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	Buffalo City Hall Common Council Chambers, 13th Floor
8	65 Niagara Square Buffalo, NY 14202
9	October 16, 2013
10	10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.
11	
12	
13	PRESIDING:
14	Senator John J. Flanagan Chair
15	
16	SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT:
17	Senator Patrick J. Gallivan
18	Senator Mark J. Grisanti
19	Senator Michael H. Ranzenhofer
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	SPEAKERS:	PAGE	QUESTIONS
2			
3	Regent Robert M. Bennett Chancellor Emeritus - Erie County New York State Board of Regents	9	22
4	Nicholas Storelli-Castro	9	22
5 6	Director of Governmental Affairs & Special Projects New York State Department of Education	,	22
		4.0	
7	Dr. Pam Brown Superintendent Buffalo Schools	40	49
9	Linda Hoffman	69	80
10	Erie 2, Chautauqua, Cattaraugus, and BOCES; And also Area Director for New York State School Boards		
11	Association, representing Erie, Niagara, Orleans, Genesee, and		
12	Wyoming counties		
13	Jim Sampson Board Member	69	80
14	Buffalo Board of Education		
15	Naomi Cerre Principal	86	104
16	Lafayette High School		
17	Dan Drmacich Retired Principal	86	104
18	Rochester City School District		
19	Deann Nelson Parent/Grandparent	115	147
20	(No affiliation denoted)		
21	Carrie Remis Executive Director	115	147
22	Rochester's Parent Power		
23	Eric Mihelbergel Parent	115	147
24	(No affiliation denoted)		
25			

				3
1	SPEAKERS (Continued):	PAGE	QUESTIONS	
2				
3	Todd Hathaway Teacher	150	160	
4	East Aurora High School			
5	Stephen Allinger Director of Legislation	150	160	
6	New York State United Teachers			
7	Scott G. Martzloff Superintendent	173	184	
8	Williamsville Central Schools			
9	Dr. Paul Vermette Professor of Education	188	199	
10	Niagara University Also, affiliated with Partnership for Smarter Schools			
11	<u>-</u>	100	100	
12	Preethi Govindaraj Co-Founder Minerva	188	199	
13	Also, affiliated with Partnership for Smarter Schools			
14	Mark Beehler	202	224	
15	Vice President Empire State Supervisors and	202	224	
16	Administrators Association			
17	James Spanbauer Principal of LaSalle Preparatory School	202	224	
18	(Niagara Falls) Also, Former Chief Education			
19	Administrator of Niagara Falls High School			
20	Ryan Schoenfeld, Ed.D.	202	224	
21	Principal North Park Junior High School			
22	(Lockport, NY)			
23	Dr. Bruce Fraser Executive Director	230	239	
24	Rural Schools Association			
25				

_				4
1	SPEAKERS (Continued):	PAGE	QUESTIONS	
2			248	
3	Cheryl Oldham Executive Vice President U.S. Chamber of Commerce Dr. John McKenna	239	∠ 4 8	
4		249		
5	Elementary Principal in Tonawanda School District	249		
6	Representative of Niagara Region PTA			
7 8	Kevin Boatwright Elementary Principal in the Buffalo School District	259	276	
9	Assistant Superintendent of Office of	259	276	
10				
11		250	276	
12	Kevin Eberle Building Principal Representative of NYS Federation of	259	276	
13 14	School Administrators - Buffalo Council of School Supervisors and Administrators			
15	5.5.4			
	David Hursh	283	305	
16	Professor University of Rochester			
17	Samuel Radford	283	305	
18	President District Parent Coordinating Council			
19				
20				
21	00			
22				
23				
24				
25				

SENATOR FLANAGAN: So, good morning. 1 2 Nice of all of you to be here. 3 Again, appreciate your patience, and let's start today's hearing by standing and saying the 4 Pledge of Allegiance. 5 I'll ask Senator Ranzenhofer to lead us in 6 7 the pledge. 8 (All participating in the hearing 9 recite, as follows:) 10 "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the 11 United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under god, indivisible, 12 13 with liberty and justice for all." 14 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much. 15 So a couple of quick things: 16 I'm very grateful to be joined by my 17 colleagues Senator Gallivan and Senator Ranzenhofer, 18 both of whom have a deep and abiding interest in 19 education, as I do believe all of you do who have 20 joined us today. This is our third in the series of 21 22 five hearings. 23 The first hearing took place on Long Island; 24 The second hearing in Syracuse recently; 25 Today, of course, in Buffalo.

Two weeks from now we'll be in the city of New York;

And our last hearing will be in Albany, two weeks thereafter, right after Veteran's Day.

And I hope people generally understand that the thrust of what we're trying to do is, frankly, listen, seek input from the educational community, including administrators; principals; teachers; parents, most notably; to get a sense of where we are in terms of educational policy in the state of New York.

And I would remind everyone that we in the Legislature play a critical role, but we have a unique role, and, educational policy, as many of you know, is set by the Board of Regents and the State Education Department.

I see Regent Bennett who will be joining us this morning to testify, and he can certainly offer comments to that effect.

But, I want everyone to clearly understand that all the comments that we get are made part of the written record.

Everything that we've received to date, including emails from any part of the state, have been made part of the record already.

Anything that we have submitted here today is either up online or will be up online, and for people who want to submit comments hereafter, you're certainly entitled to do that.

That will all be made part of the public record.

In addition to that, I think it's important to recognize that we are having these hearings because we want to seek input from people.

The Governor is not doing any hearings,

SED and the Regents are not doing any hearings, the

Assembly is not doing any hearings, so the Senate is

stepping out on this and trying to get a good

cross-section.

We've had comments from people about the nature of our panelists and people who are testifying.

There's no end game here.

The idea is to have a very diverse group of opinions, and I think today is probably a very good example of the diversity of those opinions.

And our expectation is, that we will work together as a conference and probably come up with a set of recommendations after all this is done, something that might be -- I think it will be useful

for everyone to take a look at.

But I just want to reiterate that everything that we have will be forwarded to SED, to the Regents, to the Governor, and, frankly, it's available for public review.

And, we have a number of people who have joined us today.

I'm going to go over a couple of quick things.

First of all, I want to thank our Senate technology people because, half the reason that we -- well, probably more than half the reason, but the reason we get all this stuff done is because of the great staff people that we have helping us all the time.

So if you look out on camera, these folks are the ones who make you look good.

Beyond that, the policy is, in case anyone can't read these signs in front, reading of testimony is not a fruitful endeavor.

If you're going to come up and you're going to be speaking, summarize what you have to say, please; and if people are reading, I will politely and diplomatically stop you from doing that, because the idea is to have a dialogue.

Everyone can read the material.

I've had a chance to look at most of the material that's been submitted before today, so I would just remind everyone, I have this nifty little timer here, just in case, and it's not to be disrespectful to anybody, but we have a lot of people to testify.

And I'll just add one last comment:

Senator Maziarz who couldn't be with us here today, he always describes his district as being 75 and sunny every single day, and now I understand why, because these lights up here make it feel like it's 75 degrees sitting back here.

But it is -- actually, this is a beautiful facility, as many of you know.

This is my first time having the opportunity to sit in this council chamber, and, this building is absolutely gorgeous.

So, we are fortunate to be in the city of Buffalo and to be hosted by the common council and everyone that works here.

So, without any further ado, I would again thank my colleagues for being here.

And, the first two folks who will be joining us today are Regent Bennett, and

Nicholas Storelli-Castro from the State Education
Department.

REGENT ROBERT M. BENNETT: Thank you very much, Senators, and particularly Chairman Flanagan, for doing this.

I think these hearings are gonna be very, very useful and helpful, and we look forward to the summary that you send on to the State Ed Department and to the Board of Regents.

And, I want to welcome you to Western New York.

It's my great privilege to serve on the Board of Regents, representing 98 school districts, from Jamestown to Youngstown, 22 colleges and universities, many cultural organizations, many agencies serving people with disabilities, and the 49 professions that we license at State Ed.

As kind of an aside, but critical I think to the reform movement, is my strong belief, starting back in 1994, in family-support centers to help families address issues that may affect their child in school.

I'm a firm believer in expanding, rapidly

I hope, career- and technical-education credit hours

and associate assessments.

And I have always believed that pre-K should be available to every child that needs it in the state, because an early start really creates great opportunities long term.

Some of the things I'm going to say in summary you may have heard from other hearings, but I would like to just comment on a couple of things.

One is that, in '07, the Regents summoned all of the many parts of USNY, (the University of the State of New York), and one of the speakers we heard was Nick Donofrio, who was the executive vice president of IBM for global strategies.

And his very brief speech basically said that he wasn't happy with the graduates that we were sending on to further education or to IBM for employment.

He said they were -- "We were not able to hire them, and that IBM didn't really have to stay in New York State," but they wanted to, they wanted very badly to; and thankfully they did.

Now they really, I think, have gone a little further and adopted a high school, but, that was kind of a wake-up call then.

And at about the same time, the new learning standards were just beginning to be discussed by a

wide range of people now known as the "Common Core Learning Standards."

We also looked a data about remediation levels of our graduates in community colleges and four-year colleges, some as high as 50 percent in English and math, for which they had to pay, and for which they got no credit, and if they enrolled in more than one central remedial course, they generally didn't stay.

We also compared ourselves to NAEP, that gold-standard of student performance, and we did not compare well.

And we heard frequently from the business council and employers that some of our graduates, not the kids that left school, which is bad enough, but our graduates were not ready to start meaningful employment, for a wide range of reasons.

So, I think that it was, when it came time to vote on the Common Core, it was an easy vote to say, yes, we should adopt this.

At the same time, we submitted an application, as you know, to Race to the Top, and several things occurred from that, and related developments.

We certainly need to have a data-informed

instructional system, so the data system has to be improved.

We believe in principal and teacher evaluation, obviously.

We believe that it was important to identify the lowest-performing schools and offer them incentives for turnaround.

Mixed success there, I would say.

And we believe that the learning standards could be a new set of rigorous standards, fewer standards, actually, that would help kids get ready for college and careers that they chose.

In addition, part of the reform movement is, in fact, we commissioned a study on whether there are industry-based assessments that are useful and relevant in categories of careers; and, lo and behold, they came back and found 13 such categories, saying that, not only are their assessments good, they're as good as Regents exams or maybe better.

So the burden is on the Board of Regents now to figure out a way to really expand career and tech ed for all students; not some students, all students.

We, of course, would like to see -- every budget year we ask for this -- is an expansion of

pre-K and better teacher preparation for early 1 2 childhood. 3 Soon we will adopt standards, thanks to the New York State and national PTA, on family 4 5 engagement. 6 Entirely measurable standards, there are 7 six categories. 8 They'll be before us at the November Regents 9 meetings. We'll have a public debate on it; send it to 10 11 the field and get input yet again. We have also, in fact, changed 12 13 teacher-preparation programs and 14 leadership-preparation programs. 15 One of my hopes that, in leadership-preparation programs, we can have schools 16 17 of business help us with communications and 18 marketing and customer service, which I think is an 19 important factor in managing a school. 20 In my many years on the Regents and in 21 teaching and in higher ed, I absolutely believe one 22 of the most important persons in the whole reform 23 movement is, in fact, the principal of a school. 24 Usually when you have an outstanding 25 principal, you have outstanding results for those

1 kids.

They're fully engaged, really high-quality teaching, and tremendous results by any measurement at all.

We have an attachment about the evolution of the Common Core Learning Standards, and who was involved.

There was a claim that it wasn't approved by -- or, wasn't developed by anybody but outsiders.

That's false.

As you see the list, you'll see that that's true, and, including the time when we voted to adopt the standards in 2010.

Also attached will be a timeline of all the training that we did over the last 2 1/2 years, which continues, in terms of, in Albany, in the field, and several thousand people came to that training, and I think that the feedback has been, it was very, very helpful.

As to assessments, the number of state assessments has remained the same.

There has been no increase in state assessments, and I would like that for the record, because it is, in fact, a fact.

Local assessments, in terms of APPR and the

Common Core being merged, as it must be, and is in very great high-performing districts, 60 percent, 20 percent, 20 percent.

You all know the 20 percent is state assessments.

The other 20 percent is very important because it's a local decision, and there are many options there.

It is not a state test.

So, that how you determine where a child is at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year seems to be good educational policy anyway, and so that the locals are free to use last year's assessments, portfolio assessment, any other observations that they think will be helpful to them.

And in the case of kids with special needs, quite frankly, an IEP is pretty much equivalent to an SLO (a Student Learning Objective).

It's the same content in the file.

So one of the suggestions made by,

Superintendent Ambrose said, "Why don't you let us

do that, and if we have a really good IEP, we don't

need an SLO."

And I said, "That makes a lot of sense to

me."

So I'm going to share that with the Commissioner and Chancellor Tisch.

