



COLORADO
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
November 12, 2015, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on November 12, 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: All right. We'll now
2 proceed with item -- item 4, which is the -- the results
3 of the PARCC English Language and Math tests, which are
4 being released probably as -- as they become public here.
5 And may I ask, Joyce, how long is your -- roughly how do
6 you tend to go at this, or how do you intend to present
7 this?

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, we do have
9 obviously the results to share with you. We expect that
10 there will be some conversation that you are going to
11 want to have about the results, and perhaps some other
12 things. I believe we have an hour scheduled for this
13 conversation.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. So then you want to
15 proceed then with your basic outline?

16 MR. ASP: Mr. Chair, could I add just --

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

18 MR. ASP: -- one comment? Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Commissioner.

20 MR. ASP: Just to remind us all that this is
21 the first release, if we hadn't remembered that, of these
22 results from the assessments for English language arts,
23 as part of our Colorado measures of academic success.
24 These successes were developed by the PARCC Consortium.

25 You can see from the media attendance, as



1 well as attendance from school districts, and advocacy
2 groups, and higher ed, that there's great interest in
3 this, and we've been excited to share these results with
4 you since they are the first time we've looked at English
5 language arts assessments that -- that are aligned with
6 the Colorado academic standards.

7 With that, I'll turn it over to MS.
8 Zurkowski.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. And let me
10 say, we'll -- we'll try and -- we'll hold the questions,
11 I think, until we're through with the initial
12 presentation, and the results are all in front of us, and
13 then we'll proceed with questions.

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair, so in terms of a
15 high-level outline, I want to provide a little bit of a
16 background, in terms of these assessments; talk about the
17 performance levels; and then get right into those
18 participation and achievement results. Alyssa will join
19 me and talk a little bit about accountability. We'll
20 talk about the release schedule for school and district
21 level information, show you some sample score reports,
22 and point to a couple of resources for schools and
23 districts.

24 So in terms of what was the rationale
25 from -- for moving from CCAP, TCAP, to the CMAS



1 assessments, as you know, Colorado adopted new standards
2 in December of 2009. Updated those standards in August
3 of 2010. And we needed to have an assessment that
4 actually measured what those standards were.

5 The rationale for moving forward with new
6 standards and assessments, folks really in Colorado did
7 some deep dives into what was happening with students who
8 were exiting our K-12 system, and they knew that we had
9 about 34 percent of graduates from the class of 2013 who
10 went to public colleges in Colorado. They were in need
11 of remediation in at least one class. We know that
12 Colorado is only producing 22 college graduates to every
13 100 students who enter a Colorado high school, and so the
14 goal was to increase the readiness of our students for
15 both college and careers.

16 The Colorado academic standards were fully
17 implemented in 2013-14, so last year was the second year
18 of full implementation. Some districts did move more
19 quickly. So they are in their third or fourth year of
20 implementation. Again, the expectation is that these new
21 and more challenging standards will better prepare our
22 students for college and career.

23 The CMAS tests in English language arts and
24 math, as well as in science, and social studies, are
25 aligned to those standards. As the interim commissioner



1 indicated, the Colorado measures of academic success
2 actually consist of two different components. The one is
3 the Colorado developed science and social studies. And
4 then the other side are the PARCC developed English
5 language arts and mathematics assessments. Today, we are
6 talking about those English language arts and mathematics
7 results.

8 As I indicated earlier, again, these tests
9 are aligned to our Colorado academic standards. They
10 were designed to be administered online. That was a
11 priority for Colorado during their conversations back in
12 2009 and 2010. They feature more interactive and
13 engaging questions. And they assess concepts and real-
14 world skills that are included in the standards.

15 Just as an example of some of the changes
16 that we saw, and we do see some of the most significant
17 changes within the area of English language arts, what
18 you have on the left is an example of a middle school
19 TCAP reading prompt. And it says, "I am most proud of
20 the fact that this school year I blank." And students
21 were asked to complete that and write to that.

22 With the new English language arts
23 assessments an example is, you have read a passage from
24 "The Count of Monte Cristo," and a scene from
25 "Blessings." Think about the similarities and



1 differences and how the two authors developed the themes
2 in each text. Write an essay in which you identify a
3 theme from each text and analyze how each theme is
4 developed. Be sure to include specific details from
5 selections.

6 Very different types of writing that we're
7 asking the students to engage in. Much more academic.
8 Much more evidence based than what we have had
9 historically.

10 As we get ready to review these results,
11 just wanted to remind us some of the purposes of our
12 state assessments. They do serve as one indicator of
13 student mastery of the grade level standards by the end
14 of the year.

15 Couple of points: this is intended to be an
16 end-of-the-year assessment. It is not an interim
17 assessment given throughout the year. It's an end of the
18 year -- did the student, by the end of the year, master
19 those concepts and skills for that grade level. And
20 also, it's one indicator. We expect that schools and
21 districts will take this information, and as they make
22 decisions about decision -- sorry -- about students, they
23 take this into consideration, as well as what they have
24 locally.

25 The state assessments provide information on



1 how students are performing compared to their school,
2 compared to their district, and to their state peers.
3 And that is relatively unique to the state assessments.
4 With the ELA and math assessments we also have comparison
5 to other states. Again, most local measures don't
6 provide that kind of information.

7 As we move forward, the assessments will
8 track yearly student growth. They also allow teachers to
9 see how their students are performing against the
10 standard and identify areas they may need to adjust in
11 their practice for the future. So this is always looking
12 at future; what can we do to improve. They also do
13 provide school and district comparisons, and the
14 accountability information for parents, students, and the
15 community.

16 For the 2015 administration, we administered
17 English language arts to students in grades 3 through 11.
18 We administered math to students in grades three through
19 eight, as well as students in high school. We had two
20 different sets of high school assessments: the
21 traditional pathway of algebra, geometry, algebra II.

22 There was also a pathway for what we refer
23 to as the integrated or international pathway 1, 2, or 3.
24 And at the high school level students had some
25 flexibility, in terms of which of those assessments they



1 would take, based on what most closely matched what they
2 were taking within their classroom experiences.

3 I also wanted to mention that as we made the
4 move to online assessments, we were able to increase some
5 of our accessibility features and what we have had
6 historically. We also had accommodations. When we're
7 talking about accessibility features we're talking about
8 students being able to use things like highlighters.
9 We're talking about students being able to use
10 bookmarks -- electronic bookmarks. We're talking about
11 students being able to eliminate answer choices. They
12 also are able to get directions clarified. There are
13 things, like, word-to-word dictionaries, as well as pop-
14 up dictionaries.

15 For students, who are English learners, and
16 are engaged in bilingual education with both English and
17 Spanish, there was for math a Spanish online version of
18 the math assessment that also had what we referred to as
19 text-to-speech, so the student could hear, as well as see
20 that those words in Spanish. There was also a Spanish
21 version of the assessment.

22 At the local level folks were allowed to
23 translate that math assessment into languages that were
24 most appropriate for their students, based on their
25 instruction within the last year.



1 With these new tests we are setting a new
2 baseline. And again, the focus is on college and career
3 readiness. They are new tests. As I indicated earlier,
4 the first year of implementation was '13-'14 for those
5 new standards, so last year was the second year of full
6 implementation.

7 We expect that as students and teachers
8 become more familiar with those expectations, we will see
9 a rise in scores. Please keep in mind that making
10 comparisons between the CMAS scores and TCAP scores,
11 avoid doing that. These are very different tests,
12 assessing very different sets of concepts and skills than
13 what we have had historically. And again, this year's
14 scores will serve as the baseline to measure future
15 student growth, and school, and district improvement.

16 Performance levels. For purposes of PARCC
17 reporting, the performance level cut scores were set this
18 past summer -- thank you -- and early fall. There were
19 approximately 200 educators from across the consortium
20 that participated in that process. We had appropriate 25
21 Colorado educators who participated in that process.

22 The PARCC governing board adopted the cut
23 scores for purposes of the PARCC reports. Each state
24 will make its own decisions regarding accountability
25 reporting. And Alyssa will address that in a little



1 while.

2 What are the performance levels for PARCC?

3 There are --

4 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Could you just repeat that
5 last thing -- each state will do what? And could you
6 explain it just a little? I'm sorry.

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Each state will make their
8 own decisions regarding how they utilize the results in
9 accountability decisions.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you. Sorry.

11 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yep.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Violated my own rule about
13 interrupting, so --

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: You're the Chair.

15 So --

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Why not?

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- five different
18 performance levels for PARCC: the lowest level is level
19 1, did not yet meet expectations; level 2 is partially
20 met expectations; level 3 is approached expectations;
21 level 4 met expectations; level 5 exceeded expectations.
22 Level 4 and 5 are the levels that correspond to being on
23 track for being ready for the next grade, or for being
24 college and career ready.

25 We have received questions about how does



1 this compare to our science and social studies cut
2 scores, or performance levels rather. For science and
3 social studies our distinguished command is comparable to
4 the exceeded expectations; strong command is comparable
5 to our met expectations. Again, the top two levels are
6 the indicators of being on track, whether that be for the
7 next grade, or for college and career readiness.

