



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
September 10, 2015, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on September 10, 2015,
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado
Department of Education, before the following Board
Members:

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



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: State Board of Education
2 will come to order. Elizabeth will you call the roll
3 please?

4 MS. BURDSALL: Of course. Dr. Flores?

5 MS. FLORES: Here.

6 MS. BURDSALL: Jane Goff?

7 MS. GOFF: Here.

8 MS. BURDSALL: Pam Mazanec?

9 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

10 MS. BURDSALL: Joyce Rankin?

11 MS. RANKIN: Here.

12 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Scheffel?

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

14 MS. BURDSALL: Dr. Schroeder?

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Here.

16 MS. BURDSALL: Steve Durham?

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Here. A corium is
18 present. We - first item of business will be Interim
19 Commissioner's Report, Dr. Asp.

20 MR. ASP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good
21 morning everyone. I wanted to provide you with an update
22 on assessments as well as release of scores from the
23 PARK, English Language, Arts and Math please. Let me
24 start with assessments, recall legislation last year
25 13.23, House Bill 13.23, I made some changes in



1 assessment and as a result we've had to adjust our
2 schedule as well. So to give you an update in terms of
3 high school science and social studies, I'll start with
4 those. Recall that social studies in 13.23 was called
5 for a sampling process where essentially every school
6 would be included in social studies once every three
7 years. At this point we made -- after conferring some
8 with the legislature and as well as a variety of folks in
9 the field, both Superintendents as well as social studies
10 content area folks in different districts to not -- to
11 forgo the high school science -- excuse me high school
12 social studies assessment this year, that would give us a
13 chance to sample that in the next two years. We think
14 there might be some adjustments that social studies at
15 the high school level and so this gives us an opportunity
16 to set that aside until we see how that will play out in
17 the legislature. And we've got a lot of positive
18 feedback from practitioners about not getting that
19 assessment this fall, or this year.

20 High school science, after talking with,
21 again, a large group of folks across the state, it was
22 recommended that we give that in 11th grade. Obviously,
23 we couldn't give it at 12th grade by legislative mandate
24 and tenth grade was really -- it was really objected to
25 by our folks in the field because there were curricular



1 issues with kids having an opportunity to learn the
2 material they were on in science stuff.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'm sorry could you
4 repeat that last. They objected to why.

5 MR. ASP: Basically they want it in the 11th
6 grade because they're were curricular issues with kids
7 being taught the material before the assessment was given
8 in the 11th grade. Basically we have science standards
9 and biology, chemistry and physics. My science friends
10 would say it's a little more complicated than that but
11 basically, they need three years to be ready to take that
12 assessment. Also recall that there is -- legislation
13 called for a grade 10 curriculum based college entrance
14 exam that's also aligned with our state standards and
15 it's aligned with a college entrance curriculum based
16 exam at grade 11. Currently we have the ACT at grade 11
17 which is a curriculum based college entrance exam,
18 however we're required under new legislation to submit
19 and RFP which we are in the process of putting together
20 and that will go out probably by the end of the month for
21 vender's to apply to be the vender for the those 10th and
22 11th grade tests. Frankly, ACT will probably be one that
23 will apply. SAT could also apply for that piece, there
24 may be some others out there but those are the only two
25 that we think are going to be able to meet those -- those



1 requirements. We have to move that process along pretty
2 quickly because we are scheduled by law to give those
3 assessments in the Spring of 2016. I'm sorry, go ahead.
4 We also are having conversations about how we could
5 leverage this 11th grade curriculum based college entrance
6 exam. I have to practice that mantra here just a little
7 bit. By, for example modifying it and adding science to
8 the science portion of that assessment that may help us
9 reduce the testing load and make that science exam more
10 relevant to students who are taking it because it becomes
11 part of the college entrance exam that they're being
12 required to take.