Also attached, I think very useful, is the fact that we have a Q&A of all the questions that have been raised about any aspect of privacy, our assessments to Common Core, the frequency of testing;

The fact that contracts that we have for testing companies must meet the approval of the State Comptroller and the State Attorney General, and they have done so;

All this about our own accountability system that we got, and when getting a waiver from the federal government, to account to the Legislature and the Governor, and to the public, about how we spend \$57 billion in the P-12 system in the state of New York.

I would, if you'll permit me just to share a couple of best practices, because I think they're very, very noteworthy in terms of implementing the Common Core and the Reform Agenda, as well as teacher development and leadership development, the goal, of course, is, at the end of twelfth grade, to be career- and college-ready.

We think that's an admirable, achievable goal 1 2 for all students. 3 And so the question is, then, What about these learning standards? 4 5 What are they? 6 How good are they? 7 How much do we know about them; that is to 8 say, how much have we shared with parents? 9 How many teachers have been trained and retrained and offered professional development in 10 11 the learning standards? And in the case of Lew-Port School District, 12 13 which is in Niagara County, Senator Maziarz's 14 district, the school down there where my 15 two granddaughters go, in fourth grade and eighth grade, took the time, on several occasions, 16 17 to have sessions for parents about: 18 Why are we doing these new learning 19 standards? Why are they a higher level of learning? 20 21 Why are they requiring better teaching? 22 Why are we doing this at every single grade 23 level? 24 And, what do we expect of a graduate to be 25 able to achieve?

So there were lots of questions and answers.

And in the case of Lew-Port, they, as many schools do, track the assessment of their students every week; so that my daughter can tell whether Alice and Claire are doing well every single week.

And part of that assessment, of course, is an assessment, in terms of their portfolio, their files, their projects, whatever tests that they decided on locally that they would think would be useful to kids.

Because, one of their philosophies is, kids learn a lot from making mistakes, and it's quite all right to make a mistake, because you can really then learn what you should have done, and it's very helpful.

The other example I would give, and this is Amherst, which I believe you know about already --

I know Senator Ranzenhofer knows about Amherst.

-- but I would say to you that, in 2010,

Amherst knew that the Common Core had been adopted

by the Regents, and they introduced an instructional

action plan at that time, and so they spent about

14 months in training all their teachers, all their

teacher aides, all their assistant principals, all

their principals, the superintendent, and selected school-board members, on "What does this mean for our students?"

And then they had several sessions with parents, and explained to them why this might be a little more difficult in grades 3 through 8.

And, in fact, when the test results came out, they're fully prepared to explain it.

But they said a very, very bad approach would be trying to teach to the test; doesn't work.

These are deeper-understanding requirements in the Common Core, and they expect more from students, and they expect students to be fully engaged.

So it is not test prep in Amherst, at least, and in many of their colleague districts in my area, which would include Clarence, Williamsville, Sweet Home, and so forth.

They made sure that there was a major role for teachers in every step of the way, including teacher leaders, and I think that the superintendent there would attribute the success and the progress they're making, and they say it is a work-in-progress still, is because they engaged teachers from the beginning.

So when the Commissioner came there, he heard mostly from teachers and parents about why it's working in Amherst.

And, so, I think that that's an example that it can be done, and it could be done; it's an embracement of the Common Core Learning Standards.

She also shared with me, the superintendent there, that EngageNY, in the last year, has improved remarkably in terms of opportunities to take advantage of, in terms of what should be done and how it should be done.

They participated in all the training that have been offered for the network teams through BOCES, and in Albany, and there's a really, really solid relationship in terms of use of EngageNY.

So I think, I hope, the attachments that Nicholas has prepared, and you probably already have, answer many, many questions.

And I'd be certainly happy to answer any questions that you might have, and I will conclude.

And I kind of read from an outline, if that was okay.

[Laughter.]

REGENT ROBERT M. BENNETT: Thank you very much.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Regent Bennett, first of 1 2 all, thank you for your service. 3 Appreciate the work that you do do. And, Senator Gallivan. 4 5 SENATOR GALLIVAN: We hear the college- or career-ready often, and I know that I attended a 6 7 hearing in Albany that the Commissioner was at about 8 a year or two ago, and we talked about that. 9 Clearly, everybody would acknowledge that 10 college is not for everybody. 11 I mean, I think we understand that. Up until about a year or two ago, I was 12 13 hearing many complaints that there was just no room 14 in the high school curriculum to prepare kids for 15 something else other than college. 16 So despite hearing the career- and 17 college-ready, what changes have been made? 18 It seems that there has been some changes 19 made in the last several years about the career-ready part of it. 20 21 REGENT ROBERT BENNETT: Correct. 22 We have had 450 new career-oriented, 23 career-pathway programs registered with the State. 24 And in order to register and be approved, you 25 have to demonstrate that these are legitimate

careers with real jobs, with real pay, and, requirements that you have to, again, prepare properly for that career, and very likely take a test to enter the career, take a test at the end of that career preparation.

So, more programs have been registered.

In addition, and this has been true for about six years now, school districts can already offer nine credit hours in career-pathway types of courses.

I would like to see that doubled, quite frankly, and increase the number of credits for graduation.

But -- and I've made that known to my colleagues on the board.

But I think, if we're gonna be really serious about career education for all students, then we have to act accordingly and really begin in seventh grade, and prepare all of our districts for that fact.

Now, some districts do it better than others.

Many use BOCES.

But, in the case of Buffalo, for example, Emerson High School is probably one of the best career-pathway programs there is. It's a restaurant that's entirely run by students, and they do very well on Regents exams.

They are learning practical applications of what they're reading in their textbooks, and so they do it every day.

They order the food; they store the food.

They prepare the food; they serve the food.

They run the cash register; they account for the money.

And then they go to class and learn what they did, and what they gotta do the next day to serve their customers.

So it's a really great success story.

I wish we had a lot of more of those throughout the state.

And if it takes legislation, then I would certainly be the first in line to encourage it, to be able to change the nature of the curriculum to offer more career-oriented courses, and we're not going to worry about the assessments because they already exist.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: How are schools looked at -- I mean, are schools looked at differently, if on a local basis they say that, "We've got more kids, especially in rural areas," and we look at the

opportunities, and we hear of that skills gap:
manufacturing, agriculture, engineering; businesses
like that?

Engineering, I guess, would be excepted out of that, even though there is the gap because of the higher education required, but we keep hearing of these skills gap, and it's different in different regions of the state.

Are any schools -- I mean, do schools have the opportunity to take their students in the direction that's best for them?

Or, under the new standards, is everything completely standardized that you can't have any local flavor?

REGENT ROBERT BENNETT: No, there's many opportunities in the English and math implementation to draw in other subject matters, which Amherst has already done, so you'll see the learning standards alive and well in science and in history and global studies, and where they've integrated the curriculum, they have co-teaching opportunities.

The rural areas have done an extraordinarily good job in career-pathway programs, and in contracting the community colleges to have early-learning opportunities, and particularly in

the field of agriculture for which there are many, 1 many jobs. 2 3 Paul Smith College, for example, is contracting with school districts up in the 4 5 North Country, and I never would have thought of 6 this, for jobs in forestry. 7 They don't -- they can't find enough people. 8 Light manufacturing is an unmet need in Buffalo right now; and so BOCES, and I hope Buffalo, 9 10 will pay attention to that and develop that. They're free to do it right now. 11 It's not contrary at all to the learning 12 13 standards. 14 NICHOLAS STORELLI-CASTRO: If I could just 15 add, one perfect example of what the 16 Chancellor Emeritus was discussing was P-TECH schools, which you may have heard of. 17 We have --18 SENATOR GALLIVAN: I'm sorry, what schools? 19 NICHOLAS STORELLI-CASTRO: P-TECH schools. 20 21 In the state budget, there was an allocation that created grants for 10 schools throughout the 22 23 state. 24 We actually ended up funding 16 schools 25 throughout the state to replicate the P-TECH

high school in Brooklyn.

This has really been a great success story.

It was mentioned in the State of the Union.

It's basically a marriage between a high school in New York City, which was before it was -- before, this was a struggling school, adopted sort of by IBM, the City University of New York now offers career training.

The graduates are first in line for jobs at IBM.

They graduate with an associate's degree, at no charge to the students.

We're now replicating those schools throughout the state in every region of the state.

The one in this portion of the state escapes my mind, I'll get that to you.

But, this is an example where the schools are able to partner -- the requirements are to partner with industry in the region, partner with the higher-education institution in the region; graduate those kids with, not only an associate's degree at no charges to the students, but with the skills to then enter that career field.

And the goal here is to train kids for those essential jobs in each region.

So we're very excited about it.

We're in the planning year.

Those schools will open in the coming school year, and we'll hopefully prepare kids, as you mentioned, Senator, for sort of the local career needs.

REGENT ROBERT M. BENNETT: The local example is Trocaire, City of Lackawanna School District, and the health care -- and the health-care field with the Catholic Health System.

There's another example, and I hope that in the next legislative session, we can make charter schools eligible for all of these RFPs that come out, because right now, for some reason, I don't understand the reason, they're not eligible for a P-TECH grant or a community school.

Right now we have the health sciences charter school which, in fact, is governed by all the health employers in Buffalo and Erie county, in the Buffalo Niagara Medical Campus.

Those kids are guaranteed a job, or, subsidies to go on for a two- or four-year degree.

And, there's going to be a gap for health workers in our community of, roughly, six to ten thousand people over the next five years.

So this is one school that is attacking that 1 2 problem, with three or four hundred kids. No conflict of interest here. 3 My daughter's involved in that, and she's 4 5 sitting in the audience. Is she still awake? 6 7 SENATOR FLANAGAN: So far, yeah. 8 REGENT ROBERT M. BENNETT: Oh, good. 9 [Laughter.] 10 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Ranzenhofer. 11 SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Thank you, Chairman. And before I ask my question, I just want to 12 13 thank the Chairman for convening this hearing. 14 As he said, there are a lot of entities, such 15 as the Assembly, the Governor, and others that are not conducting these hearings. 16 17 But I just want to thank you for your 18 leadership in bringing this series of five hearings, 19 one here to Buffalo and Western New York. I will just note for the record, that, 20 21 although you've not been in this chambers, I know 22 you're no stranger to Western New York and have been 23 here many, many times on the issue of education. 24 For Regent Bennett, first of all, thank you 25 for your service.

And, I just want to pick up on the conversation that you were just having with Senator Gallivan.

And my understanding right now, in order to get a Regents diploma, is you just need a certain number of units in math and you need a certain number of units in science, until you have the appropriate number of units in order to graduate with a Regents diploma; but, yet, the policy, and you're talking about trying to match education with employment.

Like, for instance, in the area of computer science, if you took computer-science courses, that would not count towards your math or your science requirement.

And some of these other programs that you're talking about, whether it be engineering or applied technologies, the policy of the Regents, as I understand, is not to credit those towards your graduation.

So my question is:

With these Common Core Standards, and trying to be college- and career-ready, is there any opportunity to give credit for the non-traditional, you know, math, science, but some of these other

areas, like computer science and others, where you can get credit for taking these courses; and again, many of them may be more applicable in today's workforce than simply the math and the science that we had?

REGENT ROBERT M. BENNETT: There are some opportunities, but they're not enough.

I think the curriculum needs a thorough attack and revisit, which is on our agenda, and has been for a while, particularly in career and tech ed, but, right now, students can take applied math and applied English and other applied courses and get credit; in some other courses they can't, and that's what we probably should try to change.

Because I think the choices for students should be the order of the day as long as they are proficient in math and English as a basic tenet, because --

SENATOR RANZENHOFER: And I would say that if you're taking a computer-science course, which I think is a higher-level learning requirement, that certainly would qualify as, you know, basic math/science principles.

Again, that's just one example.

You know, you had mentioned some other

examples where credit is being given, but, certainly, you know, some of those higher-learning areas, like computer science, I think would encompass that, and I think you'd have a better job, because, you know, kids don't take classes they don't get credit for in graduation.

I think that would actually help your

Common Core Standards, in getting more kids in

classes that have a direct application for them

going out, either to college or to the workforce,

because, you know, you talk about the, for instance,

jobs in agriculture.

A lot of people think of jobs in agriculture as jobs on the farm, but if you go to some of these plants, you have people running very high-tech machines and computer systems.

You know, it's not the notion of, you know, sitting on the stool, you know, in these type of -- whether it's food processing, milking of dairy, or whatever the case may be.

You know, these jobs require high school, and, in many cases, college education, in order to acquire those skills.

So I think that by encouraging kids to take some of these type of classes -- and, again, I'm

just picking on computer science because it just seems the natural fit -- I think that you would, you know, do a better job of getting these kids career-ready, college-ready, because it's a very applicable with-it type of course that a lot of kids would take if you were able to make that adjustment.

REGENT ROBERT M. BENNETT: I totally agree, and I think more applied-type courses should be introduced, and the sooner the better, because I think that, in the field of technology in particular, I think the students are way ahead of everybody.

When I was forced to buy an iPad, I asked my third-grade granddaughter to show me how the hell it worked, and I said, "What are all these symbols?"