8 Remember, that we had moved forward with
9 science and social studies prior to ELA and math, so in
10 the process of the last two years additional decisions
11 have been made by the PARCC states. We will be making
12 some adjustments to how we refer to our performance
13 levels in the future, so that we aren't asking our field
14 to have to balance two different sets of vocabulary. So
15 for 2016 again, we will bring those more into alignment.
16 And again, you can see how those correspond moving down.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I ask a question?

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let's go ahead and
19 finish --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Oh, sorry.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- if we can.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Before we get to the
23 results, I wanted to talk a little bit about
24 participation. I think that's been a -- I'm going to
25 give that to you -- that has been obviously a topic of a



1 lot of conversation. You can see what I provided here is
2 participation by grade level, and by content area.
3 There's not a lot of difference between the content area,
4 right. So if we had a student participate for ELA, we
5 tended to have that student participate for math.

6 When we look at our lower grade levels,
7 grades three, four, and five, we are very close to that
8 95 percent target. When we look at grades six, seven,
9 and eight, there is a little bit of slipping, and it's
10 between about 85 percent and 93 percent. When we get to
11 high school, we see a more significant drop in
12 participation. Ninth grade at about 70 percent. Tenth
13 grade at about 60 percent. And 11th grade at about 50
14 percent.

15 We do not provide grade level participation
16 for math at grade 11, because students were not required
17 to take a math assessment in grade 11, depending upon
18 where they were within their coursework flow. So we
19 don't really have a denominator for that particular
20 assessment.

21 Keep in mind that in the legislation that
22 was passed last spring that PARCC will not be given to
23 students in grade 10 and 11 in this upcoming year.

24 As we look at who participated, it's
25 important to also look at our subgroup information,



1 right. It's one thing to say that 95 percent of our
2 students participated, or 80 percent of our students
3 participated, but we should ask which 80 percent
4 participated, right. What -- what does that group look
5 like?

6 So what you have in the next set of slides
7 are a breakout of who participated in the assessment by
8 subgroups: gender, race, ethnicity, free and reduced
9 lunch eligibility, disability status, and English learner
10 status. In the second column is what we would expect the
11 split to be, based on enrollment information. And what
12 you have in the last column is what the actual
13 participants looked like.

14 So we expected for there to be about 49
15 percent of our testers to be female and 51 percent to be
16 male. When you look at grades three through five in ELA,
17 we landed just about right there. When we look at the
18 breakout for our race ethnicity, again, there's a very
19 close match between who actually tested, and who we would
20 have expected to have tested had all kids participated in
21 the assessment. Free and reduced lunch, also very close
22 to being on target. Disability status, again, very
23 close. English learner status, again, very close for
24 grades three through five.

25 When we look at grades six through eight in



1 ELA, we see a very similar pattern, meaning our students
2 who tested represent our overall student population very
3 well.

4 When we start looking at high school, we
5 need to be more cautious in our interpretations, because
6 now we do actually see that our students who tested do
7 not represent as well our overall student population. So
8 when we look at, as an example, race and ethnicity, and
9 we look at the percent of Hispanic students we had
10 participate, we expected there to be about 31 percent, in
11 reality there was about 37 percent. When we look at the
12 percent of white students, we were expecting about 55 1/2
13 percent, there was 50 percent. So we actually had in our
14 testers a higher proportion of Hispanic students and a
15 lower proportion of white students.

16 When we look at free and reduced lunch
17 eligibility status, we see a higher proportion of
18 students, who are eligible for free and reduced lunch
19 actually participate in the assessment, compared to what
20 we have in the population overall.

21 When we look our students with disability,
22 that is more representative.

23 When we look at our English learners, again,
24 that tends to be closer to what we would have expected to
25 see.



1 The next three slides have the same
2 information broken out for math. Very similar to what we
3 have seen for ELA, so I'm going to ask that we jump to
4 slide number 25, which will be the PARCC results overall
5 for English language arts.

6 We presented the results broken out by level
7 1, level 2, level 3, level 4, and level 5. Again, level
8 4 and level 5 are indicators that students are on track
9 to being ready for the next grade level, or for college,
10 and career. The range is between 37 and 42 percent of
11 our students score at that level 4 or level 5, depending
12 on the grade level.

13 When we look and ask ourselves is that
14 reasonable, one of the outside sources that we can look
15 at are our NAEP results. And we've talked about that for
16 years, right, is we said how do we get ready for these
17 new results; what can we be looking at to give us a hint
18 as to where they might be. NAEP was one of the
19 recommendations that we said take a look at NAEP. That's
20 probably a better indicator than what CCAP and TCAP were
21 providing for us.

22 NAEP for grade four and eight we were at
23 about 38 to 39 percent. So our ELA results are
24 consistent with what we see in NAEP.

25 When we look ACT, we have about 36 1/2



1 percent of our students who achieve the college readiness
2 benchmark on reading compared to what we had in grade 11
3 here at about 40 percent. Again, relatively comparable
4 that can allow us to have some confidence in these
5 results, right. We have some outside sources that are
6 consistent with what we are seeing here.

7 For math -- for math we have this broken out
8 by grades three through eight. We also have each of the
9 high school assessments. It's important to keep in mind
10 that students could start those high school assessments
11 as early as seventh grade. All right. So again,
12 depending upon what their instruction looked like,
13 students could take, as an example, either the seventh
14 grade assessment, or an algebra test.

15 When we look at eighth grade, students could
16 take the eighth grade math test, or an algebra I test, or
17 a geometry test, or an integrated I test, or an
18 integrated II test. You'll see that when we look at
19 grade eight, that is our lowest percentage of students
20 who are achieving that readiness mark for being on track
21 for the next graded level.

22 The fact that we had about 10,000 of our
23 eighth graders take algebra, needs to be taken into
24 consideration. So our eighth graders who took algebra
25 are represented in the algebra results. All right. So



1 our eighth grade results are only for those students who
2 took the eighth grade test. And the range there is
3 between 19 and 37 percent.

4 When we look at NAEP, again, just as a
5 marker, depending on the grade level, we had between 37
6 and 42 percent of our students achieve benchmark on NAEP.
7 So again, in terms of reasonableness, relatively
8 consistent.

9 Breakouts -- first breakout we'll look at is
10 gender, in terms of English language arts. Our females
11 did outperform our males. This is consistent with what
12 we have seen in the past, especially in relationship to
13 writing; that our females write, or achieve higher in
14 writing than our males do.

15 For math we see a continuation of the trend
16 that we've been seeing over the last few years, which is,
17 our females are catching up to our males, in terms of
18 math achievement, and in some cases are exceeding our
19 males in math achievement.

20 Next group we're going to look at are -- is
21 by race and ethnicity. We provided information for you
22 for Asians, black, Hispanic, white, and the two, or more
23 race, or ethnicity categories. We did not include some
24 of the other categories, because the -- the number of
25 students we have are really, really low, right. So we



1 don't include Hawaiian or Pacific Islander. There's just
2 not a lot of those students who fall into that category
3 in the State of Colorado.

4 What we see is our students belonging to the
5 Asian subgroup are outperforming the other subgroups,
6 including our white subgroup. What we see also is that
7 our black and Hispanic subgroups are relatively similar,
8 and significantly lower than what we see with our Asian,
9 white, and two or more races subgroups.

10 Historically, our Asian subgroup has
11 outperformed our white subgroup in writing, so there's a
12 continuation of that trend here. It is a reverse for
13 what we used to see with reading. So again, as we're
14 looking at the PARCC assessments, you can see the heavy
15 emphasis in terms of the ability to write well.

16 For math again, what we see is a very
17 similar pattern with our Asian subgroup performing at the
18 top, then our white subgroup, then two or more race
19 categories, and then with our black and Hispanic
20 subgroups significantly below that. In the case of math,
21 we do have our Hispanic subgroup performing slightly
22 better than our black subgroup. Again, this continues a
23 pattern that we have seen historically.

24 Free and reduced lunch status. Our students
25 are eligible for free and reduced lunch are not



1 performing as well as our students who are not eligible
2 for both ELA, as well as for mathematics. Again, this is
3 a trend that we have seen in the past.

4 Students with disabilities. Our students
5 with disabilities were scoring at a level 4 or 5 between
6 about 5 and 10 percent, compared to our students without
7 disabilities, who were scoring between about 42 and 45
8 percent on ELA. When we look at math, we see a very
9 similar pattern with our students with disabilities
10 scoring at a level 4 or 5 at a percentage rate of about 5
11 to 10 percent, and our students without disabilities
12 between about 22 and 40 percent.

13 For our students who are English learners,
14 we've presented this information broken out by our
15 students who are not English proficient; by our students
16 who are limited English proficient; and then by students
17 who are fluent English proficient compared to our
18 students who don't belong to those categories. What we
19 see is that our not English proficient students are
20 performing significantly below the rest of the groups, in
21 terms of their achievement in English language arts, and
22 that probably makes some sense, right. If you have
23 students who have not yet become proficient in English,
24 they're going to struggle with an English language arts
25 test.



1 Again, we are not making any kind of
2 determination about our English learners in terms of
3 their literacy in Mandarin, or in Japanese. We're just
4 talking here English language arts. So that's -- that's
5 what we're measuring here.

6 As students become more proficient in
7 English, you see their scores increase, and in some
8 cases, as we look at our fluent English proficient
9 students, they not only match our non-English learners,
10 but at grade three they are outperforming our English
11 learners. So again, message there being, once our
12 students become English proficient, they are performing
13 at about the same level as their native English speaking
14 peers, or outperforming them.

