1	BEFORE THE NEW YORK STATE SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
2	
3	PUBLIC HEARING
4	THE REGENTS REFORM AGENDA: "ASSESSING" OUR PROGRESS
5	
6	
7	Syracuse City Hall
8	Common Council Chambers, 3rd Floor 233 Washington Street Syracuse, New York 13202
9	
10	October 1, 2013 11:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m.
11	
12	
13	PRESIDING:
14	Senator John J. Flanagan Chair
15	Cliair
16	SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT:
17	Senator John A. DeFrancisco
18	Senator Elizabeth Little
19	Senator Thomas F. O'Mara
20	Senator James L. Seward
21	Senator Cecilia Tkaczyk
22	Senator David Valesky
23	
24	
25	

1	SPEAKERS:	PAGE	OHECTIONS
2			QUESTIONS
3	John King Commissioner	9	24
4	New York State Education Department		
	Anthony S. Bottar, B.A., J.D.	9	24
5	Vice Chancellor New York State Board of Regents		
6	Rick Longhurst	72	77
7	Executive Administrator	7 2	, ,
8	PTA/Advocate		
9	Aimee Rogstad Guidera Executive Director	82	98
10	Data Quality Campaign		
	Reginal J. Leichty	82	98
11	Attorney/Partner EducationCounsel, LLC		
12	Kevin Ahern	107	121
13	President	107	121
14	Syracuse Teachers Association		
15	Stephen Allinger Director of Legislation	107	121
	New York State United Teachers		
16	Corliss Kaiser	145	157
17	Superintendent Fayetteville-Manlius School District		
18			
19	Diana Bowers Superintendent	145	157
20	Hamilton Central School District		
	David Syracuse	174	188
21	Science Teacher Tompkins-Seneca-Tioga BOCES		
22			
23			
24			
25			

1	SPEAKERS (Continued):	PAGE	QUESTIONS	
2				
3	Sharon Contreras Superintendent Syracuse City School District	204	214	
4	-	224	0.1.4	
5	Jennifer Pyle Deputy Director Conference of Big 5 School Districts	204	214	
6	<del>-</del>	220	245	
7	Michael Cohen President Achieve	228	245	
8	James Viola	249	260	
9	Director of Government Relations School Administrators Association of NY	249	200	
10	Paul Gasparini	249	260	
11	Principal Jamesville-Dewitt High School	217	200	
12	_	249	260	
13	Timothy Heller Principal Groton Elementary School	249	260	
14		0.10	0.50	
15	Russell Kissinger Principal Mount Markham High School	249	260	
16	<del>-</del>	0.40	0.50	
17	Maureen Patterson Assistant Superintendent Instruction - K-12	249	260	
18	Liverpool School District			
19	David Little Governmental Relations	282	292	
20	New York State School Boards			
21	Bill Phillips President	293	306	
22	Northeast Charter Schools Association			
23	Anthony Brindisi Legislative Member	312	315	
24	New York State Assembly			
25	00			

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Good morning. 1 2 Good morning. 3 (Audience says "Good morning.") SENATOR FLANAGAN: Good morning. 4 5 All right. 6 Welcome to everyone. 7 I said to Senator Valesky, I'm totally 8 unaccustomed to being -- I think I'm on a perch 9 here. 10 But, it's very nice to be here, and this is 11 my first time in this building, having been to Syracuse a number of times, but I feel like --12 13 I almost feel like I'm in church, with the way the 14 pews are setup. 15 So, I know Commissioner King is behaving already, so we look forward to hearing his 16 17 testimony. 18 But, let me start by welcoming everybody. 19 And there is a -- there's a lady outside. 20 Actually, I don't know her last name, but I do know her first name, and it's Carmelita. 21 22 Carmelita has been extraordinarily helpful in 23 putting everything together for us to be here today. 24 And for anyone who does these types of 25 events, including all my colleagues, you know that

these things don't happen without the support and help of a lot of people; our media services people.

A lot of planning goes into these things, and we are very happy that all of you are here today.

And I want to explain a couple of different things, introduce my colleagues, and then get started, and I apologize for the delay.

We are scheduled to be here from 11:00 to 3:00.

We had our first hearing on Long Island, and that was scheduled from 10:00 to 2:00.

We started at 10:20, we got out at 3:20, so, we ran an hour over, but I think, on the whole, we had a very good reception.

We had excellent testimony from a lot of different people, including State Education Department, who is here as well.

And I'm going to begin by introducing my colleagues, and I'm going to start, not to my political left, but just to my left here, with Senator Valesky and Senator DeFrancisco, both of whom reside in Syracuse and represent this great community.

And, we are also joined by Senator Betty Little, Senator Jim Seward,

Senator Tom O'Mara, and, Senator Cecilia Tkaczyk, 1 2 who is our newest member in the Senate. 3 Some of our colleagues up here are members of the Education Committee; others are not. 4 5 But, I'm going to put this in 6 parenthetically: 7 Chairman DeFrancisco has been the Chair of 8 the Finance Committee for a number of years, and he 9 has been to about 500 more hearings than probably 10 any of us, so one of the things that he is very 11 adept at is, brevity, being succinct, and asking people to be, accordingly, essentially, act the 12 13 same. 14 So, here at the basic components: 15 We are -- we have four hearings scheduled. We are probably going to add a fifth hearing. 16 17 We have been on Long Island. 18 We're in Syracuse. 19 We're going to be in Buffalo in two weeks, the city of New York two weeks thereafter. 20 21 And there's probably an excellent chance that we will be in Albany for our final hearing. 22 23 The premise of what we're doing here, there's 24 no predisposition or any kind of agenda, for anyone

25

who may think that.

We are endeavoring to listen to people who are in the field, at the professional level, at the parent level, at the teaching level, at the administrative level, to see what is going on with the Reform Agenda that's being advanced by State Ed and the Regents.

And our expectation is, that we will get a wealth of information.

That we will probably conference on a lot of this stuff at the end, and figure out what recommendations we may advance, if any.

And as many of my colleagues know, the primary obligation of the Legislature is to, in essence, provide a very broad framework and the financing of education.

Educational policy is set by State Ed and the Board of Regents, and we respect that distinction, but we also know that we have to be responsive to our constituents.

I have spoken individually and collectively to all of my colleagues.

Senator Valesky's office has been extremely helpful, as has Senator DeFrancisco, in getting this list together.

I want to be clear: No one should feel that

someone is being included or excluded by design. 1 2 We have had requests to testify. 3 We have tried to match up a broad cross-section of different people. 4 5 For example, today, we have charter schools testifying. They did not testify on Long Island. 6 7 Today we have the PTA, who I believe is 8 clearly and fairly representative of parents. 9 We have NYSED who is testifying again, having 10 done so on Long Island. 11 So what we are really shooting for is to get the best input possible. 12 13 We had a good exchange on Long Island. I expect that we will have the same today. 14 15 And I do know we have -- on Long Island we had a little glitch. We did not have a flag in the 16 17 room. 18 So I'm going to ask Senator Valesky to stand and lead everyone in the Pledge of Allegiance. 19 (All persons say:) 20 21 "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the 22 United States of America and to the republic for 23 which it stands, one nation under God, 24 indivisible, with liberty and justice for all." 25 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator, thank you very

much. 1 2 And one last thing before we bring up the 3 State Education Department and the Regents, I will do this politely, and I will do it diplomatically: 4 5 No one is going to read their testimony. We're all intelligent people, to an extent, 6 7 and we can read things that have been submitted. 8 Everything that's been submitted has already been up online. It's available for people to see. 9 10 If you want to summarize, fine. If you want to speak ad lib, fine. 11 But, we're going to try and keep it as tight 12 13 as possible, and I'm sure that my colleagues are 14 going to have questions. 15 And as we ask you to summarize and be succinct, certainly, I know my colleagues will do 16 17 the same. 18 And having said that, I'd ask the 19 Commissioner and the Vice Chancellor if they would 20 come up and start us off. 21 ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D.: Good morning, 22

Senators, Chairman.

Thank you for the opportunity to present a few remarks to you this morning.

23

24

25

It's my intent to provide you with a broad

overview of the action that the Regents have taken over the past decade or so to set the stage, so to speak, for some more specific comments that will be delivered by Commissioner King.

As you well know, one of our responsibilities in supervising the State Education Department is to oversee K-12 education, and the education that is provided to approximately 3 million students throughout the state.

The topic for today, the Regents Reform

Agenda, from our perspective, is a continuation of

work that began many, many years ago.

It wasn't too long ago, and probably within the memory of many people in this room, that a local diploma was something that was granted by a local school district using local school standards.

And in the late '70s and '80s, we realized as a state that that did not provide students with enough of an education for the world that existed then.

So about 30 years ago, the Regents began a process of elevating the standards for all students, and one of the first steps was the adoption and implementation of a Regents competency test, which was administered to all students as a prerequisite

for obtaining a local diploma.

The Regents diploma that most of you are familiar with continued on a parallel track.

That stayed in place for quite a while, and then in the '90s, we realized that that Regents competency test was not adequate.

At that time I had served on a local school board, and I remember feeling proud when we received reports from the administration that we had pass rates and graduation rates in the low 90s and high 80s.

We felt very proud of ourselves.

But then we realized that the Regents competency test, which was an avenue that about 40 percent of the students used, really only met about a seventh- or eighth-grade level of achievement.

And so the Regents said, "Well, that's not sufficient," and we started to make some changes that were phased in over a decade, which result in the system that is in place now, where students are required to take five Regents examinations to graduate.

As that process evolved, we continued to speak with parents and teachers, business leaders,

and it was clear to us that that system was not adequate; that even though we had pass rates on a statewide basis in the 70s -- excuse me, graduation rates, that the students really were not prepared for the next level, either in college, a two-year college, or working in the community.

So we developed at the time, I'm not quite sure we used the phrase "Reform Agenda," but we were thinking then about making changes to what we required.

And one of the things that we thought of is, Well, are these students really prepared?

The students who graduate from high school with a Regents diploma, which is based on completing five, are these students really prepared?

And the Commissioner and his colleagues, they did some back-mapping, and they looked at achievement in state university and city university and New York schools.

And what we learned, and it was eye-opening for some of us, that many, many students who graduate from high school are not prepared to take college-level courses for credit; they require remediation.

The percentages, I believe, are not

percentages that the wider community understands.

Here in Onondaga County, it's my understanding that approximately 60 percent of the students who attend OCC, the local community college, require some type of remediation before they are able to take credit-bearing courses.

Those percentages vary around the state, but somewhere -- and the Commissioner can give you more specifics -- between 40 and 60 percent of high school grads require some type of remediation.

Now, some have criticized us for focusing exclusively on college, but that hasn't been our focus.

We meet regularly with business leaders.

In fact, this Friday, the Commissioner will be in town at a leaders meeting out at Welch Allyn. About 200 business leaders will be in attendance, along with students.

And the main topic for our discussion, is that the business community does not have students who are prepared to learn the specific skills needed in the business community.

I've heard the same thing to the east in the Utica area, where a member of the Assembly,

Anthony Brindisi, is working with a group, trying to

raise the standards for high school grads; not college grads, but high school grades, so that they're able to learn the skills.

So that was the predicate, the background, for the Regents Reform Agenda.

It has several parts. The Commissioner may talk about them.

If you strip it all down, it's higher standards, a stronger curriculum, an assessment system, that provides us with feedback on whether the students are learning, and, an evaluation system for the educators.

Now, as part of this, the way this was rolling out, was also at that point in time when the economy was in serious trouble.

And if you look at our Regents Reform Agenda and compare it to the Race To The Top, they fit together rather well.

So New York, along with a number of other states, applied for the Race To The Top, and we were successful in securing a substantial sum, approximately \$700 million.

At the time we applied, many people supported that application.

Legislation was adopted to strengthen the

application, and school districts around the state saw, I believe, 90, 91 percent buy-in to the Race To The Top applications.

So we were all moving in, generally, the same direction of raising the standards, a process that had started many, many years ago.

We are using that money to strengthen our data system, to make sure we understand how students perform so that it will inform instruction.

We're using it to help us strengthen teacher performance, leadership performance at the principal level, and we are optimistic that this process will yield the results, which is, a citizen who is prepared and able to move on in life, to either function at a high level in college or to function at a high level in the workplace.

We believe that there are many challenges.

I'm quite sure that we will hear some of those today.

But we believe with your support, we'll accomplish the objective in front of us.

Thank you very much, Senator.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you.

Commissioner, I wanted to ask if you would direct your remarks in a couple of areas, and I know

you're going to have some comments.

For anyone who is interested, there is an extensive PowerPoint presentation from the department, which I know the Commissioner is not going to go through slide by slide.

But, one of the things that came up yesterday was test scores, and the delay in the release of those test scores.

So if you could touch on that, AIS, and the implementation as it relates to Regents in particular, because those are things that have come up, and I know you're aware of them.

But, if you would speak to those components in your remarks, I'd appreciate it.

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: Sure.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the members of the Senate who have gathered today.

I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you.

I want to try and build first on the Vice Chancellor's remarks, to say that the work that we're doing at the department is squarely focused on this very clear objective of ensuring that our students who graduate from high school graduate ready for college and career success.

The work that we're doing on the Common Core standards reflects that straightforward goal, and the Common Core standards were developed by mapping back from college and career success, asking: Given what students need for college and career success, what does that mean that they need to know at tenth grade, at seventh grade, at fourth grade, all the way back to kindergarten?

Higher education:

The business community and K-12 educators from around the country joined with governors and chief state school officers in constructing those standards.

And we have been engaged since the Regents adoption of those standards in 2010, in supporting the work of schools to move forward that implementation.

It's important to emphasize that the standards are not about testing. They are also not about a national curriculum.

They are about a common definition across states, and 45 states have adopted these standards, along with the District of Columbia, the Department of Defense schools, because they represent an indicator of college- and career-readiness.

Curriculum decisions still remain at the 1 2 local level, and that's important to emphasize; 3 although, we are building an extensive set of resources at the department to support districts' 4 5 implementation of Common Core. 6 It's important to say that what the 7 Common Core asks for is a set of changes in 8 instruction: 9 For students to read more challenging texts 10 that will ensure that they're on a trajectory to 11 college- and career-readiness; That students write more frequently, not just 12 13 in English-language arts, but across the curriculum; 14 That students learn to use evidence from 15 texts to support their arguments; 16 That students do more problem-solving in mathematics. 17 18 And the work that we're doing on professional 19 development is in support of those shifts in 20 instruction. 21 This year, in third through eighth grade, we 22 had our first assessments that reflect the 23 Common Core. 24 Students were required to use more evidence 25 from texts, to write more, to do more

problem-solving in mathematics.

The scores were indeed lower than they had been previously.

That was similar to the experience of

Kentucky that was a year ahead of us in

implementation of the Common Core. And,

undoubtedly, similar to the experience of the other

states as they transitioned their assessments to the

Common Core.

But the fact that the scores were lower is an indicator of a new baseline; a new set of standards.

It doesn't mean that schools taught less or that teachers taught less; but, rather, that we raised the standards to better reflect college- and career-readiness.

Going forward, the Regents exams were also changed to reflect the Common Core.

This year, beginning with the algebra exam, which we required of students, and will reflect the Common Core.

And students will be able to opt to take the English-language arts Common Core exam as well.

Those requirements will phase in over the next four years, such that, the students who graduate in 2017 will be the first students required

to pass Common Core Regents exams.

The Regents adopted the standards in 2010.

Again, the first students required to pass

Common Core Regents exams for graduation will be the class of 2017, so, a 7-year phase-in process for the Common Core.

It's important to say, on those Regents exams, we will continue to have two score levels, as we have for some time: one that is the passing standard, and one that reflects college- and career-readiness.

And the challenge for us as a state is to close the gap between those two things.

Last year in the state, we had a 74 percent graduation rate for those students who started in ninth grade, four years earlier, but only 35 percent of those students actually met the bar for college- and career-readiness, and that leads to the remediation problem that the Vice Chancellor described.

Turning to AIS, one of the challenges now, with a larger percentage of students scoring at the 1 and 2 level -- we have four levels of performance in the state test, 1, 2, 3, 4 -- with a larger number of students scoring at the 1 and 2 level,

districts have to reassess how they provide support to those students who are performing at the lowest levels.

What the Regents' action at their last meeting requires, is that districts serve roughly the same percentage of students in intervention services as were served previously under the old standards, allowing districts to continue to focus their intervention resources on those students who are lowest-performing.

Finally, on the issue of the test-score release, this first year of new assessments means that we had to do a process called "standard setting."

Anytime you have a new assessment system, you have to bring in educators from across the state to look at the assessment, to look at information on student performance, and to advise the department on the standards to use to identify student performance at the proficient level on that exam.

"Standard setting" meant that the test scores were released somewhat later this year than they will be in future years, but not particularly late.

There also were some districts that, because of a technology issue, got their scores turned over

to parents a little bit later than had initially been projected.

I think that's the issue that was touched on in a newspaper article yesterday.

Just -- the place where I'd end, is just that there -- change is always hard.

Anytime you try to raise standards, there will be anxiety around that, and there will be the challenge of bringing the whole community through the change process.

I was here in the Syracuse area a couple weeks ago for a "back-to-school," and I visit school districts a lot --

I had the pleasure of visiting schools with Senator Flanagan earlier this year.

-- and was in Fayetteville-Manlius.

You'll hear from the superintendent there later in the hearing.

And what you see in Fayetteville-Manlius is a district where they committed early to the work on the Common Core.

Even when the standards were still in draft form in 2009, they began having teams of teachers and administrators getting to know the standards, and integrating the standards into their curriculum

and instruction in the district.

I met with teachers and principals, school-board members, as well as visited classes, when I was in Fayetteville-Manlius, and I was struck that their early engagement around the Common Core meant that there was a clear understanding across their community about what the standards would mean; a clear commitment to integrate the standards with good work that was already happening in the district.

And I'm sure that

Superintendent Corliss Kaiser will talk about the work that's going on in the district. The way they focused on writing, for example, which we know is an area where many of our students are underprepared when they leave high school.

And Fayetteville-Manlius is committed to intensive work across the curriculum on writing, and integrating that work with the work of the Common Core.

So what we know, is that there are districts that are making huge strides, based on these new higher standards.

And our task at the department is to support that work throughout the state.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Commissioner, thank you 1 2 very much. 3 I will probably have some comments and questions, but I'm going to start with 4 5 Senator DeFrancisco, and go to Senator Valesky, and then Senator Little, and any of my colleagues who 6 7 I'm sure would like to make inquiries. 8 Senator DeFrancisco. 9 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Tony, how long have you 10 been on the Board of Regents? 11 ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D.: 1996. SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: So you're -- well, you 12 13 started, about, when you were 12? Is that what --14 [Laughter.] 15 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: The reason I ask that, the Board of Regents -- the members of the Board of 16 17 Regents do not get paid. 18 This is a commitment by a Central New Yorker, 19 right here, one of our members of this community, to education in the state of New York. 20 21 And, I just want to thank you. 22 I mean, you don't get the thanks. The other part that you'd normally get, along 23 24 with the Commissioner, on an hourly basis, is 25 criticism.

And, to me --

I get criticized. I got criticized a couple times along the way.

-- and my theory about criticism, is that the only people who don't get criticized are people that don't do a damn thing.

Okay?

Those are the ones who will never get criticized.

And the amount of time that you've put into this transition, which is monumental, needs to be congratulated, first of all.

Second of all, in any transition, there's going to be bumps in the road.

Obviously, if the curriculum is going to be more of a challenge, there's going to be lower test scores for a while.

But, do you not make that transition so that everyone feels good when they get a diploma, and don't have the skills, and are one of the 60 percent that go to a college, a community college, that need remediation?

That's criminal.

So, although there may be bumps in this road, I support this transition 100 percent, and I'll

1 continue to do so.

Now, with respect to some questions, the questions I had go more to the Core curriculum.

Just for my own edification, how was the actual -- how were the tests for the Core curriculum actually created?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: So the test-development process --

Thank you for your comments.

The test-development process starts with the standards; and so you take the standards, and then you begin to build items from those standards; so, at each grade level, using the standards to construct items.

And there's a multi-stage review process for the items that include educators from around the state.

You build the items.

You then field test the items; you try them out with students in the state. You see how the items performed with actual students.

And then you make adjustments to the items to construct the eventual test.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Who actually created the tests?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: So the vendor for the test creation is Pearson. That's the company that builds the test, but with tremendous oversight from, both, department staff, and our technical advisory committee, which is a committee of measurement experts from around the country who advise us on the construction of the tests.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Are the tests the same in Kentucky as they are in New York State?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: Not yet.

So, Kentucky created their own tests to reflect the Common Core.

New York did so.

We are also participating in a consortium of states, 20 states, that are working together to build a future generation of assessments that would be common across states.

Because, one of the flaws in past standards efforts around the country, particularly No Child Left Behind, was that every state was given the task of defining their own standards and assessments, and what you had was very different standards between Massachusetts and Mississippi, for example.

And, now, the federal government has put resources into the work of developing a potential

future common assessment, and the Regents will 1 2 consider that assessment down the road. 3 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: All right, because -and I'll quit after this, because others have 4 5 questions, but, I have grandchildren. It's hard to believe, because I look so good. 6 7 [Laughter.] 8 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: But I have 9 grandchildren, and those grandchildren are taking these tests. 10 11 And there was a question -- I got several of them, but I'm just going to ask you one. 12 "Use pictures, numbers, and words to explain 13 14 another way to say '6500.'" 15 Numbers and words I could probably figure out, but how does somebody describe "6500" in 16 17 pictures? 18 COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: So there are a 19 number of ways --20 [Laughter.] 21 COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: -- but one is, that 22 you might draw figures that represent thousands, and 23 then you would draw the figures that represent 24 hundreds as a tenth of the thousands. 25 It's another way of helping students,

particularly in the earlier grades, visualize the 1 2 concepts behind the mathematics. 3 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Oh, and that's the theory, to visualize? 4 5 Well, I'd recommend that you scrap the 6 pictures --7 [Laughter.] SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: -- and let them learn 8 9 the math in the traditional ways that I think will be more helpful to them, rather than trying to grope 10 11 with a picture of some type. But, that's the type of thing that really has 12 13 to be dealt with as we develop this further. 14 But, I think there are some valid concerns of 15 the testing, and that those concerns have to be met as we go through the process. 16 17 Thank you. 18 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you, 19 Senator DeFrancisco. 20 Senator Valesky. 21 SENATOR VALESKY: Thank you. 22 Well, it's always tough to follow 23 Senator DeFrancisco, that's for sure. 24 But let me, first, I know we didn't have an 25 opportunity, all, because we're running a little

late, to make opening comments.

I just want to thank the Chairman of the Committee, Senator Flanagan, for being here today, and for convening this set of hearings around the state.

We, as individual members of the Senate, hear on a daily basis from those who are either involved in the formal education of our children, or, in some way, shape or form, connected to it.

That's an awful big part of our job as members of the Senate.

So thank you, and welcome to Syracuse.

We appreciate your outstanding advocacy that you have shown for all of the years that you've been Chairman of the Committee.

I'm just going to ask one, sort of, broad question, and I'm basing this upon the comments that I receive, and have heard about the Reform Agenda, and I guess it's -- it's really a question for you, Vice Chancellor.

And, again, thank you for your service, and longevity of it, on behalf of the people of Central New York.

But, you had mentioned in your comments, in describing the Reform Agenda, and the time frame,

and the financial resources, particularly from the federal government, the Race To The Top application that was filed back in 2009 or '10, somewhere in that time frame, you also reminded us that, at that same time is when we were hit with a pretty severe recession.

So my question to you, and on behalf of the Board of Regents:

There are two overarching concerns that

I have heard from the education community -administrators, teachers, parents, and so on, and
those questions involve the allocation of resources
to implement the Reform Agenda, and the time frame
in which the agenda is expected to be met, or
benchmarks along that path, towards implementation.

I hear all the time, the resources are insufficient, and the time frame is not what it potentially should be.

From the perspective of the Regents -And I understand that all of us here have a
very significant role to play when it comes to
resources, obviously. That's part of the budget
process.

-- but, has the Reform Agenda been given sufficient, and have school districts, in

particular, been given, sufficient resources to meet the expectations of the Regents in the time frame that you have established?

ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D.: I suspect that my former colleagues in the school-board community and superintendents would say that there's never enough money to accomplish the change that we have set out. And I respect that.

I remember, clearly, struggling with budgets as a school-board member.

The dilemma we have, is that if we wait until everyone agrees that there is enough money to accomplish everything, then very little change will occur.

There's a certain urgency about this at our table.

We are mindful of the budgetary constraints on school districts.

We understand how difficult it is for a superintendent to present a budget with the limitations that are in place.

But from our perspective, saying that we should slow down or back off because there isn't enough money to do everything, takes the focus off of the real objective here, which is to make sure

the students are prepared for either credit-bearing 1 2 work at the college level, two- or four-year degree, 3 or ready to work any job that will pay a decent 4 wage. 5 So we're mindful of it, but we don't see a 6 way to slow it down. 7 If we prioritize, you know, our objectives, 8 I believe we will find a way to do this. 9 SENATOR VALESKY: Commissioner, do you have 10 anything to add to that? COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: I have two points: 11 One is, that the Regents have long advocated 12 13 for greater equity in school finance. 14 And I think one of our challenges, is that 15 resources are not evenly distributed. And that's a challenge, not just in New York, 16 but around the country, and something I know you all 17 18 will grapple with in the upcoming budget process. 19 But a second issue is, I don't think we, as a 20 state or as a country, are very clear on how dollars 21 get spent. 22 We have conversations, particularly in 23 legislatures, not only our own, but across the

country, about how resources are distributed.

there is, in a sense, a black box of

24

25

local-expenditure decisions.

And, so, every district has a professional-development line item of some sort, and the question becomes, How is that professional -- how are those professional-development dollars used?

Now, some districts prioritize the work on the Common Core in their use of professional-development resources; others less so.

Some districts use creative scheduling strategies to make sure that teachers have time to meet in grade-level teams or departments to talk about the work on the Common Core, to look at student work together. Other districts struggle with that.

And so I think there's work to do to ensure that we identify those districts that are going about this in the best way, and really use them as a model to inform the work in other districts, and support those districts that aren't innovating.

So here in Syracuse, for example, there's an innovation zone that Sharon Contreras, the superintendent, has worked out with her bargaining units, where the schools have extended learning time for students and extended professional-development time for teachers.

That's a promising innovation. 1 2 We'll see how that translates into changes 3 and results, but we've got to do more of that. SENATOR VALESKY: 4 Thank you both. 5 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you, 6 Senator Valesky. 7 Senator Little, and then she will be followed 8 by Senator Tkaczyk. 9 SENATOR LITTLE: Thank you very much. Thank you, Commissioner. 10 11 As been stated before, the Common Core is a change, and change is difficult, but, one of the 12 13 things that I question, and am concerned about, is 14 I understand that, when the scores are returned to 15 the school districts, there's an analysis of how the students did on that. 16 17 As a former teacher, I'd really want to know 18 how my students did. I'd really want to see the 19 test's result, and how they answered the questions. And as to Senator DeFrancisco's example, 20 21 I'd want to know which ones of my students were able 22 to visualize "6500," just so that you really could 23 get to the core of what their teaching needs are.

And I just think the test would have much

more value if the teacher could see the results, and

24

25

not just an analysis that's out there, that such-and-such a percentage did this, and that, and the other thing.

So if we could accomplish that, I don't know if that's -- is there any reason not to give them the results of the tests?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: Sure.

So, it's important to say what resources are available for educators in the state.

So, one of the things that we've made available is actually the test-design documents.

The most transparent the State has ever been about assessment design -- the actual criteria that are used to evaluate each of the questions, the actual criteria that are used to select each of the passages -- to inform teachers' understanding of what the assessments intend to measure.

With the announcement of the scores, we provided item-level analysis.

So, the "RICs," or, the data centers, in each of the big five could develop for teachers, item analysis that would say, at the level of standards and groups of standards, how students did on the different question types.

We also released about 25 percent of the

items from every test, and with those items, an analysis of -- an explanation of what the correct answer was, and an explanation of the misconceptions that may have been responsible for students choosing the incorrect option;

As well as, for the open-ended questions, the rubric that was used to score those open-ended questions, and samples of student work at the different levels of performance.

Now, we can't release all of the items because some of them are for the item bank for future tests.

Depending on the state, the [unintelligible] and the number of items, the percentage of items ranges that are released each year.

We would like to be able to release more items.

The challenge is, that items come with a cost. There's an item-development cost.

And, it's important to make sure that you have an item bank for assessments, going forward.

New York is on the -- actually on the low end of expenditures for assessments costs; the per-student assessment cost.

And one of the constraints that that imposes,

is that we are -- we need to have a limited number 1 2 of items released so that we have items for future 3 item banks. SENATOR LITTLE: But aren't these tests, are 4 5 they just disposed of when this company just throws 6 them away? 7 Or, couldn't they just return the same tests, 8 so the teacher got to look at how Mary did and how 9 Johnny did, and who needs what kind of help, in 10 order to progress? COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: So, again, for each 11 student, the teacher will get an analysis --12 13 SENATOR LITTLE: An analysis. 14 COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: -- of which questions they got right and wrong, related to each 15 of the standards. 16 17 But the tests themselves, the items, some of 18 them are saved for future test administrations. 19 So, that's why the tests are secure, and all of the items are not distributed each time. 20 Some of the items are saved for future 21 assessments. 22 23 And that's the challenge, and that's a cost 24 trade-off around assessment development, and all 25 states grapple with this.

Again, all states release a different percentage of items, based on the number of items they need to keep back for the item bank for future test administrations.

SENATOR LITTLE: So this company would charge more to release the entire test?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: If you don't have items for the bank, yes, the development of the test will cost more.

SENATOR LITTLE: One other thing that I hear a lot of, and I represent 48 school districts, many of them rural, is that the Common Core, and with the changes, and with the lack of resources, many of the schools are doing away with their business departments.

And while, you know, everyone likes to see a lot of children and a big percentage go on to college, it's almost necessary today, there are children who don't to go college; and, yet, we're not really preparing them to go out into the workforce at the local levels?

Is there any encouragement for these schools to keep their -- some part of a business program?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: Yes, I'll let the Vice Chancellor add, but, we are very committed,

that we're not just focused on college-readiness, but also career-readiness.

Business teachers have an important role to play there, as do to career- and technical-education teachers. There's an important role for the BOCES there.

The Regents are engaged in a discussion that we've been having for some time now, about how we might better incorporate career-readiness into the graduation requirements to create multiple pathways for students. And that's a conversation I expect we will continue.

And, that, to the extent that there is a viable career pathway that is clearer for districts, that may result in them prioritizing resources for things like business teachers and career- and tech-ed teachers.

But, I'll let the Vice Chancellor answer.

ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D.: One of the challenges we have is trying to find a way to offer a rich alternative to a so-called "college track."

And we're concerned that we do not develop a two-tier system, where some students prepare for college, and then the rest are prepared for, quote, "a job," or whatever that might mean.

So we have been working on this for a while.

And that's one of the purposes of the meeting on Friday here in Syracuse, is to talk about that some more.

We want to make sure that if there are multiple pathways to graduation, and to college and career success, that we've mapped that out well so the districts will have something to really offer the students.

And we hear about the comments that you're hearing as well.

In districts that do not have the resources, they're stripping away from certain programs and just offering, you know, what their vision is of college-readiness.

So, hopefully, when we have this in place, it will provide districts with options.

And it will also help the places where teachers are prepared, something more than they have right now.

