committee?

7 MS. MELLO: Yes.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (indiscernible)  
9 something like that, but --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And what happened at  
11 appropriations? Did that get knocked up to 120, or is it  
12 still at 110?

13 MS. MELLO: It's still at 110. So they  
14 will not --

15 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: (Indiscernible) updated  
16 position. We're just monitoring this bill, right?

17 MS. MELLO: Yeah, yeah, we're just  
18 monitoring.

19 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I would argue that it's  
20 kind of hard for us, unless we all choose to show up down  
21 at the capital, to take a more active role in monitoring  
22 it. It's so fluid, it doesn't make sense to try and  
23 weigh-in to what we don't know it is.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right,  
25 (indiscernible).



1 MS. MELLO: So I will keep you all  
2 informed about this as -- because you know, things again  
3 are moving really quickly on this, so I will make sure --  
4 I -- I didn't send an email out this morning, probably  
5 because I knew we were having this conversation, but also  
6 because this morning I thought they might be doing it on  
7 the floor this afternoon. I thought, God, by the time I  
8 get that email out, it will change again. I will look  
9 for moments where things are solidified long enough that  
10 I can give you an update that makes sense.

11 MS. NEAL: Okay. You do that.

12 MS. MELLO: Yeah. So House Bill 12.98 is  
13 the School Finance Act that also came out of  
14 appropriations this morning. That's much less  
15 controversial, frankly, at this point. There's a little  
16 --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)?

18 MS. MELLO: Yes.

19 MS. MAZANEC: Jennifer, excuse me, it's  
20 Pam. Did we give a position on 12.94, or did I just miss  
21 it?

22 MS. MELLO: You all had previously taken a  
23 position of support on 12.94.

24 MS. MAZANEC: Okay. All right. Proceed.

25 MS. MELLO: Okay, so I'm School Finance



1 Act 12.98; it's basically moving through the process.  
2 It's not that big of a deal, it's not that controversial  
3 at this point. But they are kind of moving it along --  
4 aside of student success. All the controversy about  
5 student success, which keeps slowing that down, keeps  
6 slowing down school finance.

7 And I guess the other thing I would note  
8 that's kind of related to those -- both of those bills --  
9 I don't know if you guys -- I know nobody spends a ton of  
10 time looking at my really pretty chart, that I sent you a  
11 link to all the time.

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I have it in front of  
13 me.

14 MS. MELLO: Oh, that makes me feel better.  
15 There were a bunch of --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I do once in a while.

17 MS. MELLO: I'm teasing. So early on in  
18 session, there were several bills introduced in the House  
19 405 that were individual components of what later became  
20 the Student Success Act. So there was an English  
21 Language Learner Bill, there was an ADM Bill, there was a  
22 Fiscal Transparency Bill. All of those bills have either  
23 been killed, or will be killed shortly, with the  
24 sponsor's consent, by the way, so that hasn't been a  
25 fight. Except for the ADM Bill.





1                   So as you recall, the ADM portions of the  
2 bill, of Student's Success Act, have been completely  
3 stripped out. There's nothing in there about ADM  
4 anymore. As a way to put pressure on the Senate to put  
5 that language back in, or do something, the House this  
6 week did move forward that free standing ADM Bill, in  
7 fact has already passed it. It was in committee I think  
8 on a Tuesday, then approached on Wednesday or Thursday,  
9 and off for the next day. So that is kind of hanging out  
10 there as a -- something that will have to be addressed at  
11 some point in this process, so just --

12                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So Jennifer, is that  
13 just to do a study, or is that to actually implemented  
14 ADM?

15                   MS. MELLO: That's to actually implement  
16 ADM.

17                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is that  
18 (indiscernible) Fiscal Bill?

19                   MS. MELLO: Yes, and the bill did change a  
20 little bit as it was moving through, so the fiscal notes  
21 being worked on again.

22                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: What's the number on  
23 the ADM Bill?

24                   MS. MELLO: You know, that is such a great  
25 question for someone who is looking at the chart. I was



1 not. So I'm flipping through my iPad right now to find  
2 it.

3 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I'm scrolling, I'm  
4 scrolling, I'm scrolling -- that's why I wanted the  
5 number, so I could find it.