15 When we look at math, we see a very similar
16 pattern. With our students who are not English
17 proficient scoring at the lowest end, and then our non-
18 English learners scoring at the highest with a couple of
19 exceptions with our fluent English proficient speakers
20 scoring highest in grade three. Again, these are
21 students who were English learners. They are no longer
22 identified as English learners. They're in their first
23 two years of monitoring, and -- and they're doing very
24 well. So as we're looking at trying to evaluate program
25 effectiveness, folks may want to look at that.



1 Then moving on to accountability.

2 MS. PEARSON: Good morning. So we just
3 wanted to talk briefly with you all today. We know
4 assessment and accountability are very closely tied
5 together, and so we just wanted to give a little bit of
6 information about the accountability implications around
7 these results.

8 First, just a reminder. H.B. 15-1323
9 created a hold for accountability this year. So these
10 new results that you're seeing are not going into 2015
11 school and district performance ratings. We have time to
12 help educators understand what the new results mean; get
13 used to them; understand where we're at; have that new
14 baseline set. So there's no accountability based on
15 these results this year.

16 Right now, based on state law,
17 accountability is set to resume next fall; however, in
18 1323 it has asked the Department of Education to provide
19 a recommendation to the Joint Education Committees during
20 the smart act hearing, which is scheduled for December
21 14th, about whether or not our state assessment data is
22 ready for accountability to resume. We will be
23 bringing -- we're working on that as we've -- we're
24 starting to dig into the new data. We'll be bringing
25 that information to you all the December meeting, and



1 having a conversation with you then before the smart act
2 hearing.

3 We also know that a large conversation was
4 had around all of the accountability implications with
5 this has been around the participation rates, and around
6 the parent refusals. As Joyce mentioned, looking at this
7 participation rates, especially at the higher grades,
8 they're really critical when you want to go to interpret
9 the scores. So we've been talking about that a lot.

10 As you all know, you made a motion last
11 February that parent refusals districts cannot be held
12 liable for them during -- in the accountability systems.
13 So we're looking at that data and how to make that work.
14 The federal requirement of the 95 percent participation
15 rate, including parent refusals as non-participant still
16 stands, but with you all approving the ESEA waiver
17 submission yesterday, I think we have a agreement worked
18 out with the U.S. Department of Ed about how to take that
19 into consideration without a -- a level of liability that
20 you were concerned about for schools and districts.

21 We wanted to share -- go a little bit deeper
22 with some of the participation rate data, so you could
23 see it. This is state wide. We'll see some different
24 things when we look at individual schools and districts,
25 but state wide you'll see here -- this is by grade for



1 English language arts. The total number of records
2 that -- of records of students that we expected to test,
3 the participation rate overall, and then the number of
4 parent refusals by grade. We know that that was
5 something very interesting, and wanted to show that data
6 to you. And then the rate of parent refusal -- the
7 percent there.

8 Parent refusals and the data that we have
9 released in participation rates are considered non-
10 participants, because we don't have scores for them. So
11 when we're interpreting the achievement data, it's
12 important to realize that they are not part of
13 that -- that data we're looking at.

14 You'll see in those percentages with parent
15 refusals compared to the participation rate that not all
16 non-participants are parent refusals. There's other
17 reasons why students were -- weren't participating, other
18 than being coded as parent refusals. You'll also notice
19 the percentage of parent refusals increases as you go up
20 in the grades. That's English language arts. And you'll
21 see a very similar pattern for math, like we've seen
22 across the board.

23 In terms of next steps, like Joyce mentioned
24 earlier, decisions about how these results will be used
25 in accountability come to you all. So the -- per state



1 statute, the State Board is required to set ambitious,
2 yet obtainable state-wide targets every year. We're
3 thinking in February we'll be ready to look at this data,
4 and will have looked at the data enough, and be able to
5 bring you some recommendations on how we used PARCC
6 results in accountability decisions resuming next fall,
7 and have you all start on that process of setting those
8 targets of what those state level expectations are.

9 So there's a few different options that we
10 can talk about, about different ways to use the data for
11 accountability, and we'll bring that to you, and have
12 those conversations later.

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Release schedule for school
14 and district level results. Before I talk about school
15 and district, let's about state. So the state results
16 obviously are embargo lifted when we started this
17 presentation. We provided information in terms of
18 achievement by our overall group. We also broke that out
19 by subgroup for gender, race, ethnicity, economic status,
20 English learner status, and disability status.

21 We have provided information, again, at the
22 state level for participation, in terms of the number of
23 participants, the number of non-participants, including
24 the parent refusals. And we have provided that
25 participation information also broken up by subgroup.



1 For school and district level results,
2 districts will receive their embargoed district and
3 school results by November 30th. On December 4th we will
4 make information available to the media under an
5 embargoed status, as well as to the Board. Sharing the
6 district and school level results, we expect that embargo
7 to lift December 11th.

8 Sample score reports are available on the
9 CDE website. Those links are provided here. There is an
10 example of a math high school report, as well as an
11 English language arts grade six report.

12 This is the first page of the report. I'm
13 assuming that font size is a little bit small to see, so
14 we'll jump in. At the top of the report there will be an
15 indication, in terms of overall performance level.
16 Students will see their skill score between 650 and 850.
17 That will be marked on the color band and parents, and
18 students will be able to see where their score falls,
19 whether that be a level 1, a level 2, a level 3, a level
20 4, or a level 5. Keep in mind again, level 4 and level 5
21 are indicators that the student is on track to being
22 ready for the next grade level, or for college, and
23 career.

24 For comparison information, the school
25 average is provided. The district average is provided.



1 A state average is provided. And an overall PARCC
2 average is also provided for parents and students to see.

3 For both English language arts and
4 mathematics there are what we refer to as subclaims.
5 Subclaim performance is indicated through arrows. An up
6 arrow means that the student basically met or exceeded
7 expectations for that area. An arrow pointing down
8 indicates that the student is not where we would expect
9 them to be in order to be ready for the next grade level.
10 And an arrow that goes back and forth, side-to-side
11 indicates that they're there. They're nearly where we
12 would expect them to be in order to be ready for the next
13 grade level.

14 For English language arts there is a reading
15 and writing scale score. The scale for reading goes from
16 10 to 90. The writing goes from 10 to 60. Information
17 that is provided for comparison purposes is: the school
18 average, the district average, the state average, as well
19 as for those students who overall scored as a student who
20 was meeting expectations what their score on these
21 subscales would be. So for reading where target should
22 be a score of 50 or above. For writing a score of 35 or
23 above. And then below you see the subclaims for English
24 language arts.

25 Resources. We have put together -- and I



1 should say that Dana (ph) and her team have put together,
2 I want to make sure we give credit here -- some resources
3 for districts and schools to use as they get ready to
4 communicate with their parents the results.

5 There's information, in terms of how to help
6 parents understand their students' scores. There's a
7 parents' guide that is available in both English and in
8 Spanish. There is also some information about how to use
9 the test results to support your student. There is also
10 what I'll refer to as an explanation guide to the actual
11 score report itself, so they go through identifying
12 different areas of the report, and then telling parents
13 what each of those pieces mean.

14 So number 1, that is dealing with the
15 student performance overview. Number 2, is the score
16 range. Number 3, is the indicator of on track for being
17 college and career ready, or the next grade level.
18 Number 4, is where you can find the comparison
19 information. And that goes on.

20 That is also provided through a Prezi
21 presentation that schools and districts can use, like on
22 a parent's night. There are also some key messages for
23 schools and districts to use, as they develop their
24 messages for their communities, as well as drop-in
25 articles that they can use.



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Are you -- is that the
2 conclusion of the -- looks like the conclusion?

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: That's the end of the slide
4 presentation.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Got right on then, didn't
6 we? We're going to do things a little bit different,
7 since I think this is probably the most important issue
8 that we'll deal with certainly in the last six months.
9 And so we're going to do the questioning, and -- and
10 comments a little different. And we'll just start with
11 Dr. Scheffel, and we'll work around, Dr. Flores will be
12 next. Ask all the questions, or make comments, request
13 additional information that you like. Take as much time
14 as you think is appropriate.

15 We will -- if we run a little bit over on
16 this, I'm not going to get too concerned, so we'll just
17 work our way around the room then starting at this end,
18 and if you think of questions you missed in the first go
19 round, we can come back. So --

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: A round robin.

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- Dr. Scheffel. Yeah.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: All right. Thank you.

23 So it always helps me to think contextually.
24 So when we think of \$360 million in federal funds with
25 these two testing consortia, one of which is PARCC, many



1 states have been stepping away from PARCC, and the other
2 the consortia also. Choosing to use their own tests.
3 We're not there today. We're looking at these PARCC
4 data.

5 So when we look at high stakes assessment,
6 the reason it was put in place is for having a return on
7 investment and metric for public education, given a huge
8 boost with no child left behind, and then continued
9 multiplicity more and more tests. The legislature
10 required us to use PARCC for ELA and math accountability,
11 right. So our task today and going forward is to think
12 about what does the data mean, and as you posed, is it
13 usable for accountability?