I mean, right now, career/technical education is kind of ephemeral, and not many education schools offer enough courses in that area.

So once we have this in place, we hope it will help address the supply of teachers.

SENATOR LITTLE: Well, I think it's really
important, because some of the -- I have paper mills
and some large companies, medical-device things, and
everything's done by computer, so it's not just
"show up at the door and you can work here."

So I am encouraged that you will continue on
that, because I think it is necessary.

And thank you very much.

ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D.: Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Little, thank you.

12 Senator Tkaczyk.

SENATOR TKACZYK: Thank you.

I just wanted to, first of all, thank you, Senator Flanagan, for holding this hearing.

I think it's timely, because we're getting a lot of questions and concerns from parents and teachers and administrators.

And I appreciate your being here.

I represent a 5-county wide district, and
I have about 28 school districts, many of them
rural, and many of them stressed because of the lack
of resources, because, not only have we implemented
changes, we've also, over the years, reduced State
aid.

And to my school districts, that's been a huge -- a huge challenge.

My -- the concerns that were raised at a public forum that I held in the Albany area, with some of my colleagues, were mentioned by Senator Valesky, which is, there's a big concern about, we -- the teachers and administrators haven't had the time to implement the Common Core standards before the kids were getting tested on them, and that schools may not have the resources to implement those testing systems.

Do you -- and I know you've gotten concerns and feedback from tons of people.

Are you making -- planning to make any changes to how we're implementing the Common Core?

And I just want to reiterate, no one has said to me, We don't want to do the Common Core.

Everyone agrees, getting kids more prepared for college and career, we're all on board.

Everyone wants to implement the Common Core.

I think how we do it seems to be the biggest hurdle.

And one more comment, and then I'll let you respond, is, when you have a school district that's struggling to pay for kindergarten, and you have to

divert so much of your resources to the testing
component, that may not make sense to them locally.

And there may be other ways for local

districts to improve the educational program for those kids to be college- and career-ready.

So I'm thinking, is there a way for those schools to be -- to have some flexibility in their version of being college- and career-ready?

ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D.: Well, I don't have a crystal ball on what we might do.

I can share with you our experience with the roll out of the Regents diploma.

I mean, that was adopted as a policy item back in, I believe, '97.

And we still have some adjustments that we made, or accommodations, are still in place today.

So, with respect to that reform, which we believe raised the level of students graduating with, you know, at least a tenth-grade education, by about, 35, 40 percent.

We had a long phase-in period, where, if we ran into a problem, if there was a hurdle, there was a bump, you know, we would step back and make adjustments.

Now, I'm not sure this is going to be as easy

for us as that was, because there are more pieces moving now than there was then.

But we -- you know, there is a track record there of us making adjustments, as needed, to make sure that we are were able to stay on track.

But to give you a specific right now, it's too early, because we just don't have enough information.

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: Two thoughts I would share, and I appreciate the question:

One is, that we've still got to grapple -the point I was making with Senator Valesky earlier,
we've got to grapple with how the money is spent
that's already allocated.

You know, since 2010, when the standards were adopted, in federal and state resources alone, there's some, billion, billion and a half, maybe more, that's been allocated to professional-development activities.

So the question becomes: Were those dollars used as effectively as possible in each district?

And I think we at the department need to do a better job of highlighting where those resources have been well-used, and supporting models of good practice.

We also have used a portion of the Race To
The Top dollars that came to the department, to
build professional-development resources; curriculum
materials that are not required, but are optional,
can be a resource for districts; a video project,
videotaping excellent teaching practice reflecting
the Common Core from around the state; a variety of
tools for professional development, for engaging
parents around the Common Core.

We made all of that available through training that we've done in Albany, that we've had upwards of 10,000 educators participate in over the last three years; as well as a website we launched, engageNY.org, that now has had, I think, nearly 30 million page reviews, and has become a go-to resource.

But, it's never enough. There's always a need for more professional development.

And I think across the education spectrum of stakeholders, not just in New York, but around the country, everyone is focused on the need for more professional development around the Common Core standards, but, really, the underlying instructional shifts: the work on math problem-solving, the work on building academic language and vocabulary, in the

early grades, and so forth.

So we're committed to that.

And I think in this year's budget process, one of the considerations should be, How do we make sure there are adequate resources to support professional development throughout the K-through-12 system as we move towards higher standards?

The other point I'd make on flexibility is, we've got to do a better job communicating to districts the flexibility that they have.

So, for example, the evaluation law leaves 80 percent of the decisions about the evaluation process to local districts and their bargaining units.

And districts have a lot of flexibility around whether they add assessments, how many, what kinds. And I think sometimes districts have not leveraged that had flexibility as well as they might, and that's something that we're working with districts on.

We know there are certainly districts that, this fall, as they look back on the first year of implementation of the evaluation system, have made adjustments to their approach to assessment:

Districts that are deciding to use prior

academic history rather than pre-tests to set goals for particular courses;

Districts that have decided to scale back the number of interim assessments that they give on a particular subject;

Districts that have realized that they were giving multiple assessments that assessed, essentially, the same thing, and weren't necessarily giving them good additional information for instruction, and are scaling back.

So -- and we support those, and I think we can do a better job providing technical assistance to districts as they do that kind of review.

SENATOR TKACZYK: Does the department track how much of -- part of the budget is going to implementation of the Common Core and the testing assessment?

Like, can you give us a sense of how much of the education budget is being consumed by that activity?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: At the state level, you know, we have a set of assessment contracts, but, again, they're fairly modest, compared to other states, at the low end of spending.

For example, I think our 3-through-8 test

development is some \$32 million over a 4- or 5-year 1 2 period, something like that. So, the per-student costs of assessments at 3 the state level is relatively low. 4 5 At the district --SENATOR TKACZYK: What -- I'm sorry. 6 7 What is the cost per student? 8 COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: The per-student cost is probably somewhere on the order of \$12 per 9 student. 10 11 Many states are more on the order of \$30 per student. 12 13 At the local level, it's hard had to identify 14 resources spent on the Common Core separate from the 15 core work of the school. 16 I mean, if you're gathering teachers for 17 professional development, hopefully, that 18 professional-development time is focused on the 19 Common Core. The State has spent hundreds of millions of 20 dollars in textbook aid and software aid over the 21 22 last few years. 23 Sensibly, that would be a set of resources 24 that would go towards the purchase of Common Core

25

materials.

So it's difficult to parse out the cost of Common Core separate from the costs of doing English-language arts and mathematics and literacy across all subjects.

SENATOR TKACZYK: I just, with that, because
I'm a parent, and a former school-board member,
I want to echo what Senator Little said about
getting the assessments and getting the test results
to the teachers.

And as a parent, I looked at what my son went through this year, and there was a test that he just totally bombed. And to me, as a parent, like, well, I want to see the test, so I can go over it with my son, and so he can understand what he didn't do well at. And that was not an option.

And I just think that that's -- you know, we're all in this together, to improve the education for our kids. And, if we don't understand what they're missing and not connecting with, we can't work with them on those aspects.

So I just find that the whole aspect of, you're taking a test, but you don't have the ability to see how you did, the child, kind of strange.

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: Again, just to be clear, there's a lot of information about how

students did on the test items. 1 2 It's -- the question is: What percentage of 3 the actual items themselves; the actual math problems, or the actual text and multiple choice, or 4 5 written-response questions, are released? Again, we're at about 25 percent. 6 7 Other states are in a range from, probably, 8 25 percent to, anywhere, 60 percent or more. 9 Most states keep some number of items for 10 future test banks so that they have items that can 11 replenish over time. SENATOR TKACZYK: 12 Okay. 13 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you, Senator Tkaczyk. 14 15 Senator Seward. SENATOR SEWARD: Well, thank you, 16 17 Mr. Chairman. 18 I, too, want to thank you, Senator Flanagan, 19 for sponsoring this series of hearings around the state to assess where we are in terms of the 20 21 Regents Reform Agenda, giving various stakeholders 22 an opportunity to have their say in front of our 23 Senate Education Committee. And I, too, want to just go on record as 24

saying, I think the objective of making sure that

25

every student that graduates from a New York State high school is, in fact, college- and career-ready.

That is the objective that I think we all share, and, how we get there, obviously, is a matter of discussion; and, in particular, the rollout and the implementation in terms of the Regents Reform Agenda is a subject for discussion, which is, I assume, why we're here today.

You know, I'd note, in terms of timing, just at the time the Regents Reform Agenda was adopted -- being considered and adopted, was, at the same time, because of the recession, and what particularly hit us here in New York State, just at the time when the gap-elimination adjustment was implemented, and even though we have been, in the years since, crawling back from that.

And, in fact, the Senate, I'm very pleased to say, is going on record in our Senate-only budget this year, we want to eliminate the gap-elimination adjustment for all school districts in New York State, and that will help them in terms of meeting these objectives.

But there's been a lot happening at a time when many districts have had fewer resources.

I wanted to just zero in on two areas,

getting back to that question of flexibility.

One of the important concerns that I have heard from my many educators in my district is, with these New York State learning modules associated with the Common Core, that there's a very scripted approach now in the classroom.

Some of our best teachers are innovators, and create a very, not only an interesting, exciting atmosphere in the classroom, but, also, you know, really help those students learn in very innovative ways.

And the concern I'm hearing, that with the Common Core and these learning modules, that ability to be innovative in the classroom is out the door.

A very scripted approach is being taken, because they feel they need to take that approach in order to -- you know, we have those tests looming at the end.

And Senator Little mentioned business courses being canceled in some schools.

I've even heard of recess being canceled in some of the lower grades in the elementary schools in my district.

Once again, just not time to -- for recess.

Toys being taken out of the kindergarten and

first-grade rooms, because there's just no longer time to allow some of those young students to blow off steam through recess and that physical activity that goes with that.

How would you -- how would you address those concerns, in terms of the ability of local districts and local teachers in the classroom, to have that flexibility and allow for that innovation even with the Common Core?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: I really appreciate the question.

I can't emphasize enough, the modules are there as a resource for districts to adopt, adapt, or ignore, and for teachers to adapt to the needs of their students.

We actually say on our website where the modules are posted, this is not -- you know, some version of "This is not a script."

The idea is to provide resources that people can use.

Now, we do, in the modules, lay out an approach to how one might teach the given text or the given math problems as a professional-development resource, but those modules are for districts to use as they see fit.

Curriculum is locally determined.

I will say, the modules emphasize application.

For example, the English -- many of the English-language-arts modules were developed in partnership with Expeditionary Learning, which has a long history around project-based learning.

Now, if people like those, they can use them.

If they don't like them, they can make other decisions. Again, curriculum decisions are made locally.

In terms of the breadth of the curriculum, one of the challenges we have is that, too often, there is a mistake made, that if we spend more time on test prep and less time on learning, students will do better.

And the department has given very specific guidance on this.

We don't think that rote test prep is the best way to help students achieve.

Indeed, you want students to have experiences with art, music, have time for physical education, so that they are well-rounded, so that they develop well as young people; so that they develop, not only to be college- and career-ready, but to be good

citizens. And, the work in art and music also supports students' success in other aspects of the curriculum.

So, you know, these curriculum decisions are made locally, but I take the challenge that we need to make sure that people understand the flexibility that they have around the modules, that they are not required. They are a resource for districts to use.

SENATOR SEWARD: One final question, which would lead to the testing; the student testing aspect of this, and the changes that have been occurred there.

I think one of the reasons that many educators feel they need to stick with the scripted approach that's being presented, rather than just an option or a resource, but, you know, as their so-called "bible" in the classroom, is that -- because of the test at the end.

And, you know, the first round of testing, you know, we're still awaiting additional data regarding that.

The early signs, as -- if I understood your testimony correctly, is that there are lower test scores with the changes in the testing, which is causing a great deal of concern, certainly among

parents, educators, and school boards, and administrators...everyone.

What -- and the impact on the teacher evaluation, just in a -- and a reflection on the local school district.

What conclusions do you take from these lower test scores?

And what impact do you feel they should have, in terms of evaluating a teacher at this stage of the early -- early stage of the implementation of this Common Core?

And, in terms of reflection on the students and our quality of education in New York State?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: I think it's important to emphasize that these assessment results this spring set a new baseline match to college- and career-readiness.

In many ways, they tell us something we already knew at the upper grades.

So if you look -- I mentioned in my testimony, if you look at our statewide graduation rate, 4-year graduation rate, it's 74 percent.

But if you look at the percentage of students who are performing at the level where they would be able to enroll in credit-bearing coursework, that's

actually 35 percent.

If you look at our NAEP performance -The "NAEP" is a national assessment that's
given to samples of students in every state, and
often considered the gold standard for comparing
student performance across states.

-- if you look at the percentage of students in New York who are scoring at the college- and career-ready level, at the proficient level, on the NAEP, it's, roughly, 35 percent.

If you look at performance on the PSAT and SAT by New York State students as a predictor of college performance, you again get to a number somewhere between 35 and 40 percent.

So, in many ways, the fact that our proficiency rate on third-through-eighth-grade assessments is now in the 30s is more a reflection of the assessments giving us a more accurate picture of where students are in that trajectory to readiness.

And, again, this is similar to what other states will see as they transition to the Common Core standards.

Because it was a new baseline, we made sure in our waiver from No Child Left Behind that no new

schools would be identified as priority schools in the accountability status, no new districts would be identified as focus districts, based on this new baseline of results.

And in the teacher evaluation, it's important to say that the state tests represent 20 percent of the evaluation for, roughly, 20 percent of the teachers whose students take the test in grades 4 through 8.

And in calculating the growth scores for the portion of the teacher evaluation, the growth scores look at how similar students did on the test that they took last year versus this year; and, so, the percentage of students scoring at the 3 or 4 level actually doesn't affect those growth scores.

The growth scores reflect relative performance.

And the percentage of teachers, for growth scores, identified as ineffective, developing, effective, or highly effective, this year were virtually identical to last year.

But that is clearly something that is not well understood, and it's something that we have to work to make sure we communicate fully.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you, Senator Seward.

Senator O'Mara.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you, Senator Flanagan, and thank you for hosting this hearing here in Syracuse today; coming up from Long island to be with us.

Thank you, Commissioner and Vice Chancellor, for sharing your time with us today.

I fully share the sentiments of my colleagues, and the anxiety over implementation and change.

It's never easy in anything we do in government, or anything in life.

So I understand the challenges in regards to that; and, therefore, I had some questions on that, that I don't need to reiterate, because they've been fairly well covered here already.

One area I wanted to follow up with you on was with regard to getting the test results back to the teachers, and you mentioned the test bank in keeping materials back.

Can you explain that to me?

I mean, I'm just visualizing a copy machine, and being able to copy these things, or scan them, and give them back to the teachers.

So what are you actually withholding that you

can't get back to the teachers?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: And so this is an issue, again, not just for New York State, but for all the states and all large-scale assessment systems.

There are, essentially, four types of questions on an assessment.

One set of questions are the operational questions that students will take, they're scored, and that you release.

A second set of questions are field-test questions, embedded field-test questions; questions that don't count towards the score, but you're, essentially, trying out for future versions of the test.

If you think back to taking the SAT, for example, or the -- or something like that -- LSAT, there's a set of questions that are just field-test questions.

You don't know, as the test taker, which are field tests and which are real, but the field-test questions are for the development of future tests.

A third category of questions is questions that appear in multiple years so that you can have what's called "linkage" between the tests, so you

can figure out, Was this year's test similarly difficult to last year's test?

And then the fourth category are operational questions that you may not release because you're going use them again in future years.

And if you assume some level of cost to the development of each item, there is a judgment that every state has to make on the percentage of operational items that you release, and the percentage of operational items you keep for use in future years.

The tests are secure, so they're not to be photocopied or kept locally. They come back to the State or are destroyed.

And, so, the goal is to have a set of questions that you might use again, as a way of managing the cost of test development.

You also have a risk that happens when you release all items, in the history of, sort of, testing in the country.

When you release all items, you also have the risk that people then reduce the curriculum to the items.

And, so, rather than teaching fractions, they teach a version of fractions that's reflected in

Questions 6, 7, 19, and 24 from the prior year. 1 2 So, there's, both, a pedagogical reason to 3 not release all the items, which is to not make the tests the curriculum; 4 5 But more relevant for most states, including New York, is the cost judgment on what portion of 6 7 the items you release. 8 But, again, we have 25 percent of the items. 9 There are a lot of items that are available, 10 and they're annotated with, again, why the answers 11 are -- why the correct answers were correct, why the wrong answers were wrong, samples of student work. 12 And that body of resources will grow over 13 14 time. 15 And again, locally, they can do a very detailed item analysis for students. 16 17 So they can say, this student struggled with fractions questions that involved mixed numbers, for 18 19 example. 20 SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you. 21 That really did help clear it up for me, believe it or not. 22 23 But -- I appreciate that. Now, the final question I have is, I've 24 25 gotten a lot of criticism of the Common Core, the

tests, from constituents, and I'm assuming you're getting it at the state level as well, with regard to, not the subject matter of the curriculum, but the subject matter of the fact patterns used in the questioning on the exams that is, somehow, politically motivated or directed, or what have you, from a variety of different viewpoints that you may have.

And I wonder if you could address that, if you're hearing that at the state level, that I am from my constituents, and what goes into the process to avoid that type of a concern.

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: So, yeah, I have heard that, maybe less in New York, actually, nationally.

I think two things are going on there:

One is, some conflation between standards and curriculum.

So, for example, the Common Core has an appendix that lists texts -- books, articles, so forth -- that could be used at each grade level to teach the Common Core.

And in some states, and including some of the web traffic in New York, the focus has been on those texts, to say, Well, if this text is taught, that's

offensive. Or, I wouldn't want my child to read 1 2 that text. And so forth. The Common Core isn't a curriculum. 3 Curriculum decisions remain local. 4 5 So, that text list is a resource, as are the 6 modules that we're publishing. 7 And, so, if people don't want to teach a 8 given text that we have included in the modules, they don't have to. 9 If people don't want to teach a given text 10 11 that's included in that text list that was an appendix to the standards, they don't have to use 12 13 it. 14 The second piece is on the test itself, and 15 the passages that are selected. 16 There's a whole process in test development 17 around sensitivity and trying to avoid any evidence 18 of bias. 19 The challenge, as you know, is that, 20 particularly in a heated political climate, text can 21 easily be politicized. 22 So, there are some who would argue that an 23 excerpt, for example, from Huckleberry Finn is

perfectly appropriate because it's an important

piece of American literature that reflects its time.

24

25

There are other communities around the country that have decided not to allow the teaching of Huck Finn.

So anytime you are developing a test, you have these judgments about the content that you choose.

We have a process with New York State educators of reviewing the items, to try and ensure that there is not bias, but we also say, both in describing the modules and the tests, that some passages will address topics that will be challenging.

You know, there are some states, for example, and districts, that have had policies to not allow mention of divorce, let's say, in a text.

You know, we feel like that's part of the reality of American life, and so it may come up, and it's -- in a particular text, the issue of divorce.

And that's sort of natural to the process of having a breadth of texts used for the tests, or for a given curriculum.

SENATOR O'MARA: Thank you very much.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Commissioner --

Thank you, Senator O'Mara.

-- I'm going to try and ask questions that

would elicit yes and no responses, as best as
possible.

It is fair to say that New York State, in essence, does not -- SED does not mandate curriculum?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: That is correct, we do not mandate curriculum.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, so in light of some of the comments that we've heard here, and in other forums, there -- there is some concern about -- it seems like there was some, almost a false expectation, and it's not a criticism, but, the state of New York, because of Race To The Top, listening to Ken Wagner and some of the folks who work with you, they were trying to help school districts, and one of the things that came up was the development of these modules.

 $\,$  I'm not sure I still totally understand it, but I know there was talk about 250 modules.

There's only, like, 25 of them out.

And one of the criticisms is, that it's well-intentioned, but not necessarily well-executed in providing that guidance.

It seems like school districts kind of waited, hung out a little bit, expecting that they

would get more from the Regents and SED, and that's been one of problems that has exacerbated some of the concerns.

Is that a fair assessment?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: Yeah, I mean, I'd say that the -- there are a lot of modules available now, covering many grade levels in ELA and math, but more to build, we add new modules almost every week now, as -- again, as a resource for districts.

It's fair to say that some districts may have waited on purchasing curriculum materials because they wanted to use the modules.

On the other hand, it's important that people don't see the Common Core as something that arrives, you know, in a shiny box. Like, the Common Cores arrive on your doorstep.

Even once you have the modules, the Common Core is really about changing instruction and changing teaching practice, and so districts didn't have to wait for the modules to do the Common Core.

And, obviously, as you talk with districts across these hearings, you'll hear from some districts that didn't, and started right away to implement the shifts in instruction in the Common Core, and are using the modules selectively

as fits their local discretion.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: So separate, but related, there's been a lot of talk about companies, like Pearson, inBloom, and, sort of, vendors or subcontractors of the State Education Department.

I have represented, when people talk to me about this stuff, that, in essences, while they are all aligned with the State Education Department, that none of these tests, none of these issues, none of these regulations, or whatever ultimately comes out to schools and to the public, while they may be a subcontractor, everything is signed off by State Ed before it goes out the door.

So whether there's credit or blame, it rests at, ostensibly, your doorstep?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: Yes, and I have received both.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Fair enough.

Going back to the questions, and particularly what Senator O'Mara said, and I hope this is artful, but, I'd suggest this:

I recognize the cost limitations.

I recognize why you're not going to necessarily

release every test.

However, it seems to me that if you're going pick a number, 25 or 30 percent, that what you should probably be doing, is taking the questions that are the most problematic, and you would know that, and the department would know that, better than anybody, don't take the 25 percent of the easiest questions where everyone does well; pick the 25 percent where everyone's kind of screwing up.

And if we're going to learn from that, it would seem to me that's probably -- take that as a subset, again, if the number's going to be 25 percent, and use that.

Do you do that now, or is that something you're contemplating?

COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: We tried to have a range that was reflective of the test.

So the test has a range of difficulty across the questions, and we tried in the sample to have a range of difficulty.

And over time, that bank of sample items will grow each year.

We had some that we put out before the test, we had some that we put out after the test, and we'll continue to grow that bank.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay.

And, finally, one of the things we all endeavor to do is communicate with our constituents.

I believe that State Ed has done some very laudable things, but I also believe that they're not communicating as well with people in the field; and in particular, I'd say in terms of educational professionals.

Now, I know, based on information that's been provided by the department to the public, that you have a wealth of educators who are involved in the process.

I don't think that's getting out there.

I don't think that's getting out there so people understand.

And I've heard the number, there were 95 educators who were part of a team.

People say, Yeah, they may be well-intentioned, but we don't really know who they are, we don't know how they're directed, and are they true, legitimate people who are, quote/unquote, "in the classroom."

You don't need to comment.

I'd just very strongly and respectfully suggest that, in terms of marketing, and letting people know who is part of the overall team, and

even the subcommittees, that it would be extremely 1 2 important for parents, as much as anybody else, that 3 that information be put out time and time and time 4 again. 5 Mr. Vice Chancellor, thank you for your 6 service, and your time, and your patience. 7 ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D.: Thank you, 8 Senator. 9 SENATOR FLANAGAN: And, Commissioner, really 10 appreciate your input. COMMISSIONER JOHN KING: 11 Thank you. ANTHONY S. BOTTAR, B.A., J.D.: Thank you. 12 13 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Next is Mr. Rick Longhurst 14 from the PTA. 15 RICK LONGHURST: Senator Flanagan and members of the Education Committee, I want to thank you for 16 17 this opportunity to speak with you. 18 We've shared our full testimony with your 19 office, including some backup material, and probably 20 500 pages of comments that we've received from 21 recent surveys. 22 The conclusion that we've drawn from much of 23 the work that we've done with our membership, is 24 that, while many of our members support the promise

of the Common Core, the extraneous issues that are

25

perceived as being linked to the Common Core actually are beginning to threaten the parents' support, and, potentially, the ultimate success of the reform.

Just to give you some sense as to what we see, and what we welcome, as the promises of the Common Core, let me just offer a couple of comments that seem to repeat themselves.

We welcome instruction that asks students to not only learn important facts, but to be able to apply them to everyday life;

We welcome instruction that seeks to leverage pride that Americans have in their ability to think independently and to exercise creativity;

We welcome shifts in instruction that help our children to better compete with their international counterparts;

And we welcome the increased rigor that builds essential pre-college and career skills in our children before they graduate from high school.

I have some notes in front of me because

I think I can be more succinct using the notes than

if I were just to speak off-the-cuff.

On the other hand, what our members perceive, the extraneous issues, and many of these are

test-related, are inappropriately shifting instruction away from the positive promises that benefit the education of the whole child.

Negative perceptions can become reality.

Because that reality is linked to

Common Core-based reform, the result that we fear is

that support of the Common Core could be replaced

with opposition.

And what do we do about that?

Quite simply, we need to keep our eye on the prize, and the prize is that support and the promise from the Common Core.

We look at what the Education Department has done over the past years, and we commend them for the job that they have done in building technical resources that are necessary to implement a positive change; yet, successful implementation must also include a strategy that builds family and community commitment, and it's here that we see a gap.

For some parents, the benefit -- and I stress the word "some" -- for some parents, the benefits of the technical efforts are dismissed because they're perceived as being linked to issues that are perceived as negative.

For those parents, Common Core becomes

indistinguishable from these extraneous factors.

If "some" parents becomes many or most parents, we fear that the entire reform effort could be placed in jeopardy.

What have we done to encourage collective support?

Over the past several months, New York State
PTAs worked closely with other members of the
Educational Conference Board to propose a five-point
plan that would move Common Core reform toward a
positive track.

And we strongly support that plan, and I believe that others will speak to it.

New York State PTA is working with the Education Department to schedule five town hall meetings across the state to give parents an opportunity to engage department staff with essential questions and concerns about testing and about the Common Core.

We have partnered with the New York State
United Teachers, to prepare a simple-language
brochure that educates parents in some of the basic
elements of the Common Core.

And, finally, we're educating, and we're encouraging, our members to ask questions of school

staff and boards of education that can only be answered through the observation of the implementation process, so that they are provided with feedback and forms, growth and understanding, for, both, the educators in the schools, and also for families.

In the end, we acknowledge that the process of implementing reform will be difficult, but the process really is simple.

We need to be in the business of developing people: educators, families, and students; not just skilled test takers.

Does this mean we oppose testing? Absolutely not.

We need tests to measure what our students learn, and as one aspect of supporting our efforts to improve learning.

We cannot, however, allow the perception that we are obsessed with only one part of our accountability system, to take our eye off the prize by threatening, not only good what is good, but also essential to our children's future.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much. 1 2 I do appreciate it, and we, obviously, have 3 your written testimony. The EngageNY website --4 5 RICK LONGHURST: Yes. 6 SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- you talk about 7 technologies, and advances in technology. 8 I think this is probably characteristic of life, generally, professionally and personally, 9 10 that, you know, sometimes people need to keep 11 hearing things or seeing them before they get a level of comfort. 12 13 Certainly, the communities that I represent, 14 there seems to be more consternation, and there's 15 more talk about things like, opting out, which I don't necessarily think is a prudent exercise. 16 17 RICK LONGHURST: Nor do we. SENATOR FLANAGAN: So how do you deal with 18 19 parents in that regard? And there's been a lot of talk, you know, we 20 21 need -- someone said that there are no parents testifying today. 22 23 I'm fairly sure that you're a parent --24 RICK LONGHURST: I am a parent. 25 SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- and I'm fairly sure

that "PTA" stands for Parent-Teacher Association. 1 2 RICK LONGHURST: Yes. 3 SENATOR FLANAGAN: So, what are you doing, sort of, at the field level? 4 5 And I just said to Senator Valesky, those five town hall meetings, if you pull them off, those 6 7 would be quite interesting in and of themselves. 8 What are you doing at the street level to, 9 not only hear what your parents are saying, but, 10 sort of, taking that and reporting back to people like us? 11 RICK LONGHURST: We have a website. 12 13 We have a blog. We're on Facebook. 14 15 We're on Twitter. We communicate regularly with the, roughly, 16 17 2,000 PTA units and councils throughout 18 New York State, to provide them with encouragement 19 that says that they must be partners in this whole 20 process. 21 We're seeking to work with parents and with schools to provide a welcoming environment for 22 23 parents, to share the responsibility with schools 24 for the development of their children, but I think, 25 in the end, recognizing that reform is not just a

technical or content-based effort.

It represents a change in the way that we instruct our children, and that change needs to be understood by our parents, by our schools, by our communities.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: And one other question:

If you had the opportunity to, in essence, say to
the State Education Department, We have a lot of
concerns, here are our issues; but, if you were able
to tell them one thing to do in relation to these
issues, what would you suggest that they do?

RICK LONGHURST: Okay, and I've already said this to a number of people in the department.

As I listened to the comments here this morning, I hear a great deal about testing.

What I don't hear as much about is the question: How do we know that schools are actually implementing Common Core instruction?

And what I would say, is that the best way to determine if Common Core instruction is actually being implemented, is that our administrators and our principals need to be in the classrooms and observing what teachers are doing, and assuring that the transition that is offering all this promise is actually being implemented in the classroom.

And the results from that, we see as being a necessary precursor to measuring results in terms of student performance.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: So, very quickly, on a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being the most effective, if you were to pick a number, your assessment, by your organization, of where State Ed is in terms of what you were just describing, what number would you give?

RICK LONGHURST: Probably somewhere in the middle.

Not -- we would give them high marks for the technical work that they have done.

We would give them less high marks for their success in communicating with parents, with communities, with school districts, in spite of huge investments that have been made in seeking to promote those efforts.

It's a very big lift.

We can't underscore that enough.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: So is that a "5" or a "6"?

RICK LONGHURST: We'll say a "6."

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay.

Senator Tkaczyk.

SENATOR TKACZYK: Just a quick question: You

```
mentioned the five town hall meetings?
1
 2
               RICK LONGHURST: Yes.
 3
               SENATOR TKACZYK: I'd love to know if you
        have one in my area, or --
 4
 5
               RICK LONGHURST: We do.
               SENATOR TKACZYK: -- if you could just share
 6
7
        with us, where they are and when you have them
8
        planned.
9
               RICK LONGHURST: I don't have that right in
        front of me.
10
11
               In your area, at the Shenendehowa High School
        West on October 16th, which is a Wednesday.
12
13
               SENATOR TKACZYK: Great, thank you.
14
               RICK LONGHURST: There is a meeting -- a
15
        town-hall meeting the day before that on
        Long Island.
16
17
               The first town-hall meeting is in the
18
        Spackenkill High School on October 10th.
19
               Then there's also one in New Hartford, and
        one in the Buffalo area in Williamsville.
20
21
               SENATOR TKACZYK: Thank you.
22
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Mr. Longhurst -- oh,
23
        I'm sorry.
24
               Senator DeFrancisco.
25
               SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: I just want to make a
```

comment.

I really want to thank you for helping the communication process, because, I was on a school board for 4 years, president for 1 year, about 35 years ago, and, the communication with parents is extremely essential.

And it's -- your organization can either help make or break this process, because once parents feel comfortable in the process, it's going to move in a positive direction.

So, thank you.

RICK LONGHURST: Thank you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much.

Next we have, addressing data privacy, we have Aimee Rogstad Guidera, executive director of Data Quality Campaign, and, I believe, Reg -- as opposed to Reginal -- Reg Leichty from the EducationCounsel.

Thank you very much for being here.

AIMEE ROGSTAD GUIDERA: Thank you so much, Chairman Flanagan and other distinguished Senators.

