	PUBLIC HEARING		
THE RE	GENTS REFORM AGENDA: "ASSESSING" OUR PROGRES		
	Suffolk County Community College Grant Campus		
	1001 Crooked Hill Road Brentwood, New York 11717		
	September 17, 2013		
	10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.		
PRESIDI	NG:		
Sena Chai	tor John J. Flanagan r		
SENATE	MEMBERS PRESENT:		
Sena	tor Philip M. Boyle		
Sena	tor Kemp Hannon		
Sena	tor Kenneth P. LaValle		
Sena	tor Carl L. Marcellino		
Sena	tor Jack M. Martins		
Sena	tor Lee M. Zeldin		

			2
1	SPEAKERS:	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2	Ken Wagner	10	20
3	Associate Commissioner - Curriculum,		
4	Assessment, and Education Technology Nicholas Storelli-Castro		
5	Director of Governmental Affairs & Special Projects		
6	Dennis Tompkins		
7	Chief of External Affairs New York State Education Department		
8	Roger Tilles Regent	66	8 0
9	New York State Board of Regents		
10	Jeanette Deutermann Parent	90	110
11	Bellmore, New York		
12	Marianne Adrian Parent	90	110
13	Levittown, New York		
14	Stephen Allinger Legislative Director	113	123
15	New York State United Teachers		
16	Nadia Resnikoff President, Middle Country	113	123
17	Teachers Assoc., Selden, New York Member of NYSUT board of directors		
18	Robert Vecchio	133	157
19	President, Board of Education William Floyd Union Free School District	133	137
20	<u>-</u>	100	4.5.5
21	Jim Gounaris President, Board of Education Herricks Union Free School District	133	157
22			
23	Dr. Donald James Superintendent	166	194
24	Commack Union Free School District		
25			

25

SENATOR FLANAGAN: All right, thank you very much.

Now, I'm hoping that everyone can hear well enough. I'm told that the microphones are hot and sensitive, so...

Good morning, Senator Boyle.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Don't encourage him.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Anyway, welcome to Suffolk Community College.

And let me start by saying thank you to the college for their hospitality and their professionalism and all the courtesies they've extended to us.

I just want to take 30 seconds and tell you, if you don't know, what a great institution this is.

It is a three-campus community college, the only one of its kind in the state of New York, and it is remarkably successful.

It is a gateway, it is a great opportunity for so many young men and women. And, a lot of students who graduate here on to four-year schools.

And we should all be justifiably proud of the quality of higher education right here in Suffolk County, and in the state of New York.

And I don't see one in the room, but I'm just

going to ask everyone if you would kindly stand. 1 I'm going to ask my colleague Senator Zeldin 2 to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. 3 (All present stand, and say: 4 "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the 5 United States of America and to the Republic for 6 which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, 7 with liberty and justice for all." 8 9 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you. I welcome everyone again. 10 11 I would like to introduce my colleagues, in 12 no particular order. 13 I'm just going to start, he just obviously 14 just helped us out, Senator Lee Zeldin, 15 Senator Jack Martins, Senator Marcellino. 16 You know what? 17 Senator Zeldin chairs the Consumer Protection 18 Committee; 19 Senator Martins chairs the Local Governments 20 committee; 21 Senator Marcellino chairs Investigations and 22 Operations; 23 Senator Hannon chairs the Health Committee; 24 And Senator Boyle chairs the 25 Ethics Committee, and, Alcoholism and Drug Abuse.

So, you have a good cross-section.

And I believe Senator LaValle will be joining us, and I'm sure most of you know that he chairs the Higher Ed Committee.

So, let me make some very brief comments.

There have been a lot of comments and thoughts and questions relative to these hearings.

This is the first of four hearings.

Obviously, the first one is on Long Island, today being September 17th.

We have hearings scheduled in Syracuse on October 1st; Buffalo, October 16th; and New York City on October 29th.

We have had many people call us, looking to testify, to add comments; certainly have offered a number of suggestions, not only on the format of the hearings, but as to what the content should be.

I want to be clear with everyone, very clear, that the thrust of what we're trying to do here is listen to people who are actually out in the field.

We certainly have our own opinions as individual legislators, but, part of our job, as you well know, is to listen to the public and the constituencies that we represent.

So, everyone should be comforted by the fact

there are no preconceived notions here.

We've tried to get a good cross-section,

I think we have, frankly, of people to testify.

But I also want to make it extremely clear, for anyone who wants to submit written testimony, all of it will be made part of the public record.

To the best of our ability, all the comments that have been submitted so far are already online.

All the testimony from the people who will be testifying today was put up last night.

So, anyone who wants to look certainly has the opportunity to do so.

Anyone who wants to submit testimony can do that, and, again, we are going to make it part of the record.

Of course, the only distinction I would add is, please be clear, please be fair, please be professional, and please be respectful of other people's opinions.

Not only in terms of written submission, but we have a lot of people who will be testifying today.

I'm sure there will be a good colloquy with my colleagues and some of our panel members.

So I would tell you, which I think all of you

know, we should all act as adults, we should all act as professionals, and recognize, that while there may be differing opinions, that we have a fundamental obligation to respect what each other has to say, and that includes listening to the folks who are on the panel.

Essentially, the format is, we are going to call people up. I think most of you have a copy of the witness list.

We're trying to adhere to a time schedule.

We've already broken that, and I accept the responsibility for that in terms of starting late, but we do have a number of people who will be testifying.

And the -- I think the ultimate goal here, is to put together a wealth of information from people who have strong opinions, share it with SED, share it with the Regents, share it with the Governor, and, certainly, share it with our colleagues across the state.

I'm gratified by the attendance of my colleagues here today.

And I will quickly add, that I believe this is the first real public opportunity for people to express their opinions on some of these matters,

1 Common Core testing privacy. There have been other forums, but the 2 Assembly hasn't done anything, SED hasn't done 3 anything, the Regents haven't done anything, the 4 Governor's Office hasn't done anything. 5 So, we're trying to fulfill our 6 7 responsibilities, by allowing people to share their 8 input in a way that everyone can see, and, 9 hopefully, everyone can understand. 10 Having said that, I'll just open it up 11 quickly, if my colleagues want to say anything. 12 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Just briefly. 13 Many of you may know, I taught school for 14 20 years in the city of New York. 15 And, I look around this room, and I see 16 everybody jammed to the back. 17 There's empty seats in the front, and there's 18 people standing. 19 So, you know, we could --

(Unintelligible comments made by many audience members.)

SENATOR MARCELLINO: We can unreserve them.

So, if you want to come down and sit, I suggest you do.

20

21

22

23

24

25

Makes me nervous when I see people near the

back door.

And those standing, as Regent Tiller just said, will be tested on whether they heard the questions or not.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: All right.

Our first group for today is the

New York State Education Department; Ken Wagner,

Nicholas Storelli-Castro, and Dennis Tompkins.

We have allotted more time for the

State Education Department, because we have an

expectation that they will be asked to respond to a

number of questions from my colleagues.

Dennis does external affairs for the department;

Nicholas does legislative relations, working with the Assembly and the Senate;

And Ken is responsible for curriculum assessment and education technology.

He won't tell you this, but I'll you:

He is a Long Islander by birth, by rearing, by education, by professionalism. He is a school psychologist.

He has a wealth of experience in a variety of different capacities. Having come from Long Island,

served as a principal in Nassau, Suffolk, county; Shoreham Wading Rivers.

So, he is a Long Islander.

And, gentlemen, thank you very much.

And, Ken, we talked about this, your ability to be succinct and on point will allow us to have a more free-wheeling dialogue.

So, thank you again.

KEN WAGNER: Thank you, Chairman Flanagan, and members of the Senate.

My name is Ken Wagner, and I'm deputy commissioner for curriculum assessment and educational technology at the New York State Education Department.

I'm here to testify on behalf of
Commissioner King who's not able to be with us
today, because of the Board of Regents are meeting
in Albany.

I'm joined by colleagues Dennis Tompkins and Nicholas Storelli-Castro.

As you mentioned, it's good to be back on Long Island.

As some of you know, I grew up in Seaford, and began my career in education as a board of education trustee in the Seaford School District.

Before moving to Albany and joining the

Education Department, I worked as a school

psychologist in Freeport, an assistant principal in

Herricks, a principal in Shorehamm Wading River, and
a program administrator at Eastern Suffolk BOCES.

As you've heard in the past from

Commissioner King, New York State is engaged in an

important effort to ensure that all students

graduate ready for college and their careers.

Of course, college- and career-readiness is more than just test scores, but test results contain important information that cannot be ignored.

There is converging information on both

New York and national measures, including the

National Assessment of Educational Progress, or, the

"NAEP," and the SAT, that indicate only about

35 percent of our students are on track for college

and their careers.

Each year, about 140,000 students statewide exit their fourth year of high school not ready for college and their careers.

Each year, about 19,000 students on

Long Island, or about 50 percent of the Long Island

cohort, exit their fourth year of high school not

ready for college in their careers.

That is unacceptable, and it means that our students pay for remediation in college that they should have received for free in high school.

That means that our state and our nation are less competitive economically.

The Common Core are the first set of learning standards that are based on research, and are back-mapped from what our students need to know and be able to do in college and their careers.

The Common Core focuses on things that the college professors and employers have said are important.

The Common Core was state-developed and state-adopted by 45 states and the District of Columbia, but a recent AP survey indicated that 52 percent of parents nationwide have never heard of the Common Core.

There is clearly more work to be done.

There is a difference between standards and the curriculum used to teach those standards.

Adopting and implementing curriculum is, and has always been, a local responsibility; however, with Race To The Top funds, New York has taken the unprecedented step to help supplement these local efforts.

On our website, EngageNY.org, educators will find English and math curriculum modules, test guides and sample test questions, videos of professional practice, and Common Core planning and selection rubrics.

Parents and families will find information about the Common Core, and tools and tips to help their children.

Since 2011, EngageNY has over 26 million page views from 2.4 million unique visitors.

Our statewide professional-development initiative is called the "Network Teams Institute," or, "NTI."

Since 2011, NTI has provided Common Core turnkey professional-development training to over 10,000 attendees from across the state.

Despite the urgency, there is a 7-year Common Core phase-in.

The standards were adopted by the Board of Regents in 2010, three years ago.

The EngageNY website and the NTI trainings were launched in 2011.

The first Common Core tests in grades 3 through 8 were administered in 2013, and the first Common Core Regents exams will be administered in

2014.

These Regents exams will be phased in by cohort, and the first year of the phase -- and during the first year of the phase-in, districts may allow students to take the old test in addition to the new test, and have the higher score count.

The first students required to take a Common Core Regents exam for graduation purposes are not expected to graduate until June 2017.

There are two key questions during this phase-in:

How do we know that students are making progress?

And, how do we measure progress early so help can be provided to students who are not on track?

Of course, student progress consists of much more than test scores, but test results contain important information that cannot be ignored.

Without these assessment results, teachers, students, families, and the public have no other statewide progress measure.

It is important to note that educators were involved in all stages of Common Core test design, and educators reviewed each and every Common Core test question in advance of test administration.

Educators recommended the Common Core proficiency cut scores to the Commissioner, which the commissioners accepted as is, with the approval of the Board of Regents.

When we released the test scores, we made it clear that this was a new baseline relative to the Common Core.

We made it clear that this new proficiency baseline would not negatively affect school or district accountability, would not negatively affect teacher or principal evaluation, and would not negatively affect student remediation services.

This was about improving instruction.

So when we released the scores, we also released 25 percent of the test questions, with annotations of what the right answers were, what the wrong answers were, and why.

We released detailed descriptions of what students should know and be able to do at each performance level, and in each grade.

We released access to the test-score data and reports, including access to individual item analyses.

We released guidance on how to interpret the test scores, and we released parent reports.

It is important to keep in mind that there was no increase in the number of required state tests in 2013 when compared to 2012.

In fact, in the younger grades, and based on field feedback, testing times decreased in 2013.

Of course, in some cases, additional tests were adopted at the local level, as determined by collective bargaining, in order to implement teacher and principal evaluation.

As part of Race To The Top, in order to provide further support for this work, we will soon release the EngageNY portal.

The EngageNY portal will allow educators, students, and families to log in to EngageNY and access secure educational technology tools.

School districts in New York and across the country have routinely provided confidential student data to for-profit vendors in order to meet core district needs.

This includes providing data to vendors for scheduling, report cards, and transcript purposes;

This includes school districts providing data to vendors for special-education service monitoring;

This includes school districts providing data to vendors for lunch and transportation services;

And this includes school districts providing data to vendors for online service -- online learning systems.

The Family Education Rights and Privacy Act, or, "FERPA," does not require parental consent for these core district activities, such as providing data to a vendor when building a high school schedule so you can open school.

FERPA does require school districts to have policies around parental consent for non-core activities, such as providing data to vendors for yearbooks or class rings.

InBloom is a service provider on the EngageNY portal project.

Like any service provider, inBloom could be replaced with another party that can meet the same requirements.

InBloom did not create the sharing of data with vendors. That has been happening in New York, and across the country, for many, many years.

InBloom provides non-proprietary data services to help make it more secure and more effective for school districts to continue to do what they are already doing.

There are important facts about the EngageNY

portal and inBloom.

Student data are never sold;

Data are accessible to vendors only when authorized by a local or state contract, and only for that contract's purpose;

Data must be destroyed when the contract terminates;

The State does not and will not collect social security numbers;

And data stored through inBloom are encrypted, which means that the data would be unusable because they are encrypted, even in the unlikely event that the firewalls had been breached.

I don't know of any New York school district that offers this level of protection.

In closing, as we travel around the state, we are continually inspired by the work of our teachers, our school and district leaders, and our students.

As we pursue this goal to help all students graduate ready for college and their careers, we are reminded that there is much work to be done, but there is just as much reason for confidence and excitement that this goal can and will be achieved.

Thank you again for the opportunity to

testify, and I'm happy to take your questions.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Ken, thank you.

I'm just going to follow up on what Senator Marcellino said.

We're doing our best to provide seating.

There are probably 8 to 10 seats up here, if people want to. Don't be shy, you can walk up.

It's all right.

Ken, thank you for the testimony.

There's also a very lengthy PowerPoint presentation, which we did not have presented, but it is certainly online for everyone's review.

And, I am going to start by -- I'll pass my own opportunity to ask questions at the moment, but, I'm going to start with Senator Hannon, and then go to Senator Marcellino.

SENATOR HANNON: Thank you very much.

You touched upon three different topics in a very quick fashion, and I think that each one of them is worthy of almost a separate hearing.

The question of the curriculum, now called "Common Core"; the question of how that curriculum is implemented, and how the testing itself is done; and then, third, questions of privacy, vendor, vendor selection, and all of that.

I just think that there's a major lesson, however, for the Regents to be learned in this state, because all three of those vast policy decisions that have been rolled out in this state in a very quick fashion.

And I think it's somewhat a little disingenuous for you to say the testing in 2013 was not more than it had been, because somewhere --

[Applause.]

SENATOR HANNON: I'm sorry. That's not an applause line, for me.

-- it's, just, that there has not been the engagement with the public, with the Legislature, that one ought to when you're doing major policy rollout.

Now, I'm just going to leave it at that.

But I find that, if you think this is working successfully, that's mistaken.

[Applause.]

SENATOR MARCELLINO: We're not here for that.

Believe me, I'm a politician, and

I appreciate the applause, but this is such a
serious thing that we're engaged in, that -- and
it's the first hearing.

Senator Flanagan, congratulations for having

the first hearing, because we haven't had that before.

And it's amazing to me that, here's -- the last comment I'm making:

I get criticism on the Common Core curriculum by people who probably don't understand it, but are either on the left in terms of politics or on the right in terms of politics, and it's very unique that you could have united that group.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you, Senator Hannon.

I would, diplomatically, and respectfully, ask this:

If there are periodic interruptions, we might all be having dinner together, and Suffolk Community College will make sure that we don't have that opportunity.

So, I'm going to move to Senator Marcellino who I know is very humorous and concise and succinct in his own right.

Senator Marcellino.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: I'll try to be succinct.

Again, John, thank you for having the hearings. This is very important. The topic is extremely important.

I'm just piling on a little bit with what 1 Senator Hannon just said. 2 My constituents do not think the way 3 Common Core has been implemented has been done well. 4 It hasn't been done well, in my mind. 5 6 They're confused. They don't know what 7 you're trying to do, and what they're getting is a series of tests. 8 9 Now, we've asked this question before, 10 and I think Senator Flanagan asked it at a 11 previous meeting that we had: How many tests are 12 currently mandated? 13 Third grade, eighth grade; or, fourth grade, 14 eighth grade; or whatever it is, how many tests are mandated for Common Core? 15 16 KEN WAGNER: So the mandate is not part of 17 Common Core; rather, the mandate is part of the 18 U.S. Education Department's requirements around Education Secondary and Elementary Act [sic], or, 19 20 "No Child Left Behind." 21 Those requirements include annual tests in 22 grades 3 through 8 --23 SENATOR MARCELLINO: How many? 24 KEN WAGNER: Sorry?

SENATOR MARCELLINO: How many?

25

KEN WAGNER: There's one test per year in each grade, grades 3 through 8, in both English and math, as well as one test per year in grades 4 and 8 for science.

And then there is a requirement for a test in English in the high school years and a test in math in the high school years.

Those are the federal requirements.

We also have a requirement, a federal requirement, to assess the needs of students who are English-language learners. That test is called the "New York State English as a Second Language Achievement Test";

And we have a requirement to test the needs of students who have the most severe educational disabilities. That test is called the "New York State Alternate Assessment."

Finally, not required by the federal government, we have Regents exams which we have historically offered.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: So the way I count, you have a test in each of the years, 3 through 8, one test --

KEN WAGNER: Correct.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: -- in English and math?

KEN WAGNER: English, math. 1 And then in grades -- so, two tests, one in 2 English and one in math. 3 SENATOR MARCELLINO: That's two. 4 KEN WAGNER: And then, in grades 4 and 8, 5 there's a science test. 6 7 SENATOR MARCELLINO: So, plus the two tests, you said, in English and math in high school? 8 9 KEN WAGNER: Required by the federal 10 government, a test in English and math in 11 high school. 12 SENATOR MARCELLINO: How much time are these 13 tests taking in the elementary grades? 14 KEN WAGNER: So, roughly -- and in the 15 slides, we have the exact times, but, roughly, 16 it's -- on Slides 34 and 35. 17 But you have three sessions, because there's three days of testing. And, roughly, 45 minutes to 18 19 70 minutes per day, for about 270 minutes of testing 20 for each of those ELA and math assessments. 21 SENATOR MARCELLINO: All right, I missed 22 that, and I'm not being facetious. 23 KEN WAGNER: No, no. 24 So let me just pull up the slide, and I'll be

25

precise with you.

So in grades 3 through 5, ELA, there are -there's a difference between the amount of time that
we estimate it will take students and the amount of
time that's scheduled.

We schedule for 90 minutes, for 3 days, in grades 3 through 5, ELA;

And we schedule for 90 minutes, for 3 days, in grades 6 through 8, ELA.

The amount of time that's estimated for students to actually take is slightly lower than the time that we schedule, and that depends on the test.

For math, we -- in 2013, we scheduled, in grades 3, 70 minutes, for 3 days;

In grades 4, 70 minutes, 70 minutes, and 90 minutes;

And in grades 5 through 8, 90 minutes, 90 minutes, and 90 minutes.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Is anything going on other than those tests on those days?

KEN WAGNER: So we encourage, and what school districts typically do, is they use the morning time to administer the assessments, and that's typically the activity for the morning.

Students -- some students have extended time based on accommodations that they're provided,

either "English as a Second Language" extended times, or "Students With Disabilities" extended times.

And then typically what happens, is schools move about the rest of their activities for the remainder of the day.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Now, is there any flexibility within the districts, administering these tests?

KEN WAGNER: So, there are specific days that are assigned for the testing windows, and then there's days that are open for makeups and scoring of the tests.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Who scores the tests?

KEN WAGNER: That depends on the districts.

There's different models that are allowable.

School districts may score the tests within the district, with the provision that teachers may not score their own tests.

School districts may collaborate with other districts to score their tests regionally, or, they may contract, for example, with a BOCES to do scoring at the BOCES level.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Now, when you bring in -- you said these are federally mandated,

"No Child Left Behind," tests that are required here.

When you bring in Common Core, when the districts implement the Common Core standards, how does that impact the testing?

KEN WAGNER: So for the Common Core implementation, what we did is, we modified, we changed the tests; we rebuilt the tests from scratch, with -- as I mentioned, with educator involvement, to have the Common Core tests measure student progress on the Common Core standards, which is different from the prior tests which measured student progress on the prior set of standards that were adopted in 2005.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: All right, so the test that came out this year, which showed significant drops in success over the prior year's tests, were totally different than the prior year's exams?

KEN WAGNER: They measured a different -they measured students' progress on a different set
of standards.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: And should not be compared to one another?

KEN WAGNER: When we released the scores, we explained to the public, and to the media, that this

is a new baseline that is not directly comparable to prior-year assessment-score results.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: I would suggest that that explanation was not done well, because there is great confusion out there as to whether or not schools are succeeding or not.

I liken it to the example, and I will end with this, John -- I liken it to the example of playing baseball.

I'm a 300 hitter, on current standards.

Major League Baseball decides to move first base back 5 feet, I'm no longer a 300 hitter.

I'm the same person with the same skills, but now we have a different set of rules.

So we change the rules, and we haven't thoroughly explained it, and we haven't given time for the people who have to implement the new rules and the new standards a chance to test drive the system.

I think the problem is, you needed time, and you didn't give them the time.

I understand when they brought them in -[Applause.]

SENATOR MARCELLINO: I'm not looking for that. Please.

I understand, when you brought them in, in 2010, and all the other stuff that went down with it, but, when the teachers have to come in, and as a former teacher myself, I needed time to get used to the new standards, I needed time to figure out how the kids in my classes learned. They learn differently, as you well know. Not all kids learn the same way.

So you have to adapt your curriculum to the way your kids in the classroom learn.

That takes time to test it out, to work it out, and to do it.

This was not allowed.

And I think, when Commissioner King's statement, after a while, that it wasn't going to be — that this wasn't going to be an evaluative tool on the teachers, and it wasn't going to be an evaluative tool for the kids, I think that got lost, because it came out late.

I mean, that should have come out very first thing going.

If you were going to use the new standards, they needed time to get used to them, and to prepare the kids for them, and actually do the job that you're asking them to do.

So this is -- as Kemp said, this has been handled poorly. It's been handled very poorly.

And some cases, I lay it on the school

districts, because I don't think all of them actually did the right thing with it.

But in some cases, most cases, in my mind, State Ed didn't help.

And I think you have to go back and you got to relook and rethink what you're doing, because if you think this is being done successfully, you're wrong.

And I would suggest, although I do not support, you're going to see a bigger pushback from the community. And I think you're going to need that.

[Applause.]

SENATOR MARCELLINO: And I want to make it clear, I'm not encouraging that.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: I'm just still adjusting to the picture of Senator Marcellino playing baseball, but that's just me.

Senator Martins.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

Good morning.

KEN WAGNER: Good morning.

SENATOR MARTINS: You know, I'm still having a hard time understanding a basic premise that comes up from time to time, and that's that our high school students are not college-ready.

And, so, can you describe for me how you or how the State Education Department arrived at that figure?

I know that there's a statewide statistic, and then there's a Long Island statistic.

I'm specifically concerned regarding that Long Island statistic, and how it was arrived at.

What's your background for that?

KEN WAGNER: Sure.

So what we see is that, whether the measures are national or New York, there's consistent information.

So one of the measures that was a New York measure, at the secondary level, was back in 2010-2011.

The Board of Regents, in working with information from colleges, for example, SUNY and CUNY, started to ask some questions about, What are some of the qualifications that college-admissions directors look for when students are, not only accepted into college, but, if students are going to

be successful, in terms of enrolling in credit-bearing courses and being successful in those courses?

So one of the pieces of information that we got, is that it was not sufficient to just be graduated with a New York State Regents diploma, but the scores on the Regents exams made a difference.

So, the passing score is 65, but what college-admissions directors told us, is a 65 was not good enough; but, rather, if a student scored, for example, a score of 75 in math or a score of 80 in English, that that was a more appropriate predicter of whether or not a student was going to be able to be enrolled in a credit-bearing course and be successful in that course.

When we looked at our cohort data, not just based on the percentage of students in the cohort that were graduating, but, rather, based on the percentage of students in the cohort who achieved at that higher level of cut score, that's when we found that, although our statewide graduation rate was, roughly, 74 percent, our cohort graduation rate, with those higher cut scores, was, roughly, half; about 35 percent.

On Long Island, those statistics are, I think

it's 86 percent overall graduation rate, but about a 50 percent cohort statistic if you factor in those higher assessment scores.

But that is by no means the only measure, and I want to be very clear about that.

But if we look at another measure, the percentage of the cohort that graduates with advanced-course experiences, we have a credential called the "Regents Diploma With Advanced Designation," and that's a very rigorous diploma that's not based on test scores; but, rather, is based on taking advanced coursework.

And if you look at the percent of the cohorts statewide that graduates with that "Advanced Designation" credential, you will find a similar number; that it's, roughly, 35 percent of the cohort.

Whether you use the regular diploma with higher cut scores on Regents exam, or you use the "Advanced Designation" diploma, and they're not the same group of kids, the percentages are roughly the same.

But it doesn't just stop there.

If you look at databased on the College Board tests, things like SAT and PSAT, again, you get a

percentage that ranges from the mid 30s to the low 40s.

If you look at the federal assessment, the National Assessment of Education Progress, you get similar results.

SENATOR MARTINS: But that depends on where the State Education Department decides to place that cut score.

Wherever you decide to put that mark will determine that 30 percent or 50 percent mark that you talk about.

And, frankly, I just -- you know, representing the districts that I do, and being involved, and not just the lighthouse districts that we have in parts of my Senate District, but some of the middle-of-the-road districts, some of the more challenged districts, some of the districts that represent areas that are socioeconomically challenged, those kids are performing well.

They're graduating, they're going on to 4-year schools. They're successful in college, and they're graduating, and they lead successful lives.

So when we talk about 50 percent of -[Applause.]

SENATOR MARTINS: When we talk about

50 percent of kids not being college-ready, that's a very disturbing statistic, because it forces us then to question the rubric that you're using, and the State Education Department is using, for coming up with that statistic.

[Applause.]

SENATOR MARTINS: I can tell you that I've got districts that graduate 97, 98, 99 percent of their kids. They're going on to 4-year schools. They're achieving extraordinary well.

And across the board; not just the high achievers in the school, but the school has a phenomenal record of bringing all of those students and elevating education.

So, numbers like 50 percent of students not being college-ready here on Long Island is a concern.

And perhaps we need to look at those numbers, look at the methodology, because it -- it raises questions in parents.

I've got four daughters.

And, so, when I think about my kids in college, or, in high school now, going on to college, I question statistics that say that 50 percent of our kids aren't college-ready.

