



Colorado State Board of Education

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
BEFORE THE
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION
DENVER, COLORADO
October 13, 2016, Part 1

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on October 13, 2016,
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 MS. SCHROEDER: Biz, Biz, Bizy. Are you
2 ready. Are you ready? Good morning ladies and gentlemen.
3 I'd like to call the meeting back -- of the State Board of
4 Education back to order. Ms. Cordial, would you please
5 read the roll, call the roll.

6 MS. CORDIAL: Happy to. Okay. Board Member
7 Flores.

8 MS. FLORES: Present.

9 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Goff.

10 MS. GOFF: Here.

11 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec.

12 MS. MAZANEC: Here.

13 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin.

14 MS. RANKIN: Here.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Here.

17 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Schroeder.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Here. First item this
19 morning is an information item, quality instruction, and
20 leadership. This Denver public schools submission and the
21 annual report on the -- their alternative preparation
22 programs. Madam Chair try to introduce our presenter.

23 MS. ANTHERS: Sure. Thank you. I'm just
24 gonna turn this over to Dr. Colleen O'Neill to introduce
25 our speaker.



1 MS. O'NEILL: Absolutely. Good morning,
2 Members of the Board. I'm Colleen O'Neill, I'm the
3 Executive Director of Educator Preparation, licensing and
4 educator effectiveness. Today with me is Sarah Almy with
5 the Denver Public Schools. Sarah represents the executive
6 -- she is the Executive Director of Talent Management for
7 DPS. Today we bring forward to you an information item
8 only, with regard to Denver Public Schools and the Colorado
9 Department of Education memorandum of understanding, with
10 regard to alternative Educator Preparation. In your board
11 packet materials, you have a little bit of a cover letter
12 that explains what the MOU allows DPS to do which is really
13 an alternative educator pathway that they do in conjunction
14 with different universities and educator preparation
15 programs. You also have an annual report to the Colorado
16 Department of Education State Board presented by the DPS
17 Staff. Today Sarah and I are here really just to help
18 answer any questions that you may have around that MOU or
19 the subsequent report as the information item. So we stand
20 at the ready to answer any questions you may have.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Colleagues, have you any
22 questions?

23 MS. FLORES: I have a question.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Dr. Flores.



1 MS. FLORES: Oh, sorry. And the question
2 is, you know, yesterday we saw some of the -- not
3 alternative but innovation schools, and you know they
4 conform to law and all. But the gist is that we didn't see
5 anything that was innovative. It wasn't spelled out what -
6 - what you were gonna do that was different than that we're
7 had been done before, and so will this address this?

8 MS. O'NEILL: I think Dr. Flores, I think in
9 some ways I'm gonna answer for Sarah and then I'll
10 certainly let her jump in. I think in some ways they're an
11 alternative pathway to help fill all of their Educator
12 Preparation needs. I think you have some upwards of like
13 900 positions that you fill in a year with Denver Public
14 Schools. The innovative side of the alternative Educator
15 Preparation Program and the development of that is -- is
16 kind of where that starts to intersect with the innovation
17 schools. So this is really about the educator talent
18 pipeline for them, and this is one of the -- the few
19 districts in our state that really takes that always on
20 themselves and collaborates very specifically with filling
21 that pipeline. So that's part of I think if we were trying
22 to attach that innovation piece that would be kind of where
23 -- where we would attach the educator talent pipeline.

24 MS. FLORES: All right.



1 MS. ALMY: Yeah I would, I mean, I think
2 exactly that the programs that -- that are outlined here
3 and -- and the information that you have are really
4 designed to meet some of our highest need, hardest to fail
5 subject areas across all of our schools, and so working in
6 partnership with some of those schools that have it
7 innovation status as well as, as you know, any other school
8 in our -- in our district, and I think as Colleen said
9 really just around working to make sure that -- that we are
10 being innovative in thinking about how we get the best
11 prepared and most qualified teachers to all of our
12 students.

13 MS. FLORES: I know you have some internship
14 programs, and I also notice that on a list that we've got,
15 that I guess my area it doesn't have as many, I guess, cold
16 programs with universities in training as does say the --
17 the west side, and are we working towards you know some
18 internships with maybe industry and is that kind of part of
19 it?

20 MS. ALMY: Yeah I mean I think we're looking
21 at a lot of different partnership opportunities, and -- and
22 these two programs are in partnership with -- with a couple
23 of universities. We certainly have partnerships with, you
24 know, many other universities. We are -- we're also
25 looking at some, you know, route to teaching programs for



1 our own students and thinking about that, and so I think
2 thinking about industry, partnerships relating to that, and
3 different opportunities, so I think these are two -- two
4 pathways that we're taking.

5 But as, you know, as was mentioned every
6 year we're filling upwards of 900 vacancies and so
7 certainly exploring a lot of different opportunities to
8 partner and I think trying to make sure that -- that we are
9 identifying opportunities across the city and for schools
10 across the city. I think that's something that
11 historically the partnerships have tended to happen more,
12 you know, potentially between a University and a specific
13 school, and we're trying to make sure we're being really
14 strategic about ensuring opportunity across that district.

15 MS. FLORES: Okay. When you say vacancies,
16 you mean vacancies for kids within those schools within
17 those industries?

18 MS. ALMY: Sorry that was -- those are
19 teacher vacancies.

20 MS. FLORES: Oh teachers too work with
21 (inaudible) with these special kids.

22 MS. O'NEILL: And Dr. Flores there are quite
23 a few pathways and I know that DPS right now is also
24 focusing on kind of the Grow Your Own program, as well as
25 how do we bring some of our own kids along as we graduate



1 from high school and teacher cadet programs grow your own
2 into those pathways. International recruitment associates
3 with DPS. They do international recruitment and work with
4 Spain, I think as well as a couple of other international
5 components. So quite a few different pathways that DPS is
6 working on and then has just developed a fellowship with
7 Harvard University as well to bring student teachers and so
8 multiple Colorado institutions as well as some other ones.

9 MS. FLORES: Just the two internship, aren't
10 they? Just two internships are with Harvard?

11 MS. O'NEILL: Just -- yeah, just two interns
12 right now, yes. So it's really - it's really a pilot that
13 we're doing this year and we'll assess it that kind of the
14 midpoint of the year to determine if we may want to -- to
15 expand that partnership.

16 MS. FLORES: There was another program that
17 you got rid of for training teachers. Can you explain a
18 little bit about that training. I mean it seems that you
19 hire 900 teachers per year so that's a lot of teachers and
20 so tell me a little bit of it.

21 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah, so that was our Denver
22 Teach Today program, and that was our alternate route
23 program that -- that really was an accelerated route into
24 the classroom, and so teachers went through a very
25 intensive preparation. The summer prior to them becoming



1 the teacher of record. There -- there were a lot of things
2 to celebrate about that program including the number of
3 teachers that we were able to bring in for some of our
4 highest need subject areas, and the biggest challenge there
5 was -- was the sustainability of the program and the costs
6 of the program, and when we launched that program in I
7 believe it was 2013. You know, the opportunities and sort
8 of the other routes into teaching and alternative pathways
9 for -- for individuals who hadn't gone through the
10 traditional four-year preparation route, were much more
11 limited than they are now.

12 So I think in partnership with our
13 universities and universities on their own have -- have
14 launched a lot of other ways for -- for individuals to come
15 in through alternate routes, and so due primarily to the --
16 to the issues of sustainability that we had as a district,
17 to be able to sustain that program, as well as just the --
18 the reality of the landscape now as there become more
19 programs, led us to the decision to -- to phase out that
20 program.

21 MS. FLORES: Thank you. Any other
22 questions? So I have, actually maybe not a couple, when
23 you said the cost sum of that program that you've
24 eliminated, I was trying to think what were the cost.

25 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah.



1 MS. FLORES: What was the structure that
2 made it expensive?

3 MS. O'NEILL: So -- So I think staffing
4 could be because that we -- we really we're in that program
5 providing the -- the coursework, so -- the field support to
6 those teachers-

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, you were providing
8 everything?

9 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. The mentors, the
10 stipends --

11 MS. SCHROEDER: Go it.

12 MS. O'NEILL: We -- we, yeah. We had fully
13 absorbed the cost of that.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So I -- I do have a
15 question about your residency program. Only that you
16 didn't say much about your mentor teachers, how do you go
17 about choosing them? What are the training opportunities
18 or, I don't want to say promotional but additional teacher
19 responsibility, opportunities for that piece of your
20 residency program? I think it has great potential.

21 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. Thanks for asking about
22 that, because that is a really important component of it.
23 So -- so we do carefully select all of our mentors. We
24 work in partnership with -- with school leaders to identify
25 mentors. We do use, you know, information that we have



1 available through our leading effective academic practice
2 or our growth and performance system to identify those
3 mentors and then, we do provide ongoing training and
4 support. So the field managers who work with our residents
5 and support residents also work closely with our mentors
6 out in the buildings to -- to ensure that, you know,
7 they're both the mentors are developing and growing in
8 their leadership capabilities but also that they're
9 providing the kind of support that residents need. We also
10 have monthly trainings that we do with the mentors. So we
11 -- we really do place an important value on that to ensure
12 that those -- those teachers are developing both themselves
13 but also, you know, supporting the rest of them.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: So you're sort of creating
15 teacher leaders at the same time that you are --

16 MS. O'NEILL: It's -- it's -- Yeah. It's
17 very much part of our teacher --

18 MS. SCHROEDER: -- preparing new teachers.

19 MS. O'NEILL: -- yeah, as we built out as a
20 district, a more distinct teacher career pathway and
21 teacher leadership opportunities. It's -- it's very much
22 part of that -- that opportunity to work one to one and to
23 have a resident in the classroom.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: That's -- that's a great
2 model. Thank you very much. Did you have another
3 question?

4 MS. FLORES: I did. I noticed that you work
5 with DU and I know that that's an expensive program. Why
6 not include UC -- UC Denver, Metro. I -- I mean, I think
7 those are -- we need teachers. They we're hiring 900
8 teachers a year, that I can't imagine that DU could fill
9 all of that for you.

10 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah and they --
11 and they don't and we do have partnerships with them with --
12 - with UCD and with Metro as well to -- to bring teachers
13 and we have some work that we're doing around student
14 teacher residents and -- and partnering really closely with
15 them and student teachers. So -- so very much, yes, deeply
16 engaged in partnership with both of those universities.
17 And with the -- the DEO, there are some- some costs and so
18 I think, you know, that's something we're really looking at
19 as we think about how we -- how we expand some of the
20 really great work that's happening with the residency but
21 increase the access. We do have, in partnership with DEO,
22 tuition reimbursement, opportunities, and so, for -- for
23 residents who continue with the district. They do have the
24 opportunity essentially to, you know, to -- to pay back or
25 for us to pay back to reimburse the costs of the program.



1 MS. FLORES: Right. Have you ever thought
2 about, maybe that a paid internship like a- a fifth year,
3 where you would take these students from CU and Metro and
4 do a fifth year really close internship with a -- a group
5 of students? I mean, I -- I know that that's worked in
6 other states where I've -- where I've worked.

7 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. I think we're -- we're
8 open to exploring a lot of things that -- that's a little
9 bit like what the student teacher residency experience is,
10 that we're doing with Metro and with UCD, where they really
11 -- the student teachers in their fourth year actually spend
12 their -- almost the entire year in the classroom alongside
13 a mentor teacher and then have kind of one day of
14 coursework that they're doing. And so -- so I think it is
15 similar to that model but, you know, as we are really
16 looking at the pipelines and how do we really, you know,
17 work closely with our partners but also ensure that we're
18 getting, you know, the -- the teachers -- the caliber of
19 teachers, all of that, that we need and want for our kids,
20 that we're open to exploring a lot of different things. So
21 I think that would be an interesting model to look at.

22 MS. FLORES: And the one I was talking about
23 was a -- a fifth -- a fifth year would be -- would be a
24 paid year working closely within the classroom of a -- of
25 another teacher where the student gets to get almost most



1 of the Master's program, I mean, a Master's program. So
2 it's a Master's program but working closely in the
3 classroom with another really great teacher.

4 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Other questions folks?

6 Thank you very much, Ms. (Inaudible), it's a very good
7 report. Next time, tell me also about the mentors because
8 I think -- I think that kind of -- expansion at --

9 MS. O'NEILL: At the Colorado associate with
10 that looking so much deeper.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: -- the Colorado associate
13 with enriches. It shows how you've enriched your program.

14 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. We will definitely do
15 that. Thank you very much.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much. Thank
17 you Ms. O'Neill and don't move.

18 MS. O'NEILL: Many go ahead and hang around
19 for a little while, like most of the day, I think.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Most of the day?

21 MS. O'NEILL: Here, we'll trade this out and
22 I'll just put this over here and we'll just put this one
23 out then.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So our next -- our next item
2 is culturally and linguistically diverse needs and
3 strategies.

4 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you Madam Vice
5 Chair. This is a follow up to the information item we
6 presented last month and this is in some -- some respects
7 in response to our Department of Justice and Inquiry, as
8 well as just a lot of feedback and needs from across the
9 state. So I'm going to turn it over to Dr. O'Neill again.

10 MS. O'NEILL: Hello. Nice to see you.
11 Colleen O'Neil, Executive Director Educator Preparation
12 Licensing and Educator Effectiveness. With me today is our
13 Associate Commissioner, Barbara Hickman, as well -- and our
14 director of English Language Acquisition for Aurora Public
15 Schools, Jean Burke and so --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Welcome.

17 MS. O'NEILL: -- I'd like to welcome them
18 for joining us. Based of the conversation that we had at
19 our last meeting, we were talking a little bit about our
20 Colorado culturally and linguistically diverse educator
21 pathway, and there were some critical questions that came
22 from the Board of Education. We wanted to come back, spend
23 some time being able to answer some of those critical
24 questions and also, be able to engage a little bit deeper
25 about pathways needs district level. So we have invited



1 Jean to help join us today, to talk a little bit about
2 strategies in your Board packet.

3 You will also -- were giving them a little
4 bit of a memorandum that helped address some very specific
5 questions around our culturally and linguistically diverse
6 and, or our ELL population. And so we wanted to be
7 prepared today and we stand pretty much at the ready today,
8 as well, to answer any questions that you have around that
9 memorandum of understanding, or to be able to really
10 further elicit insight into the need at the district level,
11 the strategies that we talk about when we talk about an
12 English language learners and all educators and, or any of
13 the data around the specific ELL outcomes as it stands
14 today. So for the most part, we are here to engage in a
15 conversation and help answer any questions that may have
16 come forward from that memorandum of understanding.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Colleagues. I think there
18 were concerns about the proposal. Maybe, can -- can --
19 could we put up some of the basics?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

21 MS. O'NEILL: I think let's go -- let's go
22 ahead and open up that memo that sits there and let's go
23 ahead and walk through it just a little bit. So last month
24 and -- and you have another memorandum I think in front of
25 you.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Some of us.

