



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
May 13, 2015, Part 5

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on May 13, 2015, the
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

Marcia Neal(R), Chairman
Angelika Schroeder (D), Vice Chairman
Steven Durham (R)
Valentina (Val) Flores (D)
Jane Goff (D)
Pam Mazanec (R)
Debora Scheffel (R)



1 MADAM CHAIR: We had to postpone the
2 discussion this morning regarding C Mass, and so we are now
3 reconstituted with the C Mass discussion. Commissioner.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you very much.
5 This item is brought to you again. We try to bring back to
6 you is two options besides the original one that we
7 presented as we feel they're required by law to set and cut
8 scores, and that's the responsibility of the Board. We've
9 tried to give you some options here for discussion today.
10 So with that, I'll turn it over to Joyce Aposki (ph).

11 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Joyce.

12 MS. APOSKI: I've had some opportunity to
13 think since earlier today, and before we jump into what the
14 options are, I want to take this opportunity to talk
15 briefly. I promise briefly about norm reference testing
16 versus Criterion referenced testing.

17 So when we had a Criterion reference test,
18 we are assessing against a set of expectations, a set of
19 content standards, and a set of performance levels. What
20 we're looking at is what kids know, and are able to do
21 against those pre-established standards, those pre-
22 established expectations. When I have a Criterion
23 reference test, I can score that test based on a single
24 kid, because I am scoring that student against those
25 content standards, not against any other kid.



1 For a norm reference test, we are assessing
2 students against how other students perform. So the score
3 I get is dependent upon the other students who actually
4 test that day. It is not connected directly back to a
5 content based decision. It's a distribution of scores. So
6 in the end, with just a percentile rank, I cannot answer
7 the question of what it is that the student can, and cannot
8 do.

9 As a matter of fact, I could have a test
10 where just about all of my students really actually do meet
11 the expectations, and yet there will be some students who
12 score at the second percentile. Or I can have a test where
13 none of the students meet the expectations, what we
14 actually want our third graders to be able to do, and yet
15 there'll be students who are scoring at the 98th
16 percentile. It's a ranking system.

17 Kids who know the least, to kids who know
18 the most, but there's not a connection back to the
19 standards. Both our state law, and our federal law, and
20 those systems are based on the premise that we will have a
21 Criterion based system.

22 Okay. Something that is generated off of
23 the standards, which is why we started first with the
24 content standards, then developed those performance levels,
25 and now we're trying to establish cut scores based on those



1 performance levels that's based on the content. It's a
2 content base decision.

3 If we were going to establish scores that
4 were based on more of a norm reference system, what would
5 happen is that rather than pre-establishing what it is that
6 we expect kids to know and be able to do, and measuring the
7 kids against those expectations, we would actually be
8 setting the standards. What do we want kids to be able to
9 know and do based on actual performance? It would be the
10 exact opposite of what the system is set up to do.

11 When we're looking at standard setting
12 expectations and score requirements, again, under both
13 state and ESEA, there's reference to being consistent with
14 relevant nationally recognized professional and technical
15 standards, having adequate technical quality, and meeting
16 the requirements under the law.

17 We have to report out on performance levels.
18 We have to have those performance levels be reflective of
19 proficiency. The results have to include scores that are
20 aligned to the standards. They must include performance
21 levels. They cannot just be raw scores, scale scores,
22 percentiles, things like that. The school and the district
23 reports that are generated have to reflect those
24 performance levels as well. One of which has to reflect
25 what we mean by proficient.



1 So when we're looking at normative data or
2 descriptive data, what role does that play? We, in the
3 generation of our individual student reports, took very
4 much to heart the concept of we are moving to brand new
5 standards that, frankly, schools and districts are in the
6 process of implementing, and it's new to students. And we
7 knew from the Criterion based perspective what the
8 standards were asking our students to know and be able to
9 do, it was going to be tough.

10 So we wanted to provide additional
11 information that would allow folks to also ask questions
12 of, okay, so my student may not know everything that
13 they're supposed to know according to the standards, but
14 how do they compare to other kids, to other schools, to
15 other districts?

16 You had in your packet two sample reports,
17 and we had been requested to bring those reports with us
18 today. And when we look at those reports, I want to point
19 out where we're talking about, kind of a Criterion based
20 system, versus where we're talking about where you can make
21 some of those other comparisons to other students.

22 So at the top of the report, what we have
23 is, obviously this is a content area for science. There's
24 a scale score. The scale score is what allows us to
25 compare performance from one year to the next year. So



1 here we have a scale score of 573, that has been assigned
2 to a performance level. And it's of moderate command.

3 The student's diamond is at the top. It's
4 the big diamond. And when we look at that student's
5 diamond, yes, it is sitting at that moderate command level.
6 When we compare that student's performance to the student's
7 school and district, that student is actually a high
8 performer. Right. They're doing better than the average
9 for that school or district. But when we compare that to
10 the state, the student is not doing as well as the state as
11 a whole is.

12 And again, that's one of the purposes of the
13 state assessment is to be able to look outside of just your
14 community, and have a broader perspective. So again, this
15 student has a moderate command of the standards. The
16 student is doing better than the school or district on
17 average, but the student is not doing as well as the state
18 on average.

19 We then break that score down into sub
20 scales, and for science we have physical science, life
21 science, earth system science, and then scientific
22 investigation, and the nature of science. For social
23 studies, we have history, geography, economics, and civics.
24 With this, we can start to look at a deeper level in terms
25 of how the student is performing, and when we look at



1 physical science, again, the student is performing better
2 than the average for the school or the district.

3 When we look at life science, the student is
4 performing slightly better. When we look at earth systems
5 slightly worse, and when we look at scientific
6 investigation that does appear to be a strength area for
7 this particular student.

8 As a teacher, I'm going to be especially
9 concerned about the earth systems piece. Right. Why is my
10 student not performing as well on that area as the other
11 areas? Why is my student not performing as well as his or
12 her peers within the school, within the district?