14 And the accountability that it's used for
15 right now is primarily accreditation; is that right? Is
16 there any other accountability relevance, besides the
17 accreditation ratings that are given to districts, based
18 on these data and --

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So -- so school and
20 district -- our district accreditation and school plan
21 type assignments. The school districts may use it for
22 their own accreditation of schools. Right now we're
23 in -- these results can't be used for educator
24 effectiveness for that teacher level accountability, or
25 educator level accountability. In the future I think



1 it's intended.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: But they will in the future.

3 And that's why --

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: (Indiscernible).

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- the question are they
6 usable for accountability is so central, right?

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yeah.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: For what? Well, for teacher
9 performance, for -- right now just for accreditation
10 though, right? Okay. And that effects, of course, real
11 estate values, public perception, all of that.

12 So just, by way of context, I think that
13 helps why are we here today? Well, we're looking at
14 these data. What do the data mean? How can they be used
15 for accountability; in what ways?

16 So as I look at it, the most important
17 slides to me are 35 and 36, looking at how heavily
18 language loads on these tests. And some of us on the
19 Board took the opportunity to review -- Joyce, you
20 remember that -- the questions on the --

21 MS. RANKIN: Yeah.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- questions on the test,
23 both in math and English language arts, and really had a
24 chance to read the items, the stems for the questions,
25 the actual excerpts. And what astounded me walking out



1 of that opportunity was the heavy linguistic load on the
2 test. And it shows up in very bright lines on these two
3 slides.

4 So are we testing -- we're trying to get a
5 return on investment. Content knowledge. The ability to
6 apply knowledge and skills. And I really don't believe
7 the tests test that. I think it assesses linguistic
8 acumen. And that's why we see such huge gaps with
9 English language learners until they're proficient in
10 language. So if that's what we intend to test, because
11 we're trying to make meaning of the data, and trying to
12 figure out if it can be used for accountability.

13 If we're trying to focus on language acumen,
14 then perhaps the test is helpful, but in terms of
15 readiness for whatever we're looking at, workforce
16 readiness, however, we define that; content knowledge. I
17 felt that the test really did not deliver, in terms of
18 content knowledge when I had reviewed it.

19 So I -- I think that the language piece is
20 so central to the way we interpret these data. I also
21 think that its beyond our -- our purview, as far as
22 authority, to say this high stakes assessment is not
23 helpful to us, but when we see it so heavily loading on
24 language and not on content knowledge, per se, or
25 application. We have to wonder how it should be used for



1 high stakes decision making. And I think that, to me, is
2 kind of the center piece of our discussion today.

3 So I think it dramatically disadvantages
4 students who don't -- who -- whose second language is
5 English, and even students that just have not developed
6 great vocabulary skills, or syntactic abilities, or
7 whatever, and so I think it really links to, not so much
8 what students are learning, but their language acumen.
9 So that would be my first comment on these data.

10 End.

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Any additional comments in
12 this round?

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Not right now.

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Okay. Dr. Flores.

15 MS. FLORES: Well, I don't think
16 it -- it -- it really helps poor and minority students.
17 I think that we were doing greater strides when we were
18 really putting ESSA monies to use at the very beginning,
19 and that was during the '60s and the '70s. And we did
20 see that during those years we did have kids -- there was
21 almost parity between minority kids getting to college,
22 and white kids getting to college. And -- and that's
23 kind of really sad for me to -- to think that in a sense
24 I was privileged, and my friends were privileged, you
25 know, because of my age, and because of, you know,



1 when -- when the baby boomers, I think, went to college.

2 I don't think high stakes testing helps. If
3 you made a comparison between PARCC and NAEP, and you
4 said that NAEP -- there was almost parity, so in essence
5 we have a test, which I think is far better than PARCC,
6 and this is the National Assessments for Educational
7 Progress. And it has been around for a long time. I
8 think the questions may be fair, and it really looks at
9 what people need to succeed.

10 We know that PARCC is not being used by
11 private schools. It's not being used as in -- to -- in
12 NAEP -- to better NAEP at all. So I think we're using a
13 far -- an instrument that is not as good as, say NAEP.
14 If you want to know how the world is doing, and how each
15 state is doing, we already have an assessment that does
16 that.

17 Again, I'll say that high stakes testing
18 have never helped kids. We're back to it again. I think
19 we need to get back to the real issues of education, and
20 education actually is about teaching and learning. It is
21 not about accountability. It is not about high stakes
22 testing. And we are spending, and have spent such a
23 large amount of money that I think have -- has been
24 wasted. I think Common Core is not going to help us.
25 It's not going to help us get to better -- better



1 students. In fact, I think that we have a curricula that
2 has very much narrowed. And it -- our kids are not going
3 to be creative.

4 We're back to where the Japanese, and the
5 other countries were looking at us to see what was so
6 special about us that we were so creative. And -- and
7 the things that we -- we did, because we were much more
8 open to learning about -- there was much greater
9 knowledge, I guess, that can be found before than can be
10 found in PARCC.

11 So we should really look at helping our poor
12 and minority kids get better. And I think the way to do
13 that is by focusing on teaching and learning, and we were
14 doing a great job of that I think during the '90s, but
15 somehow we -- we have fallen, and missed our mark, and
16 we're not on focus.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Follow up --

18 MS. FLORES: And these tests show that.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- well -- well,
20 let's -- let's go ahead and go around, then we'll come
21 back. So just make a note of questions.

22 Dr. Schroeder.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: So I guess I'd like to get
24 back to the assessment. And I appreciate Dr. Scheffel
25 your comments that we've always talked about the fact



1 that if kids don't understand the question, they're
2 unlikely -- they're highly unlikely to get the correct
3 response. And this has always been a worry in math,
4 which is the area that -- I'm sorry -- but I feel is just
5 absolutely critical. We know from scores, but we don't
6 know from scores for sure, whether that's a significant
7 weakness in our education system.

8 So I do feel that this is the first year of
9 this assessment. There's another reason for this time
10 out and maybe additional time outs, which is that we need
11 to have an opportunity to look at the assessment, and to
12 have experts look at the assessment, and evaluate Dr.
13 Scheffel's deep concern about the level of language, and
14 whether that is extremely problematic. I -- I respect
15 that. And I know we had some experts who came -- some
16 psychometricians, if that's the right word, who said
17 sometimes it takes four to five years to really get an
18 assessment the way it ought to be. And so I think we
19 should keep that in mind before we turn ourselves inside
20 out about these results.

21 I would like to ask the question
22 you -- thankfully you did look at the NAEP, and you saw
23 that we were, I guess, a little higher, even than our
24 NAEP scores, but was the gap similar, because one of the
25 things we're often identified by in Colorado is



1 having -- is -- is as having some of the largest gaps.
2 Did you see that as well, or did you have -- I'm sorry
3 did you have time to even do that?

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Please proceed.

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So when we're looking
7 strictly at Colorado data, it is fair to say that the
8 patterns are very similar to what we have seen
9 historically.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: And it is aggregations as
11 well?

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: And it is aggregations as
13 well.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So to look at Dr.
15 Scheffel's question about how should this information be
16 used, I would say number 1, very carefully. Not only
17 because it's the first year, but because we still have
18 things to learn.

19 Number 2, these kinds of assessments are
20 simply a proxy. We want to know how are the kids doing.
21 And we know that certainly these assessments don't
22 measure everything that goes on; everything that teachers
23 do for kids, so that's why we're talking about our
24 accountability system, and making some changes to
25 it -- changes to it so that we reflect more about how



1 well our kids doing; what are their environments, et
2 cetera. So I think we -- I think to answer your
3 question, we should just do it very carefully.

4 It doesn't mean that they're to be thrown
5 out, but it certainly, in my opinion, needs to be about
6 are modifications necessary; what do we learn; what
7 didn't we learn from these assessments. I think that's
8 almost as important as what we -- what we do learn. And
9 then look forward.

10 I do appreciate very much the very last part
11 of your presentation about how to communicate with
12 families, but also how can families help their kids.
13 When we had -- what was it the Iowa test, or whatever it
14 was that my kids took -- I never had a -- I mean, I got
15 results, but it told me almost nothing, except that they
16 were X number of kids that were stronger students, X
17 numbers of kids that were weaker students, but there was
18 absolutely nothing in there about what her -- their
19 father and I could do to help them; what are the
20 questions we should be asking in the classroom, et
21 cetera. So I am very grateful for that piece of this
22 assessment, because I think it will really resonate in
23 our communities. Thanks.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And most of those
25 tests, could have -- if you had paid more money, you



1 could have had that data.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: MS. Goff.

3 MS. GOFF: Thank you.

4 I'll start at the end. I -- I wanted to
5 echo appreciation for the communications tools currently
6 developed, and always in progress I hope -- process. I
7 think that's going to be key.

8 The other -- the other challenge may be for
9 us -- always something to work on is important, I believe
10 I have had more questions regarding the assessment system
11 around the idea why did it take so long for these
12 results, and unless -- unless you are an individual like
13 we are, who live this life, you understand that, or have
14 some background in doing the development, it's very hard
15 for people to understand, especially when there was a lot
16 of touting early on, which we supposedly and -- and did
17 support, for computerized exams -- online exams so that
18 one of the main benefits would be great quick results
19 that are accurate, but I -- I think maybe we've gotten
20 past it now. Maybe it won't be an issue at this point,
21 but from now on -- maybe with the next iteration of
22 whatever we choose to do, that there is some easy to
23 understand language and explanation story around why it
24 takes so long, and the fact that there were educators
25 literally involved in this from the beginning. That's



1 been a little bit misunderstood.