2 MS. FLORES: Oh, some of us? I don't have
3 it.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: No, I don't think we have
5 anything.

6 MS. O'NEILL: We don't have that any?

7 MS. MAZANEC: We only have the memo --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have the first page.

9 MS. MAZANEC: -- presentation of the data.

10 MS. O'NEILL: Well, that's just not going to
11 work out. Okay. I apologize because I thought you have
12 the memo.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Morgan can send that.

14 MS. O'NEILL: Okay, perfect.

15 MS. CORDIAL: Do you want it posted?

16 MS. O'NEILL: Yes, please.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Can I have a hard copy?

18 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah. I'll put it right.

19 MS. O'NEILL: Can you get additional copies?
20 Here's one.

21 MS. CORDIAL: Okay.

22 MS. O'NEILL: So small delay. Hold on,
23 small delay.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: But I think while --



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm try -- I'm trying to log
2 on to.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- we're doing that maybe --
4 One of the questions that the Board specifically asked last
5 time that I think we're prepared to answer here without a -
6 - a PowerPoint is about these strategies that are different
7 in -- in -- in a classroom of Yale students as opposed to a
8 classroom of non Yale students. I think we can answer that
9 right now without number data because that was a specific
10 issue the Board had, was how would that look different and
11 what would take place in a specific training if teachers
12 were to go through those hours of trainings?

13 I think we can address that I -- without a -
14 - a PowerPoint which is why we have our highly skilled
15 guest from Aurora Public Schools who can talk about that a
16 little bit. What would it look like if you were a teacher
17 with 15 years experience and you were to take a class in
18 this? What would it look like? What would be different
19 and what are the strategies? So maybe we can move to that
20 and -- and get this other data to you as quickly as we can.

21 MS. FLORES: Just to be specific, it would
22 be teaching English to second language learners.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: I think we need to make sure
24 we define the differences. This is not necessarily
25 teaching specifically only English. This, I believe, we're



1 talking about more probably academic content in a mixed
2 classroom. So in other words, many -- many -- many of our
3 classrooms have students who are English learners in an
4 inclusionary setting with students who are already English
5 speakers and this is really what those strategies look
6 like. That's- that's what I --

7 MS. FLORES: Academic.

8 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yeah. I think that's what
9 we're talking about right now is what that would look like
10 not what specifically teaching English to second language
11 students.

12 MS. FLORES: That would be like (inaudible)
13 and academic learning -- academic.

14 MS. O'NEILL: So we have articulated that a
15 few -- I'll go back and just kind of refresh our memories a
16 little bit --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we need to.

18 MS. O'NEILL: -- as we wait for the
19 documentation. We had articulated a couple of different
20 pathways around culturally and linguistically diverse
21 education for our teachers. One of those pathways was kind
22 of a six hour or six semester hour, which is important to
23 know, six semester hour pathway that really focuses in on
24 every teacher, every student in their classroom, which was
25 what Ms. Hickman was talking about here just a minute ago.



1 So making sure that we were able to really target all of
2 our students in our classrooms from all of our teachers not
3 necessarily pull out program but very much in -- in every -
4 -

5 MS. FLORES: I wasn't talking about
6 (inaudible).

7 MS. O'NEILL: Yep. So and not -- and not
8 necessarily around, just linguistic. It was learning --
9 learning acquisition and language acquisition for all
10 teachers. So again, I'll go back to kind of the example,
11 Colleen O'Neill, the English teacher -- high school English
12 teacher being able to really understand how my -- my
13 students who come from ELL background and, or a culturally
14 different background. Again, I think I gave a -- an
15 example of Somalian refugees coming to the United States,
16 but Colleen O'Neil is the English teacher really
17 understanding how students acquire language, understanding
18 the strategies that I can use to differentiate instruction
19 around that in a six kind of semester credit hour class,
20 and a certification.

21 And then also really identifying some of my
22 cultural competence, and or cultural biases as I go into
23 that classroom really being able to focus on that. So when
24 we left our meeting last time, that was one of the
25 pathways. And I think some of the questions that came



1 forward from that is really, what were those strategies?
2 Tell me the difference to what that would look like. So I
3 think that's, if we can address that first and really dig
4 in which is what Ms. Burke could really help us understand
5 from a district level. What does that look like for the --
6 the content teacher in the classroom that is not an ELL
7 teacher every day. So with that, I will turn it over to
8 Ms. Burke and put her on the spot --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Great (inaudible).

10 MS. O'NEILL: -- for some -- some pretty
11 specific strategies around what we work with.

12 MS. BURKE: So feel free to interrupt me and
13 ask me questions because I realize we're both meeting each
14 other for the first time so --

15 MS. FLORES: So I do -- I want a question
16 and the question is --

17 MS. BURKE: Can she start?

18 MS. FLORES: -- will everybody take these --
19 every student who goes through our system takes these too?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is for teachers.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Teachers.

22 MS. FLORES: For teachers, they will all
23 teachers take this course?

24 MS. BURKE: That -- that is -- that is a
25 part of this conversation. That is the end result of this



1 conversation with the state Board. We're not asking for
2 that decision today. That's -- that's --

3 MS. FLORES: That can be done in one course
4 but, for everybody.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Could she continue,
6 please?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

8 MS. BURKE: Thank you. So let me just tell
9 you a little bit about my context. I don't mean to speak
10 for everybody in the State of Colorado but I think I have a
11 pretty broad context. When, Aurora Public Schools
12 currently has about 38, almost 40 percent of our students
13 come to us with a first language other than English, that
14 has grown dramatically over the past few years, it's kind
15 of settled out. In layman, in kind of a layman's terms, in
16 an elementary school, about one out of every two students,
17 first language isn't English. In our middle schools its
18 about one out of every three, and in our high school is
19 about one out of every four.

20 That doesn't mean there aren't also students
21 in a high school, for example, whose first language isn't
22 English but who have come to a more fluent stage of
23 English. But one thing to remember about being a language
24 learner is you're always a language learner, that never
25 goes away, right? You're always learning language. Even



1 adults today who've studied languages for many years will
2 tell you it's all -- it's an ongoing process. So that's
3 the context of the work. And one of the things nine years
4 ago when I started and my colleagues with me today when the
5 two of us started. We really realized that you cannot just
6 retrofit a program and fit students. If you can't have a
7 program for English speakers and then just hope you can fit
8 in the language learners. That you really have to think
9 differently about the day for a language learner, and all
10 those changes we make benefit everybody. They're not just
11 good for language learners, they benefit everybody.

12 So one of the things that, it's not a matter
13 of a few simple strategies that I can teach a teacher in a
14 couple of hours and put up a few pictures in a classroom.
15 First and foremost, you really have to think about how
16 you're gonna differentiate for students and those
17 approaches to literacy and teacher understanding are very
18 specific strategies. And it takes time for me to teach
19 them to you, for you to try them on, and then for you to
20 practice in your classroom. You know, there's also a
21 difference when we acquire language in your proficiency
22 level, so you're new at the learning the language, some
23 people are learning it in more of a level two or three,
24 some become more proficient with levels fours or fives.
25 Currently, in the state of Colorado we use the WIDA



1 standards, right? To help guide that. And so you also
2 have to think about differentiating based on your student's
3 level of understanding of English.

4 So cognitively, students have the same
5 understanding. They come in, Colleen was saying as English
6 teacher, she's teaching 10th grade English, she's got a 15
7 year-old student in there. Well, he can't speak English,
8 his cognitive ability is still there, but how do we tap
9 into that? And those -- those are, those take a long time
10 for us to help a teacher understand how to differentiate
11 for that. One of the other things someone asked is that we
12 realize too is that language learning isn't just the
13 responsibility of an ESL teacher anymore. I can't think,
14 maybe, there are maybe a few districts in the state, but
15 really, it's got to be everybody's responsibility and we
16 realize that -- we realize that as well. So --

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: Can I just stop for one
18 second and ask you to define ESL verse what -- what we're
19 talking about so people are clear about the difference in
20 those --

21 MS. BURKE: Okay.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- in those acronyms?

23 MS. BURKE: ESL is a little more antiquated.
24 We don't utilize it quite so much but I try to use it
25 because a lot of my own friends don't understand the



1 vernacular very well anymore. So ESL, English as a second
2 language, I think a -- a previous model would have been one
3 teacher who was the ESL teacher in the building. She would
4 take those kids, pull them, teach them a little English,
5 and they go back to class. And we thought that was okay.
6 And I suppose if you only had a couple of students in your
7 building whose language wasn't, first language wasn't
8 English it probably worked.

9 But nowadays, that's not enough, and
10 certainly not with Common Core standards you cannot help
11 students access the content knowledge they need to have to
12 be successful. So you have to have a lot more robust
13 understandings. So the other reason Aurora, so nine years
14 ago, we realized our teachers were nowhere near well
15 prepared. They may have read a chapter in a book, in some
16 class around diverse learners but none of them had the kind
17 of background we needed to really support language
18 learners.

19 And so we began a condition of employment.
20 We do have an agreement with the Office for Civil Rights
21 and with them we came up with a common plan together, an
22 agreement and those teachers now take courses and we
23 provide that coursework via Regis University. We've also
24 worked with Colorado -- University of Colorado Denver to
25 help provide that coursework.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Questions?

2 MS. CORDIAL: Any questions around that?

3 Deb.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Do you have -- how long have
5 you been doing it again?

6 MS. BURKE: We've been providing -- we've
7 been providing as well as supporting teachers to get that
8 coursework for eight years and it is exorbitantly,
9 astronomically become expensive and so --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: Do you have a sense of -- of
11 if it is helping?

12 MS. BURKE: I think it makes a difference in
13 -- at the very beginning especially for teachers to
14 understand who the students are in their classroom. Many
15 of them don't even have any, they come to us with
16 university degrees and they're -- they're qualified people
17 but they don't have any experience with language learners.
18 They don't understand when I'm a new learner of this, a
19 speaker of the language as opposed to someone who's been,
20 has more, and then I have to make changes in my instruction
21 to be able to meet the needs of all the kids.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah.

23 MS. FLORES: Well, there is a program that's
24 been out there for years. It's called CALLA, it's a
25 Cognitive Academic Language Learning Acquisition. I don't



1 believe I'm pull out as well. It just takes up too much
2 time. And the, what we did in Nevada was actually design a
3 course so that it was, we had kids from all over. It
4 wasn't just Spanish-speaking kids, they -- they were coming
5 from Russia, they were coming from everywhere. So it -- it
6 was to teach English for the teacher to -- to know and take
7 them at every level. I mean, to teach a specific academic
8 language that they needed to know, and there are psychology
9 and cognition has come a long way as far as language
10 acquisition. So it really homed in on those methods and
11 strategies, very much strategic for learners --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Val, we need to let people
13 ask questions, do you mind?

14 MS. FLORES: No, but I'm saying that this is
15 from --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: We're -- we're addressing a
17 proposal and I think we need to focus. And I -- I think it
18 be really helpful if we get that proposal back up because -
19 -

20 MS. MAZANEC: I agree.

21 MS. BURKE: So there's two things that just
22 got handed to you.

23 MS. MAZANEC: We won't be able to read this
24 while we are talking.



1 MS. BURKE: No, I totally agree. It's the
2 proposal and then also the memorandum that I was addressing
3 that I was incorrectly said that you had in your hand. So
4 there's those two things. I will go ahead, and would you
5 like the proposal or the PowerPoint? Because the
6 PowerPoint was the summary from the last time.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Folks --

8 MS. BURKE: Do you want --

9 MS. SCHROEDER: -- what would be, what do
10 you think would be?

11 MS. BURKE: What would be most beneficial
12 because the PowerPoint had this -- a short summary of what
13 we were talking about.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Sorry, we're just --

15 MS. BURKE: You're great. No, it's great.
16 So it would be the PowerPoint from the last time.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Pam, you had some questions?

18 MS. MAZANEC: I do. Thank you for coming
19 today.

20 MS. BURKE: Sure.

21 MS. MAZANEC: One of my -- my overarching
22 question and concern is the effectiveness of a cultural --
23 cultural and linguistically diverse certification. Just
24 recently we, you know, how is it working for you for nine
25 years in Aurora doing what you're doing? Because we just



1 recently saw the news that Denver public schools again, did
2 not meet the mark for the English language learners. And
3 I'm, that's what I'm most concerned about is what works?
4 We -- we need to make sure that our, if we call them ESL or
5 we call them ELL's. Clearly, learning our language would
6 be absolutely necessary for academic success. So what I
7 want to know is, does this work?

8 MS. BURKE: That's -- that's a great
9 question. And I would say we have pockets of some great
10 success in specific places. I would say we have a couple
11 of things that have been challenging. Teacher turnover, so
12 they go through the program and then we lose them for a
13 variety of reasons. I would say another challenge is not
14 all of our administrators are CLD-trained and I think
15 that's something we are trying to rectify now.

16 MS. MAZANEC: Are you referring to
17 principals?

18 MS. BURKE: That's right.

19 MS. MAZANEC: I just want to clarify.

20 MS. BURKE: Administrators or anyone who
21 would have a role of overseeing and supervising these
22 teachers. It wasn't part of our initial agreement, and I
23 think it was an oversight on our part, and I, we realized
24 that we really need. So you need an administrator who can



1 support folks, as well as then the teacher training so that
2 we're all talking the same understandings.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: Go ahead.

4 MS. MAZANEC: And so -- so you, are you
5 telling me that if you have a teacher who is trained and
6 stays and hopefully you have an administrator that is
7 trained and stays, you really, that's the secret? Or are
8 you saying that --

9 MS. BURKE: I don't think it's the only
10 secret. I think it's an important part of it. I think
11 you've also got to look at a strong curriculum, an aligned
12 -- an aligned program and an entire district. There's so
13 many pieces of that. But in terms of the educator
14 effectiveness, we -- we can no longer retrofit students
15 into our English speaking program anymore. We've really
16 got to look at the holistic piece of it, and what do we
17 need to be doing more better differently for everybody in
18 front of us. And I -- I believe many of the teachers we
19 have, who have come out of the program are stronger for it,
20 better for it and they're, just their voice of advocacy for
21 students and families is impressive.

22 MS. MAZANEC: Final question. What is the
23 biggest challenge? I mean, assuming you have all those
24 pieces that you'd like. What is the biggest challenge to
25 success for these -- these learners?



