



Colorado State Board of Education

---

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS  
BEFORE THE  
COLORADO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION COMMISSION  
DENVER, COLORADO  
March 11, 2015, Part 6

BE IT REMEMBERED THAT on March 11, 2015, the  
above-entitled meeting was conducted at the Colorado  
Department of Education, before the following Board  
Members:

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



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The Board will  
2 immediately come back to order, please. Attention,  
3 attention, Board.

4 MADAM CHAIR: All right. At 5:15 we are  
5 taking off on 20.01, the CMAS and CoAlt Science and  
6 Social Studies High School Cut Scores. Please note that  
7 we have 30 minutes allocated for this activity, and then  
8 after that we have a very short resolution, and we can go  
9 home. We can't go home. We have to go to dinner. So we  
10 need to get moving.

11 So, anyway, who is leading this. Are you  
12 leading this?

13 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Yeah.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Let's go.

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: We have to go to Joyce.  
16 Let's hit it, okay --

17 MADAM CHAIR: Joyce.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- because we talked  
19 about it at the last Board meeting.

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair, this is a  
21 follow-up to our presentation last week -- last week? --  
22 last month -- it seems like last week --

23 MADAM CHAIR: No, it seems like six months  
24 ago.

25 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- when I came and shared



1 with you the process that we were going to be following  
2 for establishing recommended cut scores, the CMAS  
3 (indiscernible) assessments. I know that there was a  
4 request at last month's meeting that we not read the  
5 slides, and I trust that you guys have gone through the  
6 slides already, so I'm going to be skipping a lot of the  
7 slides. Let me know if I need to go back to capture  
8 some.

9 Today we're here to ask you to adopt the  
10 recommended cut scores and performance level descriptors  
11 for both CMAS and the Colorado Alternate Assessment in  
12 science and social studies for high school.

13 Board responsibility, this again was  
14 requested last month. There is legislative direction.  
15 The Board is required to specify an acceptable  
16 performance level on each state content assessment and  
17 then performance level is defined in Section 22-7-402(9).  
18 And the performance level specifically references being  
19 relative to a content standard.

20 For the standard-setting, again, a reminder.  
21 We followed a content-based cut score-setting approach.  
22 Colorado, when they moved forward with CAP4K, started  
23 with standards. We've built the assessments and now we  
24 are bringing forth recommended cut scores based on that  
25 content.



1 I am going to jump, with your permission,  
2 all the way to slide number 19.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Well, that was good. I liked  
4 that.

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: You're very welcome, Madam  
6 Chair.

7 So getting to the meat of it, the panel's  
8 CMAS recommendations. Remember what the panel are asked  
9 to do is they get an item-ordered book with items ordered  
10 from easiest to hardest, and they're essentially asking  
11 the question, which of these would we expect students to  
12 get correct at certain levels?

13 You see here, essentially, the page numbers  
14 that they marked for each one of the performance levels,  
15 and this is what the distribution looks like. When we  
16 are looking at social studies we have 1 percent of the  
17 students who fall into the distinguished command level,  
18 we have 9 percent that fall into the strong command  
19 level, with the remaining students falling at the  
20 moderate or limited command level. For science we have 2  
21 percent of the students falling at the distinguished  
22 command level, 17 at the strong command level, and the  
23 rest of the students falling at the moderated or limited  
24 command levels.

25 We did ask the panelists whether or not they



1 could support the final recommended cut scores, and what  
2 you see on slide number 23 is that over 70 percent, up to  
3 100 percent, could strongly or moderately support the  
4 final recommended cut scores.

5 What we are asking the State Board to do  
6 today, again, is to adopt the high school science and  
7 social studies recommended cut scores and their  
8 associated performance level descriptors for the Colorado  
9 Measures of Academic Success.

10 I'm going to pause there --

11 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- and ask whether you want  
13 to stop, have a conversation here, or whether you want me  
14 to also address the Colorado Alternate Assessments.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Board, what is your pleasure?

16 MS. SCHROEDER: I have a question.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Angelika's got a question.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So can you just sort of  
19 describe the discussions when you're talking about the  
20 support, strong support and moderate support? What sort  
21 of -- do some folks feel they are too easy, they are too  
22 hard? Is it all over the map? Are there only particular  
23 areas where there's -- I mean, this is a bit of a  
24 consolidation of our prior interesting discussions.

25 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

2 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Absolutely. We are pulling  
3 some additional information. What we tended to see was  
4 exactly what you indicated, which was some people said  
5 they were a little too high, some people said that they  
6 were a little too low. It is true that for the science  
7 strong command cut score there was a group that thought  
8 that they were, quote/unquote, "really high," way too  
9 high. So there was a group of about 25 percent of the  
10 educators who said they were way too high with over 55  
11 percent of the educators saying that they were spot-on,  
12 and then the rest of the educators split about being a  
13 little bit too high or a little bit too low.

14 That is where you saw the most difference.  
15 When we look at social studies for the moderate command  
16 there was the -- sorry, for moderate command there was a  
17 little bit more of a split between them being appropriate  
18 and being a little bit too high. For social studies, for  
19 the strong command and for distinguished command, we had  
20 over 70 percent of the panelists saying they are  
21 appropriate, not a little too hard and not a little too  
22 easy but spot-on.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Questions? If I've got this  
24 right, we're talking elementary, middle school, and high  
25 school?



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair, this is just  
2 the high school.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Just high school.

4 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Remember last summer, in  
5 August, you approved the cut scores for the elementary  
6 and middle school science and social studies assessments.

7 MADAM CHAIR: I have forgotten that but  
8 you're right.

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: And so this is just for high  
10 school, the assessment that was administered in November.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Other questions?  
12 Steve.

13 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. Just so I  
14 understand, looking at the chart on page 11, where you  
15 have the social studies. So the group that said what  
16 they believed the students should know, and then you  
17 tested these questions on a sample group of students. Is  
18 that correct?

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: No. The assessment was  
22 administered statewide in November. It wasn't a sample  
23 set of students.