13 So we're having those discussions with not
14 only folks in the field but will also be talking to the
15 legislators about them as well. But more than anything,
16 we want to look at how that might work with venders,
17 whoever the test vender ends up being. The idea of
18 augmenting one of those college entrance exams is not
19 unique to Colorado, Illinois has been doing it for a
20 while, for example to use it as a standard assessment as
21 well.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Scheffel?

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Could you just clarify again
24 because we had CMAS that was for science and social
25 studies, now we're talking new test with a new vender,



1 would you just?

2 MR. ASP: Sure, they're actually. Yeah,
3 it's a great question, thank you. We have CMAS, science
4 and social studies that we developed as per legislation
5 for elementary, middle and high school.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: That vender was Pearson
7 wasn't it?

8 MR. ASP: The vender was Pearson, yes it
9 was, uh-huh. And we've had an ACT required assessment in
10 grade 11 for quite some time, I think since about 2001,
11 2002, legislation passed last Spring basically said we
12 want you to add a grade 10 assessment that's aligned with
13 a grade 11 college entrance exam. And the original
14 legislation that called for the ACT to be administered --
15 couldn't, they couldn't use an actual vender in the
16 legislation so the description that was written was only,
17 could only be given by ACT. That same general
18 description is in the legislation now, calling for us to
19 go out for bid on college entrance assessment at 11th
20 grade. But now SAT has changed it's assessment enough to
21 where it might be able to bid in that -- for that
22 contract. And again, there may be others out there, but
23 essentially this 11th grade test is a college entrance
24 exam similar to what we've been administering, but now
25 we're adding a 10th grade one that aligned with that.



1 Some folks would argue that should be the ACT and it's
2 partner, The Aspire. Others would say you should use SAT
3 and PSAT, the pre SAT test for that 10th grade one.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: So in reality we're adding
5 another test, so we've gotten rid of I think, two, am I
6 right?

7 MR. ASP: We got rid of english, language
8 arts and math at the 10th grade and 11th grade.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: So is the college board then
10 going to do a test specifically as an achievement test
11 for SAT?

12 MR. ASP: If they choose to bid on the
13 contract.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: That's what it would be?

15 MR. ASP: Their 10th grade test would have to
16 the aligned with Colorado standards as well as predict
17 the kids scores on the 11th grade college entrance exam.
18 How am I doing with this guys, am I confusing you?

19 MS. MAZANEC: Okay, so the tenth grade test,
20 what is required in the tenth grade test?

21 MR. ASP: That it be a curriculum based, not
22 a -- the old, the reason that is says that the old SAT
23 would be much more of an ability kind of test, you do
24 these analogies and so forth and it wasn't really
25 content. Now it would be a curriculum based college



1 entrance exam that's aligned with the 11th grade college
2 entrance exam so you could serve as a predictor and also
3 that it reflects our state standards, that it could be a
4 measure of our standards.

5 MS. MAZANEC: And our standards in math,
6 english, social studies and science?

7 MR. ASP: And science.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please proceed.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: There's four test or the one
10 test with four subjects.

11 MR. ASP: One test with four subject areas,
12 like an ACT for example. That's the best example I can
13 give you there.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: And the PARK would still be
15 the one for the...

16 MR. ASP: PARK is given in the ninth grade.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Then, excuse me, the PARK
18 would be given for the lower grades, elementary, middle
19 school?

20 MR. ASP: Three through eight.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Three through eight, okay.

22 MR. ASP: And we'll give you this.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: Three through nine.

24 MR. ASP: I'm sorry, three through nine, I'm
25 sorry, SCAP is here. We will give you this in a chart,



1 so I probably shouldn't have launched into this much
2 detail.

3 MS. MORGAN: There is a chart somewhere.

4 MR. ASP: Yeah, I'll provide that for you.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. I think this is a good
6 opportunity, we're going through a bid process to ensure
7 that the RFP or whatever it's now called contains our
8 strict privacy requirements and particularly since there
9 may be another bidder, and I would certainly encourage
10 SAT to bid, because if, based on my conversations with
11 the Commissioner, with Robert before he left, he said
12 that ACT just refused to comply essentially with what was
13 already Colorado law and certainly if there is another
14 option that is willing to comply not only with the law
15 but with the standards the boards already put in place,
16 those should be incorporated into the bid document and --
17 so that we don't make a decision based wholly on price if
18 -- if there's a reason to disqualify one of the bidders.