1 MS. BURKE: I do believe there has to be a
2 systematic, you train teachers, train administrators, and
3 aligned curriculum, and aligned process for how students
4 are gonna move through the system and meet the standards.
5 I think that that's critical. And places and schools that
6 have that have shown a lot more success than those that
7 don't. So just to train a teacher and a principal isn't
8 enough. Then, are there resources in place? Do we have a
9 plan for how we're gonna work with the variety of
10 proficiency levels in the building? Those, all of those
11 pieces have to be there as well. But this is an important
12 -- an important foundational step. The, when people come
13 to us without the training, it's just they don't know what
14 they don't know and it's astounding to me. When we first
15 start to have conversations around cultural competency and
16 what it's like to learn through a second language. It's
17 incredibly eye opening for them. You know, ELL's like you
18 said they're doing double the work, but teachers sometimes
19 don't see that at least not at the beginning.

20 MS. MAZANEC: One last question that is
21 still not clear to me. That, I would -- I would like, I
22 guess, a little more detail on what the -- the program
23 teaches. Do we hear that --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Pam.

25 MS. MAZANEC: Is that inappropriate?



1 MS. SCHROEDER: No, I think -- I think, this
2 is what I was gonna say. I'm wondering if you can give us
3 an example. We are a citizen Board [OVERLAPPING] tuned in.
4 But I think in terms [OVERLAPPING].

5 You wanna know what a teacher would learn.
6 What are they learning that will be really translate to
7 success in teaching these students?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Thanks, Pam. That's good.

9 MS. MAZANEC: I'm looking for return on
10 investment.

11 MS. BURKE: Okay. Fair enough. So one
12 example they would learn is, I alluded to it before.
13 Students come, when you're learning English, therefore, you
14 are at a continuum of place where you have to learn the
15 language. Correct? You may be brand new to the country
16 and you don't have very much English. You may have lived
17 here most of your life but you've grown up in a Spanish-
18 speaking or a different language families so you don't get
19 access or you've been in the country. So you've got a
20 variety of levels. Teachers often just read all of those
21 students or provide the same for all of those kids, and
22 yet, it's very different what each of them need.

23 And so one of the very first things we do is
24 talk about what is the difference when you are -- you are a
25 new or a level one or two, as opposed to what the needs are



1 if your four or fives. How do I -- how do I grade a level
2 one or two? Had it been my literacy class, he's been here.
3 How do I -- how do I create something for him to read?
4 Well, he's not cognitively delayed but he's learning the
5 language. So what's a fair assignment to give them. And
6 we talk about those different levels and what do I need to
7 do to target and differentiate. Teaching is hard work and
8 teaching with EL's in your classroom is very hard work.

9 MS. MAZANEC: And I suppose we don't -- you
10 probably don't put them into groups like we did in first
11 grade in reading groups --

12 MS. BURKE: Well, that's one option.

13 MS. MAZANEC: -- you know, putting into the
14 level.

15 MS. BURKE: Grouping is one option during
16 their -- during their English when they are doing their
17 dedicated time to learn English. There is a time in Aurora
18 public schools where students have a dedicated time just to
19 learn English. We do put you by your proficiency level.
20 You're more comfortable, we can target the instruction, and
21 we can really help you. That's -- that's a small part of
22 the day about 40 minutes or a course for a high school
23 student. But then the rest of the day, I've still gotta
24 find ways to engage you and help you understand the
25 content. So yes, we do put kids by proficiency level for



1 part of the day, and then there are other parts of the day
2 where they -- they are with their English speaking peers as
3 well as other language learners.

4 MS. MAZANEC: I -- I apologize but it's
5 still not clear to me.

6 MS. O'NEILL: Madam Chair, can I just make a
7 quick response to that as well?

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Please, yeah.

9 MS. O'NEILL: I -- I think one of the
10 examples that might work there, and this will sound almost
11 low level, but we were talking about grading. For a second
12 language students in a class, they might use there, their
13 or they're incorrectly. If you were working with strictly
14 an English speaking student you might grade that
15 differently because they would, you would expect them to
16 know the differences in there, their or they're. If you
17 were working with a student learning English that might be
18 a slightly different thing if they had contextual knowledge
19 of what you were asking.

20 Another example I think, because I -- I
21 still think we need to probably get a little bit more
22 specific about what happens in the classroom and this again
23 will sound kind of low but it's a teaching skill. When
24 you're trying to teach in science for example, where
25 there's a lot of vocabulary. There is a very specific



1 skill in defining the words that you use, particularly when
2 you have English learners in class. So that you want to
3 learn how to use a vocabulary word, define it and use it
4 again if you have a high number of English learners. And
5 it's a scaffolding technique that teachers would
6 specifically learn how to do to make sure that they were
7 bringing academic content along with English learners.
8 There are a bunch more that I'm sure that you can
9 demonstrate. I think we just need a couple more really
10 specific strategies that teachers would be using in EL
11 classrooms or mixed classrooms.

12 MS. BURKE: And can I -- one more thing. I
13 don't think I did a very good job of level setting the --
14 or framing this conversation today. So I'm gonna go back
15 just a little tiny bit for a minute, and level set just a
16 little bit more. We have not as a stakeholder group dug
17 into the exact content of each one of these six hours.
18 When we came to you in October. It was really about a very
19 high level plan of can we continue down this pathway as a
20 stakeholder group to meet the need that we had talked about
21 with regard to the fact that we really need to be talking
22 about how to ensure that all of our kids have an equal
23 opportunity around education, and we see this as one of
24 those opportunities for us.



1 So when we came in October, you will notice
2 that the plan was definitely not flashed out in great
3 detail, and the strategies that we were talking about and
4 the specific course requirements or anything along that
5 line was not flashed out. It was more along the lines of
6 is this the pathway that we can continue to investigate and
7 what some thinking that we really should be keeping in our
8 thinking caps, because there's -- there's lots more that
9 actually goes with this planning process. It was more a
10 high level conversation around, can we continue down this
11 path with the stakeholders, flashed it out in greater
12 detail, keeping in mind your concerns and some of the
13 really clear artifacts that we need to bring back, and have
14 our plan as we go forward. From that, it's there were just
15 a lot of questions which were incredibly wonderful
16 questions for us to kind of go back and think about. We
17 are still to be perfectly honest in that phase of we don't
18 have the detail. So I think what -- what -- when we talk
19 about the strategies, I think we have not dug down so
20 deeply for the six, you know, credit hours of a
21 certification to say, "This would be exactly what it is.
22 We have a whole list of standards that are endorsement
23 outlines, and the criteria and the strategies around
24 that."



1 But this would be something very different
2 that we haven't done, and I think where we were really
3 headed was is it something that the Board can support us to
4 at least continue to investigate, knowing that we would
5 have to come back with stakeholder recommendations. Very
6 deeply ingrained into the exact things that Gene was
7 talking about with regard to the strategies. So I didn't
8 do a very good job. I'm gonna try not to hit my
9 microphone, knock it off on the table. I didn't do a very
10 good job of setting that up at the very beginning.

11 So really today, part of the outcome is
12 taking all of the critical questions that we have. Taking
13 them back to the stakeholders. If this is a pathway that
14 we want to continue down. If we are really concerned as a
15 Board about the pathway as a whole, I think that's -- is --
16 then we really want to know that and then we really want to
17 shift directions very quickly. And so I apologize for not
18 doing a little bit more level setting and certainly not
19 having the memo in front of you that you needed to make an
20 informed decision. So with that I'll go back answering any
21 question.

22 MS. SCHEFFEL: Do you have any question too,
23 Joyce? Joyce was next.

24 MS. RANKIN: Thanks for being here, Mrs.
25 Burke.



1 MS. BURKE: Sure.

2 MS. RANKIN: I have a concern about -- you
3 are extremely experienced in this, and you say that when
4 the administrators and the teachers are all in line the
5 children succeed exceptionally well. Do we have some tests
6 or some evaluations or assessments as to prove that?

7 MS. BURKE: For the kids or for the adults?

8 MS. RANKIN: For the -- the -- for the
9 students that are being taught by those adults that have
10 been through this type of program.

11 MS. BURKE: So one of the things you want to
12 look at would be your growth on access, that would be one.
13 One place to look, are we making growth with students
14 academically and for their actual language acquisition?
15 That would be one piece. Their achievement data would come
16 through a variety of places part being one, one of those.
17 One thing to remember that achievement tests aren't
18 necessarily written for language marks, that's not their
19 purpose. So we take a -- we take a look at that at the
20 access data to see where that is overall and our students
21 making growth, but it's not in isolation, right? It's --
22 it's complicated, and I'm not trying to evade your question
23 it is complicated. But you've got to take a look at all of
24 those pieces together.



1 MS. RANKIN: And -- and I -- I hear you and
2 I -- it seems extremely complicated especially with
3 multiple language.

4 MS. BURKE: Exactly.

5 MS. RANKIN: But when it's so expensive, we
6 have to weigh the benefits and -- and a- since money is so
7 tight it -- it's a critical issue as to the success of
8 programs that are doing this.

9 MS. BURKE: I -- I don't think giving
10 teachers better information and tools, I think that is good
11 use of our dollars.

12 MS. RANKIN: I've seen. I believe.

13 MS. BURKE: I do believe that's a good use
14 of our dollars and I believe that it's a hard job, and they
15 come out of a four-year program with the degree and they're
16 eager and enthusiastic, but it's quite honestly not enough.

17 MS. RANKIN: But it would be the same
18 program for the teachers regardless of the languages that
19 are in their classroom, is that correct?

20 MS. BURKE: That's correct, but we would
21 beef it up with these -- with this other licensing
22 requirement.

23 MS. O'NEILL: And I will jump in for just a
24 moment. The strategies that we have are all evidence based
25 strategies that we used. I'm happy to invite Morgan



1 (inaudible) to give us more or we can certainly answer
2 later as well.

3 MS. RANKIN: Are we that far along?

4 MS. O'NEILL: We're that far along in the
5 State of Colorado with our culturally and linguistically
6 diverse. So we definitely this is not something that is
7 new to us at all. We have had a CLD department for a
8 number of years that really focuses on those strategies and
9 under ALPA and the funding methods that support that, and
10 then the work that the CLD team does. There are
11 significant research based, evidence based strategies that we
12 search, but evidence based strategies that we utilize that
13 would be part of this that our departments of higher or
14 institute higher education also used. So we can do quite a
15 bit more education around that, and those strategies and
16 demonstrate the evidence that supports the strategies.

17 MS. RANKIN: Those would be the ones?

18 MS. O'NEILL: I think that's maybe the
19 questions at hand, what's the evidence that supports the
20 strategies? Certainly again, we can have that -- would you
21 like to have that conversation now or would you like us to
22 kind of we want to bring it back with some information.

23 MS. RANKIN: Specific questions.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: No, I -- I -- you answer.

25 MS. BURKE: What we're looking for. Okay.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Just stay here.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah, don't go away.

3 MS. BURKE: Takes a whole team to help
4 answer.

5 MS. SCHEFFEL: Thanks for coming and talking
6 about this issue. Yes.

7 MS. O'NEILL: We have right now an ELL
8 endorsement, correct colleague?

9 MS. BURKE: Correct. It's CLD. I'm sorry.
10 I'm gonna say it's CLD.

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: CLD endorsement. So this
12 discussion is about requiring some of those courses or some
13 of that content for current teachers getting their first
14 license, is that right?

15 MS. BURKE: It's that -- yes -- yes, and all
16 current renewal teachers. So it's really about all
17 teachers demonstrating that that evidence, the sixth
18 semester hours is kind of one way if we read through the,
19 the pathways document. You can also do it in other ways.

20 MS. SCHEFFEL: So the court the -- the
21 content in the sense exists already through the standards.

22 MS. BURKE: Yes.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then universities take
24 those standards and create courses. So this is about



1 saying that if you're getting your initial license or upon
2 renewal, you have to take courses that address 10 whatever.

3 MS. BURKE: Yes.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: So okay.

5 MS. BURKE: Yes.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: So -- so that's helpful. So
7 in terms of your question Pam and others when you're asking
8 specifically what it is, we can look at specifics by
9 looking at those standards, because they already exist.
10 And the question is what kind of courses do universities
11 develop to -- to impart that information that knowledge
12 skills and the dispositions associated with it, right?

13 MS. BURKE: That is correct.

14 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. So what we're trying
15 to decide here is are we going forth on the right path to
16 require that new teachers or renewing teachers take X
17 number of hours in order to get some distinction.

18 MS. BURKE: Or demonstrate that.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: Right.

20 MS. BURKE: Yes. Correct.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay, good. So the good news
22 is we have the content, and it's in the standards. And so
23 we really just have to decide what we want to require of
24 new or renewing teachers.

25 MS. BURKE: That is correct.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then some of your
2 questions about are around what -- what specifics would
3 universities tie to that, and truthfully we wouldn't say
4 that, because universities will take that information and,
5 you know, of course at Denver would look a little different
6 than the one that the viewed but they'd be aligned with the
7 same language in the standards, right?

8 MS. BURKE: You just did a wonderful job of
9 -- I'm like -- So Dr. Scheffel, I'm gonna trade you, no,
10 I'm so not trading your spot. But I'll sit over there and
11 -- no, thank you very much for outlining. You are correct.
12 That is where we're trying to go, yes.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so in terms of the voting
14 on this we're not doing that as information item, but you
15 need kind of marching orders as of what?

16 MS. BURKE: I would -- today would be great.
17 And we've been working with this for about a year and a
18 half now, and actually since 2011. So if we kind of go
19 back to that timeline, we've been having the conversation
20 around, how do we better support our -- our yields
21 holistically. So we've been having that conversation. So
22 it was really -- in October and today, it was really can we
23 continue down this path to engage more stakeholders larger,
24 bigger, stronger conversations to be able to gather the
25 information to come back to the board with more collective



1 thought around it, and the blessing of kind of, yeah, talk
2 about these pathways and comeback.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: And so the real issues, I
4 just want one more con, would be for the universities. Do
5 we have room in our curriculum to add these additional
6 courses?

7 MS. BURKE: I think there's a couple of
8 issues there. One is absolutely that one is how do we
9 create that room, and that's a conversation that we need to
10 have with our institutes higher education. The other one
11 is at the district level where we already have professional
12 development that's happening there, around our culturally
13 and linguistically diverse in conjunction with the exact
14 standards that we already have. So that's another one. So
15 where we would wrestle with the institutes a higher ed,
16 we'd be wrestling a little bit with that conversation at
17 the district level, and then the other one is how does the
18 Colorado Department of Education and specifically our
19 Office of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse help
20 support this initiative as well. How does that happen?
21 Because we've already talked about the cost burdens, so
22 yes.