24 MR. DURHAM: Oh, okay.

25 MS. ZURKOWSKI: It was statewide.



1 MR. DURHAM: So this is -- so based on the  
2 cut score you're asking us to set, almost half of the  
3 students have a limited command, which is a pretty broad  
4 gradation. I mean, you'd have a hard time relating it  
5 from A to F, in good old-fashioned grading systems, and  
6 also the 46 percent with moderate command also lacks, I  
7 think, much gradation. And so you have a standard here  
8 where I would suspect that most of your AP students don't  
9 have distinguished command, because you must have more  
10 than 1 percent of your student body in advanced placement  
11 history.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Go ahead.

13 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair, at this point  
14 we are not able to compare scores of individual students  
15 on this assessment compared to the advanced placement  
16 assessments. If it is the Board's desire that we do that  
17 give us that direction and we will look into the  
18 appropriate ways to go about and do that, being very  
19 sensitive to the privacy of that data, and we'll see if  
20 we can accomplish that.

21 MR. DURHAM: That's not the question. I  
22 mean, I'm trying to -- I saw some statistics of the  
23 number, or the percentage of people in high school who  
24 were in advanced placement, and it was certainly more  
25 than 1 percent.





1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair, I will be  
2 honest with you that off the top of my head I don't know  
3 the percentage of the students that are taking each one  
4 of the individual AP courses. We can look into that.

5 MADAM CHAIR: So, Steve, are you thinking  
6 that the advanced placement should be higher?

7 MR. DURHAM: Well, I'm saying that either we  
8 --

9 MADAM CHAIR: No, I'm not disagreeing with  
10 you.

11 MR. DURHAM: -- either we have students in  
12 advanced placement who shouldn't be there or this  
13 standard is so high that almost none of the students in  
14 advanced placement can demonstrate distinguished command.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Do you have any idea, Rebecca?  
16 Yes.

17 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair, Jack Daly is  
18 one of our social studies panelists and he's here with us  
19 today.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Very good.

21 MS. ZURKOWSKI: And he just indicated that  
22 he would love to address that question.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Good. Jack, go ahead.

24 MR. DALY: Madam Chairman, the way that I  
25 looked at it -- because when we sat down and went through



1 the whole test, plus my experience as a teacher -- I  
2 think you're right that the AP kids should be scoring  
3 advanced. But what the problem is with this is this a  
4 social studies test, not a history test, and looking at  
5 the responses that kids were turning in for the test the  
6 problem is not that they're not scoring well in history,  
7 for example, they're not scoring well in all four things.

8 So you may have your AP kids, which the most  
9 common AP classes they're probably taking is an AP  
10 history class, scoring very well on the history. They  
11 haven't taken economics.

12 MADAM CHAIR: They haven't taken economics.

13 MR. DALY: So they just -- economics, for  
14 example --

15 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, yes.

16 MR. DALY: -- because that is very  
17 underrepresented in our state. It's not required almost  
18 anywhere and it's not taught in a lot of school  
19 districts. And so if they are not very first in  
20 economics, that, I believe, 23 percent of the test is  
21 based on economics. So even if you hit the history part,  
22 which is 26 percent, and do very well, you're still not  
23 going to score in the distinguished because you're  
24 missing that part.

25 MS. FLORES: So why are we doing cut scores?



1                   MADAM CHAIR: So would it be fair to say  
2 that we're looking at these as beginning? I mean, the  
3 whole play is, as we go through, the scores would  
4 increase and you would be changing them. But if we are  
5 going to do this for the first time ever, that this would  
6 be -- and I certainly get what you're saying there. Yes,  
7 please.

8                   MR. DALY: Madam Chairman, I think you're  
9 exactly right. I think what -- the way I look at this,  
10 as a teacher coming from a small rural district, is this  
11 helps give me some guidance on the type of classes and  
12 things that we need to be teaching our kids. Because if  
13 you look around our state -- and this comes from talking  
14 with other teachers and administrators and stuff --  
15 oftentimes our kids are not required to have very much  
16 social studies in high school. Oftentimes they don't  
17 take it after their sophomore year, or until after  
18 sophomore year and they may not take it again until their  
19 second semester of their senior year. And so there are  
20 gaps in our social studies knowledge. And I think this  
21 test is really showing that, and if districts will take  
22 this honestly and look at it and look at what their  
23 curriculum currently is and make it more available to  
24 kids, I think you'll see the scores go up dramatically,  
25 fairly easily, once the kids are taught the subjects.



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair.

2 MS. FLORES: Madam Chair.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. So would you see this  
4 then as perhaps like the beginning steps?

5 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair, I wanted to  
6 expand on something that Jack indicated.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Go right ahead.

8 MS. ZURKOWSKI: First of all, he referenced  
9 the four areas and I just want to remind us all that our  
10 high school social studies standards have four different  
11 areas, history being one, geography, civics, and  
12 economics. And remember, this is a content-based test.  
13 It's an achievement test, not an ability test, right. It  
14 is what do the kids know about these content areas. And  
15 I just wanted to remind folks that's why you may have  
16 kids who do fine in the history but they're missing the  
17 other three areas.

18 MR. DURHAM: Madam Chair.

19 MADAM CHAIR: And then it's a beginning  
20 process for many of them.

21 MS. FLORES: But why are we doing cut scores  
22 now?

23 MADAM CHAIR: Excuse me.

24 MS. FLORES: Sorry.

25 MR. DURHAM: And I -- I mean, how can you



1 possibly place 23 percent of a grade on a subject that's  
2 probably not taught in most high schools?

3 MADAM CHAIR: Well, that's the point. Maybe  
4 we will be.

5 MR. DURHAM: I mean, that happens to be my  
6 particular field of study, Madam Chair, and I'm not sure  
7 that every high school student really needs to take  
8 economics. It's really a field of study. It's what I  
9 did in college. I didn't do it in high school.

10 MR. DALY: But to be quite honest --

11 MADAM CHAIR: Go right ahead.

12 MR. DURHAM: But you're going to base 23  
13 percent of a score on a class that nobody's had.

14 MR. DALY: And you're right, and I think  
15 you're exactly right, and that's why there's a  
16 frustration with this test score. And I'll tell you,  
17 from a local control aspect, there's a large frustration  
18 with it, but part of the problem that I have as a history  
19 teacher -- as a social studies teacher -- see, again, I  
20 called myself a history teacher -- as a social studies  
21 teacher, social studies has been devalued in our society  
22 because we have focused so heavily on language arts and  
23 mathematics, because of our testing, and so with that  
24 districts haven't taught it. And even though it sounds  
25 like a lot when you're talking about economics -- because



1 I took a lot of economics in college and I know what you  
2 mean by that -- this is pretty low-level economics. We  
3 are having kids that are coming out that this is personal  
4 financial literacy, it's opportunity costs, it's some of  
5 the basic stuff that really, for them to function,  
6 whether or not at the college level, they need it to  
7 function as -- in my opinion, they need it to function a  
8 little bit better as an adult. That's what we're  
9 supposed to be preparing them to go out into the world.