13 When I look at the next part of the report
14 where we see the earth systems breakout, we have the grade
15 level expectations, and we can see that the student again
16 is at the top. Then we have district average, then we have
17 state average. And where we see the biggest difference is
18 actually in GLE 2, which deals with the earth's surface
19 changes constantly through a variety of processes and
20 forces.

21 So we've narrowed down what it is that this
22 particular student seems to be struggling with. The
23 student in terms of weather, is solid. Right. The student
24 is actually doing better than his or her peers within the
25 district, and is even doing better than the state average.



1 Again, all of this is comparison of student to student,
2 something which I've heard referenced to from this group
3 before. Wanting more of that, less of the reference back
4 to the Criterion.

5 We also have the scores broken up into what
6 we refer to as selected response. In the olden days this
7 would have been multiple choice. They look slightly
8 different in a technology enhanced world, but for our
9 purposes we can consider those multiple choice.

10 And then constructed response. And those
11 are the items where students actually have to create their
12 own response. They're not just selecting. They have to
13 actually write it out. And when we look at the student,
14 the student is performing pretty consistently with the
15 school in the district on a selected response a little bit
16 below where the state is.

17 When we look at constructed response, the
18 student is actually outperforming the average for that
19 school, for that district, but is still a little bit below
20 the state.

21 This report is actually an example from
22 fifth grade, because fifth grade already has the approved
23 cut scores, so we were able to complete the reports by
24 having this very first part where we have it split into the
25 four performance levels. And what we are asking for you to



1 do, moving forward at some point, is to give us cut scores
2 so we know where to place those four levels. The rest of
3 the reports are done.

4 We also know that when we were going through
5 the standard setting process, we did also look at student
6 performance. It was not done in isolation. Our standard
7 setters very much came from the perspective of content.
8 Right. What do the standards demand. But we did share
9 with them what performance looked like. How many students
10 got the items correct? We did share with them
11 distribution, and we asked them to explain the
12 distribution. Anything that was different than what they
13 would have expected based on their own experience.

14 The standard setters, as they indicated back
15 into March, felt that actually where those cut scores fell
16 and what that distribution looks like, was matching their
17 experience within the schools and the districts. We've
18 been asked whether or not there are other standards setting
19 options. Again, we're coming from the perspective of a
20 Criterion based system.

21 I did provide for you in your packet, I
22 think a description of a couple of the other models. So,
23 yes, we used bookmarking. We could have used (inaudible),
24 we could have used a modified (inaudible), but in the end
25 they're all content based, and they all in part our



1 dependent upon expert opinion, educators opinion, and
2 there's no reason to expect that had we followed one of
3 those, we would have necessarily ended up with results that
4 looked very -- sorry, very different from what we actually
5 have. Again, it's the standards that are driving where
6 these cut scores are.

7 After the March meeting we did consult with
8 some of our national experts about what our options might
9 be in order to meet your wants as well as still be
10 technically sound in the end, because we know that we want
11 to have a technically sound system, both for our state
12 purposes, for our federal purposes, and just good practice.

13 The (inaudible) that we had followed, a
14 technically sound and nationally recognized process. Okay.
15 This is not something that we just made up. It is
16 technically sound, nationally recognized, but they did
17 agree that there was some room to adjust to the cup
18 clients, but we would still be able to defend from a
19 technical perspective. And that was our goal, to be able
20 to make an adjustment, but also be able to defend from that
21 technical perspective.

22 You have those adjusted cut scores in your
23 packet. They are not radically, radically different. We
24 look at the March recommendation, and we had about 19
25 percent of our students who were scoring at strong and



1 distinguished. If we would make an adjustment just to the
2 strong cut, which was one of the options that we have, we
3 would have about 25 percent of our students in strong and
4 distinguished. That stays the same for option c, but what
5 happens with option C is we also adjust the moderate cuts,
6 and so we have fewer students in unlimited category.

7 So with our option C, we have 29 percent of
8 our students in the limited category. Under the March
9 recommendation, there was 29 percent. This is for science.
10 For Social Studies we had approximately 10 percent of our
11 students in March scoring at the strong, and distinguished
12 mark. With an adjustment just to the strong cut, we have
13 16 percent, a split of 15 and 1. And then if we adjust all
14 levels it actually shifts to 14 and 2. And again, we see a
15 decrease in the students in the limited area dropping from
16 44 to 36 percent.

17 Do we have some external markers to gauge
18 the reasonableness of these cuts? Back at the March
19 meeting Mr. Jeremy (ph) asked, "What about AP? What about
20 those advanced placement courses? And at that time I did
21 not have those numbers off the top of my head. We do know
22 that in Colorado we have about 14 percent of our graduates
23 who earn a three or higher on a history or social science
24 assessment. For college credit students need to earn a
25 four or more. Okay. So that's three does not get a



1 student college credit, but again, that's about 14 percent
2 pretty consistent with what we have here at 16 percent.

3 When we looked at the science advanced
4 placement, we had about 7 percent of -- 7 percent of our
5 graduates, um, earning a three or higher on a science
6 assessment. Keep in mind for both social studies and
7 science under advanced placement, there are a variety of
8 tests. They're not comprehensive, so students can take
9 just biology or just chemistry.

10 Also, we know that within the last month,
11 NAPE released their eighth grade U.S. history results, and
12 18 percent of students scored at proficient or above.
13 Again, it's a different grade level, but it is an external
14 marker to just kind of give us a gauge in terms of is this
15 kind of falling within the realm of what we would expect.
16 And it's not radically different. And we know that these
17 scores, especially in the social studies come more in line
18 with what we saw with elementary and middle school.

19 So, questions?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. So can you
22 just tell me if this sequence is right? And this is why
23 the cut scores are problematic in my way of thinking. Is
24 it right that we, of course, develop language that
25 represents the standards in Colorado for social studies,



1 and science? That language exists on our websites. Then
2 performance level indicators were identified as subsets or
3 distillations of all that language, because when we pull up
4 that language it's voluminous. We could read any one of
5 those bullets, and kind of walk away asking ourselves, what
6 did it say again? Right.