I'm Aimee Guidera. I'm the executive director of the Data Quality Campaign, and I run an organization this is a non-profit advocacy organization that is trying to change the culture

and the conversation about using data in education.

I am a passionate proponent of using data to improve student achievement in New York, and in every state in this country, and for that reason, I am so pleased and honored to be here today.

So, thank you for having this hearing.

In my short seven minutes I have with you, I'd like to really hone in on three key points.

The first is, that New York cannot afford not to use information more effectively if you want to reach the goal that the Commissioner just talked about, and which all of you have mentioned and endorsed, which is, ensuring that every single New York child graduates from high school ready for the knowledge economy.

We won't get there, we won't be able to make the decisions about how do we invest scarce resources and what works, we won't be able to personalize learning and to tailor instruction to every New York child, unless we change how we use information.

Second of all, citizens of this state, and across the nation, and especially parents, as we just heard, are raising legitimate concerns about how this data is being used, how it's being

collected, how it's being safeguarded.

We must do everything possible to build their trust and their understanding in how this data is being used to help their own kids.

This hearing is an important part of this process at building an openness and a transparency about this information, and more must be done.

And that leads to my third point:

As legislators and the state policymakers, you are in the driver's seat of ensuring, not only that the right data gets to the right people in the right time, especially to parents and teachers, but you're also in the driver's seat of ensuring that this information is kept private, secure, and confidential.

New York, like the rest of the nation, has made unprecedented progress in building its capacity, to not just collect information, but -- and to use it.

This progress, which is documented in many of the materials that I included in your packets, really documents this change in culture that's happening across the country, of changing using data only for compliance purposes and bureaucratic box-checking, to really this change of thinking

about using data for the really important process of continuous improvement of making informed decisions.

And the true power of data comes, not when it's collected and it's sitting in some fancy state data warehouse, which is really important, but the real power of data comes when we turn it into actionable information, and we get it into the hands of end-users; most importantly, students themselves, parents, families, educators, school-board members, and, yes, legislators, so each of those users can make informed decisions.

Because, the dirty little secret in education is, we've made decisions in education for a long time, and we've made it on anecdote, we've made it on hunch, and we've made it on what we did when we were kids, or what feels right.

The bottom line is, now, and today, we don't have to make those decisions without great information, because we have that data, but we have to have a culture change that allows people to trust that this information's useful, that it's valuable, and it's going to be protected.

With the education -- with the launch of the education data portal here in New York, your state will be on the cusp of ensuring that every single

student, educator, and parent in this state has timely access to this information.

This is noteworthy, and New York is on the cusp of being a leader in the country.

Only five states at this point have that ability to communicate that information to every student, parent, and teacher.

If we really want to get to the point of every child, every student, every family, and every parent having equal access to information, the State role is critical in doing that.

Without is the State role, only those districts are high -- that have high capacity or are better resourced have the ability of communicating that information with their families.

If our goal is to have every single child prepared for the knowledge economy, then we have to ensure that every educator and every family has access to that information.

With this greater focus on education's vital use in education, there is an increasing -- and a need to also personalize learning, there's been an increased attention on, How do we protect this data?

This is a legitimate and important conversation that needs to be prioritized.

Building the trust of all citizens, but especially that trust of parents, is critical to ensure the effective use of data.

People won't use data that they don't find valuable, and that they don't trust won't be used to hurt them or hurt their kids.

What we need to do is, to make sure that the public in general, and parents in particular, understand what data is collected, for what purpose, how it's being used, who has access to it, and how it is being protected.

Hearings like this one provide a critical step in this process of openness and transparency, but much more needs to be done.

We need to continue to seek input, get clarifications on facts, but the State has a critical role in ensuring that this information's protected.

As legislators, you are in a unique position to lead this conversation about how we not only ensure that data is used effectively, and that the systems are in place to do that, but equally important, that this data is protected.

For too long, the general sense was that FERPA, the federal education privacy law, was enough

to protect data.

I'm telling you today, it is not enough.

FERPA is a floor to ensuring that data is protected.

New York citizens, New York parents in particular, must know that New York policymakers, New York practitioners, are doing everything possible to protect the data of New York students.

That's your role; you need to do that, and build on the floor that FERPA provides.

There's now a growing list of exemplary state laws across the country that are showing how legislative leadership can really lead the conversations on safeguarding data across the country.

Rather than putting together a laundry list of prohibitions that really don't solve anything, but merely create implementation problems, and oftentimes get in the way, we're seeing in states, like Maryland and Oklahoma, examples of them playing a constructive, productive role in laying out and clarifying for the public, what data's collected, how it's being protected, and building governance structures that ensure that this data is part of a conversation that is very transparent and open, and

that people understand who's in charge; who's making the decisions about what vendors of access to this, what are the privacy assurances that we have.

I've put links to both of those laws in the materials that I sent you.

And I also want to draw your attention to a piece that the Data Quality Campaign put out a couple years ago, a policymaker roadmap for protecting privacy, security, and confidentially while supporting the use of data.

And in that, we really -- we hone in on the best practices from other sectors, such as the Generally Accepted Fair Information Practices, and we've tried to then create a road map for policymakers, like yourselves, of how we can apply that to education, so that in the education sector, we apply the best practices that are being used in every sector across the world, to ensure that we build trust and understanding about how data is corrected -- uhm, collected and protected.

We each have a moral and legal responsibility to respect the privacy and confidentiality of students' personally identifiable information.

To do this, we must mitigate the risks of not just the intentional, but also the unintentional

risks of misuse of data.

And, we also need to ensure the clarity of roles and responsibilities around data collection, access, sharing, and protections.

You as legislative leaders here in New York are critical to making these steps a reality.

This is not an either/or proposition.

We must support the use of data, as we just heard this morning, but we also must ensure that we're protecting this data.

Before I turn the microphone over to Reg, who can talk a lot more about the privacy pieces as a lawyer, I want to leave you with one critical piece as you think about the role of data in education.

Our tag line at DQC is, "How do we change the culture from thinking about data as a hammer to using it as a flashlight?"

And when you think about the conversation that these hearings are really focusing on is about, "How do we make sure, if our goal here in New York is to get every New York kid ready for the knowledge economy?" we need to have clear standards that are based on the realities of today's economy and tomorrow's economy.

We need to make sure everyone understands

those high standards.

Second of all, we need to provide progress reports in a timely way to parents, to educators, to taxpayers, to citizens, to lawmakers, on how well individual kids and groups of kids are doing against those standards.

And, lastly, and I would argue, as equally important, is how do we make sure that we then are guiding our decisions based on what the data tells us; not just out of those test scores, but also out of all the other data points that New York is able to connect to a child?

I would argue that we will not meet our goal of making sure that every child in New York graduates from high school college- and career-ready if we only pay attention to one or two of those legs of the stool.

If we need to be -- if we're going to be successful in our goal, we can't just pay attention to the first two.

You can't just have great standards and great tests if you don't use the information that comes out of those tests to then change what you do and guide your decision-making, whether it be as a parent, whether it be as a

a student, whether it be as a lawmaker.

We have to make a commitment to using that data, and that is what is so important now.

We have to help change the conversation so that data isn't the end of the conversation, but it's the beginning of the conversation.

Yes, we need to keep working hard to protect the privacy, security, and confidently of this data, but what we really need to do, is to do that in this larger context of ensuring that parents, students, teachers, and policymakers in this state have the information that they need to help ensure that every child is on track for success.

We can't afford not to.

Thank you very much, and I'm happy to turn it over to Reg, and then answer any questions.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you.

And, Reg, if you can be brief, it would be very helpful, your testimony is.

And I've never heard, "hammer and a flashlight."

I've heard "shield and sword," and a lot of other things, but "hammer and a flashlight," is a new one.

So, Reg, please go ahead.

REGINAL J. LEICHTY, ESQ.: No, thank you.

Again, my name is Reg Leichty. I'm with EducationCounsel.

We are a law-and-policy team that works closely with not-for-profits like, Aimee's team at the DQC, to promote education reform, and help people understand how to protect student data.

And, quickly, just to echo Aimee's comments, my testimony is going to focus primarily on the federal law that primarily focuses on ensuring that student data is protected.

It's called the "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act"; or, "FERPA."

You know, with the right state practices and policies in place, innovative data use, like those instances that Aimee talked about, can be really effectively balanced with strong protections for students.

And we think that the first step in ensuring that you have great state policies in place to protect student data is really having a firm understanding of what FERPA does at the federal level, so that you can effectively implement it and build on it, as Aimee said, to ensure that your students' data is protected to the best of your

ability.

So I just want to run through a few elements of the law at the federal level, for your, kind of, future consideration.

First, the purpose of FERPA is to limit the disclosure of personally identifiable student data by educational agencies and institutions in the state.

It also provides parents a right to inspect and challenge student records.

So, it's a two-part process, but the primary focus of the law is really ensuring that there's a floor in place to ensure that privacy protections are being implemented by states and districts.

First off, the primary requirement that all educational agencies in your state, including your institutions of higher education that receive federal dollars from the U.S. Department of Education, is to not share any personally identifiable information, except for a few limited exceptions that I'm going to run through.

Non-personally identifiable information, this aggregated data -- or, aggregated data, data that's been anonymized, that's been de-identified, can be shared without limit, that's okay.

But when it comes to personally identifiable data, you want to have a strong strategy in place to ensure that it's only being used in appropriate purposes.

There are a few educational and public-safety and health exceptions that allow personally identifiable data to be shared.

For example:

Data can be shared to evaluate federal, state, and local educational programs;

Personally identifiable data can be shared to support studies that are designed to improve instruction;

Data can be shared to deliver educational services by a district or school;

And it can also be shared in situations -emergency situations where it's important to
protecting the health and safety of a student or
other students in a school.

The Departments of Education's regulations, though, very carefully balanced those sharing exceptions with a number of privacy protections that are focused on ensuring that, whenever sharing occurs, it's only used for an authorized purpose.

They have to put procedures and processes in

place to ensure that the data is not further disclosed for an unauthorized purpose.

And, when the data's no longer used, it has to be destroyed.

Lastly, there are some penalties in place to ensure that these rules are followed, and two key ones are, first of all, the educational agency in the state or state institution of higher education could lose access to the U.S. Department of Education funding if the department finds that it has violated FERPA;

And outside entities that have access to personally identifiable information under one of those allowable exceptions can be debarred from having future access to data for no less than five years.

So, the penalties are very strict.

And, lastly, in conclusion, before we turn to questions, I just want to make a few, sort of, recommendations for you to think about as you're considering state policies to build on FERPA.

First, ensuring that you are strategically and coherently developing a plan for implementing the federal requirements around privacy and confidently.

And that includes establishing appropriate roles for data stewardship, and defining and clearly communicating, which has been a big theme today, to stakeholder groups, including educators and school leaders and parents and the public about the need to protect student data, but also the processes that are in place to do that.

Second, ensuring that you've got comprehensive policy documentation and public transparency, and strong enforcement of the rules you have.

And, third, and I think most importantly, ensuring that there's strong organizational capacity at the state, district, and school level to implement these privacy protections.

Having great laws is important, having great policies in place are important, but, you have to communicate them to the stakeholders at each of those levels of government that are responsible for delivering them, and you have to empower them to be successful in executing on them. And that includes investing in the technology needed to protect the data, on the security side.

So, lastly, I just would respectfully, you know, urge the State to ensure that all of the

individuals and officials responsible for implementing your privacy laws have those resources at their disposal;

That they've taken the time to develop comprehensive policies to implement FERPA and your state requirements;

And then ensuring that they're communicating effectively with people on the ground, in the classroom, in the school, at the district level, about these rules, and how to, actually, effectively implement them.

Thank you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much.

Senator Tkaczyk.

SENATOR TKACZYK: Just a quick question: Do you think we have, in the state, the laws in place to protect privacy for students?

REGINAL J. LEICHTY, ESQ.: Yeah, so, I'm not an expert in New York law.

FERPA has been in place for decades, and so there is institutional policy and practice in place in virtually every school district in the country, that's designed to ensure that student-data privacy and confidently are protected.

I think one important consideration that you

should evaluate, is ensuring that you're not overreaching.

As Aimee said, ensuring that data is available to stakeholders, to really make a difference from kids, is hugely important.

And, too often, we overreach with privacy protections.

So I think you need to harmonize and create a balance between these two important public goals.

So, I'd urge you to really think about, What are our policies in New York, and are they crafting the right balance between appropriate sharing, and ensuring that students and their families are adequately?

AIMEE ROGSTAD GUIDERA: If I may add to that, one of the pieces are, I think, technically, probably, sure, you know, in compliance with FERPA.

We heard the Commissioner talk about that today, that everything's in compliance with state law and federal law.

But what we're finding in states, like Oklahoma and Maryland and other states that are taking up legislation, it's to create the data-governance structure.

So the Oklahoma law -- which, again, I put

into the materials I sent you -- you can, literally, see that they spell out and they test -- they task -- the legislature and the law task the State Board of Education with very specific things to do:

That there's an annual announcement of every data point that is collected on Oklahoma students;

That there is a governance policy that -that the stated -- all points, every year, needs to
review its privacy -- all privacy policies and
security policies, and post them publicly;

That every parent can go to -- that anyone can to go a website and, literally, find the privacy and security protocols on the Department of Education website.

So there are very specific pieces.

And I think what has been the tenor of the conversation thus far this morning, has been this need to, you can have laws, you can have policies, you can have standards, you can have tests, but if nobody knows about them, and people have questions, then you have a whole lot of problems.

And I think that that's the piece with the privacy and security and confidently.

Our number one piece we say in here is, start

with communicating to people with why we're 1 2 collecting this data, and then help them understand why it's critical; the "What's in it for me?" 3 And then to go to next piece, which is then, 4 5 And this is how it's being safeguarded and shepherded so that it can be useful. 6 7 So I think there's always more you can do. 8 Protecting data, and, especially, as the technology continues to change, our privacy policies 9 10 need to continue to keep up to speed with that. And so this is -- we're never going to be 11 12 done protecting data. 13 It's not something we can legislate this year 14 and say, We're now done about it. 15 We need a process and a governance structure in place that will keep up and continually find ways 16 to safeguard data, and always. 17 18 SENATOR TKACZYK: I have your testimony, but 19 I don't have your backup material, so if you could --20 21 AIMEE ROGSTAD GUIDERA: I will get packets to 22 you. 23 And, also, in all the -- in the testimony, the links are all live, so all the material's on the 24 25 website as well.

But, I'll get you hard copies.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: I have a couple of quick ones, and I look at this through the prism of a parent.

You know, my kids are out of elementary and secondary education, but, it strikes me that there are a couple of basic things.

One, the people who are critical of the dissemination, or potential dissemination, of student data, they seem to be focusing a lot more on perspective, that now there's a lot more data being collected, it's going through a central warehouse, if you will, that warehouse being the State of New York.

And I would -- if you have it, in it terms of submitting it to us, it would be very helpful -- I'm not aware of a series of egregious violations to date.

It seems that there's much more concern about where we go prospectively.

And I don't know if you've seen this stuff, but there's a lot of stuff coming from parents now saying: Why the heck do you need by kid's disciplinary records? What does that have to do with their education?

Is that record going to be now available to a

college or an employer who, because my kid was a

truant in third grade, now they're going to be

summarily dismissed from potential future

employment?

Do you -- is that something you focus on?

AIMEE ROGSTAD GUIDERA: Yes.

So in this document, like I -- your -- we -- the Data Quality Campaign, every year, does an annual survey.

We've done it now for nine years, and we do an annual report every year, on every state.

So, literally, you can go to the DataQualityCampaign.org website and find exactly where New York is.

And I'll send you a state profile on that.

And it says exactly what data is being collected and warehoused at the state agency.

The question about discipline records, and things, again, in the Oklahoma legislation, the law, right now, it spells out exactly how that information will be dealt with, and what's part of a permanent record versus what's not.

And, again, these are decisions that you as legislators can lead in the conversation, and also

have the authority to task the Regents and the Board of Regents to create those guidelines that can assure the public at large with what is happening with this data. What is -- rather than the miss and -- misperceptions that are so now a part of social media and conversations that we're hearing about, is be very clear about what the current status is.

And if people don't think that that's the right process, "What's the process for changing that?" and having a conversation about it.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: On that point, if we have legislation, I understand that, but, in your opinion, right now, is the availability and the access to the present state of data in New York, do you believe that it is transparent, or not?

AIMEE ROGSTAD GUIDERA: I think it will be much -- much better when the portal is live.

From my limited understanding of knowing what's happening, as I said, this is the part that every single state is struggling with.

It's the provision of, one, "What data -- how do we share with parents and the public at large what data is being collected?" and states are struggling with that.

And this focus right now is very much getting states to put that information up and be much more transparent.

New York needs to do more on that.

The second piece, in terms of ensuring that parents, teachers, educators, have data on specific kids that they need to help make decisions on,

New York will be a leading state if this education portal goes live and is implemented as planned.

As I said, this is this hardest piece.

It's not just collect -- it's not building the data systems that collect the data; it's how do you create the tools, the resources, the portals, to get it into the hands of people when it's actionable information.

And that part of it, that second part,

New York will be a leading state if this goes as

planned the next four months.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Reg, one last quick question:

On the -- in your testimony, you speak to, if there's a violation that -- through the federal office, that you -- basically, you go to the guilty party and give them a chance to correct.

And I may be oversimplifying, but it strikes

me that parents would be, like, Wait a second. 1 2 And as a legislator, I want to -- you know, 3 if you violate the law, you should be smacked. It shouldn't be, like, Oh, I'm sorry, you 4 5 know, I disseminated all these social security 6 numbers. 7 Do you believe that sanctions at the federal 8 level are strong enough? REGINAL J. LEICHTY, ESQ.: Yes. 9 10 So, let me answer the first question first, because it's a good one. 11 So FERPA has, for many years, had these two 12 13 remedies: 14 The first is, withholding federal funds that 15 are provided through the Department of Education; 16 And the second is, debarring agencies, that 17 are not school districts or schools or institutions 18 of higher education, from having access to student 19 data for five years. The law says, that before those penalties can 20 be levied on a violator, the Department of Education 21 22 has to give them a chance to voluntarily remediate. 23 And the purpose of that approach, is to balance the important values of ensuring student 24 25 privacy with ensuring that there are federal

resources that are primarily dedicated to at-risk 1 2 kids in poor communities are still flowing. 3 So rather than smack them down in one fell 4 swoop with removal of greatly needed resources, the 5 department says, We're going to give a chance to 6 remediate. 7 There have not been, to my knowledge, major problems with educational institutions and 8 9 educational agencies honoring their requirements 10 under FERPA, so that tells me that the requirements are probably stiff enough. 11 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much. 12 13 Appreciate the time. 14 AIMEE ROGSTAD GUIDERA: Thank you. 15 Next we have the New York State United Teachers. 16 17 We have Steve Allinger back, for the second 18 time, having come to Long Island; 19 And we're joined by Kevin Ahern, who is the president of the Syracuse Teachers Association. 20 21 KEVIN AHERN: Good afternoon, Senators. 22 Senator Flanagan, I wanted to thank you for 23 providing us with this opportunity to be heard. 24 I have been fascinated by much of the 25 testimony coming out of Long Island, and what I've

heard so far today.

I do want to talk a little bit about -- today
I'll talk a little -- provide you with some context
about how the Reform Agenda is playing out in our
neck of the woods up here in Syracuse, and
specifically in the Syracuse City School District,
but I do -- I will also talk about the larger
context, and in talking with my colleagues
throughout the county and throughout the state, and
some of their impressions with what's going on.

I'm president of the Syracuse Teachers Association.

We represent, here in Syracuse, 2500 people who work with the students of Syracuse every day.

Over 1400 of them are actual classroom teachers working with kids in classrooms every day.

In Syracuse, also, we are fortunate to have an organization called "Say Yes" working here --

We are partnered with them, the district is partnered with them.

-- who has managed to bring together a tremendous community-wide effort to really help our kids in poverty.

We believe it's a strategy that needs to continue and be supported throughout.

Say Yes has managed to create unprecedented collaborations between the city government, the county government, the universities, community-based organizations, throughout Central New York.

Certainly, the school district and the teachers association are involved.

And I will talk a little bit more about them later, but we are -- we really believe that that is a reform strategy here in Syracuse that is worth hearing about.

Unfortunately, the efforts -- the things that are happening now that we see with the Reform Agenda threatens these efforts, and I will talk a little bit more about that.

I was interested to see -- to read the Long Island testimony.

And I think, you know, it was very consistent throughout, and you had, again, a broad swath of stakeholders who testified, and their thoughts really echo pretty much what we hear up here, too.

I think the message is very clear coming out of that, that the Regents Reform Agenda, as currently implemented by State Education Department, is not working, and, in fact, may be doing more harm than good.

This agenda has really -- and I'm not going to go through all the comparisons or similarities that we're having here with folks down there.

Suffice it to say, we are struggling with this agenda in many, many ways.

We're struggling with the implementation of the Common Core, the lack of resources to support that, the overreliance on testing, lack of adequate resources again, demoralization and de-professionalization of our members, our teachers.

It's all happening right here, right now.

The impact of this agenda has been devastating here in Syracuse because we have an already-struggling school district.

And this -- the mandate -- unfunded mandate on top of unfunded mandate on top of unfunded mandate, when you have a district that is already struggling, it can send it into crisis, and we are beginning to feel a sense of that now.

I want to talk about the demographics of this school district, because they're important when we talk about, What are we doing for kids, and how are we helping kids be successful?

80 percent of our students in this school district are eligible for free and reduced lunch.

50 percent of the children who live in Syracuse, "50 percent," live below the federal poverty line.

The implications of that are vast.

So when we talk about a school system, and the success of a school system, we must look at the children in context in that school system.

Since 2009, education funding cuts in this district have caused us to reduce 25 percent of our employees.

Hundreds of them are teaching assistants and teachers working directly with kids every day.

With the student population of nearly 20,000 that has remained consistent over that time, the amount of adults available to work with those kids has dramatically increased.

So it's this context, a high-needs student population and a chronic lack of funding to support them, where the negative impacts of this Reform Agenda are felt most acutely.

The flawed tests administered without necessary curricular support, the Common Core test last year, when you give those to kids who already struggle with standardized tests, many of whom struggle to get to school every day, that is not, as

somebody once said, ripping off the Band-Aid.

That is actually pouring salt on the wound.

It is demoralizing to those children.

It's demoralizing to those of us who work with them every day.

Add to that, the challenge of developing and implementing SLOs, or alternative measures of growth, on a scale in a district where we have 1400 classroom teachers, a couple hundred administrators, and 20,000 kids, the stress placed on our internal systems here in the district is tremendous.

It is at the breaking point, where, as all the goodwill and all the good intentions of this Reform Agenda can undermine -- can be undermined, and our collective desire to help these kids and improve outcomes for kids can be undermined, because of the stress on the system that has been unaccounted for financially.

In addition to this, there are punitive measures that come with the Reform Agenda via the Race To The Top.

Schools that don't perform well on tests get punished in this environment.

We have an entire district that does not

perform particularly well on tests.

19 our schools in this district have been identified -- 19 out of 32 have been identified as what they call "focus schools."

That is another word for failing schools.

Those schools are required to go through four turnaround models, and I won't list them all for you, but I can tell you this, two of them are simply not feasible in a district like this.

Another one, we have used up our allotment, per Race To The Top.

We are now forced to use a model that requires 50 percent of staff and the principal be removed from that school, and then reconstituted from there.

When the Commissioner talked about the I-zone, the I-zone is something we worked on, with the superintendent, to try to do some innovative things within the context of these schools being forced into a turnaround strategy that says you have to remove 50 percent of the staff.

There is no science behind the "50 percent" number.

This is an arbitrary number, completely made up by people who don't work in education, or who

oversee education but are not educators. 1 There's no science behind 50 percent. 2 3 Why not 25 percent? Why not 30 percent? 4 5 There's no science behind it. It is the idea that a lot of activity will 6 7 somehow create achievement. 8 The communities that these schools exist in, 9 we have to do five of them -- we are doing five of them -- we did five of them over the course of last 10 11 summer, and into the fall. We moved hundreds of teachers throughout the 12 13 district in order to accommodate this. 14 We pulled teachers who had been in schools, 15 some of them for well over 20 years, had taught 16 generations of families, had relationships with many 17 of the children and parents in these neighborhoods. 18 Because of this, they were moved out of those 19 schools. It's disruptive to a neighborhood. 20 21 It is disruptive to children, to parents. 22 It's certainly disruptive to the 23 professionals who work in those schools. 24 And I would also say this: It destabilizes, 25 to a certain extent, that community.

It is a very, very unfortunate set of circumstances, when we are -- when we have state-mandated disruption and destabilization.

I would also suggest this: When you look at the demographics of these neighborhoods, and that we have state-mandated disruption and unscientific methods being forced upon us to, quote/unquote, "reform that school," if that were happening in some of the suburbs surrounding this area where the demographics are significantly different, and the people who live in those suburbs are middle-class or upper middle-class, there is not a parent or a legislator in this state representing those people who would stand for this.

It happens in poor neighborhoods.

The focus schools throughout the state have one thing in common: The kids are poor. They don't have the resources.

So when I refer to Say Yes as a reform model, Say Yes actually looks at the things that matter most to the kids in the circumstances we find them in here in Syracuse. They look at, you know, providing the kinds of supports kids need.

Social, emotional supports; after-school activities, more learning in the summer; those are

the kinds of things Say Yes and our school district has been interested in since we first began that journey with Say Yes, because we recognize, as urban educators working in a poverty-stricken district, the things that our kids need.

I grew up in these schools. I graduated from Nottingham High School in 1976, and I'm a very proud graduate of that school.

But I will tell you right now, the demographics of this city, and the student population, is significantly different than it was in 1976.

"Significantly different."

So the outcomes for kids have changed dramatically as a result.

None of the Reform Agenda really addresses any of this. It doesn't address any of these kinds of needs.

We talk about a need to go to the Common Core, and, you know, I'm fine with the Common Core.

I think most teachers are relatively supportive of it. Some are very supportive; some are less.

They're willing to do the work to do that.

That's instructional; it's important that we provide the best instruction.

Teachers need support in that.

And we'll talk a little bit more about that.

But, there is no support, it seems, or nobody seems to be really be listening, when we talk about, there's this broad statement out there that our schools are failing, that has been out there for a long time.

And the Commissioner points out, you know, the ready-for-college rate, and all of those kinds of numbers.

All our schools aren't failing.

Kids in the suburbs, generally, are doing fine. They're graduating over 90 percent of their kids. They're doing well on state tests, and they're going to the college of their choice, or the college that their parents can afford.

The schools, if you did an overlay of education achievement, by whatever standard the state has, take that map and lay it over, the pockets where kids aren't doing well are in ZIP codes where poverty exists.

None of this Reform Agenda addresses that in any meaningful way.

As we talk about the State's rolling this out, and their support, it's not just our district where we haven't felt terribly supported.

Virtually, all my colleagues I talk to about the implementation of all this feels that State Ed has missed the opportunity to do this the right way.

And it could be a tragic misfire, because it will create, and has created, a problem of credibility for state -- New York State education.

Under-resourcing, and over-mandating, and not giving the appropriate amount of time, has led to a lot of doubters.

Teachers feel that this evaluation system is really only about putting them in one of four categories, and sorting them out.

Parents are feeling that the testing is obsessive and it's bad for kids.

So when that's happening, the credibility of the entire system is brought into question.

And, again, good intentions, we understand that.

You'll never hear a teacher stand up and say, I don't want to be evaluated.

You'll never hear a teacher, not this teacher or teacher leader, ever stand up and say, The system

as it existed before was something that we should 1 2 hold up as exemplary. 3 It wasn't. There are -- there's a framework in -- that 4 5 we can work within in the new evaluation system that has some real promise, that can actually do the 6 7 things for teachers to improve their practice that it should. 8 9 We're not dismissing it. 10 The same is true for the need for testing. 11 Teachers test all the time. They use assessments all the time. 12 But the obsession with testing, connecting it 13 14 with kids and teachers in a high-stakes way, and 15 school districts in a high-stakes way, has gone too 16 far, and too fast. 17 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Kevin, can I ask you to 18 kind of wrap up --19 KEVIN AHERN: Yes. 20 SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- because I know my 21 colleagues have questions. 22 KEVIN AHERN: Yes, absolutely. 23 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you. 24 KEVIN AHERN: And, again, I don't mean to 25 prattle on.

I do -- I do want to, you know, get to the ask here, so, if you'll let me do that.

I would urge you to join teachers and parents and call for best practices in measuring student achievement.

That means ensuring our youngest students are not forced to take tests that are developmentally inappropriate.

That means requiring transparency and the State's use of standardized test.

I ask you for the time, for students and teachers need to gradually implement the new learning standards in order to get it right.

That should include postponing the implementation of the Common Core Regents' exams as a graduation requirement.

It should include a three-year moratorium on the high-stakes aspect of the consequences for students and teacher who are doing everything possible to keep up with this work, despite great odds working against them.

I urge you to provide the full resources districts need to ensure all students have an equal opportunity to master the state's new learning standards. Our students' challenges are only

worsened by the State's hyper-focus on testing 1 2 instead of the supports and services they need. 3 Finally, students living in poverty need 4 State-sponsored support, not State-sponsored 5 disruption. They need safety nets, not sanctions. 6 The Reform Agenda should be supporting the 7 development of state-of-the-art community schools 8 and efforts by organizations, like Say Yes, that not 9 only provide scholarships, but also create 10 unprecedented collaborations between stakeholders, to bring the resources to our kids, and their 11 families. 12 13 If New York is really interested in providing every student with a first-class public education, 14 15 and the fundamental issue of poverty, access, equity, and opportunity must be seriously addressed. 16 17 Thank you for listening. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Kevin, thank you very 18 19 much. I know that's consistent with what we had 20 21 heard from Nadia, your colleague on Long Island, 22 from Middle Country. 23 But, I believe Senator DeFrancisco has a 24 question. 25 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Yes, the -- I was

listening to your asks just now, and I reread them. 1 2 None of the asks was to get rid of the 3 concept of the Core curriculum, get rid of the reforms. It's, basically, postponing the 4 5 effectiveness. 6 Is that fair to say? 7 KEVIN AHERN: Yes. 8 I think, we're not asking to get rid of the 9 Common Core. We're asking for a sensible, timely rollout 10 11 with the appropriate resources. SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Okay. 12 13 Now, with the appropriate resources, you 14 mentioned that there was less and less State aid, 15 especially for students in schools that have a high level of poverty; is that correct? 16 17 How much is enough? What's enough? 18 How much per pupil should the state be 19 providing that will solve this problem? 20 Because, the resources seem to be the main 21 issue, and they've been since I was on the school 22 board 36 years ago. 23 KEVIN AHERN: Well, there was a --24 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Tell me, how much is 25 enough?

STEPHEN ALLINGER: Senator, there was a process to develop estimation of what was required for every child to have a sound basic education provided in every school.

It was a costing-out study that was part of the resolution of the Campaign for Fiscal Equity lawsuit, and that was embedded in the foundation formula that was overwhelmingly adopted by the Legislature.

In the first two years, 2008, 2009, it was implemented, generally, according to the plan, and it resulted in real dollar investments in high-needs schools, that made a difference for kids, and there was an improvement in scores, and a closing of the achievement gap.

But as the Great Recession took hold, that was, first, frozen, and the gap elimination applied.

So I -- we would submit that you go back to a full implementation of the foundation formula, based on the best estimates that the State could get from experts, and what is the foundation amount needed to educate every child to high standards.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: My question is, what is the amount?