10 MADAM CHAIR: All right.

11 MS. FLORES: Madam Chair.

12 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

13 MS. FLORES: Exactly. Why are we doing cut  
14 scores? Why aren't we waiting a few years until schools  
15 catch up? They know. And so I don't think we should  
16 even be talking about cut scores at this point, because -  
17 -

18 MADAM CHAIR: Go ahead. Answer her. Yes.

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair.

20 MADAM CHAIR: You say the same thing I would  
21 say.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: As I indicated earlier, I  
23 skipped through a lot of the slides and a lot of the  
24 history. This assessment is based on the standards that  
25 were adopted back in December of 2009, so they were



1 adopted five years ago. This is the first time that we  
2 have given this high school assessment. It is baseline  
3 information. I would suggest that if we waited another  
4 five years we would have the exact same results.

5 MADAM CHAIR: Right. Absolutely. Deb.

6 MS. SCHROEDER: Great discussion. I  
7 remember having this discussion last time when we set the  
8 middle and elementary school cut scores. I was concerned  
9 then, as I am now, with setting them such that only 4  
10 percent -- am I reading it right? -- of the kids end up  
11 having distinguished command, and 17 strong command. The  
12 vast majority of kids are doing abysmally on this test,  
13 based on these cut scores. And they're based on these  
14 performance level descriptors, which I raised concerns  
15 about last time. And I just wasn't able to get a strong  
16 answer why these bullets, on these pieces of paper, on  
17 these documents, drive how these cut scores are set.

18 So, for example, to get distinguished  
19 command in social studies you have to be able to analyze  
20 the interconnectedness of the world, the movement of  
21 people, goods, and ideas, and how they can enrich  
22 cultures or create tensions. Who drafted this language?  
23 Why is that motivating the nature of these cut scores? I  
24 think we're creating the conditions for a narrative of  
25 failure far worse than we already have, based on these



1 cut scores. And it would be one thing if they were based  
2 on a mastery of specific knowledge that's typically  
3 understood to be the core of a knowledge domain, but when  
4 I read this language, this is highly ambiguous and highly  
5 subject to ideological penchant.

6 And I find that, you know, was the Delphi  
7 technique used to reach consensus with these 28 people?  
8 I mean, it's just creating such a power base with a small  
9 group of people, putting them in a situation where they  
10 must reach consensus. I've been in those meetings and I  
11 just feel the whole state is being subject now to these  
12 decisions, and I find it problematic. I think it's a  
13 great discussion.

14 MADAM CHAIR: Go ahead.

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair, in terms of the  
16 performance level descriptors, again, I'm going to go  
17 back and do a little bit of history. First of all,  
18 standards were adopted in 2009, and those standards  
19 indicated the content and skills that Colorado indicated  
20 they wanted their high school students to have --

21 MADAM CHAIR: Wanted their --

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- mastered by the time they  
23 walked across the stage.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me. May I ask -

25 -





1 MADAM CHAIR: No. Wait. Let her finish,  
2 please.

3 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So those standards are the  
4 basis of the assessment. We took those standards, we  
5 created what we referred to as the assessment framework,  
6 indicating what would be --

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: -- performance level  
8 descriptors.

9 MS. ZURKOWSKI: -- included on the  
10 assessment. That assessment framework was put out for  
11 public comment several years ago, so that folks could  
12 indicate to us what they thought was appropriate, what  
13 they thought was not appropriate. The performance level  
14 descriptors, if you look at a lot of the language in the  
15 performance level descriptors, the language comes  
16 straight from the standards, and you can see a direct  
17 relationship between those PLDs and the standards  
18 themselves.

19 MADAM CHAIR: And I don't like to interject  
20 myself before the rest of you get to talk, but you had to  
21 be here, you know, when we adopted the standards in 2009,  
22 and many of us were. We were there and we adopted them.

23 So these cut scores we're talking about are  
24 aspirational, and if you think that if we don't do it  
25 until they are smarter, I mean, how are they ever going



1 to become current in these areas?

2 And so I know it's frustrating to say, here,  
3 we're setting these scores and, you know, only 1 percent  
4 or whatever are going to be high scorers, but if we don't  
5 begin there, they're not going to get there just because  
6 we tell them, oh, gee, or because we -- it's just like my  
7 argument with Steve a little while ago about graduation  
8 rates. Kids are not getting high scores in their  
9 graduations because they don't have to, and they're not  
10 going to get high cut scores in social studies or science  
11 or anything else until we tell them it's important. And  
12 we did tell them that in 2009. I hate to say now, gee,  
13 we changed our minds. It's not important. We're going  
14 to wait until you all know them and then we'll test them.

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair, one of the  
16 things that we also heard in the fall from some schools  
17 and some districts is when we put out the report, based  
18 on the elementary and middle school, that helped people  
19 understand what the expectations of the standards were.  
20 It gave them another angle for them to kind of look at  
21 those standards.

22 Remember that we not only give an overall  
23 social studies score, we also give information at the  
24 history level, the economics level, the civics level, and  
25 the geography level. We also look at, within the



1 standards, what is referred to as the grade level  
2 equivalent -- grade level expectation, sorry -- the grade  
3 level expectations, and we give information at that  
4 level. So schools and districts are able to dive deeply  
5 and see where their students performed well, where they  
6 didn't perform as well, and start making some decisions  
7 about what they may want to start doing, such as maybe we  
8 need to start addressing some of the economics that are  
9 found in the standards and were determined to be  
10 important by Colorado.

11 MADAM CHAIR: And the schools will not do  
12 that until they know they're important, exactly as you  
13 said.

14 MS. FLORES: Madam Chair.

15 MADAM CHAIR: You know, they're not going to  
16 just begin because Val says wait four years and they'll  
17 all be smart.