19 MR. ASP: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Great
20 suggestion, that's what we plan on doing and the -- there
21 have been issues with ACT complying with what we want
22 them to do.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Please
24 proceed.

25 MR. ASP: Another question?



1 MS. GOFF: I do.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Oh, I'm sorry, Ms. Goff.

3 MS. GOFF: Along with considering SAT I
4 think a really good question to do a little exploration
5 on would be how -- how many post-secondary institutions
6 are keeping SAT as an admission indicator and whether or
7 not, well actually there has been some talk out in the
8 field for quite a while now about the revision that was
9 just done to SAT and whether or not it is aligned with
10 standards -- alignable with standards and then we'd want
11 to look into their privacy -- their privacy agreements,
12 but just as a word what we're hearing across the country,
13 various states are that SAT is becoming a non-issue as
14 far as considering it for part of an assessment system.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: What do you mean non-
16 issue?

17 MS. GOFF: Some are starting to drop it,
18 some states are taking themselves out of it. I don't
19 know how many but the list of high education entities
20 that are putting it off on the side burner, if not off
21 the stove, is also growing.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, it's one of those tests
23 that -- a lot of big University's, even Harvard and some
24 of those are not asking for the SAT anymore.

25 MS. GOFF: Or the ACT.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: The SAT.

2 MS. GOFF: A lot of states are just stopping
3 using those.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Exactly, either one of them
5 yes. Well I didn't want to throw another wrench in the
6 flow of conversation, but I do think we need to be
7 careful about checking out.

8 MR. ASP: This is a new market niche for SAT
9 to move into this curriculum content based kind of
10 assessments. I'll go ahead and move along here. Then I
11 also wanted to give you an update on -- or just remind
12 you that the PARK assessment, the english, language arts
13 and math tests, as we asked earlier would be administered
14 to all grades three through nine.

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Once next year.

16 MR. ASP: Once next year. Now all of this
17 could change depending on legislation as well, so we'll
18 see. I want to give you an update on PARK score release
19 pieces. We've been developing a schedule for the release
20 of PARK scores, and when I say PARK, I mean english,
21 language arts and math assessment results. Right now in
22 our Colorado measures of academic success that's the
23 overarching assessment package. We have our own science
24 and social studies assessments and then we also use for
25 english, language arts and math the PARK assessments that



1 were developed with a consortium of other states. There
2 have been some advantages to being in this consortium,
3 there's also some challenges in some of those come out
4 when you start to negotiate with other states who have
5 different needs and pressures just like ours are
6 different from theirs about when we release these results
7 and so on. Our plan is to bring you the PARK results,
8 state wide PARK results at your November meeting, that's
9 grades three through eleven from the past Spring. We'll
10 also disaggregate those results in various way by
11 subgroups and so on. We will then be, and this is a
12 typical process we've done with assessment results in the
13 past. We'll then make available after the board meeting
14 to our districts, their district and school results.
15 We'll give our districts a chance, we typically give them
16 a week or so to make sure they understand the results and
17 this year will be even more critical because things are
18 new and then we'll embargo those with the press and those
19 results will be released toward the end of November. The
20 district and school results, we'll provide them to you as
21 soon as we have them.