7 I mean, because the -- when one thinks of
8 standards, one often thinks of very targeted, succinct,
9 detailed language with verbs that are descriptive. And
10 when you pull up our standards as -- as -- as many
11 standards, one has a hard time landing on the verb that
12 says what exactly does this mean? But, nonetheless, we
13 have that language.

14 Then the performance level indicators are
15 sort of a distillation of that language that creates the --
16 the weights of how many items are aligned with that
17 content. Then the next step is to develop items that link
18 to the performance level indicators and the standards.
19 Then the next step is to get kids to respond to those items
20 with varying levels of proficiencies. Then the next step
21 is to create rubrics, that groups of people would sit down
22 and superimpose on levels of responses on those items. And
23 then the next step is to get focus groups or groups or
24 whatever we're calling them, to sit down and, say, yes,
25 this kind of a response looks like it represents



1 distinguished. This kind of a response looks like it
2 represents strong. Now we will align the scoring of those
3 items across thousands of kids with that sequence.

4 And -- and so if I'm correct in that
5 sequence or roughly so, then -- then I -- I guess my
6 feeling is when you're ending up with one and two percent
7 of students performing at a distinguished level, it strikes
8 me as an artifact of all the people that did the work. So
9 can you respond to that?

10 MS. APOSKI: Madam Chair?

11 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

12 MS. APOSKI: Can I make a couple of
13 clarifications about the process that you outlined first?
14 So you're absolutely right that we start with the
15 standards, and the science and social studies standards
16 were adopted in December of 2009, and keep in mind that
17 those are Colorado. Right. We're -- we're not dealing
18 with any external issues when it comes to these two tests.

19 You're right that we then also develop what
20 I'm going to refer to as performance level descriptors.
21 And what that does is that takes those standards and it
22 breaks it up into different levels. So we have our limited
23 command, our moderate command, our strong command, and our
24 distinguished command, right. So we're going to break up
25 whether we have a student who is performing at -- kind of



1 like the entry level for that standard area is approaching
2 what we would call kind of proficient, whether we've
3 crossed the bar, we're strong or whether we're at that
4 distinguished level.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let me ask --

6 MS. APOSKI: When it comes to --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

8 MS. APOSKI: Sorry.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: When I -- when I -- I
10 reread the performance level descriptors that are kind of a
11 distillation of the voluminous language in the standards, I
12 -- I can't recall if the Board voted on that language. I
13 know that when I looked at it, I thought, and I -- I
14 remember talking with Jill at the time, and I said, "Where
15 did this language come from again? Who wrote it? Who
16 created these bulleted items that are supposed to be a
17 distillation of that larger body of work? And did we vote
18 on that or did we just review it?" I don't remember voting
19 on it.

20 MS. APOSKI: Madam Chair.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

22 MS. APOSKI: I'll answer that question and
23 then I want to jump back to one other thing.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

25 MS. APOSKI: Okay. The performance level



1 descriptors are actually one of the things that you're
2 voting -- well, will -- you're being asked to vote on. And
3 they're joined with those cut scores.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thanks.

5 MS. APOSKI: Okay. In terms of the items,
6 the items are actually I would suggest written back to our
7 evidence outcomes that are coming out of our standards,
8 rather than coming straight off of the performance level
9 descriptors. So just a slight adjustment there in terms of
10 how far have we journeyed.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Except that -- excuse
12 me.

13 MS. APOSKI: Entered so --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So performance level
15 descriptors, though, are written based on distinguished,
16 strong, moderate, limited --

17 MS. APOSKI: Yes.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- so they have a huge
19 impact on those cut scores?

20 MS. APOSKI: Madam Chair?

21 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

22 MS. APOSKI: Absolutely. And that's what
23 those performance level descriptors are supposed to do.
24 They are supposed to help us orient, and gain an
25 understanding of what it is that our students know in terms



1 of those skills and concepts that are represented in the
2 standards. And be able to separate --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And you haven't
4 (inaudible) yet.

5 MS. APOSKI: Madam Chair?

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

7 MS. APOSKI: That is what you're being asked
8 to take into consideration today, and what you were asked
9 to take into consideration as well as in March.

10 Another piece that I would just like to
11 clarify is that when it comes to scoring our constructed
12 responses, they are not scored from the perspective of
13 limited, moderate, strong, distinguished. That only
14 applies to a total test level. And so we have some items
15 that are worth two points. So there's a zero, one, and
16 two, but there's not a direct correlation to these
17 performance levels.

18 And I don't -- I just had to clarify,
19 because people get confused about that sometimes thinking
20 that the performance levels are applied at that item level
21 for that scoring, and it's not.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I'm going to a
23 very rudimentary level, because I went through a master's
24 program that was competency based, and you either were
25 performing, you were competent or you were not competent.



1 And I went through two years where professors, it was just
2 like this. They were creating the program. So I went
3 through courses where I didn't even get a score, because
4 they hadn't decided what, you know, what that rubric or
5 what would look like. It was very -- oh, anxiety
6 producing.

7 So as an example, in one course, which was
8 science education, the end what I had to do was create a
9 machine that worked, and worked for three minutes. And I
10 mean it -- it -- it was a machine that moved and flew. I
11 just don't see how we have gotten from that to -- to this
12 where you either are or you're not. I can understand that.
13 But these -- these levels that are, I think, I don't even
14 remember that in theory. What theory as far as -- I just
15 didn't know that theory, and I really have kept up in this
16 area.

17 I even went to Mexico, and helped the
18 department. The you -- at the Mexican Department of
19 Education with our states to develop programs in competency
20 based education. And my description is what I just
21 described. And it didn't have this a, b, c. We were
22 trying to get away from a, b, c, d, and f, which is
23 basically what you have in -- I mean, if -- if you gave
24 these descriptors, you could actually say that level up --
25 up above is an a, and then a b, and then a c, and then a d,



1 and an f. You have five levels.

