



**COLORADO**  
Department of Education

Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
December 10, 2014, Part 2

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on December 10, 2014,  
the above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board  
Members:

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



1                   CHAIRMAN LUNDEEN:  -- talking with the  
2 members of the public, because the board members have  
3 heard me say this dozens of times already.  And I don't  
4 know that Bizy's turned us back on the record.  Is Bizy  
5 over there?

6                   MS. SCHEFFEL:  The light's on.

7                   MR. LUNDEEN:  The light is on?  All right.  
8 We're good to go?  Okay.

9                   MS. NEAL:  But nobody's home.

10                  MR. LUNDEEN:  So, at this point in our  
11 meeting we'll have comments from members of the public.  
12 The rules are:  Please state to the -- step to the podium  
13 here, state your name, if you represent an organization,  
14 identify the organization.  If you don't represent an  
15 organization, please let us know where you're from.  
16 Limit your comments to three minutes.  I've got a little  
17 ringer up here that makes noise at three minutes.  
18 Carrie's got a visual aid.  The first person to speak to  
19 us today is Ms. S. Chris. Calderone (ph).  Welcome.

20                  MS. CALDERONE:  Thank you.  I'm here to urge  
21 this body to not override the Sheridan School Board's  
22 opposition to the TriCity Charter School application.  
23 Which I guess will be on your agenda in January.  I  
24 graduated from Sheridan in 1971.  Three of my sons  
25 graduated from Sheridan and played sports for Sheridan.



1 I have been away from the area until I was lucky enough  
2 to retire a couple of years ago. In that period of time  
3 I have served as the part-time Sheridan probation  
4 officer.

5 I've been on the Sheridan Health Center  
6 board. I have helped with the Sheridan High School  
7 sports teams, and I'm literally lucky enough as a retiree  
8 to be in the thick of things in the Sheridan schools many  
9 times a week. I'm incredibly impressed with what the  
10 administration is doing now in the Sheridan School  
11 System.

12 I was unprepared for college back in the  
13 day. Sheridan had its needs back in the day. At this  
14 point in time I truly believe that you would have trouble  
15 finding any student whose needs are not being met by the  
16 Sheridan School District. You have excellent educators,  
17 Excellent administration, a very, very good pupil-to-  
18 teacher ratio, a brand-new school having just been built  
19 via a mill levy. The charter school people did not  
20 approach anyone that I know if in the community. And  
21 again, I feel that I am lucky enough to have my pulse --  
22 my finger on the pulse of the community because of the  
23 fact that I'm retired and I've become involved in many,  
24 many things.

25 The statistics provided by the charter



1 school people are incorrect. They don't seem to  
2 understand the needs or the demographics of Sheridan.  
3 Again, we are very, very lucky right now in Sheridan to  
4 have a wonderful system.

5 We are continuing to meet benchmarks for  
6 raising our educational standards. We currently, I was  
7 very pleased to hear, have students on scholarship at  
8 schools like the University of Colorado, the School of  
9 Minds, University of Northern Colorado. We are getting  
10 there, and we are doing this through the public-school  
11 system. We do not need a charter school.

12 We do not want a charter school. And the  
13 charter school people did not see fit to contact anyone  
14 in the community for information or input, which I think  
15 is incredibly arrogant. I'll just close with my belief  
16 that in a democracy, to paraphrase Thomas Jefferson, we  
17 have to have a good public-school system, and in Sheridan  
18 we do now have a very, very good public school system.

19 I would like to see it be allowed to  
20 continue without any of its resources being drained by  
21 any charter school application. Thank you.

22 MR. LUNDEEN: And to be clear, thank you  
23 very much. And to be clear, you're speaking as a member  
24 of the public, not in any official capacity?

25 MS. CALDERONE: No. A member of the public.



1 Yes. Absolutely.

2 MR. LUNDEEN: Okay, thank you. Thank you  
3 very much. Kristi Butkovich (ph), and to frame this, I  
4 believe there's several people that are going to speak in  
5 succession. Four people are going to speak in succession  
6 to make a presentation.

7 MS. NEAL: We get 12 minutes, right?

8 MS. BUTKOVICH: And we have a...

9 MR. LUNDEEN: Yep. And I think they're --  
10 were going to --

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm sorry,  
12 (indiscernible) who this is.

13 MR. LUNDEEN: They'll introduce themselves.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, okay.

15 MS. BUTKOVICH: I'm Kristi Butkovich. I'm  
16 the executive director of Denver Alliance for Public  
17 Education.

18 MR. LUNDEEN: And they do have a  
19 presentation here, and your clock is running. Please  
20 proceed.

21 MS. BUTKOVICH: Okay. So, Denver Alliance  
22 for Public Education was established in May of 2013. The  
23 Denver Alliance seeks to inform Denver citizens and tax  
24 payers about the state of public education in Denver with  
25 the goal of promoting, strengthening, protecting and



1 expanding quality education for all of the city's  
2 children. Denver Alliance is a project of the Colorado  
3 Non-profit Development Center.

4 So, if you can go to Slide 2, great. So,  
5 the demographic diversity of our survey -- our goal of  
6 the survey was to fill the gap left by the missing  
7 information from the APA survey. What we were hoping to  
8 achieve is to find out how and what parents think about  
9 tests, and if and how they are impacted by testing. This  
10 may be the very first survey of the kind in the nation.  
11 It was a totally grassroots effort.

12 Our broad reach was captured using public  
13 media, social media, Facebook, Twitter, email, word of  
14 mouth, and people forwarding the survey to other people.

15 Now if you can go to Slide 3. The result,  
16 again, we had 716 responders from across the state, 49  
17 school districts split among 565 parents, 12 guardians,  
18 25 students and 114 teachers.

19 Next slide. This slide indicates the  
20 percent in total respondents. 214 -- 241 represent K-12,  
21 436 grade 3-8 and 294 represent grades 9-12, totaling  
22 706. And here's the next speaker.

23 MS. NOONAN: My name is Paula Noonan. I  
24 supported this project of trying to gather information  
25 from parents, teachers and students across the state.



1 The methodology that we adopted was to try to follow the  
2 pattern of the Augenblich-Paelick (ph) survey so that we  
3 could make some comparisons and have those comparisons  
4 legitimate.

5 One of the first -- if you could switch the  
6 slide. One of the first questions we wanted to know was,  
7 how familiar were people with the state testing system.  
8 We wanted to have reliable informant. And fortunately,  
9 88 percent of our respondents said they were either very  
10 familiar or moderately familiar with the state testing  
11 system. We thought that allowed us to make some  
12 meaningful interpretations.

13 If you go to the next slide. I'd like to  
14 just spend a little minute -- a little time on this  
15 slide, because it's very important. This gets at the  
16 issue of to what degree to parents receive information  
17 about tests at various points in their child's career.  
18 And we have 941 respondents, because a number of parents  
19 obviously had more than one child in the system.

20 I find these numbers to be very distressing.  
21 If you look across the grade levels, except for --  
22 actually it should be grades 3 through 8 on TCAP. Other  
23 than that small section a large majority, or a  
24 significant majority of people get no feedback, say they  
25 get no explanation, of test results. That's a very



1 unhappy figure.