2 As far as the exam and results itself, thank
3 you -- thank you both. Appreciate what goes into this,
4 telling the story, and putting together a -- a slide
5 presentation. Along with the language acumen, and -- and
6 those issues, I -- I completely agree it's one of the
7 hardest things to measure is what -- what is the question
8 teaching. And -- and does the question even have a
9 chance of -- of being an -- an instructive tool in
10 itself. And then as we -- as we work through that, I
11 think we'll come to some better -- some better outcomes
12 for that.

13 One thing that was struck from the first
14 time I looked at any of this was well, it sure looks like
15 it, and then hearing, and having reinforced again that
16 these results are -- really do mirror our past, and I
17 kept hearing Joyce's repeatedly -- she said fine -- as
18 former trends have been, or as we have seen, as a trend
19 in the past, and so the question would be, does
20 it -- does the test itself -- the actual product matter.
21 I think the -- the essential question is, why are we
22 seeing the same trends no matter the tool we're using?
23 And this includes both the summative type or the -- the
24 knowledge and skill content check, and obviously the
25 performance check. So we -- we have also had a message



1 for seven, eight years now in the state. We would like
2 to have demonstrations of how -- what kids have learned,
3 and that they're able to show how that applies to real
4 life, and is that not an ongoing mantra for all of us. I
5 think it is.

6 So how do we -- how do we get around really
7 just putting ourselves in the box literally of a test
8 that we have to answer the essential question? So to me,
9 that comes back to instruction, strategies. Are we
10 moving with the needs of learners this -- in this day in
11 age? Are we -- are we -- the -- what are we doing to
12 really find out if what we're teaching, and how we're
13 teaching it, and how it's being received is working?

14 So I think -- I think that's where I am.
15 And then one last point. Couldn't help but notice lower
16 grades, if you -- if you go by the scores, the lower
17 grades are at a higher level right now. Understandable.
18 But the -- the fact that goes along with that are these
19 are the kids -- these are the children who have been
20 living the new standards, and the new ways, and the new
21 strategies, and techniques. They've lived it. Our older
22 grade students have not had that experience, good or bad.
23 They haven't had that experience fully.

24 And the other outstanding, to me, was
25 I -- I've kind of zeroed in on the title one results



1 because sort of as fruit from our conversation the last
2 few days over the waiver request, and you know, what do
3 we feel is -- is really it should be a priority for
4 targeting -- targeting money, targeting talent, targeting
5 no how, and expertise. So I'm -- I'm -- for me it -- it
6 gave me a little bit of enlightenment to some
7 conversation about within our -- hopefully a flexibility
8 with our own accountability coming up, and our own ways
9 of looking at resource -- resource allocation and use of
10 dollars frankly.

11 I think it -- I think that gives us
12 maybe -- does me -- it gives me a little bit more of a
13 pinpointed way to go in the conversation. I appreciate
14 this. I think we've known this wasn't going to be banner
15 all over down day, but on the other hand, it's what it
16 is. So what -- what do we do now? What do we do with
17 this?

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: MS. Rankin.

19 MS. RANKIN: I think we have a lot of
20 opinions out here. And I think you haven't even heard
21 this beginning of the opinions. So I'll give my opinion.
22 I -- I agree with Dr. Scheffel about the underlying
23 intent content verbiage, whether it's in language arts or
24 math. There's a lot of reading involved, a lot of
25 understanding.



1 I also look at the type of passages that are
2 put forth to the students and boy, I -- I think -- I
3 don't think you can always get it right the first time
4 around, but I think there's some subjectivity, and I
5 think there's a lot of discussion that's going to come
6 out about this. And I think that's good. I think that's
7 good. I think with challenges come opportunities. We
8 don't even know where they are yet. I mean, we just have
9 the base information. And regardless, the numbers are
10 the numbers. I mean, we -- we -- we can say whatever we
11 want, but it's right there, and I think in February we'll
12 have more information when some of this is digested a
13 little more by the people that do that, but I appreciate
14 how you presented that to us today, and the numbers, and
15 I'm curious to see where this goes. But thank you very
16 much.

17 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: MS. Mazanec.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you for the
19 presentation. I also want to echo Dr. Scheffel's
20 comments. (Indiscernible) math tests, but I did go
21 through one of the English language arts tests, and they
22 are very heavily (indiscernible) and I'm concerned about
23 that. (Indiscernible) grammar, and spelling,
24 (indiscernible).

25 That was brilliant too, and it was --



1 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Critical thinking.

2 MS. MAZANEC: Anyway, so I'm -- I'm -- I
3 echo her concerns about how language dents all of the
4 testing is, and I again, am concerned about what -- what
5 that's really telling us about how Colorado students are
6 doing. And once again, we have test results that are
7 supposed to tell us how well kids in Colorado are doing,
8 but we're cautioned not to place too much emphasis on
9 them, and we're also told that it'll take four to five
10 years to get these assessments right. And once again,
11 our children are in school now, and being taught to
12 perform on this test. And it seems that every four to
13 five years -- ten years we have another test that's going
14 to be better.

15 So I understand that we need to put
16 these -- we need to -- we need to consider them
17 cautiously. I just wonder what it means for actual
18 learning for our Colorado students.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Let's go back to start
20 with Dr. Scheffel.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thank you.

22 I had a question, Joyce, about the
23 proficiency levels. We know that standardized tests have
24 historically been used as measures of how students
25 compare with each other, so norm reference tests. And



1 then also they can be used to determine how much of a
2 particular curriculum an individual has learned, so
3 that's the criterion referenced approach. And now
4 increasingly we're having standardized assessments used
5 for high stakes assessment, so that goes back to our
6 question of how are we going to use these data.

7 And as you pointed out, very cautiously, but
8 as -- as we go back to the proficiency levels, and bands,
9 they're subjective, and they're unlike rank orders
10 in -- in a sense, because you can create the cut point
11 wherever you want to. We know that like, I think, in the
12 CCAP, or TCAP the proficiency level for reading, I think,
13 was the 28th percentile. So that was very different
14 information when you think about how well does someone
15 rank, 28th percentile is not very good, and yet, that was
16 dubbed proficient in reading.

17 So when we look at the proficiency levels on
18 this test, they're subjective. Can you speak to how they
19 are set, and what are the percentile ranks that would be
20 equivalent to those bands, or levels?

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So similar to how we've had
24 our conversations in the past about science and social
25 studies, English language arts, and mathematics standard



1 setting approach that cut score setting approach is very
2 similar. Started off with what are the expectations for
3 students at each level. That's the starting point. So
4 you identify the concepts and skills that you expect from
5 students who are ready for the next grade level, or
6 college, and career ready. I'm using that -- I'm using
7 level 4 as the marker for this conversation.

8 You are right, in terms of saying that that
9 is based on judgment. That is educated judgment. And I
10 would suggest that we rely on educated judgment a lot,
11 but yes, that did require a lot of conversations across
12 the states; involved K-12 educators; involved higher
13 education folks; was open for comment from Boards, such
14 as yourselves, as well as from parents, and community
15 folks, but what is it that you expect. What are those
16 concepts and skills that you need kids to be able to
17 demonstrate in order to be successful for whatever comes
18 next?

19 Those descriptions are what guide that cut
20 score setting process. So folks then look at the test
21 and say okay at what point are students demonstrating
22 those concepts and skills. And again, does that depend
23 on educator judgment? It does.

24 I think I have heard folks here suggest that
25 you rely on educators. You believe that educators are



1 experts. They were at the table from beginning to end
2 throughout this process. They were at the table from
3 beginning to end, in terms of this process writing the
4 performance level descriptors, participating in item
5 writing, participating in data review, participating in
6 the cut score process. They were the ones who made those
7 decisions.

8 It was not psychometricians sitting in a
9 back room who made the decisions about the cut scores.
10 Those were the educators who made those decisions.

11 In terms of course on -- corresponding
12 percentile ranks, I honestly can't tell you that today.
13 I don't have that information, but can we get that
14 information, based on Colorado information? We can. And
15 we can get that to you. Today we don't have that --

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: (Indiscernible) --

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- that wasn't part of the
18 process, in terms of what is the corresponding percentile
19 rank.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think that information --

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Again, it goes back to the
22 content. Sorry.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- I think that information
24 would be helpful to the public just because it -- it's a
25 traditional way of looking at standardized test results,



1 and because the bands are so subjective, as -- as
2 indicated with my previous example. I mean, no parent
3 would want to say I feel good that my child is proficient
4 in reading, and then underneath behind the curtain it's,
5 but they're at the 28th percentile. Most parents
6 wouldn't be very happy with that. So I think that
7 looking at both those metrics are helpful when we try to
8 make meaning of these data.

9 Can you respond to this quote somebody sent
10 me? "The goal of most tests is to sort and rank. To do
11 that, test makers make small differences appear large.
12 Questions most people get right or wrong are removed
13 because they do not help with ranking." Can you respond
14 to that?

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair? So again, when
16 you're talking about what you referenced earlier, norm-
17 referenced test, you bet, that is all about ranking.
18 When I am concerned about whether or not I'm the 14th
19 percentile or the 17th percentile, I am worried about
20 that ranking kind of a concept.