22 Now there's a couple of caveats I want you
23 folks to know for sure is that some other states,
24 particularly Ohio, Illinois are under a different set of
25 timelines, their state boards want any information they



1 have and you're going to see some results released from
2 those states, Arkansas as well, I believe, in a week or
3 so. Now we don't want to look at those results because
4 they are very preliminary, and they don't include the
5 paper and pencil portion. So if kids took paper and
6 pencil rather than the computer, those results wouldn't
7 be there. We've always been very particular about giving
8 you results that we know are final and that aren't going
9 to shift some and I'm predicting that you'll see a fairly
10 large shift when you add the paper and pencil or
11 potentially you could. Because there's a lot of kids who
12 took it on paper and pencil. So those results are
13 preliminary. Also the accuracy of the results have not
14 been verified, there's going to be a lot of dirt in the
15 data, so to speak. So we also don't want to put those
16 results out. That's why we're waiting until the November
17 meeting before we do that, which has been our typical
18 piece. We check the results internally. We also give
19 some to our districts and they give us feedback around
20 the data to make sure that it's clean. That's been our
21 process and we'd like to stay with it.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: How do you identify dirty
23 data?

24 MR. ASP: Some of it might be scores that
25 make no sense, some of it might be students who show up



1 several times under the same name and ID number, there
2 can be a number of different kinds of dirt in the data.
3 I don't know if any of our staff members want to talk
4 about that? And so what we've done typically with our
5 results from our state tests for the last however many
6 years we've been doing this, since 1997 is that we send
7 out a file to our districts and they confirm the data and
8 send it back to us in late May or early June and to make
9 sure that that data's clean and it makes sense to them.
10 I'm sorry.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Ms. Rankin?

12 MS. RANKIN: Thank you. That was a
13 demotion. Dr. Asp, I have a question for you. When we
14 get the information in November, it will be broken down
15 into districts, right? Would it be possible to get the
16 number of students that are eligible to have taken that,
17 how many took it, and I would just like to know the
18 unexcused absence on that, or can we get that with?

19 MR. ASP: And I apologize, we will give you
20 participation information in November, if we have it
21 earlier, we'll share it with you as soon as we have an
22 estimate. We are working on that now. But we'll have
23 final participation results and we're going to have to
24 give that to our districts as well because, so they can
25 interpret, and we need to help them interpret what these



1 results mean. We have a large communication effort going
2 on now, developing resources and materials and we'll do
3 some additional training with the districts to help them
4 understand the results.

5 MS. RANKIN: Thank you.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Unexcused could also mean
7 opt-out, parents who opt-out?

8 MS. RANKIN: I don't know, yeah, unexcused,
9 I guess that would be, but I'm not sure if parents opt-
10 out if that's excused if your parent writes a note. I'm
11 not sure how that works but I mean, If I had my way, I'd
12 like to see what the regular attendance is at the school
13 and then the day of the test. I mean, that might be
14 revealing in some districts and I think it would helpful.

15 MR. ASP: We'll be able to give you an
16 estimate of, kind of estimate of the kids that,
17 percentage of kids who took the test and those who didn't
18 who were eligible to take it. Staff, if you want to add
19 anything?

20 MS. MORGAN: When we release at the November
21 board meeting that will have state level data, I don't
22 think we'll have the district level data until a little
23 bit later, so just.

24 MR. ASP: We will share it with you as soon
25 as we have it.



1 MS. MORGAN: Yeah.

2 MR. ASP: Typically we have it reported
3 district level result at a state board meeting, we want
4 to give our districts a chance to see that, they'll all
5 certainly have a lot a press interest in those and we
6 want to make sure they know what they're talking about
7 first.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: The first time I heard
9 about the timetable for this, it seems to me we were
10 talking about September, October now we're into the end
11 of November, what's caused the slippage? Or has there
12 been slippage, maybe I should ask the question that way,
13 because it appears to me these targets have changed.