She said, "You only to have worry about two of them, grandpa, and it will work for you"; and she showed me, and by Lord in heaven, it works.

It's great, it really is.

So they don't know anything else, and so how we apply that, though, to the basics, is very important.

SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Thank you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Regent Bennett, just a couple of things, as much comment, or comments, as,

potentially, a question.

Yesterday I had a chance to meet with

Senator Ranzenhofer in some of his districts, and

I would clearly agree that there were at least

several superintendents who felt that EngageNY had

come a long way, and that there's a wealth of

information.

At the same time, there is a frustration that it's almost a little too rote; that it's hard to get a human being on the phone.

And if you are a school district personnel or administration, that doesn't necessarily make you special in any way, other than, if you're the head of an entity, sometimes it might not be a bad idea to give them access to people so that they can get more timely responses.

That's part of one thing that we heard yesterday, and not isolated.

I've heard that before.

I would say, listening to what has transpired at these hearings, but in a whole slew of meetings separate from these hearings, I think the problem that the Regents in particular have is a perception of a major disconnect between, SED and the Regents, and the people who are educating our children,

whether they're principals, as you spoke to directly before, or teachers or parents, trying to wrap their arms around these fundamental changes.

It seems to me that you have complaints about SED not listening; you have complaints about SED listening but not doing anything.

And in my estimation, I feel that SED is listening, but there are not a lot of changes coming, and people I think have some expectation that there should be some modifications; a slowing down, a smoothing of the implementation of Common Core.

SED had represented that there should be assessments and curriculum; they have to go hand in hand, or hand in glove, and if you don't do it that way, it's not going to work.

A lot of the people who spoke previously said you don't have to do it that way; you don't have to align them instantaneously.

So it strikes me that where we are going to see a much more significant impact is, this year, with the implementations of the Common Core into the Regents.

And while we can talk about third- through eighth-grade assessments, where parents are really

going to pay a lot more attention, in my estimation, is when their child is coming home with a Regents score that could be 20 to 30 points lower than it traditionally has been.

That could affect their ability to graduate, that could affect their ability to accessing higher education.

And I would ask you to comment on that, but I would strongly suggest that that, to me, and all the people I've been talking to, that seems to be where one of the major disconnects exist between people in Albany and the people out in the field.

REGENT ROBERT M. BENNETT: I think with regard to the availability of people in Albany, as you well know, the State Education Department has lost about 475 people in the last four years, for budget reasons, and we've not really been able to make much of that up at all.

It's not an excuse, it's just a reality.

But I do think better customer service would be appropriate for sure, and I think that the timing of the implementation of the Common Core, my worry is, that there are -- I believe the majority of the districts, like Amherst and their colleagues, are well underway in implementation of the Common Core.

And this was really a forgiving year, in the sense that no new schools would be identified, and "proceed with caution" was the advice in terms of teacher evaluation and principal evaluation.

My hope is we'll pay much more attention to principal evaluation, given the significance of that job.

But your point is well-taken.

Whether or not Regents exams in 2014 should be introduced, we believe they should be.

There have been three years to prepare.

I would be hopeful that the locals have gotten themselves prepared for that.

I think what we learned in the 3-through-8, while the scores went down, the explanation of what happened, and the comparison to last year, helped, the conversion chart.

But what I had a chance to do with the delegation here, the Assembly and Senate, was explain to them how the scores were determined, in terms of, when the Commissioner assembled about 90 teachers in the summertime, that looked at each question for each grade level over a period of five days and nights, in separate groups, then as a collaborative group, in terms of:

Was the question fair?

Was it based on a learning standard or more than one learning standard?

It had to be or it was thrown out.

And what should a student reasonably expect to achieve at that particular level?

And they decided independently, and then collectively, what the cut score would be, and these were almost exclusively teachers from around the state.

I'm happy to say Western New York was well-represented.

And so that, when they came out, they're shocked, of course; however, they're a beginning base to say, we've got to do better every grade level, and we've got to get kids ready, because we -- right now, we are not competitive in terms of our graduates.

I'm worried that the 2013 graduates are still going to have trouble, when they go to college or a career, not being able to demonstrate that they understand basic math and English.

You can't get a job at GM Powertrain unless you know technology and you know algebra, because the sophistication of those machines that are

developing more engines than anywhere in the world, 1 2 you've got to have that, or you will not be hired. 3 So I think there's a staffing issue; however, we can do a better job of responsiveness. 4 5 I've had my own experience with kids. The letters I take the most seriously from 6 7 parents, are the parents of kids with special needs. 8 I personally follow up on every single one of them, because I think these kids need our help more 9 10 than any other child. And so pushing the State or pushing a school 11 district to do the right thing for these kids, that 12 13 I basically take on myself, and I know many of my colleagues in the Regents are pretty involved, some 14 15 more than others. But I think the point is well-made. 16 17 I will make sure that my colleagues know that 18 there is a perception that we're not as 19 well-connected as we might be to the 700 school districts that exist. 20 21 There are some districts that we are extraordinarily connected to, for obvious reasons: 22 23 the performance is very seriously low.

And, that's an ongoing saga.

But I appreciate the comment, I really do.

24

25

1	SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much.
2	REGENT ROBERT M. BENNETT: Thank you.
3	SENATOR FLANAGAN: Appreciate your time.
4	Next we have Dr. Bolgen Vargas and
5	Dr. Pam Brown, superintendents, respectively, of
6	Rochester and Buffalo.
7	Is Dr. Brown with us?
8	SENATOR GALLIVAN: This is Dr. Brown.
9	SENATOR FLANAGAN: Oh, I apologize.
10	DR. PAM BROWN: Dr. Brown.
11	I'm not sure if my colleague is here.
12	SENATOR FLANAGAN: My apologies.
13	Dr. Brown, why don't you start, and we can
14	wait for your colleague from Rochester.
15	And, again, I would, please, just summarize
16	your testimony.
17	I know it's been submitted.
18	DR. PAM BROWN: Okay.
19	Well, good morning.
20	Senator Flanagan, and honorable members of
21	the New York State Standing Committee on Education,
22	I really appreciate this opportunity to discuss such
23	an important issue with you today, and that of
24	assessing our progress as we implement the
25	Regents Reform Agenda and Common Core Learning

Standards.

When I first came to Buffalo a little over a year ago, I brought with me a vision of providing a world-class education for every child, and since that time, the district has adopted that vision; and, certainly, our mission is to focus on preparing every child for college and careers.

And I want to begin my remarks by saying that I agree with the Commissioner of Education and the Board of Regents on the need to provide rigorous instruction for every student at every grade level, and to measure our progress all along the way so that we can make sure that all of our students are going to be graduating on time and fully prepared for college and careers.

Like many urban school districts, our students face some challenges in achieving those goals.

We have a poverty rate of approximately 86 percent, and as you probably know, poverty is the number one predictor of success in school.

The achievement gap between children who live in poverty and those who -- from more affluent families continues to grow.

As a recent study shows, that was conducted

by Sean Reardon of Stanford University, over the last 50 years, the gap in standardized test scores between rich and poor families has actually increased by a staggering 40 percent, and that gap continues to grow.

Another challenge that we face in Buffalo is that of an increasing population of students who certainly enhance the diversity in our district and give our students great access to other cultures and languages, but certainly provides more challenge for us in terms of being able to teach the English-language learners who are of a population that continues to increase.

I think we're at about 16 percent, as I speak.

And, so, teaching the children English so that they're able to fully engage in instruction at our schools, and, certainly, to demonstrate their competency on state tests, is certainly a challenge for us in Buffalo.

However, we as a district and community are rising to meet these challenges.

First and foremost, what we're doing, is working with our leaders and teachers to make sure that instruction is strengthened in every classroom

throughout the district, and, that that instruction is fully aligned with the new Common Core Learning Standards, and that it is informed by data to which our teachers and all of our staff members have increasing access.

So, some additional things that we're doing in the district to meet these challenges include:

We have a new five-year strategic plan that really will serve as the blueprint for our progress as we move forward;

We are brokering partnerships and strategically using the resources that are available to us to provide opportunities for extended learning time.

As we know, when students are behind in their academic performance, they need, not only great instruction, but they also generally need some additional time with that grade instruction in order to catch up.

And, so, we have worked with

11 community-based organizations; Say Yes to

Education; we're partnering with the city, the

county, and certainly utilizing district resources;

to make sure that we are providing access to

extended learning time, particularly for our

45 priority and focus schools.

We are putting additional intervention systems into place.

We are very cognizant of our graduation rate and we know that that is one of our top priorities in terms of increasing it.

Our goal is to increase our graduation rate to at least 80 percent by 2018, and we know that that's a tall order, but we certainly believe that we can achieve that goal, and we are putting strategies into place so that we will make that goal a reality.

Some of those strategies include new data systems.

We have a new data dashboard that we're using, which now includes a graduation monitoring site, where we can look at, not only district-wide, but school by school, what percentage of our students are on track to graduate, what percentage are just off-track and maybe just need to make up one or two credits, which ones need more intensive intervention.

And we're looking at that data and putting programs into place to bring more students on track to graduate on time.

An example of that is our new STAR Academy.

"STAR" stands for the Student Transition to Academic Recovery, which will serve up to 200 students who are over-age and under-credited.

This will be through an extended day program, through the use of technology and other interventions, to try to get those students back on track to graduate on time.

We are increasing access to career- and technical-education programs.

The board just approved a new policy this past spring to reduce some of the criteria that had been required for students to get into those programs.

We are providing extensive professional development and coaching for our administrators and teachers in particular.

We have just completed a new reorganization plan, which includes four Offices of School Leadership, which will be headed by chiefs of school leadership who will work with principals and provide coaching and professional development for them, to make sure that their instructional leadership skills are strong.

And there are also coaches in those offices

who will work with coaches and teachers at the school level.

We have a new student code of conduct.

We are working to continue to decrease the student suspension rate, as well as student attendance.

We have -- the board has passed a new resolution on creating a high school that will be focused on medical careers, and so we are seeking partnerships to make that a reality.

And we hope that that school will open in September of 2014, which will also assist us with our public-school-choice challenge that we are facing at this point in time.

The board has also passed a new resolution to seek the opportunity to reduce the compulsory student attendance age to 4.

As we look at the research across industrialized countries throughout the world, we know that the U.S. certainly does not rank among the top countries in terms of the percentage of our students who have access to pre-kindergarten programs by age 4.

And there is much research to indicate that the more students have that pre-kindergarten

opportunity, certainly, in strong instructional programs, that the better prepared they are for kindergarten, and the better opportunity they have to be on track, and, certainly, college- and career-ready throughout their educational career.

We are taking steps to enhance our curriculum.

We've adopted a new English-language arts textbook and eResource series through Houghton Mifflin.

We have begun using the math modules from the State Education Department.

We're also piloting a core-knowledge early childhood education program that's being provided to us by the State Education Department.

And, so, those are some of the things that we are doing to address the challenges that we face, and we have begun to see some progress.

As of this past school year, our attendance rate increased, and we also saw a significant decline in chronic and severe absenteeism.

We had about 12 percent fewer students being suspended from school.

We saw a significant decline in our student dropout rate.

Our preliminary data for our graduation rate indicates a sharp increase there.

And we certainly saw an increase in the number and percentage of our graduating seniors who applied for college and vocational school.

And, so, we certainly will continue to work on that.

And, with all of that, we certainly understand that, as we look at our college- and career-readiness rates among our seniors, as well as our students in grades 3 through 8, we have a lot of work to do, and so we believe that by continuing to implement some of the interventions and strategies that I have mentioned to you, or all of them, and perhaps more, that we will be able to reach rigorous goals and objectives.

Some assistance that we would request from the State Education Department would include:

Providing more opportunities for us to increase and enhance access to extended learning time for our students;

Helping us to decrease -- to change that compulsory attendance age to age 4;

Providing more diagnostic information on state test scores that we receive so that we can use

that data to drive our planning; 1 And, providing faster access to student 2 3 performance and accountability data. 4 And, so, I want to conclude my remarks by 5 thanking you, Senator Flanagan, and all of your distinguished colleagues, for providing this 6 7 opportunity for me to address you this morning on 8 this very important topic. 9 We are absolutely committed to making sure 10 that we see drastic improvement in our schools in 11 Buffalo. We know that can happen, and we appreciate 12 13 the opportunity to share some of the strategies that 14 we are implementing, with you. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you. 15 Senator Gallivan -- I'm sorry. 16 17 Before I go to Senator Gallivan, we've been 18 joined by our colleague Senator Mark Grisanti. 19 SENATOR GRISTANTI: Thank you, 20 Senator Flanagan. 21 Senator Gallivan. 22 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you, Chairman. 23 Dr. Brown, thank you for your testimony. 24 You indicated that the dropout rate is declining. 25

Do you know what that is?

DR. PAM BROWN: The dropout rate from the 2011-12 school year was over 28 percent, and this past year it was just over 23 percent.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: All right, thanks.