2 MS. APOSKI: Madam Chair?

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

4 MS. APOSKI: So as we're looking at this
5 concept of competency, and I -- and if you would take what
6 you had, which was essentially a two kind of level
7 approach. Right, it was, you're either are or you're not.
8 Right. What has happened with most data assessments is we
9 have said, not only do we want to be able to distinguish
10 the kids who have it from the kids who don't have it, but
11 we want to be able to distinguish those kids who have
12 really excelled from those kids who haven't. And we want
13 to be able to distinguish those kids who really are
14 extremely struggling from those kids who are approaching
15 competency.

16 So if we were going to look at as an
17 example, you just have, like, kind of like one item in life
18 with your example, but you could have built it --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

20 MS. APOSKI: -- you could have built a
21 machine that flew, but it didn't run. I think you said it
22 had to kind of run and fly. I don't know. But you could
23 have done one but not both.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

25 MS. APOSKI: And you could have had somebody



1 who, frankly, at the start did not have a clue as to how to
2 even get gears working versus somebody else who could get
3 the gears working. And you want to be able to distinguish
4 those. So what we can do on the state assessment is
5 reliably kind of put kids into four different categories
6 with three being, I've crossed that line into competence,
7 but I can also then distinguish my kids who really, really
8 are excelling.

9 And then I have my kids who are below that
10 line of competence, but be able to distinguish my kids who
11 are just at the emerging level from the people who are
12 approaching.

13 MADAM CHAIR: (Inaudible) conversation.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have another question
15 that (inaudible).

16 MADAM CHAIR: Sure, what it?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes, it's related. So
18 what happens to those kids? Do they retake that -- the
19 teacher re-teaches in a different manner, the material that
20 was not? So what happens? They just don't pass? And how
21 -- how is that going to work?

22 MS. APOSKI: Madam Chair?

23 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

24 MS. APOSKI: In Colorado, we do not have our
25 tests as high stakes for students. Meaning we do not have



1 requirements that our students have to pass the state test
2 in order to, like, graduate. In some states they do.
3 Right. You cannot graduate unless you pass the state test.
4 We don't have that in Colorado. We're not high stakes for
5 students.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We are high stakes.
7 High stakes for teachers.

8 MADAM CHAIR: Wait. Wait.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

10 MADAM CHAIR: You were dominating the
11 conversation. No one has the right to do that.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm not dominating.

13 MS. APOSKI: Madam Chair?

14 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

15 MS. APOSKI: And so, and that's why I said
16 we are not high stakes for students. Right. The students,
17 their graduation is not dependent upon whether or not they
18 pass the test. Will the state assessments be used down the
19 road for purposes of educator effectiveness? The intent is
20 for the state assessments to be used for purposes of
21 educator effectiveness down the road. Is that happening in
22 this year? It's not happening this year.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, I would just add to
24 that. You've got a room full of students, all of whom have
25 parents who want to know how their children are doing.



1 How, you know, you need to be able to give them some
2 explanations, which is what you're looking at. And I -- I
3 -- it seems like we go through different stages in
4 education where, gee, we don't want any grades, because
5 they might feel bad or they're not what, you know. I
6 appreciate what you're doing anyway. So, go ahead, please,
7 unless anyone else has questions.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, there's questions
9 over here.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Let Angelika and Goff
11 go.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Yeah, let's get Angelika and
13 Jane in here.

14 MS. APOSKI: So if you want an example of
15 high stakes for students, kind of high, the AP test, which
16 also has what, five different levels.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we're talking about
18 the park.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, wait a minute.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're talking about the
21 (inaudible)

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We're not talking by
23 the park. We're talking about the C Mass.

24 MADAM CHAIR: We're not talking about the
25 park at all.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But what we were
2 talking about is how Criterion reference exams are scored.
3 So you've got five on the AP. I don't know about the AB --
4 IB. The NAPE seems to me to be identical, and, in fact, it
5 goes right along. I mean, the scores are right in
6 alignment --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- with the scores
9 we're having here.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So for us --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But (inaudible)
13 concerned --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But you're talking
15 about is a pass --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) the
17 question I asked before. The question I asked before was
18 what about -- we want those kids to -- to get that
19 knowledge, to have that knowledge. It's not about, it
20 doesn't matter because, you know, so we -- we get a
21 template or we -- we have an assessment that says these
22 kids do not know that knowledge. So what are we going to
23 do? Because it's important to me, and I think it's
24 important to parents that kids have that knowledge.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Agreed. But you're



1 talking about what we do with the scores and we are just
2 trying to get to scores. So I don't --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Now, see you're talking
4 about a test. I'm talking about content and knowledge.
5 I'm sorry.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You are still keeping
8 to that test. And I'm talking about there's a body of
9 knowledge to know. There's a --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- there's content to
12 know.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And I want those kids,
15 even if they fail that test to retake that course, to have
16 teachers re-teach.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No -- no disagreement
18 with you.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What we're talking
21 about though --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- but that's the
23 importance of -- of -- of education and learning. That's
24 what it's about.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And that's the next



1 step after you -- after a kid finds out where he or she --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- lands on assessment.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Then we've got a job to
6 do, but we're not -- we can't even get there. And by not
7 giving any kind of feedback to the kids.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah, we could give
9 them a score.

10 MADAM CHAIR: You're not listening.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, that's what we're
12 talking about.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, could I
14 (inaudible)?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Jane.

16 MS. GOFF: The tests that were given last
17 fall, and what grades were those again? Seventh?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair? Sorry.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The tests that were
21 given in the fall were actually given to the 12th graders.
22 So they were pretty much a culminating assessment.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What's been released?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

25 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have released the
2 elementary and middle school science and social studies.
3 We did that last fall.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. (Inaudible).
5 That's what I -- I thought there was just a lower grade
6 levels that people had seen the results. I've seen -- now,
7 we've -- we've all seen an exemplar or a sample of what one
8 of those reports might look like that would go home to a
9 parent, but I can't remember right now is -- is there a
10 score on there where we're literally -- I can't remember.
11 It's in some number of points out of a certain maximum
12 number of points. And then in addition to that there is --

13 MADAM CHAIR: (Inaudible).

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- the bar --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and a diagram type
17 structure that shows where it play -- where along the scale
18 of proficiency. If we're still calling that. Actually,
19 it's competency.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam, sorry.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are -- are parents
23 seeing that, and then the second part of that, I know they
24 are. But so the second part is, has there been any
25 feedback, direct comment -- comment, feedback questions,



1 the good, the bad, and the ugly about what parents, and --
2 and families, and teachers for that matter, are learning
3 from that information? What kind of conclusions are they
4 drawing? And to me that's where the teaching, and
5 learning, and instruction part of this kicks in.