14 MR. ASP: We certainly pushed the getting
15 all the results back a bit. Couple things have made that
16 happen. One is getting states to agree on what a score
17 report would look like and so we've made some changes to
18 that and had some arguments about it frankly, and every
19 time we make a change in that it causes the vender to
20 have to reprogram the report and that's pushed that back
21 a little bit. We also -- we're in the middle of
22 performance level setting and that takes a bit of time
23 and then being able to make sure that those results make
24 sense, that's pushed us back a little bit more as well
25 and then also being sure that the data is clean has taken



1 a little longer than folks thought it would. We could
2 push these results if we wanted too, but we're concerned
3 about giving the controversy around the test and the
4 interest in it, the results we report that we can stand
5 behind and say this is what the results actually were and
6 they're not going to change. So when we thought about
7 originally trying to come in October and we don't have
8 confidence that the data will be in the kind of shape
9 that we want it to be.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Have the cut scores been
11 set at this point and time, do we know how many, of
12 course there is no right from wrong since there all
13 basically essay, have the cut scores been set at this
14 point.

15 MR. ASP: They are in the process of
16 finalizing that now for grades three through eight.
17 They're final and generally in high school scores so
18 there'll be some idea of what those percentages will look
19 like in the near future. That's some of what you'll see
20 coming out of these other states even though the data
21 itself, the cut scores have been set the data itself is
22 not necessarily clean.

23 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I though the methodology
24 for setting cut scores was done when the questions were
25 created and the group of experts that got together



1 decided that they need to do X in order to reach each of
2 these measures without any reflection on how anybody
3 actually performed, did I misunderstand how those scores
4 were set?

5 MR. ASP: Yeah, the process was a little bit
6 different, without getting too much in the weeds, there's
7 basically three standard setting processes that people go
8 about doing whether it's the realty exam or the CPA exam
9 or anything else when you have judgements about it,
10 against the criteria. Basically that the founder of all
11 this was a statistician at ETS, called Bill Angoff, and
12 so you can use Angoff's method or you can use the broadly
13 defined modified Angoff method and I'm sorry, Mr. Durham,
14 I know this is a little bit more than you want to hear.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: That's alright.

16 MR. ASP: And basically, we used a, Park
17 consortium used a modified Angoff method and so the
18 difference between those two is you get to see the
19 results. In the pure Angoff method, the experts sit
20 around and say we think that's the hardest item, without
21 looking at how kids did on the tests. In this one, we
22 went through and looked at every item, talked them
23 through, said we kind of think these items, if you score
24 about this level that would indicate a certain competency
25 or a certain mastery of the content. But then they saw



1 how the kids did on these assessments and they had a
2 chance to consider that data. The process is very
3 structured. If we ran a group together, we would do it
4 individually first to say where those cut scores ought to
5 be, then we would come back and see what we individually
6 had put together, we'd argue about it a little bit, and
7 then we'd go back and do it again. There would be
8 several rounds of that and introduced in the second or
9 third round would be the actual data itself, and that's
10 why you have to wait a little bit for that to get there,
11 because that changes where people are, so. I don't know
12 if that addressed your question.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Well it does, and I think
14 that the answer is that it's at least potentially subject
15 to manipulation and that the delay by description that
16 you've given, it really leaves itself open for
17 manipulation and I don't know how trustworthy this data
18 will be when we're done with it. I guess I'd prefer
19 given what we were told originally, what I was told
20 originally these scores were set, all the negative
21 feedback I had on my original comments from the people
22 involved in setting the cut scores for science and math,
23 I'm certainly led to believe those were done absent to
24 data that somebodies idea of what someone should know,
25 but I thought that was subject to enough manipulation,



1 but this now is -- looks like it made an instructed
2 appraisal at this point or it certainly could be.

3 MR. ASP: Could I make one comment, if you
4 may?

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Sure.

6 MR. ASP: I understand how as appearance of
7 that, this -- this method is not made up or constructed
8 for PARK, it's a standard method used across the country
9 and reviewed by technical experts so, could someone
10 influence that, I suppose they could, part of what needs
11 to happen in this is a strong facilitator who works hard
12 to keep the peace. I facilitated the first standard
13 setting for our fourth grade reading assessment in 1997,
14 across the hall from me were folks doing the writing
15 assessment, fourth grade. And we were doing this similar
16 kind of process and yeah, we had some folks who made
17 that, started to take their writing standard setting, I
18 call it south, in a sense, making it inaccurate. We'd
19 have a strong facilitator that'd pull people back and say
20 no we need to focus on what we want kids to know and do
21 and follow the process we have. So any of these
22 processes can -- can be waylaid a bit and it's -- your
23 counting on the vender to be able to verify the technical
24 elements of the process.