And if we know what that number is, and we can trust that number, we can work together towards addressing that need without necessarily pulling everyone else down.

I appreciate your testimony today.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Martins, thank you.

Senator Zeldin, and then he'll be followed by Senator Boyle.

SENATOR ZELDIN: Good morning.

I wanted to get back to the questions and dialogue with regards to the amount of tests taking place in the schools.

The answer to the question was, essentially, two tests in each grade.

And, I just want to kind of go a little further, and I don't know if there's some type of miscommunication.

My understanding -- or, my own experience with their daughters and their schools, my discussions with my constituents, but my understanding is, that there are more than two tests taking place in schools per year.

So I hope -- and maybe we can just discuss 1 that for a minute, and try to figure out what's 2 right and what is wrong. 3 KEN WAGNER: 4 Sure. 5 SENATOR ZELDIN: Because my understanding is, 6 that there are more than two tests per year. 7 KEN WAGNER: Yeah, so unless I misunderstood the question, I thought it was, What is required? 8 And that is the test that we outlined before. 9 10 Of course, there is an additional challenge, 11 12 Principal Evaluation statute.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

which is the implementation of the Teacher and

And what that has done, is that requires different components of teacher and principal evaluation.

There's the "20 percent" component that's based on state growth;

There's the "20 percent" component that's based on local achievement scores;

And then there's the "60 percent" component that's based on other measures of professional practice.

And, we all had a challenge.

Every single school district in this state, and every single school district on Long Island, had a challenge on how to interpret and implement each of those components under a tight time frame, as required by the statute.

And in that implementation, although there were options on how to implement the state portion for teachers who do not teach a test that has a state-required test, roughly, 80 percent of our teachers — only about 18 percent of our teachers are actually covered by a state-provided test.

So, how to implement the state portion for those other teachers, and then how to implement the local-achievement portion.

There were other options; for example, the using of existing state measures for other purposes, as well as the implementation of different types of assessments that are regionally developed, or different assessments that, perhaps, were developed by the BOCES, and so on.

But in the press to implement on schedule, what lots of districts did, is they elected to administrator additional tests. And, typically, those tests, as required by growth, have a "pretest" component and "post-test" component.

That, for some districts, was not a new experience. Some districts have elected, even prior

to APPR, to implement pre and post tests, because they just found them instructionally relevant.

But for a large number of districts, that was a new experience, and it caused lots and lots of questions in communities across the state, and, of course, on Long Island.

SENATOR ZELDIN: So, I mean, I could potentially end up opening up a hornets nest right now, if we were to dig deeper.

So the question -- the question that was asked with regards to "What was required?" and there was, essentially, two per grade, if we dug deeper into teacher evaluations and other tests, we would actually find out that, all year long, from the beginning of the school year to the end of the year, and you can include diagnostic tests, field tests, in addition to the two that are required, find out that there are actually a lot of tests and assessments taking place all year?

KEN WAGNER: If local school districts
elected to adopt that -- that -- those tests, then,
yes.

SENATOR ZELDIN: Right.

So --

(Unintelligible comments from many

audience members.)

2 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Excuse me.

We're going to be here for quite a while.

Decorum is really important.

Please hold your comments, out of respect to everyone in the audience and to the people who are testifying.

Ken, go ahead.

SENATOR ZELDIN: So the follow-up question is: With regards to the implementation, at the local level, of the standards, they -- if a school district did not collectively bargain standards that were approved at the state level, then they would lose out on State Education funding; is that correct?

KEN WAGNER: When you say "standards," do you mean an approvable APPR plan?

SENATOR ZELDIN: Right.

KEN WAGNER: Yeah.

Yeah, so there are other requirements to submit on a timeline, as for -- for submitting an APPR plan that's approved.

SENATOR ZELDIN: So if a school district did not -- so you're talking about, at the local level, collectively bargaining for evaluations, if the

local level, they did not successfully collectively bargain, then they would lose out on, say, education funding -- the growth in State-aid funding?

That's my understanding.

KEN WAGNER: Yes.

So there was a State-aide contingency on submitting an APPR plan. That was part of the budgeting process.

SENATOR ZELDIN: Okay.

The one other question that I wanted to ask, with regards to -- the beginning of your testimony, you were talking about how this was, you know, state-developed and state-implemented.

And, you know, my understanding -- and, just, please correct me if I'm wrong -- my understanding is that, you know, this was really initiated by, you know, private interests associated with Washington, D.C. That there were a couple of organizations, one being the National Governors Association.

 $\label{eq:And there was a -- what was the name of the --} % And there was a -- what was the name of the -- %$

KEN WAGNER: CCSSO.

SENATOR ZELDIN: -- Achieve Incorporated, you know, a DC-based non-for profit, that was,

essentially, working hard on implementing these national standards.

My understanding is, that there was a -- that there was a role that D.C. played -- I just want to understand what the facts are.

KEN WAGNER: Sure, sure.

SENATOR ZELDIN: So that -- you know, some people are claiming what you said are myths;

Some people are claiming what you said are fact;

And, then, people who are saying that this was actually initiated with D.C., and that you enlisted these two state-based organizations to -- you know, to, essentially, take on this effort.

And then it was a DC-based non-for profit that worked on implementing it with private funding, and then it was supplemented with hundreds of millions of dollars of, you know, federal aid to -- you know, to the consortiums.

So, I just want to understand what's fact and what's myth, because that's important to me.

KEN WAGNER: So the challenge around rigorous standards, you know, goes back, of course, a very long time, including into the '80s, where people were worrying very much about whether or not our

students were being taught to rigorous standards, and the impact of that on economic competitiveness, international competitiveness, and, really, just what's morally right for students.

That's been a challenge that has been grappled with by both political parties at the national level, but also at the state level.

The organizations that were most directly involved in the development of the Common Core standards are the National Governors Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers.

But, NGA and CCSSO are exactly what I said; they're a representative group of the governors from each of our states, and they're a representative group of each of the chief state school officers or the state superintendents from each of our states.

Yes, their central offices are located in Albany, but they represent the entire country.

And that work has been going on for quite, quite some time, in terms of writing the standards.

The standards were written on behalf of those two organizations, with the involvement of educators, for a long period of time, with lots of research.

The research in the standards is in one of

the appendices of the standards, and then it was up to individual states whether or not to adopt those standards.

You're absolutely right to point out that the federal government did provide some incentives for states to adopt the standards.

But, if you look closely, and, again, I take the statement about being disingenuous seriously, and I never intend to be disingenuous.

But, the feds required college-ready standards. That's what the technical federal requirement was.

States had to, for example in Race To The Top, adopt college-ready standards.

When states grappled with how to adopt college-ready standards, they had a choice:

They could go and write them again, themselves, on their own;

Or, they could look to the National Governors
Association and the Council of Chief State School
Officers that have been doing this work for a
decade, and consider those standards.

So, yes, 45 states and the District of Columbia elected, in their own individual decisions, to adopt the work that was done collectively.

SENATOR ZELDIN: Just a few, just very brief, points that I just wanted to -- I just wanted to make.

My own observations -- this is a rare opportunity that I get a chance to -- this is the second time now that we've had an opportunity to discuss this important issue.

And, last time that we got together, we were discussing -- I guess, if you were to break this entire process down to three components, you have the standards, the curriculum, and the tests.

And there are -- there's been an SED role in part of those three areas.

There's a role at the -- from local, you know, school boards, with teachers; with companies like, you know, Pearson.

These -- there are a lot of different components going into the curriculum, standards, and testing.

It's my observation that that isn't calibrated yet.

That the curriculum to prepare our students for the tests, based on the standards, are leading to a situation where -- let's just go back to the two tests that are required per year.

That you're ending up in a situation where you have, let's say, a good third-grader, an intelligent third-grader, that -- you know, who pays attention in school, takes good notes, does their homework; is going to be a superstar in life.

And that third-grader is being taught to what that teacher believes is the best attempt at a curriculum to prepare that student for the test.

Obviously, the teacher wants to get that kid to do well on the test, because, you know, it's high stakes for them now.

And that intelligent third-grader is, not only failing the test and being told that they're not proficient, but they're -- I mean, they're -- they're having a -- you know, just a miserable experience of -- you know, of failing that test from day one.

And then, you know, there's several days.

So, like, last year, April 16th to

April 18th, and April 24th to April 26th,

essentially, six days, you know, out of eight, there

were -- well, over the course of two weeks, I should

say, there were a lot of tests going on.

And I just -- I think that you need to calibrate a lot better for this to have any chance

of working.

And as I said previously, you know, if -I really do believe that if you lean too forward in
life, you know, you could end up falling on your
face.

And, unfortunately, you know, our kids have a lot to lose.

So I just -- I think that you really -- we need to look at how the curriculum is being set to the standards, and the tests to teach on the curriculum, or this has zero percent chance of working.

That's just -- and two other minor points:

With regards to the data, I believe that -
personally, I believe in the fundamental right of a

parent to control the upbringing of their child.

That, a lot of this data is getting shared.

And I think it's very important that the policies, going forward, takes into stronger accounts the rights of the parent to control how to -- how to decide what data is shared, and what's not to be shared.

And I think that they need to -- parents need to be more involved than they are right now with those decisions.

And, thirdly, I just want to say, you know, in your opening, you were talking about supplementing the local efforts. That this is supplementing the local efforts.

And, you know, I get more of the feeling that, you know, like, the local efforts may be supplementing, you know, the state and federal efforts, but, you know, I think a more accurate word might be "supplant" the local efforts.

I just -- it's important to perceptualize [sic] for parents and educators and communities throughout the state to believe that our state and federal government gets it.

And, you know, I just think that some of what has been put out is giving the perception in the public that the state and federal government doesn't get it on this particular issue.

And you may not -- the State Education

Department in New York State may not hold a school district accountable.

It's maybe saying that we don't want to hold a school district accountable for the first round of test results, but then Governor Cuomo is, you know, saying in public, that a school district faces the "death penalty" for not performing up to standards.

And, you know, he is -- you know, he has a much bigger soapbox than I do, than you do, than any of us do here in this room.

And it's very important, that if that's the message, that -- you know, that your message -- about not holding school districts accountable for the tests coming out of the gate, if that's your message, then it's very important that the Governor isn't stepping on your message by saying that he wants to have a "death penalty" for school districts for not performing to a certain standard.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you, Senator Zeldin.
[Applause.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Boyle.

SENATOR BOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Excuse me, let me just interrupt.

We have been joined by Senator LaValle.

Senator Boyle, and then Senator LaValle.

SENATOR BOYLE: Thank you, Chairman, and thank you for holding these important hearings.

Ken, I will be brief.

I just want to ask, I associate myself with some of the remarks and concerns of my colleagues on the Common Core curriculum.

1 I hear on a weekly, and maybe daily, basis in my office, from parents, teachers, administrators, 2 3 and some students, about the stress regarding these 4 tests. 5 I mean, it's really unbelievable to me. I know that a former congressman out here, 6 7 Tom Downey [ph.], used to joke during the debate on prayer in school, that, as long as there are tests, 8 9 there was gonna be prayer in school. However, it's a difference when I see third-, 10 11 fourth-graders experiencing such stress. 12 And I think it really is because of the 13 timing of this. 14

New York to trying to take a lead on this, and I see some of the other states, including
Michigan, Indiana, and I understand, most recently,
California, are trying to say, "Whoa, slow down here."

I would like to see New York join that club.

We need to slow down on the implementation of this, and I would like to get your opinion on that.

[Applause.]

KEN WAGNER: Yep, yep.

So, three things:

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The first is, that we need to think very

carefully about what's causing the stress, and who is stressed --

[Laughter.]

KEN WAGNER: -- and who's also communicating
the stress.

There's a lot of change going on right now, obviously.

These hearings are being called to help us all better understand the changes are that are going on right now.

But we do need to make a very clear distinction between the stress that we as adults experience as we collectively go through these transitions, versus, the stress that students experience, and then, most importantly, the stress that we communicate between adults and students.

You know, I started my career as a school psychologist. I've worked with children all my life, and it hurts me, ever, to see a student who is stressed.

But my wife is also a psychologist, and she had an opportunity, where she was sitting in her -- going out to her waiting room, and there was an adult in the room and there was a child in the room.

And the adults in the waiting room -- the

adults in the waiting room went over to the child and said, You've got the tests coming up; right?

Are you nervous about them?

And they didn't know each other. Those two people did not know each other.

Now, some children, we have to also understand that we cannot prejudge what children are capable of.

We cannot prejudge the level of rigor to which our students can rise.

And we have to ask ourself the question: If rigorous learning is inherently stressful, not in a bad way, but in a good way, and a challenging way, then is it better for our students to experience stress when they're in school, surrounded by competent and caring adults, their teachers?

Or, is it better for our students to experience the stress when they're done with school, and they can't get into the college that they want to get into, or, they get into the college that they want to get into and they have to pay thousands of dollars for remediation, or, they can't get the job that they want to get, or, they can't find the job with a livable wage?

So there's a collective approach to stress:

The messages -- the stress that the adults are experiencing and the message we send to children;

The very appropriate stressors that occur as students engage with rigorous instruction;

And then, finally, where is that stress best experienced?

SENATOR BOYLE: Just, Ken, the point being, that you're testing kids now, basically, on things they haven't been taught over the course of years.

If we had slowed it down and they were being taught -- and I understand there's going to be some stress involved with testing, but something you've actually been taught, and standards that you've been taught too.

It's this timing of this I think is the major problem, and I certainly hope that you and the Commissioner and the Governor will take that into account.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator LaValle.

SENATOR LAVALLE: Senator Flanagan, thank you for holding this hearing, and other hearings throughout the state.

Ken, we as legislators are an extension of people who we represent. And if we're doing our

job, we are connected and we listen to people. 1 And people are telling us something: parents, 2 3 educators, board members, across the board. A couple of things, that -- and Senator Boyle 4 5 talked about it, we kind of put the cart before the 6 horse here. 7 But what I'd like to know, so, I'm closing my eyes, and I'm trying to visualize 8 9 State Education Department, and what goes on. 10 So --11 [Laughter.] 12 SENATOR LAVALLE: -- do I see "bureaucrats"? 13

Do I see people that are bureaucrats, but say, Gee, we're hearing something. Legislators are telling us, we hear out in the field, something.

And my question is: Have you heard that?

And, is the department willing to change in accordance with the input that they're hearing from legislators, and, people in the field; teachers, principals, superintendents, board members?

KEN WAGNER: So -- so, thank you.

SENATOR LAVALLE: Parents.

And parents.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

KEN WAGNER: Our Commissioner is in schools multiple times every single week. He's spent lots

of times on Long Island, and so on.

And every single time our Commissioner is in a school, he, of course, gets lots and lots of feedback from people about what's going well and what's not going well.

Members of our Commissioner's staff, including myself, routinely do our very best to get feedback from folks that are in the field.

I have a call every single week on Thursdays at 9:00 a.m. Talking to people throughout the state every single week on Thursdays at 10:00 a.m.

And I'm just one of the Commissioner's cabinet that tries to engage with the field.

When we get feedback, for example, that we've not done as good enough job as we need to do about engaging with teachers, we know that. That we've not done as good enough job as we need to do about engaging with parents, we know that.

That we need to foster the types of the communications.

Who do parents listen to? They listen to the most trusted members of their educational network, which is their child's teachers.

So we need to do a better job to get more information to teachers, so teachers can work with

parents about how to make this process better.

So we get that.

In last year's assessments, we heard that the testing times for the younger grades were too long.

So in 2013, we cut back the testing time.

In this year's assessments, we heard loud and clear, that students in grades -- on day two of ELA were running out of time when they were completing their constructive-response items.

We took that feedback loud and clear, and we're making design changes for this coming year's tests.

Are we perfect about this? Absolutely not.

Are we sometimes not -- oftentimes not as connected to the people that you talk to as we should be? Absolutely.

Do we struggle with that daily, because we believe that more brains are better, and teachers and parents and students will help all of us do a better job? Absolutely.

SENATOR LAVALLE: You know, sometimes I think the department needs to say, We hear you, and we don't need a hearing aid.

Lastly, as you know, and we've talked, we talked over an hour in my office, about the

legislation I put in, dealing with the test.

And I would certainly -- I certainly intend to pursue that again this session -- next session.

And, I would like your professional input as to what is good, and what may not work, what would work.

Thank you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Ken, I just have a couple of quick things, and we're trying to keep as tightly as we can to the schedule.

I appreciate my colleagues' comments and thoughts.

 $\ensuremath{\text{I}}$ want to focus on two primary questions, and then $\ensuremath{\text{I}}$ have an assignment.

You touched on this, but, I think, when you talk about, you don't want to adversely affect districts or individual schools or teachers, and most importantly, you don't want to adversely affect students, I would like to hear your comments, in particular, as it relates to AIS, and in this capacity:

Parents who now see their children getting a "1" or "2," who heretofore have gotten a "3" or "4," whether it's a baseline, or whether it's adapted to what the realities of the test are, you're going to

have situations where parents are going to come in and say, I don't care what State Ed says, I don't care what anyone else says. My kid is going to get these services.

How is the department dealing with that?

And what is the message on that, in
particular, that you're trying to send to the
public?

KEN WAGNER: So the board took action yesterday, at its meeting yesterday, around AIS, so let me provide some information.

The first is, that the most effective support for all of our students, whether or not it's a student who performed at a Level 1, 2, 3, or 4, is a great teacher in front of a classroom with the proper supports.

And Common Core instruction is different.

It's not just the learning standards that are different, but it also opens the door for different instructional practices.

For example, in English-language arts, the focus on close reading of text, and the focus on students becoming active readers to gather evidence, and to respond to questions with that evidence;

Or, in math, the focus on fewer standards and

more detail, and the blending of fluency of math knowledge with deep application of math concepts.

Those are not just standards, but those are changes in instructional practice.

But, incidentally, those are things that great teachers have been doing forever, so we cannot pretend that we've suddenly invented great teaching with the Common Core.

Great teachers have been doing this work for a very --

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Ken, let me interrupt, please.

I have profound respect for your knowledge. I really, genuinely, do.

I want you to focus on what I'm specifically talking about, as it relates: What message are we as legislators supposed to send, either with the department, or with the Regents, or with others, as to how do you address that parent?

Because part of what the Commissioner has said, is that children not learning any less or necessarily learning any differently, we have a new baseline.

But how do you -- what's the message that we're supposed to send?

And, you know, in my opinion, it has nothing to do with Common Core.

I'm talking about AIS, and what does it mean to a parent who's looking to get remedial instruction for their child?

KEN WAGNER: Yeah, so AIS is required for students who score below proficiency.

The definition of AIS has some flexibility, and it's tailored to student needs.

So, AIS can range from monitoring an educator who's assigned to monitor student progress, as the least-intensive intervention, all the way to one-on-one tutorial support.

So that's the AIS regulation.

What the board acted on last -- yesterday, similar to what it acted on in 2010, was it provided a one-year transition for what the cut score is for AIS services.

So on the 2013 test results, it's not that every student who scored below proficiency on the 2013 tests is required to receive AIS; but, rather, we provided information about what is the cut score on the 2013 test that is comparable to the cut score on last year's 2012 test.

So, basically, AIS, for this coming school

year, will only be required for students who fall below the cut score that's comparable to last year's proficiency cut score.

It's a one-year transition.

If a -- that's what's required.

If a parent wants their child to receive AIS, but they're not required under this provision that the board just acted upon, that would be something that --

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Well, so let me follow up with a comment and a question, and to, in essence, complement some of what my colleagues have said.

This is where I think the disconnect occurs, and it's a challenge for us to go back and speak plain English to the people that we represent. And parents desperately care about their children no matter what community they live in.

So, let me give you a perspective example, where maybe the term "freak out" might be appropriate, and that relates to the Regents in particular.

Having seen what happened with the test this year --

And I understand some of those ramifications.

-- I'm very concerned, and I am by no means

alone in this regard, about Common Core as it relates to Regents for next year.

And there's -- I'm not disputing ELA

3 through 8, but now you're talking about college,
now you're talking about graduation.

How do we mollify, or how do we address, parents who are saying, and my colleagues, Why can't we wait?

NYSUT has testimony that's coming up today that says there should be a three-year moratorium, probably debatable.

But, what's wrong with waiting a year?

KEN WAGNER: Yep, on Regents exams, so, if

you wait on the testing, you would have to wait on
the instruction, because as lots of people have

pointed out, you need your assessments to align to
the standards.

So if you offer the old Regents exams which are based on the 2005 standards, then in fairness to students and fairness to teachers, we would need those teachers to continue to teach the 2005 standards.

There always needs to be a year one; and that year one, where you jump both your standards and your assessment has to occur. You cannot do the

assessments later and have the standards be different than your assessments.

We have a group of students who just came out of eighth grade who are moving into ninth grade, and they are aligned on that Common Core assessment continuum.

Another approach to the Regents-exam transition is two things:

One is, when we release the scores, we can also release a percentile result, which, even though the scores will be different because of the proficiency rates being different on Common Core versus the prior standards, the percentile results can show the students, that regardless of your performance level, you are at the 80th percentile, or the 95th percentile.

"Percentile" is, basically, the percentage of the students that you scored at or above.

So we can help to communicate what the scores mean by coupling the scores with the percentile.

The second thing we can do is have different cut scores for the different performance levels.

For example, the Level 3 could be what's required for college- and career-readiness, comparable to the 75 and 80 that we have used for

the graduation-rate metrics.

But Level 2, for example, could be comparable to passing, for graduation purposes, comparable to the 65 that we use right now for graduation purposes, which we know is not the right score for college-readiness purposes.

So we can have different cut scores.

Educators are part of that cut-score determination.

They were part of cut-score determination for grades 3 through 8, and educators from across the state will be part of the cut-score determinations for Regents exams as well.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: The problem is,

I understand everything that you just said. It's

just going to be very difficult to translate that

out to parents and constituents.

And I will close on this:

We're trying to, again, move along.

I'm going to ask everyone who testifies here,
I'm going to give everyone the same assignment:

We have a hearing coming up on October 1st.

By September 30th, everyone who has testified, I would like your opinion --

And I will take a snapshot in time: K through

12, nothing changes, it's static. A kid goes into kindergarten, the rubric, and, everything's, going to be the same for the next 12 years.

-- I would like everyone to provide to our Committee what you believe are all the tests that children have to take.

'Cause, to me, this is like the ultimate game of telephone.

We start out on one end. By the time you get to the other end, the story is night and day from where it started.

So, it will be fascinating for us, and, hopefully, educational for everyone, to be able to look and compare, and see how you define, you know, beauty being in the eyes of the beholder.

So, Ken, Nicholas, and Dennis, thank you very much.

Regent Tilles.

[Inaudible] your patience.

Regent Tilles, if you don't know him, is certainly a champion of education on Long Island, well known by all of us in the Legislature, and a passionate and ardent advocate for children.

And with that introduction, Roger, no pressure whatsoever.

REGENT ROGER TILLES: Thank you, Senator, and thank you for having this hearing.

I have been concerned that there is a tremendous amount of misinformation floating around.

I have been -- it's been a pleasure for me to represent Long Island, and very frustrating as well, because I'm not always in sync with the rest of my fellow Regents.

I -- in 8 1/2 years, we have 125 school districts on Long Island, I've been to over 70 of them and have had conversations with people -- teachers, parents, kids, administrators -- in all those districts. And the input that I get has been very, very helpful to me.

I'm only one of two full-time -- basically, full-time Regents; and, so, I carry with me to Albany a little more information, perhaps, than most of the other Regents, who are all good people.

I'm also one of -- well, for seven years,

I was the only Regent that had kids in the public
schools, and that has helped me a tremendous amount
as well in determining policy.

I'm also one that -- I'm the only person,
I think, nationally, that has ever been elected to
two different state boards of education: Michigan

and New York.

And, I'm on the National Board For Professional Teaching Practices.

Many of you know me as a business person, but, really, my life has been much more devoted to education policy than it has been to business.

I support most of the Regents reform agenda.

I think that most of it is on target.

Public schools provide the common bond for our citizens, and I'm worried about the use of some of the programs, No Child Left Behind, for instance, to break those bonds.

And that's why I think our agenda can actually be a very positive statement.

And I'm not going to talk about it too much, but, the improving, the recruiting, professional development, retaining, rewarding, teachers, and making the principals and the education profession as a valued one in our society, is absolutely essential. And we don't do that.

[Applause.]

REGENT ROGER TILLES: And I'm not elected by the public so you don't have to applaud for me.

Applaud for them.

[Laughter.]

REGENT ROGER TILLES: These guys elect me.

So, I think that's really important.

And if you look at the countries that are doing really well, they treat their teachers and administrators as the professionals; as real, like, doctors and psychologists.

The -- so that -- I really think that's one of the first steps, and I think the Regents are moving in that direction, by raising the standards for those that get certification to be teachers, and for the professional development of teachers.

Building the diagnostic assessments -- that we just talked about with Ken Wagner, who really is an expert on this stuff -- and which inform teachers in schools how they can improve their practices and differentiate student instruction, I think that's really important, as long as the privacy of the information is safeguarded.

Which, I'm afraid right now, under the existing policies that school districts have with sharing information with third parties, is not protected.

I think, in essence, our state data system might be a much better protection.

I have to go by the experts on that. I'm not

an expert on it.

Focusing on best practices to improve low-performing schools is one that I'm particularly interested in.

In an environment of poverty, you need to have much more than the school to be effective.

And I think -- let me give you -- well, I'll come back to that.

Lastly, the development of the Common Core standards, which the left and the right both have suggested are un-American, I believe is one of the best reforms that we have made.

It is not the Common Core standards, developing curriculum, and assessments to measure those standards. That's not a goal that has yet been implemented or attained.

But, I sat for several years on the Regents task force, develop English-language-arts standards.

The company we hired to help us with that was Achieve.

When Race To The Top came out, we were just about to publish our standards, which were very high standards.

Achieve became the company on the national level, and, indeed, took virtually all of the

standards that New York had come up with and put that into a national standard.

Every state is allowed to tweak a little bit, too.

And we tweaked those national standards, but I think the standards are very good.

In-depth learning, conceptual thinking, is really important, and not rote learning.

And that's why I think the Common Core is good.

Following the adoption of the Common Core by the Regents, New York took a very innovative step, which, I don't know of any other state that has done it, to develop curricular materials to assist the implementation of those standards.

Now, that's a good thing and a bad thing.

Because, it's a good thing, because, for the most part, I've heard very positive comments about the parts of the curriculum that we have come out with, that are online; however, we're not done with that curriculum yet.

Not all of the curriculum is done; and, yet, the State announced years ago, that students would be tested last spring on the Common Core, even though the state curriculum had not been done.

The State's attitude is, that school districts had some years to develop their own curriculum.

But, we were developing our own. And I think many, many districts relied upon that, and teachers relied upon that.

And when they weren't finished, felt that we weren't -- they weren't ready, really, to have assessments on them.