18 MS. FLORES: I'm not --

19 MADAM CHAIR: I was just kidding there.

20 But anyway, no, when it comes to social  
21 studies I get a little possessive, I guess, is the word.  
22 Because there's been a lot of thought put into this.  
23 And, no, I know those cut scores -- those scores are  
24 high, but if you're going to wait until they actually can  
25 do that, well, they're never going to be able to do that.



1 And as long as we don't ask them to do that -- and  
2 remember the resolution we passed about social studies,  
3 my resolution about social studies, how we had to tell  
4 the school districts that they're important, because they  
5 had become not important when we didn't identify social  
6 studies as one of the (indiscernible) that they needed to  
7 meet. Many of them stopped teaching social studies, and  
8 we are really pushing to get them to teach social studies  
9 again, and I don't think it's going to happen unless we  
10 put some tests in. And maybe we'll have a few bad years.  
11 But you've got the chicken and the egg, and I guess I'm  
12 putting the chicken first and you're putting the egg.  
13 I'm sorry.

14 Yes, Val, go ahead.

15 MS. FLORES: I happened to be at a board  
16 meeting for a school district in my congressional  
17 district, and these people -- this was this past fall --  
18 they were just planning to get -- you know, they planned  
19 that in five years the teachers would be ready for this  
20 test. They planned that they were going to do some trial  
21 testing on material, and this was going to be done within  
22 the next three years.

23 So if the teachers are going to be taught in  
24 five years, what are we doing here? This is a large  
25 school district. And I know. This past year I did speak



1 to a lot of teachers. A lot of teachers told me that  
2 their schools, lots of kids did not know keyboarding.  
3 You know, I hate to bring it up but this is a reality.  
4 So what are we doing when, in this particular district,  
5 only 140, I guess, students are going to take a test  
6 which, by hand, when most of those kids do not know  
7 keyboarding.

8 MADAM CHAIR: We're not talking about  
9 keyboarding. We're talking about social studies.

10 MS. FLORES: It's a reality. We're talking  
11 about a reality that you're not going to get anything  
12 from the -- you know, the results of a test where people  
13 don't know how to use a computer and don't have computers  
14 at home. This is Denver. That is a reality for Denver,  
15 and probably a lot of districts out in many rural areas,  
16 that don't even have services.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Angelika.

18 MS. SCHROEDER: So about 20 years ago I  
19 attended some sessions that were hosted by Mr. Elliott  
20 Asp, and we were looking at our new standards. We were  
21 talking about how do you really understand what the real  
22 expectations are in those standards? And what he said  
23 was you have to look at the assessments. It's once the  
24 assessments come out, it's sort of a cart-and-horse  
25 thing, but until you have the assessments it's really



1 hard to understand, really, what the expectations are.  
2 And I forget just almost everything but I've never  
3 forgotten that.

4 The problem that I see, Val, is how the  
5 results of these assessments are going to be used,  
6 because it is too early for us to lay a lot of blame.  
7 This is the same conversation we're going to have when  
8 the PARCC -- we won't be the ones setting the cut scores  
9 but it will be the same conversation. This is a new set  
10 of standards. Yes, they're five years old, but the 1995  
11 or '93 standards, whatever they were, there were  
12 districts that never adopted them. Just because the  
13 state said here are your standards, it doesn't mean  
14 districts adopted them. Until we see the assessments and  
15 teachers have a really clear sense of these are the  
16 expectations, then they will say, "Oh, my goodness, what  
17 is the curriculum that I need to find so that I can teach  
18 this to my kids?"

19 MS. FLORES: That's what they were talking  
20 about.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Wait a minute. Excuse me.  
22 Dr. Owen, you had a comment?

23 MR. OWEN: Madam Chair, I just might remind  
24 everyone that the results of this assessment for  
25 accountability purposes, going into 2015, are only to



1 help districts and schools if they want to go through the  
2 request reconsideration process. So they are not used to  
3 set ratings in the 2015 -- in the fall of 2015, for that  
4 school year. So I just wanted to remind everyone, in  
5 case you forgot. There was some legislation that passed  
6 last year that allowed us to use this year's rating as  
7 the basis for next year's rating, and prior year's rating  
8 for this year's rating. And so districts can bring that  
9 information forward if they choose but it's not going to  
10 be used in any way to penalize districts.

11 MADAM CHAIR: All right.

12 MS. FLORES: Not even teachers?

13 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Dr. Owen. See, you  
14 remind us of what we needed.

15 Given the time I'm wondering, do you want to  
16 -- you know, we're not under the gun to accept these  
17 tonight. If you would prefer to delay the discussion and  
18 accept them, I'm guessing. What is your feeling? Do you  
19 want us to accept them tonight?

20 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

22 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I won't address what I would  
23 like. What I will tell you is consequences of either  
24 adopting them at this Board meeting or postponing them  
25 for a while. Once we have the approved cut scores we can



1 then move forward with all of our reporting. So it's not  
2 until we have the approved cut scores that we'll be able  
3 to send out the individual student reports, the school  
4 reports, the district reports, that indicate how  
5 students, schools, and districts have done. That will be  
6 put on hold until we have a decision.

7 MADAM CHAIR: Good. Thank you. And would  
8 you also speak a little bit about what the cut scores  
9 mean to the various schools, that they're not going to be  
10 condemning them.

11 MS. FLORES: What about teachers?

12 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair, so I believe  
13 that Keith just tried to reaffirm for us, remind us all  
14 that in terms of accountability from the state level  
15 these scores are not going to have impact unless a school  
16 or district wants to bring them forward through the  
17 reconsideration process. So the stakes attached to those  
18 are not high. I'm going to ask Jill to address the  
19 educator effect in this issue, because the other avenue  
20 of high stakes that I think there might be questions  
21 about.

22 MADAM CHAIR: Let Jill speak.

23 MS. PITNER: Sure. Madam Chair.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

25 MS. PITNER: On the educator effectiveness





1 side, as a reminder, this year districts have flexibility  
2 to determine how they want to look at the growth  
3 component. Most districts are right now looking at  
4 weighting growth 0 percent, so they are using this year  
5 as the year to continue to work with the professional  
6 practice side of the educator evaluation process. So we  
7 are not aware of districts that are using, or would use  
8 these scores in their educator evaluation systems.