6 MS. MELLO: I'll tell you, it's going to  
7 be close to the top because it was an early  
8 (indiscernible). There it is, it's 11.39. Oh, and  
9 actually, according to this it's --

10 MS. GOFF: Sorry, Jane here. Didn't the  
11 study version of that bill -- has it already gone through  
12 all the way, did you say?

13 MS. MELLO: No, so the current the version  
14 of the Student Success Act contains nothing on ADM. It  
15 doesn't require that we transition to ADM, nor does it  
16 require that we study it. But there is another one --

17 MS. GOFF: But there will --

18 MS. MELLO: -- that would require a  
19 transition to ADM.

20 MS. GOFF: Okay. I guess I will have to  
21 wait and see, I'm just -- I'm having a hard time tracking  
22 down a study bill to study only, is lining up with what  
23 are they going to do about this? How are they going to  
24 rectify this controversy between the two? To me it's  
25 either got to end up being one or the other



1 (indiscernible). Either we do it, or we study it.

2 (Indiscernible - talking over each other)

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is this study of last  
4 year?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There was a study  
6 done on this in like 2009 and so when the whole thing  
7 came up again, this year, I thought, "What's this one  
8 supposed to be?"

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)?

10 MS. MELLO: No, there actually a  
11 distinction between the two requirements. The -- the --  
12 when there was language in the Student Success Act to  
13 require a study -- again, that language is not in there  
14 at the moment, but it was at one point, it was supposed  
15 to be a study of systems to collect enrollment data, as  
16 well as a statewide enrollment system. So it was  
17 actually a broader undertaking than just ADM. The  
18 previous study that you guys did had to do with the  
19 method of counting students, one of which was average  
20 daily membership. That's how Leanne explained it to me.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All right.

22 MS. MELLO: So -- I mean, there's never  
23 been a bill about a study. There was study language  
24 included in Student Success Act. It goes away and comes  
25 back, goes away and comes back.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's probably what  
2 I'm thinking about.

3 MS. MELLO: There is a separate bill that  
4 was (indiscernible) do it -- I mean, that's not the title  
5 or anything, but --

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's good.

7 MS. MELLO: And you're right, we'll have  
8 to see how this all plays out. So I will keep you  
9 updated on that too. I was going to move on to the last  
10 bill on the agenda, unless anyone has any other questions  
11 about that stuff?

12 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Proceed.

13 MS. MELLO: So the last bill on the agenda  
14 is (indiscernible) Bill 13.84. This is primarily about  
15 higher education that your legislative contacts thought  
16 that it was kind of interesting enough that they wanted  
17 to just put it on the agenda and make sure you guys were  
18 aware of it. Sorry, I'm scrolling through my thing to  
19 get to the -- if you were in person, I'd do a little song  
20 and dance for you right here while I find the thing I  
21 need.

22 Okay. This is a bill from the Lieutenant  
23 Governor's Office. It basically creates a scholarship  
24 program to get tuition assistance to state residents. If  
25 anyone who is (indiscernible) eligible and then higher



1 with family incomes projected to go as high as 150,000.  
2 And this bill doesn't specify a lot of the details.

3 It specifies that you're going to create  
4 this entity. There happens to be \$30 million -- somebody  
5 found \$30 million sitting in a bank account somewhere in  
6 the state that can be used for this, so they are going to  
7 use that \$30 million to start it, and then the intent is  
8 that they will approach philanthropists and you know,  
9 rich people, and try to get them to put more money in it  
10 and create this program where you have a very robust kind  
11 of tuition assistance program for Colorado residents.

12 The bill itself, all it really does is it  
13 takes out 30 million and goes into the process and it  
14 kind of creates a structure and establishes a board. And  
15 then those people are going to get together and figure  
16 out the details essentially.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who (Indiscernible)  
18 the scholarship program?

19 MS. MELLO: It's the Department of Higher  
20 Ed, is in the lead. The board would be composed of State  
21 Workforce Development Council and three representatives  
22 of Higher Education and appointed by the governor.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So there's no limit  
24 on -- on (indiscernible) -- it's for four year programs  
25 only or can apply to any kind of post-secondary



1 (indiscernible)?