6 It's also purely achievement level, and
7 whether you want to call that a raw score or a proficient -
8 - a competency -- used to that -- level, that's to me it's
9 all the same thing. However, people are talking about
10 this, and what they're all learning, how they express their
11 own learning conclusions, observations, to me that's what
12 we -- we have to keep focused on. Regardless of when --
13 when we send these scores out or not. And I think agree.
14 I do agree. People want to know.

15 No matter how many people did not
16 participate in these tests, I think, because I've talked to
17 them, families, kids, teachers, outright question, do you
18 want to know how you did, at least? Of course.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Deb?

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: So my question. I'm
22 questioning the underlying assumptions of the way these cut
23 scores are set. So your point, Jane, the people deserve to
24 know something about how they did, yes.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: But my problem is the
2 underlying assumptions have not been exposed, so that I'm
3 concerned people get these reports and they assume that
4 they're right. My child has low moderate command, and my
5 concern is just let's -- let me just read one -- one
6 example of the performance level descriptors.

7 If you're distinguished, you can analyze the
8 interconnectedness of the world, including how the movement
9 of people, goods and ideas can enrich cultures or create
10 tensions. And how the uneven distribution of resources can
11 lead to conflict, competition or cooperation. So
12 apparently if you can do that, according to what? A
13 rubric, according to a group of people that sat down and
14 said, "This is the way that analysis has to look to be
15 distinguished," and then you're going to distill it into a
16 report like that, that people are going to take away
17 teachers, parents, kids, and say, I need to do x, y, and z
18 better or worse.

19 You know, in other words, I -- I feel the
20 underlying assumptions are off determining how these cut
21 scores are set. So I'm all about talking about a positive
22 result here. How can we give feedback to the field? But
23 if we do it based on this approach, I think there are so
24 many nested assumptions in these cut scores that nobody
25 understands, that it will lead to actions that -- that



1 people may not have anticipated, and again, don't
2 understand.

3 MADAM CHAIR: That -- that could be very
4 true, but is it that simply that happens all the time.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Not to this extent. Not --
6 not the way this (inaudible).

7 MADAM CHAIR: And -- and how -- how would
8 you suggest we reach these scores?

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's what I'm saying. I
10 think that's our next -- that -- that discussion we need to
11 begin. How can we give feedback to the field without doing
12 it this way, with these assumptions that have not been
13 critically analyzed? They've not been socialized with the
14 public, so that they know what those scores mean. That to
15 me is the problem.

16 MADAM CHAIR: And what would you -- and I'm
17 sorry, but we did have this a good conversation.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You were saying that
19 you have curriculum.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well -- well --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

23 MADAM CHAIR: What do we do, Deb, in the,
24 yeah, and I'm (inaudible). What do we do in the meantime,
25 you know, school's going on, teachers are giving



1 assessments, they're giving grades.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That's why I'm asking,
3 what are our options?

4 MADAM CHAIR: What do we do about that?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we give raw scores,
6 mean scores, ranges? I mean, can we give some other type
7 of feedback that doesn't have so many nested assumptions
8 that have been, have not been socialized with parents or
9 teachers or kids, so that they'll get that report. and they
10 don't know what it means?

11 MADAM CHAIR: I don't know. I -- I, you
12 know, I -- I --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think it's possible.

14 MADAM CHAIR: -- just --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We could (inaudible)

16 MADAM CHAIR: -- I don't want to harm the
17 ongoing people in the classroom now that are giving these
18 kinds of things.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My concern is --

20 I don't want to say don't --

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- that we do more
22 harm.

23 MADAM CHAIR: -- what?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My concern is that we
25 do more harm in releasing this information --



1 MADAM CHAIR: So --

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- this information.

3 And the assumptions haven't been critically analyzed.

4 MADAM CHAIR: And I -- I -- I -- I don't
5 know. I've argued with you, I understand. But what do we
6 do right now? What are we do for the people in the
7 classroom right now? How do they determine whether their
8 students are -- are making the grade or not making the
9 grade?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well --

11 MADAM CHAIR: And how do they report to
12 parents, and how do they report the kids if we --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- that's why we're
14 (inaudible).

15 MADAM CHAIR: -- don't have any cut scores?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm -- I'm asking for
17 us to discuss. That's why we're discussing it. What are
18 our options? What kinds of data could we provide?

19 MADAM CHAIR: And -- and this might be a
20 long, long, long discussion on giving us time. We don't
21 have time for it here this long discussion. Go ahead
22 Angelika.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: So I'm going to suggest, Deb,
24 that when teachers get this feedback I don't think they're
25 going to be confused, because we went through a two year



1 process to develop these standards. And they have been
2 adopting curriculum to in order to implement that. I'm
3 going to totally agree with you that we have got a
4 communication piece to do, because much as this is
5 interesting, it is like way over my head. And I'm familiar
6 with some of this terminology, and it still is really hard.
7 So I completely agree with you that we really need to in
8 our reporting be able to speak to this. For me it has to
9 have some examples.

10 You know, a rubric for me means something
11 when it actually has a particular issue, and there are
12 examples of what is at which level. So I'm going to agree
13 with you on that part that we've got to do some serious
14 communicating, because the expectations that we have today
15 for kids are different from the expectations that we had
16 experienced as -- as students ourselves.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And the teachers
18 haven't read these -- these --

19 MS. SCHROEDER: No.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- performance level
21 descriptors?

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, yes, they have.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They understood --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, yes they have.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- what the various



1 levels are?

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes, they have.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It hasn't been voted on
4 yet.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's -- there's so much
6 of that in the standards.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's (inaudible).