21 With these tests we're not as concerned
22 about ranking. What we're concerned about is being able
23 to answer the question of what is it that you know, in
24 terms of the concepts and skills that are taught at your
25 grade level. So it is much more content based, and



1 that's the emphasis, as opposed to can I get each one of
2 you ranked in terms of your knowledge of math. Instead,
3 what I want to understand is what do you know about
4 fractions; what do you know about fractions; what do you
5 know about fractions. And so the test is built more from
6 that perspective, as opposed to a kind of ranking kind of
7 a system.

8 Historically, I would suggest that with
9 state systems there was a lot of focus on that -- what
10 I'll call that proficiency bar, right, and whether or not
11 kids were above that bar, or below that bar. And there
12 was a lot of focus on making sure that the test did a
13 really, really good job about that bar.

14 One of the mandates that was given to us was
15 move beyond the bar. We want to know how our kids are
16 doing across the spectrum, so make sure that when kids
17 are getting results, we have meaningful information,
18 regardless of whether they're above the bar, below the
19 bar, but we want to know how they're doing across the
20 spectrum, and so that's really how this test was built,
21 and will continue to be improved. Is to make sure that
22 we are not hyper focused just on this; we are focused on
23 giving meaningful information to all kids.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so we're back to really
25 to the blueprint of the test, right?



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: We know that given the
3 proficiency levels, which are subjective, and how the cut
4 scores are set, and what's -- what counts for proficient,
5 or some other level, really deciding what items to
6 include on the test, how the questions are worded, how
7 long the questions are, which answer -- answers are
8 scored correct, how the test is administered, of course,
9 how the exam results are used --

10 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Sure.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- and all of that is
12 subjective. And it's based on the blueprint of the test,
13 so as we try to make meaning of the results, we have to
14 look very carefully at what -- what the answers to those
15 questions are, and -- and help the public understand,
16 because this is a narrative of failure in many ways. At
17 least, for some very large subgroups of population,
18 and -- and other groups. So I think that -- that
19 blueprint piece, and how those subjective decisions were
20 made are really crucial as we interpret the results.

21 MS. FLORES: Right.

22 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

23 MS. FLORES: Yes.

24 You know, historically, competency-based
25 education came up in the -- in the '70s because



1 the -- the usual bell curve test, and so it was thought
2 that competency based -- well, we were really getting at
3 these things that kids really needed, but I don't think
4 that has happened. And I don't think we really
5 are -- we're -- we're just kind of faking it with
6 competency-based education. I think we need a lot
7 of -- kids need a lot of knowledge, and I -- I didn't see
8 that this test was very knowledge based. I saw very
9 pedestrian language. It wasn't using language where kids
10 would say oh, this is what this means, and -- and it was.
11 I mean, I would think that probably an engineer or an
12 accountant had worked on this -- on -- on the English
13 language portion of it. It wasn't beautiful. It wasn't
14 a beautiful test at all.

15 The math part was inscrutable -- absolutely
16 inscrutable. And I took a lot -- a lot of math. So I
17 just thought how is a little fifth grader, or a little
18 seventh grader, you know, seriously going to do -- going
19 to do that, and that's exactly what the engineers, you
20 know, whom I met before when I was writing,
21 they -- they -- they were really concerned about whether
22 kids were really learning math, because they took
23 homework to home, and these engineers could not help
24 their children with the math. So I mean, I -- I think
25 when we have people in the field who know and who say,



1 you know, this is -- this is not math. This is not what
2 my kid, you know, should be knowing.

3 Two, I think that -- well, I mentioned
4 the -- the historical part of getting away from high
5 stakes tests, and that was a big -- a big portion of the
6 discussions in education that we were having in the -- in
7 the '70s, and '80s, and such. And then here we come to a
8 system that is all based on this, and I -- I'm thinking
9 about poor kids, minority kids, where we're not even
10 thinking about strategies for them, for teachers, working
11 with teachers.

12 Yesterday I was very disappointed, even with
13 the administrators, and -- that we are -- are training to
14 help the least -- the -- these most vulnerable kids, and
15 I'm -- I'm just really worried. And especially, you
16 know, given that we're not even thinking about what else
17 we can do. And I'm sorry. Yes, it may show some truth,
18 but the truth is very ugly, and we need to think of
19 something other than what we're discussing here. And we
20 need to really measure what those thing -- what those
21 kids know. Give them a chance in some area maybe other
22 than math that they can be successful in.

23 And I'm sure that the -- tomorrow's print
24 will be that minorities did awful, and you know, the
25 narrative continues. And I don't think this narrative is



1 a good narrative for those kids in need, and for really
2 our society. These are not creative. They're not going
3 to engender creativity in our society, and I think that's
4 very sad.

5 And also, by the way, this -- these tests
6 were really came about because of millionaires; Bill
7 Gates to -- to be exact, who put in all this money
8 to -- to start Common Core, and PARCC, so it has been
9 driven -- I mean, it was a significant amount of money
10 that was placed. And you can't say that because that
11 it's not true, because it's true. So we have a case
12 where billionaires are, in a sense, driving policy. We
13 even got monies here to -- to help along in that -- in
14 that respect. So I don't think it's a good thing.

15 Franklin -- Benjamin Franklin thought the
16 common schools should be paid for by the common man,
17 regular Joe, and not by rich people. And I think we're
18 doing a great disservice to our public schools, and
19 education in this state by allowing that to happen.

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Thank you.

21 Any additional comments, Dr. Schroeder?

22 MS. SCHROEDER: If I may, I would just like
23 to talk about one comment in your presentation. Each
24 state will make its own accountability decisions. I
25 personally think that's a pretty important piece of this,



1 not only to be -- as I said previously, to be cautious
2 about this, but we have a number of options, and I -- so
3 I'd just like to give an example that in another state,
4 which I believe was Washington state, but I could be
5 wrong.

6 I don't think they took a time out, but they
7 changed the emphasis on the results. In other words,
8 they said, we've only had these higher standards for X
9 number of years; therefore, as MS. Goff reminded us, a
10 lot of the kids really never had been exposed to the
11 standards, and so getting caught up is a long-term
12 process. There isn't any way that we can take an 11th
13 grader and have that 11th grader be up to par when, in
14 fact, grades K-10 they weren't exposed to those
15 expectations.

16 And so they tried to find a metric that
17 accommodated that, and honestly I can't remember whether
18 it was grade-by-grade, or just exactly how it was done.
19 I think my only point is that we do have a number of
20 options, depending on whether we choose to take a time
21 out, or not. We have different options so that this
22 doesn't feel like an incredible hammer, based on the
23 changes. And so I'd like us to think about that.

24 I'm not opposed to some -- some more time
25 out, but I'm also -- even if we take one or two more



1 years, we nevertheless are going to have upper grade
2 students, who have been trying to catch up, whereas we
3 have early elementary grade kids, who from kindergarten
4 on have been exposed to the standards, and have been
5 expected to meet those standards, so that's a complexity
6 of how you jump into -- this is across all the
7 states -- how do you jump into higher standards, and have
8 folks, and especially have teachers feel like this is
9 really fair? So I just want to address that.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: MS. Goff, any additional
11 comments?

12 MS. GOFF: No. Well, I would -- I would re-
13 emphasize the importance of our ability to do our pilots,
14 and to develop our -- our approach to accountability, and
15 do it in the best way we can. And then I believe
16 we -- we will. And -- and without compromising the
17 integrity of what Colorado knows is the right way to go.

18 I do think all of our conversations
19 around -- I hope you can hear me, I don't hear
20 myself -- but all of our conversations around the
21 demonstrations, and looking at our graduation guidelines,
22 and the opportunities, and flexibilities within that
23 framework. I -- I know I'm sounding probably way too
24 umbrella-ish today, but that's how I tend to think. I
25 just -- I just think we need to keep our eyes open always



1 for how to connect the dots, and how to supplement
2 one -- one part of the system with another in the best
3 way we know how.

4 I don't think this test, or any test -- I
5 never have thought that this is the end all statement on
6 how we're doing, and how kids are doing more importantly,
7 but I do think we have what it takes to -- to -- to work
8 through this, accept it for what it is. Recognize where
9 we've got some stuff to do yet, and go at it in a
10 reasonable approach that doesn't keep us lagging
11 backwards with going down the road going forward the
12 kids.

13 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: MS. Rankin, anything else?

14 MS. RANKIN: I just have a couple of
15 questions. Your NAEP parallels with the ELA, the
16 scores -- I'm sorry -- parallels with this test, as far
17 as the scores, correct? How about math; did that do
18 similar?

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

20 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So when we look at the
22 performance of our English learners on math, we do see
23 that our students who are not English proficient, even
24 with the accommodations, right -- so remember that those
25 assessments can be translated into native language if



1 that's what those students are used to -- they are still
2 performing lower than our native English speakers.

3 Did I misunderstand the question?

4 MS. RANKIN: I think maybe.

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I think so too, because
6 that's what my note just told me is I missed that
7 question.

8 So were you asking about mathematics?

9 MS. RANKIN: Yes. And -- but go back --

10 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I totally don't know what I
11 heard.