That was why, I think, the assessments were anticipated to drop precipitously, as they did.

The Commissioner said, "The tests should be taken with a grain of salt."

These results were determined by the state department creating cut scores, ostensively, to match the NAEP, the national results, which, allegedly, determine college- and career-readiness.

I represent Long Island, all of Nassau and Suffolk county.

Most Long Island students, and some others around the state, received the 30 percent cut in scores, moving from about 90 percent passage to about 60 percent.

I think that that's a real disconnect.

And I don't understand, because our students,

generally speaking, go on to colleges and do well in colleges, and finish in four years, as opposed to many others.

I have a feeling, and I have said this from the beginning, that the development of college- and career-ready standards that we use for these tests were done in geographic areas that were not necessarily Long Island.

I think we need to look at how those standards were developed, because there clearly is a disconnect when it comes to our Long Island districts and the preparation of their students.

I don't like the fact that parents are saying: Gee, only 60 percent of our students are prepared to go to college. And, what happened?

Because we've had 90 percent of our students prepared and do very well in college.

I said, Nothing happened.

Nothing.

And I think that's a very bad signal, not just for parents, but for taxpayers who are in those districts, because they want to be in areas that have good schools. And when they see only 60 percent of their kids going on, it's a very dangerous item when it comes to a school budget

passing.

I have opposed the use of standardized test scores to evaluate teachers or principals.

I'm one of the few.

[Applause.]

REGENT ROGER TILLES: Even though the Governor's law requires that the Regents come up with that plan, and, indeed, the federal government has offered incentive dollars to come up with such a plan that evaluates teachers based on student test scores, as a member of the National Board For Professional Teaching Standards, the highest and most rigorous evaluation of teachers that there is in this country, we support the use of measures of student growth in all evaluations, but not on a state assessment that needs mathematical algorithms to attempt to recreate a growth measure.

And that's has been my argument with my fellow Regents, and it will continue to be.

I -- the loss of morale of the teaching community, and the great reduction of applicants to our education schools here on Long Island, and elsewhere, are strong evidence of the unwise use of this unreliable measure.

While it may be that teacher evaluation

results, which include these scores, would be relative, and, therefore, not out of line with what the other scores would have brought for evaluation purposes, I worry, as the "News Day" op-ed piece mentioned, that the gap between high-performing and low-performing districts is only going to increase, based on upon these tests.

Because, when kids come in with lower scores in high-performing districts, they're going to go out and get the help, and, they're going to buy it, or the school's gonna put extra help in, and whatever else.

Districts that don't have that capability are not going to have that, and I can see the gap increasing instead of decreasing.

I think that Long Island schools have had great advantages because our population has overwhelmingly supported our schools, offering rigorous courses with strong creativity enriched by art, music, and enrichment.

And that's true, really, for most of our school districts.

One of the inevitable byproducts of the emphasis on high-stakes testing of core subjects has been the narrowing of the curriculum, cutting out

music and art and extracurricular activities,
thinking that this has had little or no detrimental
effects on students.

We all know better.

The arts not only allow students to use their minds to create, but also to learn the literacies that allow for greater citizenship.

In addition, the arts actually caused students to do -- perform better on the very tests that are effectively eliminating them from the curriculum.

I just want to relate one anecdote to you.

I -- when I go to a school district, my normal day is to go and read poems to fourth- and fifth-graders, because I like to do that, and that's my perk. It's the only perk as a non-paid Regent.

And I have a lot of fun doing that.

And I asked these kids -- no matter what district it is, it could be the highest- or the lowest-performing districts -- I asked those kids -- and they get it; they get these poems.

They understand them, they memorize them, they interact with them, and they're enthusiastic about them.

And I asked them, How many of you want to go

on to college?

And every hand goes up.

When I go to a ninth grade in some of the low-performing districts, I go into a class. I have to assume the superintendent is sending me to the best teacher that he can find.

And I sit there, as do all the kids in the class, basically, totally bored. No interactivity.

And at the end of that, I asked these kids, How many of you want to go on to college?

And if you get one or two hands in the room, that's a lot.

And I say, Why?

You know, I ask -- then I go to talk to, usually, a group of high school kids. They're better-achieving kids.

I say, What happened between fourth grade and ninth grade with this district, which is a low-performing district, where only half the kids graduate?

And they said, Well, we don't have a lot of mentors. We don't have a lot of role models. We have peer-pressure gangs, in many cases. And, generally speaking, it's not a very healthy environment for us.

Well, I'm walking out of one of these 1 districts right here in Suffolk County, not far from 2 here, a couple of years ago, and I'm feeling very 3 depressed about that conversation, and that day that 4 I've just had. 5 And I hear a choir singing in the choir room, 6 7 and I say, Wow, they --8 I happen to be a big fan of choral music. 9 And I stick my head in, and it was a bunch of 10 seniors from that high school. 11 I thought it was a college choir at least, 12 coming in. They were fabulous. 13 Fabulous. And I sat and listened to them. 14 15 And I found out that they were training to go 16 to Salzburg, Austria, to sing in the 17 Mozart Bicentennial. Now, this is a district that graduates 18 19 50 percent of their kids. 20 I asked them, I said, Why you, and not your 21 peers? How many of you will graduate from high school? 22 23 Every hand went up. 24 Every hand up.

And when I said, "How many of you are going

on to college?" about half the hands went up, in a district that really doesn't produce college -- and I said, Why you, and not your peers?

And they said, We love music, we love the arts, we love our chorus, and that's what brings us to school. And, our teacher doesn't let us stay in chorus unless we do our work. And he calls us every week to make sure we're doing our work.

This is not rocket science.

This is what I believe is needed in schools, not necessarily all of the assessments and all of the programs.

[Applause.]

REGENT ROGER TILLES: I just think reforms, and having been on the Michigan board over 30 years ago, we're dealing with the same issues, and, pretty much, in the same way. "Measurement by objectives," is what it was called then.

And now we're talking about Race To The Top.

I'll finish by saying, as one who's involved -- who has been involved with real-estate development on Long Island, I had the opportunity to have many entrance and exist exams of business leaders on Long Island.

Obviously, I think you will agree, it is not

the low energy costs, low taxes, or easy transportation that causes business to come here on Long Island.

It is the quality of life that brings them here and keeps them here, with the number one factor being our schools.

I wonder if we will be able to keep this advantage if the tax caps and increasing pressure to narrow the curriculum continue to erode what are fabulous schools.

I certainly hope we can turn this around, and I commend you for having this hearing, hopefully, to begin that process.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Regent Tilles, thank you.

I'm gonna -- my colleagues are gonna have to be as brief as possible, since we're on a -- we have a lot of people still to come before us.

Senator Marcellino, and then Senator Martins.

SENATOR MARCELLINO: Thanks, Roger. Thank you for coming.

And I do appreciate your efforts and your work. And I know you care, because we've known each other for many years. You really do care as to

what's going on, and I think that's refreshing. 1 Just a question. 2 We know that the Governor made a statement 3 about the "death penalty" for schools. I thought --4 and I've said that that was an inartful way of 5 6 talking. I don't think it was appropriate. 7 And, you know, he's kind of back-pedaled a little bit from that, but then, you know, he's not 8 9 going to go away with that issue. 10 If there are schools that are not functioning 11 well -- and there are, we all know that -- if there 12 are districts that are not functioning well within 13 our Island, what are we doing for them? 14 What are we doing for them? I mean, are we using the tests as the 15 16 indicator? 17 Or, are we taking districts who are doing 18 well by standards that we all accept, and using them 19 as models for these other districts? 20 Are we sending them in; are we making them 21 collaborate with one another? 22 I mean, this, I would think, is a Board of

Regents' function.

Are we doing that?

23

24

25

REGENT ROGER TILLES: In terms of the

lowest-performing districts --

And we have a few on Long Island that are in pockets in the midst of very good school districts. We have a few because of economic reasons mostly, that are totally, just totally, dysfunctional.

-- and I've said this before, I think a good part of that is management, is the election of officials that don't necessarily look at kids as the first priority.

And, therefore, when you have a very low-performing district, and, on top of that, a dysfunctional school board, and there are ways of determining that, through audits, and whatever else, as a couple of our school boards are being audited right now, somebody -- and I would not recommend that the State Education Department come in and run that school district.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR MARCELLINO: I'm shocked to hear that.

[Laughter.]

REGENT ROGER TILLES: Yeah.

I came in four or five years into the Roosevelt takeover, and was appalled by the fact that our -- (a) it's not the State Department's

fault. They had no capacity to run the school district.

There was nobody -- there's nobody in Albany that does that. And we have some former superintendents who I think, probably, would be pretty good, but that's not what we're looking for.

We have recommended to the Legislature, a bill that would be able to identify those very few districts that are dysfunctional, and allow the Commissioner, the Regents, to appoint either BOCES, a master educator, a university...somebody with educational experience, to come in and run that district, whether the board is there or not, but to run that district.

That's one avenue that really has to be -has to be implemented. And I know it's not popular
with school boards, but, you know, we're talking
about less than 1 percent of the school boards,
maybe .5 percent of the school boards, that need
that.

And it's not just a couple of them on Long Island.

The Buffalo School District is another one, where we have taken action, because -- in doing that, we have appointed BOCES to come in and run

some of those schools, we have -- brought in Johns Hopkins University to run some of those schools, because we had the leverage of the SIG funds; the state improvement funds.

We don't have that with all the districts on Long Island.

That's one way to do it.

The second way, is to create, as you have done, or, in your district, there are now two STEM Magnet schools.

I believe regionalization of magnet schools will be, ultimately, very helpful in allowing kids who are in those dysfunctional districts to get an education that they deserve.

And if you don't do one or the other, the kids have no chance.

Really, no chance, especially since they're cutting out the few things that make kids want to come to school.

SENATOR LAVALLE: Thanks, Roger.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Martins.

SENATOR MARTINS: Thank you.

Roger, it's great to see you.

I just want to take the opportunity,

Mr. Chairman, to recognize Regent Tilles as just a

tremendous advocate for education and our children here on Long Island.

And I wanted to thank you for your efforts on behalf of our schools.

I believe that there's a disconnect, or a credibility gap, with the State Education

Department.

When we talk about 50 percent of Long Island graduating seniors not being college-ready;

When we talk about setting a cut score for these exams, that result in many of our children receiving "2's," when they have, historically, been better than that, and demonstrated higher achievement than that;

And then you have, by the way, telling them that their school districts do not have to provide them with remedial services;

Tells us that there is a gap there.

That, there is a disconnect, and a credibility gap, which I think is critically important at a time when credibility in implementing new policies is very important.

And, not necessarily singling you out, because I do know where you stand on these issues, and how you have fought on the right side of these

issues, but I think there's a problem for us as legislators, when we do come back to the district and we have these discussions with our parents, with our administrators, with our boards, because, those numbers, those statistics, and those actions fly in the face of what I believe to be the caveat, which is, How does it improve the educational experience of a child?

And I can't reconcile those two.

REGENT ROGER TILLES: Right.

I would -- yesterday -- in fact, I came down in the middle of our meeting, to come talk to you today.

We had a meeting with Commissioner King last night.

And, basically, I'm not surprised that he hadn't really grasped some of the depth of feeling that I've seen on Long Island.

But we basically told him, he had to spend the next year, being out there, every day, and explaining what it is that we're trying to do.

So much of what we do is misinformation.

Some of it is misimplementation, but, frankly most of it is misinformation.

And I think that that really needs to be

done.

And, it's hard for me as a Regent. I'll talk to a PTA here, or whatever there.

But, the Commissioner has a bully pulpit, and really needs to do that.

I also think it's important, and I'll use a little critical -- I probably should end with you now -- but, part of what we did, in having to implement the evaluation system now, which I think is really at the heart of what the problem is, because without -- without the teacher evaluation being part of a high-stakes nature of the tests, the tests would not be as -- they could be used diagnostically, and, we wouldn't have the emphasis on teaching to those tests. We would have a test to measure how students are doing.

The use of the scores on teacher evaluation is really, I think, been very damaging, and is at the heart of what the implementation problem is.

The speed of the test is another one of -- when we don't have the curriculum all out there, as I've mentioned.

But, some of those things, you know, the tests and the evaluation score with the -- this test score with the evaluation are things that are

prescribed, not by the Regents, but by state law and by the federal government.

And, you know, as much as I can oppose them, and I voted against them, even though it was flying in the face of state law, I just -- I just think that they're very dangerous.

Let me give you one quick example, and I know you want to run.

I have a daughter that's learning-disabled, and from the third grade, on, was taking IEP -- you know, IEP courses.

And, because the federal government came in and said, when I -- my second year as a Regent,
I think, that all kids with learn -- with -- special-ed kids should be tested on these
3 through 8 tests at their age level, and not at the grade level that they're learning at.

Well, my daughter's learning at second grade, and she's in the fourth-grade level; and, yet, we made her take that test. We made her, knowing that she'd failed that test.

The same thing with English-language learners who have only been here one year and one day, we make them take the test.

Why?

Not because the Regents want to do it. 1 Because this is federal law. 2 And we would lose the \$700 million that the 3 feds are giving us, or the special-ed money. 4 And that's one of the real problems. 5 6 SENATOR MARTINS: You know, just as a quick 7 follow-up, and I'll share an anecdote with you: I have one of my high-achieving school 8 9 districts that is also socioeconomically challenged. 10 You visited there recently. 11 It's right on the Queens border, and, a large 12 Caribbean population, immigrant population. 13 Child, fourth-grader, took an exam this year 14 and got a "2." 15 "A" student. Wants to go to college. Knows 16 how important these grades are, at that age as a 17 10-year-old. 18 And, came home and did something very destructive to herself, as a result of not doing 19 20 well enough on this exam, because, it affected our 21 children. 22 And I don't think we take into consideration 23 the impact that a score has on the self-esteem of 24 our children when we put these things out there.

[Applause.]

SENATOR MARTINS: And, you know, looking at 1 it, theoretically, the difference between a "3" and 2 a "2", when you're talking about a fourth-grader, 3 makes a difference. 4 It does make a difference. 5 And, we need to reevaluate where we are in 6 7 that spectrum, because we've sort of lost sight of the forest for the trees. 8 9 And I do appreciate your efforts. 10 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Self-esteem is not to be 11 underestimated. 12 REGENT ROGER TILLES: I agree. 13 Thank you. 14 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you, 15 Senator Martins. 16 Regent Tilles, thank you for your attendance, 17 and for your work. And now we have Marianne Adrian, and, 18 Jeanette, and I better say it right, Deutermann. 19 20 [Applause.] 21 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Now, without an ounce of 22 disrespect to our prior speakers, we're bringing in 23 heavy artillery.

We have mothers and parents who are before us now.

24

1 JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: That's right, watch 2 out. 3 SENATOR FLANAGAN: And, we certainly have everyone's written testimony. 4 I'm going to say this to everybody, so it's 5 6 by no means singling you out. 7 We just -- if you could speak just from the heart, just summarize what you have to say, that 8 9 would be helpful. 10 And, Marianne, since I spoke with you first, 11 and I appreciate the opportunity having to had --12 speak with both of you, I would ask you to start, 13 please. 14 MARIANNE ADRIAN: Thank you. 15 And thank you very much for the invitation. 16 It's very much appreciated. 17 I'm honored to be here, and speak on behalf 18 of my children. 19 My name is Marianne Adrian, and I have three 20 children: a seventh-grader, a fourth-grader, and one 21 that just started preschool. 22 You know, what I'm not here to tell today is 23 that the new curriculum is bad or wrong. I'm not

here to tell you that teachers should not be

evaluated. And, I'm not here to tell you that

24

students should not be tested.

These are all things that need to happen.

But, I would like to share you with my children's experiences.

Prior to last year, they have had great experiences in the public school system.

They've had teachers that have helped them to learn and grow.

They loved learning, they love to read.

They do their work, they have fun.

Last year, this all changed, particularly with my then-third-grader.

He had a two-week stretch, where he did not want to go to school.

The first couple of times, he told me in the mornings he didn't want to go.

I figured he was just being an 8-year-old, but, it lasted for two whole weeks. And, I started asking questions to figure out what was going on.

And what I found out was, that there were so many assessments already going on in school, the local assessments, the pre-assessments, and, it just threw him -- threw him off.

I then started looking into it a little bit more.

And what I found was, that there's the new curriculum in place, which is fine, but I started realizing that their school day was encompassing test prep for the math and the ELA tests.

And, he was also getting two to three hours of homework every night, which, for a third-grader was a little bit excessive.

So, fast-forwarding to the state-test time, he took the first two days of the ELA, and he came home and said to me, Mommy, do not make me go back for that the third day. I can't do it.

And I understand why.

He was asked to sit there for three days in a row, 90 minutes per day, for the ELA, and then had to do it all again the following week for the math test.

He actually then begged me not to make him take the math test, which he did, but, he wasn't happy, he was in tears.

And, as a parent, to see that happen, it's really disheartening.

After the test, he became a different child.

He became the happy child. Some of the behavioral issues that occurred during the school year went away.

So, my 7th grader, my then-sixth-grader, he experienced some of the same things.

The excessive homework; the -- he did not want to keep doing the homework. He said he does so much reading for the English-language arts.

And I started noticing a focus was being taken off of some of the other subject areas, such as science or social studies.

And I feel it was to make up for the teaching to the test. Uhm, prepping, for these students to take the state test.

Uhm, his experience with the state test was that he witnessed friends getting sick -- physically getting sick; walking out of the room crying.

One of his friends who's a straight-A honor student got sick, but was more scared to leave the room and go to the nurse, for fear of failing this test.

So, this brings me to the conclusion that the effectiveness of these lengthy tests should take into consideration the emotional and physical stress as well.

And that's something that test data cannot tell you.

I understand the need to look at numbers, to

assess where the children are, but, these are young kids.

They're three -- third grade. They're not really thinking about the college- and career-readiness.

They're thinking about getting through the school year, and trying to learn what their teachers are trying to teach them.

They're thinking about going to recess and going to gym, and being with their friends and socializing.

All of these things are also such an important part of a child's education.

So I feel that the way the implementation of the Common Core curriculum and standards was something that was done very quickly.

Tying the tests to teacher evaluations is something that I feel has fostered this environment of teaching to the test, making it a one-size-fits-all, as opposed to teaching to each individual child at their needs.

I'd also -- would like to talk about the data.

Sorry.

I would like to talk about data, and the

privacy of that data.

Okay, so, the "FERPA," or, the
Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, that was
created in 1974, was supposed to protect student
privacy.

With the new verbiage that's in there, allowing the State to share our children's data, my children's data, with third-party vendors, I find that concerning, to say the least.

I understand that there are security in -- there's security in place.

And, that I'm sure the State does take into consideration the privacy of this data and the sensitivity of it.

However, as we are in the digital age that we are in now, I also feel that there are hackers out there that can break through those firewalls and can get through the encryption and access this important private data.

It's stored on a cloud system, which is really the most concerning part to me, because I do not feel like that has the security that it needs to house my children's data.

I do know that there is a bill out there,
Bill S5355, that encompasses K-through-12 student

privacy data, and prohibits the use of systems like 1 2 cloud. And I think it's a great start to help 3 protecting my children's data, and other parents' 4 children's data. 5 Ultimately, I would like to see an option for 6 parents to be able to decline having our children's 7 information shared with third-party vendors. 8 Uhm, and I think that's it. 9 10 I think I would just like to end with this --11 Possibly? 12 Maybe? 13 -- okay, so here's my thought: Once you take away the love of learning from 14 15 a child, it is very difficult to get it back. 16 And once you break their confidence, it's 17 very hard to build it up. And that is the bottom line of what 18 19 I experienced this past year with my own children. 20 Thank you. 21 [Applause.] 22 JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: Do you want to ask 23 questions? 24 SENATOR FLANAGAN: No, we'll -- Jeanette,

25

we'll go wright to you.

Marianne, nicely done.

Jeanette, no pressure now that she's had that stellar performance.

JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: Okay, my name is

Jeanette Deutermann. I am also a parent; a parent

of a 10-year-old, and a 7-year-old.

My journey into this whole movement started very innocently last year.

I noticed significant differences with my 10-year-old, and how he felt about school.

Like Marianne, I experienced the same things.

My son was, all of a sudden, begging not to go to school. And this was a child who never gave me a hard time about going to school, seemed perfectly content and happy.

He started experiencing stomach aches. It was a couple of months before his third-grade tests, and, to the point where I took him to a doctor to find out if he had stomach issues. And the doctor suggested that this was stress-related.

And I said, "Stress? You know, he's eight, how could he have stress?"

But, again, I -- you know, being a new parent in the elementary district, you don't realize that this -- these tests, what they are, the fact that

they're new, the fact that this wasn't just the way things are done normally.

There's a lot of times that I've been hearing how, Oh, us parents are just being manipulated by educators, and we're just being their pawns, and we're being --

And I take such insult to that, because, really, this was something that I had to discover for myself.

And I was, frankly, really angry that I wasn't told by educators what was happening.

And I know a lot of educators are very upset and angry, and this is their careers, and this is destroying the career they love.

And a lot of them have said to me, Oh, you know, thank God you parents have figured this out.

But I kind of felt, like, why didn't somebody tell me?

You know?

And, so, to say that we are just being, sort of, coerced by educators is completely, completely unbased, and that is not the case.

So, with my son experiencing all these things, the fourth-grade year got even worse.

I started noticing the differences with test

prepping.

And, in November, they started coming home with test-prepping materials. Every single homework was math or ELA, nothing else.

They probably had two social-studies tests for the year, a small very handful of science tests.

These things were just not being done, because they didn't have time.

When asking -- I started asking educators that I knew outside of my district, because I knew the ones in my districts weren't allowed to actually tell me what was happening.

When I started asking them, What is -What are the tests? And why do I feel like my child
is taking test after test after test? What is this?

And it was, Yep, well, this is just -- this is the way we have to do this. This is not -- we don't have a choice.

And teachers seemed so dejected and upset, and sad, really.

As I researched more and more, and started realizing that I did not want my child to go through the same stress leading up to the tests last year, I stumbled on a Facebook group that talked about opting out of the state tests.

I researched it extensively myself, read as many articles as I could possibly find about what was happening, and why, in our education system.

And I created the "Long Island Opt Out" Group on Facebook.

[Applause.]

JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: And we are now close to 10,000 families across Long Island that are part of this group.

You know, and people always say to me,

That's -- you know, It's awesome, that's amazing.

How did you get so many members so fast?

And, really, I don't sell anything. I don't try to push anybody to do anything.

I'm just offering the information about what's actually happening.

And what parents are discovering, is that they're finding a reason for why they're seeing such dramatic changes in their children.

There's so many parents out there that have said to me, Oh, my God, I thought there was something wrong with my kid. I didn't understand why, suddenly, they don't want to go to school, why they hate it; why they are crying at night, crying in the morning.

And all I've done is pointed out a reason for "why," and told them to get more information.

I keep telling them.

People say, Well, what should I do?

Here's the information. You need to start reading, you need to start getting educated on what's actually happening out there.

As I was listening to the State Education

Department speaking, I sort of wanted to throw my

entire speech out, and just address everything that
they were talking about.

So, I just want to pinpoint a couple things.

They were asked what kinds of tests the kids are actually taking.

I'm just going to give you a quick example of what a third-grader might take in a school.

When they talked about the local assessments, and they said, Oh, well, that's a district -- that's up to the district, and they can decide if they want to do that"; when you say, "it's up to the districts," it really isn't.

They have to adhere to the APPR guidelines.

And this is, that 20 percent that they get for local assessments, actually helps the district, in a sense, because it's almost a guaranteed amount

of points that they can get, because that's the one controllable thing within those 40 percent, that -- those 40 points, for APPR.

Local assessments, you have -- you can have a gym SLO, which is a gym test; most of the time, multiple choice. Art. Music.

Again, these are all put into multiple-choice tests for these children.

In the middle-school grades, you can have your language tests, any of the special subjects.

You also then have the local assessments, like the MAP, STAR, or AIMSweb. Those are all computerized programs. They get harder as the children answer the questions correctly; get easier as they answer them incorrectly.

Kids have figured out that if they answer them wrong, the test ends earlier.

[Laughter.]

JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: Just an example of how ludicrous this whole system is, these -- they can take up to, we figured it out, about nine local exams the first week or two, some schools give it the first day, that these kids sit and take test after test after test.

And, because they have to count for the APPR

score, these often are made -- designed to be extremely difficult for the fall exams, so that the ones -- they have to show growth, that the children improve.

They can't take a chance that kids are gonna do better in the spring, so they purposely have to make them difficult.

And I don't blame the teachers for that,
because I don't want to lose my good teachers.

I want them to do everything they can to preserve
their careers and their jobs. And if they have to
manipulate the system, then they have to do that.

But now you have kids sitting, the first few weeks of schools, failing.

And don't say that -- you know, I've heard people say, Well, we tell them that it's not important. Don't worry about it if you don't do well.

You're talking about kids who are taking a test. They feel it when they can't answer the question. They know they did not do well.

They stress out. They get upset.

For language SLOs, the benchmarks, they give them in the language.

So, kids that have never taken Spanish before

will sit down the first day of seventh grade and take a test in Spanish. UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: That's right. JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: You know, so when it's only two exams, it's not true. They take, it's one after another after another. Then those same the locals, they give them again in the midyear; so -- and during the winter, they take them again. During the spring, they take them again.

Then you have field tests; field tests, where the State Education Department has -- we've seen the doc -- the memos sent to schools, saying, Don't tell parents that they're anything to do with Common Core or the testing, or anything. Just give it to them. Don't notify anybody.

Well, now we know about them, so now we're not taking those either.

[Applause.]

JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: You know, again, they say, Well, they're important so we can design the future tests.

Well, quess what?

I don't want my child sitting for a test

I can't explain to him, and make an 8-year-old understand, It's okay if you don't know any of the questions on a test.

They -- it just -- anybody who says that they'll take that and be okay with it, you know, getting 1's and 2's this year on those assessments, okay, the State Education Department can say to the schools, say to parents, we're not going to use them as, you know, the way we did before.

That doesn't -- we're talking about these kids. We're talking about little ones, that, they change how they feel.

When a kid starts feeling bad about themselves, like she said, it's very, very hard to get that back.

Sorry.

And being in the position I am with my Facebook page, I get messages from thousands and thousands of parents and teachers.

I'm talking, this has become a full-time job; and I have to answer them all, and I have to respond to all of them, because the stories are horrific.

You know, it's a little bit of a burden, but at the same time, I accept the fact that I have to be -- that I have to be there to try to fix this for

1 them.

Because if you heard the stories that I have to hear daily, you would not sleep.

During testing time, we had -- I had heard stories of principals who had to get on the loud speaker and try to calm the whole school down, because classroom after classroom were breaking down.

Kids were crying.

Kids were going into the bathroom and then locking themselves in.

This is not something -- you can continually say, there's statistics, and there's data, and we have to make them -- 50 percent of the kids.

I don't care about the data.

I don't care about statistics.