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, ma'am.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So, and again I think
11 when we were here in August, the educator tried to address
12 this. And he articulated that, at least from his
13 perspective, that there was a pretty clear link between
14 those performance level descriptors and the standards, so
15 that those folks who are teaching social studies, they seem
16 to be able to look at that, and say, I understand how this
17 is building. I know how to make sense of this. I agree
18 that is that everywhere at this point in the state? It's
19 not. But I'm not sure it's going to get everywhere in the
20 state until we actually put results out there, and they're
21 actually linked back to those performance level
22 descriptors.

23 One other thing that I do want to mention
24 too is that our expectation is that we will continue to
25 release items that have --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: That will be huge.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- that have not just
3 the item, and not just the correct answer, but also will
4 have what the performance looked like on that item. So
5 what percentage of kids actually got that right? And when
6 it comes to the constructed response, what did a zero look
7 like compared to what a two look like? How do we start to
8 understand what a two performance is on some of our
9 constructive response items? And again, at this point
10 we've had about 300 Colorado educators who have been
11 involved in this process. There's a whole bunch more, but
12 we have to get the information out there in order for it to
13 be used.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is just a -- a
15 thought. Is it possible for us to -- because it seems like
16 what you're combining here in these reports is Criterion
17 reference and norm reference, right?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mm-hmm.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're doing
20 comparisons as well as to what extent a student approaches
21 a criteria. Right. So for us to circulate norm referenced
22 type information, wouldn't be incompatible with the system
23 that we have set up.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair. So I
25 think I heard --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible) scores,
2 mean scores, (inaudible)?

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Right.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So when we are looking
5 up here at this table, which is the top table on the
6 reports that you have, those littler diamonds represent the
7 mean score for the school, the mean score for the district,
8 and the mean score for the state. So we were very much
9 coming from that perspective of can we provide some more
10 descriptive statistics that folks might be able to
11 understand. And when we shared this with the parents, and
12 I agree with you that when we talk about parents, there's a
13 wide variety of parents, and there's a wide variety of
14 parents in terms of what kind of information they want to
15 have. And these reports, you can stop here or you can
16 continue to dive more deeply.

17 But what the parents were able to understand
18 is, I'm going to look at where my child's diamond is. I'm
19 going to look to see which performance level, that's going
20 to give me the gauge in terms of how well we're meeting the
21 expectation of the standards. But then I'm also going to
22 look, and if my child's diamond is to the right, I know my
23 kid did better.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: If my child's diamond



1 is to the left, my child didn't do as well as. So I think,
2 and -- and again, I'm not saying that we went as far as you
3 may have liked us to, but we tried to address some of those
4 concerns about, give me some other comparative information
5 on these reports that goes beyond just the standard --

6 MADAM CHAIR: (Inaudible) because we're not
7 got to get to (inaudible).

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- that we're all
9 trying to learn.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So just a follow up,
12 and then I'll --

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, my only thought
16 would be would it make sense for it as I'm struggling with
17 this to release mean and average scores ranges, so
18 descriptive type information give a close up sense of how
19 they're doing, relatively speaking and not the cut scores
20 while we examine the underlying assumptions.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: At this point --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- Madam Chair, that
24 does not meet the state or federal stature.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. What's wrong



1 with doing it in -- doing both, Deb?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I -- may I just say

3 --

4 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- Madam Chair. I want
6 to get it kind of down to the children. The children, and
7 what they're learning, and I, you know, Denver Public
8 Schools came out, and said they didn't have material for K
9 through three. They -- they don't have material. We have
10 to listen to what the also, these experts who came to us
11 last week, and said --

12 MADAM CHAIR: (Inaudible).

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- it was an evolving -
14 - an evolving test.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and, you know, I
17 mean, I -- it just so evolving that we can't really --

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Did you find it?

19 MADAM CHAIR: All right.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- really discuss it --

21 MADAM CHAIR: We need --

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- and we're -- we're
23 doing cut scores when people don't understand.

24 MADAM CHAIR: -- we need to wrap this up,
25 because we don't have all day. What did you say,



1 Commissioner?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well --

3 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, you didn't? Okay. I have
4 a -- you -- you have sent -- I will let you speak since
5 you're the only one who hasn't.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

7 MADAM CHAIR: (Inaudible)

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a number of
9 questions. Just kind of basics.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Well, if you've got a number
11 of questions, let me speak first, because we do have a very
12 limited amount of time. Obviously we're not going to come
13 to a conclusion here. And --

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We need to --

15 MADAM CHAIR: -- I -- I have a motion here
16 that I could use to table this, and I think at, you know,
17 at this late hour of the day with tempers fraying, and,
18 probably not a solution in sight unless we to --

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (inaudible) temper
20 (inaudible)

21 MADAM CHAIR: Would you not do that to me,
22 please?

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry. Forgive me.

24 MADAM CHAIR: I think that that it probably
25 would be, I would advise that we table it and come back to



1 it, because 4:30 in the afternoon, I don't think we're all
2 up to it. But if you want -- if you just make it brief.
3 Okay.

4 MR. DURHAM: Well, yeah. I do have just a
5 couple of questions. One is where -- currently, who holds
6 the data for the individual students? Is it held in this
7 department? Is it held by the districts who administered
8 the test? Who -- who holds the data?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam --

10 MR. DURHAM: Who produce these reports?

11 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair. So once
13 the reports are produced, that data will be at the school
14 district and state level.

15 MR. DURHAM: Who holds it now? The school
16 districts don't have it?

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair. The
18 school districts do not have this data now, because we
19 can't fill in this field of what ultimately is the
20 student's performance level. So there's a hole in the data
21 at this point in time.

22 MR. DURHAM: Okay. So then -- then as I
23 understand it, this data cannot be used for teacher
24 accountability under the statute that just passed?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Correct.



1 MR. DURHAM: That it can't be used for
2 district accreditation under the standard that just -- just
3 passed. Is that correct? Can you --

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I believe it's possibly
5 -- possibly for the first.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You're correct.