I mean, do you remember from that decision?

STEPHEN ALLINGER: In those dollars, in 2007 1 2 dollars, that was about 7 billion. 3 There was a plan to reestimate, because 4 technology change, standards change, every several 5 years. That plan was shelved, the promise not kept. 6 7 I can't give you an instant Cream-of-Wheat answer, but I would be glad to have -- with some 8 time, get back to you with information on how to 9 estimate the sound and basic education full funding. 10 11 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Do you have an estimate as to whatever that "billion dollar" number --12 13 STEPHEN ALLINGER: We're several 14 billion dollars short of the plan. 15 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Excuse me, I could finish the question? 16 17 STEPHEN ALLINGER: Sorry. 18 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: That -- whatever the 19 number of billion dollars, and how much we're short, do you have an estimate as to the dollars per child 20 21 in the school district that's high poverty? 22 STEPHEN ALLINGER: It's a few thousand short, 23 but we will -- rather than just doing it off the top 24 of my head, I will get that information to you. 25 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Well, I asked for this

number, because I don't remember the number, but -and there has been a very difficult financial time.

But just so that people here know, as far as the Syracuse School District is concerned, the State aid; not federal aid, State aid alone, for 2011-2012, was \$12,264 per child.

The following term, following year, 12,986.

And this past year, 13,293.

Now, I know that the numbers were going up during the implementation of that increase in foundation aid, but not that dramatically.

So, I don't think -- what I'm getting at, I don't think money is the only issue here.

And, Kevin, you had mentioned many other issues, poverty level, and the like.

And one of the things I'd like to hear from the teachers, because this is a concern of mine, that, in some districts, and I've heard many parents in the Syracuse School District -- there was just a report in today's paper, I think -- that there's disruptions in the classroom that makes it very difficult for teachers to teach.

And, apparently, what's occurred recently, is the report today said that it's too racially biased, or whatever it may be.

Well, whoever's doing it, is there a solution 1 2 to make the job of teachers better, so that students who want to learn can learn? 3 You know, what's the solution, if you can't 4 5 suspend someone and get the disrupters out of the 6 classroom? 7 What do the teachers want with respect to that issue? 8 9 KEVIN AHERN: Teachers want to be able to 10 teach. 11 Right? So, I think there's a couple of issues here. 12 13 One, as I noted earlier in my testimony, we 14 have eliminated 25 percent of the staff of this 15 school district. Those are adults who supervise kids all day. 16 17 So as a consequence, you know, and I don't 18 have any scientific research on this, but common sense would tell us all, there are less adults 19 supervising the same amount of kids in the same 20 21 buildings, so, that can lead to lots of issues. 22 Right? 23 So I think that's one significant factor. 24 Another -- I do think this is an important 25 issue, and it's certainly not for a huge discussion

here, but I think it's a community-wide issue, and
I think it needs to be -- I think we need to find
solutions within the community.

And by "the community," I mean parents, teachers, lawmakers...I think everybody needs to address this issue of safety in the schools.

And I think last night's discussion of suspension rates is an interesting topic, and an alarming number, but I think the solution will be much more complicated than simply looking at those.

And to your earlier point, Senator, about the finances, and all of that, I don't have chapter and verse on those numbers, but, as you know, budget season approaches.

We will bring a delegation in, and I can guarantee you -- I know that Suzanne Slack, CFO for the school district, can give you chapter and verse on the impact of the lack of CFE funding.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: One last issue, because I don't want to monopolize it, but one last issue --

And I'd like to get together with you on the disruptions in the classroom.

KEVIN AHERN: Absolutely.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: -- because I don't see how any teacher -- my wife was a teacher -- how you

can possibly teach in a classroom without getting rid of the kids who don't want to learn, somehow.

Whether it's putting them in a separate classroom and teaching them with less teachers, or whatever.

But -- because you can't prevent those who want to learn, learn; and teachers who want to teach, teach, in an atmosphere they can teach.

Lastly, Say Yes, and I was involved at the beginning of that, I learned something that just totally shocked me, and I want to get your opinion on this; and that is -- because I was going into this remediation issue, and the hundreds of millions of dollars that are spent by kids using their money -- their tuition money for remediation, for colleges paying dollars upon -- millions of dollars on remediation, because kids aren't ready for college.

Now, it's a wonderful concept, in my judgment, that if a kid in poverty has the incentive of a pre-college education --

And by the way, the suburban districts don't get this. It's only the city of Syracuse, so there are things that go to the poverty districts.

-- but, I was shocked to learn that all a

student needed to get a free college education under 1 2 the Say Yes program, was to get a city 3 school-district diploma. They don't have to be ready for college. 4 5 KEVIN AHERN: Well --SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Now, let me just, last 6 7 point. 8 KEVIN AHERN: Go ahead. 9 Sure. 10 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: It seems to me, whether 11 you're in poverty or not, and if a parent knows that their kid has got to be college-ready to get that 12 13 education, there ought to be some parental support 14 to make sure the kid is ready; not just getting a 15 piece of paper pushed on to learn how to read more proficiently in college. 16 17 You know, what -- is there something, a disconnect there, or am I wrong? 18 KEVIN AHERN: Well, I -- I would say this: 19 There certainly are students who graduate, 20 21 and certainly will struggle as freshmen in college. 22 That is another one of the areas that Say Yes 23 actually does focus on. 24 They have a tremendous program, in 25 conjunction with the local community college, that

really brings kids up in the summer, prior to their freshman year, to help them get ready for the work they will do in their first semester.

And, all of this, Senator, focused on

retaining those kids once they're in college, and getting them through to graduation, which is another challenge.

So we -- you know, we've the challenge of getting kids ready to graduate high school, and actually graduating.

Then when they do, there's another challenge, getting them to graduate.

When you have kids -- you mentioned, you know, we do have kids who don't have strong parental support at home.

So, Say Yes recognizes that, and is working on that.

So, I think it's something useful that you pointed out, but I do think Say Yes is working on it.

But, you know, Say Yes needs -- school districts like ours need Say Yeses, and they don't all have them.

And the State needs to look at that model and find ways to support that kind of interaction

between all the players.

You know, Senators, as well as anybody, getting state and city governments to work together, and to get things done for kids, and to eliminate red tape, and various constituency issues, is a really enormous challenge.

And Say Yes has managed to make that happen here in Syracuse in a way that I think is unprecedented throughout the state.

We're hoping to see similar cooperation in Buffalo as Say Yes moves in there.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Valesky.

SENATOR VALESKY: Just a follow-up.

And, first, Kevin, thank you for your testimony.

KEVIN AHERN: My pleasure.

SENATOR VALESKY: I appreciate that very much.

Steve, just a follow-up, I think one of the points that you had made, and, particularly, since I had raised the issue with the Commissioner and the Vice Chancellor in regard to resources, you had referred to the Campaign For Fiscal Equity court case.

I just wanted to -- and I think it was

Senator Seward had mentioned earlier in this hearing, I just wanted to again restate for the record, that it was, in fact, the Senate Majority Coalition, actually, not once, but twice this session, both in the Senate, one-House budget, and I think a standalone legislation at the end of the regular session, as a reflection of the input from school boards and superintendents and others in the educational community, that an elimination of the gap-elimination adjustment, from the legislative perspective, was one of the most important and effective things, this is what I have been told repeatedly, that we could do as representatives of, in my case, the city of Syracuse, and many other districts, but all of us who are sitting here.

So, I guess, Steve, as we're, you know, very soon preparing for the next budget cycle, and not to speak for the Chairman or the leadership of the Senate, but I would certainly anticipate that, from a Senate perspective, we will continue to push that issue.

And I guess my question, Steve, to you, is, is I hope that you will be equally as aggressive about the need to do that.

STEPHEN ALLINGER: I'll try to live up to

that expectation.

We are thankful that the Senate and the Assembly exceeded the Governor's school-aid cap.

We believe the school-aid cap is sized mechanically below what schools need to meet higher standards; for teachers to teach to higher standards and students to learn to them.

And, we believe that you'll need to do that again, particularly in light of the fact that the tax-cap calculation is coming down well below 2 percent, well below the current services-costs increases due to inflation in that sector.

And, that if we're to be serious about reaching these unprecedented high standards, which, by the way, our -- NYSUT, NEA, AFT, have supported the implementation of Common Core, but not the obsession and premature testing.

But, we'll have to increase the amount of resources.

We're working with the Education Conference Board.

You know, we just came out with the joint statement, with all the stakeholders, to have meaningful investment, so we've the proper training, sequencing, time, resources, technology.

And the reason we've called for pausing high-stakes consequences, is we didn't get this -- we don't have an appropriate baseline.

You don't have an appropriate baseline, we have the cart before the horse.

When you have testing based on curriculum that was not properly implemented, where entire grade levels were not -- were absent, and there was a promise to districts that these supports would be in place, 45 other states are taking more measured time to implement it.

Only one other state hurried it.

And, I want to support what President Ahern said, you don't want to create a backlash around the higher standards through poor implementations, and that's why we want to get it right.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Before I go to

Senator Tkaczyk, I would just -- Steve, I would add

that -- well, I don't need to be a cheerleader for

the Executive -- we were -- we certainly built

considerably on what the Governor proposed, but in

fairness, in his proposed executive budget, he

pierced the cap, as a good starting point.

STEPHEN ALLINGER: He did.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: So we were -- we were in a

better position, and we got to a much better 1 2 position in the end product. 3 So, Senator Tkaczyk. SENATOR TKACZYK: I just have a quick 4 5 question for Steve. It's my understanding, that we're funding 6 7 schools at the 2008/2009 funding level. 8 KEVIN AHERN: That's correct, or a little 9 below. 10 SENATOR TKACZYK: Thank you. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Little. 11 SENATOR LITTLE: 12 Thank you. 13 I am on the Mandate Relief Council, and you 14 mentioned mandates. 15 Could you just briefly tell me what you believe, for the teachers -- we've heard from school 16 17 superintendents and school boards -- what would be 18 your top two mandates that you believe are not 19 effective, or schools could do without? KEVIN AHERN: Well, the mandate for 20 21 high stakes attached to these tests would be, 22 I think, the highest priority. 23 That they're -- and, you know, again, we're 24 asking for a moratorium on that. 25 I do want to make something clear, though, so

that all the Senators understand, and from our 1 2 perspective, at any rate. 3 When the State talks about, you know, only 20 percent of this is state tests, and all of that, 4 5 and that's fine, you know, that's true. There's another 20 percent called, you know, 6 7 the "local measures of student achievement." 8 So, that's another 20 percent of the 100 percent, that is -- those are tests, also. 9 10 Those are assessments, also. So when they talk about, you know, only 11 20 percent of this, it's not quite true. 12 13 It's 40 percent of a teacher's evaluation is 14 based on one form or assessment of another. 15 So when we get to this test obsession that we talk about, from our perspective, those are tests 16 that have to be implemented also. 17 18 So we have the state tests, and SLOs for teachers who do not teach subjects that have state 19 tests, as part -- as the 20 percent of that. 20 21 And then we have other measures of student 22 achievement that are more than likely going to be 23 some other form of assessment, or maybe another kind 24 of SLO, with a slightly different name. 25 So -- so in order to evaluate teachers, we

are testing kids at an unprecedented rate.

And the tests, some are for kids, so we can see where the kids are at, but, they serve two purposes:

One, is so we can see where the kid's at, and another, allegedly, tells us where the teacher's at.

So we have 40 percent of our evaluation system is testing to figure out where, supposedly, teachers are at.

So, those are the high stakes we're talking about for teachers and kids and school districts that is a metric that's looked at.

SENATOR LITTLE: Just to address the first one, but I believe that, in the very beginning, 40 percent of the tests were going to be -- of the evaluation was going to come from the state test, and it was through participation with NYSUT and everyone else.

KEVIN AHERN: Absolutely.

SENATOR LITTLE: And I also heard the Commissioner say today that there is flexibility in that 20 percent testing.

And I think that maybe some of our schools haven't really hooked into that; that they should be asking for some flexibility, or doing something

differently. 1 2 But, do you have a second one as well? 3 And I'd really -- you know, if you don't have it right now, I would love to get one from you 4 5 afterwards. KEVIN AHERN: Well -- and, you know, I mean, 6 7 the thought of testing 5-year-olds I think is another real issue. 8 9 SENATOR LITTLE: So the real primary-grade testing, you believe, is too much? 10 11 KEVIN AHERN: Yeah. STEPHEN ALLINGER: And it's developmentally 12 13 inappropriate. 14 Most national and international organizations 15 condemn that kind of testing --16 SENATOR LITTLE: Well, I, too --17 STEPHEN ALLINGER: -- for early grades. 18 SENATOR LITTLE: -- I am hearing from families on that. 19 And I also believe the testing on the 20 21 specialized students is really difficult, and in 22 many cases, it's only telling them what they can't 23 do, which is -- well, but it's an area we're looking 24 at. 25 Let me know, all right --

KEVIN AHERN: Yes, absolutely. 1 2 SENATOR LITTLE: -- if there's ever a time. 3 Because, we really don't hear from teachers as to what some of the mandates are that we could do 4 5 without. 6 KEVIN AHERN: Yes. 7 Thank you. 8 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator DeFrancisco. 9 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: That second point, 10 I agree with you 100 percent, about young people, 11 and people with certain disabilities. But, you've been decrying this whole process 12 13 of teacher evaluations. 14 Wasn't that part of -- weren't you involved 15 in the negotiations, the teachers? 16 And wasn't the ultimate result based upon the discussions with the unions, as well as this 17 18 administration? 19 Didn't you participate? KEVIN AHERN: Well, certainly, Senator, 20 21 NYSUT, on behalf of teachers, worked very closely 22 with the State to negotiate that document, 23 absolutely. 24 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Thank you. 25 STEPHEN ALLINGER: That doesn't -- if I could

add, Senator, this gets to the heart of, and that's 1 2 not in that statute, the implementation of the 3 Common Core. We certainly can implement it in a deliberate 4 5 fashion, where the necessary supports and training and planning and sequencing is put in place. 6 7 And that's one of the heart of the matter that we're concerned about. 8 9 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Are you saying that you're comfortable with the evaluation system as 10 11 long as it's --STEPHEN ALLINGER: Not as it's been 12 13 implemented. 14 I think that there's a tremendous concern 15 about the implementation. 16 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: In other words, it's 17 implemented too quickly? 18 STEPHEN ALLINGER: The rollout was -- it was 19 hurried. It was not sequenced properly. And, we believe that some of the 20 21 interpretations of the law have increased the focus 22 on high-stakes testing, rather than multiple 23 measures, which was your first --24 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: But that was part of 25 what you agreed to, the evaluation process, isn't

1 it?

STEPHEN ALLINGER: We agreed to having a focus on multiple measures, and having it in place, but not an obsession with standardized bubble tests.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Steve, can I go back to something that you just mentioned, and since you were at Long Island, you heard me say this:

For all the people that came to testify,

I had given everyone a homework assignment; and, in
a nutshell, it was to, basically, ask everyone what
their interpretation or their impression was of all
the kids -- or, excuse me, all the tests that a
child has to take.

If you take a snapshot in time, assuming everything stays the same, K through 12 -- a kid comes into kindergarten today, works his or her way through twelfth grade -- what are all the tests that a child has to take?

Now, in the past, NYSUT has provided more detailed information than most.

But, I'm not aware --

And, certainly, I make mistakes every day, but -- and could stand to be corrected.

-- you're talking about testing of 5-year-olds.

I'm not aware of any state mandate that says a 5-year-old has to be tested.

So if there -- can you explain to me what you mean by that?

Because if that's the case, I -- to me, it seems like that's a decision at the local level, by the district, as opposed to State Ed.

STEPHEN ALLINGER: I believe that the focus and overemphasis on high-stakes consequences for districts, for kids, for teachers, has led to local districts, and we don't agree with it, but feeling under tremendous pressure to move down into younger ages, acclimating young children to test-taking, which often is very stressful and counterproductive, and isn't very informative either.

That, if we had the right balance, in terms of testing and other valid multiple measures, informative assessments, in classroom work, that it would lessen the pressure that districts sometimes feel to do this kind of inappropriate early-grade testing.

Moreover, we would like legislation passed, that would not allow for that kind of inappropriate -- developmentally inappropriate testing before ages younger than grade 3.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Right, and we have clearly talked about this, but I'm not aware of any dictate that comes from the Regents, or, in this case, State Ed.

Certainly, there's testing legislation, that there's a strict prohibition on K through 2.

And that's easy to understand, conceptually.

But, I'm just trying to wrap my head around the idea, where does this come from?

If it's a decision at the local level -And we're going to have a couple of

superintendents who are coming up here, including the superintendent of Syracuse.

-- I accept that, and I understand that.

But I'm just not aware of anything where the State of New York is coming in and saying, You have to do this testing in kindergarten or first grade.

Is that --

STEPHEN ALLINGER: There's not an explicit command in statute or reg to do that, but I think that the emphasis -- overemphasis on high-stakes consequences has led to that practice.

I think it should be corrected in statute, and I think we should have a more balanced implementation on multiple measures.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Kevin, I'm just going to differentiate with one of the things you said before. And this is -- I'm being very clear, this is my own opinion.

KEVIN AHERN: Sure.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: I believe, in the state of New York, that we drive money to high-needs districts right now.

There will be a debate today, tomorrow, there were dates in the past, about how much, but on a percentage basis, in this year's budget, approximately 70 to 71 percent of all the new money went to, quote/unquote, "high-needs districts," including Syracuse.

I don't agree with your characterization, that if there were some similar problem in the suburban district, that legislators would not stand for that.

I believe Senator DeFrancisco and
Senator Valesky, who happen to represent suburban
and urban districts, keep that in mind, as do all of
my colleagues, and we grapple with, just as you do,
How do you strike that appropriate balance?

So, I'm confident, as one legislator, that I take a very hard look at the distribution of aid

and its equitability.

And there will always be some debate on that, but I think we are striving to move in the right direction.

And the more we can partner together, the better off it is for everybody, including the kids that we're talking about.

So, appreciate your time, Steve.

Appreciate you being here as well.

KEVIN AHERN: I appreciate it.

STEPHEN ALLINGER: Thank you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: And next we have -- well, funny I should have mentioned it, we have some superintendents who are going to testify.

Corliss Kaiser from Fayetteville-Manlius, a district that's been mentioned prominently at least a couple of times today;

And, Diana Bowers, from the Hamilton Central School District.

DIANA BOWERS: Hi, I'm Diana Bowers, the superintendent of the Hamilton School District.

And, I'm actually going to probably say less than I originally planned to, because a lot of what has already been said, I was going to include in my talk.

But, today I want to talk about three points. 1 2 The first would be, the -- two things the 3 Commissioner King spoke of: one is the change process, and the other is flexibility. 4 Am I not speaking loudly enough? 5 6 SENATOR FLANAGAN: I just want to make sure 7 we have our... 8 I think you're fine. 9 DIANA BOWERS: Okay, thank you. 10 I can tell you that change is hard, and I agree with everything that has been said here 11 12 today. 13 It is -- it's a very difficult process, and the change process is going to be between now and 14 15 many years to come. 16 But if you look at change theorists, they 17 really talk about four different stages of change: 18 form, storm, norm, and reform. 19 And I can tell you that we are in -- we are leaving the "form" stage, and we're about to head 20 21 into the "storm." 22 And, the change theorists also discuss ways 23 of modifying the level of the "storm," and I think 24 that's what we need to discuss today. 25 There's a lot of things that are happening

right now that people don't agree with, but if you listen to the work of Heifetz and Linsky from Harvard, if you can moderate the change and you can moderate the speed of change, it can happen and it can become systematic.

So that's the first thing.

The second is flexibility.

The flexibility that I'd like to discuss is really with the modules.

We are given the opportunity to either decide not to do the modules, or, to modify them to a certain extent.

In Hamilton, we are modifying them.

But I can tell you that, in many cases, our teachers feel the need to actually conduct the entire module, because of fear, and they're not sure where to go besides that.

So that's a second point.

The third, and the most important, are the kids.

We are educating right now the class of 2026, and if you think about the students that we have in our charge, these are kids that are going to experience a world like none other.

We can't even imagine what we're preparing

1 them for.

But one of the concerns that we do have, is that we are preparing them in a way that may not meet the needs of the twenty-first-century learner.

All of the needs, all of the things that we need to prepare our students, are in the Common Core, but they are getting lost by assessment.

And, we need to think about the innovator, the entrepreneur, the mover and the shaker, of the twenty-first century, and prepare what we need to do for them.

So those are my three points, and I'll give it to Corliss.

CORLISS KAISER: Thank you.

And I'd like to say thank you for this opportunity.

Good afternoon, Senator Flanagan and Committee members.

We've had the pleasure of having both
Senator DeFrancisco and Senator Valesky visit our
school district.

Before I begin my comments, I would like to note that we just heard from a very different context in a school district, and the context within

1 which we work.

I had the pleasure of working in the Syracuse City School Districts for four years.

I understand the needs of the district, and

I want to applaud the teachers in that district, the

parents and the students, for what it is they have

to accomplish.

I have five points that I would like to go over.

The first, talking about rigor;

The second, talking about assessments;

The third, on our evaluation system;

The fourth, on the support that our teachers and administrators need;

And the fifth, I didn't have here, but I'm adding it, it's on data. That was such a compelling discussion that was held.

As far as the rigor goes, the change around Fayetteville-Manlius, we started to talk years ago about the fact that, the United States, including New York State, and all the states, isn't necessarily keeping up with our competitors, our top performers in the world.

And, so, we wanted to take a look at the practices; so, what was happening in those

countries.

So along came the Common Core, and we said,
This is going to provide the rigor that we need.

Our teachers agreed with that.

And, three years ago, we began to develop curriculum.

It's true, you've heard today, we're not guide -- we're guided by the Common Core, but we write our own curriculum, and, we spent quite a bit of time doing what is called "curriculum mapping."

It is taking a look at those standards, knowing the type of curriculum that we need, to make sure that the students are successful.

The key to this, is the teachers are doing that work, and they did an extraordinary job of looking at that Common Core.

And, over time, they were both writing and teaching.

It was a daunting task.

I dare say that we've a lot of very tired teachers, but they did a fabulous job at that.

And, so, I would stress the fact that our teachers need to be schooled in the ways to map that curriculum, to make sure that our students are getting the real benefit of the Core.

In addition to that, the Commissioner 1 2 mentioned, we have an initiative called "FM Rights." We've decided that all classrooms, 3 "all classrooms," arts, music, physical education, 4 5 will have students involved in the writing process. And we have done everything we can to develop 6 7 our teachers, to understand the writing process, and 8 to judge that process on a regular basis in our 9 classrooms. 10 So, we dove into the Common Core, we agree 11 with it. 12 It's a good start. We need to keep going 13 with the Common Core. 14 As far as assessments go, this past spring, 15 we had the first tests out that aligned to the Common Core. 16 17 Our test scores did go down. 18 We told people they would. 19 But, it's something that we've to take a look 20 at as a long-range situation. 21 One of the things, again, looking at the 22 top-performing countries, something that I think 23 that we all need to do, they are not giving these high-stakes tests to their students. 24

Instead, what they are doing, is using what

25

we call "formative assessment."

This is regular -- and I'm going to take the word "testing" out of this -- it's regular assessment, in a brief way, of where a student is within the subject matter that they're working, so that teachers have the information to be able to work, step by step, with all children, so that they can make those necessary adjustments; monitor and adjust.

There have been a lot of questions about this. You know, What do we do with these, the test scores? What do we do with the questions from the tests? Et cetera, et cetera.

It's got to be a little closer to home; it's got to be closer to what the student is learning.

And, again, the top-performing countries are taking a look at formative assessments, and they're testing, perhaps, every three years;

Or, they're testing in a cluster approach; meaning, at the end of K-4, the end of 5-8, and at different benchmark times during the high school years.

And they're also then taking a look at some of the international assessments, such as PISA, or, the program for international assessment, which kids

all over the world take, so that they can benchmark, 1 2 but not in as perhaps a frenzied way as we are doing 3 at this point. So, I would suggest that, in a collaborative 4 5 way with the State Education Department, that we take a look at --6 7 And don't throw the baby out with the bath 8 water. We've done a lot of work, and these tests are here, we understand that. 9 -- but are there different ways in which we 10 can do this to cut down on the stress and the 11 frustration that we have? 12 13 Moving into the teacher evaluation -- teacher and principal evaluation, that all happened at the 14 15

same time the Common Core is happening, the high-stakes tests are happening.

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, unfortunately, I believe that it got put into a context that was somewhat punitive, and tried to bring out the incompetencies of our teachers.

I think Kevin stated, very accurately, our teachers are doing a great job.

So when we put them in this context, they're looking at their points. They're not looking at the instruction that they need to be looking at.

And so I would only ask, that with the

evaluation system, that we allow for a positive context, that we tell our public, that our teachers are doing a great job, but there's a lot of improvement needed.

Given the Common Core, given the testing that's happening, put it in the right context, so our teachers can breathe a little easier about this.

And that brings me to the professional-development piece, and I'm going to go back to the top-performing countries.

They spend a tremendous amount of time at the higher-ed level, five, six years, making sure that teachers come out and they are ready to hit the classroom with all the experience that they need.

I think that we need to take a look at higher education, and how our teacher are prepared, and providing them with the amount of experience that they need to hit the ground running in the classroom.

Our kids need that; they need that.

They also provide for ongoing professional development. Like, we don't -- we don't do enough of it here.

And, I think we need to take a look at that.
We need to have time in our school schedules

for teachers to collaborate; to talk about what is 1 best for kids, and to share those practices. 2 3 And we don't in our schedules now really have that kind of time. 4 5 But that's how their teachers are judged, on 6 how well they come together for the students that 7 they teach. 8 And I think we need to look at that system, 9 too. 10 Again, positive context. And I'll end by talking about the data piece. 11 I think data is very, very important to what 12 13 we're doing. 14 The good thing we get from the standardized 15 tests are a lot of great data about our students, and we're using it. 16 17 We're training each other to get that data. The -- though, looking at that system, on the 18 whole, I think may be problematic. 19 We in Central New York, and I believe that 20 21 there are other BOCES and regional information 22 centers, who present presently have data dashboards, 23 who have all of the information that we need, to 24 analyze student progress.

To go to a much larger system, in my personal

25

view, is not necessary, and costly.

I would ask you to take a look at what we're doing in our regional information centers, and perhaps use that model throughout the state.

And, I hope that we can all continue to collaborate, to move forward with the Common Core, with assessment, with evaluation, and training of our teachers.

DIANA BOWERS: And I would just like to add, one of the things that I hope we don't do, and it concerned me when I heard it today, and it's concerned me when I've heard it back in my district, it appears that, at times, we correlate the Common Core with assessments.

And it is not assessments.

Assessments measure what the students have learned by using the Common Core.

But, it has a wealth of information. It can create wonderful experiences for our students to learn in the classroom, and it can develop the twenty-first-century skills they need to be successful in life in the future.

We want to prepare our students for whatever is coming at them.

And we are going to have to modify our plans,

year in and year out, because the change is 1 2 happening that quickly. 3 But, that's our responsibility. It has to also be part of the Common Core. 4 5 We've to have the ability of modifying the practices, on a regular basis, to meet the needs of 6 7 the kids from where they are. 8 And if you imagine what our graduates are going to be like in the year 2026, or what they're 9 10 going to experience, it's going be far different 11 than what they experience today. So part of the Common Core legacy will be the 12 13 graduates, and we have to make sure that the 14 graduates have whatever they need in order to be 15 successful in college and career. Thank you very much. 16 SENATOR FLANAGAN: 17 Senator Valesky. 18 SENATOR VALESKY: Thank you both very much 19 for your testimony, and thank you for the job that you do in both your districts. 20 21 Dr. Bowers, just one question for you, and I ask the question, with the full realization that 22 23 this hearing is not about school governance. School 24 governance is not the point of this hearing.

However, that having been said, I think it's

25

important to note that, your district and a neighboring district are in a merger process, as we speak.

In fact, I think both boards of education have advanced the notion to a straw vote, I think, coming up in several weeks or so.

DIANA BOWERS: Correct.

SENATOR VALESKY: So, I've been -- as I've listened to your testimony, I've wondering, so I'm going ask you the question: To what degree has the Regents Reform Agenda, which is the subject of this hearing, been a factor, if at all, in the merger study, and the decision to move forward, in the first place, and that has led to the -- even the straw vote?

DIANA BOWERS: Well, I can tell you that the Regents Reform Agenda was something that we welcomed with open arms, and we believe that there are a lot of positive things that can come out of the work that we're doing right now in our district and in State Ed.

I can tell you it's going to add a complexity to the potential merger that wouldn't exist before it, because we're gonna -- not only will we have to measure and level out contracts, but we're also

going to have to measure and level out pedagogy.

Right now, we are -- we are adapting, and not adopting, the modules. And, I'm -- our counterparts are approaching that somewhat differently.

The staff development that's required to make sure that we're ready to produce the kind of learners, and teachers, for that matter, that will educate the kids in the potential new district, that will be something that is probably one of the first priorities if the new district is to form.

SENATOR VALESKY: Thank you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Seward.

SENATOR SEWARD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Very briefly, I was struck, I think

Dr. Bowers mentioned the fact that the -- that

these learning modules are not required to be the

guide in the classroom, in terms of covering the

material in the Common Core, but, out of fear,

you're finding that that's what a lot of teachers

are doing.

And then, your point is -- it was well-taken in terms of, the Common Core and assessments should be discussed separately.

There is not that connection, if I got your point correctly.

DIANA BOWERS: Correct.

SENATOR SEWARD: But let's face it, as a practical matter, the fact that, with the first round of testing utilizing the new tests connected to Common Core, our test scores went down, and there's a lot of apprehension from among both educators, parents, and school districts regarding that.

So, my concern is, is that there is a connection, or at least the perception of the connection.

We've talked today, and I directed the question to the Commissioner and the Vice Chancellor earlier, and I'll do the same to you:

In terms of the flexibility, you both have struck on that theme, that you -- the Common Core; but, yet, you develop your own curriculum locally. You feel you have the flexibility to do that.

But, is it possible to move away from these learning modules and go that flexible route, to allow teachers to teach the innovative in the classroom, and still have the students succeed on the assessment test?

DIANA BOWERS: Well, we, too, began -SENATOR SEWARD: The first round has not been

successful.

DIANA BOWERS: Right. We, too, began our curriculum mapping a year ago, in the summertime; and, so, we have aligned the work that we do in our classrooms with the Common Core standards.

At this point, we are looking at making modifications to the curriculum maps, so the terminology that is found within the modules, the exit outcomes that are found within the modules, and, in some cases, the literature that is found within the modules, is understood by our students.

The way that the test questions are written, very often, they will use the terminology, and also refer to certain texts or books that the kids have either have or have not read, depending on whether they are actually using the modules.

That's the part that's making our teachers fearful, because they -- they're concerned that the terminology that is used within our classrooms must match the modules of the Common Core in order for the students to be successful on the assessments.

CORLISS KAISER: I don't know that I would agree that the first round hasn't been successful.

I know the test scores went down, but, as Diana stated, change is messy.

There's no way that students were going to score at the same level, with the type of testing, with the complexity of the text.

By way of example, I took part of the eighth-grade ELA, and as I read through the text, and then I would look at the answers, nothing -- really, you cannot find the right answer in the text anymore.

You must infer.

This is a new skill, and this is a skill brought about by the Common Core.

It's a skill that our students must have.