12 MS. RANKIN: -- do you --

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So --

14 MS. RANKIN: I don't know what I said. ELA
15 if -- if I understood you correctly, the ELA in -- in the
16 NAEP, and in this test pretty much parallel --

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Uh-huh.

18 MS. RANKIN: -- with maybe a little bit of
19 adjustment. Which one was higher?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This -- this test was a
21 little bit higher --

22 MS. RANKIN: Little bit higher --

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- by about five
24 points, was it?

25 MS. RANKIN: -- is that what you said?



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So --

2 MS. RANKIN: I'm not sure.

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- in term -- Mr. Chair,
4 apologize.

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Proceed.

6 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So when we're looking at
7 mathematics, we had a range between 19 and 37.

8 MS. RANKIN: Uh-huh.

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: That 19 was at eighth grade,
10 so I want to go back to talk about eighth grade again,
11 because it -- that's really important what we have going
12 on at eighth grade. For NAEP it was between 37 and 42.
13 So our higher end was very close to what we had with
14 NAEP. Our lower end, not so much. Again, remember that
15 for our eighth grade results, that only includes our
16 students who took the eighth grade assessment. It
17 excludes our students who took algebra, or geometry, or
18 integrated I, or integrated II students.

19 MS. RANKIN: That should be a lot actually.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 MS. RANKIN: You should have algebra I in
22 eighth grade.

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

24 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes.

25 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So -- so as we're looking at



1 our eighth grade expectations, I would suggest that
2 they're different than what we had when we were in eighth
3 grade. It is -- is more reflective of some of those
4 algebra I expectations that we may have experienced, but
5 the students who are taking the eighth-grade test, like I
6 said, are getting assessed on that eighth-grade content
7 are eighth graders who are taking the algebra test are
8 getting assessed on the algebra content. And it is fair
9 to say that those populations of students aren't
10 necessarily the same.

11 I -- we will encourage districts to look to
12 see what past performance was of those students, and I
13 think it is fair to suggest that our eighth graders who
14 took the algebra test were our higher performers as
15 seventh graders overall.

16 MS. RANKIN: So is that a yes or a no to my
17 question?

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So it -- it was a well, kind
19 of sort of. No. So as we're looking at our fourth
20 graders, who on PARCC were at a 30 that is about, you
21 know, seven to ten percentage points lower than what we
22 had with NAEP.

23 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: When we're looking at the
25 eighth graders, I'm saying that --



1 MS. RANKIN: We can't --

2 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- it's -- it's messy.

3 MS. RANKIN: -- determine. I understand.

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: It's --

5 MS. RANKIN: But even if you give me a third
6 grade, it gives me an idea of the fact that they're
7 parallel. And in ELA it was pretty much the same?

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yeah.

9 MS. RANKIN: Okay. That helps a lot.

10 And then I just want to go over, on page
11 15 -- you don't even have to look it up -- but it's level
12 1 through 5 --

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yep.

14 MS. RANKIN: -- you remember the levels you
15 gave? When I'm talking to a parent --

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes.

17 MS. RANKIN: -- is it going to be
18 appropriate to say yeah, a number 1 is an F, number 2 is
19 a D? Tell me why not.

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Mr. Chair?

21 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Yes, please proceed. I
22 want to hear this one.

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I'm -- I'm glad that
24 my -- my -- my head shake was registered. So as
25 we -- again, I think that depending on the school that



1 you're in, interpretation of an A, B, C, D, F is very,
2 very different. There are some schools -- again, looking
3 back at some of our own experiences that we do, I think,
4 sometimes as we're sitting in these chairs, some folks
5 used to grade on the curve, and so you would always just
6 have 16 percent of your kids who were an A. And then at
7 a B level you would have an additional 30 percent of your
8 kids who may have scored there. And then at a C -- that
9 is not how this is done.

10 What is fair to say is that at a level 4 and
11 a level 5 students are demonstrating those concepts and
12 skills that we would expect them to be able to
13 demonstrate in order to be successful at their next spot,
14 whether that be the next -- next grade level, or the
15 next -- for college, or careers, but it's not an A, B, C,
16 D, F kind of concept.

17 MS. RANKIN: Okay.

18 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Further questions, MS.
19 Mazanec?

20 MS. MAZANEC: Couple of more questions.
21 What is -- on one of these slides you have -- you have
22 FELL/PHLOTE.

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yeah.

24 MS. MAZANEC: Would you explain what those
25 mean?



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Absolutely. Sorry. So
2 we --

3 MS. MAZANEC: The fluent --

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- have -- our students --

5 MS. MAZANEC: -- fluent English as the
6 language learner.

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- so our students who come
8 into our schools one of the questions that is asked is,
9 what are the -- what's the language that you speak at
10 home, you know, what's the -- that home language. For
11 students how have a home language other than English,
12 they have a primary home language other than English, but
13 they don't require English learner services, they're
14 referred to as PHLOTE, primary home language other than
15 English. Again, complicated.

16 MS. MAZANEC: And FELL is --

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: If a student -- yep, so
18 if --

19 MS. MAZANEC: -- fluent English language
20 learner?

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So for FELL those are our
22 former --

23 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, former.

24 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- English language
25 learners. So those are students who, at one point in



1 time, were English learners. They are no longer
2 designated as English learners, i.e., they've become
3 proficient in English.

4 MS. MAZANEC: One -- one other question. I
5 know that we're not -- we're not to compare these test
6 results to TCAP results, but remind me with our last
7 round of TCAP did we not have better performance among
8 elementary students then, as -- as opposed to high school
9 students too?

10 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So -- and you'll notice that
11 I glanced over at Dr. Asp here for a second.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Dr. Elliott.

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: But you definitely saw a
14 difference in performance, especially when we looked at
15 mathematics, in terms of what we had in terms of
16 performance of our elementary students compared to our
17 high school students. And yes, our elementary students
18 were performing higher than our high school students.

19 I don't know if you want to add to that.

20 MS. MAZANEC: Has that been true for some
21 time?

22 MR. ASP: And I -- I try not to get real
23 technical about this, but it's a great question.

24 In -- in reading and writing the differences between
25 elementary, middle, and high school were not big at all.



1 There's percentage of kids proficient.

2 In math, the way in which the -- the
3 performance levels -- the -- the what was proficient was
4 set at a much different way, so they were deliberately
5 made much harder, even though it's harder to be
6 proficient in math in high school than it is
7 in -- anyway, it -- it was pumped up even higher, so
8 those -- it always resulted in that similar pattern:
9 high elementary, little lower middle, little lower high
10 school, because the performance levels were harder.

11 MS. MAZANEC: Thank you.

12 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: All right. Let me --

13 MS. SCHROEDER: May I ask --

14 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- we'll go back around if
15 we need to. Dr. Schroeder -- Dr. Scheffel, I'm sorry.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah, as I think

18 about -- this is a great conversation. Appreciate all
19 the great information. It seems to me that we need to
20 ask the question for whom are we doing these tests. Is
21 it for the students, for the adults? What is it for?
22 And right now we're doing it for high stakes sorting of
23 districts for accreditation, and also wondering about how
24 else we can use these data for teach evaluation, or
25 whatever.



1 And we're using a test that's not content
2 based. Not based on what students know, but on language
3 really -- language acumen. And it uses a very subjective
4 approach to the proficiency levels, and how those bands
5 are set in order to sort. And so I -- I think we know,
6 as educators, that a high quality education is -- is
7 characterized by students doing things like science
8 experiments, solving real world math problems, writing
9 research papers, reading novels, and stories, and
10 analyzing them, making oral presentations, evaluating and
11 synthesizing information from a variety of fields, and
12 applying that information. And standardized tests are
13 just not a good tool for evaluating that kind of
14 learning.

15 You know, if we look at Finland, many
16 nations that do the best in international comparisons do
17 not use wide-scale standardized assessments. So if we
18 know that instruction is really trying to teach to the
19 test, and we have identified the biggest factor loadings
20 on the test, then I -- I don't -- I don't know that
21 students are going to be able to learn the kinds of
22 skills, and engage in the kinds of activities that we've
23 just listed that we know comprise of quality education.

24 So I think we have some soul searching to
25 do. If our biggest goal is to be able to sort districts



1 for accreditation, I -- I think that we're leaving the
2 kids behind, because it's not necessarily meeting their
3 needs. So I -- I think this is a great discussion, and I
4 know it's the first cut on the data, but I think we
5 really have to return to our basic questions, you know,
6 for whom are we giving these tests, and how are we
7 intending to use these data.

8 Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Dr. Flores.

10 MS. FLORES: And -- and we really should ask
11 what is the purpose of education. You know, I think
12 that's -- that's what we should be asking, what is the
13 purpose of education. And I don't think -- I don't think
14 it's about accountability. I don't think it's about
15 testing. I think it -- it really gets down to education
16 is about teaching and learning. And we are so far
17 removed from that.

18 I think too -- I mean, I thought -- I
19 thought this for a long time, even before we had those
20 other tests, that if Cesar wants to know -- if Cesar
21 wants to know how kids are doing out in the country, just
22 give it to him. And what does he have? He has -- or she
23 has NAEP, National Assessment for Educational Progress,
24 which you said was almost the same, and that's what is
25 used nationally. Give that to him. Let's not get



1 ourselves into spending more money in -- more money
2 in -- in this accountability stuff. It -- they -- they
3 want it. They get it. They have it through NAEP. They
4 do it every year.