At the very end of your testimony, you talked about a number of what I believe to be very important things, but, looking for the State help, I'm translating most of it into the way -- I'm translating most of it into a request for addition funding.

Is that an accurate assumption?

DR. PAM BROWN: Well, some of it would include additional funding.

As we look at -- we have 45 priority and focus schools.

We had four of those schools that ended their school-improvement grant funding this past school year, and for those four schools, there was no additional funding coming from the State to sustain some of the strategies that had been put into place, that in those schools we were beginning to see some progress.

In order to sustain that progress, I think that it would be beneficial for us to work with the

State to identify those strategies that seem to be working and that seem to be promoting progress, and then have an opportunity to sustain that progress through some level of additional school-improvement grant funding, for example.

I talked about extended learning time.

I know that there is some grant funding available for this coming school year, and for the next few school years, and we certainly intend to pursue that funding, but, we will have to see whether we will be one of the districts that will be selected to receive that funding.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: Yeah, I do want to come back to the extended learning time, but I just want to ask one more question as it relates to funding.

While I'm not exactly sure, statewide, on a per-pupil basis, City of Buffalo receives more State funding than any school in Western New York, far and away.

So I think the question that jumps out that I'm sure you hear time and time again, how do you answer, if you're getting more money and more State funding than anyone else, with results that are substandard, or, as compared to everybody else, don't meet all these other schools' successes, how

can you make a request for additional funding? 1 2 DR. PAM BROWN: Well, first of all, I would 3 say that Buffalo is the third-poorest city in the 4 country. 5 And as I've shared, and as I'm sure that you 6 are aware, poverty is a strong predictor of school 7 success. 8 And, certainly, I think it becomes apparent, 9 as we looked at the research and some of the data that I have shared in terms of access to 10 11 pre-kindergarten in the United States, and including in Buffalo, there is a need for additional funding 12 13 for children who live in poverty. 14 And where we have such a high concentration 15 of poverty, among the highest in the United States, 16 I would hope that that would be taken into 17 consideration. 18 It costs more to educate children who live in 19 poverty. SENATOR GALLIVAN: Now I will move off of --20 21 DR. PAM BROWN: In addition --22 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Oh, I'm sorry. 23 I'll move off of the funding, because I know 24 that's not the real focus of this. 25 DR. PAM BROWN: Okay.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: But let's go to the -just talk briefly about the extended learning time;
the after-school, extended school-day instruction.

With what you're doing so far, what level of participation are you getting?

DR. PAM BROWN: Well, this past school year, we provided an after-school academic program lasting two hours in each one of our priority and focus schools.

We extended the invitation to all students.

We had I think, initially, about half of the students signed up to participate in the after-school program.

Those numbers did decline in some sites throughout the school year.

But, I think it's important to note that we have seen some improvement in student performance, and I believe that some of that is attributable, not only to the after-school program that we offered this past year in 44 schools, but we also had a comprehensive summer-school program that actually yielded an additional 121 graduates, in addition to improvement on pre- and post-test scores for other students who participated in the summer program.

So we know that we're seeing progress being

generated, to some extent, as a result of these extended learning-time programs.

We will certainly work on increasing attendance.

That is certainly a major focus of ours for this year as we launch an even more extensive program through our partnership with Say Yes to Education.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: And my final question, actually, it follows through on that, the extended learning, I mean, while we don't have any direct indicator of cause of family breakdown, certainly, in areas where you see greater poverty, you see more problems in family and less family support.

One thing not talked about today, but I think that you'll likely agree with, is family support for kids in school is, maybe not critical, but extremely important.

DR. PAM BROWN: Absolutely.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: If we continue with this cycle of poverty, and the family structure stays the way that it is, because jobs aren't available, for whatever other distractions there may be, can you have success with the extended learning in these after-school programs?

DR. PAM BROWN: Absolutely.

I think that, certainly, the strongest indicator -- or, the strongest factors in terms of promoting academic gains, are those that we can control in our schools; certainly, through strong leadership and strong instructional practices in all of our classrooms.

And so that is certainly a strong focus of ours, but, in addition, we are implementing a number of strategies to increase parent and community engagement.

We have a parent facilitator in every school this year.

This year, for the first time, we've launched a school-based budgeting process to increase equity, and so that the funds follow the children.

And we have charged these school-based management teams in those schools, which include administrators, teachers, and parents, with looking at their data, determining their school's needs, and using their resources to meet those needs.

So they have more autonomy with the use of resources, along with the accountability that we know all of our schools have.

We've also started using interpreters in all

of our district-sponsored events.

And, so, those are some of the things that we're doing to try to engage parents more in our schools.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: Okay, thanks.

I could spend the next four hours in discussions with you, but for the sake of the respect of everyone else's time, and our Chairman, thank you very much.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Grisanti.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: Thank you,

Senator Flanagan.

Good morning, Dr. Brown; how are you?

DR. PAM BROWN: Good morning.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: You know, the -- you know, it's such a cumulative problem, when you look at the Buffalo School District, because not only is it about parents not being involved, and I'm glad to see that you're trying to implement some parent groups into some after-school programs, and do what you can with regards to attendance, and things along those lines.

I think that's something that needs to be done.

Just implementing, recently, interpreters in

the classroom, I think is far overdo, considering that I don't think students that speak 45 different languages just showed up this past year.

The concern that I have, and the concern that I think a lot of people have, is on the graduation rates.

Now, the last time we talked, I don't think the numbers came out yet, but I know what the graduation rates were for Hispanics, for African-Americans, and for Caucasians for the priors years.

Do you have exact numbers now as to what it was this past year?

DR. PAM BROWN: Well, I have preliminary data from this past year, and that preliminary data indicates that our overall graduation rate, as of the end of our summer program in August, was about 56 percent, and that's up from 48 -- just under 48 percent from the previous school year.

As we look at, for example, our African-American male graduation rates, which I know is a group of huge concern in the city, that rate is just over 40 percent.

Now, you know, we're still reviewing and auditing some of our data, but I believe that from

the previous year, what I was hearing, was that that rate was around 27 percent.

So we do want to verify that, but we know that this past year it was just over 40 percent; and, similarly, for Latino male students in the district.

So we do believe that we have seen an increase among those student populations, but, again, 40-some percent and 56 percent, I know that those rates are not acceptable to anyone in the city of Buffalo or in the state of New York.

So while we recognize that progress, we know that we have to continue to work hard to make sure that those numbers are increasing.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: And, you know, the concern that I have, is because we have a great program in Say Yes to Education.

DR. PAM BROWN: Yes.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: And the concern is, is that students are not gonna take advantage of that program if they're not graduating, and that's going to continue to lead, as my colleague

Senator Gallivan stated, into a cycle of poverty of continuing all over again and all over again.

And I don't want to dwell on the money

factor, because I'm sure we'll have talks, not only by the end of this year and throughout the next legislative session, but the concern is the dollars getting from the top to the bottom of where it needs to get, with regards to the teachers and the students in the classrooms and the after-school programs.

Those are the things that I want to see.

And, you know, I know it's not a popular idea, but that's why I actually asked, and had legislation, to go ahead and let the residents have a say, or a vote, in the school-district budget just like everybody else does in the city of Buffalo, because the fact of the matter is, it's not just the City of Buffalo's money.

The City of Buffalo itself puts in very little money into the school-board budget, but the amount of the money that the State put in comes from taxpayers all across the state, including Kenmore, Tonawanda, Hamburg, you know, areas in that realm.

And I think that it's important that we have a transparency to see exactly where these dollars are going.

And that's something that I wanted to talk to you about, not today, but after the fact.

Getting to the issue of Common Core, what has the City of Buffalo done to implement this, in the sense that, it came out roughly three years ago, and gave the City of Buffalo an opportunity of information for its teachers and -- and as to how to teach these programs?

That's question number one.

Question Number 2:

Do you also agree that social studies, science, and other avenues of education need to be tested, and not just the language and math?

DR. PAM BROWN: In answer to your first question, as to what has been done in the city of Buffalo to implement the Common Core Learning Standards, when I arrived in the district in July of 2012, I learned that many opportunities for professional development had been provided here in the district for teachers and administrators.

All, or almost all, of those opportunities were on a voluntary basis; and, so, some educators had participated, others had not.

I believe the vast majority of educators in the district had not participated in all of the modules of the Common Core Learning Standards, even though they had been offered.

So this past school year, we tried to be a little more intentional about reaching out to those teachers and administrators who had not participated, along with others who had and extending their professional development, but keeping track of what percentage of our educators had participated in all of the modules.

In order to ensure that all of our leaders and teachers had participated in some professional development, I had Superintendents Conference Day.

I actually added one in January of 2013, which required attendance by all teachers and administrators for Common Core professional development.

I instituted this year two
Superintendents Conference Days before the year
started, so that we could engage all of the staff.

So, some of the professional development has been voluntary, some of it has been mandatory.

We've partnered with American Institutes for Research.

They're continuing to do professional development.

And the Offices of School Leadership that I referred to you -- referred to earlier, will be charged with continuing to provide in-depth PD to the schools that they serve, through coaches, and through the supervising principals and chiefs of school leadership.

So it's going to be a continuing process.

In addition, when I arrived, there were not Common Core-aligned curriculum materials available to the students, so this past year we adopted a new English-language arts textbook series for grades K through 6, a series that is aligned to the Common Core, including eResources.

We are using now the math modules provided by the State Education Department; the core-knowledge curriculum of early childhood education.

So we're seeking every opportunity to improve our instruction, make sure it's Common Core-aligned, make sure it's data-driven, and to give our students access to the curriculum materials and tools that they need in order to improve their performance.

Your second question had to do with including science and social studies in the testing program.

I would -- I certainly think that I would support that.

My recommendation would be to phase those in, to give districts an opportunity over the next

couple of years to fully integrate the Common Core
Standards into English-language arts and math, while
also working to do so in science and social studies,
and then to possibly start the testing program in
science and/or social studies a couple of years from
this point in time, so that we can have that phased
in.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: Now, what are you hearing, or what's being told to you, whether it's from your principals, whether it's from other teachers that you may know, as to what the problem -- what the problems may be?

Is it that they do not have the materials that allow them to try to implement these on the kids?

Is it that too much time is spent on the core-standards testing rather than testing in a cumulative roundabout way?

Is it that -- uh, you know, they didn't have the "fill in the circles" in kindergarten through fourth grade?

I mean, most kids can't even color in between the lines, and they gotta -- they gotta --

You know, is it things like that on the test?

Is it things along the lines of, of how does

a child write a coherent paragraph in a 1 2 Common Core Standard testing that's in seventh 3 grade, when they're never, you know, told to do that before? 4 5 I mean, what are the problems? 6 And I know you may have stressed on this 7 before I got here, I know you were talking, but, 8 what do you see are the problems? 9 I mean, I think everybody agrees that, you 10 know, there's some testing that needs to be done. The question is: 11 How much testing? 12 13 Is the testing being done right? And what do we need to do to move it forward? 14 15 So what are you hearing with regards to your faculty and your people that you know? 16 17 DR. PAM BROWN: Well, certainly, I'm hearing 18 that it's clear that the bar has been raised; that 19 the curriculum must be more rigorous, and that the standards that are in the Common Core are more 20 21 rigorous standards. 22 So I'm hearing that, for example, children 23 who are in fourth grade who took the Common Core 24 tests, that the teachers saw that there were skills 25 there that, traditionally, had been taught in

fifth grade, or even sixth grade.

So there's no question that the standards are more rigorous.

However, we also understand that that has to be the case if we're going to make sure that every child is graduating college and career-ready.

I also learned that not every child in the district had a textbook that they could take home with them, so that they could study and prepare for tests, or just brush up on the lesson that would be taught the next day, or just for independent reading at home, which is so important.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: Let me stop you there.

Why would they not have a textbook?

DR. PAM BROWN: I'm not certain, but we have worked to alleviate that situation, and that's why we adopted the new English-language arts series, that's why we have adopted the math modules, so that we are certain that children have access to the learning tools that they need.

And I would go back to what I said earlier; there's -- you know, we have children who are several years behind -- who are already several years behind in their academic performance, so now the bar is raised so that they must perform at a

higher level.

Well, that puts them farther behind.

So, certainly, we know that the results that we got on our state test this year were not acceptable, but now I believe that we're in a better position, now that we have provided professional development for our teachers and administrators, and we'll continue to do so.

We're putting the tools in the hands of the students and teachers to help them to be even more effective with instruction, and we do expect to see better results.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: And besides being told the results, are you being told, like, problems in certain areas?

Are parents being told?

I mean, I know a lot of information is going into some national registry.

I have legislation out there, protecting, you know -- you know, a child's personal information, which I think is, you know, ridiculous you'd actually have to do legislation to do that.

But are you actually being told; or is it just this information being put in a registry, and that's it?