23 MS. SCHEFFEL: But wouldn't the cost burden
24 be borne by the universities, less by the district except
25 and really be by the teachers renewing.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 1: Yeah. I mean, that's
2 what all teachers are.

3 MS. BURKE: It would be --

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: And then the university.

5 MS. BURKE: -- twofold writing. It could be
6 the university bearing costs. It also is because the
7 applicant pays for, our educator pays for those university
8 courses, and our districts pay for the renewing credits
9 that they offer in many cases. So there is -- there is a
10 cost burden that we would want to have a conversation
11 about.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Wouldn't -- Wouldn't --
13 Wouldn't it be the same cost burden though because people
14 have to take X number of credit hours to get renewed. So
15 the question is in what? Now, we would be doing is saying
16 we're requiring you to take X number of hours in this
17 content.

18 MS. BURKE: It is a shift. That is correct.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: So it's really a shift in
20 what our direction, not in the cost.

21 MS. BURKE: Not necessarily the cost and
22 you're correct. Today, that we all incur those costs as
23 educators to renew, and or to get our initial license. So
24 that is true. Thank you.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So but we wouldn't get rid of
2 the ESL endorsement.

3 MS. BURKE: That the CLD. Absolutely not.
4 So the pathways that we had articulated was a six credit
5 hour that's a certificate level for all educators, which I
6 will also tell you many of them already meet because of the
7 professional development that's happening at the district
8 level, and the support that the cultural and linguistic --

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 1: So the district --

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: The districts can -- can get
11 certificate? May I continue?

12 MS. BURKE: It would be at the district
13 level that they could help support that. So the six hours
14 and then we have the 12 hour pathway as well as a
15 certificate. The certificate would still come from the
16 department, so that it is on their license so that we don't
17 have the problem of gene has trained them in APS, and then
18 they moved to Burlington. And there's no, you know,
19 there's not really a demonstration for the teacher. This
20 is we want to make sure that they're very clearly.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. So it's -- it's going
22 to be at the University because Gene is one person in
23 Aurora. And so everybody's going to take the six hours.
24 And I guess my issue is will it take away from those people
25 who are really trying to be specialist and not someone who,



1 you know. I mean, I- I believe that everybody every
2 teacher should be able to teach to ESL students because our
3 state is -- is how it is. I mean, we have so many students
4 all over the state that need this help but --

5 MS. BURKE: Thank you -- Thank you for the
6 question. It will not take away from our CLD endorsement
7 specifically. We still have a very clear criteria
8 associated with the need for our CLD and endorsed,
9 specifically endorse. This absolutely is what you said
10 about your last comment is that all teachers really need to
11 be able to teach our ESL students, and hone in on those
12 strategies that support. So yes.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: And the pull out program in
14 our state is not an answer. So let me just see if I -- if
15 we can clarify this. There will be some districts that
16 will provide six credit hours --

17 MS. BURKE: They will have --

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: -- in this area?

19 MS. BURKE: They were absolutely have an
20 option --

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: They already do, and they'll
22 have the option and we will certify for their license. But
23 other districts that are -- particularly those districts
24 that are smaller, what opportunities do we have to help



1 those teachers because they have that challenge? I think
2 anyway they can do to -- at a realistic cost.

3 MS. BURKE: I think that's where we're
4 continuing to explore what the Colorado Department of
5 Education can do. In conjunction with our CLD that we
6 already kind of offered for our Elba funding. And I
7 apologize English Language Proficiency Act Funding. So
8 that's -- that's part of the conversation as well. Gene
9 just pointed out that on page five of the document, the
10 CLD. Culturally -- Colorado's Culture and Linguistically
11 Diverse Education path. If you look at page five, the very
12 bottom of that document. I apologize it is not on our
13 PowerPoint, kind of talks about the hierarchical structure
14 of the pathways, and how you could reach some of those.

15 So it could be either through art
16 demonstration of competency that you already have, because
17 many of our veteran teachers have already taken this, they
18 already have it. It could be through the districts,
19 because they provide an extensive amount, could be through
20 the Colorado Department of Education. And there is a very
21 strong call from our stakeholders right now to articulate
22 some online supports especially for our rural districts and
23 how would we do that. It could be partnering with an
24 institute of higher education. It could be partnering with
25 both these or it could be holistically supported by the



1 Colorado Department of Education. We're coming at it from
2 a very -- and the stakeholders have been incredibly vocal
3 about the needs to come out it from a multitude of
4 pathways, because you're right. The small districts simply
5 cannot meet those needs at that level.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: I have another question.

7 MS. BURKE: Sure.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Question. The question is,
9 do you have a stakeholder group that is -- I'm -- I'm not
10 talking about people who work with ESL. You mentioned that
11 there are administrators who don't have any ESL background,
12 but who are teachers who work in ESL, who are working with
13 students in ESL. Because, I mean you need those teachers
14 in there. We don't need administrators who hackwork with
15 teachers who teach ESL.

16 MS. BURKE: We need the teachers.

17 MS. FLORES: But we need teachers. ESL
18 trained teachers. And -- and would you say the majority of
19 those teachers are in your group or?

20 MS. BURKE: I would say right now because we
21 are still in a draft development phase, we have, yes we
22 have the voice of those teachers, again this is part of the
23 process as a whole of being able to really, if we go down
24 this path, there's -- there's a lot more communication and
25 feedback that we would wanna have from a multitude of



1 stakeholders, including those folks. This actually would
2 be a rule change eventually that would have to come to the
3 Board of Education for some rule adoption. So it would go
4 through the very formal rule making process as well, which
5 would garner us some more feedback. So right now I would
6 say yes we have the voice, do we have enough? No.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Commissioner.

8 MS. FLORES: And my other question had to do
9 with the -- the institutions. If the institutions are
10 certainly doing a CL -- LD of and I'm talking about the
11 University of Colorado, Boulder, Denver, all the other
12 universities around the state, they would then take two of
13 the courses, which I mean, I'm thinking of a couple of
14 courses like Acquisition, Methodology and Teaching ESL that
15 they would have everybody take those courses. Yeah, I'm
16 not talking about, you know, I can see these institutions
17 saying well, we'll do this over here in this class, we'll
18 do a little bit in this class but actually teach those
19 courses to all teachers.

20 MS. BURKE: That would be indeed part of
21 that and our Institutes of Higher Education would have the
22 opportunity to define how that looks, they would absolutely
23 be held accountable for meeting those standards for every
24 single teacher. And I do think that's important. That was
25 a question the Board asked last time, are we talking every



1 single teacher? And our answer was we believe this is
2 important for every single teacher in the State of
3 Colorado. That's, that has been the philosophical belief
4 to today. Again is, that's a conversation piece with the
5 Board and with more folks as we continue forward down this
6 bill.

7 MS. CORDIAL: Madam Chair.

8 MS. FLORES: And now I'm gonna ask another
9 question.

10 MS. CORDIAL: Can -- can somebody else ask
11 the question for just, can you just hold the question?

12 MS. FLORES: Well, this is a corollary
13 question. Yesterday the Department of Education, the US
14 Department of Education came down with rules and said that
15 they were going to be grading institutions of higher
16 education on how their teachers did. Now, if they train
17 the teachers but let's say right now they have to take it
18 from her, from you I'm sorry Jean, they have to take it
19 from you and they have to take it from you know other
20 people, other districts and such, would the university then
21 be called down if they're not doing, if four years from
22 now, the Department of Education came down and said to
23 Colorado, "Hey you're not doing a good job on that, even
24 though you said you were going to work on it and you did
25 put something in place but it's not working."



1 MS. BURKE: Well. So I'll be honest, we
2 have not engaged in that conversation since the rules just
3 came out yesterday. We haven't gotten very deep into that
4 with the Department of Higher Education because we
5 authorized, co-authorized that, so the next steps will be a
6 stakeholder group meeting and more conversation around what
7 does that mean for us, and for our -- our opportunities for
8 authorization and re-authorization of by AGs.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Commissioner.

10 MS. ANTHES: Yes, Madam Chair. I -- I just
11 have a suggestion for progressing forward on this. First
12 of all apologies that you did not have this sort of lengthy
13 memo in front of you that has the data and the strategies
14 in front of you. My recommendation would be for us to end
15 this presentation at this point, let you all read that
16 memo, digest some of that and then we schedule some follow
17 up questions, you know answer any questions, we also reread
18 the, re-listen to the tape that Dr. Scheffel. So
19 eloquently summarized this conversation and -- and make it
20 really clear the outcomes we're looking from you. I
21 realize this -- this wasn't as clear today so that would be
22 my recommendation for moving forward.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: I think the other challenge
24 was that because there was a lack of specificity in what
25 this actually is for those of us who are not, who don't



1 really know what this means. It made it a little bit
2 harder for us to wrap our arms. So I think we're getting
3 there to the extent, I ask this all the time, to the extent
4 that you can give examples, I think it helps all of us to
5 understand better.

6 MS. FLORES: And I think we understand
7 strategies. So if you could detail the strategies, we
8 would appreciate it.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Jane. Do you have -- do you
10 have a technical problem? Sorry.

11 MS. GOFF: I was just gonna say, I think
12 what you're saying is detail strategies but I think really
13 if the standards are robust, this -- this decision is
14 really about, can we require newly licensing teachers and
15 currently license who are renewing to take specific types
16 of courses? If you look at the nature of the courses or
17 the credit hours, what they can get credit for right now is
18 fairly general. What this does is insert inside of that
19 specificity for yes, while you're getting renewed or
20 initially licensed, you have to take this content at least
21 six hours of it or whatever.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: And how soon. For example.

23 MS. GOFF: And that's really where our
24 decision point comes, it's up to the universities and the
25 students and the people offering these courses such as in



1 Aurora, to look at those standards and develop great robust
2 professional development. And -- so I think if your issue
3 is well we don't have strong contents, we can -- we can
4 look at the standards. Right. Well that would be
5 interesting but I'm just saying our -- our role is - this
6 is our role.

7 MS. MAZANEC: That's not the issue right
8 there but can we give her -- how many hours you have to do
9 for renewal?

10 (Overlapping)

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So it is only six.

12 MS. BURKE: It is only six.

13 MS. MAZANEC: So basically we're totally
14 renewing teachers?

15 MS. BURKE: Some renewing teachers, and --
16 and we've actually asked for multiple years that this would
17 be part of their curriculum, so that it wouldn't have to be
18 just in a five year span. We actually have a 10 year time
19 line, associated with that. And so, lots of conversation
20 around that because we heard exactly the same thing Pam is,
21 are you kidding me? I have to do just that? And how soon
22 because I just renewed my license two months ago. And so,
23 you know, where do I -- where do I get on or I renewed it
24 three years ago, how do I get onto that track and right
25 now?



1 MS. SCHROEDER: But Doctor how many teachers
2 do you see renewals for that have a whole lot more than six
3 hours?

4 MS. BURKE: A significant number.

5 (Overlapping)

6 MS. BURKE: I would say they take more.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Professionally I think my
8 limited experience is the majority of teachers are always
9 learning new stuff and they're gonna be engaged in
10 coursework that follows their own passion, as well as
11 probably being willing to -- to learn this. Jane. Sorry.

12 MS. GOFF: Thought questions mostly and I
13 think as the conversation continues either among ourselves
14 or among the higher ed people that will be working on this,
15 we have our division on this just culturally and
16 linguistically diverse. I am not hearing the cultural part
17 of this. I think this has an awful lot to do with language
18 acquisition, and a recognition of how key that is to having
19 that be successful.

20 Some general questions and I -- I would add
21 this to our list of last time. Do we have any idea or can
22 we get an estimate without a lot of -- a lot of trouble, of
23 the number of EL teachers are already CLD certified people
24 whatever data we might have that have had the actual
25 personal experience of learning another language. And



1 whether or not, that has come up yet in the conversations
2 about what would be thoughts among -- among higher ed about
3 making that part of a six hour credit program, or some part
4 of a course that is -- is dealt with addressed in teacher
5 prep or in professional development for renewal. I -- I
6 think I should be able to, I -- I -- I haven't had to do
7 this for a while, illustrate and I will not do it today,
8 there's -- there's just so much complexity involved in
9 learning another language.

10 And what, when we're talking about adding on
11 the layer of academic vocabulary, on the other level of
12 another language when the -- the -- the cultural life, the
13 life of the person which is always reflected in language
14 and vice versa, is not established to be something that is
15 innately familiar to the person. So until -- until I can
16 here that there has been something to address the cultural
17 development needs of teachers. Now we have had, we've had
18 some success in various districts across the state about
19 Culturally Competent Techniques, and ways classroom
20 teachers can address some of these on a -- on a higher
21 level surface -- surface starting level.

22 But I -- I just, I'm -- I'm an -- I'm an
23 experienced person in this and I have a strong belief and
24 conviction that unless a person lives in that culture, or
25 has some really good idea about what goes on in life, it's



1 going to be very difficult to tune into young kids who are
2 living that life. And this could be done in -- in a lot of
3 different ways. I'm -- I'm thinking that at some point,
4 not now, we'll get into how this impacts licensure, and
5 what qualifies for licensure, and whether or not we're
6 going to -- to look at a new way of -- of granting
7 qualifications to people to teach school. It may not be
8 our standard, our traditional route. We may be looking at
9 the 1991 teacher licensure act a little bit differently.

10 Eventually, I think we're gonna be looking
11 at that. But I'm just, I'm concerned that we are not --
12 we're not focusing in on the true human part of this, and
13 that that makes an awful lot of difference in how people
14 are gonna acquire the technical part of life which is the
15 language and the words that we use. Because without the
16 feeling and the human beingness that comes with the whole
17 thing of education, we're not gonna make the strides we
18 need to, and that, that's all I will say on that. So I'm
19 looking forward to continuing this topic.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you.

21 MS. GOFF: I just think it's so encompassing
22 of everything, and, you know, how are we gonna, how are we
23 gonna successfully teach and help -- and help kids achieve
24 and meet high standards and expectations in science while
25 we're skipping a big step there.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Ms. Flores, do you have any
2 comments on this engagement piece?

3 MS. FLORES: The cultural piece?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: The cultural piece.

5 MS. O'NEILL: I certainly resonate with what
6 she's asking, I -- I think some of the questions before
7 were really specific about strategies. You can't divorce
8 your language from your culture, right? The -- the
9 language of my home is the language of my heart. That's
10 who I am. We can't leave that kid out in the hallway while
11 we teach them English. And certainly that's a huge part of
12 what we're working very hard in Aurora to do, thinking
13 about all of our equity work, thinking about kids as -- as
14 whole. So, I resonate with that. I think you'll see
15 echoes of that in some of the work the committee's done,
16 but like Colleen said we've just barely kind of started to
17 scratch the surface about what we -- what we believe
18 teachers need to be more prepared for when they -- when
19 they come out of school, and that's what we're asking.
20 We're asking that there's some kind of an expectation for
21 that.