 $\label{thm:problem} \mbox{What I care about is the fact that I want my} \\ \mbox{son to like to learn.}$

And he doesn't.

I apologize.

I have to get that back for him.

And my little one, who's coming up now in the grades, my district did something that one of only two districts on Long Island did: they eliminated all their local assessments.

[Applause.]

JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: Here's the crazy part.

Those teachers are now going to, pretty much, be penalized, because, now, all of their 40 percent is based on those state test scores, which we know is not good for teachers.

They have chosen to do this, they agreed to it.

They said, You know what? Lesser of two evils. At least it helps the kids.

And that's what we've done.

So now my kids will not have to suffer through the entire fall session, except for the field tests, which they're not going to take anyway.

[Laughter.]

JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: But just so you are all aware of the idea that this -- this movement to end this.

You know, we had -- the State Education

Department does not want to release the information
on how many kids actually opted out last year.

Just Long Island alone, I only had confirmation of 12 schools -- school districts, out of 120. Just those 12, the numbers were over 1,000.

[Applause.]

JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: And already this year,

I have kindergarten parents sending in refuse -
sending in opt-out letters and refusal letters for

the third-grade tests.

And, you know, I've told them, You can wait a

few years. You don't have to do it yet.

[Laughter.]

JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: This is growing.

It's -- every day, I've had a thousand new people sign on in the last few weeks.

Scores are getting released this week. I'll have another few thousand within the next few weeks.

We are not going to allow our children to take part in this.

They are now opting out of all the local assessments, because we just feel that it's not fair to evaluate teachers on test scores.

It changes the entire structure of the classroom. The entire classroom becomes focused on the test.

And it has to stop.

And I know there's money tied in, and it's politics, and there's a lot of things that have to happen.

But, we're asking you guys to start.

1 Whatever has to happen, and however it has to 2 happen, we need help. And that's what we're asking from you. 3 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Jeanette, thank you very 4 5 much. 6 [Applause.] 7 JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: One last thing. I have a petition to end high-stakes testing 8 9 and data mining, and, it has about 14,000 signatures 10 on it. 11 So, I'd like to give that to you. 12 But before I do, is there any -- did you want 13 to ask us anything? 14 SENATOR FLANAGAN: I think Senator Hannon 15 wanted to make a brief comment. 16 SENATOR HANNON: No, I just -- I know that we talked, the first time, I had never met you before, 17 18 and I guess it was late July or early August. 19 And I just appreciate your continuing 20 forward, and presenting to my fellow senators what 21 you had told me then, because I think it's a very 22 powerful message. 23 And for somebody who hasn't testified before, 24 you've done a great job.

[Applause.]

25

JEANETTE DEUTERMANN: Yeah, except for all 1 2 the crying. [Applause.] 3 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Marcellino. 4 SENATOR MARCELLINO: Yes. 5 And, again, thank you for your input, and 6 7 thank you for your caring. And thank you for being willing to stand up 8 9 and protect your children. 10 I do appreciate that, because that's --11 that's a parent's job, and that can be ceded to no 12 one else. 13 The message that you've given, hopefully, 14 will be passed on to State Ed and Commissioner King. I intend to send him another letter. 15 16 I've sent him a few letters. Doesn't always 17 respond. It takes a while. I have to get Roger involved, and I have to 18 19 get John involved, to get an answer, because he 20 doesn't always respond. 21 And I think that's a problem that has to be 22 addressed, in the bluntest of terms. 23 I can handle yes, I can handle no. 24 I will not be ignored. 25 These people will not be ignored.

1 [Applause.] SENATOR MARCELLINO: This program, if we're 2 going to improve standards --3 4 5 6 all want good teaching, we all want good education for our kids. 7 8 9 10 11 to turn around.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I don't think anybody in this room doesn't want to improve educational standards.

-- but if this is not going to be destroyed, because of the way it's being implemented by State Ed in a very, very heavy-handed way, they got

I have senior superintendents who have come to me and said, We are thinking, we are rethinking, our position on opting out.

That's dangerous.

That is --

[Applause.]

SENATOR MARCELLINO: That's a message that has to get back to the Regent.

I'm glad you've told the Regent to -- that Commissioner King to go out and listen to the people. But he's got to hear.

He's got to hear them.

Not just go out there; he's got to listen, and hear them, and changes in the way this plan and

the way this program is being implemented has to 1 2 happen. And I think that's the key element here. 3 And I think that's going to be the crux of 4 the letters I'm going to send. 5 I'll give you a copy, Roger, so you'll see 6 7 And John will get a copy as well. But this is something I think has to happen. 8 9 Ladies, thank you very much. 10 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much. 11 [Applause.] 12 SENATOR FLANAGAN: As we try moving along, 13 next is NYSUT, with Stephen Allinger, and, 14 Nadia Resnikoff from Middle Country. 15 NADIA RESNIKOFF: My name is Nadia Resnikoff. 16 I'm a sixth-grade teacher; president of the 17 Middle County Teacher's Association; and a member of NYSUT's board of directors. 18 19 I'd like to thank Senator Flanagan and the 20 Senate Standing Committee on Education for the 21 opportunity to address you today regarding the 22 "Regent's Reform Agenda: 'Assessing' Our Progress." 23 I'm testifying on behalf of our members on Long Island and across New York State. 24

We are here today to testify that we stand

25

shoulder to shoulder with parents in our shared belief that neither students nor their teachers should suffer the consequences of the State's obsession with high-stakes testing.

The concerns we raised in testimony to your Committee in June 2012 have only intensified in the wake of SED's rushed and rocky implementation of new learning standards and tests.

It's time for New York State to make urgent changes. For the sake of our students, we need to get it right.

Parents across New York State will soon receive their children's individual scores on the new, significantly more rigorous state tests administered last spring.

Student scores have dropped dramatically, exactly as the State Education Department predicted, with two-thirds failing to achieve a proficient score.

In some schools with the highest number of children living in poverty, virtually every child is deemed to be failing.

Parents are understandably shocked and outraged to hear their that children's scores plunged, and they are justifiably anxious about

broad-brushed statements that their children are not college- and career-ready.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Nadia, I'm sorry.

I told everyone I was going to do this.

We have your written testimony.

Can you please just summarize it?

I've known you a long time. You are extremely competent in speaking.

Just in the interest of time, everyone can read this, but if you would be good enough to summarize, it would be a huge help.

NADIA RESNIKOFF: Okay.

Basically, what I'd like to say is that, the data that we received is meaningless for students, it's meaningless for teachers.

The State Education Department very -- knew that scores were going to be what they were; and yet, still, had students sit through rigorous tests, knowing that they weren't going to succeed.

We moved way too fast in the implementation of the Common Core standards.

There is no reason why we couldn't phase in the Common Core standards, either grade by grade, or unit by unit. That is the appropriate way to do it, so children would be successful.

I would also say to you that we need to reconsider what we're doing this year, in terms of the Regents for high school students, because if we have the same effect with the elementary and middle-school students, we're going to have one-third of our students, potentially, not graduate.

So, that's real high stakes, and we need to make sure that that does not happen.

Uhm, I think it's criminal, as parents had stated, that we have students that are being taught on material that they have not learned.

And I will give you an example just in my own classroom.

I'm a math teacher, I teach sixth grade.

The amount -- when we talk about having to be able to more deeply instruct students, it was the total opposite of that.

Because I had fifth-grade students that didn't have the Common Core, so I had to teach everything that they didn't know from fifth grade, in addition to all of the Common Core for sixth grade, and the students were overwhelmed.

I spent three periods a day; I spent their math period, their study-hall period, and their

lunch period, instructing these students on the Common Core standards, and, still, many of them were not successful.

And I don't think it's fair to have kids feel unsuccessful with the amount of work that they did.

I think that the way in which we're implementing them, definitely, is something that needs to be looked at.

Resources, very essential.

We have a tax cap.

We have less funding from the State than many districts had five years ago.

And, we need to make sure we have the appropriate resources, not only monetarily, but we need AIS services, we need textbooks that are aligned with the Common Core standards, we need professional development that's aligned with the Common Core standards.

So, we can't be expected to do it with less. It's impossible.

Resources are essential for schools and students to succeed.

Uhm, another concern is computers.

It's been stated that our tests are going to be computer-based, 2015. Starting 2015.

I can tell you, I have kindergarten students, under APPR, who are using a computer-based program, NWEA's.

They don't even know how to use a computer; and, meanwhile, we're having them sit there, taking a test with a computer.

Students are being -- teachers are being assessed based upon those scores of those students.

There should be no reason why a kindergartener is taking any sort of test that is computer-based.

[Applause.]

NADIA RESNIKOFF: It's criminal.

The other thing that I would state to you about the computers, is we're going to have to get computers into every school district, and that's a huge amount of funding.

You have schools that have one computer in a classroom. That's where it ends.

So, if we're going to look at that, then you need to make sure that students (a) have the ability to use the computer, and (b) that you have the computers in classrooms.

Something that needs to be considered.

Uhm, trying to do this as quickly as I can.

1 SENATOR FLANAGAN: You're doing great. 2 I appreciate it. NADIA RESNIKOFF: Thank you. 3 UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: Keep going, Nadia. 4 You're doing fine. 5 6 [Laughter.] 7 NADIA RESNIKOFF: The other part is, we feel that parents and teachers have been left out of the 8 process in terms of the Common Core standards: 9 10 Developing the Common Core standards, creating the 11 curriculum that's aligned with it, as was stated. 12 Some of us got curriculum at the end of last 13 year that kids were going to be tested on. And some of us still have not received 14 15 curriculum that aligns with the standards. 16 So it's, kind of, each person is individually 17 trying to figure out what they need to do. 18 But, we think it's really important that 19 parents and teachers be part of the process; that 20 our voices be heard. 21 And that, when we continue this, that that be 22 considered. 23 Something that's huge, if you are going to 24 give tests to students, have it mean something.

So, there needs to be transparency.

25

We are not able to look at the tests after they were given.

Some of us never even gave it, so I couldn't see it.

I didn't proctor my tests, so I did not see the sixth-grade math test.

So, I have no idea what the questions are, what they deemed to be the correct answers, so that I can improve my instruction based upon that, to see where my students didn't make it.

[Applause.]

NADIA RESNIKOFF: I remember a comment that was made, that, we were going to burn the tests, because we didn't want us to have access, or to have the ability to look at that.

How can we give a test, spend the amount of money that we spend, put kids through this, to create a baseline, and then say to those same people, You can't learn from this?

The whole point should be, we should be learning from this.

The tests themselves, in many instances, are developmentally-inappropriate, especially for K-through-2 students. They should not be given tests that are pen-and-paper tests.

1 It's horrendous for them.

That's not how they learn; that's not how we should expect to test them.

Assessing students and evaluating teachers should not be punitive or a game of "I gotcha."

So, now, the Commissioner can say that the scores don't matter.

But, they do matter.

They matter in terms of a teacher's score that determines whether they're highly effective or effective.

And I can tell you, just as a student has self-esteem, so does the teacher.

You can say that that score doesn't matter; they take it to heart.

And when they had no control over what was going to be on that test, when they weren't given the appropriate time to teach those students, and then to say, You're a 10 out of 20, or, you're a 4 out of 20, or, you're a 1 out 20? It matters to them.

They question their ability.

They're not able to do what's right for kids every day in a classroom.

We should not be put in that position.

So to sum it up, I am going to tell you the things that we are requesting from you.

We're asking you to get it right.

We ask you to provide, in full, the resources districts need to ensure all students have an equal opportunity to master the new Common Core learning standards.

We ask you for sufficient time to gradually implement the Common Core learning standards.

We ask you to gradually phase in the Common Core learning standards.

We ask you for a 3-year moratorium on high-stakes consequences for students and teachers.

We ask you to postpone the implementation of the Common Core Regents exams as a graduation requirement.

We ask you to support teachers and parents in our call for best practices in measuring student achievement, and for the necessary transparency in the State's use of standardized tests.

And, finally, we ask you to respect and listen to the voices of educators and parents.

Thank you.

[Applause.]

1 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you. And I'm just going to exercise a little 2 3 prerogative. 4 I appreciate you coming. 5 And I just -- these are real questions to, 6 hopefully, make a point. You are a classroom teacher? 7 NADIA RESNIKOFF: Yes. 8 9 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay. And I've heard this 10 phrase now, probably a thousand times in the last 11 couple of weeks: Do you consider yourself a real 12 educator? 13 NADIA RESNIKOFF: Yes. 14 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, good. 15 So, I completely agree with you. 16 And I recognize that you had an inability to 17 be here when we first started, because I believe you were teaching prior to coming here? 18 NADIA RESNIKOFF: That's correct. 19 20 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay. 21 We are trying to get a good cross-section of 22 people who represent education at every level, and 23 that includes having classroom teachers who will be 24 testifying before our Committee around the state.

So, I appreciate your patience and your time

25

and your diligence.

And I have a particular question for you.

You talk about, don't have any punitive consequences for three years.

Because I know this is going to get talked about, I want to make sure I'm understanding exactly what you're driving at.

If, "if," there is some smoother implementation of Common Core, are you opposed to the Regents adopting Common Core at any point in the next three years?

Because you're talking about punitive consequences, and people are going to be asking us, What "does that mean?"

Does it just relate to the coming Regents this year? Is it the year thereafter?

How do you -- can you drill down a little bit on the "three years"?

NADIA RESNIKOFF: We're not -- I'm not, and I don't think NYSUT is, opposed to Common Core if it's done in the right way and in the right amount of time.

So -- and I think how we assess students really is something that we have to think about as well.

You know, how do we know that they know something, or don't know something?

And it's more than a test that's going to determine that, obviously.

But, Common Core, I think, if we're able to get into the depth of what we're saying we want to do, is not a bad thing.

But you can't just say, "Do it this year," and assume that everything else was in place prior to that.

Because what we're doing is, we're actually doing the opposite. We're doing much more than what we did in previous years, in terms of the curriculum that needs to be taught.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay.

Prior to your arrival, and I hope I'm getting it correctly, Ken Wagner had, basically, made a representation, that I know it was frustrating Senator Marcellino, that, if you have some modification or slowdown, if you do not properly align instruction with the assessments; meaning, that they get done, essentially, at the same time, that's problematic.

I think Senator Marcellino feels, and I would tend to agree, that just because you're introducing

the new curriculum doesn't mean that the assessment
has to follow simultaneously.

NADIA RESNIKOFF: I would agree.

I think what can happen, is that you can't have the assessment there without the curriculum, which is what exists now.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay.

Senator Boyle.

SENATOR BOYLE: If I could just ask one quick question.

You touched on the costs of the computer-based testing, which is a grave concern of mine.

I visited with superintendents in the district. Some of them are talking about hundreds of thousands of dollars for computers, for software.

And I completely agree, that if Albany's going to require this, they're gonna have to give the money.

Have you gotten any -- NYSUT gotten any numbers, or general numbers, about the overall costs?

'Cause I can't even imagine how much it is statewide.

STEPHEN ALLINGER: We're working with all the other stakeholders, the Education Conference Board, to put together order of magnitude to properly fund and provide foundational resources to implement the Common Core.

As Nadia said, we have been supportive of deeper, richer learning, but we believe the cart was put before the horse.

And we've had districts having to cut professional development, for lack of money, cut curriculum resources, cut investment in computers, while the demand skyrocketed for this transformation.

So, we will be working with school boards,
Superintendents Association, Chief School finance
officers, PTA, in time for these hearings, to put
forth our asks about, What does it take to properly
support and finance the transformation to a
Common Core curriculum?

But we know it's substantially more.

And it's also just turning around the disinvestment that we've seen. Particularly in the non-ELA math subjects, we're seeing a fall-off in foreign languages, science, music, art.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator LaValle.

SENATOR LAVALLE: Yeah, just an observation, Mr. Chairman.

I think for, you know, the audience here, that we're beginning to see why we hold a hearing, as legislators, because we're beginning to drill down, and we're beginning to see, in a very refined way, the input of different stakeholders.

And, we begin a communication that begins to narrow the funnel, and, so, that we're talking to one another, and not having misinformation and miscommunication.

So as I'm sitting here, listening to people,
I think -- I'm saying to myself, you know,
This hearing is really good, because people are
communicating very specifically.

And you did a great job, when you went one, two, three, four, because you pointed out what you were trying to say, your point of view.

And because you did it in a sticcato fashion, that communication was great. Know exactly where you stand.

Not that I didn't before we got to the hearing, but...

And just, lastly, you'd be pleased to know that, if you look at my legislation, as the sponsor

of the Truth and Testing Law, for post-secondary 1 students, what we're trying to do, is to make the 2 test educational, so that the students and teachers 3 know what the students answered, what the correct 4 answer was, and we come away with, Well, here's a 5 6 deficiency --7 NADIA RESNIKOFF: Right. SENATOR LAVALLE: -- because my whole class 8 9 missed that one question, so, clearly, there was 10 something wrong.

NADIA RESNIKOFF: Right.

SENATOR LAVALLE: So we are -- I think we are moving in the right direction: the parents, communication.

The only thing that we all have to do, I'm going to put a cup at the end, so we can buy the State Education Department a hearing aid.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR LAVALLE: And we will jointly contribute.

Thank you.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

[Applause.]

NADIA RESNIKOFF: Senator Flanagan, the only -- the one thing that I didn't speak about, in terms of resources, because we spoke about specific,

you know, monies, and textbooks, and professional development, and things like that, I think what becomes very important for students is, when we spoke about that emotional piece, there are children that, obviously, you know, are very nervous about taking the tests, they're physically ill.

But in addition to that, I would say that we have lots of students that aren't successful in school because of social issues; because of, you know, a parent that maybe just passed away, or, you know, things that are happening in their home life.

And I think that we need to help the schools, in terms of resources, to help those kids to feel safe in school, and to give them the resources that they need, you know, in that social area as well.

So, I just wanted to make sure that I $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1$

SENATOR FLANAGAN: I appreciate that.

And, Senator Hannon.

SENATOR HANNON: I just wanted to put on the record, Mr. Chairman, that -- something that's obvious, probably, to people here, but maybe not on the outside:

That what we're talking about is curriculum development, we're talking about testing, we're

talking about privacy, these are not concerns, and 1 they haven't been concerns for a 2 3 couple hundred years in New York State to the Legislature. 4 5 These are the things that are regulated by the State Board of Regents. 6 7 We have tremendous fights about education when it revolves around the budget. 8 9 Who's going to get how much? 10 How much total will be given? Where it should be distributed? 11 12 How quickly? 13 Even the state, the cap on expenditures. 14 But, we have not done curriculum. 15 And what we're seeing today is evolving, is 16 something that -- moving into the legislative arena. 17 And maybe it will happen. Last Friday, in the "Wall Street Journal," is 18 19 an elaborate story about what's happening in 20 California. 21 They have not abandoned the core curriculum, 22 but they have taken the agenda of time that their 23 education department has set, and moved it back.

And, I'm afraid that this is what's going to

Taken away some type of assessment tests.

24

25

happen, because that hearing aid that

Senator LaValle wants to give to the State Education

Department isn't there.

So, I just think it should be on the record that we're just moving into this, because this is un- -- new territory for us.

STEPHEN ALLINGER: If I could address that point?

No Child Left Behind, obviously, ushered in an unprecedented amount of federal preemption; and, consequently, State involvement, including formal state, you know, statutory involvement around standards.

So I think there is room.

And I respect the province of the Regents, in terms of curriculum development, but there -- we believe there needs to be an adjustment, in terms of the consequences, and policy to stop abusive testing.

For instance:

In K through 2, where it's just bad practice to do high-stakes group-administered standardized tests;

As well as, protection of privacy rights, that I know is embodied in Senator Grisanti's

legislation.

So we

And w

appropriate,

SENAT

Thank

Next

Boards: Bob

Jim Gounaris

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So we ask that there's a careful role.

And we are asking that you consider, where appropriate, statutes to help adjust this.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you, Nadia.

Thank you, Steve.

[Applause.]

Next we have the New York State School Boards: Bob Vecchio from William Floyd, and, Jim Gounaris, who is from Herricks.

Gentlemen, same admonition: please summarize. We have your testimony already online, and copies available for everybody.

ROBERT VECCHIO: Thank you, Senator.

And thank you to the Panel for this hearing today.

Again, my name is Bob Vecchio. I'm from William Floyd School District. I'm president of that school board.

We have over 9300 students.

We're a high-needs, low-property-wealth school district, with almost 60 percent of our kids on free and reduced lunch. Combined wealth ratio, .57, one of the lowest on Long Island.

I'll let go a lot of what's already been said

here today.

You know, Common Core was implemented way too fast. The State was more interested in doing it first than doing it right.

I suggest that we need to take a step back, take a breath, and do it the right way the first time, as opposed to what we've done here in New York State, just trying to be first.

[Applause.]

ROBERT VECCHIO: As a school-board member, when I was listening to SED, it was amazing how much local control they say that we have.

[Laughter.]

ROBERT VECCHIO: And I'm here to tell you, as a school-board member for the past 10 years, the erosion of local control and governance of our schools, whether it be the federal government telling us what to put on the meals in the cafeterias, or, Race To The Top, Common Core, APPR, the tests, the mandates, we don't have local control; but, yet, we're held accountable locally.

[Applause.]

ROBERT VECCHIO: And when I mean,

"held accountably [sic] locally," school-board

members go to the supermarket and they don't get out

of the frozen-food aisle, because we're talking about tests and test scores and test anxiety.

It's a little disconcerting when you get confronted outside of mass, and you're called certain names because of the different tests.

But it really hurts when you go to family functions and your siblings are yelling at you too, and they don't even go to your district.

[Laughter.]

ROBERT VECCHIO: Here's the issue:

Common Core; the goals and the concepts of Common Core are a good thing.

The implementation has been absolutely horrible.

I was at a meeting with the Commissioner of Education on Friday; a roundtable with school-board members from around the state.

All that was supposed to be on the agenda was State aid and regionalization.

Well, I think that lasted about five minutes before we got into Common Core.

It's concerning for me that

Commissioner King, as of Friday, believes this is a

7-year phase-in. And in his own words, he's

concerned that "this is not being implemented fast

enough."

2 That's a quote.

He also believes, and I'm quoting here, because I wrote it down, "We have done more than any other state to support Common Core, and, we have supported this education initiative more than any other initiative in the state of New York."

I don't know what that means, and that may be true, but either all the people are wrong, or there's a huge disconnect between Albany and those of us at the district level.

And I would submit the latter: it's a huge disconnect.

[Applause.]

ROBERT VECCHIO: I want to highlight an example of local control in governance when it really works, and it ties in directly with Common Core, because this is a real issue for my district in particular.

William Floyd had to increase our graduation rates, we knew that. We weren't satisfied with that.

In 2006, we pushed down math and science Regents to the eighth grade.

Okay?

We had a lot of pushback from a lot of parents who didn't think we'd be successful.

This was a local decision, this was a local policy that we implemented, together with our district administration.

It's been wildly successful, because I now have eighth-graders going into high school with two Regents credits under their belt, two high school credits already earned, before they even step through the doors as freshmen.

This past year, 80 percent of our students that sat for the exam passed these exams.

60 percent of over all of our students are going into high school with two high school credits and two Regents credits already in the bank.

If I'm a current ninth-grade parent who is ecstatic in June that my kids passed high school-level courses in math and science, I'm going to be utterly confused in a couple of weeks when I get the report that says they're not proficient in eighth-grade math.

That's been the problem: they put the assessment before the curriculum.

We can debate about the phase-in, whether there's a moratorium, and the Commissioner believes

it's not going fast enough, but one point that

I don't think has been touched on, this was

implemented during a historic time where districts

were reeling from State-aid cuts due to an

unprecedented recession.

William Floyd, in particular, lost \$20 million in State aid. We cut over 240 positions: assistant principals, administrative staff, teachers, professional-development funds, AP courses.

We lost a lot of valuable programs, that when Common Core was first being rolled out, we were still just trying to tread water.

And there are a lot of districts that are in financial trouble, that can't even tackle the issues to properly implement Common Core.

And I don't think that was taken into consideration by SED when they implemented this.

[Applause.]

ROBERT VECCHIO: I've heard a lot this morning from SED about collaboration between educators.

I'll tell you what, I am grateful and honored to be here to testify today, but there was not a voice from the State School Boards Association at

the table during planning, and prior to implementation of Common Core. And that was a huge mistake.

You need to work together in a collaborative manner.

And I would strongly urge that anything done, going forward, we have a voice at the table.

Because you know what?

We're held accountable for your policies;
We're held accountable for your standards;
And, we're often scapegoated for their

failures.

Okay?

So, while we need to be honest with ourselves as board members, that we do need to do a better job, and we're in lockstep that college- and career-ready is what we all aspire to;

And, William Floyd increased their graduation rate by 16 percent through smart policy, local governance control, by implementing math and science Regents in the eighth grade. We've seen a 16 percent growth in our graduation rate. And, we're not done, and we're not satisfied;

I would submit to you, we need a voice at the table, because we know what needs to be done.

Just as the two parents who testified earlier, I'm a parent of a high school senior, but I'm, also, consider myself a parent of 9300 kids.

And my job and my goal is to get them across the stage at the end of their career, K through 12,

When we talk about Regents changes in the Class of 2017, what's keeping me up at night since Friday, is fifth- and sixth-year seniors, because, how many of those kids are not going to meet the Common Core Regents, and, not graduate;

And, how much is that going to cost my local taxpayers?

Okay?

ready, and on time.

Finally, and those of you who know me know

I can't miss an opportunity to say this, and I'm

going to read, just for a second, to make sure I hit

all the points:

We need significant, meaningful, substantial mandate relief.

We have seen the implementation of the tax cap, Common Core, APPR, yet no meaningful relief for the districts.

It's also finally time to overhaul the State-funding formulas to properly, equitably

distribute the funding necessary to carry out all these initiatives discussed here today, and the initiatives we haven't thought about tomorrow, because every child, regardless of ZIP code, needs, and deserves, a chance to succeed, and we are setting them up on a path of failure at present.

I would also say, and, Senator Flanagan,
I thank you for your attempt with regards to
PARCC assessments and computerized testing.

You know, if you think it's a great idea to have us all test on computers, and you want to pass that mandate, then you got to pay for it, because I don't have that ability at William Floyd to have a computer for every kid to take the test at the same time. And I don't know where that fund is coming from.

So, in addition to the Class of 2017, PARCC assessments scare the heck out of me.

And the Commissioner of Education said on Friday with regards to that point in particular, he'll recommend a change, that certain school districts can do it on pen and paper for a couple years, but, that's kicking the can down the road.

What do I do a couple years later?

So, I thank you for the opportunity to

testify.

2 [Applause.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Bob, thanks a lot.

JIM GOUNARIS: Good morning, Senators.

This is my first time, and, I've sat here and listened.

And after the first presentation, I am going to stick to what I have to say, because after what I heard from the State, it was a little mind-boggling to hear some of the responses, or lack thereof.