9 MADAM CHAIR: All right. Thank you.

10 MS. MAZANEC: May I ask a question?

11 MADAM CHAIR: Pam.

12 (Overlapping)

13 MADAM CHAIR: Deb.

14 MS. MAZANEC: I just had a clarifying  
15 question to Jill's comment.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Go ahead.

17 MS. MAZANEC: How long is that? You're  
18 saying it doesn't, quote, "count." For how long?

19 MS. PITNER: Madam Chair.

20 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

21 MS. PITNER: So the legislation that was  
22 adopted was for this year, and then it would go back to  
23 the 50 percent next year.

24 MS. MAZANEC: That's all right. So to say  
25 that it doesn't matter only for a short period of time,



1 is there a delay. Is that correct?

2 MS. PITNER: Madam Chair.

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

4 MS. PITNER: That's correct in terms of the  
5 flexibility that was offered.

6 MS. MAZANEC: Great clarity.

7 MS. PITNER: I do know that there are  
8 discussions about that going on across the street as  
9 well.

10 MS. MAZANEC: May I have a follow-up  
11 comment?

12 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, Pam.

13 MS. MAZANEC: I just want to say that, as I  
14 did before, when we established or we voted on these cut  
15 scores, I really think that the results of the  
16 bookmarking method are problematic. They're consistently  
17 problematic when I look at these cut scores, and I think  
18 the performance level descriptors are problematic. And I  
19 think situating power with 28 people, using this method,  
20 is very problematic. So I hope that we will have  
21 continued opportunity to discuss this and what occurs  
22 based on this approach, which is very, I think, arbitrary  
23 cut scores.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Well, and that's when I asked  
25 the question about delaying it, and I understand certain



1 things you're saying.

2 I think, you know, you need to realize that  
3 you're talking about six years of work here that's been  
4 going on. All these people have spent all this time and  
5 everything, and now you're going to say, "Oh, no, we're  
6 not going to do that." What is the message that goes to  
7 our schools? No, we're not going to test social studies,  
8 so once again it's not important.

9 MS. MAZANEC: It's not -- nobody's saying  
10 that.

11 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, they are. They're not  
12 teaching it, Pam.

13 MS. MAZANEC: I mean on the Board.

14 MADAM CHAIR: No, nobody on the Board is.

15 MS. MAZANEC: I'm not saying -- yeah, we're  
16 not saying --

17 MADAM CHAIR: But nobody has -- you know, do  
18 you have any alternative ideas? How can we keep this  
19 movement going forward if you're going to shoot it down  
20 tonight?

21 Steve.

22 MR. DURHAM: Thank you. I think -- and I  
23 really want to thank Mr. Daly, because finally somebody  
24 explained these cut scores to me in a way I at least  
25 think I understand, and I do appreciate that. But the



1 reality is, and I think the fundamental flaw -- it kind  
2 of goes back to an old William F. Buckley quote, that I'd  
3 rather be governed by the first 100 people in the New  
4 York phone book than Congress -- I'd rather have the  
5 first 100 people in the Denver phone book set the cut  
6 scores than these 28 people. I mean, I have no reason to  
7 believe that based on what's been read as the potential  
8 foundation for the standards, and their opinion on where  
9 they ought to be set, that there is any validity  
10 whatsoever in what people should know. And I do think --  
11 I don't care how you dice it, most schools, I don't  
12 think, teach economics, so to have 28 percent, or  
13 whatever the number was, percentage of the score based on  
14 that, well, of course you're going to get this kind of  
15 result because the test is fundamentally unfair.

16 MADAM CHAIR: But if you --

17 MR. DURHAM: Fundamentally unfair. And I'd  
18 like to say one thing. This is exactly the discussion  
19 we're going to have with PARCC, where we don't get to  
20 have anything to say about the cut scores, and we're  
21 going to have exactly the same kind of problem without  
22 any judgment as to whether the test is fundamentally  
23 fair, rigorous, too rigorous. Who knows?

24 So at least now I understand the problem,  
25 and so this an action item I'll move we reject the cut



1 scores, because I'm not going to vote for them now and  
2 I'm not going to vote for them six months from now at  
3 this level.

4 So I'd just like to have a vote on the  
5 issue.

6 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I'd like to carry the  
7 conversation on a bit further. That's fine. We'll look  
8 for a second in a minute.

9 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: 6:00.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Unlike PARCC, which is done by  
11 some magical person that's far away, this was done by  
12 Colorado -- it was authorized by Colorado State Board  
13 members, it was carried out by the Department. They've  
14 spent years on this and now you're going to say this is  
15 flawed? What is the next step, Steve? What do we do now  
16 if we shoot this down? What's next?

17 MR. DURHAM: I mean, I've got a couple of  
18 ideas but, one, I'd like to reconstitute -- I'd like to  
19 see a committee reconstituted that had some input as to  
20 exactly who those people --

21 MADAM CHAIR: We had input.

22 MR. DURHAM: I didn't have any input.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Well, you weren't here.

24 MR. DURHAM: What kind of input did you  
25 have? Did you approve the individuals?



1 MADAM CHAIR: Oh, how many ties --

2 MR. DURHAM: Did you review their --

3 MADAM CHAIR: Yes.

4 MR. DURHAM: -- you reviewed their --

5 MADAM CHAIR: Absolutely.

6 MR. DURHAM: You reviewed --

7 MADAM CHAIR: You all wanted to redo six  
8 years of State Board work because you're smarter than we  
9 were.

10 MR. DURHAM: Well, I don't trust 28 people  
11 the way you do. I'm not smarter than anybody in this  
12 room.

13 MADAM CHAIR: And I don't trust one person  
14 the way you do.

15 MR. DURHAM: So --

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Excuse me.

17 MADAM CHAIR: Sorry about that. I shouldn't  
18 have said that.

19 MR. DURHAM: That's all right. Say anything  
20 you want.

21 MADAM CHAIR: I take that back.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Maybe I could clarify  
23 that the people that have set these cut scores, the 28  
24 panelists, were selected through a recruitment process by  
25 Pearson and CDE. We didn't approve the people. We



1 didn't look at --

2 MADAM CHAIR: We didn't approve these people  
3 here?

4 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: The people that are the  
5 28 panelists.