22 MS. GOFF: No I -- I am very grateful,
23 appreciate everything that's -- that's being proposed here.
24 I'm just looking down the road a little bit. So as we --
25 as we look at long term success of these kids, it's -- it's



1 -- it's just innate to what they are as people, and a lot
2 of that requires a knowledge some -- some awareness, some
3 developing awareness on the part of those of us who teach
4 kids to have a pretty -- a pretty good beginning handle on
5 how literally what their lives are about, and that's why I,
6 the my initial question is pretty basic. You know, do we
7 have any information about how many EL teachers or -- or
8 administrators to have, literally have the experience of
9 living in or working inside another culture for some
10 (inaudible).

11 MS. BURKE: It will be an, I'll answer that
12 just briefly. It would be very difficult for us because we
13 do not ask those questions of individuals. It would be
14 more qualitative than it would quantitative at this point
15 in time. So we can get a kind of a high level estimate of
16 folks from like healthy groups or EL groups, but it would
17 be a very qualitative piece, yeah.

18 MS. GOFF: No, I understand, you know, I
19 just wondered if, sometimes --

20 MS. BURKE: But it's a good question I
21 appreciate it.

22 MS. GOFF: Anecdotally, things come out when
23 people talk about their experience.

24 MS. FLORES: Dr. O'Neill, would looking at
25 the standards help us? I me, I think we're expressing an



1 interest to get a little bit into the weeds which is not
2 usually what we wanna do but in order to understand better.

3 MS. O'NEILL: Sure.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Am wondering if that
5 wouldn't help us?

6 MS. O'NEILL: I think it would. They do
7 appear in the document on page nine,.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: That we -- that we can read.

9 MS. O'NEILL: Yeah. The document, the one
10 actually from last Board of Education meeting, they appear
11 in that document on page nine, which is the Colorado
12 Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Educator Development
13 action plan. The actual standards taken out of the rules,
14 the Educator Preparation and Licensing Rules begin to
15 appear on page nine. What, my disclaimer around that
16 though please know is that is 24 credit hours, semester
17 hours of content that individuals need to have. As Dr.
18 Shuffle had indicated earlier the six credit hours would be
19 usurped, basically directly from that, some individual
20 pieces that are, you know, basically the -- the best
21 practices that we can give to all teachers to really fine
22 tune that. But that would be exactly yes exactly what we
23 would be looking at.

24 MS. SCHROEDER: Other comments or questions
25 folks? Thank you very much.



1 MS. O'NEILL: Thank you very much for the
2 patience as we worked our way through.

3 MS. SCHROEDER: I believe we should be
4 taking a short break until 10:30 a.m., we have a hearing.
5 Thank you. The Board of Education will now conduct a
6 public rulemaking hearing for the rules of the
7 administration of accountability for alternative campuses,
8 1 CCR-301-57. The State Board voted to approve the notice
9 of rulemaking in its August 10th, 2016 Board meeting. A
10 hearing to promulgate get these rules was made known during
11 publication of a public notice on August 25th, 2016 through
12 the Colorado register and by State Board notice on October
13 5th, 2016. Commissioner's staff prepared to provide an
14 overview of these.

15 MS. FLORES: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair,
16 I'll turn this over to Allyson Pearson to take us through.

17 MS. PEARSON: Thanks. Good morning
18 everybody. I'm here with Jessica Nevels who needs
19 Alternative Education Campus Accountability work at CDE.
20 So the notice today or the rulemaking hearing today is
21 around accountability rules for alternative education
22 campuses. Alternative education campuses are defined in
23 statute very specifically in that statute changed actually
24 last spring, which is why we're doing this change to
25 rulemaking.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So just for the benefit of
2 the audience --

3 MS. PEARSON: Yep.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: -- what's alternative campus
5 just in terms of general?

6 MS. PEARSON: Now, alternative campus is a
7 school with now 90 percent, used to be 95 percent but now
8 with 95, 90 percent of students that meet high risk
9 categories, and those are defined very specifically and
10 statute it, maybe students who have lost a parent, students
11 who have been in an abusive situation, students who have
12 struggled with drug use or their parents have, students
13 that have been through a lot of challenging experiences.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. Thank you.

15 MS. PEARSON: Thank you. And so, we have a
16 different accountability system, where we've adjusted
17 accountability framework for those schools -- those schools
18 that serve a high population of high risk students. So
19 what we're talking about today is really just around
20 aligning the rules with the statutory changes. What we did
21 decide to do, we talked about this in August, because the
22 language in the rules was duplicative of what was in the
23 statute. So we were cleaning up, and we decided that
24 instead of repeating it all again, just like we were giving



1 the US Department of Education a hard time for that, we
2 would take that out and just reference statute, there.

3 One other thing we wanted to talk about
4 today, you all last December heard from the accountability
5 work group that was focusing on the alternative education
6 campuses, and they had some recommendations that were
7 specific to the Board rules. And you'll hear from some of
8 them today, that some of them submitted comments as well
9 about changes they'd like to see there. CDE is supportive
10 of those changes. The reason why we didn't put them in the
11 framework's right now is one, we were in the rules right
12 now, is one that we were focusing on the statutory changes
13 and two, in order to implement the changes that the work
14 group came to, we need resources to be able to do that. So
15 if we put forward and added that to the frame and to the
16 rules, we wouldn't have the ability to actually implement
17 them because we don't have the resources here. Jessica
18 will talk more in more detail about that.

19 MS. FLORES: Right.

20 MS. PEARSON: So what we are putting forward
21 is just really the cleaning, just cleaning up to align with
22 legislative changes.

23 MS. FLORES: Jessica?

24 MS. NEVELS: Hi. Good morning.

25 MS. FLORES: Morning.



1 MS. NEVELS: I'll talk just a little bit
2 through some of the comments that we got, you see on the
3 handout that I've listed all the comments that we got
4 verbatim from the co-mentors. They submitted them to us
5 from the EAC community as well as our CDE response. For
6 the first two comments that came in, most of the comments
7 could be covered within current statute and Board roles.
8 The comments were broad enough. There were few specifics
9 that we can't cover in the current rules, and those are
10 listed out in those first two comments. And then, for the
11 third comment, which Allyson introduced was from
12 stakeholders from the EAC community that are again here,
13 that are going to speak during public comment, just around
14 the addition of qualitative measures, as well as a
15 qualitative evaluation for alternative education campuses.
16 On the final page of the written comments, I just included
17 the summary from the Alternative Education Campus
18 Accountability work group that was held last fall, just
19 around what additional resources CDE would need to put
20 forward the qualitative metrics as well as the qualitative
21 evaluation, and you'll see the specific resources. I can
22 mention them here. Just be one FTE for the qualitative
23 metrics development, and then an additional one FTE for
24 conducting qualitative evaluations of the alternative



1 education campuses, plus a fairly significant amount of
2 funding going to our side.

3 MS. FLORES: So they need to go to the
4 legislature for that?

5 MS. NEVELS: Yeah.

6 MS. FLORES: Money.

7 MS. NEVELS: Okay, great.

8 MS. FLORES: Anything else?

9 MS. NEVELS: I (inaudible) none.

10 MS. FLORES: Okay, great. Thank you. Thank
11 you. Is there anyone here present to testify? And I -- I
12 do have two names. And then if there's anyone else please
13 speak up. Michael Epke.

14 MR. EPKE: Good morning. My name is Michael
15 Epke, I'm a Principal with the New America School campus
16 located in Colorado. And, regarding these qualitative
17 inclusions that we are looking for, you know, really I
18 wanna speak from a personal experience. As a school, we've
19 long struggled with some of the performance metrics that
20 are in place even with the optional measures. For the last
21 two years, however, I brought in an external team to
22 provide a review of our school and in particular looking at
23 what we went through last fall and having the same team
24 come back literally last week.



1 The learning that happens and the value that
2 comes by having an -- an external group come in and
3 communicate with objectivity and with clarity what they are
4 looking for, what we are putting forward by providing data
5 on the front end. In particular associated with some of
6 the opportunity measures that many alternative schools
7 really push for. The -- the team was able to see a process
8 unfold that began last fall and this is not through, but is
9 still in the midst of improvement and that's really what I
10 believe we're looking for in all schools. Is improvement
11 so that students have more opportunity at the end of their
12 career in school than they did when they joined that AEC
13 community, and in the case of my particular school, most of
14 our students have struggled prior to coming and it's the
15 provision of that opportunity be it night school, credit
16 recovery, additional supports for social and emotional
17 needs that really make AEC stand out. Unfortunately,
18 there's not a clean way to measure that right now.

19 But an objective team in coming in with a
20 clear set of guidelines is able to provide at least a
21 narrative response that I believe we can find value in
22 within our accountability framework.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Martin
24 Schneider, is that right?



1 MR. SCHNEIDER: Morning, Board Members.
2 Thanks for the opportunity to be here. Let us have three
3 good minutes together. Martin Schneider, I'm the Director
4 at Community Prep school, downtown Colorado Springs, and
5 will serve approximately 400 high risk youth over the
6 course of this year in the Springs. CBS is the school that
7 fulfills the bottom of the safety net in our community.
8 When students have tried multiple other options, they tend
9 to end up with us. Consequently, we try to do school in a
10 little different way to try to reengage them and capture
11 their motivation and help them to hit the restart button.
12 It is -- it is daunting and sometimes seemingly impossible
13 work. If I could cite a study commissioned by West Ed in
14 California. A few years ago, they looked at the rate of
15 graduation among kids that have been recovered from
16 dropping out.

17 And so, the study in summary looked at all
18 the kids that they studied that have dropped out of high
19 school. 30 percent of those kids were able to get in a
20 recovery dropout recovery or an alternative program. 70
21 percent state dropped out. Of the 30 percent that dropped
22 out, only 20 percent of them only made it to high school
23 graduation in -- in a national study. So what's that mean
24 in real numbers? Every thousand students that drop out, 60
25 of them will graduate, and that's what the data shows us.



1 So this work that AEC is doing cross the country and in
2 Colorado particular is very much an uphill climb, which was
3 the impetus to try and promote qualitative measures for
4 alternative schools. The working group that met for six
5 months in 2015 which I was part of, came out with a twofold
6 recommendation for qualitative measures.

7 Phase 1 or Part 1 was to adjust the school
8 framework for alternative campuses to reflect 20 percent of
9 the measure being qualitative for alternative education
10 campuses. Phase 2 was what Mike spoke to a qualitative
11 review system that rotates through schools and gives them
12 external input and it's part of the accountability system.
13 I'm here today particularly to promote and push and cajole
14 for part one, the changes to the -- the FCPA. And so, I --
15 I fully understand where the department is coming from on a
16 resource perspective. I want to push for the import of
17 what these measures can mean to alternative schools. Not
18 only will they more greatly reflect the reality of the work
19 of AECs across the state, they will also lead to innovation
20 and a new set of best practices that AECs are trying all
21 the time to support that, promote that, and to measure that
22 can make a world of difference across the states. We
23 can learn from each other.

24 And so with that to include just a small
25 part one out of five, 20 percent. In our measurement



1 system to me is not only fair and appropriate but it's also
2 something that can make a difference for these 94 percent
3 of kids that drop out, that never make it, that we can
4 capture more them by strengthening AECs. I can't say this
5 strongly enough, how important this is for those kids.
6 Thank you all for your time.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you, and thank you to
8 both of you for the comment you've made. Are there any
9 other people who wanna speak to us? Great. So that
10 concludes the hearing. Is there any further discussion,
11 colleagues and or is there motion please? Pam.

12 MS. MAZANEC: I just want to say thank you
13 very much for coming. And I -- I would just like us to
14 direct staff to be as flexible as possible with these AECs.
15 I think that he made a very good point. We have a
16 population of students that what -- what we can do to help
17 them succeed in the -- the numbers are daunting. And I
18 think we need to do everything we can to move in the right
19 direction. We need flexibility for this demographic or
20 this population of students, so.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: Jane? Oh, go ahead and make
22 a motion. Oh sorry, you have a question?

23 MS. GOFF: On the crosswalk and a part B on
24 the right, it says, "Has dropped out of school for excused
25 or unexcused absences from public school." Sorry, it is



1 on, and -- and they have, you have a paragraph there. Are
2 there any exceptions to that? Or is that exactly the way
3 it, I, when we're dealing with these kinds of students,
4 there's always exceptions to some of these rules here and
5 yet I don't see any flexibility at all there.

6 MS. PEARSON: So that's the language that
7 comes straight from the statute about how it's defined.
8 Are you thinking flexibility in terms of a student may have
9 of less than four excused or unexcused absences in a month
10 or 10 in the year and just --

11 MS. GOFF: Yeah. It's still small, you
12 know, and it's -- you know, not consistent month after
13 month. I just, that -- that was a little bit of a concern
14 to me. But if it's in statute what --

15 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

16 MS. GOFF: And then on G below that, it says
17 has a documented history of mental or behavioral health
18 issue or has experienced significant trauma or is there
19 some supposed to be after that?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. I can respond to
21 that. That's just on. There is another letter after that.
22 I guess that would be N. But that there is no change
23 required for that. So the order just kind of hangs out.

24 MS. PEARSON: It just is hanging chair, the
25 -- THE capitals are what changed in the -- from 2016



1 legislation. And so we just put that in the other pieces
2 that remain the same.

3 MS. MAZANEC: And then on the responses to
4 written comments a new assessment. Maybe you can just
5 clarify for me. I thought that a student, we were
6 responsible for education before their 21st birthday. But
7 it's something about if they turn 21 before October, how do
8 we get to that odd date or is that student count? Is that
9 something that has to do with that? I'm a little confused
10 on how old they can be when we have to teach them.

11 MS. PEARSON: I mean I don't know all the
12 school finance pieces, but I do know that it goes up to 21.

13 MS. MAZANEC: Yeah. So if they're 21 in
14 February, then that's all they get up there in February of
15 their high school senior year or something like. I --

16 Kick them out. They may have to get back to
17 you on that question. Yeah. There's a living thing talks
18 planned October. Here it is October 1st on the right under
19 age 21 on October 1st.

20 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. And I think that what
21 was in there students under the age of 20 years. That's
22 what the statute currently.

23 MS. GOFF: So we wanna change the statute
24 there correct.



1 MS. PEARSON: Somebody -- somebody might
2 wanna do that to align with the funding. Yeah, I think
3 (inaudible).

4 MS. GOFF: And then on that left side it
5 says, "And his parent is a parenting student a pregnant
6 student or the partner of a pregnant student?" Can you
7 define partner there?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 4: Father or mother.
9 Father.