25 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr Scheffel?



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: My question is, do we get to
2 see the raw data, and also did we participate in the cut
3 score setting, in other words we're a governing entity,
4 right? For the PARK, are you on the committee or is
5 somebody at CDE sitting there on these committees feeding
6 into the setting of the cut scores and then can we see
7 the raw data?

8 MR. ASP: Let me make sure I understand, Dr.
9 Scheffel, the raw data, you mean.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Before the cut scores are
11 set, in other words according to the data.

12 MR. ASP: Okay, how many kids scored at each
13 level?

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Before it get manipulated or
15 put in categories or whatever.

16 MR. ASP: I don't have that, it's possible
17 we could take a look at it. We did have Colorado
18 teachers and content experts participate in the standard
19 setting along with folks from other states. As part of
20 the governing board, we then review what, from a policy
21 perspective, not a technical one, we review where those
22 cut scores are and make some adjustments depending on how
23 we think useful those scores are. We don't make those
24 adjustments outside of certain statistical range so --
25 there's a phrase I wanted to use with my kids sometimes,



1 there's an error of judgement, you might call them that,
2 and what I mean by that is, if we were all on a committee
3 and we set the cut scores here and you're here and maybe
4 Pam's score is wide, within that judgement range we can
5 adjust those with some feeling of accuracy. The
6 governing board didn't adjust outside that. They didn't
7 go and say we don't like that score so we're going to
8 move it over here. We were part of that discussion and
9 some of it's actually going on this week as well too.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: I mean one question I thought
11 was interesting when we looked at the PARK, when we're
12 able to view some, that I just wonder what, how did the
13 test list in the ELA side or even the math side become so
14 heavily loaded with reading comprehension. I thought
15 that was interesting and I think the people that set the
16 cut scores would notice that and be part of that
17 discussion saying, I mean -- when I thought about the
18 content that was either on the test or not on the test it
19 stuck me as heavily loaded for merely reading
20 comprehension. And do you remember at discussions was
21 it, I mean was that a deliberate, you know, plan to
22 render math heavily loaded with reading comprehension and
23 then the ELA the same. I just wondered what you thought
24 of that when they sat and talked about it.

25 MR. ASP: I wasn't part of the discussions



1 when the discussions when the actual items were being
2 developed and so on, I had a different role. But there's
3 certainly discussion that came out of the standard
4 setting process where folks will say, I'm concerned about
5 this item lets talk about this one, can we item
6 statistics that let us know does it function well with
7 the other items, certainly that came up as part of the
8 process and it'll, the assessment will continue to be
9 refined because of that kind of feedback. Sometimes
10 there's feedback as well from content experts involved in
11 other aspects of reviewing content.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I know that the test
13 branches, so when we reviewed it and we didn't look at
14 every single thing but we did have a fairly good sense of
15 what's on there, and if teachers are held accountable, we
16 have their evaluation for teaching the standards and the
17 PARK test is heavily loaded toward reading comprehension
18 then I think that would be an important discussion for us
19 to have as a state, I mean, is this test really giving us
20 what we want as far as testing content. I would kind of
21 question it, at least based on what I looked at. It
22 struck me as not a lot of content but a lot of reading
23 comprehensions, larger discussions.

24 MR. ASP: Certainly a discussion that we
25 could have.



1 MS. MORGAN: Um-huh.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Schroeder?

3 MS. SCHROEDER: So the way you describe this
4 makes me think back on when I was teaching and gave tests
5 and then went back and looked at it. Every now and then
6 I would realize that the majority of the students somehow
7 misinterpreted the question. I didn't do a good job
8 asking it clearly for them, this is college level. Is
9 that what goes on when they go back to that very last
10 step, that they actually evaluate whether there was a
11 serious misunderstanding of what the question really was
12 or what is that last piece when they go back and they
13 actually -- are able to look at the tests.