6 MADAM CHAIR: That are sitting at the table?

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No, no. The people  
8 that are the panelists. The 28 people, we didn't approve  
9 them.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

11 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: They were recruited by  
12 Pearson.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Do other Board members have  
14 any further comments?

15 MS. ZURKOWSKI: Madam Chair. Can I just  
16 provide a little bit of clarification in terms of the  
17 panelists?

18 MADAM CHAIR: Sure.

19 MS. ZURKOWSKI: So it is true that the State  
20 Board did not approve those panelists. They were  
21 selected through a recruitment process, not just by  
22 Pearson. It was also by CDE.

23 MADAM CHAIR: Right.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: But not by the State  
25 Board.



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: And I know that you have  
2 concerns about that, but I want to make sure that we're  
3 focusing in the right spot.

4 The panelists were selected based on their  
5 knowledge of the content standards. So again, when we  
6 look at where this is coming from, it is back to those  
7 standards, and again, I understand that some folks don't  
8 like those standards, but the test does go back to those  
9 standards.

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I finish please?

11 MS. ZURKOWSKI: And we tried to make sure  
12 that we included a representative sample from across the  
13 state and from a variety of districts, a variety of  
14 sizes, rural is represented, metro is represented, et  
15 cetera.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. Deb.

17 MS. SCHEFFEL: I just want to say that the  
18 bookmarking method used by Pearson and the nature of the  
19 consensus-building among those 28 people is a very  
20 specific way of doing this business, and it results in  
21 these kind of test scores. There's a lot of artifact in  
22 it, and there are other ways of doing this work that are  
23 very credible.

24 MADAM CHAIR: And how long will they take?

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: I have no idea.





1                   MADAM CHAIR: I have no idea either. Any  
2 more comments?

3                   UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: How can we find out  
4 about them, Deb? I mean, you keep saying there are other  
5 things.

6                   MS. SCHEFFEL: We can have a study session  
7 on it. When we --

8                   MADAM CHAIR: And start all over. I'm sorry  
9 but this -- you know, having been on the board for six-  
10 plus years now, and having worked on this, to see it shut  
11 down by new people who weren't here, who say this is all  
12 -- you know, we're going to start all over again, is just  
13 devastating to me personally, and I think to many of the  
14 people, employees that work for us, who have worked so  
15 hard. You know, the work you did was no good. It's  
16 worthless. We're going to start all over and do it  
17 again. That's what you're saying.

18                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair.

19                  MADAM CHAIR: Is there a second?

20                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Please don't put words  
21 in our mouth. We did not say that.

22                  MADAM CHAIR: That's what -- there's --

23                  UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: You can interpret it  
24 but that's not --

25                  MADAM CHAIR: That's how I interpret it.



1 You're right.

2 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's not fair to  
3 characterize all of our opinions.

4 MADAM CHAIR: That's how I interpret it.  
5 We need a second for Steve's motion.

6 MS. SCHEFFEL: I'll second it.

7 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: What was the motion?

8 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Here we go again.

9 MADAM CHAIR: That we --

10 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I would like it written  
11 out.

12 (Overlapping)

13 MR. DURHAM: This was an action item. You  
14 don't have to write out these motions.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Well, I like to know what I'm  
16 voting on. Repeat it again.

17 MR. DURHAM: I'm happy to restate it. That  
18 we reject the proposed CMS and CoAlt standards.

19 MS. FLORES: The standards?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Cut scores.

21 MS. FLORES: Cut scores.

22 MR. DURHAM: Cut scores. I'm sorry. That  
23 we reject the cut scores.

24 MADAM CHAIR: You don't reject the  
25 standards, as they were written?



1 MR. DURHAM: No. Just the -- well, we might  
2 deal with that later but let's -- the action item, I  
3 think, is on the cut scores, to approve the cut scores.  
4 Am I correct about that?

5 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Well, part of this is  
6 getting into micromanaging, from the what the opinion is  
7 from the attorney general. But I'm not going to get into  
8 that with you, okay.

9 Secondly, if you want to do this action, the  
10 next question is, at some point we have to set the cut  
11 scores, okay, or we get nothing back. I mean, you would  
12 agree with that, okay.

13 So, I mean, I'm going through my head.  
14 Okay, what next? So you could reject it. What do we do  
15 next? Do you want us to revisit them? Do you want us to  
16 have a study session? You know, help me here a little  
17 bit, because rejecting them, yeah, you can do that, but  
18 we kind of need another what-if. At this point do you  
19 want the existing committee, or a new committee formed,  
20 or do you want us to bring back recommendations to you?  
21 If you could help with that, I'd appreciate it.

22 MR. DURHAM: I'm going to refer to Dr. --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Deb.

24 MS. SCHEFFEL: So I would just say that I  
25 think we need to look more deeply at the nature of the



1 way the cut scores were set, look at alternatives for  
2 setting cut scores, get parental input.

3 MS. FLORES: Oh, my goodness.

4 MS. SCHEFFEL: Again, this is being  
5 superimposed like a huge behemoth on the entire public  
6 and on all the teachers in the state. I think that's  
7 very problematic.

8 MS. FLORES: Parents?

9 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Daly, did you have --

11 MS. SCHEFFEL: Kids are the ones that carry  
12 around the failure.

13 MR. DALY: Excuse me, ma'am. Can I --

14 MADAM CHAIR: Can we have a comment from Mr.  
15 Daly.

16 MR. DALY: -- I just want to make a comment.  
17 Ms. Flores -- I'm sorry -- Board Member Flores, you  
18 stated earlier, when you were talking about the  
19 graduation requirements and when she was talking local  
20 control, she was talking about using teachers as experts.  
21 The teachers were the ones on the cut score and were the  
22 ones that are teaching them, and I feel as though the  
23 teachers should be the experts in it. And when you talk  
24 about bringing in outside members, or being chosen -- and  
25 I don't know how you choose, but if you chose them



1 personally it may not be a -- you may not be getting  
2 experts, and you may not do as fair a job teaching the  
3 standards as what the experts are supposed to do.