They must have higher-order thinking skills, and perhaps the schools haven't done everything that they can do.

So, what we will do, from now, our baseline, which, certainly, all of us know that we need work to do, we will begin working more and more with those strategies and skills that the students need.

I guess what, you know, I thought about this whole thing was, I was glad when it was finally over. All of the anxiety and frustration, we were working in fear of unknown.

And now we know; and now we know what we have to do.

And within our own individual capacities, we will work with our teachers and our students, and our administrators, to better understand those skills that our students need.

And I'd really like to look at it in that way: What do we do from today, on? How do we move forward with this?

And we all have some work to do, and some moving forward to do.

And I think that's why we basically say, we agree with the Common Core. This is something we want our students to be able to master.

DIANA BOWERS: And as Corliss said, the -I'm not sure that we weren't successful as well.

And I think that there's a chicken-and-the-egg kind of situation here; that, the outcomes of the test matched the NAEP results, and they matched the college- and career-ready results.

And I think that there was a purposeful movement to realign the test scores with those measurements so we could then align, and move forward.

So, I think that there was -- we knew three months in advance that they anticipated that the scores would drop 30 points. This was before a

child ever sat to take a test; and, so, there was a 1 2 realization that there needed to be a realignment. 3 I'd also like to remind you that this realignment happened two year after another 4 5 realignment occurred. 6 So we have gone through multiple changes 7 within cut scores, and the -- and they were 8 purposeful, and they were determined by the 9 State Education Department. 10 So, I'm not sure that our students did much 11 differently than they did the year before. I'm hoping they actually did better. 12 13 But, the assessments didn't measure that. 14 SENATOR TKACZYK: I have a quick question. Do you feel you have the resources you need, 15 moving forward, to implement the Common Core 16 17 standards at your schools? 18 DIANA BOWERS: Well, I --19 SENATOR TKACZYK: What would you identify as 20 the, you know, things that you need to make that successful transition? 21 22 DIANA BOWERS: In Hamilton, I can tell you 23 that the resources we have, we've looked in other 24 places other than the traditional sources to get

25

them.

And, it doesn't just come from State aid. 1 2 We are a district that is the home of 3 Colgate University. We have support from our 4 counterparts there. 5 Grant writing, other things that are out 6 there, we need to go to sustain what we presently 7 have. 8 So, in the traditional funding methodologies, the answer is no. 9 10 By thinking out of the box, the answer is 11 yes. CORLISS KAISER: And I think what I would say 12 13 of Fayetteville-Manlius, is that we presently have 14 the resources. We've used them wisely. 15 Remember what the Commissioner said about, Are we using those resources wisely? 16 17 We have decided that professional development 18 for teachers and administrators is key, and there 19 are many ways in which we're doing that. 20 Sometimes they cost; sometimes they don't. 21 But we are making sure that we leverage every 22 minute of the day for our teachers, administrators, 23 and students, to make sure that it is efficiently

24

25

and effectively used.

Could we do with less? No.

I think that we have been able to leverage 1 2 every dollar that we have in the best way, moving 3 forward. SENATOR FLANAGAN: I have a couple quick 4 5 things, and I want to thank Diana. I told you before, I got the phrase 6 7 "hammer and flashlight." Now I have "form, storm, norm, and reform." 8 9 [Laughter.] 10 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Learning all kinds of good 11 stuff here. Obviously, both of your districts are 12 13 extremely well-served by your leadership. 14 So, appreciate you being here. 15 I want go back to, Kevin Ahern is still here, and we talked about this in kind of a broad sense: 16 17 If there's no direct mandate, is there some 18 sort of tacit understanding, or, subliminal 19 pressure, if you will, to start doing testing at such an early age? 20 21 And in your respective districts, are you --22 you know, a kid comes in kindergarten, are you 23 saying, All right, is this kid going into science, 24 or math? Or are they going to have an aptitude for 25 the arts?

What are you doing at the local level to 1 2 address that? And do you feel that the State is, you know, 3 like the sword of Damocles hanging over your head? 4 5 How's that for a loaded question? 6 [Laughter.] 7 CORLISS KAISER: It is. 8 And I'm going to say, every district is different. 9 10 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Yes, certainly. 11 CORLISS KAISER: Every district has its own 12 approach. 13 Every district's students have individual 14 needs; and, so, they work within those needs. 15 At Fayetteville-Manlius, we work very hard 16 with the students to get the basics in kindergarten, 17 to make sure that they are meeting the Common Core 18 standards. 19 I wouldn't say that testing is something that is central to that. 20 21 Again, I mentioned formative assessments. 22 Are we benchmarking along the way to see if they're doing okay? Yes, we are. 23 24 And we use that term "benchmarking" quite a bit. 25

For example, literacy is a big part of kindergarten, and, the students are benchmarked, but, they wouldn't know that they are getting a high-stakes test.

All right?

It would be a prompt, and something would be recorded.

So there are different ways in which you can assess students' ability to handle what they're given.

And, again, something that I really would like to see the State look at is, maybe more emphasis on this formative assessment.

It takes it away from the high stakes, and gives the teacher and the student and parent room to breathe, and learn.

DIANA BOWERS: And I agree.

We, too, use formative assessments, right from -- actually, we start in pre-K.

We have pre-literacy strategies that we look for, and the creation of those, and we begin to benchmark as soon as our kids get into kindergarten, until they ultimately benchmark out. And, at that point, we feel that they have the literacy skills necessary to move ahead into middle school and

high school. 1 2 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Yeah, I sit as one of the 3 25 member on the Governor's Education Reform Commission. There's been a lot of good work done 4 5 there. And there was a reference made to -- Kevin 6 7 spoke to this -- Kevin Ahern spoke to this, about 8 Say Yes. 9 They've done a phenomenal job, and working with those folks has been phenomenal. 10 11 But let me go back to, it's sort of an educational-leadership question. 12 13 And I recognize it, very clearly, that each 14 district is different and unique. 15 And, certainly, there are differences between your two districts. 16 17 But, how would you respond, particularly from 18 Fayetteville: 19 The Commissioner spoke about how you jumped How your district was like, All right, it's 20 21 2009, we're getting ahead of the curve. We'll see 22 how it goes, but we're gonna -- we're going all in. 23 Correct me where you disagree.

A generalization saying, What the heck, if you can do it; you went in, and you did all of these

24

25

things and you got ahead of the curve, and you dealt 1 2 with the bumps along the way, why can't everyone else do it? 3 CORLISS KAISER: It's a cultural thing, 4 5 again, in districts. Can it be done? Yeah, it was done. 6 7 Were we totally successful in getting every 8 child to be proficient? No. 9 But we were willing to, as I put in my 10 testimony, step up to the pump. 11 It was our feeling that the rigor coming down with the adoption of the Common Core was what we 12 13 wanted for our students. 14 We discussed this with our parents, too. 15 And in some cases, our parents were, "Oh, that's a bit much," but, we did some hand-holding 16 17 along the way. 18 We have what are called "curriculum nights," 19 so we're always putting this out to parents. We're 20 explaining why we're doing it. 21 And, again, it was tough this year, when some 22 kids who are generally proficient, weren't 23 proficient; but, again, we're reaching out to our 24 parents, we're asking them for their support. 25 So I think everybody has to take to heart

what it is that's in their culture, and how they want to move forward with this.

And I believe that if everybody digs in, they will make progress in this, probably at different rates, but they will make progress, and they will move forward.

DIANA BOWERS: And I'm sure the particulars with FM is somewhat different than Hamilton, but I can tell you that we actually started the staff development that led to the success that we're having with the Common Core, six to seven years before it actually happened.

The terminology didn't even exist, but, we knew what kind of instructional strategies we needed to use for our kids so they could learn well.

Luckily, they do correlate with the instructional strategies that are outlined in the Common Core.

I do feel that some of our colleagues around the state have not been afforded that, and may be having difficulty figuring out what to do with the instructional practices.

I would like to see that added into the plan in the future, for the Common Core, that people receive the type of staff development that's

directly aligned with what they're asking us to do. 1 2 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, and if I may, one 3 last question: Relative to the State Education Department, 4 5 and this is -- it's putting you on the spot, but, I would say the single largest criticism that I've 6 7 heard, and I've done a lot of traveling, is not a 8 wholesale objection to Common Core; but, rather, to the timing and the implementation, more than 9 10 anything else. Correspondingly, there's a very strong 11 feeling in the field, if you will, at all levels --12 13 teachers, parents, administrators -- that State Ed 14 is just not -- not even contemplating, modifying 15 some of their steps, if you will, including the Regents. 16 17 On a scale of 1-10, 10 being a really good listener, what would each of you give State Ed for 18 19 their performance to date?

DIANA BOWERS: Well, I'll take the jump first.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay.

20

21

22

23

24

25

DIANA BOWERS: I would give them a "3."

And I feel that the need to understand the stressors that are out in the field right now is

mandatory for success.

It's not that they're -- they do listen, but to a degree that matches what they're hoping to accomplish.

I think that if they listened a little harder, and understood the difficulties within the school districts that are implementing the Common Core, it would benefit everybody.

CORLISS KAISER: I would have to say that, in the beginning of the process, I would agree with Diana's "3."

I have able to sit with the Commissioner, with NYSCSS, the executive committee.

So over the last couple of years, I have been able to watch how the collaboration went from, pretty much, "This is the way we're going to do it," into one that is now more respectful of what we bring to the table.

So, I'm going to inch that up to a "6," at this point, to say that things are -- we are seeing things change, and the collaboration is increasing.

And the rhetoric from the State Education

Department -- we just had a fall conference -
I think is more in line with, What is it that we
have to do to help you change instruction, change

```
the things that need to be changed?
1
 2
               We need to keep going in this direction.
               I think we need be listened to.
 3
               I brought up, you know, different ways of
 4
 5
        testing.
 6
               And I would like to see, over time, that
7
        we're listened to, and we can work collaboratively,
        in order to get there, because I think there's just
8
9
        a lot of avenues we can follow, and much more
10
        opportunity for us.
11
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: I see the superintendent
        of Syracuse is sitting --
12
13
                    [Technical difficulties.]
                    [A recess was taken.]
14
15
                    [The hearing proceeded, as follows:)
16
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- a little more than
        five minutes.
17
18
               I apologize.
19
               Our next panelist is, David Syracuse, who is
        a science --
20
21
               Oh, Superintendent, you are -- David, first,
22
        then you're next.
23
               I apologize.
24
               I think.
25
               Yes.
```

```
SENATOR LITTLE: His name is Syracuse, that's
1
 2
        what's confusing.
 3
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: It's the excitement, you
        want to get up here. Right?
 4
 5
               DAVID SYRACUSE: It is an exciting place, it
 6
        looks like.
7
               Are the other Senators going to be joining
8
        us?
9
               I'd rather not testify to half a panel, if
        that's possible.
10
11
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: David, if you would like
        to testify, you'll testify now.
12
               DAVID SYRACUSE: That makes sense to me,
13
14
        I guess.
15
               Fair enough.
16
               Well, thank you to --
17
               SENATOR TKACZYK: The light behind you,
18
        that's shining right in my face, and I can't see
19
        you.
               So, adjust that light in the back.
20
               DAVID SYRACUSE: I'm not that much to look
21
22
        at.
23
               UNKNOWN MALE SPEAKER:
                                      I concur.
24
                    [Laughter.]
25
               DAVID SYRACUSE: Accuracy is appreciated by
```

scientists. 1 2 Well, at any rate, I am Dave Syracuse. 3 And thank you very much to Senator Seward who 4 got me into this meeting. 5 He's not here, unfortunately, at the moment, but, hopefully, he'll be joining us shortly. 6 7 The novelty of a teacher testifying at an 8 education hearing hits me right here. 9 Are there any other teachers here, by any chance? 10 11 Couple. Excellent. 12 13 This is good. 14 Hopefully, I can provide a much-needed 15 perspective on this. 16 I've been listening to a few things, and kind 17 of been resisting the urge to call out, so a couple 18 of things that I'd like to point out before I get to 19 what I had to say. These modules are suggestions, and they're 20 21 only suggestions, and teachers should think for 22 themselves. 23 You know what the Common Core says. 24 I know what all the shifts are. I'm a 25 science teacher, if you couldn't have guessed.

And, I know what the English-language-arts

Common Core says, I know what the math Common Core
says, because I'm going be responsible for lots of
it. There's lots of technical writing, and there's
lots of good stuff that science teachers can do in
all of these Common Core curricula.

So I know about it.

If there's modules that are suggestions and you would like to use them, that's fine, but teachers who are afraid of using modules, or they're afraid of what they're going to -- would happen if they don't use modules, it's no different than the curriculum before.

You know what you have to teach.

If the module is the best way to do it, go for it.

If it's not the best way to do it, be a teacher.

I've got a master's degree, I can decide what the best way is to teach my students.

So, the module thing was bugging me a bit.

In terms of testing and time, that is a legitimate concern.

If we're going to expect more of our students with the Common Core, which we absolutely should,

our students need to be pushed further;
all students.

And, clearly, there are lots of problems in this respect.

Students with special needs, poverty, all that kind of thing is important to take into account, but the Common Core is, in general, a good idea, but we can't expect more work to happen in less time.

Last year, I had to take a week and a half out for this SLO testing at the beginning of the year, and then, all sorts of Regents exam testing and other testing at the end of the year.

I was trying to squeeze in a lot more to a lot less time, and that was just not helpful.

So, I don't know if extending the school year is a possibility, I don't know if reducing the amount of testing is a possibility, but, certainly, you can't expect more achievement crammed into less time.

And in terms of teaching, someone made the comment that, Gosh, we have that distractions in the classroom.

We can't remove students who are distracting, because we have to educate all students.

We in public education have that charge. 1 2 We have "all" the students that we have to 3 educate. And I don't want kids going out there who 4 5 don't know. I'm the last science teacher they might ever 6 7 have. 8 I teach eleventh- and twelfth-grade science, and that keeps me up at night. 9 10 It really does. 11 I don't want them going out there not knowing about the science behind lots of scientific 12 13 concepts: genetic engineering, abortion, cloning. 14 I don't want them going into that voting 15 booth to vote for people like you, not having the 16 hard science to understand what exactly they're 17 voting on. 18 So, that's scary to me, that -- that we can't 19 have kids removed. 20 We've got to work with parents, we've got to 21 work with support staff, with principals. 22 We've got to lessen the load on principals 23 and vice principals, so they can actually do the 24 discipline we need, instead of doing the mountains

of paperwork required by the APPR.

25

It's going to take some work, but we can't 1 2 push kids to the sidelines. 3 So, that's really, really important. In terms of listening, State Ed is doing more 4 5 than listening. I'm on a listserv of teachers that share 6 7 ideas throughout the state, and it's really 8 productive. 9 If I need a particular worksheet, or, I say, Hey, I'm teaching evolution, and I need something to 10 11 get at this particular aspect, I can put it out there and, you know, 100 people will send me, Here's 12 13 what I do it. Here's --14 It's a great forum for discussion. 15 State Ed, their education department, has people watching that listserv, just so we don't 16 17 misstep, just so we don't, I don't know what. 18 So I don't want to call it spying, because 19 that seems disingenuous, but, they are monitoring the listsery, and that seems a little odd. 20 21 I know about this, because they sent me a 22 cease-and-desist letter as a result of something 23 I posted on that listserv. 24 [Laughter.] 25 DAVID SYRACUSE: Funny story I can tell you

1 later, if you'd like.

But, at any rate, down to what I'm here to talk about, I'm really concerned about the private meddling in public education.

Pearson's been mentioned a number of times.

They've got a

32-point-something-million-dollar contract over 5 years with the State of New York.

And what the Commissioner perhaps didn't say before is, the company doesn't want to release more test questions because they want to make a profit.

They want to make a profit. They're keeping the test questions, so they don't have to work and pay more people to develop more of them.

He gave a really nice explanation of all -and that's a fantastic idea of how to make a test,
and all the different types of questions on tests,
that's true.

But I have it -- I can't believe that Pearson is just saying, Oh, we need to keep these for pedagogical reasons.

They're a company. They're responsible to their shareholders, and they need to turn a profit.

And, so, I think that's why they're keeping a lot of their questions hidden.

Now, I have absolutely no way to prove that, and I don't mean to be libelous or slanderous, but, that just is a very interesting and rather cozy situation that I thought that I'd bring up.

And, I'll go all the way back to the Jeffersonian model of education that a lot of the educators in this room are probably familiar with: That, if you have an educated population, you've got to have good schools to educate them.

So schools should be free, and you should make sure that everyone has a chance, a shot, at a good education.

Once you get that good education, you go and you vote for people to take the country in the right direction.

So, we voted for you, because we think you're going to take the country, our state, our, you know, whatever, in the right direction.

If any part of that breaks down, our country ends up going the wrong way.

Or, if any part of it is driven towards something that is not the will of the people, like Pearson, or like another testing company, or something like that, then our country is going in a very different direction.

So, if we have people like Pearson, if we have other test companies like that, designing tests, and then teachers are trying to get their students to do well on those tests, because the teachers are going to be judged on the results of those tests, well, is it really the people that voted that are determining which direction education goes?

I don't know if it is.

And that concerns me.

I'm a proponent of public education.

Mr. Webb [ph.], Mr. George Webb, he was my high school biology teacher in ninth grade.

And ever since I had him, I said, You know what? Wow, he is having an awful lot of fun doing that. I mean, he's up there, and he's doing all these cool labs, and he's got these cool demonstrations, and there are animals all over the room. I want to do that.

And I think I'm very unusual in the fact -probably unusual for many ways -- but I'm unusual in
the fact that, from ninth grade, I really knew
I wanted to be a teacher, and I wanted to teach
science, because I enjoy it, and I think it's
useful. And it's certainly necessary.

But when we've people who are not me, who are not educators, who are not elected officials, who are not teachers going to write Regents exams, making policy, or making decisions, whether it be de facto or de jure, or whatever, for our state, that worries me, because, are we privatizing education?

If we are, let's call it that, and let's have an open discussion about it.

But, it really does worry me in that respect.

So private meddling in public education really does worry me.

It also worries me that a lot of the Regents who are elected by the Senate of New York don't have a lot of education experience.

And I know that the Regents supervise a lot of things.

They supervise, you know, museums, and informal education, and all sorts of things like that, but a lot of them don't seem to have much experience in terms of education.

A lot of them might be hospital administrators, they might be -- certainly, leadership abilities is there in abundance, but, I don't know if those are the people that I want

approving education curriculum.

Maybe it's just more of a rubber stamp if they don't actually have the experience in education.

And the final point that I would like to make, and then give you some time for questions, is evaluation.

I'm a "79." That means that my evaluation score from my SLO was a 79 percent.

That puts me in the "effective" range.

I don't know if that means that 21 percent of what I say is complete rot and you shouldn't pay attention to it, but, I'm a "79."

That's what I am.

I don't care who knows that, because the evaluation system that I went through, and I know this is separate from the Common Core so I'm not going to conflate the two, but did not improve my teaching at all.

It did not enable me to implement the Common Core in any meaningful way.

It didn't help me reach a child in anything else.

If anything else, through any calculations, I spent at least 24 hours of my life in staff

meetings and whatnot last year, completing SLO 1 2 paperwork, and all sorts of things like that --3 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Did you say 20 percent? DAVID SYRACUSE: 24 hours. 4 5 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Oh, all right. 6 DAVID SYRACUSE: My apologies. 7 -- which was time I certainly could have 8 spent collaborating, or doing anything else, other than this silly paperwork. 9 10 So the question remains then: Don't complain unless you have a solution. 11 Well, it seems that this high-stakes testing 12 13 that we've been talking about, and the 14 implementation of the Common Core, and all that kind 15 of thing, is driving us toward analyzing teachers, and we should. 16 17 We should definitely evaluate teachers. But, students are not products. 18 19 For the love of Darwin, they are not 20 products. 21 You can't send them down the assembly line. 22 If I am making televisions, and I am the best 23 antenna installer possible, every television that 24 goes down my line, the antenna is going to stay on 25 there, and it's gonna be stuck on there for the rest

of that television's life. 1 2 I have students who are selectively mute. 3 They don't talk or write because they are so anxious about it. 4 5 I have two students this year who are 6 pregnant. 7 I have students who are in abject poverty. 8 One is homeless. 9 So I tried to call home, and I couldn't, because there was no home to call to. 10 11 So evaluating me on how those students do, doesn't exactly seem fair. 12 13 I am more than willing to be evaluated, 14 because you should know what kind of education your 15 students are getting; your children, whatever it 16 happens to be. 17 But basing it on these high-stakes tests, it 18 seems, just does not to make a lot of sense. My suggestion is, since I've been 19 complaining, here's my suggestion: Have teachers 20 evaluate teachers. 21 22 Have a bunch of master teachers that you know are what the State of New York thinks should be 23 24 great teachers, and have them go around and look at

25

other teachers.

Now, I am not certainly -- you know, it's 1 2 above my pay grade to figure out how to implement this kind of thing. 3 There's my idea, though. 4 5 Principals have so much to do. Vice principals have all this paperwork that 6 7 they're doing with the APPR and SLO and all these 8 Common Core things. 9 Why don't we have teachers who we know and 10 trust to be good at their jobs, evaluate how other 11 teachers are doing? That seems to be like a good idea to me. 12 13 That's all I've got. 14 I really want to thank you for the 15 opportunity, and I'll certainly entertain any questions you might have. 16 17 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Seward. 18 SENATOR SEWARD: Thank you, David, for coming 19 up today, and I'm delighted you're here. My question is this: 20 21 In terms of, we're here to, you know, assess, 22 you know, where we are in terms of the 23 Regents Reform Agenda. 24 DAVID SYRACUSE: Uh-huh. 25 SENATOR SEWARD: And my question is:

know, in terms of what you do in the classroom, as a 1 2 teacher --3 And as I say, I think you have carried on the legacy of your biology teacher very, very well. 4 5 DAVID SYRACUSE: I hope so. 6 SENATOR SEWARD: I'm sure you're doing a lot 7 of cool things in front of the classroom, and I'm sure there are a lot of animals around in the 8 9 classroom. -- but, how has that changed with this --10 11 with the Regents Reform, and, in terms of what you -- how you conduct yourselves -- yourself, in 12 13 terms of teaching? 14 And, also, do you see any measurable benefit 15 in terms of your students? 16 DAVID SYRACUSE: I'm sure there will be measurable benefit down the line. 17 18 Right now, I see students who are focused, 19 who are really pushed into the ELA and math, because that's what we've got in terms of the Common Core so 20 21 far, and then a lot of their other instruction is 22 lacking. So I have students who don't understand basic 23 24 concepts, like density. 25 I have a student who reads at a third-grade

level, which is really tricky if we're trying to do a science experiment that requires them to read the directions.

So, I've seen a lot of changes.

And I've only been teaching for eight years,
I have to add that caveat, so I don't have a huge
sample size.

Let's be, you know, transparent here.

But it seems, over the years, that because of the push toward ELA and math, that a lot of other concepts have really been diminished, in terms of what I've been getting when they get to eleventh and twelfth grade.

SENATOR SEWARD: So in terms of what you do in the classroom, though, how has your life changed?

DAVID SYRACUSE: I've had to back up and teach a few things that might not have been taught, either, because teachers think they need to use modules and they're excluding certain things, not specifically in science;

Or, because they're focusing -- the lower grades and the primary grade, they're focusing so much on ELA and math that they're missing out on a lot of the basic science concepts.

I would expect anyone to know that density

equals mass over volume.

It's easy to figure out, but, when they really haven't been, you know, pushed in that direction, because they've been pushed in so many other directions, it really does cause a problem.

And I think, if I had to pick a theme for the couple of moments that I have, it would be, unintended consequences.

Because, it's great to push kids to achieve more, and we really, really should.

We really need to do that, but there are unintended consequences of doing that.

And one of those might be, if we push them toward ELA and math right now, well, science and social studies might be heading down the drain.

The Regents are talking, tossing around a proposal of making, you know, a CTE credit (career and technical education) perhaps count for a global-studies credit.

I don't know if that's such a good idea.

Should we make sure that people who are going to become cosmetologists and culinary artists, and things like that, do they -- does that really replace the idea of, like, learning about all these old civilizations and the history of the world?

I don't know. 1 2 So, whereas, yes, this Reform Agenda is a 3 good idea, because we need to have multiple paths to 4 graduation, because there are so many different 5 types of students and so many different types of 6 home lives. 7 Isn't there a common canon of knowledge that 8 we would want everyone walking around with in their 9 head? 10 I want people to know what happened in 11 history so they don't repeat it. I want people to know a certain bit about 12 13 science, so that if their kid gets a fever, they 14 say, Oh, the kid's really hot. I'll dunk him in 15 cold water. 16 And I've had students tell me that before. 17 I've had students ask me, during what phase 18 of the moon they can't get pregnant. 19 I mean, this is the year 2013. 20 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator DeFrancisco. 21 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: What phase of the moon? 22 I mean, I could try. 23 [Laughter.] 24 DAVID SYRACUSE: Whoa! 25 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: I'd like to attend your

class. You must be an extremely good teacher. 1 2 DAVID SYRACUSE: You all have a standing 3 invitation. 4 Come on Fridays. We do something cool on 5 Fridays. 6 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Okay. 7 The question is, where you do teach? DAVID SYRACUSE: I teach TST BOCES. 8 9 Tompkins-Seneca-Tioga BOCES, in their career- and technical-education center. 10 11 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: And that's located in what --12 13 DAVID SYRACUSE: In Ithaca, New York. 14 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Ithaca. Okay. 15 Secondly, you had mentioned about Pearson, and the privatizing. 16 17 I've got a feeling that some of the people 18 against the Pearson doing that, think that they may 19 have some private agenda with the testing, and so forth. 20 21 Have you -- do you feel that's the case, 22 other than simply the concept that private companies 23 shouldn't be doing this, the public should, is there some kind of bias in how they conduct the test, in 24 25 your opinion?

DAVID SYRACUSE: No, I don't think they have a bias. I don't think they're Republican or Democrat, or they're trying to push students to say, Oh, well, little Johnnie likes red. Oh, he's a Republican now.

Not that kind of thing.

Nothing like that, but I do think they're a for-profit -- well, they are a for-profit company, and with that comes a certain, I don't know if I can call it a set of ethics, but a set of ideas, in that, their job is to make money.

Their job is not to educate students.

And I question, when a company like that is in charge of evaluating our students, and our teachers, because I had to take tests to become a teacher, test administered and developed by Pearson, uh, that seems like a lot of control for one company to have over public education.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Lastly, you had mentioned a system, your thought would be, that master teachers evaluating others.

DAVID SYRACUSE: Uh-huh.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: What's the remedy if a master teacher -- what would your remedy be, if a master teacher finds that this teacher is just not

doing his or her job?

What's the remedy if that's the finding?

DAVID SYRACUSE: Well, there's two things

I can say, and both will get me a lot of flack no matter what I say, so I'm just going to say them both.

If a teacher's not going their job, they shouldn't be teaching.

I think that we can all think back into our past, and think of someone, not a teacher, but a person serving us coffee; a person driving a bus; a person doing something, that was not doing their job. And consistently didn't do their job.

And I've had a bad day. Trust me, I've had bad days with my students.

When there's a pep rally and it was Halloween and they're all sugared-up, you know, I can be the best teacher in the world, but, they're not going to listen to me.

If a teacher demonstrates that they're consistently not --

And this is coming from a teacher, mind you. This is why I'm going to get flack for this later.

If a teacher demonstrates that they are consistently not helping students, and that they've

demonstrated that they've tried to improve what 1 2 they're doing, maybe they shouldn't be teaching. If a bus driver continues to wreck the bus, 3 and doesn't take a driving course, maybe that bus 4 5 driver shouldn't be driving a bus. 6 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: So not a very novel 7 thought that you're coming up with here, you realize. 8 9 Thank you. 10 I enjoyed your presentation. Thank you. 11 DAVID SYRACUSE: I enjoyed giving it. 12 13 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Little. SENATOR LITTLE: Thank you. 14 15 As a teacher, I have to say I admired your passion. 16 17 And I just want to tell, you had the 18 attention of every single person in this room for 19 the entire talk. 20 So, your students are very fortunate to have 21 you. 22 DAVID SYRACUSE: Very kind to say. 23 SENATOR LITTLE: As a teacher, would it be 24 helpful to you, to have, to see, the test results of 25 the students in your class who took the test?

DAVID SYRACUSE: Absolutely.

I teach eleventh- and twelfth-graders, so if we're talking the 3-through-8 tests, I mean, that information might not directly have an impact on how I would conduct myself in the course.

But, certainly, it would be beneficial to see the entire test, and to say, Well, these kids didn't really quite get this, maybe I need to focus on this.

That would make sense.

I always give all of my tests and quizzes back, because I make up new ones every year, because if I do the same thing year after year, I would go crazier than I already am.

And -- so I don't see why we can't do that.

We do with that with the Regents exam now.

They're all posted online just a couple of weeks after they're given, every single last question.

SENATOR LITTLE: And we spend years taking Regents exams as practice for the others.

But, you know, I think you hit on something, because the Commissioner did say it would cost more to get all the tests back, which doesn't make any sense.

Hand them back. 1 2 Send them back. 3 But, thank you, and you did a great job. DAVID SYRACUSE: Well, thank you very much. 4 5 We could, certainly -- I mean, all of our exams, the bubble sheets, and things, are scored and 6 7 scanned at local schools. 8 It wouldn't seem that they would need to be sent back, except for things I don't understand. 9 10 SENATOR LITTLE: No. Right. 11 12 Thank you. 13 SENATOR TKACZYK: Do you have any suggestions for what would be good ways to get kids college- and 14 15 career-ready, other than -- from your perspective? DAVID SYRACUSE: In terms of curriculum? Or 16 in terms of -- I mean --17 18 SENATOR TKACZYK: As a teacher, what is the 19 most important thing for you to do to get kids 20 college- and career-ready? 21 DAVID SYRACUSE: To not disengage them from 22 education. 23 We've got a cycle of just disengaged 24 students, because, perhaps their parents went 25 through an education system that really didn't help

them, or was not beneficial to them, and then their parents say, Oh, well, you know what? I've got a \$15-an-hour job, I'm doing fine. You can just do the same thing.

Well, you know, news flash, \$15 an hour isn't going to be that much with the class of 2026 coming up.

So, we need to find ways not to disengage students.

Over-testing them is certainly one of those ways that can disengage them.

I know so many of my students get anxiety over tests, simply because they don't know what the result is going to mean.

Am I going to have to be a postal worker for the rest of my life, just because that's what I got on this particular thing?

Nothing against postal workers, working outside seem fine.

But, they get so stressed out about testing.