DR. PAM BROWN: Well, we are told that there 1 2 is certain information that will be available to the 3 public. We have not been required to put that 4 5 information -- well, we do input certain data through our accountability office. 6 7 We do provide information to parents on a new 8 parent portal that we have, so that they're able to 9 track their student's test scores, as well as 10 grades, and disciplinary data, as well as 11 attendance, on a daily basis. So, we're hoping that that increased access 12 13 to information for parents will be helpful, and help 14 them to monitor their student's progress and promote 15 their success. But -- so, that's where we are at this point. 16 17 SENATOR GRISTANTI: Okay. Thank you, Dr. Brown. 18 19 I'll pass it over to my other colleagues. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Dr. Brown, just one 20 21 question. 22 You were talking before about SIG grants and 23 funding. 24 DR. PAM BROWN: Yes. 25 SENATOR FLANAGAN: I just want to make sure

I understand, and, certainly, I can check this independently, but, is the lack of continuity in funding based on performance by the district, or, a lack of funding because there's no more SIG grants?

DR. PAM BROWN: It's my understanding that the school-improvement grants are available to us for a particular period of time, and, that,

I believe, has been about a three-year period.

There is another type of grant that is,

I think, a school-innovation grant, that only lasts
for two years.

So when the term for each one of those grants runs out, that funding is gone.

And so the point I was making earlier was that, certainly, among those four schools that are no longer receiving school-improvement grant funding as of this year, several of those schools were making marked progress, and we certainly know that there's some specific strategies that were being used in those schools that were being effective.

And, so, we were able to provide some additional support for those schools, but nowhere near the level of funding that they had been receiving through the school-improvement grant.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much.

DR. PAM BROWN: Thank you. 1 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Next we have Linda Hoffman 2 3 and Jim Sampson. Jim Sampson with the Buffalo Board of 4 5 Education; 6 And, Linda, I think we're getting a hat-trick 7 with you today; you have Erie 2, Chautauqua, and 8 Cattaraugus. LINDA HOFFMAN: BOCES, and I'm also area 9 director for New York State School Boards 10 11 Association, representing Erie, Niagara, Orleans, Genesee, and Wyoming counties. 12 13 And among my responsibilities on my BOCES and 14 on my NYSSBA, and all the rest of the things I do, 15 I represent school districts that are rural, suburban, small cities, and even Buffalo, as my 16 NYSSBA role. 17 18 I'm going to go kind of off script here a 19 little bit, because --20 JIM SAMPSON: Who starts? 21 LINDA HOFFMAN: I guess I'm going to start, 22 because I'm a lady, I -- ladies go first. 23 SENATOR FLANAGAN: That's the house rule. 24 [Laughter.] 25 LINDA HOFFMAN: I've been a school-board

member, as you can see, for -- since 1981.

I've seen reforms come from

Commissioner Ambach, Sobol, Mills, Steiner, and

King, and through all of this, I've known everybody

is concerned about testing.

We've always had testing.

We've had testing -- high-stakes testing for kids, in terms of what they do personally on their own grade work, in order to graduate, in order to move on to the next class, in order to do that.

And then we moved into even higher-stakes testing for school districts and schools when we went to NCLB, and, NCLB is not going to go away.

We still are going to be required to do testing in third through eighth grades, and I don't see any stop to that because I don't see any hope of anything happening in Washington to change the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

So the testing is not going to go away, but now we have decided that we're going to go to Common Core testing, and, we never had protests about the tests before.

Teachers were part of the high-stakes testing.

People didn't protest the tests that we had

under NCLB, even though they're rigorous.

And, I don't know whether it's because they're locally developed then; the standards were locally developed, and now we're going to national standards and people are fearful of that.

People are fearful of a large corporation being in charge of the tests instead of the Board of Regents and State Ed.

And I think that there has not been enough rollout to parents especially, about the kinds of tests that their children are getting.

We used to know, you know, it was 100 points on the test.

You got 20 points from your essay, you got 20 points from your two small essays.

You got -- you know, parents and students and teachers knew what was expected of them, and it has changed so rapidly that many people have been feeling left out, left behind.

And I think that 3012-c is -- was the response that was necessary to get the waiver from some of the NCLB requirements, and I understand why it was done, and I understand the time frames in which it had to happen.

Unfortunately, because it was in such a

compressed time frame -- uhm, how shall I say it? --1 2 I won't say mistakes were made, but I would say 3 that, uhm, it left out some periods that might have brought more thoughtful reflection on the 4 5 implications of the law. 6 We can't do anything about NCLB, but you 7 gentlemen can do something about 3012-c. 8 I don't know if you will with this, but we're 9 asking about assessing our progress, and part of our 10 progress is dependent on that law. 11 So, I also have some questions about PARCC. It's in my written statement, but I will talk 12 13 from a member of a rural community. 14 I live in Springville, New York. It's 25 miles from here. 15 16 I have no cable. 17 I have no high-speed, unless I pay \$250 a 18 month to Verizon for a 4G connection. 19 Many of our students in our rural areas don't 20 have computers. 21 We have students in Springville who come and 22 sit in the parking lot so that they can connect to the school's Wi-Fi. 23 24 They don't have it at home. 25 And we talk about going on to the next step

of the testing and doing it on computer.

I have grave concerns about that; about the district's capabilities of doing that, and I have grave concerns about the pedagogy.

I have concerns that our teachers are going to be looking at third-, fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-graders who will have to do essays on a computer, who will have to move things, objects -- because I haven't quite seen it yet -- but, supposedly, move objects on the math sections, who do not have that knowledge of how to do it.

They don't have the understanding of how to do these things.

They know how to write, "See you later",

"CUL8er," you know, with an "R", but they don't know
how to write essays on the computer.

They don't know how to do those things.

They're capable of filling in the dots, because they've been doing that for quite a while, but the new capabilities on the PARCC testing, I think are going to be -- are gonna have to be very, very carefully looked at.

And that districts, students, teachers, and parents need to be considered and talked to and listened to about influencing those -- that next

level of testing.

I will also piggyback on some of the things that have been said about BOCES and career and tech education.

So, I abhor vacuums, and when we have our BOCES education, we have students who come to us, for junior and senior year, for half a day, and spend up from -- anywhere from 15 minutes to half an hour each way on the bus from their home district to the BOCES centers.

And that's here.

It's worse at the BOCES centers in the North Country and other places where you have greater geographic distances.

But they are -- and -- and we are pushing in, which is appropriate, English and science and math into those modules that they take; and they're taking their exams and they're doing very well, but they would do so much better if we had a full-day program.

And that's in the legislation.

They would do so much better if they could go for four years, or they could elect to do a four-year program, a half day for two years, and then full day for the next two years.

We're talking about career. 1 I mean, we say "college- and career-ready"? 2 3 In order to be career-ready, we have to really look at our career and technical education, 4 5 like the Regent Bennett said, and do some real refurbishing of it, and look at what we need to do 6 7 for our students. 8 Because that's where I'm at: 9 I've been an advocate for students for 31 10 years. 11 Thank you. SENATOR FLANAGAN: 12 Thank you. 13 Mr. Sampson. 14 JIM SAMPSON: Yes, thank you. 15 Welcome to Buffalo, and this beautiful chamber, and I hope you got a chance to enjoy the 16 17 city. 18 I was elected to the school board in May --19 Buffalo School Board in May as a "reform" candidate. I don't know what that means. 20 21 And I've been continually identified as a 22 "reform" member of the Buffalo Board of Education. 23 But let me give you just a real quick 24 background about myself -- not intended to be a job 25 interview -- but, I've had the opportunity to run

three large child-welfare agencies: one here in Buffalo Gateway-Longview, and then two in Wisconsin;

And I was also vice president of a health-care system in Wisconsin specializing on serving kids.

Also, I spent the beginning of my career in corrections, and I think I've had the opportunities through my professional life to see what happens to children and adults who don't have access to high-quality, relevant, and germane educational opportunities.

I don't remember talking to any inmate in a prison in Wisconsin that graduated from high school.

Probably the one common denominator of kids in foster care is they frequently come from families whose parents don't have a high school education or have not graduated from high school.

I retired from Gateway not too long ago, but, three years ago, I had the opportunity of serving as the first president from -- for Buffalo Reform Ed, at the request of Katie Campos who helped found that organization, and also was its first executive director.

So, I have some sense of maybe what reform is, but, from my perspective, reform is not

necessarily charter schools, it's not necessarily 2 vouchers.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

What it is, is, how we learn to focus on what happens in the classroom, day in and day out.

I would also suggest that poverty may be an indicator of success, but adults use that as an excuse so we don't have to try and be held accountable.

I don't know of any greater pathway out of poverty than a high-quality education, and, that's our responsibility as a community and as adults, and I think as a board of education.

I would say about the Common Core Standards, that I think New York State is to be commended for being the second in the nation, right behind Kentucky, in advancing the Common Core Standards as a new way of learning; and, in fact, Regent Bennett mentioned the word "reform."

There probably is no greater reform that's on our doorstep in New York State than the Common Core Standards, and, hopefully, how it will reinvent the kind of work we do in every school in the state.

I think it's important that, my kids, who I'm not going to say how old they are, but all the kids

who are entering school now are entering a much, much different world than the world that I entered when I left high school and college, and that's changing every day.

And at the same time, much of what we do in an educational structure hasn't changed all that much since I was in high school.

This is the one opportunity we have, I think, to really dramatically change that.

To give you a little bit of background, yes, graduation rates in Buffalo may have gone up, we don't know for a fact, but we do know one piece of data that's very, very critical:

If 50 percent of the kids we had last year, maybe 3,000 kids eligible to graduate, who entered the freshman year four years previous, if 50 percent graduated, that means we had about 1500 kids eligible to go to college.

Within that number, 10 percent were collegeor career-ready, which means we're having a really bad return on our investment.

And, I think the Common Core Standards is going to be directed at helping change that.

This becomes particularly important for Buffalo.

I always get disoriented when I'm in these chambers, of where Main Street is.

If you go to Main Street, wherever it may be, and look at the medical corridor, we're expecting to have over 10,000 advanced manufacturing jobs there within the next few years.

This district is not equipping kids to either go to college or to assume a job in that advanced-manufacturing capability.

Close to 50 percent of the kids who leave Buffalo and go to Erie Community College have to take remedial courses, and from our perspective, that's unacceptable.

So what I would suggest is that, for all the criticisms the Common Core Standards is receiving, and I appreciate the genesis for that, and the concern for that, I think it represents an incredible opportunity for the kids of this community, whether they've been in City Honors, or whether they're going to Riverside, or whether they're going to East High School, and I see the principal for Lafayette, or, Lafayette High School, I think it offers a great opportunity.

I am very, very concerned that the district does not have the capacity or the resources to

provide the kind of training and support for 1 2 teachers and principals to carry this out, because 3 that is where the reality is. And I think Dr. Bennett mentioned that, that 4 5 without that kind of support, and without that kind of staff development, we're going to have an uphill 6 7 struggle in implementing the Common Core Standards 8 here in the city. 9 So, thank you. 10 SENATOR GRISTANTI: I have no questions. 11 SENATOR GALLIVAN: No questions. 12 LINDA HOFFMAN: Wow, no questions. 13 Really? 14 Okay. 15 SENATOR FLANAGAN: You're not getting off that easy. 16 17 Linda, to your point, I just wanted to make a 18 comment. 19 We -- our colleagues have taken a very hard look at the PARCC issue and the assessments, and the 20 21 computer-based testing. 22 Even if we had the money and we could 23 distribute it, I'm not sure it would work --24 LINDA HOFFMAN: Right. 25 SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- because of exactly the

issues that you raised. 1 2 The Senate passed legislation, that if the 3 State thinks it's a good idea, that they have to pay for it. 4 5 So, it's kind of the gist of what it was. It's a -- let's put it this way: 6 7 In your 32 years being on the school boards? 8 LINDA HOFFMAN: Yes. 9 SENATOR FLANAGAN: The legislation, make sure that it's a fully funded mandate. 10 11 LINDA HOFFMAN: That would be very, very nice. 12 13 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Exceedingly rare, perhaps, 14 as well. 15 But, Jim, just one quick question: If you were particularly coming in as someone 16 17 with a wealth of experience, but a new member to the 18 board, if you were to mark the Buffalo School 19 District for their implementation of Common Core, for the changes that are coming now, on a scale of 20 21 1 to 10, 10 being the highest --22 JIM SAMPSON: Where is it today? 23 SENATOR FLANAGAN: I'm sorry? 24 JIM SAMPSON: What is the end of the 25 question, excuse me?

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Yeah, how would you grade 1 2 the district, based on what you've seen as someone 3 who has very broad background but newly elected to the board? 4 5 On a score of 1 to 10? JIM SAMPSON: 6 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Yes, sir. 7 JIM SAMPSON: Probably below 5. 8 SENATOR FLANAGAN: 9 Senator Ranzenhofer. 10 SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Thank you both for coming here today and testifying. 11 And a question for you, Jim. 12 You had mentioned that you feel very 13 strongly, and I think this has been the common 14 15 theme, that the Common Core Standards are very good, 16 but your concern is, right now, that at the 17 principal level and the teacher, it's not being 18 implemented in the schools. 19 The program is good, but it's not getting into the classroom to have its effect, if 20 21 I understood you correctly. 22 What needs to be done in order to make sure 23 that these standards, which everybody has said are good and more rigorous, that they actually get into 24

the schools so the kids benefit from this more

25

rigorous and thorough curriculum?