4 And I don't mean to put words in your mouth  
5 but that's what you stated. And I really agree with  
6 that. And the makeup of the committee, which coming from  
7 a rural district I feel ignored most of the time. We do.  
8 We were in part of this and it was kind of nice to be a  
9 rural district sitting next to somebody from large  
10 District 51, I think, out of Springs, Cherry Creek. And  
11 so it was a pretty good representation of that.

12 I think all of this comes back to, guys, is  
13 that it's not being taught.

14 MADAM CHAIR: It's not being taught.

15 MR. DALY: It's not being taught because  
16 it's not valued if there's no -- now we're talking  
17 teachers. They can do those standards there for five  
18 years.

19 MS. FLORES: Teachers didn't know them.

20 MR. DALY: Ma'am.

21 MS. FLORES: Not in Denver.

22 MR. DALY: Well --

23 MADAM CHAIR: Val, let him finish.

24 MR. DALY: -- as a professional, when I  
25 graduated from college, one of the things that we were



1 told that we needed to make sure we do is teach to state  
2 standards, because standards have been around for a  
3 while. Those are one of those things that as a  
4 profession we do. Now in the history/social studies  
5 area, most of us thought there would never be a test,  
6 because it was too political, and most of the teachers  
7 that you talk to, and boards or districts, have really  
8 ignored the standards. And I don't feel the standards  
9 have been taught in the past five years. I don't think  
10 they're going to be taught until we see that maybe our  
11 kids aren't meeting those standards.

12 And I agree the cut scores are very  
13 shocking. I hate to see that 1 percent of our kids are  
14 meeting it. I absolutely hate that. But I think it's  
15 not accurate. I think if we teach it, we're going to  
16 have a huge number jump into it. But we're not going to  
17 teach it until we're required to be.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Deb.

19 MS. SCHEFFEL: I guess I'd just like to  
20 comment on your comment. I certainly hope we can find  
21 other incentives to encourage teachers to teach subjects  
22 that they love apart from testing something and creating  
23 these kinds of cut scores. If that's the way our  
24 educational system is functioning, I'm very sorry that  
25 we've created that environment.



1 MR. DALY: I don't think it's at the teacher  
2 level. I think it's at the district level. If they  
3 don't have test scores coming down telling them  
4 something, districts aren't funding it. Sixteen years of  
5 teaching and all my professional development that's come  
6 from the district level has been aimed at me, as a social  
7 studies teacher, teaching math and language arts, because  
8 it's not valued.

9 MADAM CHAIR: Steve.

10 MR. DURHAM: I think you can't get past the  
11 fundamental problem. I know how these are going to be  
12 used. These are going to be used as a demonstration of  
13 failure for our education system. And I happen to agree  
14 with you. I don't happen to believe 99 percent of our  
15 people don't have a pretty good grasp of something. It's  
16 got be at least the top 5 or 10 percent have to know  
17 something about these areas.

18 The problem is it is absolutely unfair to  
19 test people over something they have not had an  
20 opportunity to learn.

21 MR. DALY: You're right.

22 MR. DURHAM: It's unfair. And then it's  
23 unfair to paint them, and to paint the whole group with  
24 this brush, as, well, we really have a bunch of  
25 illiterates, social studies illiterates in the state,



1 when they haven't -- and not every school is going to  
2 teach all the four subject areas you just mentioned.

3 MR. DALY: You're right.

4 MR. DURHAM: That's not possible. So for  
5 some schools we have set an impossible barrier.

6 MR. DALY: Can I address that, since you  
7 were addressing me with it?

8 MR. DURHAM: Yeah. Yeah.

9 MR. DALY: I think it goes back to local  
10 control. Part of this issue is local control. We  
11 haven't been teaching it. And as local control, we need  
12 to take some personal responsibility at our district  
13 level. And right now we're not. So my district has  
14 taken that personal responsibility because, luckily,  
15 they've listened to me -- and I'm the only teacher there  
16 so that's totally different than DPS. I understand that.

17 So we started teaching economics, but it is  
18 because those kids weren't getting it, and to be honest,  
19 that means I wasn't doing my job. And that's where I  
20 take this. I don't take this as anything against kids. I  
21 think we need to make ourselves better, and I think this  
22 helps them. Me make it better, and I think it will help  
23 districts help us make it better.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Okay.

25 MR. DALY: I hope, I should say.





1 MADAM CHAIR: We need to get out of here. I  
2 would just, as Chair I should get one or two comments.

3 Steve, when we had the earlier conversation  
4 and you thought that we should let the local schools do  
5 the graduation and all these kids would graduate and  
6 everything, and I disagreed with you. Local schools,  
7 probably 25 percent of the kids that graduate are poorly  
8 educated because nobody ever told them they needed to.  
9 Nobody put any expectations of them, except the local  
10 schools. And some do better than others. We all know  
11 that.

12 But for us now to say we're not going to do this  
13 anymore because somebody might feel bad, or that they  
14 will teach it. If you take this action, everybody is  
15 suddenly going to start teaching things they've been  
16 ignoring for years? I just think this is a terrible step  
17 backward and I'm really sorry to see us take it.

18 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam.

19 MADAM CHAIR: Ms. Carey --

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Madam Chair, may I?

21 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, you may.

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. Now you can  
23 ignore me on this.

24 MADAM CHAIR: They ignore me. They might as  
25 well ignore you.



1 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: No. You're the Board.  
2 I'm just a Commissioner. Okay.

3 Let's, right now, the hour is late, we've  
4 heard your concerns, okay. I really wished you wouldn't  
5 take an action. That is your right to take an action.  
6 Let us come back, come back with some thoughts and  
7 recommendations, and if you want to take an action you  
8 can do it at that point. But let us -- we need to go  
9 back and think about this instead of trying to come up  
10 with something on the fly right now, unless you feel  
11 strongly to do otherwise.

12 So I hear your concern, okay. We just need  
13 to problem-solve this thing and see where we stand, and  
14 that's all I can say.

15 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you, Commissioner, and  
16 that was sort of where I was going when I earlier made --

17 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think Steve a motion  
18 on the table.

19 MADAM CHAIR: -- the remark about -- Steve,  
20 would you be willing to table it until next month?

21 MR. DURHAM: No.

22 MADAM CHAIR: No?

23 MR. DURHAM: No.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. Did you have a comment  
25 that you wanted to wrap up for us here?