10 MS. GOFF: I'm sorry.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE2: Father.

12 MS. PEARSON: I think that's what -- that
13 what the, how much it was intending.

14 MS. GOFF: That -- that would be the intent.

15 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, because a mother can't
16 do it.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 3: Mother is the one
18 that's pregnant.

19 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 9: Usually.

21 MS. PEARSON: And that -- that was, you
22 know, we're, in statute defines parent. It says parent and
23 doesn't, it says pregnant as well but it also says parent.
24 So we thought that you could understand parent, the parent
25 of a child that has been born or has not yet been born and



1 incorporate this request or concern into that definition to
2 that point about looking flexibly.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE2: (Inaudible) parent or
4 a partner?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 1: A parent would be the
6 father, correct?

7 MS. PEARSON: Exactly. Exactly.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 1: This seems to be
9 LGBTQ inclusive?

10 MS. PEARSON: And I don't know what the
11 intention was from that person who submitted that.

12 MS. GOFF: Anyway, those were the thing, the
13 questions I had.

14 MS. MAZANEC: And that's what it says, more
15 gender inclusive.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE2: So as a bit of an
17 aside, I think we wanna remember that under ESSA, we are
18 going to be looking at another variable in our
19 accountability system. However, I believe it's one that
20 needs to be quantified in some way. Quantified but also
21 can be a qualitative measure. So when we're working on
22 that in our ESSA plan, let's be remembering this request in
23 the, with the possibility there are some, that it's helpful
24 to have the overlap for both regular schools and
25 alternative schools.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I'm just kind of thinking
2 it's possible that that might, it might -- might move
3 forward in that direction rather than needing to go to the
4 legislature to change the accountability rules for
5 alternative schools. Jane.

6 MS. GOFF: Well, I mean I need -- I need to
7 get some clarity on what you mean by overlap because we're
8 talking. As I'm hearing, a lot of different circumstances
9 with AECs and accountability than we are with regular
10 schools and I think our fourth, fifth option for our
11 indicator needs to be something that's scalable statewide.
12 So whether that's interpreted as all AEC you see state by
13 which this does or rather it means something unique to AECs
14 that we're trying to scale statewide. I'm not sure how
15 that would go. So I just wanna know what the overlaps are.

16 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I think that's a good
17 consideration for that work group to think about of when
18 they're looking at the other indicator, how would that
19 play, plays. We already have some additional indicators
20 for AECs in terms of attendance and truancy and engagement
21 measures and other optional measures they can submit to.
22 There is more flexibility in that framework right now than
23 we currently have.

24 MS. GOFF: Is that in rules, it not in
25 statute?



1 MS. PEARSON: It's in the rules.

2 MS. GOFF: Oh, good.

3 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

4 MS. GOFF: Okay. So that does give us --

5 MS. PEARSON: You guys have that
6 flexibility. We have the conundrum of whether or not.
7 Federally, they're gonna look at our AEC framework as well
8 because it is different than our traditional framework, and
9 interpretation of the ESSA is not totally clear on whether
10 we're gonna be able to continue federally not because it's
11 in our state law clearly.

12 MS. GOFF: Okay.

13 MS. PEARSON: But we're just gonna have to
14 do some work there.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Yes.

16 MS. FLORES: And 20 percent that you talk,
17 excuse me and the 20 percent that you spoke about. You
18 said a new set of practices of 20 percent induction by
19 strengthening. Do you mean that there is a curricular that
20 would be, that all would have to use that's 20 percent? I
21 didn't understand that part.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE2: May I? We're not
23 supposed to interact with those (inaudible).

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Recommendations from
25 their AEC workgroup that 20 percent of the revised school



1 performance framework for AEC is our recommendation out of
2 that workgroup were qualitative measures. And that's a
3 reflection of innovative practices that AECs are currently
4 doing.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, thank you. Thank you
6 very much.

7 MS. GOFF: We're looking at the responses to
8 written comments in that table, current and proposed. So
9 that's not written into the rules though, right? I mean
10 where does this go? The percent for academic achievement,
11 for growth, for engagement and so forth?

12 MS. PEARSON: You're looking at that table
13 at the end, right?

14 MS. GOFF: Yes.

15 MS. PEARSON: So that -- that's just an
16 addendum we put to the written comments. That came out.
17 You all saw that last December. It came from the
18 accountability Alternative Education Campus, a kind of
19 workgroup and their recommendations. We wanted to give it
20 to you in contact since it related to some of the comments.
21 So those are things that could be changed. But like we
22 said, those are things we didn't put them forward into the
23 rules 'cause we don't have the resources and capacity right
24 now to implement that fully.



1 MS. GOFF: And so, can you say how that
2 works with implementation and capacity 'cause doesn't that
3 table just say that the -- the metrics, the algorithm sort
4 of to determine how the schools are -- are assessed
5 changes? But does that -- does that take resources because
6 --

7 MS. PEARSON: So because they added. If we
8 looked at opportunity measures at the bottom is added as
9 new additional indicator.

10 MS. GOFF: What is an -- what is an
11 opportunity like a qualitative measure?

12 MS. PEARSON: Do you wanna talk about that
13 (inaudible).

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 1: Yeah, the additional
15 resources would be required through creation of those
16 metrics of the opportunity measures. There are about five
17 opportunely measures that were suggested as part of the
18 workgroup where AECs could select which ones which were
19 most appropriate for their school. So in order to develop
20 those measures, we would need some more resources at CDE,
21 and then to test them out and obviously put in roles and
22 talk with the (inaudible).

23 MS. GOFF: Are there opportunity measures
24 that already exist, so you don't have to develop them? I'm



1 just thinking to make these shifts doesn't strike me as
2 resource intensive, unless you have to develop measures.

3 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. I think there's some
4 existing measures in the country that you could pull from
5 and how those roll out in Colorado, and how they're
6 implemented from school to school, and our schools are
7 using them. I think there just needs to be some research.
8 Before we put anything in accountability, we wanna make
9 sure we're doing some research and understanding of what
10 those measures are and how they used and the burden on
11 schools and districts to include or if it's an optional
12 piece. Something as we have staff time we can start slowly
13 implementing, but it's nothing that we can commit to right
14 now because we just don't have the staff resources to be
15 able to do that.

16 MS. GOFF: But does that mean the rest of
17 the table stays the way it is. Academic achievement is 15
18 not five. Growth is 35 not 25. Is right?

19 MS. PEARSON: We're at right now.

20 MS. GOFF: So what do we think of that? I
21 mean because I think what you're saying is this workgroup
22 suggested these changes. So shouldn't we be thinking about
23 whether or not are good suggestions and leave the
24 opportunity to measure peace alone for the moment?



1 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. Absolutely, I think
2 that was part of that conversation last December about this
3 was what the workgroup was, and if we wanted to have any
4 changes to the system.

5 MS. GOFF: But it looks like they're not in
6 the rules, so we're not voting on these responses we're
7 voting on the rules.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. We're just voting on
9 the changes. At this time, we are not prohibited from
10 coming back to this with further discussion. In fact, we
11 are, I think we're all open.

12 MS. GOFF: Would it be unusual that these
13 metrics are not in the rules? Or wouldn't -- would it --
14 would it, wouldn't these metrics saying, in other words
15 when we do post workforce readiness or whatever we're
16 saying what percent is growth? Well, or just achievement.
17 What percent is growth? What percent is achievement? Is
18 that in our rules or where is that? And so by analogy for
19 this, where is, where are these metrics? It's not in the
20 rules then just in our procedures or something? Okay. So
21 they're not in the rules anyway?

22 MS. PEARSON: Yeah. If you all would like
23 to come talk about the alternative campus more plus
24 frameworks more, we could have that conversation.

25 MS. GOFF: Yeah.



1 MS. PEARSON: We're getting a lot of the
2 AC's, we're getting NC and what the AC frameworks and that
3 we've got the regular frameworks that we're working on,
4 it's more of a hand process cause they do have optional
5 measures. So we could talk about those percentages and
6 weightings probably for the 2017 frameworks, because the
7 timing would be really hard to do it for 2016.

8 MS. GOFF: I just think they're really
9 suggesting some fairly dramatic shifts.

10 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

11 MS. GOFF: I mean to say achievement is 15
12 and to propose five means that the nature of the population
13 is really maybe more needy than we thought or maybe it's
14 just, I don't know, but there's got to be a reason for that
15 big of a suggestion.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. I think it's an
17 important discussion that --

18 MS. GOFF: Right. I think so.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: -- we have to dig into.

20 MS. GOFF: I mean, they're just, you know,
21 these folks --

22 MS. SCHROEDER: And right now, what we're
23 trying to do is align the rules with the change in
24 legislation.

25 MS. GOFF: Right.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: And we're acknowledging that
2 this needs to come forward --

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: -- along with 3,000 other
5 things that are on our agenda for the next six months.

6 MS. GOFF: Okay.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Unfortunately (inaudible).

8 MS. GOFF: Yeah, that sounds good.

9 MS. PEARSON: But I think.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay --

11 MS. PEARSON: Yeah, and to --

12 MS. SCHROEDER: -- not to be forgotten.

13 MS. PEARSON: -- having that conversation.

14 No, and having that along with the ESSA, once we are
15 getting a little more clear about how we can go forward
16 with ESSA and REEC, as is in how that all fits together, I
17 think it will be a really important to have that
18 conversation.

19 MS. GOFF: So currently, the current
20 framework will go for this academic year '16, '17, and then
21 changes could kick in for the next year. And what's the
22 date by which we'd have to decide so that we could actually
23 make a change?

24 MS. SCHROEDER: It makes sense for us to
25 hear what --



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: -- from the feds what we can
3 do before we --

4 MS. GOFF: Make a shift. What would do that
5 date be like? Fall?

6 MS. PEARSON: No.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: We have a good plan.

8 MS. PEARSON: Yeah.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. That will be
10 adoption of the plan.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So is that (inaudible).

12 MS. PEARSON: We want to think about how
13 much of the detail we want to put into our ESSA plan, but I
14 think we could have the conversation at the same time, and
15 I think it's hard for schools and districts for us to wait
16 until the end of a school year of which they're being held
17 accountable to make those decisions, but that's what we've
18 done for the '16. So I think, you know, come this spring,
19 we'd want to have that decision made in the spring if we
20 want to change it. If you're going to align it more with
21 the work group recommendations, I think there's a lot of
22 support and buy-in for that already since that stakeholder
23 work was done there.

24 MS. GOFF: So if we could just put it on the
25 calendar sometimes so that we don't, you know, so for '17,



1 '18, we are able to catch it soon enough to at least think
2 about these suggestions.

3 MS. PEARSON: Sure.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Folks, I'm ready for a
5 motion.

6 MS. FLORES: No, excuse me. I'd like to
7 just ask.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Sure.

9 MS. FLORES: May I have a hard copy of that,
10 of the indicators? Because I have the rules, I don't have
11 the indicator responses to comments on new assessment
12 provisions. Are you sure it's not in the back?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You have it. It's in
14 your packet.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We all got it. We all
16 got it in our packet.

17 MS. FLORES: I'm sorry, I don't have it, and
18 I've really looked.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I'd be happy to share
20 mine with you.

21 MS. FLORES: Thank you.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: She's got it in her
23 hand. Never mind.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, I don't have it.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Folks, can I have a motion,
2 please? Thank you.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I move to approve the rules
4 for the Administration of Accountability for Alternative
5 Campuses, 1 CCR 301-57.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Is there a second?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Are we ready to vote?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah. Should we read
10 the next one about the unanimous vote? Yeah.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sure.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: If vote is not unanimous, the
13 Board will consider approval of these rules at the
14 September State Board meeting. Does that mean unanimous,
15 you know, September doesn't work very well. Let's go
16 November.

17 How about November? Yeah. How about
18 November?

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And then we can deal
20 with the second.

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: My question is -- is
22 unanimous what we have here right now?

23 MS. CORDIAL: Yes, yes, yes.

24 MS. FLORES: Did I vote?



1 MS. CORDIAL: No, we haven't called the roll
2 yet.

3 MS. FLORES: Oh, good because I was looking
4 over this material that I didn't have.

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

6 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We did that.

7 MS. SCHROEDER: Are we ready to vote, folks?
8 Any more comments?

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And we're voting on?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: A motion --

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we need a
12 second.

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: To approve.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes, we had a second.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Thank you, Jane.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jane wants a second.

18 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Flores?

19 MS. FLORES: I guess so.

20 MS. CORDIAL: Okay. Board Member Goff?

21 MS. GOFF: Aye.

22 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Mazanec?

23 MS. MAZANEC: Yes.

24 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Rankin?

25 MS. RANKIN: Yes.



1 MS. CORDIAL: Board Member Scheffel?
2 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.
3 MS. CORDIAL: And Board Member Schroeder?
4 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.
5 MS. CORDIAL: Thank you.
6 MS. FLORES: I just wanna say that I need to
7 have all this material.
8 MS. CORDIAL: We'll make sure you have all
9 of your materials next time, Board Member Flores. Thank
10 you.
11 MS. FLORES: Thank you very much.
12 MS. SCHROEDER: Our next item. So notice of
13 rulemaking for the roles for the administration of School
14 Turnaround Leaders Development Program 1 CCR 301-95.
15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can start later.
16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.
17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We just came so early.
18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: So go ahead.
19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We can be really quick
20 if you want to be really quick on this because there's been
21 11:00 a.m. actual time.
22 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah, another rulemaking
23 hearing at 11:00 a.m. But we have a minute so we can.
24 MS. SCHROEDER: I thought we could be late
25 for rulemaking just not early.



1 MS. CORDIAL: We can.

2 MS. SCHROEDER: Am I wrong?

3 MS. CORDIAL: No, you are correct.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. Sorry, Madam Chair,
5 but we are -- not for Madam Chair, me -- I'm the Madam
6 Chair. Next item on the agenda is the consideration of a
7 notice of rulemaking for the rules for the administration
8 of the School Turnaround Leaders Development Program 1 CCR
9 301-95. So a motion on the table, please?

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I make a motion to
11 approve the notice of rulemaking for the rules of the
12 administration of the School Turnaround Leaders Development
13 Program 1 CCR 301-95.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: It's the proper motion. Is
15 there a second, please?

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you. Commissioner,
18 the staff prepared to provide a quick overview.

19 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you. This is just
20 a notice of rulemaking, very quick overview and I'll turn
21 it over to Alyssa Pearson and Peter Sherman.