So if we can find other ways not to disengage them. If we can make sure that school isn't so high pressure, and school is couched in a language that, Hey, you don't know everything, and you know what? That's okay, that's why you're here, and that's why

I have a job. 1 2 Let's learn a few things together, instead 3 of, I've got this stuff to get through, and if we don't get through it, I'm going get a worse than a 4 5 79 on my evaluation. That's not helpful to education. 6 It's taking the flavor out of education. 7 There's another catch phrase for you: "It's 8 taking the flavor of it." 9 10 SENATOR LITTLE: Thank you. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Valesky. 11 SENATOR VALESKY: Just one comment. 12 13 David, thank you for your presentation. I appreciate you being here. 14 15 I don't think, by the way, that your response to Senator DeFrancisco's question, I don't think 16 you're going to get if trouble for your response. 17 18 I actually think most teachers would agree 19 with you, that they don't want to be teaching with 20 bad teachers. 21 I happen to be married to a public-school 22 teacher. I am a son of two retired public-school 23 teachers. 24 So, all the teachers that I've ever been

associated with or know, have no interest in

25

```
teaching with bad teachers in the classroom.
1
 2
               So, I'll just share that.
 3
               DAVID SYRACUSE: Well, thank you.
               I appreciate that.
 4
 5
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: I do have a question.
               We have a wide variety of people here,
 6
7
        testifying.
8
               DAVID SYRACUSE: Yes, sir.
9
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: In terms of teacher
10
        evaluations, is it your contention that,
11
        essentially, only teachers should be evaluating
        teachers?
12
13
               DAVID SYRACUSE: Uh-huh.
14
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay.
15
               So, by extension, because one of the groups
16
        that's gonna come up, and I'm sure they'll comment
17
        on this, are the school administrators.
18
               In your opinion, they're not competent to be
19
        doing that review?
20
               DAVID SYRACUSE: No, that's not what I mean
21
        to imply.
22
               And if I did, I apologize.
23
               So, let the record show that that is not the
24
        case.
25
               I think they are more than able to evaluate,
```

because most of them, if not all were them, were 1 2 teachers themselves. They know what aspects of good 3 teaching is. They are overwhelmed with the amount of stuff 4 5 that they have to do. My administrator had two tiny little 6 7 observations, and that's what he had to base this, 8 27-, 32-page Danielson rubric on. 9 And, I don't think that was beneficial to me. 10 I don't think that was beneficial to my administrator. 11 I don't think it helped the kids. 12 13 So, if we could have teachers, retired teachers -- again, it's above my pay grade to try 14 15 and figure out how this would work -- but my idea is, teachers know what good teaching is. 16 17 Why not have them evaluate teachers? Just as, if you're going to have someone take 18 19 a driving test, you want a good driver in there 20 certifying that the person is a good driver. 21 You don't -- and that just seems to make sense to me. 22 23 Certainly, principals are able to do that. 24 Certainly, superintendents are able to do 25 that, whatever the -- it happens to be in the

particular district.

But, they're

But, they're overwhelmed with the amount of discipline, and the amount of paperwork that they have to fill out for all these other things that we're trying to do.

And it might actually improve the system, to have teachers looking at teaching.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Last thing is just a comment, and I keep going back to this, because I hear it in so many different locations.

Whether it's Pearson or, frankly, any other company, McGraw-Hill, whomever it may be, ultimately, it's the State Education Department that is responsible.

They certainly are a for-profit entity, as are many groups that deal with the State Education Department.

But, in terms of policy, and what goes out the door, it is, ultimately, the responsibility of the Commissioner, and the department, and the Board of Regents.

So, but thank you for your time.

DAVID SYRACUSE: My pleasure.

Thank you.

SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Can I make a last

_	
1	observation?
2	There's still some superintendents in the
3	room.
4	You may get a job offer before you leave here
5	today.
6	[Laughter.]
7	DAVID SYRACUSE: Thank you very much for your
8	time. I appreciate the time.
9	SENATOR FLANAGAN: Superintendent Contreras,
10	you're patience is appreciated, particularly in
11	light of the fact that we are in your home turf.
12	Good afternoon, and welcome.
13	SHARON CONTRERAS: Thank you.
14	JENNIFER PYLE: Good afternoon.
15	SHARON CONTRERAS: Good afternoon.
16	SENATOR FLANAGAN: And, Jennifer, welcome to
17	you as well.
18	JENNIFER PYLE: Thank you.
19	And I'm going to leave my time to the
20	Superintendent today.
21	I've submitted some brief comments, that
22	I know you'll be hearing from other superintendents
23	in other cities.
24	So, thank you, though, for the opportunity.
25	SHARON CONTRERAS: Good afternoon,

Senator Flanagan; to the great supporters of the Syracuse City School District, Senator Valesky and Senator DeFrancisco; to the Education Committee.

I appreciate the opportunity to testify today on this, the first day of Breast Cancer Awareness Month.

So, today, I honor those we've lost, those who are survivers, and those who are still fighting.

I am so proud to be the superintendent of the Syracuse City School District where we have 21,000 bright, talented, and gifted students.

I'm also so pleased to be here to discuss the New York State Regents Reform Agenda.

As you know, the Syracuse City School
District has just implemented, or is in the second
year of implementation, of our five-year strategic
plan, which is directly aligned to the
Regents Reform Agenda.

Our ultimate goal in the strategic plan is an educational community that graduates every student as a responsible active citizen prepared for college, careers, and the global economy.

And I just want to point out that areas of specific alignment, include:

Making sure we fully implement the

1 Common Core;
2 Include

Including instructional data systems to inform teachers' and principal practice;

Making sure we're recruiting, developing, retaining, and rewarding effective teachers;

And, turning around the lowest-achieving schools.

And we deeply believe in these four components.

Most districts, including Syracuse, saw a tremendous drop in our assessment results this past summer.

And it was very, very difficult to receive these assessment results.

However, for us, it was a reminder and a reason to continue the Regents Reform Agenda.

As stated in an op-ed that I co-authored with Superintendent Corliss Kaiser, "Change can be difficult, but movement to embrace the Common Core learning standards is vital and necessary to the success of our students."

I truly believe in the highest standards within the Common Core, and that they will benefit all of our students.

And I feel this, we have right now, a

baseline, that will help us move forward, and know exactly how to support our students.

I also commend Commissioner King for his unyielding commitment to and focus on equity for every single child in the state of New York; and, also, his uncompromising belief, it's a shared belief, that New York State can make certain that every single student will be prepared for college and careers, that ensure at least a middle-class existence.

So I want to talk a bit about the steps we've taken to do this work in reform.

In Syracuse, we've engaged in implementing the rigorous Common Core. We've trained teachers. We offered 35,000 hours of summer professional development.

And the teachers attended.

There was a 33 percent increase in the time that teachers spent in professional development this summer, indicating their ongoing commitment to their professional practice and to the children in the city of Syracuse.

We offered more than 100 courses, covering Common Core to learning standards, and we spent hundreds of hours developing curriculum aligned to the Common Core, in English-language arts,
social studies, and math.

We've implemented new-talent recruitment, support, and retention; systems including mutual consent, because we know that when teachers choose to work in a school and they know they're selected by the principal, and there's mutual consent, teachers are more satisfied, and, ultimately, they will be more effective.

The State can help us, however, by holding teacher-preparation programs accountable for the quality of the candidates that are enrolled, and accountable for the quality of their program.

We've also developed a teaching and learning framework that defines what effectiveness is in teaching and leadership. And that was done through a community-wide task force.

So, even though we had to come up with the -- a system that was approved by the State, we did include the community in that process.

We piloted, the new evaluation system was in 2011-12. We fully implemented, last school year, for the first time.

And, now, because we have some data, we are now able to offer targeted supports in the schools.

We've also launched the innovation zone made up of seven schools; seven of the lowest-performing schools in the district.

We have new principals.

We've staffed those buildings through mutual consent. Only two teachers were actually placed in the innovation zone.

Teachers receive extra professional development every single day, about five hours per week.

And, we've increased instructional time for our students by 20 percent. They receive an extra hour of instruction every single day.

However, the Regents Reform Agenda is being undermined because reform is expensive to implement, and the State funding is not equitable.

In some cases, SED has provided additional funding.

In the example of the I-zone, we received \$31.5 million to implement that initiative.

We receive funding through the strategic teaching -- Strengthening Teacher and Leadership Effectiveness Grant, helping us to include peer evaluators.

Interesting that you just mentioned how

1 teachers can help other teachers.

So, in our evaluation model, we have content specialists who are teachers, who do at least one of the evaluations or observations for teachers.

But, that is funded through a grant, and there is no sustainable way to fund that without the grant.

We also just received a \$2.8 million grant to expand career/technical education.

And we have a groundbreaking partnership with MACNY, with Onondaga Community College, to provide 50 students a year with training in advanced manufacturing, manufacturing technology, electrical-engineering technology.

They will graduate with an associate's degree, and then one of our MACNY corporations will provide them with a job in the 40,000-to-60,000-dollar range when they complete high school.

So, we are receiving some support.

However, the cost is huge of implementation of APPR, and of the Common Core, and we're using our already-diminishing scarce resources.

As Kevin Ahern mentioned, we've lost 25 percent of our staff.

And I just want to give you some numbers about how much this costs.

In 2011, it cost the district 1.2 million to roll out the Common Core, and another 2 million in the design and implementation of APPR.

Last year, we spent \$9 million on Common Core and 6 million on APPR implementation.

That's \$15 million in one year alone.

These figures include costs related to development of materials aligned to the Common Core, purchase of materials aligned to the Common Core, development and purchase of new assessments to measure student growth, APPR data systems, and professional-development requirements for our teachers.

We believe eliminating the gap-elimination adjustment would yield about \$8 million per year for Syracuse.

And that is a specific example of a way you can help us, so that we can continue to implement the Reform Agenda without laying off additional staff.

I also want to stress that we have to ensure there's not an overreliance on the standardized testing.

Even as standardized assessments give us vital information to measure gaps in student learning, we have to ensure there's not this overreliance.

Yes, achievement data and growth data based on state assessments are important indicators of performance, but they are not meaningful when considered -- they are most meaningful when considered alongside other measures.

And I speak specifically about the impact on our English-language learners, special-education students.

We have 1600 English-language learners, 2100 refugee students, many who come to the United States, and Syracuse, with little or no formal schooling.

Elements of the state accountability systems that rely on proficiency, at one point in time, without considering the trajectory, can penalize school districts and individual schools that serve large groups of refugee students.

And this is problematic for us.

And we continue to have an influx of these students. Since July 1st, I have enrolled 400 refugee students into the district.

As you know, the State funding formula is frozen, and I'm not receiving State aid for additional students in the Syracuse City School District.

I think we also must provide financial and legislative support for initiatives that provide health and social-emotional supports for students living in poverty.

This includes funding for the Say Yes model.

We are the first Say Yes district in the nation.

We have mental-health clinics in twenty-one of our schools.

We've school-based health centers.

We have social workers and counselors, but, we've had to cut some of those social workers and some of those counselors when our students need them desperately.

You heard Senator DeFrancisco speak to the discipline -- high-discipline, out-of-school suspension rates in the district.

They are unacceptable out-of-school suspension rates, but we could do more to support these students if they had support services.

Say Yes provides Last Dollar tuition

scholarships to all of our students, but we have to get them to the point where they will graduate and be successful in college.

Without support systems, like Say Yes to Education, it makes our job in Syracuse even more difficult, so I ask that you support that.

The Say Yes initiative, our strategic plan, and the Regents Reform Agenda represent a long-term collective investment in their students, and their future.

And I have no doubt that we can succeed with the Reform Agenda, if given -- if we have the will, the focus on instruction, and a fair funding system.

Thank you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you, Superintendent.

Senator Valesky.

SENATOR VALESKY: Thank you,

Superintendent Contreras.

I just have one question, and you sort of addressed it near the end of your remarks, but I wanted to revisit it for a moment.

Before I do that, though, I just -- you know, particularly in light of the assessment grades, and in this school district, and the attention to those scores, I think it is important to remember, and to

highlight, as I know you do all the time, the 1 2 success stories from your school district. 3 And I, along with you, had the opportunity to welcome the President of the United States to one of 4 5 your high schools, Henninger High School, about a 6 month ago, or so. 7 And, the young man, his name was Emilio Ortiz [ph.], I think --8 9 SHARON CONTRERAS: Yes. 10 SENATOR VALESKY: -- who attends Corcoran High School, was just incredibly impressive 11 in his introduction of the President. 12 13 And I think that we all need to celebrate those success stories more than we do, and more 14 15 often than we do. So I want you to know how impressed I was 16 with his presentation. 17 18 SHARON CONTRERAS: Thank you. 19 SENATOR VALESKY: And, yours, in getting that 20 high school ready, and under that challenge that the 21 secret service I know presented. 22 My question has to do with Say Yes, and 23 I know the Say Yes program predates you in your term 24 here, and it also predates the Regents Reform 25 Agenda.

So, to what degree has having the Say Yes program in effect here, uhm, helped ease the transition through adoption of the Common Core and the entire Reform Agenda?

And, to whatever degree that might be, is that a model that -- understanding that's not a government model -- but, is that a model that can be replicated in other areas, that would be helpful?

SHARON CONTRERAS: I think so.

There are four elements of the Say Yes model.

There are the health supports; social-emotional supports; financial supports, which is the tuition scholarship; and academic supports.

I think what is posing a problem is, while
Say Yes to Education is very well aligned to the
Regents Reform Agenda, you end up making decisions
that you shouldn't have to make about what to
support.

So, we have eliminated some of the social workers and counselors, when that's an element we need to actually implement the Regents Reform Agenda, in terms of providing adequate academic supports, because, without those wrap-around kinds of supports, it's difficult for teachers to really deal with the academic needs of

1 our students. 2 So, I think that Say Yes to Education is a 3 great model for reform, and I think it aligns well with the Regents Reform Agenda. 4 5 SENATOR VALESKY: Thank you. 6 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Seward. 7 SENATOR SEWARD: Yes, very briefly, 8 Madam Superintendent. 9 I had -- I was struck by your comment that --10 in the -- I think in some of the failing schools 11 that you may have here, or -- I assume that was based on test scores? These high-stakes tests? 12 13 SHARON CONTRERAS: The priority schools, 14 and -- priority schools yes. SENATOR SEWARD: "Priority," that's what you 15 call them, yes. 16 17 I shouldn't call them "failing schools." But, in any event, you said one of the steps 18 19 that were taken, was to find an extra hour of 20 instruction time per day. 21 And -- which seems ambitious to me, because 22 one of the -- I know one of the things I hear about, 23 particularly with the Common Core, that there's so 24 much to cover in a short time -- period of time,

that it's really jammed in the day -- the school

25

1	day.
2	How did you fine an extra hour of instruction
3	time?
4	Did something else have to give
5	SHARON CONTRERAS: The teachers
6	SENATOR SEWARD: in order for you to
7	accomplish that?
8	SHARON CONTRERAS: You're asking me how do we
9	use that time? Or how are
10	SENATOR SEWARD: How did you find an extra
11	hour?
12	SHARON CONTRERAS: Oh, how did we find the
13	extra hour?
14	SENATOR SEWARD: Did anything else have to go
15	in order to accomplish that?
16	SHARON CONTRERAS: Well, it was no.
17	It was actually mandated, as part of the
18	turnaround-school model.
19	And we negotiated, and sat down with STA, and
20	we figured out where that extra hour would be placed
21	during the day.
22	However, the schools have a governance model,
23	where they can choose to extend the school year.
24	They have 20 percent additional time. Or,
25	additional time, and that amounts to about

20 percent over what they currently have.

And those schools are allowed to determine how they use that time, and when they use it.

So, next year, there may be schools that say, We want the same school day that we had last year, but we want to extend the school year and offer year-round schooling.

They are able to do that in this model.

But, the additional time is being utilized to provide differentiated supports for students.

And we're also able now to really focus on science and social studies, which was being left out previously because of a short school day.

We realize that, eventually, most of the schools will have a longer school day, because every single school in the Syracuse City School District is a priority or focus school.

And we're working with the National Center on Time and Learning, to provide technical assistance to every school in how they will find that time and use that time.

In addition to that hour, every teacher has an additional half hour per day of common planning time, giving them a full hour of common planning time.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator DeFrancisco. 1 2 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Is that -- actually, 3 there's more hours in a day that are in the school day at those schools right now? 4 5 SHARON CONTRERAS: Yes. 6 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: And is there a -- is 7 there are corresponding change in salaries as a result of that? 8 9 SHARON CONTRERAS: The teachers receive a 10 \$6,000 stipend that is funded through that 11 \$31 1/2 million grant. SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Okay, so the State is 12 13 providing the funds for this additional mandate? 14 SHARON CONTRERAS: Yes, they have. 15 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: Okay. Lastly, I just want to clear up about the 16 17 Say Yes program. 18 I support it; have supported it from the beginning. 19 My point simply is this: 20 21 There are many people in every one of our 22 districts, including mine, and Syracuse is part of my district, that parents say to me, What am I; 23 24 something wrong with me? 25 I'm not very rich, and I'd like my college

tuition paid for, too. 1 2 So it seems, at the very minimum, these 3 students should be college-proficient -- that have a condition should be, for a free college education, 4 5 that they be prepared for college and not have to 6 have remediation. 7 That's my only point. 8 And -- because the program -- it's a good 9 concept. I understand Buffalo is consider -- they're 10 11 considering doing it in Buffalo. That's great. 12 13 But, for that enormous, enormous benefit, 14 there should be a corresponding responsibility, so it's fair to other districts that don't have it. 15 That's all I wanted to point out. 16 17 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Tkaczyk. 18 SENATOR TKACZYK: Thank you. 19 I wanted to ask you about the funding. You mentioned, in 2011, you spent 20 21 1.2 million, and 2 million, on Common Core, and 22 APPR. 23 And, today, it's to the tune of 9 million, 24 and 6 million. 25 Are -- is that amount of money going to be --

continue to grow? 1 2 Is this -- are you -- is that the level 3 you're going to be expected to cover every year? Kind of, what -- could you explain, is this a 4 5 growing thing? And what -- did you get any money from the 6 7 750 million that the State got from the Race To The 8 Top grant to cover that? 9 SHARON CONTRERAS: We did receive Race To The 10 Top funds. 11 We used the entitlement. We used the general fund. 12 13 I don't expect it will cost this much every 14 year, but teachers are going to need professional 15 development for some time. 16 The cost of developing assessments is 17 astronomical. 18 The cost of purchasing assessments is 19 astronomical. So, we have to find better ways to do this. 20 21 Because, even when we develop the assessments 22 on our own, you still have to pay the teachers for 23 their time. 24 There's printing costs. 25 I think we had over 200 assessments for SLOs.

And I do want to just clarify one thing: 1 2 The local piece of APPR, you don't have to 3 use all of those assessments. We chose to do that, because we didn't have 4 5 enough time to develop something that was more progressive, and that teachers would have felt was 6 7 more meaningful. 8 So, you can develop performance tasks, you can use portfolios. We simply ran out of time, 9 10 based on the State's deadline. So, I just wanted to be clear, you don't have 11 12 to use that many assessments. 13 We're doing that, because it was the quickest way to comply with the State requirement. 14 15 SENATOR TKACZYK: And just going forward, what do you -- what is the most pressing thing, 16 17 resource? Or, could you identify things that you need 18 to make this a successful process? 19 Is it time? Is it money? 20 21 Is it -- what is it going to -- from your 22 perspective, gonna make it -- continue to improve, 23 and get to where we're getting more kids ready for 24 college and careers? 25 SHARON CONTRERAS: I think that, obviously,

we do need funding to make certain that we can continue this, but time to do this in a way that teachers -- so that teachers and administrators believe this is a credible system.

It's not just time in the development.

It's time to communicate to our families, who, all of a sudden, their students are taking a lot more assessments. They don't necessarily understand all the components.

Many people get confused with Common Core and APPR. When I'm talking to them, they're not quite sure what their issue is, but they know they have an issue.

So I think if we had a little more time, we could have rolled this out more effectively.

However, I have to say, that I understand the sense of urgency when you look at the number of students who are going to college, not prepared; or when you sit at a business roundtable, and your local businesses and corporations tell you how underprepared students are for the workforce.

So -- but there still has to be a balance so that we can do this well and have a credible system.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Superintendent, you knew I was going to ask you one question:

So on that scale of 1 to 10, no pressure, 1 2 there's a drum roll in the background, but there's 3 no pressure? SHARON CONTRERAS: The communication with 4 5 State Education Department? 6 Is that the question? 7 Okay. 8 I always have access, because of the 9 Big Five, NYSCSS, with the Commissioner, and the deputy commissioners, assistant commissioners. 10 11 But SED is a vast, vast organization, and the level of communication is not consistent throughout 12 13 the organization. 14 So, if I have to, I can reach the 15 Commissioner and they always listen to our concerns. They don't always agree with what we're saying. 16 17 But I do feel I can, at any time, get them to 18 the table, because of the Big Five, NYSCSS, and just 19 because they have a relationship with us, and they sit and try to resolve issues. 20 21 But that is not consistent throughout the 22 State Education Department. 23 SENATOR FLANAGAN: That was good. 24 [Laughter.] 25 SENATOR FLANAGAN: However, 1 (indicating)

1 10.

SHARON CONTRERAS: I don't know how to answer that. I'm sorry.

But I feel like I have very good communicationing [sic] and great access to the leadership at SED.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Yeah, but, frankly, part of the reason I'm asking is, by virtue of the fact that I Chair the Committee, I mean, I have excellent access to the department, the Department -- and so do my colleagues, just as being elected officials, but, I'm trying to, you know, glean from the people who are here, and a lot of stuff we get in terms of e-mails, what that level of communication is.

I certainly have great respect for what you do, and I'm not trying to put you on the spot, but I will also underscore that, we're the only ones having hearings.

SED's not having hearings. The Regents are not having hearings. The Governor's not having hearings. The Assembly's not having hearings.

We're doing this so people can lay out what their wishes are, what their desires are, and what their concerns are.

But, Say Yes, Mary Ann is excellent.

I really like working with her. I felt I learned 1 2 quite a bit from her. 3 I do have one other quick question. SHARON CONTRERAS: 4 Yes. 5 SENATOR FLANAGAN: As a superintendent, the upcoming Regents, I believe that this is where, kind 6 7 of, the rubber meets the road. 8 The ELA exams, and everything, 3 through 8, it's not that they are insignificant, because they 9 10 are; however, now we're talking about graduation, 11 and now we're talking about college. My concern is, that the Regents having full 12 13 implementation of Common Core for this upcoming 14 year, or, this year that we're in, that has a 15 potential to be highly problematic. 16 Because, if there's a 30 percent drop in the 17 scores now, what's going to happen when a kid, who 18 probably would have gotten, like, an 85, or an 86, 19 gets a 71, or a 69? 20 Do you -- are you --21 SHARON CONTRERAS: They will still graduate 22 with a 71. 23 And, to my knowledge, the universities do not 24 use the Regents in any way, and I think that's

something that Commissioner King is working on.

25

I think you would see better results on the 1 2 Regents if they were actually used by higher 3 education in a meaningful way. And they are not. 4 5 Instead of students having to take placement 6 tests, they should be using these Regents scores in 7 higher education, to indicate which courses students 8 should be taking. 9 So, certainly, there may be a drop, I expect 10 a drop, but I prefer that we have good information 11 about where students really are. The parents deserve that, and the students 12 13 deserve that. 14 But I think we need to work more diligently 15 to ensure that those Regents are used by higher education. 16 17 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much. 18 Appreciate it. 19 SHARON CONTRERAS: Thank you. 20 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Next we have, 21 Michael Cohen, president of Achieve. 22 And I want to reiterate for everyone who has 23 had the patience to stay with us and continue to listen, that all the written testimony is online. 24 25 Everything we get will go up online.

And, this is being live-streamed, so, for those who are sticking it out, there are people who are here listening to you directly, and indirectly, and we appreciate your patience.

Mr. Cohen.

MICHAEL COHEN: Senator, thank you very much for the opportunity to testify before you this afternoon.

Let me tell you a little bit about myself, and about Achieve, before I jump into the substance of my remarks.

First of all, you should know, I am a product of the New York City public schools, and the SUNY system here in New York State.

I grew up in Brooklyn.

Went to SUNY Binghamton; met my wife from Glens Falls there.

And, I have family elsewhere in the state.

I took -- when I was in high school, which was a long, long time ago, I took Regents exams, I earned a Regents diploma, and I got a Regents scholarship.

Throughout that time, neither I nor anyone in my family knew what a "Regents" was, except, the name of the tests that we took and the diploma that

1 we got.

It wasn't until much later in my professional career that I understood there's actually a governing body with that name.

Keep that in mind when you raise concerns about the ability of State Ed Department to communicate.

Right?

It is a challenge. It's not a brand new one.

I graduated in 1968, so it was a while ago that we participated in all of this without fully understanding what the State was up to.

I'll come back to that point more substantively in a few moments.

Achieve is a bipartisan non-profit organization, independent.

We are governed by governors and business leaders.

And, we were founded in 1996, basically, to help states with standards-based reform.

Even before the Common Core were developed, we had worked with more than half of the states to improve their math and literacy standards so that they reflected college- and career-readiness.

We actually did research, that came out in

2004, that identified the skills that were needed in order to succeed in post-secondary education, including career training programs.

And we also determined, by the way, that almost no state required students to demonstrate those skills, or even to take courses that had a chance of teaching those skills, in order to earn a high school diploma.

So we've been working for a decade with states to close this expectations' gap between what students needs to know in order to succeed, and what they need to demonstrate in order to earn a high school.

We've got to bring that [indicates], the expectations and the requirements closer together than they have -- than they are now, and have been for a long time.

We worked with the National Governors

Association and the Council of Chief State School

Officers to help states develop the Common Core

state standards, so we've been in the middle of the development.

We have been working with states to support their implementation, including a network of about 20 states that are using a tool that New York State

helped develop, to evaluate the alignment and quality of instructional materials.

We've been helping 20 states use that same rubric in order to look at their own instructional materials.

It suggests the power of collaboration in common, that states can use the same tool to look at quality, even though they developed their own curriculum and instructional materials.

And New York's been a key player in that.

We are also helping a slightly different group of 20 states develop the PARCC assessments that Commissioner King referred to in his testimony.

These are next-generation tests based on the Common Core in math and ELA, right, that I will talk about a bit, because they help address some of the issues that you've been debating here with regard to the role of assessments.

So I want to spend a couple of minutes telling you about that.

But, overall, what I bring to this hearing is a national perspective on Common Core implementation, and I want to just put the comments and discussion that you've been having here in a national context.

First thing to keep in mind, as people have pointed out, 45 states have adopted the Common Core.

50 states are working to develop college- and career-ready policies, right, that, basically, overhaul the mission of the K-to-12 system, so that its purpose, right, it's reason for existence, is to prepare all of the students for post-secondary success.

When I went to high school, right, the mission of the K-to-12 system was to prepare about a quarter of us for post-secondary success, and the rest could find their way in the workplace, on their own, without much difficulty.

Now we're in an economy where, virtually, all of the jobs that pay well and have advancement potential require some kind of post-secondary education.

It could be a 4-year college, it could be 2-year college, could be technical-training program that leads to an industry-recognized credential, but our research has showed, that to succeed in any of those programs is, literally, a common core of quantitative and literacy skills that are necessary for all students to acquire when they leave high school.

And that's the premise of Common Core state standards, is that there really are common expectations for success in college and career, at least in those core subject areas.

All of the states that are pursuing this agenda, whether with Common Core or without, are experiencing some of the same tensions that you've heard surfaced here in this hearing:

The tension between the urgency to improve achievement;

The costs, there are such high remediation rates;

There are some of these signals from employers, that students are graduating from high school poorly prepared, academically, for what's needed in the workplace;

Signals from college faculty, that even students who are in credit-bearing courses lack -- that many of them lack the skills they need do real college-level work.

So the environment is providing all kinds of signals that we need to improve the preparation of young people as they come out of college, many of them, to much higher levels than they are now.

Real sense of urgency behind that.

And at the same time, this is really complicated work to do.

The standards, as you've heard other people describe, call for fundamental shifts in instructional practices for many teachers.

Some have been teaching this way for a long time, but for many, this really requires pretty fundamental changes in what they teach, and how they teach, and in particular, how they teach the most disadvantaged students.

Those changes don't occur overnight.

So I've heard a debate here about, just how fast should implementation proceed here? how fast should assessment proceed?

You're not the only state that is wrestling with it, and I'm not going to tell you exactly what the answer ought to be.

I think you've got to find that here in the state, but I'm telling you, you're not alone in wrestling with this, and the struggles that you're facing are being faced elsewhere as well.

With regard to the implementation of the Common Core themselves and the State's role, a couple of things, from a national perspective, and I'll be brief in this:

First, it's worth keeping in mind, as you've heard from a lot of people, implementation of the Common Core is both a state responsibility and a locally responsibility.

Local districts, local leadership, matters a lot in the pace and effectiveness of implementation.

Compared to other states, the effort that

New York State is making is probably the most

robust -- robust and aggressive of any state in the country.

All over the country people are looking at the EngageNY website, to look at the curriculum materials, the instructional tools, the assessment tools, the professional-development tools, the basic communications tools for talking about the Common Core.

Right?

Bar none, New York State is ahead of the rest of the states on that.

That doesn't mean it leads to even, consistent, rapid implementation at the local level, but in terms of what states typically do, the effort here in New York far surpasses what states have done before, right, and it surpasses what almost any state is doing now.

That's particularly with regard to, if you will, the technical work or the substantive work.

You know, instructional modules,

That's different from the communications and coalition building that has to go along with implementation.

professional-development materials, and the like.

It's different from the cultural change that needs to occur, that has to go along with implementation.

And here's a place, where, as I listened to the testimony you've been hearing, something occurred to me that I had not thought about before I got here.

We are working with many states around the country, and with foundations that are supporting these efforts, to support third -- independent third-party coalitions, typically involving the business community, the education community, higher education, and parents.

Right?

Those partners have to play a critical role in building support for implementation, in sustaining the efforts, and providing a trusted place where the tensions that you're working through

here around pace and timing and money, and the like, 1 2 can be worked out. 3 Right? Foundations are looking to support that work 4 5 in states around the country, and there are some really outstanding examples of those kinds of 6 7 coalitions. 8 TN-SCORE, is one example. 9 AdvancED Illinois, is another. 10 I could go on. 11 The point I want to make is, they're having a very hard time finding, right, that kind of 12 13 third-party coalition right here in New York. 14 You are missing that. 15 You don't have a place -- as best as I can tell, or anyone else looking from outside the state, 16 17 you don't have a place that brings people together, 18 to work on these tough issues from across sectors 19 with the shared commitment to a successful 20 implementation. 21 Instead what I'm seeing is, disparate 22 efforts, right, lots of pockets of advocacy of one kind or another. 23 24 That's not a recipe for sustained reform. 25 The states historically that have undertaken

ambitious reforms.

I'm thinking now back to the '80s, right, in the wake of "A Nation At Risk."

South Carolina had one of the most ambitious reforms.

Right?

Then-Governor, subsequently, Secretary of Education, Dick Riley created a business-education partnership that brought all those parties together, had some oversight responsibilities for reform, not in a formal governance way, but in the matter of, kind of, paying attention to how implementation was going, and trying to keep the effort sustained for a decade. And they succeeded at that, despite changes in the governor's office, despite changes in party control of the governor's office and the legislature.

Other states have done the same thing.

I don't see that kind of infrastructure here in the state, so I'd suggest that's something that you might want to give some thought to.

Another topic I want to talk about, quickly: assessment.

You heard the Commissioner talk about the new Common Core assessments, you've heard lots of people

talk about that, and the results that you've gotten.

Those are not surprising, by the way, that the proficiency levels went down very much, and it is largely a sign of the increased rigor of the standards that they're measuring and the tests themselves.

I want to just take a minute to tell you about the PARCC assessments.

Those are coming from a network of 20 states, including New York State.

The states are in charge of the assessments, Achieve facilitates the process.

Right?

There are some things about those assessments that represent advances of what's going on now, that I want to bring to your attention.

First of all, a high level of transparency, right, in the design of the test, in the specifications for the test.

You've had a discussion about this.

There will be a significant number of items that are released every year so people can see exactly what the test looks like.

I haven't determine quite the number of items yet, but it will be a substantial portion, so that

will be readily apparent.