JIM SAMPSON: I think that, you know,

I mentioned that we do much the same things we did

when I was in high school, and we probably do much

the same things we've done for the past 100 years in

public education, particularly in urban districts.

I think we're organized around, and people will disagree with this, but as you look at everything that we do in Buffalo, we're organized around central office, and that's where the resources are.

I think we ought to be organized around the school, and we should put as much in the way of resources into each one of our 57 schools.

We've got some wonderful principals, and
I think if they had more access to resources, with
support from central office, not direction from
central office, with the understanding -- and they
know this, as do teachers -- that the real
difference is going to take place in what happens
between the child/the student, and the teacher and
families, and I think with the right kind of
support; in other words, almost flipping the
district upside down.

SENATOR RANZENHOFER: So are you saying,

then, that you believe the resources are sufficient, but, the allocation, it being top-heavy as opposed to ground up?

JIM SAMPSON: Oh, I -- as a board member and elected official, I would be hard-pressed to ever ask the State for more money, to Senator Gallivan's point.

I mean, if a school is getting a student -a school-improvement grant, at the end of that
grant, there's been no discernible progress in
turning that school around, I think it's -- how can
we ask for more money?

You know, what we ought to be doing is saying, Why isn't that school turning it around?

And, perhaps, closing it and opening it as a different kind of school.

I think there's plenty of resources in this district, if used wisely, could accomplish the job.

SENATOR RANZENHOFER: So when you open as a new school, I mean, how does that change the dynamic if you just have a different coat of paint and a different label?

JIM SAMPSON: Well, I think what you -- you know, Sam Radford is in the audience, and he's been a driving choice behind the parental-choice plan,

and I think that's a good plan.

I think it -- I'm glad that the State's holding us accountable to our responsibility for parental choice, but I also think it's an opportunity for this district to implement reforms way beyond what the State is requiring on the short term.

For example, within that plan, we're going to be looking at least two, perhaps even more schools, that are non-performing, which means the students in that school are in non-performing schools, of actually closing it, and opening it as a district-sponsored charter school.

That changes the governance of the school, it changes where the resources are, it changes the leadership, and it changes the accountability.

I'm also a trustee and a founding member of a charter school, and I really appreciate the creative attention between what SED requires, and New York has got one of the best enabling legislations for charter schools, and knowing that, if parents aren't satisfied, they'll go someplace else, and they'll have that opportunity.

So I think, through creative thinking, creative discussion-making, engagement of critical

stakeholders, especially families and parents, we can find ways to change the culture in schools.

And I don't want to dismiss at all, and I'm not intending to do that, we don't listen enough to principals and teachers about how we can change the culture of a school.

We direct them of what it's going to be.

And we should -- it should to be the opposite; we should be asking them, "What needs to be done for you to be able to do your job?"

SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Thank you very much.

LINDA HOFFMAN: And I would agree with that, and many suburban and rural schools also, that are failing, or our school districts; are grades are failing, and our children that are failing.

That we need to be talking to the principals and the teachers, and saying, "What do you need?"

SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Thanks.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much.

JIM SAMPSON: Thanks.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Next we have, and I'm sure I'm going to botch this somehow, but I know he's been with us before at at least one hearing:

Dan Drmacich, principal, retired teacher, and, Naomi Cerre, principal of Lafayette High

1 School.

You look like you're coming in from opposing corners here.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: I would thank everyone again for their patience while these folks are joining us, and just would remind everyone, summarizing, because I know, Dan, you have very extensive testimony.

A concise summary is hugely helpful, and we will continue the house rule, that, ladies first.

Naomi.

NAOMI CERRE: Good afternoon.

First of all, I want to say that I'm extremely happy to be a principal in the Buffalo schools, as well as the principal of Lafayette High School, which is the pride of the west side.

I'm here today to first say, as I was listening to you, the many conversations regarding, and testimonies regarding, our situation with our students.

Each student deserves a high-quality education no matter of their race, their religion, or their socioeconomic status.

The issue is, is that it cannot be a one-size-fits-all approach onto education, because that has never really worked, and never will.

The best approach for a better outcome for students is a child-centered education customized to students with appropriate resources and support for educators.

Lafayette, the demographics, as you well know, 70 percent is ESL, 45 different languages, over 30 different countries are represented, and the native tongue for my students is varied and very complex.

Students and their families have arrived in Buffalo seeking refuge.

Many come from war-torn locations and have seen various horrors as young people.

Despite the limitations, they have navigated the schools, the community, language, and different customs, and they have pursued educational goals with humility.

You have read and have seen many versions from the media that describe Lafayette as a failing school.

We are a priority school, not a failing school.

These scores are not a reflection of the learning and quality of teaching happening in the school.

would also reduce.

Intervention for ESL support, it is just not stand-alone quality instruction.

You must have customized supports to support ESL students, especially as it relates to a literacy-filled environment.

The question that should be raised is:

Are the students being failed at Lafayette?

Four of six of the failing high schools in

Buffalo have the highest concentration of

non-English speakers, and that would mean if there

was more customized supports in those schools and

moving in a direction to also teach gen-ed teachers

how to really work well and support our ESL

Many students are SIFE students; and that is, students who have interrupted or no formal education.

population, there might be a significant increase in

our graduation rate, as well as, our dropout rate

They have arrived at this country -- in this country with either no education, or they've had an informal or interrupted education; and, therefore,

indeed, are struggling to navigate the system.

Language fluency takes five to seven years, so we are requiring that our ESL students complete in four years.

They need a -- at least, minimally, a year, if not more, of English immersion to transition into our high schools.

Despite the language navigation, students are expected again to meet graduation requirements.

Now, I want to say this is not typical just to Buffalo, this is not typical just to New York State.

It is a national crisis, that we are not receiving enough supports and resources in relation to ESL coaches, ESL coordinators, as well as interpreters.

I have 45 different languages and 2 standing interpreters at this time, even though we are moving towards hiring additional interpreters.

There's a need for that level of support.

Another thing that I want to mention, as it relates to all children, if we're talking about addressing students in relationship to poverty, many do not come from a language-rich environment; so, therefore, literacy is an issue.

If we do not, and I repeat, "if we do not" take a diagnostic, prescriptive approach to addressing reading and writing with our students, how many programs or extended day or learning pieces that the district puts out, or that the state puts out for us, indeed, we need to make sure that students, we know where they are in their levels, and how to prescriptively work with students and develop a treatment plan.

If you have high levels of students that have reading difficulties or literacy difficulties, having an extended program can be wonderful, but if it's not addressing, specifically, those issues related to literacy in a more prescriptive diagnostic approach, then we are not moving in the direction that we should.

And that's a conversation that must be had by all educators and by all politicians and by communities, that, indeed, we are looking at programs, and, yes, we are looking a standards, but are we addressing students' levels in a more diagnostic way, in a more prescriptive way?

And that's a question that really has to be looked at.

I added two additional reading teachers to my

budget, because I wanted to make sure that all of my students are tested at their levels.

Do note, that when they come in, that they are not tested in their native language, and that is something that also needs to be done.

Every student should have an opportunity to be tested in their native language to see if, number one, that they not only speak, but they write and read in the language that they come forth from their native country.

So, clearly, when we have students that walk into our school buildings who need an abundance of resources, we are not a failing school; we are a priority school.

And "priority school" means exactly that; that, indeed, we should have priority saturation of resources and priority saturation of capacity and building capacity.

And a lot of this has been due to the fact that there hasn't been enough research and data that has been accepted by our educators regarding what our needs are for ESL students.

So at this time, I want to say to you that we do need to increase those customized supports, not just in the area of ESL supports, but in literacy

supports; a more diagnostic, prescriptive approach. 1 2 And we're asking that, that that's really 3 formally looked at on all levels, so that the value 4 of having immigrants come to the west side is a 5 fantastic thing. When I walk down the streets of Grant Street 6 7 and I walk into my school and I hear 45 different 8 languages, I'm excited about the opportunities that 9 Buffalo could possibly have if we really invested in 10 this particular population. 11 They are an asset; they come in ready to work. 12 13 And I just want to thank you for listening, 14 and for taking the opportunity to hear my testimony. 15 Thank you. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Naomi, you must be a lot 16 of fun to work with. 17 18 I wouldn't want to get in trouble and have to go to the principal's office. 19 20 [Laughter.] 21 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Dan, go ahead, please. 22 DAN DRMACICH: Thank you. 23 My name is Dan Drmacich. 24 I'm a retired principal from Rochester City 25 School District, where I was the principal for

23 years.

Prior to that, I taught for 20 years within the system.

I think it's important to note that
School Without Walls is a member of the
New York State Performance Standards Consortium,
which probably some of you haven't heard of, but
it's been approved over the past almost 20 years by
the New York State Regents, in terms of having more
flexibility with the curriculum, more flexibility
with assessment.

In fact, the only Regents or Common Core exams that our students would take to be the ELA.

But what's interesting about it, if you do
the research, and I've noted this on my testimony
that you have a copy of, is that students from
consortium schools, despite the fact that they have
more special-ed students, more ESL students, that
they have more students who are behavioral issues at
times, they perform much better.

In fact, it almost replicates the research that was done back in the 1940s when the 8-year study was done on progressive schools that were across the country in the '20s, 30s, and '40s under John Dewey.

And what they did was called the "8-year study," to find out how graduates of progressive schools would do in comparison to graduates of traditional high schools.

And they had over 300 colleges involved, over 100 schools were involved, and they found out that the kids of progressive schools, the graduates who were accepted into college on no basis other than teacher and principal recommendations, that these kids performed as well as or better than students from traditional schools.

The other variable about this, which is very interesting, is that those kids scored much higher in citizenship; that they're more likely to vote, that they were more likely to participate in community activities, in terms of changing things in their neighborhoods.

That type of thing has been replicated by the consortium schools in New York State.

So I encourage to you take a look at that in terms of a more genuine, authentic model of education reform.

I'm going say a few things about the reform model in New York State, that I hope it's not too insulting, but I'm going to be direct and blunt.

I think it's a complete disaster, and the reason I say this is -- well, as I said in my testimony, it's on wrong track, headed in the wrong direction, on the wrong train.

And what I'd like to say about this is that, if I were an enemy of New York State, or an enemy of this country, and I wanted to disrupt the education system, I can't think of a better way to do it than what our reformers in New York State and in this country have done.

Andrew Cuomo, Arne Duncan, our Board of Regents, our Commissioner, are all ignoring the research in terms of what research says makes an effective education for kids.

They don't deal at all with what motivates kids to take a more effective, engaging approach into education.

They ignore what motivates teachers to teach more effectively, to be more creative, more competent, and ignores all the research in terms of what makes an effective humanistic organization that adults and kids can thrive in.

It is not paid any attention to.

What we end up with is reformers, including our Governor, our Education Commissioner, and also

the corporate leaders of Gates, Broede [ph.], and 1 2 Walton, is to turn our students into products. 3 All they're interested in is test scores. If you look at what's tested, there's nothing 4 5 in there that really asks a kid to apply their learning to the real world. 6 7 That's the real test, and nothing is done, 8 because it's cheaper to do it this way. 9 So our kids are basically -- they basically 10 become products. 11 Teachers and principals are being turned into 12 technicians as opposed to -- who can produce high 13 test scores, as opposed to really working on what 14 engages kids. 15 I want to make one point here that's kind of interesting; is that there's a socioeconomic 16 17 principle called "Campbell's Law." 18 Campbell's Law says that whenever you reduce 19 a socioeconomic goal in a country, a city, a state, whatever it might be, into a number, corruption and 20 21 perversion of the process to get you there is 22 inevitably going to occur.

> And that's happened within New York State and around the country.

23

24

25

All we have now is more "teach to the test";

""One size fits all";

Narrow the curriculum for the sake of disregarding art, music, citizenship, character development, and student interests;

Focus on test scores rather than the joy of learning;

Even ignore poverty as a variable that seriously affects student engagement in learning.

I get insulted every time I hear this, because I dealt with kids who lived in poverty, for 40 years in the district and, I know poverty affects them.

It's not only poverty -- we all know about the heroic examples of kids who exceed poverty, but those are far and few between in terms of what happens to the rest.

I think what we look at is that, even if we look at the graduates of high schools in large cities, like Buffalo and Rochester, and we find out that only 14 percent of kids from -- who are low-income Black and Hispanic students graduate from college, compared to 54 percent of Caucasian students.

So, I think what we're at, is that we need to reevaluate where we're at with this reform movement,

because it doesn't make much sense to me in terms of the direction that it's going.

It's ignoring the research.

How can you do that?

I don't understand it.