2 MS. MELLO: The bill is not specific on  
3 those issues. My guess would be that once -- if the bill  
4 passes and the entities were created, that would be one  
5 of the things they would develop through -- I don't know  
6 that it's an official rulemaking process like you guys go  
7 through, but it would be something along those lines,  
8 where they figure out the details of the program.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And -- and this has  
11 already passed the Senate, right?

12 MS. MELLO: No, it's a House bill.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, but it passed -  
14 - it's already moving through quickly.

15 MS. MELLO: It's passed the House and it  
16 still needs to work its way to the Senate.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At the House?

18 MS. MELLO: Yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Does anybody on the  
20 staff want to make any additional comments on this bill?

21 MS. PITNER: This is Jill. The only thing  
22 I would share is that this is something that the  
23 Department of Higher Education has been working closely  
24 with our opposite post-secondary education -- Rebecca's  
25 team -- to ensure a lineup with our college, career ready



1 objectives. And so they have been active partners with  
2 us on trying to crack this in a way that is supportive of  
3 our objectives from the Department as well. If the key  
4 priority of the Department of Higher Education is part of  
5 their alignment and support between K-12 and higher ed.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And just to -- sorry.  
7 Would any of you know if there was detail in there that  
8 would (indiscernible) for a first time college, higher ed  
9 entrance only? Or -- because it would be something that  
10 at some point within the -- within their post-secondary  
11 years, they can apply for as well.

12 MS. MELLO: That level of detail is not  
13 contained in the bill, so again, that's something that  
14 would be worked out by the HT. I don't -- I don't think  
15 there is any intent to limit it to first generation  
16 students. I mean, I think they want to make this as broad  
17 as they can. My guess is, that will be -- I mean,  
18 funding will dictate how big they can go, right? I mean  
19 if they claimed \$5 trillion, then it's probably every  
20 college -- you know, anybody who wants to go to college  
21 in Colorado is a resident. If they find 500,000, well  
22 it's probably -- they'll have to find some way to  
23 restrict the dollars.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

25 (Indiscernible - talking over)



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And Jennifer is there  
2 -- afraid it's been used before, is merit-based? Is that  
3 what it's intended to be? It's not income-based, it's  
4 merit-based?

5 MS. MELLO: No, I believe it's actually  
6 intended to be income-based, but incomes are much higher  
7 than traditional levels. That wasn't very artfully said,  
8 but it's not just for (indiscernible) -- it specifically  
9 talks about serving lower income and middle income.  
10 Because you know, there's a sentiment that middle income  
11 kind of squeezed out. They can't really afford it, but  
12 they don't get the financial aid either. So I think --  
13 very intentionally, they are trying to address that.

14 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Well, I would say,  
15 thanks for bringing this before us; I don't have an  
16 appetite for taking a position on it. That's my personal  
17 feedback on it.

18 MS. MELLO: That's fine. I think we just  
19 wanted everybody to know about it. It is a Higher Ed  
20 Bill, so --

21 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Sure. I appreciate you  
22 bringing it in. Thank you for doing it.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That is it. Unless  
24 you guys have questions on any of those.

25 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: I think I heard





1 something from Kansas -- speak up, Kansas.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible)

3 Kansas.

4 (Indiscernible - many speaking at once)

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are you

6 (indiscernible) Kansas town, Pam?

7 MS. MAZANEC: Yes, I am. (Indiscernible)

8 Kansas. (indiscernible)

9 (Indiscernible - many speaking at once)

10 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right, well do we  
11 have any other questions or shall we charge Jennifer with  
12 going back across the street and fixing everything that's  
13 going wrong over there?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

15 (Indiscernible - many speaking at once)

16 MS. NEAL: Try to whip them into shape,  
17 Jennifer.

18 MS. MELLO: Do my best!

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go forth.

20 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: All right, thank you  
21 all.

22 [Unintelligible - many speaking at once]

23 CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN: Next regularly  
24 scheduled meeting. Thank you all.

25 (Meeting adjourned)



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 5th day of April, 2019.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright

Kimberly C. McCright

Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC

1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165

Houston, Texas 77058

281.724.8600