So, good morning, and thank you.

My name is Jim Gounaris. I'm president of the Herricks School District School Board.

And I come to you today, not to complain about issues I probably and should have come to complain about, but I'm here to talk about what we can and should be doing.

The data on the most effective schools in the world is clearly and unequivocably, and in our mind, extraordinarily convincing.

Many of the preconceived notions about what makes effective schools is just that: preconceived notions without the data to support them.

And to have you understand that, I would like

to take you back 200 years.

Herricks is celebrating its bicentennial.

And, by the way, any proclamations you wish to issue, we're more than willing to accept.

[Laughter.]

JIM GOUNARIS: In 1962, residents of our district took -- went to the Supreme Court to fight SED, for school prayer, and written by them, and the whole bit.

So, we had an issue -- we've had an issue with them for, I would say, 50-plus years now.

But, I would like to tell you a couple things about Herricks, first.

We -- five-decades strong, we're proud to tell you that we have a 99.8 percent graduation rate. Almost all of our graduates move on to higher education, many to some of the most prestigious colleges and programs in the state, country, and in the world.

Most of our special-education students are receiving Regents and Advanced Regents diplomas.

Almost 80 percent of this year's graduates took at least one AP course in the high school, and 75 percent of them got "3s" or higher.

Herricks ranked in the top 3 to 4 percent on

the state's Common Core, grades 3 to 8, assessments; 1 And two-thirds of our students scored 2 a "3" or "4" on the Common Core ELA and math tests; 3 And 95 percent of Herricks grade 11 students 4 5 were deemed college-ready or better, based on this 6 year's English Regents. 7 But these successes are testimony to the amazing jobs all the levels of our Herricks 8 9 education system provide. Our elementary schools provide a strong 10 11 foundation for our students; 12 Our newly-transformed middle school, where 13 we've gone through a whole renaissance on 14 programming and curriculum; 15 And then in the high school, where they 16 are -- the expansion of their mental capacity, and 17 the way the courses are taught, and the variety of course offerings, allow them to do so. 18 19 These numbers I mentioned speak for 20 themselves. 21 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Jim, I'm sorry, I got to 22 do it. I have the same standard for everyone. 23 Please, just --24 JIM GOUNARIS: I am.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- summarize your

25

testimony.

JIM GOUNARIS: I'm going to go right through it right now.

So --

UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER: [Inaudible.]

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: That's right.

JIM GOUNARIS: I'm going to try and go as best as I can.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you.

JIM GOUNARIS: I'm a little nervous, so it was easier for me to stay with what I said.

So, these successes aren't achieved overnight, and they're not by some sort of miracle, based on the State Education and their reforms, and issued by them.

Their successes belong to the community and the people based in the community who voted for a school board, and put the right teachers and administrators in place, to make sure that these successes were constantly guaranteed by the residents who lived in our school district.

The new state mandates, while I believe are understandably there for certain areas, and let's just say, New York City and continually lower-achieving school districts, like Hempstead and

Roosevelt, we have to question what they're there for to -- to do for people like us, school districts like us.

School districts, like Herricks, and others, like Great Neck, Roslyn, and Manhasset, Garden City, East Williston, and Rockville Center, have worked tirelessly to be at the top of the education reports.

And by excluding us, and districts like us, SED could then focus their efforts on the school districts that actually need the extra support and the extra guidance.

[Applause.]

JIM GOUNARIS: The state's reforms actually made it harder for us to do what we're successful at doing the best at Herricks.

And let me just take you back, just a little bit: recently, the 2 percent tax cap.

While I personally believe the tax cap itself was necessary because of the runaway school taxes, as I explained to Senator Martins, the issue we had was with its immediate and catastrophic implementation.

The State was complicit in the runaway school taxes, and in the end, did nothing on their side of

the equation to also feel the pain of the cap's implementation.

UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: That's right.

ROBERT VECCHIO: A staggered implementation of 4 percent, 3 percent, and 2 percent over three years would have greatly given us the flexibility to be able to adjust to some of these things.

The State could have shown true backbone, and deemed it educate -- deemed an education fiscal emergency, and voided all existing labor contracts and put them all up for negotiation, but my personal belief, is no one had the intestinal or electoral fortitude to battle organized labor.

In addition, that intestinal fortitude was absent when it comes out -- when it comes to the out-of-control retirement system and health-care payments that we're making.

A school district's biggest expense and its biggest resources are its staff.

And our \$100 million budget, 85 percent of it is for labor and benefits, leaving us 15 percent for the students and textbooks and extra programs, and training, and everything else that goes along with it.

We've lost over 100 people in the Herricks School District.

We've had a rise -- a tremendous rise in class sizes, deep cuts in athletics, and devastating dramatic changes in certain services and extracurricular activities.

And my question to all of you is: Was the 2 percent tax cap, was it the State's goal to make Herricks look like New York City, or New York City look like Herricks?

Either way, we have not gotten what we truly deserve.

[Applause.]

JIM GOUNARIS: The cost of APP -- and may
I add, that 2 percent tax cap that you've just put
in place? We're down to 1.66 for this upcoming
year, which is another travesty.

The cost of APPR almost cost -- cost Herricks \$300,000.

And in the State's infinite wisdom, they passed one state standard for all the students, but allowed 700 school districts to come up with 700 different APPR plans for evaluations, contrived by the school districts and the teachers unions in those districts.

Where was the true standard for everybody to follow if we were going to do this?

[Applause.]

JIM GOUNARIS: Herricks did not need an APPR plan to tell us what teachers were effective or not.

The numbers I gave you before speak volumes of how effective our teachers and how effective our administrators are.

The assessments for the Common Core, I'm putting emphasis on a different way of learning for the students. Made perfect sense for us, because we've been doing it for years, and our scores matched up pretty well.

So, a good teaching method and a great school district is a model to follow.

Why they had to do all this sort of stuff, when we already had it in place, and to come up with it, they could have came and spoke to us ourselves.

[Laughter.]

JIM GOUNARIS: Similarly, the implementation of the new more-demanding college-readiness standards for high school students also makes a great deal of sense to us.

The likelihood is, that the exams, though, will -- that go with them are not perfect, and they

will need to be refined, but they're steps in the right direction.

And let me just tell you, briefly, about my son who's a ninth-grader, who struggles a little bit in school.

And I have four children: one in college, eleventh-grader, ninth-grader, and a fourth-grader.

He is now going to take the English Regents in eleventh grade, but it won't be the English Regents he's been taught for all these years.

He's gonna be taught, he's going to be taking Regents tests that's gonna model an AP exam.

So, now, nine years of his eight years of his existence in the Herrick School District has to be changed and modified for him to be able to take that test and be successful by Herricks' standards on that test.

We've taught him on a slope, like this.

Now the State says, This is not good enough. We want him, here.

So in three short years, we have to bring them up in a dramatic fashion, at an angle that is really going to be intensive for him to do.

And that's for every ninth-grader in the

state.

I can understand why they want to get where they want to get to, but I have to -- again, have an issue with the implementation of the standards.

So, as I leave you, I want to just tell you a couple things about what Herricks is doing for the betterment of our school district.

Moving forward, the challenge for Herricks is, how do we move our education program forward?

And we're using things from the "OECD," the economic -- Organization for Economic Cooperation

Development group, PISA testing for kids; and the information from Andreas Schleicher on the most effective schools in the world.

These tests are worldwide accepted standards on educational practices. They make a lot of sense to us and our community.

Why nobody in Albany seems to pay much attention to them is anyone's guess.

But to the best of our ability, we will make that research the foundation of our district, as we move forward, because the data on those tests clearly show that effective schools are not effective because of culture, history, national norms, or even levels of spending.

The most effective schools share four things in common:

Hiring top educators from top colleges, like Herricks does;

Setting high standards for all students, like Herricks does;

Massive amounts of targeted professional development, like Herricks tries to do continually every year;

And intervening early and forcefully in dysfunctional situations, like Herricks does, not just using the state minimums to do so.

Many countries have followed.

Canada has done so, and they are now in the top 10.

We're excited at Herricks to participate in this program.

We're willing to put the Herricks students and our staff up against the best in the world, because that's the only way we're going to see how we compare to them; what they're doing good, what we're doing well, and how we can make our education system better for our kids.

Our community demands it, nobody from Albany, but our people who the school-board members

represent, who answer to, with melting ice cream in the freezer section on their carts every day.

So my plea to you is fourfold:

Part of me wants to say, Can you just get them to get off our backs and give us a chance to breathe?

But that's not gonna happen, and -- although it should.

Herricks, and other districts like us, don't need to be under the oppressive hand of the State.

We are successful by our own right, and not by any commandment from SED or its commissioners past and present.

But this is an election year, and it's on the horizon, and there's too much campaign money in play right now, and there's the need for soundbites.

And we all know how important that's going to be.

But we need to focus on the areas in the state that need help.

The 50 years have gone by, and the students in communities, like Hempstead and Roosevelt and New York City, need help.

While attending that same meeting in Albany last year, that this gentleman spoke of, we spoke

about reform initiatives getting underway, and the detrimental effects of the cap.

Herricks would have gladly given up its \$300,000 cost to APPR to give that money to a district like Hempstead or Roosevelt to help them better their education system for the kids there.

[Applause.]

JIM GOUNARIS: The State allows this never-ending cycle of inferior education, urban devastation, and socioeconomic, financial, and moral degradation to continue, and why?

The children going into Hempstead and Roosevelt, going into kindergarten and first grade, can't even be graduated -- can't even be guaranteed that they're going to graduate from high school, let alone go on to college.

And, in fact, the odds are better that they'll drop out.

So, if you want to do something interesting, take the PISA testing and put it for every kid, every 15-year-old, in New York State, and really measure New York State up against everybody in the world. And you'll really see where the state's Department of Education, where we've done, where we need help, what we need to do.

I would ask you, that, the APPR reforms that you -- that discussed earlier, have been a little detrimental to us.

We put in a place -- we put in a system, and it's accountable to nobody.

SED is accountable to nobody.

They sit, and they'll do what they do; they'll make all these things, and at the end, I'm not sure where they come to.

Many of us sincerely doubt the advocacy of many aspects of New York's reforms, and believe that they will only produce a wide variety of consultants and private companies selling products and services in the name of reform.

[Applause.]

JIM GOUNARIS: I leave you with the following:

After all the Race To The Top money vanishes, and after all the political soundbites have been captured and recorded, and most of those who have made those statements have vanished or moved on to higher and higher offices, who will be left?

People like me, and my four kids, and my community.

We'll still be here fighting every day for a

quality education for all the kids in New York State.

So now I leave it up to you.

If you really want to know the true worth of New York State, I encourage you to do the PISA testing for every 15-year-old in the state, if you want to know the truth.

But I'm not sure if people in the political annals of New York State really want to know the answer to that question.

And one last suggestion: Why don't you get the best and brightest superintendents together, let them run the State Education Department.

[Applause.]

JIM GOUNARIS: I'm sure for them it would be a labor of love.

They have the knowledge and the real-life experience to launch the New York State education system to the moon, and beyond, because they have the most at risk: their integrity and reputation as true educators.

All of New York State's children deserve that.

And I thank you.

[Applause.]

1 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you, gentlemen. Senator Zeldin. 2 3 SENATOR ZELDIN: To the last speaker, just to clarify, so I understand: Do you support 4 Common Core or do you not support Common Core? 5 6 JIM GOUNARIS: We've done things to that 7 nature, all the way through. We support the Common Core implementation. 8 9 But, for us, we've been doing it, in essence, 10 for a couple of years. 11 So, for us, it wasn't like a big guillotine 12 coming down to chop off our neck. 13 We adjusted our programs, going forward, and 14 we continue to adjust it annually, to make sure that 15 we're able to implement it. 16 But, we had the ability to be able to do 17 that. We're a smaller district. You know, we're 18 19 much smaller than William Floyd. And, we had 20 practices in place that already implemented some of 21 those programs. 22 SENATOR ZELDIN: Do you have any concerns, 23 specifically, with the way that Common Core has been 24 implemented?

JIM GOUNARIS: The amount of pressure it's

25

put on staff, teachers, students, families, to make sure that everyone is up to speed has been nothing but a disaster.

It's been a PR disaster from the State.

And it's not held -- it's not -- and here's the thing: They put it in place, and now we're getting the Governor saying one thing, the Commissioner's saying something else, the gentleman here saying something else.

We can't get a consistent answer from anybody.

If I understood what he said about, you can't have the test without the curriculum, and you can't have the curriculum without the test, it's like the "chicken and the egg" thing, which came first?

But at some point, we need a way -- somebody to improvise -- to implement a plan to put it into place, and put it into place for everybody equally.

It's not fair.

We got that.

SENATOR ZELDIN: So if there were just a specific idea or two to improve the implementation, what would your ideas be?

JIM GOUNARIS: I would say that they should have put it in at a graduated level.

To tell everybody, like my ninth-grader,
that -- for that example, that he's got to take a
new test in three years, and now he hasn't been
taught for that test. And in three years' time,
he's got to learn all this new type of stuff, that's
not fair.

If your goal is to set a twelfth-grade college-readiness level, you have the way to go backwards, grade by grade, and assess where they will be -- where they should be at each level.

So, the plan should have been: We need them to be here.

Where are they now?

And how do we get them to go forward?

And how do we get them to go down?

If you're a first-grader, you're not going to have a problem, because you have 11 years to go.

If you're a tenth-grader, you're in trouble.

And, if you're in a school district that wasn't able to do it, you're in a lot of trouble.

We don't -- there was no funding available to do this. There was no extra resources provided for anybody.

So, you know, we always, at Herricks, try and take ourselves a little bit out of the norm, because

we always try to be forward-thinking, but we're nimble enough to be able to try and do that with certain aspects. Certain aspects we can't.

And it's been like a sledgehammer for us, too, on certain things.

But that would be the proper way to do it.

And the best way to have done that, is to get the super- -- maybe regionalize it by area and get those superintendents, and say, This is what we need. How are we -- help us to help you get there.

 $\label{eq:what do you -- and have them come up with a $$\operatorname{plan}$.$

They're the ones on the front lines every day with the teachers.

Not me. I'm a civilian.

SENATOR ZELDIN: I would just close, just with one comment.

You know, there are 213 legislators in

New York State, the Governor. You know, we're not
all -- you know, we're not all created equally.

We have diverse backgrounds, representing different parts of the state.

I haven't met you before.

You represent -- you're in a school district represented by one of the other senators.

And I would just offer, in your testimony, that, you know, there were some things in there that, you know, for me personally -- let me back up a second.

On the issue, uhm, I'm -- I'm -- I would consider myself one of the most -- I hope, maybe one of the most receptive legislators --

Maybe we all would want to vie for that title.

 $\ \ --$ one of the most receptive legislators on this particular issue.

I have had a lot of meetings, a lot of conversations, with a lot of people, and my only interest is getting this right.

I actually have -- I graduated from William Floyd. I have two daughters in the second grade there.

And just, with all due respect, there were some things in here that I took a little bit exception for, because you're kind of putting -- you're just making an assumption based on, say, one individual legislator, or others.

And there are a lot of natural allies in this process right now in the Legislature.

I think you heard it earlier in some of the

testimony from some of our colleagues who are here, and some who have left, but, you know, there's just some things in here that I would take very strong exception to.

Just -- I just -- I read it. Just, it

doesn't -- I know it doesn't apply to me, and it

doesn't apply to a lot of people who I need to rely

on as allies, to be able to fight for formula

reforms, or to -- you know, fight for, maybe, you

know, testing to be implemented as appropriately as

possible.

So, I would just encourage you to -- you know, some -- some of -- there was some extra verbiage in your words that really weren't applicable to me.

JIM GOUNARIS: So, Senator, honestly,
I appreciate your comments.

But, if I'm a parent of a student in one of those other school districts, or New York City, like where I used to live, which I'm [unintelligible], you know what? The verbiage has to end. The thing has to stop.

The truth needs to be said in a way so that everybody understands it, and that we have a common goal of saying, Okay, this really needs to stop.

50 years, or 40 years, or 20 years, of students in school districts not performing, like the Hempstead and Roosevelt school districts, and the plans that have been put in place, have not changed the results for those kids going there.

And those kids and those families deserve the same education that the Herricks kids get, and that some of the other top-performing school districts get.

And I appreciate that.

At the same time, I can't have someone say,
Well, you guys are doing so good, so you can afford
to do this in a kind of a Robin Hood kind of thing,
"take from the rich and give to the poor" thing.

Because that's is not the answer either.

It's, collectively, we have to come together and face the devil that we all see, and face the evils that we see, together.

And it's us helping them; everybody helping each other.

And that can't come from just people like the school-board presidents.

That really comes from the presidents of the teachers' unions and the school-board administration -- and the school administrations,

1 and the superintendents, to come together to do that, because they know what works, and they know 2 what can help all their students. 3 SENATOR ZELDIN: But you also -- and you're 4 5 asking us to invalidate every labor agreement in the 6 state of New York. 7 So, from --JIM GOUNARIS: [Unintelligible] --8 9 SENATOR ZELDIN: I'm sorry. 10 From one standpoint, you're saying that we 11 need to work together. And the other one, the labor 12 agreements negotiated at a school-board level --13 JIM GOUNARIS: Right. 14 SENATOR ZELDIN: -- you want the 15 New York State Legislature to come in and invalidate 16 all labor agreements. 17 Now, listen, it's just one particular point. 18 It was filled up with many points. 19 JIM GOUNARIS: Right. 20 SENATOR ZELDIN: I don't want to rehash every 21 single thing that you said in here. 22 I'm just suggesting, I want to be able to 23 work with you, and maybe there were some extra

JIM GOUNARIS: So understand this: When they

24

25

soundbites in there.

passed the 2 percent cap, that was great, I was supportive of that.

But the problem was, that we had labor agreements in place that far exceeded that 2 percent cap.

So if you had given all the school districts the ability to either go back and renegotiate them, or, to go back and take that 2 percent cap and implement it in a more friendly way, so that way, the negotiated contracts, who, really, nobody wanted to void out, but they were 3.5 percent a year, whatever, 5 percent a year, whatever they were, were already in place before you cut us off.

So you cut us off at our knees, and we weren't able to now find the balance without cutting all those teachers that we couldn't do, and raise our class sizes, and eliminate athletics programs and music programs and foreign-language programs and extracurricular activities.

SENATOR ZELDIN: Out of respect for, just, the Chair, and the hearing, I have a feeling that if you and I, we could continue to go back and forth --

SENATOR ZELDIN: -- and we will continue to get further away from the subject of, you know,

JIM GOUNARIS: Yes, that's it.

```
testing and privacy, and -- and all valid points.
 1
        Don't get me wrong, but...
 2
               I apologize to the Chair.
 3
               We, uhm -- I'll accept responsibility for
 4
        both of us --
 5
 6
               JIM GOUNARIS: Thank you.
 7
               SENATOR ZELDIN: -- back and forth, a little
 8
        bit off topic.
 9
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: This is why we call it
        "democracy."
10
11
               Or part of the reason.
12
               Gentlemen, thank you very much.
13
               JIM GOUNARIS: Thank you.
               ROBERT VECCHIO: Thank you.
14
15
                     [Applause.]
16
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Next we have our
17
        superintendents: Dr. Donald James from Commack,
        and Dr. Thomas Rogers, Nassau BOCES
18
19
        Superintendent.
20
               Okay, I had mentioned your names. I'm going
21
        to mention them again: Dr. Donald James from
22
        Commack, and Tom Rogers, Nassau Superintendent of
23
        BOCES.
               Gentlemen, and you know the drill.
24
25
               Please be succinct. Your testimony is very
```

helpful and very detailed.

DR. DONALD JAMES: Thank you.

I only have about 20 pages to read from.

[Laughter.]

DR. DONALD JAMES: Let me start by saying a couple of things, not the least of which is, I agree with a great deal of what was said here today.

I think the idea that we are playing from behind, both as educators and parents, have put us in a position that we're really trying to make some very difficult choices about what we should do, knowing what we think is right for children, and, simultaneously, trying to meet the demands put before us by the State Education Department.

And I was just telling Mr. Rogers here -- Dr. Rogers, that, I think I'm going to weave in a story, as a parent.

And I have four children, the youngest of which is four. She goes to pre-K this year, for the first time. She went to preschool last year.

And, as you might imagine, I didn't put her in the pre-K in the district where I work, because it's a lottery, and I didn't want there to be any confusion about that.

[Laughter.]

23

24

25

DR. DONALD JAMES: So I put her in a pre-K associated with another school. And this is a kid who is relatively new to the country, loves life, loves learning; just loves everything that she does. Loved going to preschool last year. And, we put her into this program. Lovely school, lovely place. Teachers, very nice. She starts coming home the first week, and says, "I don't want to go back." And this is very concerning to my wife, and she says, "Why don't you want to go back?" "Well, they just make us sit and do this work So I said, "Well, you need to go talk to the teacher and see what's happening." The teachers says, Well, the school is concerned that, you know, the Common Core is here, and the Common Core assessments, and we're really worried about that, so we're actually moving some of So here she is, "four."

Suffice it to say, she doesn't go to school there anymore.

[Laughter.]

1 DR. DONALD JAMES: So, I tell you that story because, part of it is, what's happening to our 2 3 children; and part of it is, what's happening to our teachers. 4 Because, there's a lot of conversation about 5 6 reform efforts in public education, and in 7 particular, they focus on teachers. Only, a lot of what teachers do, and what 8 9 they control, is now out of their hands. 10 It has literally been removed. 11 I'm not here to blame anybody. 12 I'm here to disagree. 13 And I think the idea that we are left in a 14 position where, we are in the field, saying, we 15 disagree with things. And people saying, Well, 16 that's fine, but we're going to move forward at any 17 rate. 18 Now, I spent my entire professional career in 19 public education. 20 I've worked in inner-city Philadelphia; 21 I've worked in inner-city New York; 22 I've been a superintendent -- a community 23 superintendent of Staten Island schools;

I've been upstate in a rural district;

And I've been here on Long Island, I've spent

24

25

the last three years, in moderate-wealth, high-performing school districts.

And I can say that the real work at hand really is about, What do we want students to know, be able to do, and truly understand?

And how do we know that?

What do we do with that information?

And how do we make sure that we're providing the best education possible for our children?

So in my current district, literally, every child graduates, whether they have an IEP or not.

And, almost every single child goes to college.

And, yet, now we are subjected to an assessment that says between 40 and 60 percent of your elementary children aren't going to be prepared to go to college.

I'm going to tell you, I don't believe it.

I don't believe it for a second.

And I do think that the changes are well-intentioned, but they're ill-conceived.

I think that's where we really run into problems, and I'm going to list out just four primary concerns that I have.

One is "loss of local control." That was talked about prior.

And by that, what I mean, it's not just what 1 school boards, superintendents, and administrators 2 can do, but where do our teachers and parents fit 3 into this conversation? 4 Where are the voices of those that are 5 working with these children on a daily basis? 6 7 And I hear people say, Well, we've included educators. 8 9 10

Well, then, it needs to be a broader voice.

From my perspective, there needs to be a broader voice.

Superimposing changes on schools that ostensively don't need change. Schools that aren't struggling is ill-conceived. There is no purpose in that.

So, we lost local control.

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

"And the overemphasis on high-stakes standardized testing."

Not opposed to the Common Core.

There are parts of the Common Core that are strong, they're solid. They've just recently been released. I mean, just recently.

So -- and we've already tested kids on those concepts.

So, that's very difficult for us.

"The manner these tests were administered." 1 2 I'm not going to rehash everything that you've heard about how they were administered: 3 The fact that they were administered before, 4 5 you know, the Common Core was completely released; 6 The fact that they were ill-timed; 7 The fact that they were just -- there are dozens of assessments. 8 9 When you get the list from us that shows you 10 how many assessments are associated with the 11 Common Core, as well as APPR, it will go on and on 12 and on. 13 So, the manner in which they were 14 administered is also called into question. 15 Again, it's in my testimony. I don't need to 16 rehash for you everything that -- and the way it was 17 handled. 18 And, the potential for future changes 19 associated with Regents exams is a significant 20 concern for us. 21 You heard people talk about it here today, and it does affect children. 22 23 There is no way around that.

As an educator, and a parent, my primary

concern is, doing the best that we can for these

24

25

kids, day in and day out.

How do we prepare them for what they want to do when they leave us?

Do they want to go to college? Then how do we prepare them to do that.

So, I think that managing that really becomes our primary concern.

So, as we think about what we've done, moving forward from when the Common Core, and the legislation associated with that, and whether it was because someone submitted a grant to the federal government and now we're bound to that, we put ourselves in a position where we're doing things that are very, very detrimental to students.

And I don't say that lightly.

And, in fact, I know in my testimony, I point to a lot of research, talks about, how we should be engaging teachers in this conversation, how we should be engaging parents in the conversation, and how we should not be superimposing change on schools that are successful.

And even schools that are successful, we should not be superimposing change. We should be engaging them in conversations about what they can do to better prepare students for what they want to

do when they leave us.

We can talk about the finances, and there is a significant component associated with the finances.

I am not naive about that.

I understand the economic state of the country, and the state, and certainly our communities. That does make it difficult.

However, how do we manage this, moving forward, and what do we do with that?

So, as we think about our work, and some of the data that's pointed to, regarding the number of students who are not successful when they get to college, and/or need remediation, it's my understanding that the majority of that data is taken from the SUNY system and many districts.

Only about 30 to 40 percent of the students actually attend SUNY schools.

So we have another 60 or 70 percent of students who are attending private schools, and that data would be a different data set.

[Laughter.]

DR. DONALD JAMES: So, looking at that, we have to think about that in particular.

So -- and I'm going to really try to sum this

up. I know -- I know that you've got other things to do.

If we can demonstrate real data that our students are actually performing at a high level, and the level that they need, to the best of their ability, to do what they want to do when they're finished, superimposing additional assessments is not necessary.

The work is simply not necessary.

I would certainly take -- I'll take this opportunity to say, I don't think you have to implement an assessment because you put in place a new curriculum.

You can put in place a new curriculum, utilize that curriculum over time, and then assess at a later date.

You can assess formatively; meaning, as the curriculum is being implemented, day in and day out.

And teachers are assessing all the time.

They're assessing both informally and formally in their classrooms.

And we do that at district levels.

We do do some of that assessment at district levels.

So how do we use that data to drive

instruction?

2 That's important to us.

So this audit of our performance, which I -- is what I consider state assessments, is not necessary every single year.

And it absolutely, in my professional opinion, demonstrates a lack of understanding of the developmental abilities of children --

[Applause.]

DR. DONALD JAMES: -- [unintelligible].

I'm going to try to close this up, because I could go on.

Senator, I've spoken to you any number of times about this, Senator Marcellino.

I will tell you, that, there is a very rich voice among the superintendents. We've been engaged in conversations, in fact, as recently as yesterday, about how we will attempt to insert our voice at a higher level.

That doesn't mean that we all agree all the time. It's okay, in my opinion, to disagree.