2                   If you look in the column that says, yes  
3 percent 2014-15, that tells us that a very few number get  
4 feedback and explanation the -- the term after the school  
5 year ends. So, if the testing occurs in the spring of  
6 2014, parents -- a small number of parents are getting  
7 feedback in the fall of 2014. So, you have a very  
8 significant delay.

9                   This feeds -- this whole problem feeds into  
10 a larger issue of whether parents, students and teachers  
11 feel the testing system is beneficial to them.

12                   Perhaps the most disturbing number is the  
13 alternative tests. These are special tests. These are  
14 tests for ELL kids, and others who may be having some  
15 difficulty -- academic difficulty. 65.7 percent of our  
16 respondents, 157 people, say they received no  
17 information, no explanation, of those test results.

18                   MR. LUNDEEN: Okay, Paula, thank you very  
19 much. And you folks obviously can continue with the  
20 presentation as you see fit. And I'm just checking off  
21 people's names as they speak.

22                   MS. KAPLAN: Jeannie Kaplan, founder of  
23 Denver Alliance for Public Education, former Denver  
24 Public School board member.

25                   Slide 7 please. This slide shows you that





1 Augenblic-Paelick asked its respondents on a scale of 1  
2 to 5 if the tests were beneficial for instruction and  
3 content mastery. Teachers rated the test as below 2 for  
4 these criteria. 1.3 for instruction, 1.8 for content  
5 mastery. This survey used a different scale but was  
6 inquiring to the same subject. Not beneficial, minimally  
7 beneficial, moderately beneficial, highly beneficial. At  
8 all three grade sections a large majority of respondents  
9 answered Not Beneficial. Essentially 0 on a 1-5 scale.

10 These numbers are overwhelming and very  
11 disturbing. These numbers indicate that from our  
12 respondent's perspective the state testing system is  
13 bankrupt. It does not give timely feedback or feedback  
14 at all. The results aren't used to improve student  
15 achievement, and it has earned an F grade. The bottom  
16 line is there's no need to rush into more testing. I  
17 think the State of Colorado needs to do more research,  
18 and I think these numbers would concur with that  
19 conclusion.

20 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you.

21 MS. KEYSEKER: Next slide, please. My name  
22 is Sherri Keyseker (ph), and I'm here with Denver  
23 Alliance because I was part of the grassroots helping  
24 this. On, slide 8 if you look, our survey did mirror  
25 what the 12.02 task force survey said. And they asked



1 participants, and so did we, whether we kept -- would  
2 like to keep current tests, do some version of a random,  
3 or alternating years of tests, do federally mandated  
4 tests only, or opt out of all annual standardized tests.

5           If you look at the numbers, 66 percent of  
6 the respondents prefer to opt out of all annual  
7 standardized tests. Only 2 1/2 percent of the  
8 respondents were in favor of keeping our current system.  
9 Those numbers speak volumes. It's a very low number.  
10 And as -- so is the support of the federal minimums, or  
11 random alternating years of testing, but we'll go into  
12 that on the next slide, please.

13           96 percent of respondents want either no  
14 annual testing, or less annual testing. 96 percent. You  
15 can see that 48 percent said less testing, but in the  
16 previous slide where most wanted to opt out, only 18  
17 percent supported the level of federal minimums. Meaning  
18 that they wanted even less testing than the federal  
19 minimum. The vast majority of parents don't value these  
20 standardized annual tests. Therefore, we can inference  
21 in no situation should these summative tests be required  
22 for graduation or to pass on to the next grade level.  
23 These tests aren't meant to measure learning. They're  
24 not informing instruction. They're not helping children,  
25 and way too much emphasis is put on them in education.



1                   The testing system as a whole has very  
2 little support from teachers or parents. It's a failing  
3 system. We infer that replacing TCAP with PARCC,  
4 especially with the amount of PARCC-ing twice a year is  
5 going to increase time. Could you switch slides please?  
6 So, the amount of seat time for classroom testing and  
7 test prep time is going to increase.

8                   Who should have input on how kids are  
9 tested? I think the better question is who does have  
10 input? Apparently, it's not the parents. If 96 percent  
11 of them are saying they have no need for these tests, and  
12 its' definitely not the teachers, because in APA's survey  
13 they rated it at 1.3 to 1.8 at best, on a 5 percent -- 5-  
14 point scale.

15                   You also have hundreds of Colorado students  
16 who recently opted out. You've got thousands of parents  
17 emailing the 12.02 task force saying they oppose testing.  
18 Clearly, we aren't listening to the stake holders who are  
19 closest to the tests, those who know them best, and who  
20 are affected the most by them. They should be  
21 considered, but they're being left out of the process.

22                   Several parents in this survey also  
23 commented that as tax payers they would like to have a  
24 say as to how their education dollars are spent. Those  
25 selling the tests, or the software, or the computers



1 necessary for the tests should not have a seat at the  
2 table deciding who gets to decide tests for our children.

3 Also, we decided to -- oops, go ahead.

4 MR. LUNDEEN: You can complete your though.

5 Okay.

6 MS. KEYSEKER: Probably not.

7 MR. LUNDEEN: Rachel Strickland (ph).

8 MS. STRICKLAND: Can I give my time to  
9 Kristi Butkovich, possibly?

10 MR. LUNDEEN: Sure, we'll wave the rules.

11 MS. BUTKOVICH: Thank you. So, in closing,  
12 if you can just go to the next slide. With the results  
13 from the survey, what Denver Alliance is hoping -- before  
14 we move forward on PARCC, that there be a hold -- since  
15 this is a hold Hermless (ph) year, that it be for  
16 everyone. Schools, teachers, students and parents and  
17 that there is opt-out without retribution. I also wanted  
18 to let the Board know that the Denver Alliance Survey  
19 cost \$26. In keeping with transparency, the raw data is  
20 posted on our website and Facebook pages, and is being  
21 sent by email to all of these people. Thank you for your  
22 time.

23 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you very much.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

25 MR. LUNDEEN: And we've got the PowerPoint



1 to distribute to the board members. Thank you. Okay,  
2 Cynthia Lewis (ph). Actually -- yeah. Cynthia Lewis.

3 MS. LEWIS: Good morning. My name is  
4 Cynthia Lewis, I'm a community member from Sheridan. I'm  
5 here today to give comment on the appeal by TriCity  
6 Charter Schools of the decision by Sheridan School  
7 District #2 School Board to deny their application for  
8 the establishment of a charter school.

9 I have spent the majority of my life as a  
10 student and resident of the Sheridan School District, and  
11 stand behind the decision of our school board to deny  
12 this application. The TriCity Charter School is not  
13 offering the students of Sheridan a curriculum that  
14 offers anything different from programs students already  
15 receive to meet their needs.

16 Sheridan schools have been implementing  
17 programs of research-based reform and are posting test  
18 scores that show impressive increases for almost all  
19 cohorts of students.