22 MS. PEARSON: Hello again. So this is
23 really we'll just do those quick and dirty of this notice.
24 The Office of Legislative Legal Services, OLLS reviews our
25 rules every year that there's a change. And reviewing the



1 rules, they had a question about the RFP, the Request for
2 Providers, for the Providers for the School Turnaround
3 Leadership Development Program, and they wanted to make
4 sure that there was a differentiation in the rules around
5 Providers applying just to be Providers and Providers that
6 were applying for funds.

7 We had that differentiation in our RFP, but
8 they wanted to see it in the actual rules. So we've added
9 in language to the actual rules that mirrors what we're
10 doing in the RFP. You all saw that draft RFP that got
11 emailed to you a little bit ago, probably a month ago, I
12 think now. So this is just cleaning up and putting those
13 details into the rules that OLLS asked for. In addition,
14 we changed one of the dates in the rules just to work on
15 timing that works better with Providers and all that.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Give folks more time.

17 MS. PEARSON: To give folks more time to do
18 it. So that's what this notice is about.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Colleagues, do we need to go
20 through the PowerPoint that staff prepared? I'm sure we've
21 all read it. Are there any questions about this?

22 MS. PEARSON: The other thing we thought
23 we'd offer if you all want more details on the program
24 itself and kind of putting both of those things together in
25 this PowerPoint, where we could spend some time in a future



1 board meeting, really talking about the Turnaround Leaders
2 Development Program and who's been participating in what
3 we're seeing out of it. If you guys would like that in the
4 future, we can have that conversation.

5 MS. FLORES: And this is for leader to the
6 Charter Schools?

7 MS. PEARSON: This is for all leaders in
8 Colorado of Priority Improvement Turnaround Schools.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is there a program at
10 the university for this, at the universities?

11 MR. SHERMAN: This is a Grant Program that
12 as Alyssa said, supports providers. And then there's a
13 latter part of the Grant Program that where we issue awards
14 to districts and to Charter School Leaders to attend the
15 identified programs.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Questions, Jane?

17 MS. GOFF: Just remind your technical, the
18 request to change the date, the grants are still effective
19 for the following school year, right? So they're still set
20 up on a traditional school year start cohort groupings.

21 MR. SHERMAN: Correct.

22 MS. GOFF: And then is there a particular
23 time of year when we get a report, an annual update? I
24 know we've had one recently, I can't remember if you all
25 have a regular expected date.



1 MR. SHERMAN: We're just finalizing that
2 report and as Alyssa said, we'd be glad to share that with
3 you in a future meeting. Or just get it to you.

4 MS. GOFF: Just trying to keep mine, yeah.

5 MS. PEARSON: No, I know. There's so many.

6 MS. GOFF: So this would be Peter for the
7 results of it from last school year. So in other words,
8 this '15, '16 school year would be --

9 MR. SHERMAN: That's correct.

10 MS. GOFF: -- what we hear about?

11 MR. SHERMAN: That's correct.

12 MS. GOFF: Okay. Thanks.

13 MS. SCHROEDER: Any other questions?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And who are the
15 providers? And will the universities be able to provide?

16 MR. SHERMAN: Currently, we have six
17 identified providers that have been approved by the State
18 Board over the last two years.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Who are they?

20 MR. SHERMAN: They are University of Denver,
21 Catapult Learning Generation Schools, the Consortium of
22 Promethean and the University of Florida, the University of
23 Virginia and the Relay Graduate School. We currently have
24 an RFP out for potentially new providers. We expect that
25 RFP is open right now. It's due on November 7th. We



1 expect to have a number of applicants. We held a webinar
2 this morning, and there were seven or eight different
3 organizations that attended that webinar.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And would again
5 universities be able to apply?

6 MR. SHERMAN: Absolutely. And there were a
7 number of universities on the webinar this morning.

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. And
9 Colorado universities?

10 MR. SHERMAN: Correct.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Thank you. Nobody.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: Any other questions, folks?
13 Colorado State Board -- go ahead.

14 MS. CORDIAL: That's for the next rulemaking
15 hearing.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This one is? Okay.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So I think we have a motion
19 on the table, do we not? This one. In a second. Does
20 anyone object? Bingo. Thank you.

21 MS. PEARSON: Thank you.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: So now, we move to the
23 rulemaking hearing. The rules for the Administration
24 Waiver of Statute and Rule 1 CCR 301-35. Colorado State
25 Board of Education will now conduct a public rulemaking



1 hearing for the rules for the administration of the Waiver
2 Statute and Rule 1 CCR 301-35. The State Board voted to
3 approve the notice of rulemaking in its August 10, 2016
4 Board Meeting. A hearing to promulgate these rules was
5 made known through the publication of a public notice on
6 August 25, 2016 through the Colorado Register and by State
7 Board notice on October 5th, 2016. The State Board has
8 authorized to promulgate these rules pursuant to 22-2-
9 104(1)(c) CRS. Commissioner of staff prepared to provide
10 an overview, please.

11 MS. ANTHES: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair.
12 Actually I will be providing the overview and Melissa Bloom
13 and -- and Kelly Rosensuite are in the audience to answer
14 any detailed questions if needed. These are rules that
15 come before you as technical cleanups again as a part of
16 our OLLS Office of Legal Services Review. They point out
17 small technical changes for us to adjust. So one of the
18 issues around, correction around which State Statutes can
19 waive or not waive is one of the issues. In addition, we
20 had a new law passed, House Bill 16-14-22. And so we just
21 were aligning to that new law. No substantive changes.
22 The third issue was actually just changing the 90-day time
23 frame for which staff can provide feedback to districts on
24 any waivers or plans that come forward to 120 days. We're
25 just seeing a higher influx in volume of these plans and so



1 allowing more back and forth time between us and the
2 District would be helpful. We have not received any
3 comments to date on these changes, and it doesn't look like
4 anyone's on the hearing.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. Is there anyone in
6 the audience who wanted to speak to this? All right. So
7 is there further discussion among colleagues?

8 MS. MAZANEC: What is this 2.06 where it
9 says, "Limits and requirements for school districts
10 conducting educational programs outside of its territorial
11 boundaries," does that mean online? Or what does that
12 mean?

13 MS. BLOOM: This is Melissa Bloom. I don't
14 know if you have had the pleasure of meeting her. Yes.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have not.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Deb, would you repeat
17 that question?

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: I was just looking at 2.06 I
19 -- and it's in blue. I think it's an addition, and I just
20 wondered what it was referring to outside its territorial
21 boundaries.

22 MS. BLOOM: So that part of Statute refers
23 to, if it can be that but it can also be if district is
24 running a program in another district's boundaries or it
25 isn't just limited to online.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: So would the rules then have
2 these limitations and requirements then? Or is it just --
3 what does this sentence mean?

4 MS. BLOOM: So this part of the rules is
5 simply mirroring as Dr. Anthes suggested. It's mirroring a
6 change to State Law that occurred- or excuse me. This
7 portion of it actually was pointed out by LSS, we had
8 accidentally in the last revision of these rules left that
9 Statute off the list of things that were ineligible for
10 waivers. So LSS pointed that out to us, and we've now just
11 added it back into the list of things that districts cannot
12 waive.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Okay. Thank you.

14 MS. BLOOM: Yeah.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: May I have a motion, please?

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: I moved to approve the rules
17 for the administration of the Waiver of Statute and Rule 1
18 CCR 301-35.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: That's a proper motion, is
20 there a second?

21 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Second.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. And again, if a vote
23 is unanimous, we will finish this today, otherwise, we'll
24 bring it over to the November meeting. Are there any



1 objections to this motion? I'm trying to learn it from
2 Steve how to do this quick (inaudible). Thank you.

3 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

4 MS. BLOOM: Thank you.

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Thank you very much. 7.0
6 says lunch.

7 MS. CORDIAL: So we have --

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Nice.

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Bizy?

10 MS. CORDIAL: You have an option to do
11 either take a 30 or so minute lunch break or take 15
12 minutes into a working lunch and have that ESSA
13 presentation happen while you're --

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Colleagues?

15 MS. SCHEFFEL: Joyce is ready.

16 MS. SCHROEDER: Oh, okay.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: We need to see if Joyce --
18 let me know.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay. So how about we get
20 our --

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'd like to move ahead if we
22 can. Whatever we can do.

23 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. I still -- do we
24 still have to wait until 1:00 p.m. --



1 MS. CORDIAL: Yes, we do have to wait until
2 1:00 p.m. and 1:15 p.m. or 1:15 p.m. and 1:30 p.m. for the
3 rulemaking hearings.

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Sorry.

5 MS. CORDIAL: But those two --

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, actually these things
7 like 10:00 a.m. instead of 1:00 p.m.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Shall we get our lunch and
9 then if staff, starve -- starve our staff and let them come
10 and talk to us about ESSA?

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

12 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Is our lunch here?

14 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yes.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: All right. Let's go have
16 lunch.

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, your call?

18 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes. Please, go have lunch.
19 Get your lunch, bring it back, I guess is what I'm saying.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Do we need to get your
21 lunch, bring it back? (Inaudible).

22 MS. SCHROEDER: Was I suppose to say
23 adjourned?

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think so.

25 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I don't think so.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: I know.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay.

3 MS. CORDIAL: Yeah, I just got it.

4 (Overlapping)

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay, folks. My alter ego
6 is going to gavel in the meeting. Thank you. So the next
7 item on the agenda is an update on the Every Student
8 Succeeds Act State Plan Development. Commissioner?

9 MS. ANTHERS: Yes.

10 MS. SCHROEDER: It's all yours.

11 MS. ANTHERS: Thank you, Madam Chair. We
12 have a variety of staff here today to give you an update on
13 all of the workings of the Every Student Succeeds Act.
14 We're gonna -- I'm gonna turn it over to Pat just to frame
15 the full conversation, but I wanted to let you know that
16 Joyce Zurkowski has come back down. We did have a request
17 from a Board member yesterday, so that's why you did not
18 get this material prior to just now. We had a request from
19 a Board member yesterday to provide some information on
20 first year US English learners. And so Joyce has to catch
21 a plane a little bit later, so she'll be first on the
22 agenda. And this is just to give you some initial
23 information about it, and then we can keep processing it
24 through out the upcoming weeks. So with that, I'll turn it
25 to Pat, and then Pat will turn it over to Joyce.



1 MR. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Commissioner
2 Anthes. So for today, we're gonna do a few things, we're
3 gonna provide you some updated information regarding some
4 of the proposed rules that -- some of the rules that have
5 been proposed by the US Department of Education related to
6 supplement not supplant and reporting. We're gonna do a
7 deeper dive into the effect of quality instruction and
8 leadership, Spoke Committees work related to ESSA. And
9 then hopefully at the end, if there is time and if there's
10 not, it's not that big of a deal because it's really at the
11 end we had proposed to walk you through some of the
12 physical information and some of the programmatic
13 information with regard to the new -- the new law in
14 anticipation of a deeper dive coming back to you in
15 November with much more detailed information wanting to
16 kind of get your -- your direction as to what you would
17 like to hear most about.

18 So if we don't get to those very end slides,
19 that's okay because we'll be coming back to you in
20 November. But right now, I'd like to turn your attention
21 to this, particular the first year in US English learners
22 slide, and Joyce is gonna walk us through that.

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So as Katy indicated, there
24 was a request yesterday for us to introduce this topic.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: It was -- it was mine. It
2 was my request.

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: It was your request?

4 MS. SCHROEDER: It was my request because I
5 was hoping that this -- because it's an area in which the
6 state has to make a decision, I would -- and we've been
7 talking about it. I wanted to give you guys an opportunity
8 to kind of think about it over the next month to see if the
9 Board already has a strong opinion one way or the other so
10 that we communicate with the Hub as well as the Hub
11 communicating with us, trying to figure out how we continue
12 to communicate so there are no surprises when the plan
13 comes forward to us. That's my intent, and I made extra
14 work for you guys and I thank you.

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: You are most welcome. So a
16 little bit of background. Historically, Colorado had
17 different rules regarding participation in English Language
18 Arts for our first year in US students. Colorado required
19 all of those students to test and to take the English
20 language arts test. The federal law did not require those
21 students to test in their first year. With 15-1323,
22 Colorado introduced the concept of not requiring those
23 first year in US English learners to take the English
24 language arts test in their first year. So for starting
25 with last year and for this year, districts were given



1 flexibility in terms of whether or not they chose to test
2 their students. Depending on which path they chose,
3 different things were intended to happen with
4 accountability. So I'm gonna run through that first and
5 then I'm gonna talk about what occurred with ESSA.

6 So love to bring you a chart. So what you
7 have here is a chart that basically talks about those two
8 different pathways. And so you have one of the pathways
9 that is in very light peach color and another pathway
10 that's in a light blue color, and it all starts up with the
11 question of, will students' test in English language arts -
12 - we're limited to that right now, in their first year? If
13 students do test in that first year, they are counted for
14 participation. They obviously do not have a score from the
15 prior year, so there cannot be a growth calculation. They
16 are not included in achievement for that first year. When
17 we look at the students who did not test in their first
18 year, they are still included in the participation
19 calculations and they count as a participant as long as
20 they take the English language proficiency test, Access.

21 Obviously, there's not a growth score
22 because they didn't test in the prior year, and obviously
23 they cannot be included in the achievement calculations
24 because they did not test this year, right? So the
25 difference between the two groups in year number 1 is



1 basically whether or not the child sits for that English
2 language arts test. When we go into year two, the students
3 who tested in year one, they're still testing. They are
4 included in participation calculations in that second year
5 because there's a score from the first year. They are
6 included in the growth calculation. They are not, however,
7 included in achievement. And the rationale for this
8 pathway is -- is that English learners, as they demonstrate
9 their knowledge of English language arts proficiency, what
10 we expect to see is a great deal of growth between year one
11 and year two.

12 But we fairly do not expect them necessarily
13 to be proficient, right? Because they're still working on
14 English language proficiency. For year number 2 -- I'm
15 sorry, in year number 2, if the student did not test in
16 year number 1, they need to start testing, right? So by
17 year number 2, all English learners are testing, they are
18 again included in participation calculations, they cannot
19 be included in growth calculations because there's not a
20 score from the preceding year. Therefore, to be included
21 in the performance calculations for accountability, they
22 are included in the achievement calculation, the mean scale
23 score.

24 By year number 3, everyone is testing still,
25 everyone is still included in participation, and now



1 everyone is included in the growth calculations, and
2 everyone is included in the achievement calculations. So
3 the biggest difference, again, is first year does a student
4 test or not test. In the second year, students who tested
5 in the first year will be included in growth calculations.
6 Students who didn't test in the first year would be
7 included in the achievement calculations, and I have those
8 where those differences are in purple to try to help. So
9 again, last year and for this year, districts were given
10 flexibility in terms of which pathway they chose.