But how do we come up with the things that we can all settle on so that we're doing the best thing that we can for children.

We need to be very careful -- let me rephrase

that.

Those that are making the decisions about additional changes to these assessments and these assessment protocols need to be very careful about what they do, because it will affect children, there is no doubt.

And it could affect their future; meaning, if they fail Regents exams, either they have to repeat the course, or fail to graduate.

Now, they may have gotten a 1600 on an SAT, but fail a Regents exam.

So, I really think that that's something that needs to be considered.

So when I say "slow down," my real sentiment around slowing down is, just saying it's okay to push the pause button right now, and say to ourselves, Okay, we can implement the curriculum.

We can manage the -- no one's saying that we don't want standards, higher standards.

My community will be the first one to tell you, We're okay with higher standards for students, okay with higher standards for teachers, okay with higher standards administrators.

We're okay with that. We're okay with being accountable.

However, doing it in this fashion is just not appropriate, and it's ill-conceived.

And it demonstrates, in my opinion, I'm sorry
I'm not going to be popular with some of the
decision-makers, it's ill-conceived, and it's not
going to work.

So we -- that is also a big part of our concern.

We know, the research supports, that giving teachers continuous feedback about the work that they do on a daily basis, and measuring student growth locally over time, and helping them meet their needs, is the way to do this work.

And that's rooted in the research.

We certainly stand, I think, at the precipice of doing significant damage; damage to other content areas -- damage to the arts; damage to content areas, whether it's social studies and history; damage to physical-fitness programs; damage to socially-emotional programs -- because there's a rush to get higher test scores.

And there's a rush to get higher test scores because people are held to a high-stakes level of accountability.

And whether they count or not, they are going

to be published, and a parent's going to call and say, What's my teachers' APPR score?

They're going to call. We've set up the protocols.

And whether we say to them, "But, oh, this

And whether we say to them, "But, oh, this test didn't count," that's not going to stop them from saying, I wonder if that's a good teacher, because the kids didn't do well on the state tests.

So from my perspective, looking at providing a sound, well-rounded educational program for our children is our work.

We can do that at the local level.

I'm going to be perfectly frank: We don't need state tests to tell us whether we're doing a good job or not.

I thank you for your time.

[Applause.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Don, thank you very much.

Tom.

DR. TOM ROGERS: Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

As you know, I'm Tom Rogers. I'm the district superintendent of Nassau BOCES. That's actually a dual role, and you're all familiar with this.

I work both for the Board of Education of Nassau BOCES, but I also work for the State Education Department.

It puts me in a delicate position.

[Laughter.]

DR. TOM ROGERS: And, so, in order to reconcile those two things, I will tell you that the opinions I'm going to give you are not necessarily representative of either of those bodies. They are my own.

And they come formed from a career that's now 23 years of education policy work, first in the Senate, as you know, working with Senator LaValle; and, subsequently, I represented the superintendents of the state, as the executive director of the State Superintendents Association.

And, I'm coming up on my fourth anniversary here at Nassau BOCES.

So, I will say that we all have one problem to solve that is bigger than all of us, and it is the conversation that we're having.

And the problem that we're trying to solve, is making sure that our kids are ready for the world in which they are going inhabit.

And, the data about that world is frightening

from the perspective of the expectation of level of skill that students will have to have in order to be successful.

So, the Center for Workforce and the Economy at Georgetown says that, by the year 2020,

90 percent of students will have to have some form of college education in order to be able to enter the workforce.

We have a 74 percent graduation rate.

If we can't get to 90, and not by lowering standards, we have to get to 90, we're going to have lots kids that, if they don't graduate high school, they're not ready for college.

If they're don't have college, there won't be a job for them.

And if they don't -- if there isn't a job for them, they'll be unemployed.

And if we don't believe this statistic from the year 2020, the statistic for this last year is, that, for high school -- recently graduated high school students with a high school diploma, a 24 percent unemployment rate.

So what we know is, that the high school diploma is no longer good enough, and a barely-passing high school diploma is little better

than none at all.

The challenge then is, how do you move this huge diverse system?

With the rural Adirondacks, the densely urban New York City, a suburban Long Island, how do you move this entire system in a positive direction so all children have access to the kinds of programs that will allow them to go on to higher education, and then succeed in college, and then in life and in work?

That's the challenge that we face.

And the series of reforms that have been taken are intended to address that challenge.

And the hearing today is to ask the question, whether they have succeeded or not.

Regent Tilles said that the Common Core is probably the finest part of the Regents agenda.

And I find myself agreeing, but the Common Core is more than just what the curriculum itself is; it is also a question of how it is implemented in the state.

And I think there have been real challenges.

But on the Common Core, one of the things that it has done is, it has focused and narrowed the curriculum.

We had a curriculum that was a mile wide and an inch deep, and we've gone much deeper with concepts.

We're asking students to use problem-solving skills, higher-order thinking skills.

This is a very different level of expectation, and a very different level of preparation.

And we should not be startled that it is a multiyear process of getting teachers and building leaders, to understand this different curriculum, and the different expectations of it, and an ongoing and recurring -- recurrent professional development so that we become better at implementing it.

As Don said $\mbox{--}$ you asked me to address four things, the Common Core being the first.

And, what do we think about this 30 percent drop in proficiency rates?

I talked to a superintendent of a very high-performing district who said, We had the most college admissions to competitive colleges ever before; and, yet, our college-readiness went down 30 percent. So, who should my parents believe: Harvard or Albany?

[Laughter.]

DR. TOM ROGERS: And that was one point of view.

And the other point of view is, are these kids on track to graduate, and are they going to be ready for the expectations that are there?

And we have a 74 percent graduation rate with an admittedly lower standard than the Common Core.

What are we going to do as that standard goes up?

I think we also have a problem with mismatch.

A lot of districts on Long Island accelerate kids from the ninth-grade math curriculum, and they take it in the eighth grade.

It's Algebra 1 Regents, but they take it in eighth grade in order to free up more time in high school.

So, it gives us a nice group to compare:
eighth-graders who took both the 3 through 8
Common Core math assessments, "Math 8," and, this
Regents-level ninth-grade Algebra 1.

So they're taking ninth-grade harder

Algebra 1 in eighth grade, and their proficiency

rates are higher on the harder test than they are on
the eighth-grade test, which is supposedly easier.

And I gave you the statistics here.

So, I gave you an example of a single district, and then we ran the numbers for Nassau County-wide.

I think both of those tests, and the cut marks that were used, are used as definitions of "college-ready."

But those two definitions, both by the

State Education Department, of "college-ready" don't

even agree with one another, and they think there's,

certainly, an alignment issue in terms of the

curriculum being taught.

But there is also, I think, implicit in that data, an understanding that these data are imperfect, and that we should react to them accordingly.

I think another challenge with the implementation of the Common Core has been the rapidity with which materials were made available.

So, as Ken Wagner said early on, the State has gone to extraordinary lengths to support the implementation of Common Core.

Unfortunately, the time frame in which they've been able to deliver on those extraordinary lengths has not matched up with the expectations.

So we started the year that would be assessed

with Common Core, in 2012-13, for tests that would given in the spring of '13.

At the beginning of the year, there were none of the Common Core curriculum modules available.

Throughout the course of that fall, a number of were added to EngageNY.

But even by the middle of that year, only about 24 out of what will eventually be 250 modules had been uploaded.

So, at this point, there are still 61 "ELA," English-language arts, modules to come, and another 57 modules, or partial modules, and, we're already beginning the second year of implementation.

I don't use these statistics to lay blame at the feet of the State Education Department.

I actually think it is a stunning -- it was an incredibly ambitious thing to take on. And it's stunning that they've delivered so much content, and that the content is of such high quality.

There are some problems with it.

In order to make the content free, they had to use open-source texts, so that means that some of the text material is out of date or out of print, and, therefore, hard to access.

But, the curriculum is of high quality.

And I think the Commissioner appropriately cautioned people in their use of the testing data, knowing that most of this curriculum was not developed in time.

Now, Mr. Wagner also said that curriculum development is a local responsibility, and that's absolutely true.

But this is a very different kind of curriculum, as I mentioned, and the State already signaled that they were going to prepare a curriculum.

So districts dealing with the tax cap, understandably, had to make a resource choice. And rather than develop their own curriculum, knowing that the State was going to develop a high-quality curriculum, chose to wait for the State to deliver.

And I think that mismatch of timing is at least a partial explanation for what has happened with our test scores.

You asked me to address, also, remediation, and, academic intervention services (AIS).

As was mentioned earlier, the new test scores are intended to be a new baseline, and the department released what are called "comparable rigor charts." And Mr. Wagner referred

to those.

They're supposed to equate the old test to the new test, and provide AIS services at, roughly, the same point.

We saw something that was done by Erie 1
BOCES, and we replicated it for Nassau, and had very similar results.

Even though the baselines are supposed to be comparable, the new cut scores would result in about 2 1/2 percent more kids going into AIS this year than did last year.

And that translates into a little more than 2,000 kids for ELA, and a little more than 2,000 kids for math.

So those are new sections of AIS that are gonna have to be developed.

And there's a lot of question marks surrounding the AIS model: how effective it is for how costly it is.

And, again, in an era of resource constraints, I think there's a balance to be struck between pushing more kids into a model that has some question marks associated with it.

And we probably should have done some thinking about AIS in parallel with this move that

ends up asking us to do more remediation services for kids.

The third thing you asked me to address was, the implementation of the Regents exams.

And I share the concern of the board president from William Floyd, about what happens with an eleventh-grade English-language-arts test if there is a large drop in passing rate.

So, whatever the impact on students, a disappointing performance on a 3 through 8 test still has lots of years of instruction to go before graduation looms.

And even for the math test, it would be typically given in ninth grade, and so there would be other opportunities to retake that test.

But in eleventh grade, there will really be very few opportunities to reteach, and then to retake that test, and it could result in students being held back from graduation.

Now, it's a higher standard that we want them to aspire to, but there will be a cost associated with getting them to that standard in such a short period of time.

And I'm not sure that we've really are taken account of that cost.

I think another thing that will happen, at least in the short term, is the unfortunate result of having more testing at the eighth-grade level in math.

The reason being, for all of these districts that accelerate and ask our kids to do more in eighth grade, which I believe is the right thing to do, those students will still have to take the Math 8 exam, part of the 3 through 8 Common Core exams;

They will take Algebra 1;

And then they will also -- and that Algebra 1 will be Common Core-aligned.

And then they'll have a safety-net exam, which is the old Algebra 1 exam.

So we may see students in eighth grade taking as many as three math exams in one year during this transition period.

Lastly, you've asked me to address student data and privacy.

And I have to confess, this is the area

I gave the most thought to, because I think it has
the broadest implications.

First of all, we do use lots and lots of student data in ways that I think are very helpful

to improving the education that we give students, and I think there are lost of places where we work with third-party providers to do work for the district.

So, student-management software systems, scheduling software systems, bus-routing systems, I could go on and on, these -- we don't write software. We're educators.

We buy the software, and the services are run by these private providers.

I think the difference between how data is managed now, and how our relationships with third-party providers is managed now, and how it will differ in the future that is envisioned by the use of inBloom, is, essentially, around governance, and the governance change is this:

First of all, the amount of data that is collected will be much more extensive than it ever was before. And, it will not just be data for individuals from just one state, but it will be from multiple states.

It will -- there will be data about students that could be very sensitive, in terms of students' preparation, or, their disability status, or, their attendance status in schools.

And there will be data associated with those students about their teachers as well, because, in order to understand some of the student-achievement data, you have to associate them with the class that they were in.

Having all of that data in one place,

I think, raises the stakes for the data, and it
should raise the governance bar for that data.

Instead, right now, the governance bar is, individual boards of education can pick and choose between competing contractors for their student-management system, for their bus-routing system. They can choose the one that they think is most secure. And, they control the data through their individual contract relationship with that provider.

In the future that is envisioned, all of that data will be sent out of state, and the contract will be managed by the State, with the national organization. And the national organization is not governed by an elected body. It is a not-for-profit that's governed by a not-for-profit board.

The not-for-profit board, it's a list of luminaries. They're a Who's Who of data, but they're not accountable to elected officials.

Now, I chafe sometimes at the challenges of running an incredibly regulated organization, and I wish for more flexibility.

So, it is surprising to hear myself saying that I think there needs to be more elected oversight; and, yet, I think in this case, it does, because here's what happens:

What changes, from a governance perspective, is that the contract is now controlled by the State, not by the district.

What changes from a district perspective -
I'm sorry, from a data perspective, is that the data
is now available to all vendors, and not just the
ones contracted by the district.

So, it isn't just one our student-management system or bus-routing software. They all have access to it, and they could all, presume, to tell me that they could do bus-routing cheaper, but they all have access to that data.

And that, I think, is the piece that makes me the most nervous.

So, in conclusion, I would just say that, because of this challenge that we have, of where our students have to get, because of how the world around us is changing, the pace is being dictated

externally.

So, we want to try and find a pace that is optimal for our implementation, and there are some logistical limitations that just cannot be overcome, but I would caution that we can't pretend that this external environment isn't there as well.

And you have the difficult and unenviable task of having to balance those two things, to make sure that our students have a future to join, and to make sure that we don't implement things so quickly that we break the system in the process.

And I wish you all the best of luck in that.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: All righty.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: So, Tom, I just want to double-check, those opinions were your own? You're not --

DR. TOM ROGERS: Those are my own.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay.

I have one simple question.

Going back, I think, listening to the comments, Senator LaValle, and many of my colleagues, talked about a disconnect, and, you know, whether a hearing aid is necessary, and things

of that nature.

Just, I would appreciate if you would comment on one particular aspect, and I could have easily asked the same question of NYSUT:

When the cut scores were being developed for the data that was released in the summer, and now with the individual scores coming out, it seems to me that there are occasions when SED is not getting any acknowledgment or credit for trying to bring people in from the field.

Now, I consider you, Tom in particular, to be a policy wonk.

Don, having seen 87 footnotes in your testimony, I now recognize that you wear the same shoes.

They talked about having 95 educators as part of a group, to figure out how to do that right.

Do you -- did they get any props for that, or, is that just -- is that pyrrhic?

Does it matter?

Or...?

DR. TOM ROGERS: Where testing has evolved is something called "item-response theory."

So, the way item-response theory works, and this is also a little bit of an explanation of

field-testing, you have a number of questions on an exam. We call them "items."

And those items are -- some are more difficult than others.

How do you know?

Well, you could guess, but what you do is, you field-test the items.

So, if this is an item that 90 percent of kids get right, we assume it's easy.

If it's an item that only 10 percent of students get right, we assume it's hard.

So after that field-testing is done and we have these percentages of correct answers for each of the items on the field test, what happens is, those items are ranked from hardest to easiest.

And then a group of educators, 95 in this case, are in a room, and they have to agree where the cut point is between below basic and basic, 1 to 2; between basic to proficient, 2 to 3; and where the cut score between proficient and mastery, 3 to 4, should exist.

And, so, looking at all these questions, seeing what the content is of the questions and the difficulty level, they use their judgment as educators to say, This is really where the break

point is.

Then they statistically go back and map that onto the tests based on those items.

If there is no field-testing, there can be no ranking.

If there is no ranking, there can be no educators in a room doing item-response theory on trying to figure out where the cut points belong.

But, they are using the state-of-the-art model for how large-scale testing is done.

This is -- it's very common in the literature, and this is what most states do.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: But do you think they're using the right people?

And I understand -- I believe I understand the model. I'm just -- and I'm not trying to play a game. I'm just trying to grapple with things that I hear.

And when I hear that there's 95 educators, many of them classroom teachers, who are involved in this, I would think that should be a good thing.

But I don't know how, if it's accurate, or --

DR. TOM ROGERS: Yeah, Don wants to jump in.

DR. DONALD JAMES: I think -- I am not going to draw a conclusion about the individuals that were

in that room.

I think the -- the -- an issue at hand perhaps is, is not just where the cut score was drawn, but the fact that the -- what was required for proficiency, not passing, but proficiency, the types of information that were required on the assessments was rolled out prior to the implementation of the curriculum and the standards, so, the staff and the students didn't really know what they were going to be tested on.

So then they administered these tests, and put in place a cut score. And that cut score was based on what they did with field testing.

Some field-testing was done in the actual assessments. And that's a different conversation.

But managing that, moving forward, and those 95 individuals, I don't want to draw any conclusions about them.

I can only imagine that they were well-educated, well-intentioned, and thoughtful about what they did.

I think the disconnect may be -- not as much around the cut score itself, but what was being measured, and the fact that things hadn't been rolled out.

That's my position.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Zeldin.

SENATOR ZELDIN: Two quick things.

First, with regards to the piece about privacy and the data.

I personally, I see -- I agree that there's a lot of value in data these days: knowing an individual's e-mail, knowing an individual's cell phone, knowing their personal interests.

It's just a new day and age, where, you know, we have social media.

I'd like to welcome our Chairman to Facebook as of a few days ago.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR ZELDIN: There's a -- I understand the value to data.

The -- I think it really -- the government, people in government, who -- who are trying to take advantage of the value of data need to place more of an emphasis on the rights of the individual, to not share that data.

And I think, with regards to the Common Core and the sharing of data, that we have parents who don't want to share their child's data.

And I think that, going forward, that has to

be taken into consideration a little bit more than it is.

But, I wanted to ask this question, and, I'm gonna -- I want to explain my question after I ask it, but -- gives you some time to think about your answer, and I would be interested in your opinions.

And my question is about Mesopotamia.

[Laughter.]

[Applause.]

SENATOR ZELDIN: The -- and, you know, we were discussing, like, you know, the standards, and whether or not they're age-appropriate.

And -- so I have -- so my two daughters, as

I mentioned a little while ago, they just started

second grade. They just finished first grade a few

months back.

And, you know, they've -- they've learned -- they learned a lot in kindergarten, they learned a lot in first grade, and they're doing great.

And the ELA standards, I'm just going to read a few of them.

These are for first grade; first-graders.

"Explain the importance of the Tigress and Euphrates rivers, and the use of canals, to support farming and the development of the city of Babylon."

"Describe the city of Babylon and the Hanging Gardens."

"Explain the significance of the Code of Hammurabi."

"Explain the significance of gods, goddesses, ziggurats, temples, and priests in Mesopotamia."

There's a lot of standards here for ELA.

These are for first-graders.

I could go on.

And my daughters who just finished first grade, you know, it's important for -- it's important for me as a parent to see them learn about, you know, the United States, our democracy, our Founding Fathers, our Constitution.

[Applause.]

SENATOR ZELDIN: And, it's also important that we challenge our students.

And the goals -- I understand that the goals of setting these standards are, is that you're, you know, developing critical thinking. You're making them think very deep, and you're looking into ancient civilizations. And that's all important.

I want to know more, and I -- just, I can tell from when you guys were both speaking, that you're, you know, the perfect people with some great

insight, as to whether or not the standards are currently age-appropriate?

And if, going forward, we should be making any changes?

Because in my opinion, it's not; it's not age-appropriate.

We shouldn't be asking our kids some of this stuff.

[Applause.]

DR. DONALD JAMES: We just looked at each other and said, "Who will go first?"

I think that -- that at the root of what we want to do in schools, is we want to know what we want students to know, be able to do [unintelligible] really understand.

And a lot of that, and this is my humble opinion, has to be determined at the local level.

And how we are preparing our students for success as they move through our program, and then whatever it is that they want to do when they graduate from high school.

So, if we want students to develop a certain skill set that has to do with critical thinking, and some of the work that I think they were trying to get at by using those examples, we need the

authority to use other types of examples so that it meets the needs of our children.

So do I think that they pushed it too hard?

In some places, absolutely. There is no doubt in my mind.

We just talked about my pre-K child who -- she came home and said, "What is this?"

So -- so, if she's intuitive enough to say this is not appropriate, it appears all too obvious for us.

And I'm not pandering, I honestly am not.

I really do pride myself in listening to students, listening to teachers, parents, and those that are have deal with the greater policy issues associated with, as Tom said, moving this entire system, so -- and grappling with the issues associated, not just with, you know, districts that don't have -- or aren't struggling, but with districts that are struggling.

But how they're doing that is really what I'm calling into question.

So putting in place standards that are higher and harder, and so on and so forth, without allowing opportunities for staff to work with those standards, and then determine what they're going to

utilize at the local level to implement that, and
bring children to a place where it's appropriate,
that's really where the struggle is.

We're saying -- or, we're being told,

We're saying -- or, we're being told,

Everybody do this, everybody take this test, and

you'll all get to the same place at the same time.

It doesn't work that way.

[Applause.]

DR. DONALD JAMES: And it absolutely is developmentally-inappropriate.

I will tell you, it is developmentally-inappropriate. It is -- that's not right.

[Applause.]

DR. TOM ROGERS: As you might have guessed, I'll offer a more nuanced view.

[Laughter.]

DR. TOM ROGERS: I would say, just reflecting, that the concept of grade levels is this sort of archaic Prussian concept that was calcified by No Child Left Behind.

So Regent Tilles talked about the experience of his daughter taking grade-level tests at a -- when they weren't cognitively-appropriate. And that is because of No Child Left Behind calcifying that,

based on an age, and not on a developmental level.

So are there some first-graders who are ready for ancient civilizations, Hanging Gardens, and the Code of Hammurabi? There are.

Are all of them ready for that? No.

So the question is not, should kids be or not be exposed to ancient civilizations?

The question is: When are they ready for it?

And can we give them -- can we not have low expectations for them, so we do push and challenge them, but do we not overestimate their abilities?

So I'd offer you in, grade 3, the English-language-arts curriculum references passages by Leo Tolstoy.

So, you know, from my own sense, Tolstoy in third grade seems a little bracing, to me.

But, again, should students, at some point, be ready to challenge Tolstoy? Absolutely.

Ultimately, what we need to do is, get to a place where we're better able to personalize the instruction of students. And that will mean, starting to think more about when it's developmentally-appropriate, not as though every child develops at the same pace, but, rather, when it's developmentally-appropriate for each child,

keeping the challenge on for them to be able to 1 stretch their minds. 2 SENATOR ZELDIN: And just a little bit 3 earlier, you were asking about whether or not to 4 believe Harvard or Albany. 5 6 And as I mentioned to Senator Flanagan, I graduated from the State University of New York, 7 which we called "Harvard on the Hudson." 8 9 [Laughter.] 10 SENATOR ZELDIN: The -- I've seen the show, "Are You Smarter Than A Fifth-Grader." 11 12 And when I read through some of these 13 questions, I just wonder how many people in this 14 audience, with all due respect to everyone who's 15 here, how many people are smarter than a 16 first-grader when you read some of this. 17 Because, I mean, I would need a refresher course on the first grade if this was the standard 18 19 to pass. 20 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much, 21 gentlemen. Appreciate it. 22 23 [Applause.] 24 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Wait. I'm sorry!

25

Senator --

SENATOR LAVALLE: No, no. That's fine. 1 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay. 2 All right, next we have the superintendent of 3 West Hempstead, who has been patiently waiting with 4 everyone else, John Hogan. 5 6 JOHN HOGAN: I guess I'm curious as to why 7 Tom and Don get to sit together, and I sit by myself. 8 9 [Laughter.] 10 SENATOR FLANAGAN: They said they were 11 nervous. They're not really used to doing this. 12 JOHN HOGAN: Yeah, they're "nervous." 13 Senator Flanagan, Senators, thank you for 14 giving me the opportunity to represent 15 West Hempstead today. 16 It is truly an honor for me to do that. 17 In terms of my background, I am presently the superintendent of schools, as you mentioned, in the 18 19 West Hempstead School District. I'm in my 20 seventh year in that position. 21 Prior to being superintendent in 22 West Hempstead, I spent 11 years in the 23 Elwood School District as a building administrator, 24 and then assistant superintendent.

I am somewhat unique, I think, from many of

25

my superintendent colleagues, in that, before being in public education, I spent 18 years in education in the Diocese of Brooklyn, which may be why I was sitting there trying to do your homework assignment.

So I was sitting there, thinking, and I'm saying to myself, Okay, in kindergarten, you get some SLOs, and you get ELA SLOs, and you get student learning objectives, and you get math student learning objectives. And then -- well, wait a minute, if we do social studies, there are probably student learning objectives for that.

So I'm doing that, and I'm thinking, so, the kindergarten is, without me thinking too hard about it, already, probably up to six or eight exams, some at the beginning of the year, and some at the end, not to mention everything that happens in between.

And I'm not at all sure that I'm right, to be honest with you, because the way in which SLOs work are somewhat -- is somewhat obtuse to me.

And then I say, Well, let me think about the high school a little.

And I stopped thinking about it very quickly when I realized that, you know, you have six or seven courses, and there are state exams, and everything else.

So, without going too far, I have to figure that, between kindergarten and twelfth-grade students, are somewhere between 50 and 100 exams.

And that's not counting, in my view, the normal exams, quizzes, that teachers are giving on any given day or any given week.

And I'm thinking maybe my testimony could end there.

I am not a policy wonk by any stretch of the imagination, nor am I a data guy.

 $\label{eq:and-probably-saw-that-in-my} \text{And I think you probably saw that in my} \\ \text{written testimony.}$

I am a former -- not a former. I'm still a social-studies teacher.

I believe in narrative.

And what I'm going to try to do is, is not replicate what I wrote for you, but just really try to speak from the heart, in terms of a number of things that I've heard this morning, and then reflect the West Hempstead community, as well as what I think after being in education since 1976.

I have great fear that we're losing the joy of learning, and that we're losing the joy of teaching, in our schools.

I have a daughter who just graduated college,

and sent out somewhere in the area, I'm going to say, 150 résumés. And she was fortunate enough to find a job in a local Catholic school.

And I will tell you, I was actually relieved, as her father, that she was not going to be teaching in the public schools.

Because, I was very concerned that if she did, she wouldn't have fun as a teacher, and she wouldn't be able to connect with the kids in front of her, and she would be so consumed by APPR and evaluations, and so consumed by getting her children ready for exams that were going to happen in April, that, again, she would lose the joy of teaching and they would lose the joy of learning.

And when we start to lose the joy of teaching and learning, and I think that we have, then we really have to step back and take a look at what we're doing, as a state, and as a state education department, and as educators.

You know, West Hempstead, like other districts, has not had it easy over the course of the last few years.

Our average budget increase has been about 1.15 percent.

We've had a contract freeze.

We've lost 108 positions in a school district that serves about 2100 boys and girls.

We are unique, in that we transport about 1500 boys and boys and girls each day to other locations.

We have a district that's diverse, very religious, and they send their children either to yeshivas or they send them to the local Catholic schools.

So we are transporting a hundred different -- again, a hundred locations each day, which represents about 10 percent of our operating budget each year.

When you talk about a district like ours that has lost 108 positions across the board, that is bound to have an effect on what you can do, and the product that you can deliver to the boys and girls in your care.

We've lost teachers, we've lost clerical staff, we've lost custodians, we've lost directors.