5 So I think we need to start thinking about
6 that, and then think about local. Local assessments are
7 better than these high stakes testing. They will do
8 more. And I just think when you have 7 states that are
9 cooperating with PARCC, you have 43 states that said
10 no -- no to PARCC. And we should really think about
11 that. Why should we be the experiment? I don't like to
12 be -- I don't want to be. I don't want our kids to be
13 the experiment.

14 Thank you.

15 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Joyce, I'll try and
16 conclude with a couple of things. One, you and I have
17 had a number of discussions about -- about the potential
18 arbitrary nature of using -- of -- of the -- of the
19 criteria based standards being set, based on a group of
20 individual's judgment of what people should know. And
21 that is a completely arbitrary -- it may be well
22 intentioned, but you cannot take away from the fact that
23 it's the arbitrary judgment of a group of people.

24 So one of the things that I -- we discussed,
25 and I asked is whether it's possible to convert these



1 scores on a district-wide basis and a school-wide basis
2 to a norm referenced -- a norm-referenced basis. And I
3 think we concluded that that could be done. That you
4 know what every individual scored. You know what every
5 individual scored in the school. You can get an average
6 for each school. You can get an average for each grade
7 in each school, and each district.

8 And I don't -- with modern technology, I
9 don't believe that's too hard to do, and so I'm going to
10 ask for a consensus from the Board to -- to ask you to do
11 that, and provide those to us, and to the public at the
12 next meeting. So that the public can still compare
13 school A with school B and district A with district B,
14 and allow them to make choices. There are a number of
15 private and public organizations that rely on this kind
16 of data.

17 The -- the criticism of -- of the norm-based
18 data is that -- I had to find some way to politically
19 correctly say this -- is that we're trying to find that
20 all we're really finding is the fastest turtle, because
21 we don't compare ourselves with Singapore, and -- and
22 Finland that it's really not relevant data for worldwide
23 comparison. And that may or may not be true, but it's
24 certainly -- it's certainly relevant, so that we can
25 compare ourselves internally. And I'm going to guess



1 that there are -- there's probably data available from
2 the other states that they cannot hide. They're probably
3 publishing it this morning, as well, that would allow us
4 to compare ourselves with the six other PARCC states.

5 And -- and I think when you -- when you
6 evaluate the effectiveness of -- of these exams I think
7 you have to look at a couple of things. Only six states
8 use the PARCC test. Number often heard is seven, but the
9 last time I checked -- and of course I have old
10 information, the District of Columbia is not a state.
11 Fifteen states use Smarter Balance. So by my old math
12 that's 21 states that have acquiesced in the beginning,
13 or continue to acquiesce to the attempt at federalization
14 of these testing consortiums. At least 25 states, and
15 that leaves a few states in doubt, use state-specific
16 assessments in grades three through eight in math in
17 English arts.

18 So quite clearly, we are in a very small
19 minority, which -- and -- and I think the whole
20 concept -- the reason that we went down this road,
21 starting with no child left behind, was that somehow we
22 needed to be able to compare our performance -- the
23 performance of our students with Massachusetts and
24 Mississippi. I don't think that's even remotely possible
25 with the -- the fact that we now have, at least, 27



1 different -- different standardized tests out there
2 trying to draw these conclusions, and whether they can be
3 successfully normed one to another, I have my -- my
4 serious doubts.

5 I think -- I do think the other element
6 that -- that's been alluded to that these tests don't
7 test knowledge, and they certainly don't try and test any
8 common body of knowledge that we would expect students,
9 as Americans, to know or understand, and that I think is
10 a serious shortcoming. When, in the sample junior high
11 question you have here, no one is asked to draw on any
12 knowledge of literature they have read, or should have
13 read to be able to -- to be able to answer the question.
14 So they're -- they're by and large knowledge absent
15 tests. And I think that is -- is -- is part -- is one of
16 the fundamental problems.

17 The other fundamental problem is -- is next
18 year's cut scores could be subject to manipulation, just
19 as this year's cut scores could have been subject to
20 manipulation, because you'll have new questions. You
21 will have new evaluations of how many of those questions
22 someone could get right. You will probably have new
23 evaluators. I don't expect you will have the same 30 or
24 40 experts setting the standard of knowledge that we
25 expect sixth graders to know when they take the math



1 test. So I'm not, at all, convinced that by using -- by
2 using this criteria referenced approach, that we will
3 ever have tests that can be compared from year-to-year,
4 and really be an accurate portrayal of academic progress.

5 So I think -- I think there are a couple of
6 things that we can hope for. If -- if you take these
7 results at face value, almost two-thirds of our students
8 have failed.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They have.

10 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Now, I have a hard time
11 believing that number, because we have two-thirds of our
12 students who have failed to attain what we believe they
13 need to know to move to the next grade, which means we
14 ought to be retaining 60 percent of our students in the
15 grade they're in. If those are the results, you
16 can -- you can draw very few -- your number of
17 conclusions you can draw are very limited.

18 One of them is, our school system is a
19 catastrophic failure. It may be. It may be that we're
20 the slowest turtle. And on that measurement, we are a
21 catastrophic failure. I'm not inclined to believe that
22 these results are as dire as they appear, but there is no
23 way for me to assert that with any greater degree of
24 certainty than anyone else on this -- on this dais can
25 assert that they are, in fact, an accurate and true



1 measure of what's going on, and that's the fundamental
2 problem with these tests.

3 So the -- the other problem I think -- I
4 think Dr. Scheffel clearly mentioned is, who are we
5 trying to serve. Are we trying to serve children?
6 Because if we're trying to serve children, these results
7 would be available in a timely fashion, and we should be
8 able to help them improve, because they have the results
9 available so the teachers know what they need to know.

10 We're almost halfway through, and by the
11 time these results trickle down it'll be Christmas
12 vacation. So for all intense and purposes, we're halfway
13 through another school year without the -- the helpful
14 commentary, that can be associated with these exams,
15 available to the teachers that have inherited these
16 students after -- after they took the tests last -- last
17 May. So from that perspective, these tests have failed
18 to serve the one group that we should be trying the
19 hardest to serve, which is the children of the State of
20 Colorado. And in that regard, they're a catastrophic
21 failure, and -- and if we proceed with PARCC, we need to
22 insist that these results are available in a much more
23 timely fashion. That -- the absolute minimum we ought to
24 be able to achieve.

25 So I would -- would anticipate, if I don't



1 see objection, that we will have the norm-based results
2 comparable for districts, and I would presume that we
3 should be able to -- if someone scored 650 on the test,
4 we should probably be able to convert that to, at least,
5 a state-wide average of what percentile that is.

6 So with that, I think we'll conclude.

7 Oh, yes, Dr. Asp.

8 MR. ASP: (Indiscernible).

9 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: No, go ahead.

10 MR. ASP: We can certainly produce those
11 percentile results. Having those for you in December
12 will be very difficult for us to do, given the other
13 pieces that we need to produce for that.

14 MS. FLORES: But don't you have those, so
15 they'd convert them to this? And one last -- last thing.
16 Why are we even thinking of pursuing any further -- any
17 further use of this test? I think we should be thinking
18 about getting out of -- of -- getting out of PARCC.

19 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: I think the answer -- the
20 answer, Dr. Flores, is that the law requires us to use
21 it, and whether we like it or not, we're going
22 to -- going to have to follow that law. And
23 until -- until the policy makers conclude that, you know,
24 either this is the right way, or this is a flawed
25 process --



1 MS. FLORES: It's a flawed process.

2 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- we're stuck. So --

3 MR. ASP: We'll -- we'll look this, and give
4 you --

5 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- and --

6 MR. ASP: -- and get back (indiscernible).

7 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: -- and Dr. Asp, I
8 would -- I mean, I -- you know, my computer knowledge is
9 not the greatest, but it -- it would seem, to me,
10 that -- that it is maybe -- maybe I oversimplified it as
11 a one button push on a computer, but maybe it's two
12 buttons. I don't know.

13 MR. ASP: We'll do the best
14 (indiscernible) --

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Give me five.

16 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: But -- you know,
17 and -- and I -- I would simply say we have other
18 obligations that we need to meet before we provide
19 the -- the normed-based data, so those will come first,
20 and -- and with the limitations of staff and time, but as
21 soon as possible I think it's going to be very important
22 for really everyone in this state to be able to start to
23 make those cross district and school-by-school
24 comparisons.

25 So thank you very much.



1 MS. FLORES: Get out of PARCC. I would like
2 to have our public have the assurance that this will be
3 clear. There's -- there's quite a bit of difference in
4 understanding what it means to report in this -- in this
5 way we have versus the other way. And if you've
6 got -- if you -- if we're going to do this, I would just
7 adamantly ask that there be some way of outlining for the
8 public and parents what the difference is here, and what
9 it means, what this number means, as compared to this
10 number, if you can do that. I -- I (indiscernible) --

11 CHAIRMAN DURHAM: Your catch phrase is when
12 finding the fastest turtle you use this particular data,
13 so all right.

14 Why don't we stand -- why don't we go ahead
15 and proceed to our lunch break and executive session. We
16 will lay over the rule making hearing until the first
17 thing after lunch at about quarter till 1:00. And we'll
18 stand at recess until 12:45 p.m.

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 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