1 MS. ZURKOWSKI: I do. Thanks, Madam Chair.  
2 Again, I am now reacting to the calls that I  
3 do know that I will get tomorrow from folks saying we're  
4 not getting reports. So I'm acknowledging that, that I  
5 am reacting from that perspective, that my phone will be  
6 ringing. A suggestion that I'm putting out there is for  
7 you to consider accepting these cut scores as  
8 provisional. That would allow us to move forward with  
9 reporting and to give us direction to pursue a standards  
10 -- a cut score validation process to be determined by the  
11 Board across the next year prior to the next  
12 administration of this assessment.

13 I'm just trying to find a compromise  
14 position and now I'll sit down.

15 MADAM CHAIR: I appreciate that. How about  
16 that, Steve? Would you accept that compromise?

17 MR. DURHAM: No.

18 MADAM CHAIR: Okay. That's all we need to  
19 know.

20 MR. DURHAM: But I think there's a reason  
21 why we shouldn't accept it, because the damage will be  
22 done, and it may already be done with the information  
23 that's put out. It's publicly available right now that  
24 we have a standard that 1 percent of the Colorado  
25 students made excellent on. So the damage, I think --



1 MADAM CHAIR: Mr. Durham --

2 MR. DURHAM: -- may already be done.

3 MADAM CHAIR: -- you think there's that

4 damage. We don't all think there's a damage.

5 MR. DURHAM: Well --

6 MADAM CHAIR: The mere fact that you said

7 it's damage does not make that true in 100 percent.

8 MR. DURHAM: Well, all right. That's fine.

9 MADAM CHAIR: There are people here that

10 don't think that, but we'd probably better vote and get

11 it over with and move on.

12 MR. DURHAM: Good.

13 MS. MARKEL: Madam Chair, would you like me

14 to call the roll?

15 MADAM CHAIR: Yes. Call the roll.

16 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can we please share

17 what we're voting on?

18 MADAM CHAIR: The motion has been made and

19 seconded.

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Can I hear the wording

21 again? Can I hear the wording, Carey?

22 MS. MARKEL: Mr. Durham, would you repeat?

23 MR. DURHAM: Just that I move to reject the

24 cut scores as contained in Action Item 20.

25 MS. SCHEFFEL: And I seconded.



1 MADAM CHAIR: Yes, ma'am.

2 MS. MARKEL: Steve Durham.

3 MR. DURHAM: Aye.

4 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Flores.

5 MS. FLORES: Aye.

6 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.

7 MS. GOFF: No.

8 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.

9 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.

10 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.

11 MADAM CHAIR: No.

12 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.

13 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.

14 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.

15 MS. SCHROEDER: No.

16 MADAM CHAIR: Steve, would you like to read  
17 your proclamation?

18 MR. DURHAM: Do we have the version that was  
19 agreed on?

20 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: It's right here.

21 MADAM CHAIR: Board resolution by Board  
22 Member Steve Durham.

23 MR. DURHAM: Thank you, Madam Chair. This  
24 is the reworked version from --

25 MADAM CHAIR: Thank you. I'm sorry. I



1 forgot to --

2 Thank you for your work.

3 MR. DURHAM: This is great work represented

4 --

5 MADAM CHAIR: I appreciate it.

6 MR. DURHAM: And I wanted to thank my

7 colleagues for rewriting it.

8 The State Board of Education acknowledges,  
9 respects, and strongly supports the rights of parents to  
10 make choices regarding their child's participation in  
11 testing and related data collection about their child,  
12 and the State Board strongly supports the right of  
13 parents to have complete, accurate, and timely  
14 information about making the choice to refuse their  
15 child's participation in testing and related data  
16 collection that is not specifically required by state or  
17 federal law.

18 And whereas the State Board strongly  
19 discourages any manner of action on the part of local  
20 school boards or local school districts that interfere  
21 with any parent's exercise of these rights, or that  
22 attempts to influence any parent's legitimate choice for  
23 their child in connection with testing and data  
24 collection.

25 Therefore, be it resolved that the Colorado



1 State Board of Education is committed to upholding  
2 parents' rights upon their children's participation in  
3 testing and related data collection, and that this  
4 resolution be provided to all school districts, BOCES  
5 organizations, and members of the General Assembly House  
6 and Senate Education Committees in order to obtain  
7 maximum publicity concerning parental rights related to  
8 testing and data collection so that parents may exercise  
9 these rights when appropriate.

10 MADAM CHAIR: Is there a second to the  
11 motion?

12 MS. SCHEFFEL: I second.

13 MADAM CHAIR: Deb seconds the motion.

14 Is there any objection to it?

15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: May I ask the Board a  
16 question? Which one were you reading from?

17 MR. DURHAM: I hope it was the most recent  
18 one.

19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. There was one  
20 that you and Jane, or somebody --

21 (Overlapping)

22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Okay. All right. I  
23 just wanted to make sure. Okay, because I had two here.

24 MADAM CHAIR: Do you want to call the roll?

25 Go ahead.



1 MS. MARKEL: Steve Durham.  
2 MR. DURHAM: Aye.  
3 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Flores.  
4 MS. FLORES: Aye.  
5 MS. MARKEL: Jane Goff.  
6 MS. GOFF: Aye.  
7 MS. MARKEL: Pam Mazanec.  
8 MS. MAZANEC: Aye.  
9 MS. MARKEL: Marcia Neal.  
10 MADAM CHAIR: No.  
11 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Scheffel.  
12 MS. SCHEFFEL: Yes.  
13 MS. MARKEL: Dr. Schroeder.  
14 MS. SCHROEDER: Yes.  
15 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: And, by the way, Madam  
16 Chair, could I just say that actually Jane deserves all  
17 the credit on that.  
18 MADAM CHAIR: What?  
19 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Jane actually deserves  
20 all the credit on that rewrite.  
21 MADAM CHAIR: Jane deserves what?  
22 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: All of the credit on  
23 the rewrite.  
24 MADAM CHAIR: The meeting is called out of  
25 session for this time. We will take it up again





---

1 tomorrow.

2 (Meeting adjourned)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26



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

C E R T I F I C A T E

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal this 25th day of January, 2019.

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

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