What I have submitted to you in terms of testimony, I put in the form of eight myths that exist within New York State, and pretty much around the country, in terms of the Common Core and the efforts, the high-stakes standardized-testing movement that's gone on, in terms of trying to reform education, which I refer to as "deform" as opposed to reform.

But I encourage you to read my testimony and look at the myths in there.

You heard from the last person who gave testimony, the school-board member, on charter schools.

Charter schools, in general, are not effective.

The research from the CREDO Report, in terms of Stanford University, proves this.

You know, there's exceptions, there's good charter schools, but, by and large, they aren't any better, and most are worse than public schools.

So you've got to look at the research in 1 terms of what the research is saying. 2 3 I have no idea why New York State pushed for more charter schools and evaluation of teachers 4 5 based upon test scores. It's both craziness. 6 7 It doesn't make any sense. 8 If you look at the research in terms of 9 motivation, I mean, look at the popular book 10 "Drive," by Daniel Pink, it challenges all of this 11 by thorough research. So, I could go on and on in this because 12 13 I feel so passionate about it, but what I do want to 14 do, is just take a couple of minutes to --15 If I could, two minutes, please? Okay. 16 -- is to review the recommendations that 17 18 I have for you, and I promise not to read it. 19 First of all, I think the New York State Assembly and Senate needs to reestablish its efforts 20 21 in terms of creating a war on poverty in 22 New York State. 23 You will see much higher test scores, if 24 you're gonna measure kids by test scores, if you 25 just focus on poverty, and deal with things like

medical care and other things, job training, parent training, early childhood education, incentives for middle-class suburbs to create sliding-scale housing developments.

You'll get a much more drastic impact in terms of increase of student performance if you deal with that.

Increase legislation to give incentives to middle-class suburbs to partner with urban schools to create metropolitan school districts.

If you look at the book "Hope and Despair in the American City," by Gerald Grant, who is professor emeritus at Syracuse University, he compares Syracuse to that of Wake County,

North Carolina, which isn't perfect, but it has a 92 percent parent-approval rating in terms of their kids' education there, and that's with a district of 150,000 students.

Provide funding to reduce all -- and this one I'm sure will blow you out of the water -- reduce all poverty-stricken schools to a student-teacher ratio of 12:1.

Declare a moratorium on the use of

Common Core and high-stakes testing until it can be

field-tested for five years.

Require each student to demonstrate their 1 2 proficiency different. 3 Through that -- this is really a new paradigm if we're going to go to this, but it makes much more 4 5 sense. It's what colleges do in terms of college 6 7 dissertations. 8 Evaluate kids based on a portfolio of all 9 their work, as opposed to that of a test score, 10 which are completely unreliable and invalid. 11 Again, look at the research in terms of what 12 the research says. 13 Lastly, providing incentives to school 14 districts to replicate schools that adhere to the 15 consortium that I talked about. Rescind the charter legislation. 16 Rescind APPR. 17 18 Require New York State to shift their role to 19 more of a helper as opposed to an imposer of unreasonable unfunded mandates. 20 21 Work with the Board of Regents to come up 22 with four new sets of diplomas. 23 Come up with a vocational diploma for those

students who -- there's no loss of honor in terms of

being a good electrician, a plumber, a carpenter.

24

25

1 Why can't we do that?

A new set of graduation requirements for any district that would want to come up with something, as long as it's approved by the body.

And, lastly, I know you're not going to like this, but encourage the resignation of Commissioner John King.

John King does not support anything that I just talked about.

Nothing.

In fact, there's so much outrage about this, in terms of New York State, he recently canceled four PTA conferences, forums, that were to be held in New York State.

Is that the spirit of democracy that we want to model for our kids?

And, lastly, Board of Regents:

I would encourage you to seek legislation that would require all Board of Regents members to hold degrees in education and/or psychology, with at least three years of teaching experience, so that they can relate more effectively to the teaching profession.

Thank you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Dan, that was a little 1 2 over two minutes, but there's a lot of material; there's a wealth of detail in your testimony. 3 I did have a chance to go through it, and 4 5 including the myth and reality. And, Naomi, I think I'd rather go get in 6 7 trouble in your principal's office than him. 8 [Laughter.] 9 SENATOR FLANAGAN: But, you know, there's a 10 lot of provocative stuff in there, and we do appreciate it. 11 So, Senator Gallivan. 12 13 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Naomi, I have one question about your testimony, and I just may not have heard 14 15 it correctly.

it correctly.

You talk about some of the facts and the challenges that the kids are facing -- the language challenges of people that are coming into our

19 melting pot.

16

17

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

But, anyway, written testimony says, "Across the nation, including a region, lawmakers have not taken supportive research seriously."

Then I thought I heard you say, but I might have misunderstood, that there was not any research, or enough research, in this area.

Did I hear correctly, or no? 1 2 NAOMI CERRE: I'm saying that districts have 3 not really looked at the data and the research in a serious way, to connect with the capacity of 4 5 resources, as well as professional development. SENATOR GALLIVAN: So there is research out 6 7 there regarding --NAOMI CERRE: Yes, there is. 8 9 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Could you -- if you have 10 time in your busy day, could you point us to some of 11 that research, just in follow-up, whether it's my email or whatever it may be? 12 13 NAOMI CERRE: Absolutely. 14 SENATOR GALLIVAN: All right. 15 NAOMI CERRE: Absolutely. SENATOR GALLIVAN: 16 Thank you. SENATOR GRISTANTI: Yes, good morning; how 17 18 are you? 19 A couple of questions, I want to follow up 20 from previous testimony. 21 Did your students get the curriculum and the 22 books that were needed for the Common Core? 23 NAOMI CERRE: Yes, we have our books. 24 We still do need -- because we are a school 25 that has so many different languages, there needs to be a review of curriculum.

There needs to be review of what kind of supports need to go on in the classroom in order for content teachers who do not have a background in ESL, to actually instruct with ESL strategies.

So, we've been working with the multilingual ed department, thanks to Dr. Alsace, along with Johns Hopkins and national experts, but that just began as of the end of last year, as far as the intensive kind of professional development and review of curriculum.

So we're looking at rigor.

We're looking at Bridges for Academic
Success, which is a program that's coming out of -actually, New York State is supporting it, to
actually work with students and teachers regarding
professional development, as well as delivery of
instruction, because the kind of delivery
instruction for ESL students is quite different than
it would be in a different classroom.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: But the students that have a language barrier, how are they able to take the test?

NAOMI CERRE: The -- we have, again, some interpreters, and we do have an opportunity to offer

students in the classroom what we call "ESL 1 2 periods," where they are learning certain levels 3 English immersion. Is it intense enough to meet the level of 4 5 impact? The answer would be no. 6 7 They need more time. 8 They need more time. 9 So, yes, we do have materials. 10 Yes, we are reviewing more materials that --11 within our transformation framework, to address that piece, but there has to be a district-wide universal 12 13 protocol in how we address and provide supports and 14 curriculum and resources to ESL, as well as 15 bilingual students. 16 SENATOR GRISTANTI: And would you agree --17 because it's, you know, just an observation from the 18 last three speakers: 19 We had, when I got here, the first speaker that was, you know, all for Common Core; 20 21 We had, the second speaker that I was here 22 for, somewhere in the middle; 23 And now we have, you know, it's got to be 24 done away with. 25 So there's definitely not continuity.

```
I mean, there's questions of how to fix it,
1
 2
        or how to do things, or what have you.
 3
               But my question to you, then, is this:
               The -- there was talk by the Board of
 4
 5
        Education newest member, Jim Sampson, about, you
        know, having the ability of having resources in your
 6
7
        school, rather than you having to go through the red
8
        tape to get the resources from city hall.
9
               Do you agree with that?
10
               NAOMI CERRE: Yes, I do.
               SENATOR GRISTANTI: Okay.
11
               What are the problems that you are seeing?
12
13
               Is it strictly funding?
               Is it having somebody listen to you as to
14
15
        what's needed at Lafayette?
16
               I mean, what are things that you see that are
17
        needed, that are not being attended to by the board?
18
               NAOMI CERRE: Let me say this --
19
               SENATOR GRISTANTI: By the administration,
20
        I should say.
21
               NAOMI CERRE: -- it's not just a district
22
        issue.
23
               It is a trickle-down effect that -- in
24
        regards to supporting ESL students.
25
               So when we're talking about resources, yes,
```

funding is definitely a high priority, but the other piece, is knowing what resources should be in place; the kinds of resources that should be specific to each building.

Every building has a different face and a different culture, and a different tone and tenor;

And, accountability:

When you send out a standard, any kind of standard, you have to make sure that there's differentiated -- just like we have differentiated instruction, there has to be differentiated accountability from the federal government, to the state government, to the district, all the way down to the building level; and all of those have to be aligned.

We're given the standards to work with, which is fine, but, you have to have levels of supports and building capacity, with strengthening teachers, their ideas, and even views of an ESL child; diversity training.

Recruitment in HR has to be changed, where we're not just recruiting internally, but we're recruiting outside of the district, to meet bilingual and ESL pieces.

So there has to be a shift in our thinking on

how we work with schools.

Bennett is different, has different needs, than Lafayette, and you cannot give me the same resources that you would at Bennett.

It's just a different -- it's apples and oranges.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: There was talk also about grants that expire after two or three years.

Now, those grants, my understanding, are supposed to actually be to aid your school, to aid Bennett, to aid other schools.

NAOMI CERRE: Correct.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: The odd thing is, that the grant money was actually used, in some circumstances, to hire administrators, rather than that money going to the schools themselves to implement the programs that are needed that the grant was supposed to be used for.

So it was, either, that the money was coming out of the money that the State was giving for the education, or the City gave under the budget, but then it was said, no, it was grant money that was used so it wasn't any moneys from the State or the City; it was grant money that was used to hire additional administrators.

NAOMI CERRE: Well, I --

SENATOR GRISTANTI: Now, grant money that's set up for grant money is supposed to go to your school or to Bennett or to McKinley or to any of the other 40 schools to -- plus, to utilize for implementing the programs in your schools; correct?

NAOMI CERRE: Well, I can only speak for

Lafayette and East [sic] because we are -- we have

not received SIG funding as of yet, because of

the -- we did not -- the application process was not

fully processed correctly; so, therefore, we lost

that grant funding; and, therefore, Easton and

Lafayette, we were -- we received a mandate from the

New York State Commissioner to move forward with

working with BOCES, which was not a framework, but

it's definitely a positive addition.

But most importantly, wherever we are, whether it's SIG grant or there's a combination of SIG grant and district funding, there has to be a level of understanding of what the needs are for that building.

So no matter if it's SIG grant, if the SIG grant comes today, it will leave, and there has to be a universal protocol on how certain schools are supported.

Yes, principals are given a budget to work 1 2 with, but, still, there's this formula based on 3 enrollment versus need, and so when you're working with the budget, you have to look at the needs of 4 5 the school, and the needs of the students, as well as the teachers. 6 7 So, we're talking about a shifting of 8 thinking on everyone's part. 9 There's no pointing fingers; it's just a 10 shift of thinking, and how do we go about doing that 11 in a transformation process? SENATOR GRISTANTI: Everybody working 12 13 together. 14 Now, is that working now? 15 I mean, I know it's just been implemented with BOCES. 16 17 Any idea of how many students are actually 18 taking advantage of it? 19 NAOMI CERRE: From my building, 58 students 20 are taking advantage of it. 21 SENATOR GRISTANTI: And that's similar, Dan, 22 to what you were talking about, is, you know, not 23 everybody's going to graduate, but getting them into

plumbing, electrical, you know, things that are

taught at McKinley.

24

25

Out of curiosity, do they still have the 1 2 travel program at LaFayette? 3 They used to have the travel-and-tourism 4 program. 5 NAOMI CERRE: No. 6 When we were going through this 7 transformation turnaround process, that is a part of the transformational framework, so this year is a 8 planning year to implement firm CTE programs. 9 10 And that's aligned with the National Academy Foundation (NAF). 11 SENATOR GRISTANTI: All right. 12 13 Thank you, Naomi, and thank you, Dan, for 14 being here. 15 NAOMI CERRE: Thank you. 2:00:18:9 16 17 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Two quick comments before 18 I say "thank you": 19 Dan, To your point about other venues and forums not taking place, I think that underscores 20 21 the value of what we're trying to do by having 22 people like you and Naomi, and others similarly 23 situated, testify before us. 24 And, Naomi, one of the things that I have 25 found enlightening, and a tad disconcerting is,

I don't mind that New York State gets blamed for things that New York State is actually responsible for; and that's justifiable, because we take credit for things that we do well, also.

But, I'm finding that there's a disconnect, to some extent, between what parents know for sure, and the role of the federal government.

A lot of the things that we're talking about, English-language learners, students with disabilities, when they have to take tests, even if it's not advisable, they're hamstrung to a degree by federal regulations that force us to do some of those things.

So, frankly, I think one of upshots of what we should be doing collectively, is working more closely and putting more pressure on our federal colleagues.

They're a little otherwise engaged right now, but putting more pressure on them to make some potential changes.