20 The application targets at-risk below-grade-  
21 level students, yet TriCity purports to only increase  
22 student learning by one years' growth in one years' time.  
23 This will not help students make up learning. Sheridan  
24 Schools have been posting scores that show more than a  
25 years' growth in a one-year period of time, helping their



1 students catch up to their grade level.

2 The core knowledge program that TriCity has  
3 proposed is not a very clear alternative to our students.  
4 The application also sites English Language Learners as a  
5 target audience but does not offer any substantial  
6 support for this population of students.

7 The citizens of the Sheridan School District  
8 recently supported a mill levee to build a new school for  
9 our students. The addition of a charter school will pull  
10 from an already small population of our students. The --  
11 and would cause undue financial hardship to our district,  
12 potentially creating a reduction in staff, and increase  
13 in class sizes within the Sheridan schools.

14 In addition, the application does not offer  
15 a clear budget that sufficiently satisfies the question  
16 of having the resources to fund the computer-based  
17 program that they are extoling.

18 I am concerned that as I talk with my  
19 friends and neighbors in the community in which I live no  
20 one seems to have been contacted by any representative of  
21 the TriCity Charter Schools. In fact, it seems that the  
22 only contact the Tri-City Charter Schools have had with  
23 the community was a booth at a community event in the  
24 fall of this year.

25 In fact, in conversations with my neighbors,



1 no one has expressed support of this proposal, and all  
2 are against any loss of revenue from our local school to  
3 the charter school. My neighbors that have children who  
4 attend Sheridan schools are happy with the programs and  
5 reforms that the schools are currently implementing.

6 In addition, many parts of the application  
7 were not changed to reflect the needs of a small school  
8 district such as Sheridan, and carry the tone of being  
9 targeted at a much larger school district, such as  
10 Littleton. I strongly feel that the TriCity Charter  
11 School does not meet any need in the Sheridan School  
12 District, and the decision to deny this application by  
13 our local school board should be upheld by the state  
14 board. Thank you.

15 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you. Maurine Cilaph  
16 (ph).

17 MS. CILAPH: Good morning.

18 MR. LUNDEEN: Good morning.

19 MS. CILAPH: I'm Maurine Cilaph, from  
20 Littleton. The college board is an alleged nonprofit,  
21 private organization that is dictating how American  
22 children are learning about U.S. history. However, 30  
23 percent of the College Board are not even Americans, but  
24 are made up from other countries to present a different  
25 and negative view of America.



1 David Coleman is not an educator, but a  
2 business man. A very smart business man who has made  
3 himself very wealthy by rewriting curriculum for all  
4 grades, to be used across the country.

5 In the new AP U.S. History outline  
6 negativity is emphasized, and American exceptionalism is  
7 denigrated. No mention of the great life-changing events  
8 in history. If you want to talk about equal rights,  
9 which APUSH emphasizes, you must talk about Martin Luther  
10 King. I think we'll all agree that he is the father of  
11 equal rights. However, APUSH ignores Dr. King. He's  
12 been censured out of the outline. It ignores major  
13 events that have created American exceptionalism.

14 The founding fathers were not terrorists, as  
15 depicted, they were patriots. Men who led a poor,  
16 downtrodden country to rebel against a foreign,  
17 tyrannical ruler. From this a great country was born.  
18 This is the most important event that should be taught to  
19 our children. Not that the founding fathers were  
20 terrorists. The intent is to view America through our  
21 enemies' eyes in order to internationalize America.

22 Using foreign laws to interpret our  
23 constitution threatens our very way of life and subjects  
24 our constitution and America to international law.  
25 America is exceptional. That is what the world and our





1 children need to learn.

2 I am an American exceptionalism, and live in  
3 an exceptional country, and this is the heritage I will  
4 hand down to my children and grandchildren. I request  
5 that you do whatever you can to stop the implementation  
6 of APUSH until an independent review of the APUSH outline  
7 has been completed. Thank you.

8 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

10 MR. LUNDEEN: Bret Miles. Morning.

11 MR. MILES: Good morning. Bret Miles,  
12 Holyoke School District. I'm also serving currently as  
13 the Board President with the Colorado Rules Schools  
14 Alliance. And thank you Mr. Chairman, board,  
15 commissioner. Just for a minute, after our December 4<sup>th</sup>  
16 board meeting, and then our December 5<sup>th</sup> member meeting,  
17 we had a considerable amount of conversation, and I was  
18 asked to just relay that conversation back to the  
19 Commissioner and Board.

20 Main concerns expressed during our most  
21 recent board meeting and member meeting were about the  
22 rule-making processes at the department. And a  
23 considerable amount of concern that rules are made that  
24 are adding more than the statutes require. And we would  
25 really ask that the department and board look at that



1 closely as we go through rulemaking processes in the  
2 future.

3 We would ask that that would be some time  
4 taken to relook at the rulemaking process and examine  
5 opportunities for some input. And as Rule Alliance Board  
6 Members we're offering our time and energy when rules are  
7 made to offer comment on how this may actually impact a  
8 small district. And -- but as small, rural districts, it  
9 is tough for people in our roles to have our eye out on  
10 each one of those rules. And while they are posted to be  
11 looking forward to, that's not always enough. And we  
12 would ask that there would be a mechanism to reach out to  
13 us and ask us specifically to come in and examine those  
14 rules. So that we can help rule makers see the impact in  
15 the district. So, thank you for the opportunity to share  
16 a major conversation at our latest meeting, and that is  
17 all.

18 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you very much.

19 MS. NEAL: What school district now?

20 MR. LUNDEEN: Holyoke. Rob Clinton.

21 MR. CLINTON: Mr. Chairman, members of the  
22 board, Commissioner Hammond. I'm Rob Clinton. I'm the  
23 president of the Colorado Council for Economic Education.  
24 And I am here today at the request of my colleagues that  
25 for various organizations, that comprise the social



1 studies policy group, and we are the organizations that  
2 provide teacher professional development, mostly free or  
3 very low cost, as well as various student programs across  
4 the state.

5 And we're here with respect to your letter  
6 to the House Bill 12.02, the Standards and Assessment  
7 Task Force, to thank you for including social studies in  
8 a general way in your proposed, or your recommendation  
9 for continued state assessments.

10 The bottom line for us is that the new  
11 social studies assessment has resulted in a far greater  
12 quality and quantity of social studies teaching and  
13 learning in Colorado, especially in economics and  
14 personal financial literacy, two of the newer subjects  
15 that comprise social studies.

16 We know of multiple school districts that  
17 are adding economics and personal financial literacy in  
18 various ways. This is driven by the incentive of the  
19 assessment. So, while I realize that isn't necessarily  
20 visible to all parents, it is what's going on. There may  
21 be other ways to accomplish that same goal, but Denver,  
22 Poudre, St. Vrain, Brighton, District of Lebanon in  
23 Colorado Springs, Littleton and many others have taken  
24 these kinds of actions as a result of the assessment.

25 The other thing I'd mention is that 16



1 states across the country do assess economics. I'm not  
2 sure what it is for all of social studies. And Colorado,  
3 of course, being a local controlled state, does not  
4 require that a specific course be offered, or that one be  
5 taken. So, the assessment is one way to get this kind of  
6 actual teaching and learning. And that really, for us,  
7 is the most important.