14 MS. GOFF: So are you asking about the item,
15 the item is not a good item because so many kids missed
16 that item and so you throw that item out?

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Or the answer that they get,
18 is correct given the way they understood the problem.
19 Those are two different things.

20 MS. GOFF: There is ESL kids, when I saw
21 that test...

22 MS. SCHROEDER: The question was for
23 Elliott. So just a sec okay.

24 MS. GOFF: Oh sorry.

25 MR. ASP: Thank you, basically the standard



1 setting process doesn't really involve a review of the
2 items although some of it will come out as people are
3 looking at them. Before the items even make it to the
4 test they're reviewed for several different aspects.
5 Some about bias, some about, when I say bias, bias some
6 culturally, but also bias for special education students,
7 for example will be taking the test. And then also a
8 review of whether or not these items actually are
9 interpreted that same by every student.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Different folks. So you're
11 saying that - that should be filtered out early.

12 MR. ASP: And then there is a field test of
13 the items as well in which -- there are some item
14 statistics, without getting too heavy in the weeds, that
15 you can look and see, does this item fit in with how kids
16 scored on these other items and if it doesn't you flag
17 that and pull it out and start to say why, and sometimes
18 you just pull it out and get rid of it because for
19 whatever reason it doesn't work. I know you're shocked
20 and appalled but sometimes test items just don't work
21 and, I'm sorry bad joke about assessment, but you're
22 trying to -- you don't know all the time why it doesn't
23 work, it just doesn't fit there and even though it looks
24 fine it doesn't work because kids look at it a different
25 way.



1 MS. GOFF: And I thought that's where you
2 were testing two things in math. You were testing
3 reading for ESL kids and you were testing math, so I just
4 -- for ESL kids it's a different thing and so I don't
5 know whether you're going to get a score on english
6 reading or a score on pure math and some of those were
7 difficult.

8 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yeah.

9 MR. ASP: The math test was very difficult.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: To put it mildly. Okay,
11 any, please proceed, is that it.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just a question. Will
13 our, will the information, the scores we get coming up
14 include both the performance assessment part and the
15 number two PARK?

16 MR. ASP: That's what comes together.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So two components are
18 niched, alright.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I have a question for
20 Dr. Asp. When the test scores come out, you said that
21 the districts are going to be informed as an explanation
22 of the test. I wonder if we could get that?

23 MR. ASP: Sure.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Or if there is anything
25 written that we could have even before it comes out, so



1 we know what we're looking at.

2 MR. ASP: That's a great question. We'll
3 make sure you have that before we bring it to you in
4 November because they are, the scores just look a little
5 bit different, that's why we had a big argument, excuse
6 me, a discussion about how the score report should look.

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any further questions from
8 members of the board. Thank you, Dr. Asp. The next item
9 is, I believe the Executive Session. Ms. Burdsall if you
10 would like to read the appropriate language for us.

11 MS. BURDSALL: An executive session has been
12 noticed for today's State Board Meeting in conformance
13 with 24-6-402(3)(a) CRS to receive legal advice on
14 specific legal questions pursuant to 24-6-402(3)(a)(II)
15 CRS and all matters required to be kept confidential by
16 Federal Law, Rules or State Statutes pursuant to 24-6-
17 402(3)(a)(III) CRS.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Is there a
19 motion to convene an executive session?

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Convene.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Dr. Schroeder.
22 Is there a second?

23 MS. MAZANEC: I second.

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you, Ms. Mazanec.
25 This requires five votes to pass. Is there object to



1 convening in executive session. Seeing none, that motion
2 is adopted, and the board will stay in recess for the
3 purpose of an executive session.

4 (Meeting adjourned)

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
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 25th 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