11 ESSA essentially requires the state to come
12 up with a consistent statewide policy in terms of how we
13 treat our students, who are first year in US English
14 language learners. And so there are essentially three
15 different options for us. Colorado could require all first
16 year US English learners to take the English language arts
17 assessment, as we had done historically prior to 15-1323.
18 Or we could exempt all of our first year in US English
19 learners from taking the English language arts assessment.
20 And that would mean that starting in year two, they would
21 be included in that achievement calculation, that means
22 scale score, and then they would be added in for growth in
23 year three. Or we could develop some consistent guidelines
24 that would be utilized across the state regarding which of
25 our first year in US English learners would take the



1 English language arts assessment and which of those first
2 year and English language learners would not.

3 MS. FLORES: Example?

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: An example. I was right
5 with you. So as an example, we could look at, like, we
6 have students who are first year in US English learners,
7 some of whom walk in never having heard a word of English
8 before, never having necessarily even entered a classroom
9 before. We have other first year in US English language
10 learners who are coming with some background in English.
11 Again, it's not their first language and they're not
12 completely proficient, but they have some background in
13 English and they have been in schooling throughout their
14 past three, four, five, six years.

15 Can we treat those two groups of students
16 that I'm oversimplifying differently and say that if you
17 are walking into a US school for the first time and you
18 cannot understand a word of English, spoken, written,
19 either way, say those students are exempt from having to
20 take that English language arts test? But if you have a
21 certain level of English language proficiency and
22 educational background, you will take the English language
23 arts test. If we would go the route -- that route, the
24 work of the spoke groups would be coming up with exactly
25 what those guidelines would be. But essentially, we would



1 be acknowledging that not all of our first year in US
2 English learners are the same.

3 MS. FLORES: Excuse me, you're talking about
4 two things. You're talking about an English language
5 proficiency test and then you're talking about English
6 language arts PARCC test.

7 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Correct. So all of our
8 English language learners must take the English language
9 proficiency test. That's a given. If you are an English
10 learner, you will take that English language proficiency
11 test.

12 MS. SCHROEDER: How soon after you walk in
13 the door?

14 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Your very first year. So
15 you actually get screened --

16 MS. SCHROEDER: First year?

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yeah. You get screened when
18 you walk into the building. Actually, I think you have 30
19 days.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: Thirty days, okay. Thank
21 you.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: You get screened and then
23 you participate in Access the very first year that you're
24 here, and that is a measure of how much English do you
25 know. What we're talking about here is at what point do



1 those students need to take the English language arts test.
2 Starting in their first year or starting in their second
3 year, or do we treat some English language learners
4 differently than other English language learners when
5 they're first year in US? I think what you were hoping for
6 was to start the conversation with your fellow Board
7 members.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Well, or at least to have
9 you think about whether we, as a Board, have a strong --
10 strong commitment to which of those three. Now on the
11 third alternative, then each of those different -- the
12 students will be in two different groups and their results
13 would be handled then differently in year two and year
14 three on the accountability. So the rules are the same --
15 you're right, year two. Correct.

16 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Thank you.

17 MS. SCHROEDER: Okay.

18 MS. FLORES: So they wouldn't take it, they
19 would take it the second year?

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So by the second year,
21 everyone is taking the English language arts test, yes.
22 That is required regardless of which of the three pathways
23 you choose to go. Second year, all English language
24 learners are participating.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: Joyce, talk about the
2 criteria that districts have used in their decisions to go
3 either one or two or three that you know of?

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So I will share with you
5 some of the rationales that have been shared with me. And
6 again, when the flexibility came through with 15-1323, we
7 had conversations within our department, we had
8 conversations with districts about, "All right. Which way
9 do you think you wanna go?" And what we found is that
10 there's -- there's a divide in across our districts in
11 terms of what they saw as most appropriate. So there were
12 some districts that really valued that growth metric and
13 did not see the harm in having students sit down in their
14 first year and said we will do what I refer to as
15 empathetic testing, which is we would have all students sit
16 down for the English language arts assessment.

17 But if you have a student who sits down,
18 opens up the test, and starts to look at it or starts to go
19 through the screen and clearly is having a challenging time
20 engaging with it, you can end the testing and say, "We are
21 done." For other students, you have students who -- they
22 are able to engage with that test in a more meaningful way.
23 Again, they may not have enough English language to be able
24 to effectively answer the question of how well do they
25 perform in language arts, but they are able to engage in



1 the test in a meaningful way and you can get an answer in
2 terms of how well are they engaging with English language
3 arts. And so those districts made a decision to say we
4 will test in year number 1, and then from an accountability
5 point of view, we will count growth in our accountability
6 system in year number 2, then year number 3. Remember,
7 fully participating. There were other students --

8 MS. SCHROEDER: If a student put his head
9 down or her head down and did not -- was unable to answer
10 any question, that's the starting point for growth, which
11 would be a zero.

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So it's a little bit more
13 complicated than that.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: That's why I asked.

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So it depends about how much
16 of the test they actually engage with. Right. So there's
17 multiple sessions of the test and things like that and
18 there's a criteria in order to (inaudible). In order to
19 qualify for growth the student ends up having to at least
20 get a score. Right. So they have to engage with it enough
21 to get a score. What districts -- who were saying, we're
22 going to start with the assumption that all of our kids are
23 starting -- are going to test, is saying that they had an
24 oath for those students that they were most concerned about



1 with their ability to engage and that was a, if it's not
2 working, we'll pull 'em out of there.

3 For districts who made the decision not to
4 have them participate in year number one, they again, I
5 would suggest, were most concerns -- concerned about those
6 students at the lower end of English proficiency and they
7 were making a construct argument essentially saying that
8 their English language proficiency is so low we can't get a
9 measure of their English language arts proficiency and so
10 therefore it is not a valuable use of that student's time.
11 We're not going to have them set. Again, I would encourage
12 you to talk to, you know, your own districts to get their
13 point of view. It is -- the people are very strong in
14 their opinions. And like I said, across our districts, we
15 had clearly folks who went in this direction and clearly
16 folks who went in this direction. An then --

17 MS. SCHROEDER: So this is why it matters?

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Right. And I think frankly
19 even for both sides who thought that they were going to
20 make a unilateral decision. What they found out in the end
21 is, well, actually you know what, I do have this new
22 student who's a first year in US, English language learner,
23 but they have an English language proficiency level of
24 four. I am gonna have them test. I didn't think I would
25 do that. I -- though it's not the population that I was



1 thinking about. Right, I was thinking about a different
2 population when I made this decision. And there were, like
3 I said the other districts who said we will start to test,
4 they did have some kiddos that they ended up not testing
5 cause they saw it. You know what, the student just arrived
6 a week ago, has not had any exposure to English, has not
7 had exposure to a classroom. We're gonna put that aside.

8 MS. SCHROEDER: Hasn't held a -- hasn't held
9 a pencil.

10 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Got it. So --

11 MS. FLORES: But there's also --

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Yes, ma'am.

13 MS. FLORES: There's also the -- the point
14 where they may not be proficient with a computer. Where a
15 paper and pencil would be better for those students than --
16 than, say, get them in front of a computer. And that would
17 make a difference.

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So important to note that,
19 in addition to having accommodations for our students with
20 disabilities, we also have accommodations for our English
21 language learners. So we have versions of the assessment
22 in math and science that are in Spanish. So if you have a
23 student who has come from an educational system that has
24 been based in Spanish and that's where they've been
25 receiving their mathematics instruction and their science



1 instruction, they can take our mathematics assessment or
2 our science assessment in Spanish. We have the use of
3 glossaries, we have in Colorado also a Spanish language
4 arts test. They can also make the decision to say I have a
5 student who has a certain level of English language
6 proficiency but they don't have the technology background.
7 I am gonna have them take the paper based version and
8 that's an option in our state.

9 MS. FLORES: Okay. So that districts who
10 don't -- who may not understand that the paper should be
11 first before the computer even if --

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Well -- well and I would
13 suggest that that's not always the case, but that is an
14 option. Right. We -- we're in an interesting spot with a
15 lot of our kiddos and you can go into even kindergarten
16 classrooms and see whether or not kids are more comfortable
17 with the iPhones or if they're more comfortable with paper
18 and pencil. And you can watch even your new students to
19 the country and see how quickly do they, kind of, get used
20 to the computer versus how quickly do they get used to
21 paper and pencil. And I would suggest that the decision is
22 different for different kids. And schools and districts
23 can make the decision based on the individual child. That
24 does not need to be a universal decision.



1 MS. SCHROEDER: So thoughts. Joyce. That
2 Joyce.

3 MS. RANKIN: Do we have to -- do we have to
4 decide one two or three? I mean, could it be a local
5 control thing or do we have to be consistent across the
6 state even when we're dealing with the --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE 4: Quit shaking your
8 head. Yes.

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I was shocked in that.
10 Right. We're trying to get to know so let me see what I
11 can do. So I -- I -- I believe that we are looking at
12 number three as a potential way to try to get to know. It
13 is kind of a compromised position that would say we would
14 have consistent guidelines across the state but different
15 English learners would still be being treated differently
16 but it would be consistent, right? It wouldn't matter
17 whether that student happened to be enrolled in Aurora or
18 Denver or Boulder. Whether or not the student tested would
19 be based on that student and the guidelines as opposed to
20 district preference.

21 MS. RANKIN: And those guidelines are
22 proficiency guidelines or not?

23 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So again, as we were having
24 our conversation about, so how would you go about number
25 three. I referenced proficiency as a possibility. There



1 may be some other avenues for us to look at. And again,
2 you could suggest two years spokes and I would suggest that
3 your spokes are gonna think about this even if you don't
4 suggest. What are those guidelines that we might be able
5 to develop? I think it is fair to say that what we are
6 looking for, in the end, is what is right for the child,
7 meaning compliance requirements, but there is some
8 consistency so that, again, what happens to a child does
9 not radically shift based on the school that the child
10 enters. It's a child based decision within guidelines as
11 opposed to a district decision.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: So what I'm thinking is,
13 number three, there's some flexibility there but there's
14 gonna be a cut score. Kind of, so that there is
15 consistency across the state and that's a requirement that
16 we do that. Okay.

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: There needs to be
18 consistency across the state.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I got it.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Just one moment,
21 please.

22 MS. MAZANEC: So we have to choose one. We
23 -- we don't have the option anymore. I'm saying, choose
24 one or two?

25 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Correct.



1 MS. MAZANEC: It seems to me that,
2 particularly for those districts who would find some value
3 in knowing where the child stands in the first year, almost
4 leaves us with number one. Well there's districts who like
5 to know and they go ahead and do the assessment in year
6 one. If we did year two, then we effectively take away
7 that information from those districts who wanted to have
8 it.

9 MS. FLORES: Are you finished, Pam?

10 MS. MAZANEC: I am.

11 MS. SCHROEDER: So go ahead Val. Val?

12 MS. FLORES: Yes I'm -- I'm listening. I'm
13 just thinking.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: You have a question? Deb,
15 go ahead.

16 MS. SCHEFFEL: Just in response to Pam your
17 comment. Wouldn't they have that information anyway. In
18 other words if they're interested in what the English level
19 of proficiency is they would have that through the access
20 test, right? This is a question of how we use that
21 information to determine whether or not they take PARCC.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So there is -- there --
23 there's a difference between the information that you get
24 off of, or from the access test, from the information that
25 you would get from an English language arts test. The



1 access test essentially provides an indication of whether
2 or not the student has enough English language proficiency
3 to engage in a meaningful way in an academic classroom. So
4 it really looks at, do I know enough math words to now
5 participate in a math classroom? It doesn't answer the
6 question of do I know how to fully read or fully write.
7 Yes. There's a nuance there and there's definitely a
8 relationship, I'll give you that, there's definitely a
9 relationship but they don't answer the same question.

10 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I was just thinking is
11 this what you said that you're saying some people, some
12 schools or districts, want to know how their students are
13 doing as far as proficiency in English so that they would
14 know when they would -- when it would make sense for them
15 to take that test. And I'm saying I think they have that
16 information.

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So regardless of which of
18 these pathways you take they always get that English
19 language proficiency indicator. They won't always get an
20 English language arts proficiency indicator.

21 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I just think that because
22 of the heterogeneity of ELL students, we -- as you pointed
23 out, we've got some kids who've been there three
24 generations and yet they still are struggling with English?
25 And others that just got here from a country that doesn't



1 have a written language at all and they're struggling with
2 the concept of written language.

3 So I -- I -- I guess I think it would be
4 difficult for us not to choose three given that we're
5 forced to do so. Ideally it would be great if the
6 districts could make this -- if to configure this out but
7 if their -- if the requirement is that we can't do that.
8 I'd hate to see us have a one size fits all because some
9 kids, I've just watched them try to take this test when
10 they have such language issues and it's miserable. I mean,
11 you get a lot of drama and then you have a negative
12 experience with testing. So I -- I guess I would -- I
13 would feel like three makes the most sense.

14 MS. FLORES: I think, also, back to your
15 spoke committee, because of phone calls I got, and because
16 you did ask if there were any ESL teachers in that group
17 and there were no ESL teachers.

18 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I just wanna correct that.
19 So the assessment spoke committee does have English learner
20 educators on it sitting in the room that day.

21 MS. FLORES: Not teachers though.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Sitting in the room that
23 day, there was not. But the spoke committee does have
24 English learner (inaudible).



1 MS. FLORES: And we do need teachers on that
2 spoke committee.

3 MS. SCHEFFEL: I agree with -- with I think
4 three, it seems the best, most balanced, most probably
5 receptive approach. I can't help but ask though, how --
6 does any of this relate to the READ act, as far as -- I'm
7 sorry. But what -- but what happens. I'm sorry, I'm truly
8 am sorry. But we have a -- we have a first or third grade,
9 we have Pre-K (inaudible). All of these -- all of these --
10 other -- other grade levels besides those starting in first
11 grade. Don't worry about that specific question. It's
12 just I'm trying to just see how -- how districts and
13 schools districts can have as much flexibility as is
14 workable for them, address the varying groups and needs
15 among those little kids and yet -- how -- how can we --
16 we're gonna have to help everybody keep all this straight.
17 Because when you're talking about a readiness -- readiness
18 test or readiness measure and then we're talking about can
19 they -- can they be allowed -- can we measure their reading
20 skills only in English? Are we gonna really find out about
21 reading only by an English test or do we merely need to
22 open up the flexibility doors to allow for them to be
23 tested in their own language?

24 (Meeting adjourned)



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

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

/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