8 This is a copy of the letter that was sent  
9 to all parents in Matericry (ph) School District, along  
10 with the social studies CMAS report. It's true that the  
11 six-month lag time is long, but every parent received  
12 this, so there is some parent feedback.

13 In any case, we're talking to the 1202  
14 commission, of course, and we thank you very much for  
15 your support of the general notion of a social studies  
16 assessment in keeping social studies on a par with the  
17 other critical content areas. Thank you very much.

18 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you very much.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

20 MR. LUNDEEN: B. Parker.

21 MS. PARKER: I'm Bonnie Parker, from  
22 Sheridan, Colorado. Board member.

23 MR. LUNDEEN: Yes.

24 MS. PARKER: And resident. I'm a native of  
25 Sheridan. In our school board we've went through this



1 process and asked of you guys to please uphold our  
2 opinion of denying this. Okay?

3 MR. LUNDEEN: Okay, thank you very much.  
4 Dallas Hall.

5 MR. HALL: Good morning. My name is Dallas  
6 Hall, and I'm the mayor of the City of Sheridan. Thank  
7 you for allowing me to speak. On behalf of the Sheridan  
8 City Council I'd like to express the city of Sheridan's  
9 support in the decision by the Sheridan School District  
10 to deny the application made by the Tri-City Academy for  
11 a new charter school in the city -- or in the Sheridan  
12 School District.

13 We agree with the Sheridan School Board that  
14 the application is not in the best interest of the  
15 students, the school district, or the Sheridan community.  
16 Over the past several years the Sheridan School District  
17 has made great strides toward improving the performance  
18 of our school and students. There is pride in the  
19 Sheridan schools again due to -- due in no part to the  
20 district's efforts to engage the community.

21 The Sheridan community supports our schools  
22 again, evidenced by the most recently -- by their support  
23 of a new mill levy to secure a state best grant for the  
24 new construction of the new Fort Logan Northgate School,  
25 which is a beautiful building, by the way.



1                   The Sheridan School -- or, the Sheridan City  
2 Council is concerned that the TriCity Academy application  
3 does not demonstrate any local Sheridan-based community  
4 support for its charter school proposal. No Sheridan  
5 students, families, or community members have come  
6 forward to support the application. In fact, other than  
7 the applicants, all of the public testimony to the  
8 Sheridan School District Board during the application  
9 review was in opposition to the application.

10                   The Sheridan -- or, the Sheridan City  
11 Council is concerned about the potential impact a new  
12 charter school would have to our existing schools.  
13 Sheridan is a small school district with limited  
14 resources. We are concerned that this new school would  
15 undermine the recent \$29.5-million investment made by the  
16 community and the state for the new Fort Logan Northgate  
17 School. We are concerned that the potential enrollment  
18 impacts as submitted by the TriCity applicants would be  
19 devastating to the existing schools, and at a time when  
20 such positive improvements are being realized in the  
21 schools.

22                   The city council is concerned that the  
23 application does not address any specific need, or  
24 shortcoming, that have been identified by the Sheridan  
25 students, teachers, families, or community members. The



1 Sheridan application is generic in its substance, and  
2 does not demonstrate an understanding of the Sheridan  
3 School District or the Sheridan community.

4 The city council appreciates what the  
5 TriCity Academy applicants are trying to accomplish,  
6 however, we do not believe that there -- have  
7 demonstrated that Sheridan is the right place for their  
8 school or that they have a Sheridan-based support for  
9 their schools. We thank the Board of Education for  
10 considering our concerns. Thank you very much.

11 I do have copies of this letter for you, if  
12 I could --

13 MR. LUNDEEN: Just give it to staff there.

14 MR. HALL: Thank you very much.

15 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank -- thank you very much.

16 Sharon Kaminsky (ph).

17 MS. CHIMENSKY: Hi there. My name is Sharon  
18 Kaminsky. I have been an Englewood resident for the past  
19 17 years. And I'm also a member of the District  
20 Accountability Committee for the Englewood schools.

21 I would like to start my comments by saying  
22 that I believe in charter schools. However, as you  
23 review the Tri-City Charter School application between  
24 now and January 7<sup>th</sup>, you will find that it is poorly  
25 written, and it's a mediocre attempt at building a strong



1 plan, at best.

2 I have participated on the review of this  
3 charter school application with the Englewood School  
4 District Accountability Committee for the past three  
5 years. In that time the charter applicants have made  
6 little to no improvement on their application. This is  
7 something I could accomplish in two weeks. However, I'm  
8 not interested in spending my time on this particular  
9 charter application, because I'm happy with the service  
10 provided to my family by the Englewood schools.

11 That aside, this particular charter school  
12 application doesn't show that this business is prepared  
13 to thrive. I feel that this -- that opening this charter  
14 school would be a disservice to the community of  
15 Englewood and the students who attend the schools.

16 The taxpayers of Englewood voted a few years  
17 ago to support the renovation of our high school. This  
18 was a vote of support for the public schools in  
19 Englewood. The community has rallied around the schools  
20 that are currently in place. It's a very exciting time  
21 in the Englewood community for the public schools.

22 Parents are not showing any support for an  
23 additional school to the Englewood system. As a  
24 community member and DAC member, I am not aware of any  
25 Englewood parents who have expressed interest in an





1 alternative to Englewood Public Schools.

2           The elementary schools in Englewood are  
3 already tailored to fit the diverse needs of the  
4 community. Bishop Elementary is tailored to reach the  
5 needs of the many ESL students and families in our  
6 community. Clayton Elementary School is tailored to fit  
7 the graphic and fine-arts needs of kids and families who  
8 are so inclined. Charles Hay World School is tailored to  
9 fit the needs of kids and families who valued the  
10 integrated IB Program. Cherrelyn is a robust,  
11 traditional, all-around school, but also has a focus on  
12 reaching the needs of the highest special needs kids in  
13 our community.

14           Within this framework parents in the  
15 community are not expressing a need for an additional  
16 elementary school. These schools ae actually pulling  
17 kids from out of district. There are also students in  
18 Englewood -- in the Englewood District choosing to attend  
19 charter schools and other magnet schools outside the  
20 district. This is not different from other communities  
21 in the Denver Metro area.

22           Parents today in every district are shopping  
23 around for schools that meet the needs of their children.  
24 It is my belief that this charter school will not meet  
25 the -- meet the needs of any children in the Denver Metro



1 Area, because it's poorly designed. The poor design of  
2 this charter application leads me to believe that it will  
3 be poorly executed. The fact that this application was  
4 submitted to multiple communities shows me that the heart  
5 of these applicants is not with the children of my  
6 community, it's with the romantic idea of charter  
7 schools.

8 I ask you to deny this charter appeal on  
9 January 7th for two reasons. One, it's poorly designed  
10 and will be poorly executed, and will do a disservice to  
11 the Englewood Community and neighborhood -- neighboring  
12 communities for which they plan to recruit students.  
13 Second, there's no show of community support or demand  
14 for this charter school in the City of Englewood, or the  
15 neighboring communities to which they have applied.  
16 Thank you.