7 MR. DURHAM: Yeah.

8 MADAM CHAIR: You got it.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And -- and, yes, for
10 the second. I -- I think -- I think it's permissive under
11 -- under the -- the teacher.

12 MR. DURHAM: That's not -- not state
13 required?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry.

15 MR. DURHAM: And so it -- it is -- it is --
16 it does -- it -- if released would provide some information
17 to individual student on their performance. That's the one
18 thing it would do, and I think the most compelling argument
19 that the Chair made is that students, some of them, some at
20 least may be interested in this data, although given the
21 number who didn't take the test, it may not be as large as
22 we think.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's 82 percent.

24 MR. DURHAM: Secondly, the comments that
25 we'd be out of compliance with state and federal law, I'd



1 just like to make one comment. The legislature cannot
2 compel any member of this Board to cast a vote any way that
3 they don't want to, number one.

4 If, in fact, this Board decides not to
5 release these scores, there is no penalty then that accrues
6 to any one individual or to the Board for that matter. And
7 if somebody wants the scores released, their option is to
8 go to court, and -- and have the court release them, since
9 we fail -- since we failed to do it, and it gives us a
10 chance to make a legal case about whether their valid or
11 not. So I'm not too worried about -- about that.

12 But I -- I do think that --

13 MADAM CHAIR: You're not worried about not
14 releasing the scores?

15 MR. DURHAM: I -- I don't think there's -- I
16 think that the -- the biggest damage comes from individual
17 students who took the test, and are, in fact, interested in
18 the results.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Well, yeah, I think that's --

20 MR. DURHAM: I think -- I think that's,
21 that's the problem.

22 MADAM CHAIR: You're right.

23 MR. DURHAM: So, you know, I'd hope we might
24 be able to come to some sort of compromise on this, but the
25 more it -- the more I hear, the more I -- I guess less



1 likely I am to compromise, because I keep falling back into
2 the mode that -- that these could very well be designed to
3 create a crisis in education for the purposes -- for
4 political purposes with which I don't happen to agree.

5 So, but taking that out of it, I'm -- I'm
6 certainly -- certainly willing to go along with the motion
7 to table, but I think we ought to have -- I really think we
8 ought to have enough time to discuss whether we could
9 release this for some purposes and not others. That is not
10 for district comparisons from district to district, but
11 were only -- only released on an individual basis to
12 individual students, so that wouldn't affect teacher
13 accountability, wouldn't affect district accreditation.

14 In fact, the press would not have the
15 opportunity to make those comparisons, because that data
16 wouldn't exist to be able to compare Cherry Creek to
17 Cheyenne Mountain, for example.

18 And -- and we might be able to do some of
19 those things and minimize -- minimize the press damage,
20 which is going to be that, you know, Colorado students and
21 teachers are all failures, which is going to be the
22 headline when this data is released and we have a crisis.
23 So --

24 MADAM CHAIR: But we also have the crisis
25 when they take -- the State Board refuse to -- to release



1 this information, and then there's going to be a second
2 crisis.

3 MR. DURHAM: Well, I don't -- I don't happen
4 to believe that's crisis, because if -- if the information
5 -- if

6 MADAM CHAIR: (Inaudible).

7 MR. DURHAM: -- if -- if the majority of
8 this Board believes that the information is inaccurate in
9 some fashion, that's our position and I think it's a
10 defensible one. And I think -- I think Dr Scheffel made a
11 pretty good prima facie case at least that they're
12 questions about the data.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

14 MR. DURHAM: So can we get --

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

16 MR. DURHAM: -- a long enough discussion at
17 some point to see if we can work out some compromise based
18 on for what purpose it might be released, in what format it
19 might be released, to whom and might be released? And we
20 can maybe deal with the simplest (inaudible).

21 One -- one last question is, if we set this
22 as a cut score --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Well --

24 MR. DURHAM: -- it's -- is it only for this
25 year, and only for this -- does this carry through in any



1 way for the future?

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Cut scores can be
5 evaluated on an ongoing basis. Typically, you don't change
6 them year after year after year, because that eliminates
7 the ability to really evaluate whether or not there are
8 changes within your system. But I would encourage us,
9 especially given the circumstances that we experienced this
10 fall, that we have a clear plan for doing ongoing
11 investigation about whether or not these scores are indeed
12 at the right spot. And I would love to be able to see how
13 students perform without what I'll call all the extra
14 noise.

15 MR. DURHAM: Well, I'll just make one --

16 MADAM CHAIR: Go ahead.

17 MR. DURHAM: -- final closing comment then.

18 The, you know, I think in all the debate that went on at
19 the Capitol, one thing became very clear, and that the --
20 the -- the group that has no stake in this, at least a
21 stake that they can perceive are the students. And they
22 are opting out -- in the -- in the -- at senior level, they
23 voted with their feet. They don't believe, at least, they
24 have a huge stake in this.

25 It's quite clear the teachers don't think



1 they have a huge stake in this, and/or that they do have a
2 huge stake, and that it's improperly applied. Parents I
3 think really don't know at this point in time how to
4 evaluate this, because of I think the noise in the system,
5 which, you know, I -- how we got here is by the way of
6 going to be a fun debate.

7 But I think we need to set aside enough time
8 to see if we can work through some compromise or for some
9 release of some of the data, but I think a full release,
10 even with these modified levels, I'm still not willing to
11 vote for.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

13 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Mr. Durham, that's a
15 question maybe you can answer. I don't know how we can --
16 don't know right now, and that's something we have to get
17 back with how do we parcel it out. Okay. That's some way,
18 I don't know if that's possible, but that's something if
19 you want we will get back.

20 I don't know -- I know, because the system,
21 how it's designed. Okay.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Come on.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair?

24 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And respectfully, I'm



1 willing to look at all kinds of different options, and take
2 into consideration all of your suggestions. There is a
3 little bit of a conflict between what I'm hearing on this
4 side, which is please be sure to give us the comparisons of
5 the student, against school, against district, against
6 state for that comparison purposes. And then saying we
7 won't release it.