We've cut clubs, we've cut sports.

We've lost, for example, seventh-grade volleyball and basketball for the boys and girls. We cut the wrestling program.

We sit there year after year after year, and

we say, What's left? How do we maintain a comprehensive school system?

And we think we've actually done a pretty good job doing that, but then we turn around and something else is coming our way.

The amount of data that is collected by the State Education Department on a daily basis has become insurmountable.

And, on any given day, I will have an assistant superintendent, my director of technology, and a clerical person working all day long. And, then, being [unintelligible] connected with the buildings, to make sure that we're either uploading or downloading or "side-loading," or whatever it is they're doing.

[Laughter.]

JOHN HOGAN: And in the meantime, they're not doing what I need them to do for the kids that we service.

And that's very problematic to me.

And when you get to the beginning of the school year, and this was mentioned earlier, we're already giving exams in the first or the second week of school.

Teachers are already focused on, you know,

how are they going to maintain their effectiveness?

And as a result of that, sometimes they're distracted. And they don't want to be distracted from their primary purpose, which, of course, is to teach the boys and girls.

APPR, for all intents and purposes, is, in my view, very onerous, and doesn't make much sense.

It took us 18 months to put an APPR plan together that we thought would work for the school district. And we're a small school district.

We lost 180, "180," administrative days to training.

I have 18 administrators, including myself, and we all had to do 10 sessions of training out of the school district. And that doesn't count for, you know, the teachers that we sent out, or when we pulled teachers out of class for training.

"180 days" may strike a bell with you.

It's the -- you know, it's the school year.

We lost a year of administrative time to training.

Something's wrong.

How do you run a school district when your principals aren't in their buildings?

And how do you support new curriculum when

your principals aren't in the building?

How do you support new curriculum when teachers are being taken out, so that they can learn the Common Core, which they absolutely want to do?

How do you remain, quote/unquote,
"effective"?

How do you run a school district when you're giving exams that last three days for ELA, three days for mathematics, and you have to bring in subs, perhaps, because you now have to grade those exams afterwards?

How many of the 180 days, "180 school days," do you have left after all of that has been taken care of?

You've heard it before today, I know you have, you know, the Common Core assessments were given too soon.

I mentioned in my written testimony, being in a test-and-measurements course back in 1974.

And Professor Healey [ph.], it was actually Brother Healey, was standing there, and he said to us -- and I'll never forget it -- he said:

"If you give a test and more than 50 percent of your kids fail that test, then you did something wrong. You either didn't teach it well, or the test

was poorly constructed. And you have the obligation to go back and fix it, either by reteaching it, figuring out what you did wrong and reteaching it; or, by reconstructing that exam."

I would submit to you that, in his wildest dreams, he never expected any of us in that room to give an exam to our kids knowing beforehand that they were going to fail it.

It never would have crossed his mind.

And another thing I mentioned in my written testimony, it's like saying, I'm going to teach my child how to swim, so I'm going to throw them in 20 feet of water and see if they swim.

Well, what if they drown first?

Many of our kids drowned last year, and now we're dealing with the aftermath of that, and trying to explain it to our teachers, to the boards of education, and, to the parents, most importantly; parents that are generally supportive. In fact, very supportive of what we do.

We have parents in West Hempstead who are so supportive, but even now, they're saying, Maybe we should join this opt-out movement.

I respectfully --

[Applause.]

JOHN HOGAN: I respectfully submit to you that I think State Ed has a tiger by the tail, and they don't know it.

I sat in my office a few years ago, and parents were saying, you know, We're concerned about this.

And I said, Well, you need to make your voices heard.

And at that point, you know, they really didn't do that.

Another piece of this that I don't get, frankly, is, and it was mentioned earlier, I think, by the teacher who was here, one of the other things we were taught was: When you give an exam and you get it back, and you grade it, you utilize that exam for teaching purposes.

We can't do that with Common Core standards.

25 percent of the questions have now been put out there for us to look at and analyze.

Well, if we're going to look at data, how do you do a proper analysis if you don't have the data in front of you?

How do I know that the 25 percent of the

questions they put out there were questions that, in some ways, my kids did well on, or perhaps my kids didn't do well on?

And what about the district next door? Maybe those 25 questions represent well for them, but not for me.

There are just a number of things that aren't making sense to us.

Whether or not it reflects college-readiness, again, it's been addressed.

Depending upon which expert you read, they'll say, Yes, it does. Or somebody will say, you know, No, it doesn't.

All I know, as I look at this, and I look at the data, is that, in my view, kids are being hurt.

And, I've been at this a long time, and the last thing you ever want to do is walk away from your classroom or from your school, and say, You know, somehow we did harm this year. We hurt kids.

I don't know how you explain to a kid who's always been considered proficient, or beyond proficient, that, all of a sudden, they need AIS services.

I don't know how you do that.

So, we sit there and we write letters.

Tonight I have a board meeting. 1 That should be entertaining. 2 [Laughter.] 3 JOHN HOGAN: In fact, maybe I'll just stay 4 here and keep talking here. 5 [Laughter.] 6 7 JOHN HOGAN: But, so far, it's been okay. Those of you -- well, you're all politicians, 8 9 so you know Dwight Eisenhower, and you know that 10 when he left office, he said, "Be very careful of 11 the military industrial complex." 12 One of the things I've said in public at my 13 board meetings is, "Be very careful of the educational industrial complex." 14 I wonder how much of -- I'm worried about the 15 16 connections we now have between our State Education 17 Department and large testing companies who are creating the exams, creating the textbooks, creating 18 19 the online resources. 20 I'm just concerned about it. 21 And I think that, you know, the State Senate 22 needs to be concerned about that as well. 23 One of the things I was asked to address was 24 special education.

I'm not a special educator.

25

1 I, obviously, know something about it.

I would not pretend to sit before you this afternoon and tell you that I know everything there is to know about it.

What I do know about it is, putting kids in the room and telling them to take an exam that in no way, shape, or form they could possibly pass, is cruel.

There's no other word to describe it.

It's just cruel.

A few years ago, I watched a young lady take a math Regents, and watched her break down into tears; knowing that we all knew it, knowing that she couldn't pass it, but also knowing the only way she could get to the RCT would be to take this exam.

So she got less than 20 percent on that, and then she took the RCT and was able to pass the RCT.

And instead of getting an IEP diploma, was able to get a local diploma, which, for all intents and purposes, we don't offer any longer.

And I have to question, why do we keep doing that; why do we keep putting kids in positions where we know they can't succeed?

Again, I submit the only word I can come up with is "cruel." There's a cruelty to it.

I watched as my special-education boys and girls this year, who normally do better, I watched just three-quarters of them scored at Level 1, on the average. And in some cases, 85 percent of them scored at Level 1.

None, "none," at Level 4.

I echo what's been said earlier.

My board sent a letter to a number of legislators about many of the things I'm mentioning here: about the loss of local control, about the micromanagement from Washington.

I understand enough about politics, that, you know, I understand a lot of things get tied to money.

I understand that.

But I really wonder how much authority our local school boards have retained over the course of the past few years.

A few years ago -- some of you may have known him, some in the audience may have known him -- I was at superintendents conference in the fall, and Dr. Santo Barbarino, who tragically passed away last year, stood up to address the Commissioner, and basically said:

What's the hurry?

1 Can't we pilot this? Can't we take a look at how this is best 2 3 going to work? The answer, you know, politely, was "no." 4 So here we sit today, and I have to question, 5 6 you know, is this where we want to be? 7 You know, is this the end we wanted to get to? 8 9 You know, do the means justify the end, and 10 is the end really what's best for the boys and girls in our care? 11 12 All I can do is ask you to consider my words, and the words of those that have been here. 13 14 I don't think any educator will ever tell you 15 that assessments should not be given. 16 Of course, they should be given. We have to know where our boys and girls are. We have to know 17 18 how they're progressing. 19 But, I would again just submit to you, that 20 I think we could have done this in a better way, 21 with perhaps a little bit more thought. 22 I worry when kids are constantly a number, because kids aren't a number. 23 24 You know, there's more to life than data.

Life is very complex, and there are an awful

25

lot of culture aspects that get involved.

A lot happens in a classroom that's not measurable, but, I've observed enough teaches and I've seen enough principals to know when they're connecting with kids, and when they're interested in kids.

And I have to tell you, I don't think it matters what school district in the state you go to, you're going to find those people, because they're educators, and that's what they want to do.

But I think, sadly, in many ways, we've put assessments and data ahead of the best interests of the boys and girls, again, who are in our care.

So, I thank you for this opportunity.

[Applause.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: John, I appreciate your sincerity.

I just wanted to throw out one thing in particular.

Working with my colleagues, and on a couple of the points that you raised, we have actually, genuinely, really tried.

For example, I, as representative of our conference, have been very outspoken about the transition of APPR. We fought like the dickens, but

to no avail, frankly, with the Executive, in particular, about a smoother and more timely implementation. Something like a pilot program, or a scrimmage, or a spring training; however you want to analogize it. And, we didn't have partners.

We fought like heck to get money in the budget to pay for the proper implementation of APPR.

And, while I have great respect for SED, they didn't like it, the Executive didn't like it, and,

Jack Martins, in particular, was quite vociferous on an issue like that.

And the problem was, we didn't have partners.

As it relates to computerization and PARCC testing, and what's coming, we have actually passed a bill in the Senate -- this is gonna be a big shock to some of the people in the room -- we passed a bill in the Senate. It said, if the State is going to mandate this, we have to pay for it.

And, to me, that's -- while it's separate, to some extent, we're at a fundamental crossroads in terms of the financing of education and some of the educational mandates.

And in our area, we certainly have our complications.

But in the rural parts of the state, as you

well know from your colleagues, they don't even have the bandwidth.

JOHN HOGAN: Correct.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: So, to force them to do something that they can't even do if they had the money is somewhat patently absurd.

But those are just a few quick comments.

I appreciate you being here.

And, if you want to stay and -- you know, we can give you a note for the board meeting.

JOHN HOGAN: No, I will just add, in terms of the computerized testing, how about the student -- one student takes it on a screen this big, another student takes it on a screen this big, another student [gestures with hands].

And then the district's going to be facing a phone call from a parent who's going to say, My child took it on an iPad. They really should have taken it on, you know, a 19-inch screen like the kid in the next classroom did.

So, there's -- there are all sorts of things.

It reminds me, when all of this started,

of -- I was principal at the time at

John Glenn High School, and my assistant principal

came in and he said, you know -- and you've all

225 heard this analogy before -- "You know that light at 1 the end of the tunnel?" 2 And this is, 2001, 2002, he said, "That's not 3 a light. That is a locomotive that is coming at us, 4 and it's just going to overwhelm us." 5 And he was right. 6 7 And now the question is, you know, How do you get that locomotive to slow down? 8 9 I -- you know, I hope you're successful. 10 SENATOR FLANAGAN: We are trying. 11 Thank you very much. We appreciate your time 12 again. 13 JOHN HOGAN: Thank you. 14 [Applause.] 15 SENATOR FLANAGAN: All right, 16 Claudine DiMuzio, from the Pines Elementary School 17 in the Hauppauge School District, who is a 18 principal, who is a parent, and who is a facilitator 19 for the Hauppauge Parent Advocacy, Group, or 20 Council, I'm not sure of the title. 21 But, the principal was extraordinarily 22 gracious. 23 Commissioner King had been out to Hauppauge

last week, and had a chance to see her school in full-blown operation.

24

25

226 1 I guess it was -- it really was the first day of school? 2 CLAUDINE DIMUZIO: Yes. 3 SENATOR FLANAGAN: So they treated all of us 4 5 very well. 6 So, Claudine, thank you. CLAUDINE DIMUZIO: You're welcome. 7 And thank you for attending our school. 8 9 It was a pleasure to have you, and to have 10 the Commissioner there as well. 11 We were very proud to showcase our students 12 and our programs. 13 And, we really were so grateful to receive so 14 many compliments, that we were off to a great start 15 right from the get-go. 16 I wanted to introduce myself as the principal 17 of Pines Elementary School, and also a facilitator 18 of the Hauppauge Parent Advocacy Group. I am very fortunate to have many parents in 19 20 my building who are concerned about the direction 21 that State Education has taken their education 22 reforms. 23 And I was very fortunate that they involved

me in their very early discussions about how we

could advocate for our students, because they have

24

25

very deep concerns.

So, we were able to organize as a district.

And we have also been reaching out to other districts, to start letter-writing campaigns, and to make more parents aware of what is going on in our schools, so that parents can advocate appropriately for their students and our children.

So I am here today to speak on their behalf as well.

And, also, as you said, I am also a parent of four children, all who will be involved in state testing, either now or in the future.

Our concerns are really, as you know, multifaceted.

We really have five points that we outline in our letters.

And, today, I won't read for you, word for word, but I will try to summarize where we are coming from, collectively, and not repeat too much of what has been said already.

I wanted to talk a little bit about the time spent on testing in schools.

I know that some people here today talked about the time on testing, and, we didn't hear as many specifics.

We did come up with some specifics to

Hauppauge, in our attempt to make our SLOs

meaningful for teachers, so that they could receive

some data that was also accurate about children,

but, realizing that we were doing this because we

had to fall under our APPR requirements.

We now give our students many, many tests.

And when we looked at a fifth-grade student throughout the year, we are now giving an additional 19 separate state and local APR tests.

And when we totaled the time, it was about 930 minutes of testing a year that we would not be giving our students unless we were trying to reach those APPR and state mandates.

 $\label{eq:continuous} \mbox{ If you think about how long the students sit} \\ \mbox{ for these tests } --$

I know that the gentleman from the State said, Oh, 90 minutes, and 90 minutes.

-- but I don't know if people realize that the length of the state tests that our third-graders start taking, up to our fifth-graders, and then up to eighth grade, are longer than the AP exams, the SAT exams, the ACT exams, the GRE exams, the LSAT exams, and the MCAT exams.

Only the test that accountants take, which

maybe is why my husband never became a CPA, and he's only a public accountant -- a private account, is longer than what our students sit for this year.

And, we also prepare in tests -- for tests during the school year.

As you can imagine, teachers feel a lot of pressure to prepare students for tests, and that's twofold:

We want to prepare students so that they're successful, we have an obligation;

And we also want our teachers to be successful, because they also have an obligation to their profession.

And, I know the parents that are here today, they have been so wonderful in public to speak about how our teachers are not pressuring students, or putting students in a position to feel badly about taking these tests, or to put them in situations where they feel any more stress than they need to.

But, let's face it, we're taking a lot of meaningful time away from the schoolday throughout the year to prepare for these tests.

And when the State talks about implementation, last year, it was very difficult to even find materials, forget curriculum, to prepare

students for state tests.

We were asking colleagues all over the Island, you know, What are you using? What are you using?

There weren't a lot of good resources to even prepare students for the tests.

So, people were really grappling with a lot of issues, to prepare students for the test.

But, you talk about being able to help students who are struggling, or to help enrich students, as we've always tried to do in the past, more of our time was spent preparing for tests than ever before, for those reasons.

When you think about the State's goal of twenty-first-century skills, I know that many people, such as Tony Wagner, Thomas Friedman, they talk about what students need to know in the future, and they disagree with where the State is going in having our approach be so test-driven.

The way the that tests are created, these are not the best assessments to assess what students $$\operatorname{know}.$$

They are not the type of skills that are necessarily the skills that students will need.

So there really are great concerns from

people in academia about where we are headed with these tests.

So, that is a very -- you know, a very big problem.

Then, also, the reliability of these tests.

When you look at teachers' scores, you look at principals' scores, you have experts in the field that have been warning for years about the reliability and the validity of these assessments.

And, that, is not to be taken lightly.

You talk about a teacher who is a 1 out of a 20, or an 8 out of a 20, and people aren't supposed to feel that.

Well, think about students who are receiving those scores too, and how many experts in the field are saying these tests are not reliable and accurate from year to year?

Is the State going to guarantee that these tests are true measures year after year of performance?

In the past, they always said that they weren't.

The third-grade test wasn't -- the fourth-grade test wasn't created to be a true measure of what the students then learned in between

third grade.

Now are they?

I mean, that's a very big problem.

I did submit with my testimony, some research about that, which it was created by many people in the field.

And just looking at two examples that are recent:

If you look at Florida, they've been using grades for schools for over a decade.

And they are saying that schools, where students are served with high minority or high poverty rates, those schools tend to get D's and F's in their scoring systems.

And schools where there are students who are served by higher affluent populations, those schools rarely -- schools never receive those scores.

So is it fair to rate teachers and principals for students in those communities?

And then you have D.C. Councilman Brown talking here, trying to get teachers to come to Washington, and waiving evaluation systems tied to scores.

So how can we tell teachers and principals and students in New York State that these scores are

fair, when so many other systems have seen the results of them and they're backing away from them now?

Also, when you talk about the arts, there hasn't really been a system where school districts are -- are -- have the same measures in place for music and art, so, they're grappling with those assessments.

And in many times, believe it or not, you can have a physical-education teacher being assessed on the ELA scores.

They don't teach ELA, but they had to pick something.

Or, they could be assessed on students that they don't even teach in gym, because they chose fourth-grade math scores, but they don't teach fourth-grade students.

Is that really a fair and accurate measure for teachers and students?

We're also very concerned about student privacy.

And something that people haven't spoken about here yet, is, you think about identity theft.

Will parents have to pay to protect their children's data one day?

Will grade theft become the new identity theft?

People are very concerned about other people having that information about their child.

We talked about having information about special education or family situations.

Is a child supposed to live with this data out there and have, who knows who, having access to this data over years?

It would seem to me, as a parent, very scary that this data will not be, as I did not know, controlled by someone who is elected.

I think that there are all sorts of scenarios that we can imagine that are disastrous for children.

Also thinking about the costs associated with the APPR, I believe Hauppauge is receiving a little bit less than \$20,000 for RTT money.

And, we've spent a lot of money on buying materials to prepare students, scoring students, testing students, getting locals in place...all of these things at a time when, as you know, we also are facing the tax cap.

And I believe that, Hauppauge, we've done a great job trying to keep those costs under control.

Our units have all accepted deals, and have done what they've needed to do, but, you know, let's face it, we had to spend a lot of money on APPR.

And our taxpayers, many of them, don't feel that was a good way to spend their money.

That could have went directly to children and instruction.

And, then, Common Core implementation.

Again the State talked about the insufficient materials, the curriculum that wasn't there.

It's -- I mean, it was very hard for teachers, last year, this year.

You talk about the math modules? Things are slowly coming out.

And when you tell people teachers have to teach to a test, when there really isn't a curriculum, or, you're getting the curriculum a week before you can do that module, that's not fair to teachers, it's not fair to students.

Last year, we thought about fifth-grade students.

Fifth-grade teachers had to go back and teach children fourth-grade math, third grade math, in, pretty much, the same amount time we had during the schoolday in previous years.

And our fifth-grade scores, when they came out, they were not good.

And teachers felt horrible that they had done a disservice to children because they just couldn't catch them up.

They couldn't catch them up.

And to see children struggling like that, it breaks your heart when you're at the building level.

To see teachers struggling like that, it's just demoralizing. And it just, like, it makes you wonder.

That gentleman said he's glad that his child isn't teaching in a public school.

I would probably never advocate for any of my four children to go into public education right now, because I feel that this direction is just not good for the long term.

Talk about research labs, people haven't talked about these things.

You know, Massachusetts, Finland, Ontario, they've all implemented reform models that didn't include this test-driven, heavy-handed punitive system.

Massachusetts?

New York is sitting here and saying, Oh we're

the first state to offer curriculum to go with those standards.

Massachusetts did that a long time ago, and they did it with good results, and they put money into the schools that needed it, and they also gave teachers the support that they needed.

So, it didn't have to be that way.

And, then, when you also talking about these test scores, and how important these scores are, if you read Paul Tough's research, he has spent a lot of time in Harlem, with Geoffrey Canada. He's really been in a lot of areas where people are really struggling to find ideas that are new and fresh.

And he interviews the gentleman in charge of the KIPP charter schools, and they were so proud that they were graduating students with very high standardized test scores.

And then they were finding out that they were barely graduating college. They were having very few children graduate college.

If you go to page 52 in this book, it outlines how KIPP, even after those very high standardized test scores, we did a lot of what they do to include social-emotional learning, character

education; teaching children the other facets of life, because, just thinking about math and reading and test scores was not producing the citizen that they thought that they were producing in the long term.

So, today, you know, I put my questions for you to think about in my testimony.

And I think that -- you know, I know that you come to our school. I think that you think that we have a great school.

I know we have a great school.

And, I think that the State Education

Department needs to include educators in the conversation, because these pieces are really important, and it's affecting children right now.

"Right now."

[Applause.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Claudine, thanks a lot.

And I'll just tell you, quickly, as a living example of the quality of education, I've been over there in the last couple of years. They have student-government elections, and it's great, because they have -- for the different grades, and all of the kids get up, and they have to give a speech.

Some of it's hysterical. You know, some of the kids get upset.

But, it's -- it really is a lot of fun to watch. And that's educational in its own right.

But thank you again, and appreciate your patience, and being here and waiting.

And, we're good, so you're free --

CLAUDINE DIMUZIO: Thank you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- for now.

And, now we have -- she was here first, and she has been extraordinarily patient,

Michelle Marino, who is the principal in Southdown Primary in the Huntington School District;

And, John Nocero, who has -- and he's been around a long time, a story career in the local area, with the Council of Administrators & Supervisors.

And we appreciate both of you being here.

And, in deference to the lady, ladies first.

Michelle.

MICHELLE MARINO: Thank you.

It was an honor to have been asked to be here, and I do appreciate being asked, and I'm looking forward to giving you my impressions of how it went last year, my concerns, and maybe some

advice as well.

I've been in education for over 30 years, and I've seen many, many changes.

And I would like to ask you to perform some mental imagery with me right now, if you wouldn't mind.

So, pretend that you are flying a plane and you're in midair, but, the engineer is still creating the plans, and the mechanics are still tweaking the engine, and you're still learning the dashboard and how to land this plane; but, yet, you have, 30, or 400, students behind you.

That's pretty much what happened this year with our rush to the Common Core and the state assessments: we were building the plane as we were flying it.

Rushed implementation: I don't understand why we were the only state that decided to implement the assessments the very same year that we implemented the Common Core curriculum.

It was unfair to teachers, and it was unfair to students.

To place a test in front of students whom have not been comprehensively taught these skills that they'll be tested, was a tragedy.

And our test results showed that as well.

As a district, we spent a tremendous amount of time and energy, and, to help our teachers to embrace the Common Core standards and the modulars, with professional developments, with learning opportunities for them.

We have an amazing website, and our superintendent of schools and board of education have done a magnificent job of informing parents of the Common Core, and what the standards are, with many, many presentations.

But the reality is, that there was no time.

Teachers were not allowed the time to learn the curriculum, to embrace it, and then to figure out a way to help their students become engaged in that curriculum in a meaningful way.

It was not just a matter of opening your textbooks, "Let's learn it, let's do it."

You know that the single most variable in student success is that connection that a student has with their teacher and the learning.

And that was something that I really think was pushed to the side in this implementation.

Okay, I'm just going to rush -- go through my points. I don't want to regurgitate a lot of things

that have already been said.

There is a danger in relying on testing as a single indicator of student success and teacher effectiveness.

There is a tremendous amount of research that cites multiple measures as being a better indicator.

Our board of education, this last summer, passed a resolution, calling upon the federal government to reduce testing mandates, and support the role of focus on multiple measures on student learning and student quality of accountability systems.

When you're spending the kind of testing that we are doing with our children, we are eroding the educational system.

I overheard one of our teachers say that she felt as though New York State has hijacked teaching and education.

And that really is a common thought among the teachers; that, they are not given the time to develop the curriculum to help their students learn.

We are now in a very difficult place, in that, our -- well, our APPR scores have already come out, and my teachers already know where they scored last year.

And, of course, a lot of that was the 20 percent and 20 percent, which was a very difficult pill to swallow.

And now the parents are going to be in the same place very soon.

This is going to be difficult for them to understand, that this was truly not a student problem. This was not that students learn less and teachers taught less.

This was a test problem.

This was a calculated effort to move the bar, and we knew in advance that our students were going to drop.

And although our parents -- many of my parents were prepared, because I spoke of this many, many times.

And our teachers were prepared. They also knew the reality of, when that score came out and they saw the scores of their students.

It was heartbreaking.

"It was heartbreaking."

We spend a lot of time with our students, trying to help them develop a positive-growth mindset.

I'm not sure if you know the work of

Dr. Carol Dweck, but it's very powerful.

Basically, what it is, is that some students, and many adults, think of themselves as being art-smarts, or, I'm not good at math.

That's called a "fixed mindset."

That's, "No matter how hard I work, or no matter what I do, I'm just not good at it, and I'm not going to get any better at it."

That's a "fixed mindset."

And it's very dangerous for children, and it's dangerous for adults.

We spend a lot of times with our students, trying to help them to realize that it's a positive mind growth. It's something that you can change. If you're not doing something well, we have to try to figure out what it is that you need to work a little harder on, and that we'll continue to move forward.

So our students were very involved in the assessments; the ongoing multiple assessments that we use throughout the year; for example, the math sprints.

Math sprints are trying to help our students develop fluency, which is one of the shifts for mathematics.

We wanted our students to learn those math facts quicker and quicker, so that when they were presented with a math problem that involved a lot more than just calculation. They had to figure out what did they know about this problem, to be able to move forward with an unknown.

They tracked those math sprints.

And students looked at those scores, with the teachers, and said, You know, you did really well here. Look at your score this week compared to last week. Or, today versus yesterday.

So students were invested in making those strides forward.

They are now going to get this, kind of, badge of failure.

And it's going to be very difficult, on my end, to try to help them to promote that positive growth. To let them know that this was not about, what do they know?

This is truly about setting the bar -resetting the bar, and we're going to move forward.

It's going to be a very, very hard task ahead.

Lastly, I am very afraid that the assessments are going to widen the gap for the English-language learners and the students with disabilities.

Again, it's the multiple measures that are going to count there, because, if we look strictly at the absolute performance, those students are going to be in danger. And that's what my fear is.

So, it was a very interesting year.

I look forward to having more modulars to work with my students and my teachers.

Again, they were not there for us.

Last year, we started in September with not one math modular to even look at, and they trickled out through the year.

That is a very uncomfortable place for me, and for my teachers, when they have to turnkey that learning into meaningful and engaging teaching.

So, I appreciate being here.

Thank you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Michelle, I appreciate that.

[Applause.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: And we'll have John, but I just wanted to add, I think, one of the unique aspects of Huntington School District, which I knew when I represented it, was the diversity of the population.