17 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you very much. I've got  
18 a couple more names that look like they were appended  
19 down into the corner here. R Lanado (ph) -- okay.  
20 Please, step to the mic. And then Charles Sawyer perhaps  
21 behind -- and please do introduce yourself. I'm having  
22 trouble leading -- reading your...

23 MR. LANADO: My handwriting actually is  
24 better upside-down. So, at any rate. Thank you for  
25 having us. There're a lot of positions taken by people,



1 and a lot of people use statistics which put most people  
2 to sleep. And a lot of very, very honest opinions,  
3 they're heartfelt. However, as a city council person I  
4 take my responsibility very, very serious. And I read  
5 all the documents, but what I really read were the  
6 citizens.

7 I want to speak to the grandparents, I want  
8 to speak to the truckers, I want to speak to real estate  
9 agents who are trying to sell houses. And, by the way,  
10 our houses are selling rather quickly. But when I'm  
11 talking to the different parents and the grandparents,  
12 and even the children, I try to present both sides of  
13 this argument as best as I could, and I did not find one  
14 group, one person, one grandparent who may have been in  
15 city council, or in Sheridan as a council person or a  
16 citizen.

17 Now we have issues, and we're addressing  
18 them now. But I think it'd be a tragedy to just  
19 basically derail our system. Because we have parents  
20 now, they come home, and they work, and they still take  
21 time out to go help our students. They're there helping  
22 other students learn English. I don't find us in other  
23 districts. In Sheridan we have a community that's proud.  
24 We are very proud. And some people say, well, we're  
25 poor. Poor doesn't make you wrong. Poor makes you work



1 harder. And that's just what our Sheridan people want.  
2 They work harder and they're going to -- really are not  
3 in favor of this. Not a one event the grandparents, real  
4 estate people. And I am not in favor of this charter  
5 school. Because it's really, really weak. These  
6 positions they take are -- I think they send them to the  
7 (indiscernible) because they didn't come back with real,  
8 hard facts. And that's what I try to present. And I  
9 couldn't find any. Thank you.

10 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you very much. And  
11 Charles Sawyer.

12 MR. SAWYER: Hi. I'm Charles Sawyer. I'm a  
13 resident of Sheridan, Colorado. And I'm thank you for  
14 letting me to express my opinions here. I've had nieces  
15 and nephews that go to Sheridan. I have a nephew that  
16 graduated and became a marine, and when he graduated and  
17 is in college to be a firefighter. And I have a niece  
18 who's a senior at Sheridan High School who's taken all  
19 her classes at Arapaho Community College.

20 Um, I think the charter school's a bad idea.  
21 The point I want to make to address, is that I think this  
22 is bad for the community. I think this could rip the  
23 community apart. And Sheridan is a very tight, and  
24 Sheridan is a very tight-knit community. And I think  
25 that this would be -- I would hope that you would agree



1 and deny this charter school at your January 7th meeting.  
2 Thank you.

3 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you very much. And that  
4 -- those are all the names that I can make out on this  
5 list. Are there other people here to testify in the --  
6 or to comment in the public comment session? Please,  
7 step to the microphone, state your name.

8 Ms. Sampayo: Hi. I'm Sarah Sampayo, and  
9 I'm from Monument, Colorado. I have three children in  
10 the public-school system. I have a document here, if you  
11 would be so kind to pass it out, thank you. This is copy  
12 of a lawsuit against the governor, the commissioner of  
13 education, the department of education, the treasurer,  
14 the attorney general, and others. It is a suit  
15 challenging the disbursement of state funds to a testing  
16 consortium claiming the very existence of consortiums  
17 like Smarter Balanced and PARCC are a violation of  
18 Article 1, Section 10 of the U.S. constitution.

19 The petition points out that by signing the  
20 state into this consortium the governor and commissioner  
21 have engaged in a course of conduct that would cede the  
22 state's sovereignty over educational policy within its  
23 borders to the inter-state consortium.

24 It points out that although the consortium  
25 operates under the influence of federal regulators, it



1 operates with closed meetings and purports to be exempt  
2 from both state and federal open records laws. The  
3 consortium prevents teachers, administering it's  
4 assessments from reviewing the assessments, and is  
5 insulated from public accountability in a way that state  
6 and federal governments are not.

7 This suit was filed just a few months ago on  
8 September 12 of this year in the State of Missouri. They  
9 have already received a temporary restraining order  
10 against participation in the testing consortium.

11 I am respectfully asking and requesting  
12 action from this governing body that you exercise your  
13 constitutional authority to restore local autonomy over  
14 education by declaring the school districts are no longer  
15 bound to the PARCC consortium at is -- as it is an  
16 illegal compact, and therefore null and void.

17 Further, I would argue that the MOU was  
18 signed under coercion, because House Bill 12-1240, as  
19 written violates the separation of powers. Because the  
20 legislative branch required by law that the governor, the  
21 commissioner of education, and the Chair of the Board of  
22 Education to act in a certain way in their official  
23 capacity. They were not free to do otherwise.

24 As we close this year of 2012 -- 2014, it's  
25 upon your shoulders to do everything in your power to



1 right this wrong and save the State of Colorado from  
2 going down the path of litigation these matters. Thank  
3 you.

4 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you very much. Is there  
5 anyone else who would like to make public comment at this  
6 time? Okay. Then with that I would -- I would caution  
7 the board as you head into your January meeting to abide  
8 diligently by the rules with regard to ex parte  
9 communications in charter school appeals. I won't have  
10 the opportunity to participate with you, but I would  
11 encourage you to give that thought. I -- obviously  
12 there's concern in the community and I just want to make  
13 sure that you abide by the rules or encourage you to do  
14 so.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And what that means  
16 is...?

17 MR. LUNDEEN: Carrie, do you want to  
18 describe how to manage the ex parte communications with  
19 regard to charter appeals?

20 MS. MARKEL: Thank you, Mr. Chair, members of  
21 the board. In considering charter school appeals you are  
22 sitting in a quasi-judicial capacity. And what that  
23 means in part, is that the hearing shall be based on the  
24 record that's presented to you at the time of the charter  
25 school appeal. And that if someone outside of the



1 context of a State Board meeting contacts you to speak  
2 about the merits of the charter school appeal under the  
3 rules of -- that govern charter school appeals as well as  
4 ethical rules. You should not have that conversation and  
5 encourage the person to be part of the appeal, if  
6 possible.

7 MS. NEAL: English would be helpful.

8 MR. LUNDEEN: Absolutely. Or certainly more  
9 elucidation of what it means. And as I've sign-posted my  
10 absence I noticed that the individual who has been  
11 elected by the vacancy committee for the Fifth  
12 Congressional District to replace me is, in fact, in the  
13 room. Ralph Laures (ph) who was elected in the previous  
14 general election is here. But I would also acknowledge  
15 Steve Durham, who's in the back part of the room there as  
16 the fellow who has been elected to -- in my stead in this  
17 seat. So good morning, and welcome to the board room,  
18 sir.