Comparability; right?

These tests are designed so that the 20 states that participate, if they continue to, will be giving the same test.

We'll able to compare results across states.

You could tell New York State making more rapid gains, larger gains, than other states; or are you slower than everyone else?

You have no way of knowing that now.

You would as part of a consortium of states developing the same test.

These tests were developed -- many people are concerned that testing programs in states now drive instruction: what's tested, what gets taught -- is what gets taught.

And that creates a fair amount of pressure, and can distort the instructional program.

The PARCC tests were deliberately created, are being deliberately created, so that we started with the standards.

We started with -- you heard people talk about the instructional shifts, the kinds of instruction that are needed.

And the question for the test developers and

the states that are working on this, is: What does the test need to look like so that it will support those changes rather than drive a different kind of instruction?

So as just one example:

On the PARCC tests, there will be some time set aside for reading the kind of complex informational text that are called for by the standards, by perhaps reading two for three pieces on the same topic, and writing several essays around them, just as you would do in a good instructional unit.

Right?

The tests are designed to mirror what good instruction would be, rather than supplant good instruction with teaching to the test.

That, it's a big change in how testing would be done.

One other thing I want to mention, these tests are about college- and career-readiness.

A previous witness talked about how nice it would be if post-secondary institutions actually paid attention to the results on the Regents exams and used those to indicate whether students are ready for credit-bearing work or not.

That's exactly what the PARCC assessments are designed to do.

And, the post-secondary systems in every one of the participating states is at the table, helping determine the content of the tests; reviewing the tests design and test items; will be involved in setting the cut scores, the standards on the test, so that they can be confident, that if a student reaches that level, they can tell them that they will -- they can tell that student that they won't have to take another placement test when they get to college. They will be ready to do credit-bearing work.

Alternatively, for students who don't do well, they can be told, that, You're only in the 11th grade now. You've got another year of high school. Here's what you need to do to fill in the skill gaps.

So, that's just an overview, right, of new work that's underway on assessments that New York can take advantage of in the next several years.

And I know there's a discussion with the Commissioner and the State Board about whether that's an opportunity to take advantage of.

I want to close with one other suggestion,

based on what I've heard: a lot of concern about 1 2 over-testing in the state. 3 One thing that we are -- that we have historically done in education, and we're seeing in 4 5 other states, is new tests get layered on old -- on 6 top of existing tests. 7 Some of the tests may be replaced, but most 8 districts have benchmark tests, diagnostic tests, 9 quarterly tests. It would be worth thinking about what an 10 11 audit of testing in the state would look like. What are all the tests that kids need to take 12 13 every grade? 14 Who uses them for, what purpose? 15 Like, can any of them be replaced or merely eliminated? 16 17 My guess is, you'd find a way to alleviate 18 some of the concerns about testing, simply by 19 finding out what's going on, and what can be changed 20 in that space. 21 So on that note, I will stop, and I will take 22 your questions for as long as you want to ask them. 23 Thank you. 24 25

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Michael, I checked with my 1 2 colleagues, and nobody has any questions. 3 Senator DeFrancisco does have to leave. But I just wanted to ask you --4 5 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: The lack of questions has nothing to do with the quality of the 6 7 presentation. 8 It has to do with the hour of the day. 9 MICHAEL COHEN: I'll accept that. 10 SENATOR DeFRANCISCO: And I have to leave, 11 because I made another commitment at this time. I have the testimony of everyone else, and 12 I will read them if you haven't testified yet. 13 That's all I wanted to mention. 14 15 Thank you. MICHAEL COHEN: Thank you for that comment. 16 17 SENATOR FLANAGAN: So, one question. 18 MICHAEL COHEN: Yes. 19 SENATOR FLANAGAN: One question, because 20 I would say, and I'm by no means unique, we have 21 groups of people, in different parts of the state, 22 say that: Common Core is horrific. This is the wrong way to go. People should be opting out. This 23 24 is a perversion of our whole system of education 25 across the country. That this is a federalization

1 of education.

Part of my response is, whether you like Common Core is different from the question as to whether or not it's a mandate.

It is not -- do you agree with me that it is not a federal mandate?

MICHAEL COHEN: I am absolutely certain it is not a federal mandate.

It was developed by states.

The only role the federal government played was, after the tests were -- I mean, after the standards were developed, they provided incentives through Race To The Top for states to adopt them.

I will tell you that's not the only time the federal government, right, has given states money around standards or assessments.

In fact, if you go back to 1990, then-Secretary Lamar Alexander and the Bush Administration gave states funds -- every state funds to develop their own standards.

Since then, the Title I program has required states to have standards, required states to have tests.

From 1994 through 2001, when No Child Left Behind was passed, and it was extended, the federal

government has provided money to every state to develop standards and tests since 1990.

The Common Core standards are the only state standards, since 1990, that have been developed without federal funds.

It is precisely the opposite of a federal mandate or a federal takeover, despite what others might tell you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: I have also heard, as somewhat of a parallel to that, that, Well, because the Race To The Top money was tied to this, it is a federal mandate.

It is my understanding that the Race To The Top speaks to the adoption of standards.

It doesn't speak to, it has to be Column A or Column B; but, rather, to the sort of generic approach, that you have to have a set of standards that would be approved by your education department.

MICHAEL COHEN: So, uhm, it's a little bit more than that.

Right?

The Race To The Top grant program gave states that applied some extra points -- maybe a dozen out of 400 possible points in the review of applications -- if they adopted standards, I forget

exactly how they word it, but the gist of it is was, if you adopted college- and career-ready standards that a lot of other states have adopted as well.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay.

MICHAEL COHEN: That really spoke to Common Core.

But it's significant, I think, that maybe a dozen states that have gotten Common Core grants.

There are 45 states that adopted the standards. They would have adopted it with or without Race To The Top.

They might not have adopted as quickly as they did, because they had to get grant applications in, but this was a state-led effort. And, states -- you know, states, with or without Race To The Top money, have adopted the standards.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Yeah, and I -- I'll close by just saying, thank you, and I appreciate your testimony.

And this is one of the values of having the written testimony submitted, because I think we will -- your written comments and your spoken comments will engender probably other comments and e-mails that everyone will get a chance to see.

So thank you for your time.

MICHAEL COHEN: You're welcome. 1 2 Thank you for the opportunity to speak. 3 If any of the questions that my testimony engenders are actually relevant, that you'd like my 4 5 answers to, I would be happy to respond. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Trust me, if we don't 6 7 know, we'll call you. MICHAEL COHEN: Good. 8 Thank you. 9 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you. 10 Okay, now we have: Jim Viola, and our 11 administrators, Paul Gasparini, Timothy Heller, Russell Kissinger, and Maureen Patterson. 12 13 Do you all feel like you've been waiting outside the principal's office all day? 14 15 MAUREEN PATTERSON: Yes, but it's okay. 16 JAMES VIOLA: Good afternoon, 17 Senator Flanagan, and honorable members of the 18 Senate Education Committee. 19 Thank you for holding this hearing today, for 20 your stamina, and in answering questions, and 21 staying engaged the entire time. 22 It's our pleasure to present some testimony 23 to you, and we want to thank you for inviting us to 24 present testimony on the behalf of the 25 School Administrators Association of New York.

I brought with me four school administrators from four different school districts, so you would have the opportunity to ask on-the-ground, more granular kinds of questions about, How is this playing out?

That's why I have Russ Kissinger from

Mount Markham High School; I have Paul Gasparini

from Jamesville-Dewitt High School; I have

Maureen Patterson from Liverpool School District;

and I also have Timothy Heller from the

Groten Elementary School.

Now, down to the brass tacks:

In terms of costs and revenues, it's important to remember that school districts were asked to sign on to the Race To The Top program without ever having seen the application, without knowing what their allocation was going to be, without knowing what the costs were going to be, for implementation.

Each one of the reforms in Race To The Top includes significant additional costs for school districts, costs that school districts could not have planned for.

These things were put in place at the same time that there were fiduciary controls put in place

at the state level; things like property-tax cuts, debt-elimination adjustments, and the flat funding of the foundation-aid formula.

These kinds of things greatly affect school districts' ability to comply and effectively phase in these educational reforms that we're talking about here today.

They're acutely felt by small rural school districts throughout the state.

They also -- what they do is, they entrench and they somewhat exacerbate the gap in educational opportunities from school district to school district.

Right now, there are school districts, some school districts in New York State, saying, How do we identify and plan for every student that needs academic intervention services, to get those services?

There are other school districts on the other side of the continuum that are saying, We don't have the resources to provide AIS to every kid we're mandated to provide these services to.

Some school districts are planning right now to provide bifurcated high school programs for English and mathematics, so students will be

prepared to take two types of Regents examinations at the end of the 13-14 school year.

Some school districts are saying, We have resources for one roof. That's what we're going to be doing.

In terms of college- and career-readiness, that is actually the basis and the goal of the education reforms that we're talking about.

We first started hearing about this in 2010.

And it's interesting that, as of today, I've never really seen an operational definition of what "college- and career-readiness" is.

It's loosely understood by many people, and we would submit, it's a concept that needs some reworking.

It is counterintuitive to us, that there would be one threshold for students to successfully transition from high school to a college program, regardless of the college program they're interested in.

It's counterintuitive to us, that there is one threshold for students to successfully transition from high school to career.

And the idea that 35 percent of students are graduating from high school college- and

career-ready does not match up to our reality.

We think that the basis upon which that was calculated is erroneous and should be reexamined.

Going one step further, to tell you the truth, we empathize with the concerns that you raised earlier.

As we go through this transition for high school students, we are concerned that, as we go through the transition, that, nevermind successful transition to college; that the high school graduation rate will go down, that the high school dropout rate will go up.

And we're also concerned, as we go through the transition time, how will New York State's high school graduates compete against graduates from other states that have not so quickly phased in their Common Core assessments at the high school level when they're competing for acceptance in the highly competitive colleges?

We support the transition to the higher, the more rigorous Common Core standards, but you've got to keep in mind that this is a multi-faceted process.

Beyond the adoption of standards, there's the development or the adoption of curriculum.

Then there's the purchase or adoption of instructional materials.

Then there's the transition to Common Core pedagogy.

And then there's extensive professional development and local monitoring systems that have to be put in place to make sure that it's done with fidelity.

This has been done in a very uneven way during the 2012-13 school year, and for good reason: certain parts of the state were hit with catastrophic weather events.

School districts across the state had very different personnel and financial resources to implement these reforms.

And the State Education Department, as late as August of 2012, was then rolling out curriculum materials and instructional materials, with the intent that they would be implemented during that school year, when it's too late.

It's too late to do that in many of those school districts.

Going on from there, APPR, I'll tell you, I'm very proud of school administrators around the state, because they have done a yeoman's job of

doing all of these education reforms, the APPR, et cetera, that's been put on their plates.

75 percent of school administrators that responded to a survey said they did not receive timely, helpful information from the State Education Department needed to phase in those reforms.

77 percent of the school administrators reported that, not only did they not get any help from the school districts, not only did they not get any refinement or adjustment of their work responsibilities in their school districts; in fact, on the other side of the continuum, in many cases, assistant principals, deans, supervisors, were excessed, because of the financial challenges that they were facing.

Nonetheless, the State Education Department fully expects that the APPR will have employment ramifications, despite the fact that it was phased in in a faulty sort of way.

For example, their chief architect of the state of the APPR, or, the State Assessment System, Kristen Hull [ph.], on March 11th did a detailed presentation to the Board of Regents and SED leadership, explaining in great detail, how the 2012 and 2013 3-to-8 results are not comparable.

Nonetheless, they were compared.

And then the State Education Department said,
That's okay, because we're going to put in an
additional layer of comparison, and that will make
the invalid, unreliable data, valid and reliable.

Some people call that "voodoo mathematics."

To your point about the testing, and I know that you raised it in Long Island, because I was there as well, and here's the answer to your question:

Virtually every school district is doing more testing today than they were four years ago.

But the other part of the answer is, what is being done in one school district is different than what's being done in another school district, and many times within the same school district, what's being done for two different students at the same grade level may be different as well.

So there is no clean answer to that.

The other part of the equation is this: For the state assessments themselves, the end game is college- and career-readiness.

That's what it's all about.

Not Common Core alignment, because that's just part of college- and career-readiness.

```
So the answer -- the question is, When have
1
 2
        we arrived?
 3
               Because, in 2010, the cut points were
        adjusted.
 4
                     So that there would be alignment with
 5
               Why?
 6
        college- and career-readiness.
7
               In 2010, the ELA scores, the proficiency rate
8
        dropped 24 points.
9
               The mathematics proficiency rate dropped
10
        25 points.
11
               That lasted three years, because we all know
        now, in 2013, we had new tests that were aligned.
12
13
               Why? For Common Core alignment, and,
14
        college- and career-readiness.
15
               Again, for ELA, the proficiency rate dropped
        another 24 points. That's 48 points altogether.
16
17
               The mathematics proficiency rate dropped
18
        34 points. That's 59 points altogether.
19
               So the question is, Have we arrived?
               And the answer is, I don't know.
20
21
               Because here's where I'm coming from: What's
22
        going to happen in 2014-15, when the
23
        PARCC assessments that you just heard about are
        going to be administered?
24
25
               We get different answers from the
```

State Education Department as to whether those tests must be done on computer-based, or whether there would be some breakout in terms of doing it paper-and-pencil and computer-based.

But what we're saying is this: Is that going to be, flip over the Etch-A-Sketch, here we have a new baseline again?

Should we be expecting that student performance is going to be declining again?

We don't know.

But here's the bigger question: What's going to be happening for high school students in 14-15?

Because the reality is, we've done two recalibrations of the 3-to-8 tests already, haven't we?

We've never done a recalibration of the Regents exams.

Never.

And I've heard stories about students, just 2013, middle-school students who successfully completed the Regents examination in mathematics, but didn't pass the Common Core test in mathematics, for eighth grade.

What's going to happen when these tests are done for students, in terms of graduation rates, in

terms of post-secondary-education opportunities, 1 2 et cetera? 3 I want to share one thing with you: There is 4 an alternative. 5 There's an alternative model, and you know 6 who's doing it? The State Education Department. 7 Because, during the current school year, in 8 January 2014, there will be a new test administered. 9 The test was actually developed by CTB/McGraw-Hill 10 for the high school equivalency program. 11 The test is called the "Test Assessing Secondary Completion." 12 13 There's a three-year contract with 14 CTB/McGraw-Hill, so that during, over a three-year 15 period, those tests will evolve to become 16 Common Core-aligned, because there is no capacity 17 right now to administrator all those tests based on 18 computers. 19 The full expectation is 100 percent of those tests will start off being administered, 20 21 pencil-and-paper, and will evolve as capacity 22 evolves, so that they will become computer-based. 23 In closing, I'd just like to say: 24 We all are interested in doing what's right

25

for kids.

We want to do everything that we can to 1 2 ensure their success in post-secondary-education 3 opportunities that are commensurate with their interests and commensurate with their abilities. 4 5 But as opposed to the State Education Department motto of, "Gee, we're kind of building 6 7 this plane as we're flying it," I would propose we 8 think about the Hippocratic oath. 9 "First, do no harm." 10 Thank you. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Jim, it may just be me, 11 but I think you and David McMahon should probably 12 13 stop drink Jolt Cola in the afternoon. 14 [Laughter.] 15 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Your passion is obvious, and it's real and sincere. 16 17 So, Senator Seward. 18 SENATOR SEWARD: Yeah, Jim, the next time, 19 would you please tell us how you really -- how you're really thinking here. 20 21 But, I appreciate all of your associates coming; and, particularly, Tim Heller from Groten, 22 23 and Russ Kissinger from Mount Markham. 24 They come from a certain Senate District at 25 those schools.

1 We're delighted to see you.

It's pretty obvious we're talking about here, in terms of the testimony that Jim provided, a real disconnect between the principals who are really key, you know, in the buildings throughout the school districts, and the State Education Department.

Some of the communication that our Chairman asked other witnesses today, I think we got the answer, your answer, in terms of a real disconnect between SED and the building principals around, at least in the districts represented here today.

Is that --

PAUL GASPARINI: That's correct.

SENATOR SEWARD: -- fair to say?

PAUL GASPARINI: That's correct.

Senator Seward, Paul Gasparini, from

Jamesville-Dewitt High School, which is a suburb
east of Syracuse here.

I wanted to just let the Senate know, and then respond to something you asked to an earlier witness before the Committee.

There have been -- our math department chair has been at Jamesville-Dewitt High School since 1997.

In that time, she has overseen four different curricular changes.

She started with the math; course one, course two, course three, curriculum for math, and moved to Math AB; then it moved to the integrated algebra, integrated geometry, and Algebra II Trigonometry that we now have; and now it's Common Core.

So in 15 years, we've had four different curriculum changes.

It's very difficult to assess how effective any of them have been, when somebody who started in kindergarten, a kid has been going through school, there's been four curriculum changes for that student.

That's a real concern.

I really appreciated your question earlier about the modules, and the concern about modules.

I think everybody who testified earlier today did a very nice job, but I do take issue with some of the answers about that.

The problem -- you know, people say fear, or fear of change, et cetera.

That's not it at all.

I think, Senator Flanagan, you said in an earlier testimony, you talked about how important,

how high stakes, the Regents exams are.

Our algebra teachers today, "today," have no idea, "no idea," what the test their students are compelled to take in June of next year looks like.

They have no idea what it looks like.

And the only reason they're hewing as closely to the modules as they are, is because that's the only road path that they have, the only guidepost that they have, to that end.

Nowhere else, "nowhere else," in education.

And if I did that as a principal, said, Okay, we'll just drib and drab the curriculum out, and I won't so show you the test till the end, our board of education would have me fired.

That would never happen.

And I think that that's the biggest problem now, is that our teachers are told they have to go down this path, but they're given no direction on where the path leads.

And that's, for me, the biggest concern we have with the algebra and the modules right now.

SENATOR SEWARD: Just a quick follow-up.

In terms of, what's the answer here?

Is it a -- more of a phased-in approach?

Is that what you're suggesting is the answer?

Is it --1 2 PAUL GASPARINI: Yes, I would say that --3 SENATOR SEWARD: -- we've gone too far, too fast? 4 5 PAUL GASPARINI: -- the building of the airplane in the air, I would say it in a different 6 7 That we're building a skyscraper, and we're 8 starting on the tenth floor. I mean, if you really want to have a 9 10 successfully integrated curriculum all the way up, 11 you start with kindergarten, and you work your way through. 12 13 I do not know why that that is not happening. 14 I honest to God don't. And then you will have a very articulated, 15 well-scaffolded, strong infrastructure for 16 17 education. 18 Building an education infrastructure takes 19 time. 20 You can't just say, Here it is, and it's all 21 built in a year. 22 SENATOR SEWARD: What would you say to the --23 and I'm not disagreeing with you at all, because 24 I think, you know, I have concerns about too far, 25 too fast, myself.

But, what would you say -- I assume that if the department is still here, they would counter and say, Well, what about those students, first through twelfth grade, that are going to miss out on this more rigorous program that would better prepare them for both college and career?

PAUL GASPARINI: As I say, it's changed 4 times over 15 years.

TIMOTHY HELLER: They've already missed out.

So, in this past year's administration of ELA and math, starting in third grade, the State is assuming that the children have had the past three years of background information.

You can't backfill that in a year, so, they've already missed the boat.

So now we have to play catch-up, and the further the children are along that path, my last grade is fifth grade, so I have fifth-graders who have missed those first four or five years of foundational skills.

You can't make that up, so they're always going to be behind.

And the teachers are struggling with, Okay, which dart do I throw on the dart board to get closest to where I need to be?

SENATOR SEWARD: I know the hour is getting late, but, Mr. Chairman, one more comment or question here.

When you say "they've missed out," I hope you don't mean -- they may have missed out on that particular set of goals, but not missed out on a good education in New York State.

TIMOTHY HELLER: No, no, you're right.

I'm talking about --

SENATOR SEWARD: You know, we don't want this a condemning the great work that our public schools do.

TIMOTHY HELLER: No, no.

SENATOR SEWARD: At least the ones I'm familiar with in my area.

MAUREEN PATTERSON: But there are districts, like Liverpool, which is really somewhere between Fayetteville-Manlius, in terms of a wealth ratio, and Syracuse schools, in terms of their poverty ratio, that have jumped in.

We jumped in even before the Common Core were adopted. When they were in draft version, we created all kinds of data-point assessments so we could monitor where our students were, K through 12, so that we weren't doing anything with our students

that they wouldn't miss out on an education as we went along.

We've had data systems all along, we've been teaching our teachers.

And I'll tell you, frankly, it's been between the administrators and the teachers who have created a very collegial relationship, and worked together on the evaluation system, worked together on the data systems, worked together to make it happen, because the kids are always the ones that sit in the center of the table for us; for not just our school district, but for all of our school districts.

So, they're not missing out on anything, but do we believe they will be penalized down the road?

Very concerned about the algebra assessment that's coming out.

If those scores drop by that much next June for our math students, that will be that many more students that will need remedial work in summer school, another year of math, and it's also one of the first gauntlets that they have to face heading off to graduation.

And I'm concerned that that four-year cohort is not going to be able to graduate in a timely manner because their assessments changed.

Their instruction has been changing all long as we have beefed up the rigor over all of the years.

But as the assessments have changed, and we have been forced to use those now for students, but this past year, for our teachers, to identify teachers' strengths and weaknesses.

We do that in our evaluations. We do that every single day when we work with our teachers.

So, the system does need to slow down, and it needs to become more focused, and to be listening, not only to principals and assistant superintendents, but also to our students.

RUSSELL KISSINGER: I think one of the pieces in my school, as you know, 58.7 percent of my kids in the high school alone are on free and reduced lunch.

In the 10 years I've been there, we've moved up, finally, past the 90 percent graduation rate last year. We've moved up about 20 points, despite it being a more rigorous criteria to get a high school diploma.

We've just introduced six advanced-placement classes this year.

We had honors classes over the last couple of

years, building confidence in the students and the 1 2 staff, of academics. 3 If we roll out a Common Core algebra test and the kids don't do well on it, the confidence in 4 5 those kids right now is very, very fragile, they may not move on to geometry, trigonometry, and calculus. 6 7 They may say, I'm clearly no good at math. 8 And we're going to slide backwards, and 9 that's my biggest fear. 10 I put that test in front of my kids, they're gonna say, "I can't do it." 11 TIMOTHY HELLER: I also have parents 12 13 reporting that their children, who have always loved 14 school, and have always loved math in particular, 15 don't want to come to school anymore. It's that aggressive for them to be 16 successful. 17 SENATOR SEWARD: Thank you for your input. 18 19 Senator Tkaczyk. SENATOR FLANAGAN: 20 SENATOR TKACZYK: I just have to follow up on 21 what you just said, and what Jim said earlier, about 22 "do no harm." 23 When we did our public forum in Albany, we 24 had a student, a 12-year-old, who talked about what

it was like to take these tests.

25

And he said: What I learned in Boy Scouts is, the thing with first day, do no harm.

He said: I think that's what's going on here. Please do no harm. It's very stressful and discouraging, and we're so frustrated, and we don't understand why we're taking all these tests, because we want to learn.

I think it was just really -- I'm really struck by, you know, the student said the same thing you just described.

And I know the hour is late, but I -- and I have to leave after you're all gone, but I think we have to respect that you're all leaders in the educational system.

And I think what -- what I don't see happening is, you're goal-oriented; you need to know what the goal is.

And to me the goal is, getting kids collegeand career-ready, and are you able to do that?

It might mean different things on how you get there in the different schools, because of what you're dealing with.

So I just wanted to you comment on, what would you do to get your kids more college- and career-ready, and do you have the resources to move

in that direction?

Or, are we spending so much focus on the testing and resources on the assessments, that we're not really able -- are you able to focus on the college- and career-ready goal that is really behind all of this?

MAUREEN PATTERSON: I think our high schools are focusing on that.

And I know Paul can speak to that as our high school principal, too.

But our high school has talked for years about restructuring, and really looking at those smaller learning communities, so that we can focus our children's strengths and their needs, and adjust academically.

But, we heard Sharon Contreras talk about the mental-health issues that are out there.

We need to address those also, before we let them leave the world, when they walk across the stage.

And then we have to give them all kinds of internships and partnerships.

And, right now, no, we don't have a lot of that time, to be able to find the other resources to do that.

One of the resources I think that is truly missing, is the sharing between school districts.

Many of us in the area do that together on all of these initiatives, moving forward, but we need to do that in particular, looking at the college- and career-readiness for our students.

How are they doing in it one school district?
How can we do that?

And it shouldn't just start in ninth grade.

We should be talking about kindergartners, and what are those soft skills that they need, moving through school, to cooperate, and learn how to speak to each other, and then they're ready to make some of those choices when they get to be in high school.

PAUL GASPARINI: Yeah, one of the things we did at -- we have a very high percentage of our students go on to college.

We're very blessed in that regard.

Over the course of the past 10 years, we've gone from, I think the number is about 88 students taking 150 AP exams, to, we have nearly 256 students now taking 435 AP exams.

So we've been pushing rigor long before the rigor thing became the bell-ringer at SED.

The issue that I have, as a former social-studies teacher, is my concern that, you know, we've had public schools in the United States for nearly 220 years. Right?

And one of the things that's been constant about our country over those 220 years, demographics have changed, our whole -- the way our country looks have changed, our economy's changed; but what hasn't changed, is that we're a democracy.

And I very much am extraordinarily concerned that we are losing focus in schools, and teaching students to be good citizens, to being good role models, to grow up to be leaders, and involved with their community.

And sometimes this drive, whether anybody -people don't like to say it, but it's a drive
towards testing, sometimes I think takes away from
the big picture about what is important for us as a
nation.

And that's our concern at times.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Pretty hard to follow with that answer.

I have a couple of things.

I certainly appreciate, again, your patience, and the time that you've spent listening to your

1 colleagues in education.

I'm asking this somewhat rhetorically, but

I would appreciate your response, and you have to be

careful. You can't throw anything up here.

One of the things that I have heard, kind of tangentially, is a lot of consternation about the time that's involved in doing observations and evaluations.

And I have had some people, parents, basically say to me, like, What were they doing before?

Wasn't that part of your responsibility?

Weren't you supposed to be observing and evaluating before?

I mean, I think I know the answer, but, frankly, hearing your response to that.

You know, in the past, was it 10 percent of your work, and now it's, like, 37 percent?

Or was it just -- is it something now that's far more aggravating because of paperwork?

RUSSELL KISSINGER: I'll tell you one of the big differences for me, is exactly what Paul just said.

I build a lot of rapport with my students and I got to know them really well, in the hallways and

the cafeteria, outdoor in the playing fields to 1 2 watch them play sports. That's cut back so much now, because I'm in 3 my office doing that paperwork. And the kids don't 4 5 know me like they used to. And I think that's going to have some really 6 negative ramifications down the road. 7 TIMOTHY HELLER: It's about six to ten hours 8 per teacher, per observation. 9 10 And for non-tenured teachers, I have two observations and two walk-throughs to do. 11 12 Okay? 13 I'm it, in the building. 14 I have an associate principal who also 15 doubles as the CSE Chair. 16 That -- we spend a lot of our time doing 17 minutia. 18 I have teachers who will tell me, I would 19 much rather you come in my room more frequently, and just come in, than have to go the dog-and-pony show. 20 21 And that's what they feel like it is. 22 MAUREEN PATTERSON: It was also learning a 23 new system, because we now show -- chose have the 24 rubrics to do, and we had to fill those out in a

different way, and think about evaluating someone in

25

a different way.

So for the last couple of years, we've learned that new system. And then we put it up with technology, and we've had to learn that system, for us first, and then to teach all the principals and the teachers how to participate in that.

One of the things, at the end of the year, is that every teacher had what we call the "reflective rubric conference" with their principal.

And the principals ended up having to schedule about an hour and a half with every teacher.

It ended up to be wonderful time spent, and great conversations, but it was also time that both sides spent preparing for that.

And they might have been able to do some of that in a different way, and had those conversations in smaller spurts over the course of the year; or, perhaps, done their observations in a different way, so that they really did save the time for the good conversations, that could happen one-to-one, that doesn't say, Here's what your number is, but here's what your strengths are.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: One last question, a two-part.

You heard me ask this before, so, on the scale of 1 to 10, where would you put State Ed's effectiveness in terms of communicating in the field?

And, correspondingly, if you could -- within reason, of course, if you could each say, Here's one thing I would like to see changed coming out of State Ed, what would it be?

TIMOTHY HELLER: I would give them a "4."

And one thing that I would ask, is that they come and see people in the trenches, and see what the day is really like. That we're not sitting around eating bonbons.

MAUREEN PATTERSON: I would give them a "4," only because we have spent a lot of time going there instead, and getting right in front of them, being part of trainings, or going to the meetings that Jim holds with them, and being able to bring that back.

So that's the only reason I think they've been even that responsive to us.

And I have to agree with you, they need to come out.

We invited State Ed to come out last year, and it took about six months before anybody even showed up in our school district, to really walk in

```
to see what our students were doing and what our
1
 2
        teachers were doing.
 3
               RUSSELL KISSINGER: I'd say probably a "3."
        I think their communication is a complex topic.
 4
 5
               They talk to us, they talk at us.
               I don't think they're listening to us.
 6
7
               And I think it's a big part of communication.
8
               And I'd have to agree, I'd like for them to
9
        come out, and we've asked them many times, to see
10
        what it is that we're doing, and to see what our
11
        teachers are doing.
               You know, our teachers are crying; literally,
12
13
        crying. They have no idea what to do next.
14
               In my district, we've lost so much.
15
               It is me.
               There's a superintendent, there's me.
16
17
               And there's principals in the middle school
18
        and elementary school.
19
               We build the APPR plan, we build the
        Common Core, we do all the training.
20
               We do all of it, and we do it as best as we
21
22
        possibly can, given the direction from SED.
23
               I don't know if they realize that.
24
               I'd like them to understand what we do.
25
               I'd like for them to come in and see what
```

1 we're doing.

PAUL GASPARINI: I give SED a "3" for the reasons that I explained earlier, about the rolling out of the modules, and kind of going blind forward on this, the algebra; moving toward the algebra Regents.

No one has any idea of what that assessment looks like.

I think that's a big problem.

That being said, I think your average person -- and I -- you know, I have kids, too, and I have kids who are in school, not in the school district in which I work.

When I look to hear things from the school,
I look for the school district.

I don't look for SED.

I don't consider SED the school district.

I want to hear from -- and we operate on that philosophy, too.

If people -- if the parents of the students in my school want to know anything, they're calling us. They're calling the counselors, they're calling the assistant superintendent.

Mostly, they're calling the building principals and assistant principals.

So I think our school districts are doing well, and really are aware of communicating with the public.

The one thing I would change, to answer that question, is I think that the New York State data dashboard is an enormous boondoggle and waste of money.

I think you're rolling out \$60 million for this, which is a redundant system.

All of our school districts have systems that communicate with parents, all -- in which students -- parents can get their kids' grades via an online system, whether it's SIS Grade Book, or whatever.

We have all of the data about student testing.

We have all of the students' records.

It is all available, and there.

And the New York State data dashboard making districts buy into another system, in which they already have that information, is a redundancy.

Race To The Top is supposedly paying it for -- for the first year. I hear it's about \$60 million.