8 I -- I just have to be up front about that.
9 That almost by default, even if we would somehow say we're
10 only releasing the individual student reports, by default
11 there are -- there's school data, and there's district
12 data.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Again, not that we
15 can't make shifts. I'm trying to figure out how to meet
16 both expectations.

17 MADAM CHAIR: And we need to wrap this up
18 quickly. Angelika.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: So factual information, 82
20 percent of the seniors took those two tests, so it's not,
21 yes, 18 percent of the kids in those 82 percent of the kids
22 who did take it are now being cheated because we are not
23 providing information. Their parents are not getting the
24 information.

25 Nothing is going to change about how, based



1 on these new hard standards with a different framework than
2 we've ever used before. It's the same framework NAPE's
3 been using, the AP has been using. It's a lie for us to
4 say it's something different than what one of these three
5 is, because this is, these are the results. What we want
6 to see is improvement. We want to see kids who aren't near
7 the top getting more help, but to say this is not the
8 truth, there's just nothing that supports that comment,
9 because this is the truth. It's substantiated by a whole
10 lot of other assessments that our kids have been taking.

11 MR. DURHAM: Well, I'd love to have an hour
12 to debate that with you, because I think you're wrong.

13 MADAM CHAIR: I would love to add to that.
14 I think perhaps some of you don't have any idea what are --
15 we're not releasing test scores. Kids and parents are not
16 going to know what they did, and because of our actions,
17 and you think that this is not going to raise a huge storm
18 in the state. What do they think they're doing up there?

19 This is not good -- good for the State
20 Board, and I would -- when you talk about the number of
21 students who opted out, they opted out with their feet.
22 They were whipped up to that. There -- there was a lot of
23 publicity going on at -- that was not true, was not right,
24 but, you know, they bought it. And kids loved to opt out.
25 I mean, that's the best thing they can do is opt out.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I (inaudible).

2 MADAM CHAIR: So I think --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Inaudible).

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I wanted to make to
5 make a motion. Do we have it or not?

6 MADAM CHAIR: I think if -- I'm ready to
7 offer the motion that we table this, but if we table it ,
8 then we're not talking about it till June.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is ridiculous.

10 MADAM CHAIR: And the kids are out of school
11 in June. I just think it's -- it's, you know --

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's unprofessional.
13 It's just plain unprofessional.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Unprofessional, good word. It
15 just boggles my brain that we would do this. But, you
16 know, Angelika, would you perhaps do the motion? Would you
17 say that?

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd love to make a
19 motion.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Go for it. Make a
21 motion.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, I like to make a
23 -- a motion that we give grades a, b, c, and f, so --

24 MADAM CHAIR: I can't change the whole thing
25 like that.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You can't do that.

2 MADAM CHAIR: You can't, you know. We
3 either release the grades or we don't release the grades.
4 We can't just suddenly come up with a new grade scale.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't see why not out
6 of (inaudible).

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I mean, this would be
8 probably more meaningful than --

9 MADAM CHAIR: (Inaudible).

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- it probably would be
11 more meaningful to parents than what they'll be getting
12 with that -- with that score scale or with that scale. I
13 think they will understand a, b, c, and f. So --

14 MADAM CHAIR: I think the feelings are hot
15 enough that we're going to wrap this up.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not hot enough.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So I move to table the
18 action on the high school science and social studies
19 recommended cut scores, and their associated performance --
20 performance level descriptors for the Colorado measures of
21 academic success, and Colorado alternate -- alternate
22 assessment until the June Board meeting.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Is there a second? No? No
24 second?

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Not me.



1 MADAM CHAIR: You want to sit -- sit here
2 and continue --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. I'll make another
4 motion.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: There's no second.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, why not take up
7 my motion.

8

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'll make a substitute
10 motion.

11 MADAM CHAIR: That we sit here all night?

12 MR. DURHAM: I -- I've been with the
13 legislature the last two -- last two weeks.

14 MADAM CHAIR: You're used to that.

15 MR. DURHAM: I -- I can promise you I can
16 stay all night. I'll make a substitute motion that -- that
17 this layover until tomorrow, and that we devote at least,
18 find the time to devote 30 minutes to it and see if staff
19 can come up with some compromise that we might be able to
20 live with that incorporates, because it incorporates at
21 least some of the concerns that they've heard. Maybe they
22 can't, but we'll see if they can.

23 MADAM CHAIR: That's a good motion.

24 MR. DURHAM: And so that's --

25 MADAM CHAIR: And I think Jane's going to



1 second it.

2 MS. GOFF: And I will second it, because we
3 just happen to be in the same direction.

4 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Then moved and
5 sect that we -- that we set aside 30 minutes tomorrow,
6 which will not be easy. We've got a very full schedule
7 tomorrow, but we'll find 30 minutes, and try to come to
8 some conclusion. Maybe (inaudible) have some suggestions
9 for us.

10 I really think people this is so important.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Stay up all night.

12 MADAM CHAIR: We are, you know, we're just
13 letting ourselves in for a huge firestorm if we don't
14 release test scores this year. I just -- I -- and we can
15 talk about the fact that we need to do further study on how
16 to norm them, and all that sort of thing, but these tests
17 have been given, and the fact that we won't release them is
18 just huge.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I --

20 MADAM CHAIR: With that we would move on to
21 the next item on the agenda.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

23 MADAM CHAIR: I will (inaudible) -- oh,
24 (inaudible). Yes. Bizy, will you call the roll?

25 MS. BURDSALL: Steve Durham?



1 MR. DURHAM: Aye.

2 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Flores?

3 MS. FLORES: Aye.

4 MS. BURDSALL: Jane Goff?

5 MS. GOFF: Aye.

6 MS. BURDSALL: Marcia Neal?

7 MADAM CHAIR: Aye.

8 MS. BURDSALL: Pam Mazanec?

9 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

10 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Scheffel?

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Aye.

12 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Schroeder?

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Aye.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Thank you for the

15 very productive discussion.

16 U UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So much, I think I

17 had your book by accident. Sorry.

18 MADAM CHAIR: That's okay.

19 (Meeting adjourned)

20

21

22

23

24

25



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 22nd day of January, 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