19 MR. DURHAM: Thank you.

20 MR. LUNDEEN: So, we will move on at this  
21 point to our action on the legislative priorities. Mr.  
22 Commissioner.

23 COMM. HAMMOND: Thank you, Mr. Chair. At  
24 the last board meeting I think we finally got to a point  
25 where, on your legislative priorities, I think we've





1 reached consensus. But we'll know that today.

2 Like Ms. Jennifer Mellow, if she's here,  
3 come forward and we'll go over your priorities and see if  
4 you concur with us and we'll finally have everything  
5 (indiscernible). Jennifer?

6 MR. LUNDEEN: Hello again.

7 MS. MELLOW: Hello again. Long time no see.  
8 So, at the last meeting you all reached consensus on most  
9 of these topics, but you wanted to continue to discuss  
10 the section around assessments. Also, in that time frame  
11 you all worked together on a letter that you sent to the  
12 12.02 commission. That process actually completed itself  
13 before I put pen to paper here. So, I hope that what you  
14 see here is not actually a surprise. It's intended to be  
15 very reflective of the consensus you reached in that  
16 letter. Seems like we might as well use that.

17 So, it's not word-for-word in every  
18 instance. And I re-organized it a little bit. Just  
19 because of the nature of this document versus the nature  
20 of that document, but that's where all of this comes  
21 from.

22 MR. LUNDEEN: Immediate questions.

23 MS. NEAL: That's -- you're talking about  
24 number four on your report?

25 MS. MELLOW: Mr. Chair, Vice Chair, yes.



1 MR. LUNDEEN: Start at the far end of the  
2 dais. Elaine.

3 MS. BERMAN: So, thank you for including the  
4 language. When we were writing this letter, it was -- it  
5 was an interesting little project, and I think we were  
6 all shooting in stuff, and Carrie was trying to manage  
7 that.

8 There is something in here that I wasn't  
9 comfortable with before, and I'm still not comfortable  
10 with now, because I don't -- I don't know enough about  
11 it. So, I'd like to suggest we delete it. And that's  
12 the statement: Except students from further assessment  
13 upon demonstration of mastery of relevant standards.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Where?

15 MS. BERMAN: I'm on number four, well all  
16 the red stuff is.

17 MR. LUNDEEN: Three lines from the bottom of  
18 the red.

19 MS. BERMAN: I had, at that time, requested  
20 some feedback from staff in terms of how they felt about  
21 that, but we were moving too quickly. So, because I  
22 don't understand it, and because I'm not sure about it, I  
23 can't support that particular statement.

24 MS. NEAL: You want comments on her comment?

25 MR. LUNDEEN: Sure. I'd be happy to respond



1 to that (indiscernible)

2 MS. NEAL: I just would want to respond to  
3 Elaine. I agree with you it needs to be expanded upon.  
4 It's, you know, that's not clear at all. So, I think  
5 that we need to expand on that sentence.

6 MR. LUNDEEN: Okay. So, it was my thought,  
7 and we could recharacterize it. Now here's the thing,  
8 though. I don't want to beat -- this is really, in many  
9 meaningful ways, this is something that I am kind of  
10 handing off, to a certain extent, and walking away from.  
11 So, I don't want to force upon you things that you may  
12 not be comfortable with. So, I don't want to advocate  
13 too vigorously. But let me say, here's what I was trying  
14 to get at.

15 It's this idea of students who've passed a  
16 point in their academic career being pulled backwards to  
17 be tested on something that maybe is one or two or three  
18 years in their rear-view mirror. This idea of concurrent  
19 enrollment students being drug back into the classroom  
20 for a test that is -- was meaningful to them three or  
21 four years previously, but no longer meaningful to them.  
22 For the purposes, primarily, of accountability. And then  
23 it calls into question just how valuable it is for the  
24 purposes of accountability. I mean, the student taking  
25 the test has absolutely zero motivation to participate in



1 a meaningful way on the exam. So that's what I was  
2 trying to get at.

3 MS. NEAL: And, Mr. Chair. I would -- I  
4 would respond that I totally agree with you. I just  
5 think that it needs expanded, and it's not real clear  
6 exactly what kind of -- I mean, we just spent an hour  
7 talking about some rules and what they meant.

8 MR. LUNDEEN: Sure.

9 MS. NEAL: So, I just think that it leads --  
10 we need to define that, and how it would work. But I do  
11 not -- I don't --

12 MR. LUNDEEN: And again, I would just say  
13 I'd accept whatever language you come up with around  
14 this.

15 MS. NEAL: I do not disagree with you.  
16 Okay?

17 MS. MAZANEC: My quest -- on this issue, I  
18 mean, it goes on to say: Upon demonstration of mastery of  
19 relevant standards. I don't know. Seems like that  
20 could... what's the problem with that?

21 MR. LUNDEEN: Pam. Or, I'm sorry, Angelika.

22 MS. SCHROEDER: The problem is some of the  
23 things that we've been talking about, which is that the  
24 assessments as they are today are not structured for a  
25 competency-based system that allows time to be flexible



1 and outcomes to be set. And so, we have lots of concerns  
2 with the system the way it is now.

3 In particular, we thought we would be able  
4 to have end-of-course assessments at the high school  
5 level, and that didn't come into play. So, there's no  
6 question in my mind --

7 MS. MAZANEC: But that would change that.  
8 Right? If we did them, like, end of course?

9 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. There's no question  
10 in my mind that there are problems with the assessment  
11 system and that we would like it to be different, so that  
12 it acknowledges the variation in time. But that's not  
13 exactly what I'm -- my question on this part D is, is  
14 this even legal? Because we're not -- we're not really  
15 taking care of the notion that all students will be  
16 assessed. Which is part of the system that we have.

17 What you're suggesting is that the timing of  
18 the assessment ought to vary, and I wouldn't argue with  
19 that, but that isn't what this is. So I think -- I have  
20 a hunch that D is probably illegal. But we just say that  
21 some things don't have to be assessed at all.

22 MR. LUNDEEN: Jane?

23 MS. GOFF: Yes. I agree with that, and I  
24 agree with what was said previously. I, personally, am -  
25 - I look for ways to avoid the laundry list syndrome.



1 And in addition to that maybe it's the word "exempt" that  
2 is dangerous, or poses big problems. If you say except  
3 you're taking it -- that has a connotation to -- a  
4 different one as far as however many people you ask about  
5 it.

6 The idea was, and I will support the -- I  
7 understand what it meant. I got it right away, because I  
8 was fresh out of conversations with the gifted education  
9 community about this. And part of their goals all along,  
10 their goals, have -- has been how do we fit this in. The  
11 phrase they use, and there is some language in some of  
12 their writings, their documentation, they use off-level  
13 testing.

14 So, it's the same sort of thing as with  
15 concurrent enrollment kids. These advanced learners who  
16 are on a path of jumping over and that's where their --  
17 that's what a lot of that is all about. The opportunity  
18 to advance to move, whether it's sideways, ahead, for  
19 these kids. And I will say, in general, special  
20 education categories, but Especially the GT community.