You have some of the wealthiest people in the

country, and some of the poorest people in the 1 2 country as well. CLAUDINE DIMUZIO: And some of the greatest 3 children in the country. 4 5 Just to say. 6 [Applause.] 7 SENATOR FLANAGAN: That's true. That is true. 8 9 But just the diversity of languages, it 10 was --11 CLAUDINE DIMUZIO: Yes, yes. 12 SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- I always found to be 13 quite illustrative of diversity. 14 So, John. 15 And it's 37 years; right? 16 JOHN NOCERO: Yes, it is. 17 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay. JOHN NOCERO: Good afternoon. 18 19 My name is John Nocero. I'm representing 20 today the Council of Administrators & Supervisors of Nassau and Suffolk county. 21 We represent over 1300 school administrators 22 23 in Nassau and Suffolk county. 24 My own personal experience: I was a teacher 25 and school administrator in the Smithtown Central

School District for 37 years.

And I had the pleasure of retiring this summer.

With that pleasure goes the responsibility to share my experiences, and what I have seen change over those many years as an administrator.

And I would like to share with you today a lot of the comments, concerns, that we have heard from our council members.

My joy as the school principal, was arriving to school early each day, seeing the students come off the buses, see them go to their classes, smiles on their face, greet them in the hallways; walk into classes, see exceptional teaching taking place; meet the students in the cafeteria; stay after school and see a sports program, a concert, a drama production.

Well, that is changing, and changing quickly.

As the reasons we've heard today, and the many reasons that have been cited, there's no more joy in our schools.

I'm sad that I'm not a principal anymore because I would enjoy facing that challenge, but, our current administrators are facing tremendous challenges with the students.

We do not disagree with the fact that we need

higher learning standards, we need to better prepare our students, that we need to implement twenty-first-century learning skills to prepare our students.

We don't agree with the need for testing or assessment.

We do disagree with the way this has been implemented, and we've heard this over and over today.

We've heard the statement that we're flying the plane --

You stole my line.

That's the joy of going last in a program.

-- before it's been assembled.

And I think, you know, we certainly have heard that and seen that today.

Dr. King had stated that, you know, we must act now, and we must implement this testing now, for the benefit of our students.

And I will disagree, on behalf of our members today, saying that the way we're implementing it is incorrect, inappropriate, and, in fact, it will hurt our children in the long run.

We're forgetting one fact here, ladies and gentlemen, today, that we're in this business for

children; for what's best for children.

And I don't think there would be one administrator in our council that would disagree with the fact that we need to make some changes, but as I said, it's the way we're doing it.

So I will quickly summarize my testimony, which you have in front of you.

Most of this we have heard today. This is the joy of going last on a program.

We are concerned, number one, with the implementation of the new standards, and the way that it's been rushed and pushed ahead without teacher preparation.

We've heard today the fact that eighth-grade students are taking an assessment that they have not been prepared for in alignment with Common Core.

Wouldn't it make more sense to phase this in in a more rational, prepared way so we don't hurt our students and put them in undue stress?

We need a bottom-to-top overhaul, but it's the way we're doing it that's an issue.

The questions on the assessments are often ambiguous. They were designed for students to fail.

 $\label{eq:weighted} \mbox{We were told that before the students even} \\ \mbox{took the assessment.}$

I don't understand what kind of good educational practice that is, when we tell students "you're going to fail" before they take the test.

We have neglected, and we've heard this also today, the developmental stages of children.

Their brains at a young age, as you quoted, "Mesopotamia," are a very concrete way of thinking.

And as children develop, and if we understand child development, we know that their thinking becomes more abstract as they get to middle school, and go to high school.

This has been neglected with the test questions.

We're concerned about the time allocated for the testing.

We've heard over and over, the amount of time, the number of tests that students are taking.

And here's one other fact that wasn't brought up today:

Many of our special-needs students have IEP's that allow them extended time.

So when we're saying 90 minutes of testing a day, some of those students will get time-and-a-half.

That is excessive for any student.

And when you look at children as young as 8 or 9 years old, that is indeed cruel to do to them.

One of the concerns I had last year was,

I believe it was the seventh- and eighth-grade ELA
assessment, there was of the same question on each
assessment. And we were told that one of those
questions was a field-test embedded question.

Well, what about the student who cannot answer that question, their self-esteem, their confidence in continuing on that assessment?

And then, my school, Accompsett Middle School in Smithtown, was required to administer, in any case, a field test, in addition to the field-test embedded questions.

We're concerned about, what are we going to do with the remediation in an era of 2 percent tax cap?

You know, and it seems to me that it's a contradiction, and a disservice to our students, for us to say: 70 percent of you need remediation; yet, what we're going to do is, we're going to give you a waiver this year. You really don't need it. We're going to take a look at that comparable rigor chart, and we're going to say, You don't need it this year.

Isn't that talking out of two sides of our mouth?

If we're saying these students need the help, then let's give them the help, and give us the resources to help them.

The 2 percent tax cap, we've heard many districts, the challenge with that, and how they're addressing it, and we're all abiding by that. But, with these additional staffing needs for remediation, I don't know how we get around that.

We're concerned about the lack of availability of the previous tests, and how our teachers, students, parents, administrators, can learn from that.

We're concerned about teaching to the test, as we have heard.

I have to say, I was a music teacher in the Smithtown School District for over 20 years before I became a school administrator.

I saw the joy students had from performing music.

I saw the connection we can make with students when we give them an opportunity to excel at something that love, and want to come to school, as Regent Tilles had indicated earlier.

I saw that firsthand.

And I saw many students who would not have been successful in school, become successful, because the opportunities we provided them through the arts, through the humanities, that, today, we are reducing, because we say: You have to go to AIS for remediation. We don't have the money for a music program. We're discouraging creativity.

The high-poverty districts, low-income districts, we've spoken about.

What about the student that comes to school hungry, that comes from substandard housing, who have a family that is not intact and not a nuclear family; what are we doing as a society to help those students?

The testing results used to score:

I have to say, I was fortunate to be the principal of Accompsett Middle School from 2004 until my retirement.

Senator Flanagan, you helped us open the school back in 2004, and it was a day of excitement.

Our teaching staff has come together in a very unique way, and they have become so child-oriented, child-centered, and caring about what's best for kids, delivering, not only academic

programs, but social-emotional programs.

This new system is throwing that into chaos.

Our teachers have become demoralized.

From what I understand, the start of the school year is presenting many new challenges.

And it really is unfortunate for those that put their love and heart on the line to help children, that, now, scores are being used to deem them ineffective.

What about the measurements of the qualities teachers bring to a classroom: teaching character development, teaching how to be good citizens in this country of ours?

Where does that come into play?

Or, is the score merely what we're going to account?

And, of course, you know, we've spoken about the over-testing today.

And my perspective on that is, yes, it's taken an emotional toll on the students. It's put unwanted stress and anxiety, as we have heard.

Our teachers are becoming demoralized.

And, I'm sure there are many people questioning why they should go into such a field.

Our parents, as we have heard, and I've seen

this and heard this from my own PTA organization, are very concerned, and are beginning to opt out.

Our school administrators, who I represent

today, have become frustrated.

We have spent excessive amount of times in training for the APPR, for the different character programs that we need to put into our schools.

The days of testing, where we're pulled out of the building, last year, I believe, I had, probably, about 10 training sessions, out of the building, during the schoolday.

And in addition to that now, we as school principals have the additional responsibility to evaluate each and every teacher, in depth.

And that is not just so simple, ladies and gentlemen, as to walk into a classroom and to observe the teacher, and score something;

It takes a pre-conference meeting with the teacher;

It takes the observation itself;

It takes reflection on my part and the teacher's part;

A-post conference meeting;

And then a follow-up observation.

When you have a high school of 150 students,

or, a middle school like mine, with teachers -- with approximately 80 teachers, how do you do that several times during the school year; yet, be hands-on with your parents, your teachers be an instructional leader that you need to be?

So I'll sum up my comments, and you can read the rest of my testimony then.

We do have a wonderful opportunity to implement higher standards if it's done in the right way.

I hope that the State Education Department is listening to us today; listening to the testimony we have heard through these many hours that we have sat here, and I do hope that they consider making some changes.

We're not looking to eliminate the rigor and the higher standards, but it's how we're going about this process that we need to take a close look at, the best impact, the students of New York State.

I thank you today, Senators, for the time, and the opportunity to speak.

[Applause.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Michelle and John, thank
you again for your patience, and for all the work
that you do.

And, that word "retiree," people like you
don't retire, John.

JOHN NOCERO: I can sit here all day. I have

 $\,$ JOHN NOCERO: I can sit here all day. I have nowhere to go.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: John Hogan may need help at his board meeting tonight, so...

All right, we have two more, and I appreciate everyone's courtesies.

We have Professor Arnold Dodge, who is the chairperson of the Department of Educational Leadership and Administration at CW Post, LIU.

Professor Dodge, I know you are keenly aware, and I see that you have some very interesting testimony here, and your ability to summarize that will be greatly appreciated.

PROFESSOR ARNOLD DODGE: Absolutely.

Well, I have actually switched my notes six times, because everything's already been said, so, I'm going to be saying, hopefully -- hopefully, I will not repeat what's already been said.

First of all, I am of the ivory-tower crowd

for about six or seven years, but before that, I was a teacher and a principal and a superintendent of schools for 38 years, so, I come with a great deal of observation of the public schools in New York.

And the last six or seven years, I've had the opportunity to travel around the world, and see schools around the world, and around the country.

And, as bad as things that you've heard today are, from the witnesses' standpoint, they're worse than that in New York State.

It is my contention that New York State is maybe doing the worse job of all of the venues that I've seen around the world.

[Applause.]

PROFESSOR ARNOLD DODGE: And this very painful.

I went to school in New York, not only public school, but I went to college in New York. I'm a graduate of my current university.

And, I take this very seriously.

And I, quite frankly, think what's going on in New York is shameful.

I have never seen a group of policymakers so out of touch with the reality of what children's needs are, and I know this has been said in so many

ways today.

So, I took it upon myself with, actually, a delegation of other colleagues, to travel around to different parts of the world.

And I actually have a project going on regularly in South Africa, where we deal with issues of poverty and schools. And we have a very interesting relationship with schools in New York and schools in South Africa.

But, I want to focus on the two other places that I've been recently, and one of them was China.

And we visited ministers in China, and we visited, everybody, from students to teachers; we were rural communities, we were in Shanghai, we were in Beijing; because I wanted to know, What's the deal here?

How competitive are these Chinese people going to be in terms of their education?

And let me tell you something, almost to a person, and I'm talking about, from the ministers, down to the children, they said: You know what our problem is? We're too competitive. We've got to have kids ease up. We got to get kids to say, You know what? Enough already, with all these tests.

They take this major test that is the

be-all-and-end-all of whether they're going to get into a university, and everything else is put aside while they're taking this test.

And the kids go crazy.

Literally, some of them go crazy.

And the parents in the largest country in the world have said, Enough already.

And the ministers have said, Enough already.

And what is so ironic, is that New York State says, No, we're going to double-down and make it even more difficult, more pressure.

And I've heard Bill Gates in person, say,
I've been to Shanghai, and it troubles me that we
don't do as well as Shanghai.

Well, I've been to Shanghai, and Shanghai is like Beverly Hills on the water.

So, you can't compare the very rich portions of some countries to a 300-million heterogeneously-populated United States.

So there's all kinds of mythologies about this issue.

And in my testimony that I gave you, there's a wonderful article from last week's "Times," in which they talk about the fact that the Chinese kids are now saying, All we do is memorize. And we

understand, in America, they actually have science equipment. We like that.

So instead of us doubling-down on our science equipment and STEM, we say, No, we need more tests with bubble sheets.

The stupidity of it, we are awash in stupidity.

And it is so galling to me, as someone who cares so much about, and my colleagues as well, to hear this kind of stuff going on;

And to have our chancellors say, We should be in the deep end, and have, you know, the image of kids flopping around.

And someone mentioned earlier, and they drown in the deep end.

Well, you know, if there has to be casualties, there has to be casualties.

And then you got a governor who says, You know, for failing schools, we might need the death penalty.

It's this kind rhetoric and this kind of imagery that is the opposite of everything I signed up for when I got into this profession, which was the nurturance and the developmental needs of children.

And they are all being ignored, to the -- and we can't even tell how bad this is yet.

Because I think, as some people have said today: You're only 8 years old, once. You've only got an 8-year-old psyche, once.

If you damage that psyche, I don't know if you ever repair it, because you are so vulnerable and fragile.

We are damaging these kids' self-esteem right now with this program.

Even Daniel Koretz, who was a supporter, and consultant from the State Education Department, just recently in an interview said, I don't know what New York State's doing.

I'm paraphrasing.

He said, Because we don't even know what college- and career-ready even means.

I was -- had the opportunity three months ago to be in California, where Secretary Duncan was speaking.

And he laid out a speech to education researchers about how, Enough already with the pressures. We have too many multiple-choice tests. I hate to hear to hear kids say their numbers.

Well, they made a mistake, and they gave me

the microphone.

2 [Laughter.]

PROFESSOR ARNOLD DODGE: And I asked him if he had even read his own law.

I said:

Do you understand, you can't talk out of both sides of your mouth and not think smart people are going to not get it?

Okay?

Because, you are screwing us up. You're suffocating the kids with this.

And if you don't stop, we're gonna have no innovation, no imagination, no creativity, and your idea that we're going to be more competitive in the world is gonna be a laughing stock of the rest of the world.

So I ask you, Mr. Secretary will you call a moratorium?

He said, "I'll get back to you."

So I'm still waiting.

But I think speaking truth to power now, and I've said this for the last number of years, we as educators have to do that.

That's why I was so delighted that you invited me to speak today.

And I've seen you at meetings before, and you're an excellent listener.

For five hours, you've been listening attentively. And I knew -- and this gentleman as well.

And I knew, even if I were one of the last ones, you'd still pay some attention.

So, I appreciate this.

I'm going to tell you, this is an emergency.

We can't wait any longer.

We can't have this debate.

I said in 2001, when I saw NCLB, I was at a big meeting, I said, "This thing is not going to work."

And somebody said, "Oh, sit down. You know how these things come and go."

Well, you know what? Ten years later, Race To The Top is NCLB on steroids.

And what is the next version going to be?

What is the next President going to come in

with, or the next Secretary of Education, and say:

We're going to do it. You know what? There's a

little too much oxygen in the room for other things.

Let's completely take all the oxygen out of the room and make it only about tests.

We are losing our kids. 1 We are losing our kids to this debacle. 2 And somebody, responsible adults, like 3 yourselves, have to step up and say "No." 4 5 [Applause.] PROFESSOR ARNOLD DODGE: Politics aside, 6 7 individual interests aside, we must say no to this, because it is damaging our children. 8 9 Thank you. 10 [Applause.] 11 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Professor, I have one 12 question based on what you said. How do you define "college- and 13 14 career-ready"? 15 You're in college now. 16 PROFESSOR ARNOLD DODGE: Daniel Koretz 17 actually started -- starts the conversation, which we should be having, which is, for some kids, it 18 means a certain kind of college. For other kids, it 19 20 means a certain kind of career. 21 Do you know, in Finland, 45 percent of the 22 kids in tenth grade go to vocational school. Almost 23 half the population. 24 They say, We're gonna start thinking about

25

careers now.

I think we've got the whole thing backwards. 1 We like these slogans, but do we really even 2 know what we mean when we say "college- and 3 career-ready"? 4 5 I defy anybody to take a 7- or 8-year-old and 6 tell me what 10 and 15 years from now, a "collegeand career-readiness" would even mean, given the 7 technology we have, given the changes that we have. 8 9 [Applause.] 10 PROFESSOR ARNOLD DODGE: We are fooling ourselves if we think we can do that with a 7- and 11 8-year-old. 12 13 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay. 14 Thank you very much. 15 [Applause.] 16 PROFESSOR ARNOLD DODGE: Thank you. 17 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, so, Professor Dodge certainly doesn't lack for passion, which is good. 18 19 UNKNOWN FEMALE SPEAKER: [Inaudible.] 20 [Laughter.] 21 SENATOR FLANAGAN: And last, but certainly by 22 no means least, I have had a couple of nice 23 conversations with Lisa Rudley, who is from the Autism Action Network. 24

She's actually -- well, she's like a lot of

25

people here. She's involved in about 89 different 1 things, but, she is kind enough to come down today, 2 and will be focusing her comments on privacy. 3 But, Lisa, thank you for your patience. 4 LISA RUDLEY: Thank you so much. 5 And it's an honor to be here, and I'm very 6 7 appreciative that you asked me to speak. 8 Yes, I'm involved in many different 9 organizations. 10 I'm here representing Autism Action Network. 11 We all know that there is about 12 1 in 50 children now diagnosed with autism. 13 It's an epidemic. 14 We've been working a lot in the state to 15 protect the rights of people with autism. 16 I also am here representing the newly formed 17 New York State Allies for Public Education Organization, where my wonderful friend and 18 19 colleague Jeanette is part of. 20 It's a centralized group that represents over 21 40 allies across the state, and growing. We -- the last count we had was about 22 23 60,000 hits to our Facebook. 24 And that's a number -- that's a force to be

25

reckoned with.

And, I think, about 59,000 come from 1 2 Long Island, but, uhm... 3 [Laughter.] LISA RUDLEY: You know, I woke up today, and 4 I went and got the -- our local newspaper, the 5 6 "Journal News," and it says, "We must not become a 'collect it all' society." 7 And today happens to be Constitution Day. 8 9 In 1787, our framers signed the Constitution. 10 And, I'll read one excerpt. 11 "The Constitution, the Fourth Amendment, 12 protects the right of the people to be secure in 13 their persons, houses, papers, and effects, except 14 when the government obtains a warrant based on a 15 probable cause." 16 Today I'm here to speak about privacy of our 17 children's personally identifiable data. And I think we touched on that a lot towards 18 19 the end of this hearing. 20 And, everybody's asking the question, Why did 21 we rush the Common Core? 22 And why do we rush the assessments for the Common Core? 23 24 It took me about five hours, and I wasn't

quite -- you know, I was thinking, Well, should

25

I mention this?

And it became very clear, we rushed this, because it's a data point.

It's a data point that they want collected in this huge database cloud that is hosted by Amazon.com. And the name of the database is called "inBloom."

And I think it's really important that people understand that, "FERPA," the Family Education Rights and Protection Act, was expanded unilaterally by our Secretary -- our United States Secretary Arnie Duncan, unilaterally, without Congressional approval, to expand, to allow, third-party vendors to be authorized representatives.

And what that did is, that opened the door to these contracts throughout the country, eight of which have -- essentially, eight states, essentially, have pulled out of the inBloom contract.

Two of those states are on the -- one of those states are on the fence. That's Massachusetts;

And the other two have -- one district or two districts are straggling.

New York State is the only state that is

still standing alone in giving our personally identifiable data, New York State, to this inBloom database.

So you have to ask yourselves, well, of course they rushed those assessments. I mean, they need a data point.

And, you know, quite frankly, I wrote the State -- I wrote New York -- EngageNY Help Desk, because I said, "How do I opt out my children from their personally identifiable data being shared?"

And they said to me -- well, the

Problem Request was, "Ms. Rudley would like to know
how to opt out uploading of her three children's
information to inBloom, and if all schools are
required to use inBloom?"

It's funny, I was on the phone with State Ed, and I said, you know, "How do I opt out my children?"

And they said, "You have to e-mail EngageNY."

The answer I got back is, "Yes, every school is required to upload student data into inBloom.

"You should contact your" -- I'll paraphrase.

You should your child's school district to inquire about their policies.

Well, gentlemen, Dr. Rogers just said that

1 the data is controlled by the State, not by the 2 districts. The ambiguity around who is responsible for 3 our student data is really concerning. 4 And I think it's important to note, some of 5 6 the items, the attributes, that were created. 7 And before I do that, there's a great comment from this commentary in our "Journal News." 8 It says, "Just because we've built the 9 10 technology doesn't mean we have to populate it." 11 Some of the attributes makes my hair curl, 12 but, I -- curl even more. 13 "Discipline Information," it's a category. 14 The data that would be uploaded: 15 Student Violation: Victim. Witness. Ιf 16 you're a reporter. 17 The Academic and Disability information: 18 Learning-disability type. Class-tracking grouping. 19 Career-path type. 20 Which, FERPA has said is unconstitutional, 21 and it is not legal to upload this information. 22 And even more disturbing, even the 23 long-outdated and stigmatizing references to "mental retardation." 24

That is an attribute in the database.

25

1 2 3 Parent and personal work e-mails. 4 Why do we even need to collect this data? 5 6 7 violation. 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 create this database. 17 Why is New York standing alone? 18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Parental Home Information: If there's a single parent at home. A military parent. A pregnant teen mother. A displaced homemaker.

You can talk about encryption, security; you can talk about all of that, but it's a civil-rights

It's the -- without parental consent, to have this data uploaded, and this issue hasn't been talked about very -- hasn't been talked about, until recently, because we didn't know what was happening.

So, Race To The Top funds were attributed, and states were told that if they take the Race To The Top funds, they also had to be mandated to

So, it's been a long day for everybody.

And as -- under my name, the topic was "Special Education."

And Regent Tilles spoke about his daughter, and it being developmentally-inappropriate.

And there are many, many children who have special needs, and are classified for special education, who are sitting for these excessive

tests.

And no amount of extra modifications is going to make these tests any more appropriate, developmentally, in any which way or form.

And I conclude with this:

Last spring, the Assembly passed two bills unanimously, bipartisan support, to protect students' data.

One of the bills is to allow you to opt out, and the other one is for parental consent.

And just recently, as of Friday, I found out that the Senate, two people on the Education Committee, Senator Jack Martins and Senator Joseph Robach, have also introduced same-as bills.

So what I come here today, is to ask the Senate to, of course, please move that forward, those two bills in the Senate, and see to it that it's passed through the Legislature, and, hopefully, signed into law.

But the real -- the real ask here is, we should be removing and pulling out of this contract.

It's not necessary to have this data.

The outcomes -- for students to have better outcomes with the data is not connected to

personally identifiable data.

And I ask you, the Senate, to carry this forward, Senators from the Education Committee.

And, I really appreciate being here today.

And, thank you.

[Applause.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Lisa, I know the hour is late, and I try very hard not to speak for my colleagues. I have enough challenge doing it for myself.

But, Senator Zeldin chairs the

Consumer Protection Committee, and, identify theft,
and issues in that area of the law, he takes very
seriously.

I must say, following up on some of the things that Tom Rogers said, this one, to me, is a -- it's simple in a way, but it's vexing and frustrating at the same time, because there are a lot of moving parts.

And I recognize the basic need for appropriate data that ties into things that enables you to get State aid, that enables you to get federal aid.

 $\label{eq:AndI} \mbox{ And I want to ask you a couple of quick} \\ \mbox{things.}$

I'm leaving aside perspective right now, but, FERPA, as many of the things we talked about today, NCLB, all that kind of stuff, emanates from the federal government.

I haven't seen this, so I'm asking you in earnest, are you aware of any pattern of violations that exist right now?

Because, when I do think about it, and Dr. Rogers talked about this, you know, if you have one central repository, that's perilous, and, it may be efficient as well.

Because, I look and think, there are real -no real safeguards or protocols for the school
districts who now may be trying to do the right
thing, but may not, by default, if nothing else.

Are you aware of any egregious violations that we should be aware of?

Because I haven't seen anything like that.

LISA RUDLEY: Well, this database doesn't exist with this personally identifiable data.

So, in terms of talking about student data today that's personally -- again, personally identifiable and sensitive data, it does not exist today.

However, there have been breaches.

If you just Google "security breaches and student data," you'll find that there are breaches in many different facets in higher education, mainly.

So the issue is -- for me, is, one, why are we even collecting this sensitive data?

Two is, absolutely, there's been breaches in security. I mean, it's been publicly documented.

Living Social, a discount company, there's an Amazon -- the Amazon cloud that it exists on, was breached, and all these consumers' information was available to the public.

I think, in Virginia, there was a mistake in the database, and all the mailing labels had the students' social security numbers on it.

It's about the sensitive data.

I understand, and I appreciate, that we need to share the data with the busing companies.

I understand we need to share the data for scheduling.

But why does someone need to know if -- what someone's career path is when they're in third grade or fourth grade or fifth grade?

Why do they need to know if my child is diagnosed with autism? Or has mental retardation?

Here's a great example, or, you know, 1 2 something we can play out. 3 My son is very close to being declassified right now. 4 5 6 7 8 9 we don't think you can get the job. 10 11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

his choice.

And, what if, down the road, this identifiable data, he goes for an opportunity and they say, Well, you know, Max you had autism, you know, you were classified for autism, so, you know,

And if everything else is in place, because that piece of data, that he -- he can choose to tell that company he had autism, or has autism, but it's

And it's my choice as a parent to protect my children's data.

And without my consent, this data should not be shared, this sensitive data.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, let me -- I just want to refocus for a second.

Since you have a burning interest in this area, that's one of the main reasons I'm asking.

Now, you talked about Amazon.com.

I'm focusing with a laser-like attention on schools.

And if you have it, please share it with us.

Can you share with us any data that demonstrates there have been problems with the inappropriate release of data involving schools and students?

And I'm going to throw in one fact, the fact as I know it.

State Education Department represents, frankly, in adamant capacity, that they do not collect social security numbers of students.

So, in one respect, I have to take that at face value.

But if you have anecdotal evidence, or you have statistics, it would be useful for us to know that.

Because, again, I recognize the need for some of this, but like many other things in life, it's a balance.

I have three kids, they're a little older. You know, I don't want their data shared.

And I don't -- frankly, I don't want my own data shared.

So, your assistance in that regard would be very helpful.

And I do appreciate you traveling down, and I'm sure we will talk again.

LISA RUDLEY: Great. 1 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much. 2 LISA RUDLEY: Thank you. 3 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, quick recap: 4 You're like the strong and the faithful here. 5 It's -- we started at twenty after ten. We 6 had it scheduled for four hours. We ran over for 7 8 one hour. 9 I appreciate everybody listening, 10 I appreciate everyone's attention. 11 I'll reiterate that, all the testimony was put online last night. 12 13 All the written e-mails that we had received, 14 and will receive, we will put up for people's 15 edification. 16 We made it clear to anyone who submitted, 17 that they have to have an expectation that we would put it out there. 18 19 We don't have --20 Lisa, you'll be happy to know about this. 21 It's only a name. 22 So if it's "John Flanagan," all it says is, 23 "John F." 24 There's no e-mails, no phone numbers, or 25 anything like that.

We will have three more hearings.

And, we are having people asking us to do at least one more.

So, the timing, again, they're every other week. That gives everyone a little breathing room.

And, the goal here, is to provide information -- to seek input, to get that input, and to provide information to the Governor's Office, to the State Education Department, to the Regents, and certainly to my colleagues.

And, I would be remiss if I didn't -- well, since you served, I may be taking a liberty here -- I want to thank my wingman for staying with us all day.

[Applause.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank God he's got those two school-aged daughters. That's how we kept him here for five hours.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: So, ladies and gentlemen, thank you again.

(Whereupon, at approximately 3:13 p.m., the public hearing held before the New York State Senate Standing Committee on Education concluded, and adjourned.)