After that, my understanding is, that's

another cost on school districts, and we're paying 1 2 for the same thing twice. I think that's had an enormous waste of 3 4 money. 5 And if I had a recommendation, I'd say to 6 move away from that. 7 SENATOR FLANAGAN: We've had extensive 8 conversations with Ken Wagner, and the folks who do 9 that work, on that very issue. 10 But, two things -- well, three. 11 One, thank you. Two, I don't need to be his spokesperson, but 12 13 I do have to say Commissioner King travels a 14 tremendous amount. He has been around -- I know he's been out in 15 my area. I think I've taken him on at least 16 3 visits, and I'm one of 63 members. 17 18 So, I know he's out there traveling. 19 The disconnect may be in terms of what happens as a result of this. 20 21 But on a slightly humorous note, hopefully, 22 when I'm asking on the scale of 1 to 10, I think 23 back to being in school, and I believe everyone can 24 appreciate this: 25 My parents were never as much concerned about

```
the grade I got, as they were about the number that
1
 2
        went with it.
 3
               If you got an A-3 as opposed to a B-1, "1"
        being the better effort, I remember being chided
 4
 5
        periodically by my father and my mother for, you
        know, not having the best effort put forward.
 6
7
               So, maybe next time I ask that question, I'll
8
        do it with a letter and a number, so...
9
                    [Laughter.]
10
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much for
11
        your time.
               MAUREEN PATTERSON: Thank you.
12
13
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: David Little, New York
14
        School Boards.
15
               DAVID LITTLE: Senator, I can cut to the
        chase.
16
               "10" for listening, "1" for their response to
17
18
        what they've heard, for a composite score of "5."
19
                    [Laughter.]
20
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay.
21
               DAVID LITTLE: Okay?
22
                    [Laughter.]
23
               DAVID LITTLE: They've -- the testimony that
24
        I provided laid out a construct of an economic and
25
        an educational, as well as a social and kind of
```

moral construct, and I don't want to get into the specifics of that because, obviously, you know, you can get to that.

I'll give you two short anecdotes that, hopefully, will kind of focus us in on what's at stake here.

When I -- the last thing I remember learning in law school was at our law school graduation, when Dean Josiah Blackmore, best name ever for a law-school dean, said to us, "You will never know more law than you do right now."

Over time, the breadth of that knowledge drops off from recollection, the circumstances that you apply it to change so that it's no longer relevant, until what you're left with is a core essence of the ability to find the knowledge, assess it, put it in a rational context, extrapolate out what you need, and communicate that in an effective way to people.

That's the Common Core learning standards.
Okay?

What happened 30 years ago in law school, and has served me well, is what's now being attempted in the Common Core learning standards, where they've recognized that in -- at an amazingly rapidly

changing environment, where business for 40 years
has always told us, "You're not producing employees
that are usable to us," well, of course not, because
business is a jet ski, while public education is a
cruise ship.

It takes us 17 years, hopefully, to get the

It takes us 17 years, hopefully, to get the kid through the entire process, when, as they've said, we have curriculum changes, we have business changes.

Who would have ever thought that TWA wouldn't exist today has a company?

Who'd think that the auto companies would need to be bailed out?

Business changes too rapidly today for us to plan for 17 years from now, what a student's going to need in terms of content knowledge.

What they need to be able to do, is to be able to access the information, figure out what they're going to do with it, put it into a context, and give it a usable form and be able to communicate that.

So, I think, using my own son is probably the best example that I can use here.

My younger son graduated from RIT.

When he applied to RIT, it was not his first

choice. And he was told by several colleges, You're okay, but your school's not.

And I took offense, because I've been president of that school. And when I left being president of the school board at that school, we were ranked the highest school district in northeastern New York.

They were right.

Okay?

When he got to RIT, it took everything he had for four years, not doing extracurriculars, not doing the kind of undergraduate experience that you would expect somebody to have, it took his entire focus, and one trip to the hospital, just to get through the program, because he wasn't prepared to be there, even though he was an excellent student in high school.

They're telling the truth when they say that our kids aren't college- and career-ready.

Now, whether colleges and careers ought to recalibrate according to what we can provide, that's a whole other issue.

But this all started for him, and the reason he's such a poignant example, is because he was in the first class of fourth-graders that took the NCLB

test; the fourth-grade assessments. 1 2 Okay? 3 And the first thing that happened, was, I was so excited when he was put into Mrs. Craney's [ph.] 4 5 class in the fourth grade, because, for years, she had been known for being the teacher that really 6 7 immersed the kids in things; that really had 8 interactive experiences. 9 For Thanksgiving, they're the ones that did 10 the Native American and Pilgrim village in the whole 11 classroom. In Danny's year, all that went out the 12 13 window, because they had to get ready for the 14 fourth-grade assessments. 15 And when he came back, learning what he had gotten on those fourth-grade assessments, it stuck 16 17 with me for, what, probably 15 years now, he said, 18 "Daddy, I'm a '4.'" 19 Not, I got a "4." 20 Okay? 21 "I'm a '4'; meaning that he'd been 22 successful. 23 And to me, that's central to what we're 24 dealing with here, is that, to me, if kids are 25 nauseous over taking exams; if kids are coming home

identifying their own personality, identifying 1 2 themselves based on their performance on a test, that's on adults. 3 We've transmitted our concerns into a child 4 5 that should never have those concerns. 6 If there are fourth- and third-grade 7 assessments going on, and we consider them to be 8 high stakes, all a third-grader should know is, it's 9 time for music, it's time for recess, it's time for 10 math, it's time for the test, and then we have 11 lunch. Because there is no -- I defy anybody to tell 12 13 me what the high stakes are for a third-grader in 14 that high-stakes exam. 15 Okay? That third-grader shouldn't know whether or 16 17 not there are high stakes to that test at all. 18 Okay? 19 So we have issues, and, certainly, the state of New York spends an inordinate amount of 20 21 money on public education. 22 We spend \$59 billion. 23 The entire United States of America spends 24 590. 25 So we're one of 50 states, but we're spending 10 percent of the money here.

Okay?

An amazing amount of money.

More than GE makes worldwide, more than many countries in the world have as a gross domestic product.

Okay?

An incredible amount of money; and, yet, we have historically intractable pockets of underperformance; a lack of academic performance that's absolutely unconscionable.

To me, my colleagues in the ECB, all of whom were sitting here over the course of today, just yesterday, we put out a five-point plan for how to support the Common Core.

I feel like the Dos Equis guy: We don't always agree, but when we do, it's on the value of the Common Core learning standards.

You know, and -- that, and the need for funding, and to change the inequable nature in which we fund, that, quite honestly, has doomed kids from birth because of their ZIP code, to an inadequate education; and, therefore, an inadequate future.

So, from my perspective, the things that we need to do, and we don't have to enumerate them

here, but there are five points in that ECB program
for how we support the Common Core.

I think that SED needs to recalibrate according to reality.

I understand why they don't want to look behind them. This is a Satchel Paige moment.

They don't want to know what's gaining on them.

They never planned to do this in the midst of the worst economic recession that we've faced in our lifetimes.

But the fact is, that trying to do this when we're doing the 2008-2009 funding levels is an astronomical undertaking.

And there are things that -- this is too important to do badly.

Okay?

And I don't care whether it takes more time, but, certainly, lost time is lost future for kids.

I know that it will take more money to do it right, but the fact of the matter is, I asked my colleagues in the ECB at a meeting this summer, specifically, very directly and very poignantly, because people were expressing all the kinds of concerns that have been expressed here today, so

I said:

2 "What's Plan B?

"If we're not going to do this, from my perspective, this is our generation's attempt, and if we're not going to do this, what are we going to do?

"What's Plan B?"

Nobody's got Plan B, other than to simply go back and have each individual classroom do the best job that they can, and have some kids succeed, and have some kids, depending upon which teacher they get, doomed for a generation again.

It can't happen.

Our state simply doesn't have the luxury, because of our political instability, because of our economic instability, right now.

And until we find the next best thing, we've always had one thing in particular that's attracted people to us, whether it's been the Port or the Canal or the Industrial Revolution or Wall Street, until we get to the next thing, whether that's nanoscience, or whatever it is, the thing that we've got is our people.

And right now, we're systematically preventing large portions of our population from any

chance whatsoever of success in life.

And the high debt level that we have, the high tax level that we have, is forcing our college-educated kids out of here.

They're being replaced by an immigrant population that is not as immediately able to contribute to the economy.

It's a downward spiral, that unless we figure this thing out, and unless we figure out a way to equitably get the resources to those pockets within our state that can't do it for themselves, and unless we do it in an effective means, and if it's not the Regents Reform Agenda, then we'd better figure out what it is, because we don't have the luxury of time.

New York State doesn't have it.

I just don't mean the sustainability of our educational system; our public educational system.

I'm talking about the sustainability of our state, and our state's economy.

We don't have the luxury of time to do this, unless we figure out, if the Regents Reform Agenda is not working, to me the Common Core does work, and let's figure out how to recalibrate and go forward quickly.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: David, same question

I just asked all the administrators, if you could,
obviously, within reason, "State Ed, change this,"
what would the one thing be?

DAVID LITTLE: I think the one thing -- they do a phenomenal job of listening, you're absolutely right.

I've been with the Commissioner three times in the last week and a half at three different forums.

You know, he listens phenomenally.

The department listens.

They don't do a good job of communicating out, the absolute necessity of trying to do something, of trying to improve the level.

You know, I think that, because of the intractability -- the historical intractability of the issues, I think they're daunted by what happens in places like Buffalo, and others, obviously.

And I think that, until they get out into the community, and take what they've learned and turn it around and tell people why it's so important that they're doing this, then I think people are focused on the annoying aspects of this, rather than the absolutely vital need to turn this cruise ship

around so that we actually start serving those 1 2 pockets. 3 Because, if we haven't gotten to the point, in the next few years, of being able to raise the 4 5 achievement levels in those particular schools, because, you're right, we have the best education 6 7 system in the world in this state. 8 We also have one of the worst, because of this historic inequity that we have in our funding 9 10 system that makes it largely dependent upon the 11 resources of each individual community. So I would say, get them out and let them 12 13 tell people why this is so important. 14 SENATOR VALESKY: Thanks, David. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much. 15 Thank you for your patience. 16 17 Mr. Phillips. Hang on one second. 18 19 [Pause in the proceeding.] 20 [The hearing resumed, as follows:] 21 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Mr. Phillips, you have 22 been so patient, and here so long, you have now 23 grown a beard. 24 [Laughter.] 25 SENATOR FLANAGAN: But you look great.

BILL PHILLIPS: You know, as I was driving 1 2 here, I was trying to figure out exactly how you 3 were going to pick on my beard. And, you finally found it. 4 5 Anyway, thank you for having me. And, actually, thank you for hanging in 6 7 there. 8 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Our pleasure. 9 BILL PHILLIPS: I'm going to talk about two 10 things. 11 I'm going to talk about a very narrow charter-schools issue, and then I'm going to talk --12 13 offer some general observations about the 14 implementation of the Reform Agenda. 15 So the narrow issue I want to talk about is actually school closures, high-stake consequences. 16 17 I think it's important to talk about that 18 because, I am fairly certain, in all your hearings, 19 you're going to hear people be against high-stakes 20 consequences. 21 And I want to be clear, for chartering, it's 22 fundamental to chartering. 23 And that's why, as an organization, we've 24 actually supported the closing of, actually, our 25 member schools over a decade that didn't actually

meet the terms of their charter.

I'm going to talk about this a little bit from the standpoint of the Regents, less so than SUNY.

In New York, you have two major agencies for chartering: SUNY and the Regents.

I'm going to talk about the Regents on this issue.

Let me just briefly talk about just charter basics.

So chartering is, the schools get more autonomy, freedom and flexibility, for -- as a trade for charter-based -- closure-based accountability, and with these decisions, that should be made in a timely fashion.

The charter is supposed to be five years.

Until last year, the Regents had never closed a charter school for academic performance.

It had been mostly for compliance issues -- a legal problem, financial problem -- but never for, You said you'd do X with these children academically, and you didn't make it. Sorry, we're closing your school.

In the meantime, they've actually put more rigorous metrics in place, but -- which is better,

but there's still issues that remain.

The problem that has now come up -- and, actually, we support that the metrics are more rigorous, but the problem that's come up, is they now have seventy-six of them.

As in a charter -- the framework for chartering is now measured on 76 items, and the department has not been clear about what will actually get you closed.

They're not going to hold the school -- it's not a case of, if you don't get all seventy-six, you're getting closed, but the problem is, the department won't tell us whether or not, is it forty? is it fifty?

Are academic metrics more important than the other metrics?

How so?

We've asked them to be clearer on that, and we just cannot get any clarity.

And so what we have now, is we have schools that are coming up for renewal, and they don't actually know what will cause them to be closed.

You know, there's a couple -- you know, there's a couple of issues.

Where this typically pops up, as you can

imagine, is in the gray area; a school that's right 1 2 on the border. 3 The way that's historically been solved, is you'll get what's known as a "short-term renewal." 4 5 You have a five-year charter. Nobody's 6 really clear as to whether or not you should get 7 more, so you get two years. 8 And what happens over time is, it goes, two, two, two, they don't make a decision. 9 And that violates that third piece I talked 10 to you about, which was the timeliness. 11 What's frustrating about this right now, is 12 13 that there are other states that have, actually, 14 already solved this problem. 15 Other states are using what's known as "a default-closure" approach, and here's the basic 16 trade: 17 18 The authorizer is very clear about what will get you closed: 19 You have to meet this many metrics. 20 21 If you don't meet this many metrics, you're 22 not even allowed to apply. 23 I mean, literally, the school is closed. 24 It's actually fairer for both. 25 It's fair for the school, because the school

actually knows what matters; and it's better on the authorizer, believe it or not, because the way it works right now, the authorizer has to vote to close the school.

A lot of our schools are in some pretty tough places, where you're -- you are legitimately worried that you're sending the kids to a worse place.

If you set the default closure up in advance, essentially what happens is, the action takes place, the school could still have an appeal, but now the closure has been set.

And if there's an extra reason for an exemption, then you make it.

But the point is, that the default is towards, You didn't do what you said you would, you're closed.

And that's fair to both.

To date, we've talked to the Regents and the department about this, and they're just not open to it.

Frankly, and I mentioned to you, because, actually, SUNY has already done this once with the UFT Charter School.

Our preference would be to fix this through regulation.

I just think it's a more flexible approach.

But I'm telling you now, if we cannot get some flexibility on this shortly, we're going to come to you and ask for a legislative fix.

The reason I think this is important, is we are talking about consequences.

And even though the charter sector is a little bit different than the traditional-district sector, in that, we say this: Closures are fundamental.

You have some schools that are, obviously, you have to deal with this.

And we have over 90,000 kids in charter schools now, so there is, obviously, something that can be learned from what we're doing.

I would like to talk, just briefly, about some of the general observations.

So I think the best way I would put it, as it relates to the Regents Reform Agenda, is I'm actually surprised that anybody is surprised by all this consternation.

I mean, let's just think of what we're doing here.

We have five major leverage points going on at the same time.

1 You have the Common Core standards;

You have the new testing;

You have the evals;

You have all the consequences hitting at the same time in a context where you just had a recession. You don't have money.

Frankly, my colleague who just spoke, David, his explanation and his testimony, you know, I won't repeat it, but if you want to get a better explanation of everything I just said on those five standards, he went through them beautifully.

I think the problem that we are having, is that, either, you know, we've struggled to find -- we've got these pressure points, but we've struggled to find a pressure-relief valve.

Let me go through those -- a couple of those -- well, and, actually, the reason it concerns me is, I'm deeply concerned that the implementation of the Common Core, the standards themselves, will be conflated with and derailed by associated implementation problems.

And I think this is where the Regents think they have to have sense of priority, getting the standards implemented and getting everybody used to them, is far and away their most important task.

The other stuff is important, but we have to start showing some flexibility.

Now, let me -- I want to take out a couple of the pieces here so that we can just talk about what I think is important.

First of all, I want to go at the money first.

There is a chart -- the Regents had a hearing -- I don't know if it was a hearing or a presentation, two years ago, where they talked about the financial pressures on public education.

And I think, in their report, there is a chart that shows that, you know, the expenses bar going one way, and the revenue bar staying flat.

That chart has terrified me for two years.

There's just a staggering gap between our revenues and our expenses.

We agree, wholeheartedly, with the need for equity.

I suspect we might debate with some of my colleagues what "equity" actually means, but we agree that there's got to be equity.

And I -- quite frankly, it's clear, the current model, the current way we're educating kids, is broken.

And, you know, I think we have to accept, in the education community, that there's a lot of pressure on the Legislature already. There's only going to be so much you can do on finances.

I thought Tom Rogers said it well, when he said, "We're going to have to do a better job with what we have."

I know you're gonna try to get us more and more every year, but, at some level, we're going to have to do something different with what we have.

To be clear: I agree that the reasons were right to move to the higher standards, as I've already said.

And, I think I'm like a lot of my colleagues, I actually think they did the right thing in doing the testing early.

Now, there's a couple of reasons why I think that makes sense.

The reason I think the testing early made sense, it was a measure of how far along we were with the implementation, with the curriculum that's aligned to the standards, and the teaching practices that we needed to align to the standards.

I think it is just human nature: you're not as far as you think you are until you've actually

measured.

And, look, let's be clear, most of the charters, you know, got hit just as hard as the district schools, so this isn't us saying, Look, the charter schools did great. What are you're all worried about?

We struggled, too.

But I just think, until we publicly measured, that sense of urgency just really, truly, wasn't going to kick in.

The other thing that I think is also important, is I think the Regents have gone out of their way to say that this was a baseline year, and that there shouldn't be consequences against schools and teachers for this work.

Now, as you noted, Mr. Chairman, I've actually listened to a lot of testimony today, so there's clearly a disconnect in what the Regents and Commissioner were saying, and what some of the schools are saying.

I think that's a perfect place for the Legislature to chime in.

I think the Regents are right to say this year should be a baseline and there should be no consequences, and I think the Legislature should

make sure that's actually what happens.

I think that's only fair.

Just to be clear, as it relates to charters, we have some charters that up for renewal this year, and in particular, I'm thinking of three schools that were given one-year short-term renewals.

I don't actually know how we would use the data from this test to make a decision.

And, quite frankly, I think any renewal that comes up, any renewal that comes up where this year's test data would be the determinative issue, I don't know how you would vote to not renew it.

Want it to be very clear on one piece there, I'm focused on the data there.

If a charter school has a financial problem, or it has a legal irregularity, or it has, you know, governance problems, that's a totally separate issue, but if the data is the determining point, you shouldn't be closing it this year, at least based on this year's data.

Okay, just one final point about consequences and time.

I mean, that's what I talk about when
I'm mentioning the baseline. I'm talking about
you've got time. That's probably one of the few

tools you have to move things.

In Long Island, I thought Senator Marcellino and the Regent Tilles had a really thoughtful conversation about some districts that were struggling, as to what do you do with -- I mean, I think talked -- they called them "failing districts."

What I appreciated about the conversation, was that there was an appreciation that we in the education community, the Legislature, we can all do everything, but there's just going to be some districts and some schools that just simply do not get better, or do not get better quick enough, and there is a point where you have to do something more dramatic.

I remember the Regent's response was about changing of leadership, but then he noted one other thing that I thought was interesting, which he said, Well, you know, maybe the other thing you do is, you let these kids go to magnet schools.

I would like to humbly suggest that they could go to charter schools, and that we could, actually, maybe start regional charter schools.

I'll tell you why I think this is actually important.

There's been a lot of conversations about 1 2 consequences, and I think the reality is, that the 3 public can actually only take so much in terms of consequences. They have to actually see some hope. 4 5 And so, really, the only two levers I can 6 think of, is that you actually either buy some time 7 to have some successes, or, you actually give them 8 better choices that they can go to. 9 That's my testimony. 10 SENATOR VALESKY: Just a couple of quick 11 points, actually. BILL PHILLIPS: Sure. 12 13 SENATOR VALESKY: One question that I had, 14 you answered. This issue of the default closure? 15 BILL PHILLIPS: Yes. 16 SENATOR VALESKY: So you are the working with 17 18 the Board of Regents and that the department, but if that's not successful, you think a legislative 19 20 remedy might be necessary? 21 BILL PHILLIPS: Yes, I do. 22 SENATOR VALESKY: And that you would come to 23 us at that point? 24 BILL PHILLIPS: Correct. 25 We've had some closures that have came up,

that we gave suggestions as to how we thought we could handle them.

The problem for the Regents, is they were changing their standards in midstream, and so you had schools that had started under one set, and ended up under another.

And I thought the fairest thing would have been to actually just buy them some time, and actually just make really clear standards, and say You're automatically closed if you didn't hit them.

And that was not accepted, and the Regents got sued.

And I think they'll get through that, but
I just think it's the canary in the coal mine, quite
frankly.

And if -- and, so far, the suggestions haven't really gone anywhere.

We will, obviously, try again.

Failing that, I will be visiting.

SENATOR VALESKY: Bill, the other thing I was gonna raise, in terms of your comments in regard to the baseline year as opposed to these assessments.

I'm not sure how the Legislature -- I think you implied that the Legislature could have a role in ensuring that that's the case?

I'm not sure how --1 2 BILL PHILLIPS: Well, essentially, people are 3 having a problem with -- they're having a --Excuse me, I didn't mean to interrupt you. 4 5 SENATOR VALESKY: No, go ahead. BILL PHILLIPS: They're having -- what people 6 7 are having trouble with is consequences. 8 They're -- it's actually -- I don't think people really have trouble with the data. 9 10 I think they have problems with that people are being held accountable in ways that I think --11 you can make conceivable arguments that they're 12 13 being held accountable, employment-wise or school existence-wise, based on a scenario that's not been 14 15 fair to them. I think -- I mean, I heard the Commissioner 16 talk about how 80 percent of it was under the 17 18 control of the local school district. 19 I do actually think what you could do, is you 20 just -- I think it would be very easy to add 21 something in a piece of legislation that said, that 22 there will be no -- you know, there will be no 23 consequences. 24 List out the consequences based on this set

25

of data.

I would really hope you don't have to go that 1 2 far. 3 I feel the same way about the closure piece as I do about that. 4 5 But at the end of the day, look, you all are 6 providing the pressure-relief valve. 7 You're asking the questions in your hearing, 8 and, clearly, you be wouldn't be having these 9 hearings if you weren't hearing a lot from the 10 public. 11 Right? And so that's a -- you know, that's a very 12 13 blunt tool, but sometimes it's a necessary tool. 14 SENATOR VALESKY: Thank you. 15 SENATOR FLANAGAN: And, listen, I would come to Syracuse if Senator Valesky invited me anyway. 16 17 DAVID SYRACUSE: Dinosaur Barbecue, and all 18 that, I understand. 19 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Paul knows, he's a graduate, a proud graduate of [unintelligible] 20 21 Syracuse [unintelligible]. 22 Thank you for your patience, and your 23 comments. 24 BILL PHILLIPS: Sure. 25 I'm not leaving until you ask for the number.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: [Unintelligible].

2 BILL PHILLIPS: "7."

The reason I have them as a "7," is

I actually -- I deeply admire their vigor in

implementing the standards, and I thought it took a

lot of courage to do the testing piece, for which

they're, you know, taking a bunch of grief.

If you asked me one thing I would change, their sense of urgency, it lacks humility.

And what I mean by that is, they have an uncanny ability to pick -- they pick every fight.

And what I mean by that is -- so, for instance, I'll give you a district example, and then I'll give a charter example.

I recall a year ago, they were in a fight with the Buffalo teachers, because the teachers didn't want to be held accountable for performance of kids that weren't in their -- that never showed up.

I don't know how many kids we were talking about or how many teachers, but I just -- that seemed like a pretty reasonable concern.

And I couldn't understand why we couldn't just sort through that, and we fought about that for six months.

On the charter-school side, I don't know if you realize this, but the -- well, they're asking for data from schools as to how we evaluate our teachers.

That is -- it's not contained in our charter, so they're asking us to, essentially, manufacture data so they can fill out a data component.

We have been very clear, that if a charter school takes Race To The Top money, that you have to play by their rules.

The charter schools actually had a choice, and the ones that didn't choose, I -- it's offensive to be asked to provide data that doesn't exist in our charters just so that they can have a complete data set.

It's offensive, and I think just bad policy. We've been arguing about that for a year.

It just seems to me that we're -- you know, as much as we have 90,000 kids, and maybe half of the schools now are not doing the Race To The Top piece, that's still -- seems to me it's a big old fight for not a lot of kids, and there's got to be better things to do.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Very good comments. Thank you.

BILL PHILLIPS: My pleasure.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: All right, last, but by certainly no means least, we are joined by one of our colleagues in the Assembly,

Assemblyman Anthony Brindisi, who has come to the realization, based on today, that he will never run for the Senate.

ANTHONY BRINDISI: This will be the shortest testimony you've ever heard, Senator.

And I brought you an apple doughnut, because I know it's a long day. We stole it from Mayor Miner's office, so feel free to help yourself to an apple doughnut from the local farmers market.

Again, Senator Flanagan, Senator Valesky, thank you so much for being here in Syracuse today, and allowing me to testify at the hearing.

Very briefly, I just want to shift focus a little bit away from Common Core and the Regents Reform Agenda, and talk a little bit about the future of education policy in New York State.

And specifically what I would like to address is, what I see as the need to create alternative pathways to a high school graduation; and, specifically, a career-and-technical-education pathway, or, a CTE diploma.

I think we've all heard from manufacturers across the state, they have this problem where they have job openings, but they cannot find enough skilled workers to find their job demands.

And in a state that's making big pushes into nanotechnology, biosciences, advanced manufacturing, as well as a state that still has a proud and long history of traditional manufacturing, I think that's a big problem.

For the last three years, since the "Pathways To Prosperity" report from Harvard came out, talking about the importance of CTE programs in high schools, the Board of Regents has been studying this issue.

We've gone through committees, blue-ribbon panels.

Now there's talk of doing a symposium in the fall, to look at how we can expand CTE offerings to high school students.

But to me, other states are already acting.

You look at places like Massachusetts that have vocational high schools.

You look at California which has 500 career academies.

You look at Florida that has CTE pathways

that require students to get industry-recognized certifications for graduation.

We're not moving fast enough here, and we see a real middle-skills job gap opening up in New York State.

So what I have done is, I've proposed legislation. It's not introduced yet.

It already has 12 co-sponsors in the Assembly, and we're looking for Senate sponsors as well, to create a CTE pathway to a high school graduation, or, a CTE diploma, which really substitutes either electives or Core classes with approved CTE-approved coursework.

You could graduate high school with an FAA certification, or a Cisco-certified entry networking-technician certification, which would open the pathway up for eight different career paths, whether it's computer-networking specialist or computer web design.

The goal really is to increase the number of students going into apprenticeships, and to help students get into two-year community colleges to advance their certification.

I think this is going to do wonders to help reduce dropout rates in the state, and really help

boost our graduation rates, which we've been talking 1 2 a lot about today. 3 You know, for me, the time is now to act. We've been studying this issue for a long 4 5 time. The Board of Regents has looked at this for a 6 long time. 7 I know it's not the usual way of doing 8 business in New York State. 9 Usually we get recommendations from SED and 10 the Board of Regents, and then we put it into 11 legislation, but, in this case, I think it's incumbent upon us, as a Legislature, to step and up 12 13 act, and give a timeline to the Board of Regents and 14 SED to create a true CTE pathway. 15 Not another committee, not another commission; let's get moving and create a pathway so 16 17 students can start graduating with a CTE diploma in 18 2015. 19 So, that's where we are right now. That's the basis of my testimony. 20 21 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Is your point that we 22 should set up a timeline? 23 Or, we -- are you advancing the notion that you want to say exactly what that CTE should do? 24 25 ANTHONY BRINDISI: I don't want to say

exactly.

I think there are experts in SED, I think there are people out there smarter than I am, who can develop the pathways.

I think, you know, we -- they're very close, about a year ago, to implementing a CTE pathway, the Board of Regents.

And what they were talking about doing, is removing the "global studies in geography" Regents and then implementing a CTE substitution.

They got a lot of pushback from the global-studies lobby.

I didn't know we had a global-studies teacher lobby, but we do, and they abandoned that, and they put it back to their commission, and they've been studying the issue ever since.

So, I don't want to develop the exact curriculum.

I think we can look at what other states are doing, and look to the "Pathways To Prosperity" report that Harvard did, for some models that we can implement here in New York State, but I think we really need to gave a timeline to Board of Regents and SED to move forward on this, because, like I said, with nanotechnology moving west of the

Capitol District, with biosciences in the Hudson Valley and Long Island, and with advanced manufacturing making a big push back into the state, we can't wait.

We really need to implement a career-and-technical-education pathway for our students so they can graduate, and then advance their certifications on to two-year community colleges.

The Syracuse Superintendent talked about the 50 students who shall be partnering with MACNY, the Manufacturers Association, to get two-year degrees before the students graduate -- when students graduate high school.

Why not open that up to all students?

There's some students that, frankly, you know, the Regents diploma is not meant for them.

It's, really, you know, they're more hands-on learners, and we should give them a pathway to receive a high school graduation.

Not sacrificing rigor. I understand we don't want to dumb-down the curriculum, but we really need to give a pathway for students who are going into these advanced manufacturing jobs, which New York is very big into right now.

We need to give them a pathway to graduate.

I brought an article from the "Albany Business Review."

Last week, there was an insert in the "Businesses Review," talking about growth and change, and it's talking about the resurgence of manufacturing in New York State.

And they profile a woman who had dropped out of high school. She had bounced around different jobs for about ten years.

And, then, finally, she took her GED, and she got into Hudson Valley Community College, in the manufacturing technical-assistance program, where they have a 98 percent -- 98 percent of the students graduating from this program are employed before they graduate.

And they talk about the need for more skilled workers in the state, but we just don't seem to be moving fast enough to implement programs to do this in our high schools.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: It certainly would require a discussion with the Governor's Education Reform Commission as well.

Assemblyman, we thank you.

And it's -- frankly, it's unusual to have one

of our Assembly colleagues at this fine hearing, but 1 2 I can tell you that the overarching reason that 3 you're here, is because Senator Griffo gave you the 4 green light. 5 ANTHONY BRINDISI: I heard. 6 And you have a wonderful evening to spend 7 with him, too, tonight. 8 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Yes. 9 ANTHONY BRINDISI: You can do it all again 10 tonight. 11 SENATOR FLANAGAN: That's it. For those who are still listening, and those 12 13 who are still in attendance, this concludes our 14 hearing for today. 15 We did start a little late, for which I apologize again. 16 This is a 5 1/2 hour hearing. 17 18 All the testimony that will go up, I think it 19 will probably be up tomorrow, live, for anyone who wants to watch a recorded version of this. 20 21 And we intend to continue to put the written 22 comments that we receive as part of record. 23 The next hearing is going to be in Buffalo on 24 October 16th. 25 We look forward to seeing people there.

1	And
2	SENATOR VALESKY: And before you bang the
3	final gavel, can I have one final minute?
4	SENATOR FLANAGAN: Well, I yes.
5	But I want to thank Senator Valesky for his
6	patience, and for all the good help.
7	SENATOR VALESKY: Thank you.
8	I just wanted to take the liberty as the host
9	Senator, to giving you, Senator Flanagan, a grade of
10	"10" for your conduct of this hearing, and of your
11	commitment to this issue.
12	SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you.
13	[Applause.]
14	SENATOR VALESKY: Thanks, everybody.
15	(Whereupon, at approximately 4:26 p.m.,
16	the public hearing held before the New York State
17	Senate Standing Committee on Education concluded,
18	and adjourned.)
19	00
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	