21 So, they use off-level testing. And that  
22 can mean let's have that -- let's make that opportunity  
23 available so that if a student has advanced, mastered the  
24 standards, shown, demonstrated that they have met the  
25 standards, or exceeded them in most cases. Then they can



1 move on, do the next thing.

2 So, it's not that it's a bad idea, but I  
3 would agree that maybe for the -- for the sake of our  
4 legislative priorities it's a general statement, set of  
5 statements, around the assessment system. We, I would  
6 think and hope, still have flexibility, as the process  
7 plays out, that we can create other proposals and  
8 propositions around that, and work within rules, if it  
9 comes to that point. To make that clear.

10 I would say -- I'm spending a lot of words  
11 saying that it can stay in or it can come totally out.  
12 But if it stays in, it does need some clarification.

13 MR. LUNDEEN: So, if we just soften the verb  
14 does that solve this conversation? No. It doesn't.  
15 Okay.

16 MS. NEAL: Can I add, again.

17 MS. GOFF: Not really.

18 MS. NEAL: I -- this is a perfect example of  
19 we just spent an hour talking about the language on some  
20 rulemaking. And I have -- I totally agree. I just think  
21 it -- we need to explain it to the schools. What is it?  
22 We provide opportunities for students to opt out if they  
23 meet certain expectations. We don't know what those  
24 expectations are. Is it 85? Is it 75? Is it 100? You  
25 know. I just think it needs to be expanded on, and I



1 don't think this is a good place to do that. I think we  
2 can trust that, you know, maybe Jennifer could send it  
3 out and we can respond to her and expand upon it.  
4 Because you're arguing with my idea just because I, you  
5 know, said relevant. I don't want to sit here for an  
6 hour and talk about what we're going to do  
7 (indiscernible).

8 MR. LUNDEEN: Hour? We got three hours  
9 budgeted for this.

10 MS. NEAL: I know. And we're good at that.  
11 So I just think it's -- it need -- is there anybody who  
12 disagrees with the concept?

13 MS. SCHROEDER: What concept? Of leaving it  
14 in, or taking it out?

15 MS. MAZANEC: Taking it out or leaving it  
16 in?

17 MR. LUNDEEN: My -- the concept as offered.

18 MS. MAZANEC: Oh, the concept of  
19 flexibility.

20 MS. NEAL: The concept as offered. That we  
21 provide opportunities for students who are qualified to  
22 opt out. I don't think anybody agrees with -- disagrees  
23 with that, so let's work on it. Well, Angelika may, but...

24 MR. LUNDEEN: Let Scheffel bite at the apple  
25 here.





1 MS. SCHEFFEL: I was just going to say,  
2 these are just our legislative priorities. So, whether  
3 they're, quote, legal or not, is -- I don't think we have  
4 to worry about. We're just saying this language --

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh. I do.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, the point is, though --

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We probably ought to  
8 be.

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: These are our legislative  
10 priorities. So, as we interface with the legislature and  
11 we look at what laws are past, that we're considering in  
12 terms of taking a position on it, we want to let this  
13 language inform or influence whatever it is or isn't on  
14 the legislature, and on the bills that are proposed. So,  
15 it's not like we have to put this language under the lens  
16 of whether or not a bill could be passed that would  
17 embrace this language. We're just saying that, as a  
18 board, we embrace this language and it will inform our  
19 discussions with the legislature. Or whether or not we  
20 take a position on the bills.

21 So, it's not like we have to take the  
22 current law as a lens to this language. These are our  
23 priorities. So, I think that at least helps me think  
24 about it. It's not like we have to benchmark this  
25 language based on what exists.



1 MR. LUNDEEN: Different rules.

2 MS. SCHEFFEL: We're using it to inform what  
3 could exist.

4 MR. LUNDEEN: Very good point.

5 MS. GOFF: But we're not necessarily in  
6 agreement about --

7 MR. LUNDEEN: What could exist.

8 MS. GOFF: About exempting.

9 MS. NEAL: That's the word.

10 MS. GOFF: We may be well be talking about  
11 timing as opposed to exempting.

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Well, the question is, is the  
13 language acceptable because it's somewhat ambiguous. And  
14 candidates on how you think --

15 MS. GOFF: It's not ambiguous at all. I'm  
16 wondering if we could talk about what we're saying in C,  
17 and maybe include something about -- I mean, I'm opposed  
18 to D. I just don't think it helps us at all. But I do  
19 think that the -- a deeper discussion about what's an  
20 appropriate assessment system given that we have  
21 standards, that we have time as a variable, and that we  
22 are on a competency-based system that some students  
23 probably in fourth grade aren't ready to take the fourth-  
24 grade assessment based on what they are.

25 I mean, this is a pretty big conversation



1 we've not had. I'm not ready for the legislature to pop  
2 something at us, either, other than some deeper studies.  
3 If you listen to the psychometricians, they're making  
4 suggestions, but they haven't actually -- I mean, there's  
5 a lot of research going on in this. And, by the way,  
6 there's going to be a webinar next week through NASB  
7 talking exactly about assessments and performance  
8 assessments and having different kinds of assessments.  
9 Because that's where we need to be going. But D doesn't  
10 get me there at all.

11 MS. GOFF: Well, and before we go too far.  
12 I have a little problem with C. Somebody moved --  
13 somebody moved right to D, and I didn't get to talk to C.

14 MS. GOFF: Sorry. Go ahead.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's amazing we all  
16 signed this letter. Isn't it?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did we sign this?

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No we didn't.

20 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes we did.

21 MR. LUNDEEN: Yes, we did.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It's verbatim from  
23 our last --

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was amazing.

25 MR. LUNDEEN: It was!



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: And we must have been  
2 unconscious at the time.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No. It's a small  
4 one, though.

5 MR. LUNDEEN: It was well -- it was well  
6 chewed upon.

7 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And well received.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He was definitely in  
9 our letter.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It was well received.

11 MR. LUNDEEN: Okay.

12 MS. GOFF: No. My only problem with C is  
13 limited impact on instructional time. I'd like it to say  
14 minimal. I think my concern with limited is that it  
15 could be defined. I like minimal because it's not --

16 MS. NEAL: You got to define minimal as well  
17 as limited. What do they mean?

18 MS. GOFF: I just -- I just want -- I just,  
19 I think it has more meaning as far as the last, then  
20 limited.

21 MR. LUNDEEN: Sorry. I'm going to seize  
22 this back from a -- and I would suggest we're not writing  
23 a rule here. And we're not being -- we are not  
24 responding to our responsibility for elucidating with  
25 more clarity a law that has been given to us. This is,



1 in fact, a set of conversations that are dynamic. You  
2 know what, for the four years I've been on this board the  
3 conversations have never been static. They've moved,  
4 they're -- it's just, you know, things we want to think  
5 about, chew on.

6 And toward the end of moving us forward with  
7 regard to the first issue, if you want to do something  
8 with that, I'll receive whatever you will as long --  
9 because I heard among the board members kind of a unified  
10 concern over this concept that I raised when properly  
11 elucidated. So, I don't know that we want to take the  
12 time to properly elucidate everything here, and I'd like  
13 to move us forward if I could.

14 MS. NEAL: And I would agree with you, Mr.  
15 Chair. Because we must remember that the legislator's  
16 not going to take this as some sort of Bible. They're  
17 going to do what they want to do.

18 MR. LUNDEEN: Well I know one who's  
19 listening to it.

20 MS. SCHROEDER: He better.

21 MS. NEAL: Except for this legislator.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're going to be  
23 (indiscernible)

24 MS. NEAL: So, I, you know, it's a general  
25 concept of what we'd like to see. I think we've -- I



1 agree with Paul. I think we're wasting a lot of time  
2 wasting talking about wordsmithing each little word.

3 MR. LUNDEEN: So, does Ms. Berman retract  
4 her objection, perhaps, at this point? Yes? No?

5 MS. NEAL: No pressure.

6 MS. BERMAN: Think I'd rather come up with  
7 different language. Because I don't think -- I would  
8 either -- to Marcia's point. I would either suggest  
9 eliminating it or making it clearer. But the way it is  
10 now I don't think I could support it.

11 MS. GOFF: Nor I.

12 MR. LUNDEEN: So, I'd say scratch it and  
13 move on. We've talked about it. It's in the record that  
14 there is unanimity around the broader concept. I don't  
15 want to spend the next 15 minutes re-wordsmithing that.

16 MS. NEAL: Yeah. I agree.

17 MS. BERMAN: I agree.

18 MS. NEAL: And it, you know...

19 MR. LUNDEEN: Strike it.

20 STAFF: Mr. Chair, just for clarity, may I  
21 ask, are we just striking the exempt students from  
22 further assessment upon demonstration of mastery of  
23 relevant standards?

24 MS. NEAL: Right now we are.

25 MR. LUNDEEN: Yes.



1 STAFF: Okay. I just want to make sure I  
2 was tracking what you guys were telling me to do.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes.

4 MS. NEAL: Why, you can't track us?

5 MR. LUNDEEN: Right.

6 MS. MAZANEC: Why couldn't we say explores  
7 the concept of?

8 MR. LUNDEEN: Well, we could. Because I've  
9 heard that we could get the consensus if we spent the  
10 time to do it. That's -- I've heard that in the last 10  
11 minutes. I'm just saying --

12 MS. MAZANEC: Well, that'd be very broad,  
13 but --

14 MR. LUNDEEN: Doesn't have the force of law,  
15 but let's move forward.

16 MS. MAZANEC: He just wants to check this  
17 off his list.

18 MS. SCHEFFEL: If he wants to do it, whether  
19 it's in there or not, he can influence that. I'm --

20 MR. LUNDEEN: All right, other comments.  
21 Did you want to pursue your comments around C, Pam? You  
22 had said minimal instead of limited, or minimized?

23 MS. MAZANEC: Not now.

24 MR. LUNDEEN: Not now? Okay.

25 MS. BERMAN: So help me figure out. We're



1 keeping D in, but it says --

2 MR. LUNDEEN: We're striking that one  
3 phrase.

4 MS. NEAL: One phrase.

5 MS. BERMAN: So any local choice you should  
6 align closely with Colorado Graduation Guidelines, and --

7 MS. NEAL: Provide transparency.

8 MS. BERMAN: Provide transparency.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Period.

10 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Period.

11 MR. LUNDEEN: Get you there, Elaine?

12 MS. BERMAN: Sure. I'm fine with local --

13 MR. LUNDEEN: Get you Angelika, there?

14 Okay? Other feedback on that?

15 MS. SCHROEDER: Yeah. I don't know that it  
16 -- I don't know that it says anything. What does it say?  
17 What does D say now?

18 MS. GOFF: Menu of options.

19 MS. SCHROEDER: I mean, that's what  
20 districts already have. That's, there's a...

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Angelika, we signed  
22 this letter and it's been read and distributed widely.  
23 And we've already --

24 MS. SCHROEDER: It has?

25 MR. LUNDEEN: We're re-plowing the field.





1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, yeah. We've  
2 presented this at the CASB conference.

3 MS. NEAL: Yeah. Let's move on.

4 MS. SCHROEDER: I mean, it doesn't say  
5 anything. It doesn't say anything that doesn't exist  
6 right now, which is what (indiscernible) are doing.  
7 Right?

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Was submitted over to  
9 (indiscernible)

10 MR. LUNDEEN: Oh, I think it says several  
11 things. Approved menu of options, cross-district  
12 collaboration, it re-supports graduation guidelines,  
13 which is a budding conversation.

14 MS. SCHROEDER: Sure. I'm just saying this  
15 is already going on. This doesn't require any  
16 legislation.

17 MR. LUNDEEN: No. I realize that.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: This is what districts are  
19 doing.

20 MR. LUNDEEN: Okay.

21 MS. SCHROEDER: So, I'm trying to figure out  
22 why we have it in our --?

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Because we support  
24 it.

25 MS. NEAL: Because we asked to do it.



1 MS. SCHEFFEL: Because in one way I think  
2 there -- the whole impetus for these comments was in  
3 light of the work the task force where things might  
4 change, these are -- these are (indiscernible) --

5 MS. SCHROEDER: Right. These are values.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: That you all support.

7 MR. LUNDEEN: Thank you.

8 MS. NEAL: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

9 MR. LUNDEEN: Other comments more broadly?  
10 So my one little phrase is the only thing which we  
11 actually could come to consensus on if we spent the time.  
12 Other comments? I think a motion is in order.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: I so move.

14 MS. NEAL: Good. She so moved. I move to  
15 approve the board's 2015 Legislative Policies.

16 MR. LUNDEEN: And there's a second?

17 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Elaine's --

18 MR. LUNDEEN: Jane had her hand up first.

19 Um, is there any objection? Hearing none, motion  
20 carries, thank you very much.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.

22 Next item on the agenda.

23 MS. NEAL: Oh, Mr. Chair, before she goes  
24 away. I just -- the board needs to think about next  
25 month when they appoint a new legislative liaison.



1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Liaisons.

2 MS. NEAL: Two new legislative liaisons, so  
3 you want to be thinking about that for next month.

4 MR. LUNDEEN: Good point.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Who are they today?

6 MS. BERMAN: They're Marcia and me.

7 MS. NEAL: Well they -- Elaine and I are,  
8 but --

9 MS. BERMAN: Or maybe it's Marcia and I.

10 MS. NEAL: But whether we do it, Elaine  
11 certainly will not be here. So, we need a new democrat  
12 then.

13 MS. BERMAN: That's very accurate.

14 MS. NEAL: So just something we need to  
15 think about.

16 (Meeting adjourned)

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 8th day of March, 2019.

/s/ Kimberly C. McCright  
Kimberly C. McCright  
Certified Vendor and Notary Public

Verbatim Reporting & Transcription, LLC  
1322 Space Park Drive, Suite C165  
Houston, Texas 77058  
281.724.8600