But thank both, very much.

NAOMI CERRE: Thank you.

DAN DRMACICH: One other thing is,

I encourage all of you to read at least a couple
chapters of this book, "A Reign of Error," by

```
Diane Ravitch.
1
 2
               A lot of research, a lot of good
        recommendations in here.
 3
 4
        2:02:11
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: And, thank you.
 5
               And our next panel is Deann Nelson,
 6
7
        Carrie Remis, and Eric Mihelbergel.
8
               I'm going to say that one wrong.
9
               I don't mean to botch it, but, Eric, you'll
10
        forgive me in advance.
11
               All right, Eric, you obviously know you're
        going third.
12
13
               ERIC MIHELBERGEL: I'm sorry?
14
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: You obviously know you're
15
        going third.
16
               ERIC MIHELBERGEL: Yes.
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: And, again, please do the
17
18
        best you can to summarize.
19
               We have a lot of people who are still coming,
20
        and I appreciate your patience.
21
               So, Deann why don't we start with you,
22
       please.
23
               DEANN NELSON: Oh, good, okay.
24
               The devil is in the details, so I'm going to
25
        show you some details.
```

1	[Inaudible.]
2	SENATOR GRISTANTI: You just got reprimanded.
3	DEANN NELSON: I want to talk about rule of
4	law.
5	SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Can you put the
6	microphone closer to your mouth.
7	DEANN NELSON: Yes, I will.
8	Thank you.
9	Friedrich Hayek, who is a Nobel Prize-winning
10	economist, writer, philosopher, wrote "The Road to
11	Serfdom," said that "Rule of law is the embodiment
12	of freedom."
13	It distinguishes a free country from a
14	country with arbitrary government.
15	Well, we're here today because rule of law
16	has been broken in our state and country.
17	I want to there's five of them that I can
18	discern.
19	The U.S. Constitution, the Tenth Amendment,
20	which gives education rights to the states;
21	20 USC, Section 1232a, which is the
22	prohibition against the federal government getting
23	involved in education;
24	The New York State Constitution, Article 11,
25	Sections 1 and 2, which the Legislature has

responsibility for education, and the Legislature 1 2 has responsibility for overseeing the Board of 3 Regents; New York State Law, Article 35, Section --4 5 Statute 1709, giving boards of education responsibility for local control; 6 7 And the last one, the Family Educational 8 Rights and Privacy Act, which, up to this time, 9 considered the privacy of students in our state. 10 But, the federal government decided they 11 would change the definitions, and so this no longer is applicable. 12 13 And, so, because we have this grand -- our 14 grand principle has been trounced, has been broken, 15 has been violated, the Board of Regents should be replaced, and the Commissioner of Education should 16 17 be replaced. 18 Now, the second point that I wanted to talk 19 about was the mathematics program. Mr. Grisanti asked about textbooks. 20 21 Well, in the mathematics program, there are 22 no textbooks. 23 There are three questions that we should be 24 asking about the mathematics program; EngageNY 25 mathematics:

One is, what is the research base for this 1 2 program? Number 2: 3 What is the effect size of this program? 4 5 And, Number 3: Was this program field-tested before it was 6 7 imposed on our children? The first one, I could find no research on 8 9 EngageNY mathematics, so, there is no effect size. "Effect size" is a very important concept. 10 11 I'm listed as a parent and a grandparent, but I also have a doctorate from UB in educational 12 13 psychology, and I was a school psychologist, I was 14 guidance counselor, I taught health. 15 I am certified as a school-nurse teacher, and I am certified in elementary. 16 17 So, I have a broad background in this. 18 Effect sizes are so important, and the work 19 of Dr. John Hattie in 2009 was groundbreaking work on effect sizes, because you can compare 20 effect sizes of programs. 21 22 He took, and he had 800 meta-analyses. 23 That means, he took a lot of different 24 studies. 25 He had 52,000 studies, in fact.

And he did -- and he had millions of 1 2 students, millions of subjects, that he was looking at in all of this. 3 What he determined was, that an effect size 4 5 of 0.40 is the hinge. Anything at this point or above is effective. 6 7 It works for all students. 8 Anything below this works on some students. 9 And let me just give you an example: 10 For years, and it's still being used today, whole-language reading was implemented. 11 It has an effect size of .06. 12 13 That's hardly better than chance. 14 It doesn't work. 15 Yet, when children were in that program, they flowed into special education because the program 16 17 was so poor and so weak. 18 We have Ze'ev Wurman saying that 19 "The Common Core will be the cessation of educational standards in our country." 20 21 I'm so glad I followed Dan, because I believe 22 in most of what he said. 23 Instead of having rigorous programs --24 because the math program is not rigorous -- but 25 instead of having rigorous programs, we're going to

have critical thinking and twenty-first-century skills.

These do not cut it for our students.

We know already that college-readiness is a myth, because there are people on the standards, readiness standards, who would not agree to sign off on them because they were so weak.

What we're going to get is a dumbing-down in our colleges if this goes on.

R. James Milgram said that, by grade 5, our students would be a year behind other countries, and by grade 7, they would be two years behind.

Now, this program that we have, the EngageNY, here are some just general things about that:

I looked at nearly every -- every frame, every sheet, in kindergarten, grade 1, grade 2, grade 3, and most of grade 4.

Those are our most important grades, where children learn the basics, them have to master the skills, and they're not going to do it with this math program.

The program is unwieldy, it is cumbersome, it breaks things down into very small parts, and then they use the parts.

They don't use the whole numbers.

121 It's expensive. 1 2 A class, for instance, of 18, which is the 3 reasonable number, uses anywhere between 126 and 162 sheets of paper per day, plus colored computer 4 5 ink. 6 Parents do not get to see a textbook. 7 All they get to see is this one sheet that 8 comes home. 9 They can't look ahead and see, Let's see, 10 what's going on? 11 What's coming? What will you be doing? 12 13 They can't look back to help a child, because 14 they have no textbook to look at it. 15 They just have a worksheet. And we see that much of what they do is done 16 17 with manipulatives. 18 These are Unifix Cubes. 19 They use cubes, they use their finger, they use their hands, they use their arms, but we want 20 21 children to get it into their brains. 22 We want them to master the facts so that they 23 can apply this in math work, math problems.

But they don't do this with this program.

There's no criterion of what is mastery in

24

25

```
this program.
1
 2
               And Dan reported --
               I call him Dan, because I didn't really catch
 3
        his last name and I know it's a difficult one.
 4
 5
               -- "one size fits all."
 6
               Just think now:
7
               Some of you are younger than others and you
8
        have young children.
9
               Think about your children being in a program.
10
               Say that you have a disabled child; they're
11
        in this program.
               Or that you know children who are
12
13
        low-performers; they're in this program.
14
               Everybody goes through the very same thing.
15
               Could we just -- okay, let's just look here
        now; okay?
16
17
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Again --
18
               DEANN NELSON: Yes.
19
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: You need to -- you need to
        wrap up, please, because you have extensive
20
21
        testimony which --
22
               DEANN NELSON: Oh, I know, but we were
23
        20 minutes late in starting.
24
               Maybe I can have five of those minutes?
               Could I?
25
```

1 No, but --2 SENATOR FLANAGAN: We have a whole host of 3 other people. 4 DEANN NELSON: -- but you need to look at 5 this so that you understand what's going to --6 what's happening. 7 SENATOR FLANAGAN: I'm a very good reader and I'm an excellent listener. 8 9 I'm listening very carefully to everything 10 that you're talking about, including the cubes, but, 11 I'm just asking you, if you would respectfully -continue. 12 13 DEANN NELSON: Okay, am I to continue? Did you say, or not? 14 15 Somebody else? SENATOR FLANAGAN: Continue so that --16 17 DEANN NELSON: What is your decision? 18 SENATOR FLANAGAN: I would appreciate it if 19 you could wrap up your comments so we can have the other panelists. 20 21 DEANN NELSON: How about, this is like a 22 movie; we'll go through this really quickly. 23 Do you have your packet there? 24 SENATOR FLANAGAN: I was told I wasn't 25 allowed to look at it yet.

```
DEANN NELSON: You were -- you cheated.
1
 2
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: No, I didn't.
 3
               DEANN NELSON: Oh, okay, let's look at it
 4
       now.
 5
                    [Laughter.]
               SENATOR GRISTANTI: He's waiting for you to
 6
7
        tell him it's okay for him to look at it.
               DEANN NELSON: Okay, let's go.
8
9
               All right, okay.
10
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: K through 5, Lesson 19.
11
               DEANN NELSON: All right, here we go, we're
        gonna go pretty fast.
12
13
               Number one --
14
               SENATOR GRISTANTI: I don't have that.
15
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: He doesn't have a copy of
16
        that.
               DEANN NELSON: I know.
17
18
               I couldn't afford to give you all copies, and
19
        I didn't know how many there would be, so look on
20
       with Senator Flanagan.
21
               SENATOR GRISTANTI: Senator, you're the only
22
        one being tested.
23
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: There's -- I will just say
24
        for the record that there's at least 8 -- there are
25
        20 --
```

DEANN NELSON: There's 19. 1 SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- 19. 2 3 DEANN NELSON: Yeah. And I gave you an article there on, "Closing 4 5 the Door on Innovation." This was by 118 educators, prominent people 6 7 in our society, who have said, this "one size, one 8 all," this national curriculum, it closes the door on innovation. 9 And it does. 10 There's no research to support this math 11 program; yet everybody in New York State, all of the 12 schools in New York State, are using it. 13 14 What's going to happen if it's a 15 boondoggle? -- which I think it is. 16 That means that our children are ill-prepared to go on to college. 17 18 There's no pre-calculus. 19 There's no calculus. You go to a good school, a good college, and 20 21 you want to go into the business program, first 22 thing they ask you, "Have you had calculus?" 23 But you don't get it with this program. 24 If you look here, Sheet Number 1, everything 25 they want to do is, they break down numbers into the

```
component parts --
1
 2
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Excuse me.
 3
               I'm not going to go through 19 pages right
 4
        now.
 5
               I will -- I promise that I will look at
 6
        these, but if you -- please, don't go through every
7
       page.
8
               DEANN NELSON:
                              Okay.
9
               How about I go to a page, like, page 3?
               Can we look at that?
10
11
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Go ahead.
               DEANN NELSON: Okay, because this is a
12
13
        homework page for kindergarten, it's the fifth
        module.
14
15
               Look at the reading level.
16
               Children are not reading at this level in
17
        kindergarten.
18
               There's, almost every word in that first
19
        sentence is an irregular word.
               What if you're a low-performer?
20
21
               You can't do it.
22
               Your mother doesn't know how to do it.
23
               See, you get two pages of this, and look how
24
        few things are on the page.
25
               That's expensive, and they only use one side.
```

```
Let's see.
1
 2
               Go to, let's look at -- let's look at page 8.
 3
               And thank you for being so agreeable.
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: You're welcome.
 4
 5
               Thank you as well.
 6
                    [Laughter.]
7
               DEANN NELSON: I know, I'm driven.
8
               Okay, Number 3, look it, here's a simple
9
        addition: 18 plus 6.
               But we have to break it down into its
10
11
        component parts, and we use the component parts, we
        don't use the "18" and the "6."
12
13
               We're in grade 2, "grade 2," and they're
14
        doing this.
15
               So we add the 8 and the 2 to get 10.
16
               So got 10 plus 10 plus 4 equals 24.
17
               We could have just learned to carry and add
18
        the 18 plus the 6.
19
               Let's go to 11, okay, we're jumping ahead
20
        here.
21
               Look how fast we're moving.
22
               Thank you, Senator.
23
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: "11" will be the last one,
24
        so we're going really fast.
25
               DEANN NELSON: I like your smile.
```

You have a nice smile. 1 2 [Laughter.] 3 DEANN NELSON: Okay, here's, grade 2, fourth module, new step in how we're doing this, 4 "19 plus 32," which would be very simple to add; 5 but, no, we're going to break down the 32 into 6 7 30 plus 2. 8 And now we add 19 plus 30 -- and now we have 9 a new rigmarole here, a new line -- equals 49, and then we add 2 to that to equal 51. 10 11 And if you jump down to Number 3, we have a new way of doing that. 12 13 Off to the side, we do, breaking down the 14 18: 10 plus 8; 25: 20 plus 5; we get 30 plus 13 15 equals 43. 16 We have all of these steps, when we could 17 have learned to use the algorithm. 18 ERIC MIHELBERGEL: I'll be touching on the 19 same things a little bit as well. DEANN NELSON: Oh, good. 20 21 Okay, go to 14. 22 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, this is the last 23 one. 24 DEANN NELSON: Is it? 25 Oh, gosh.

```
Oh...
1
 2
               Okay, 14: we're learning how to divide
        54 by 6.
 3
               What's the answer?
 4
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: "9."
 5
 6
               DEANN NELSON: Okay, good.
7
               All right, but --
8
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: It wasn't on the sheet, by
9
        the way.
               I figured that out myself.
10
11
                    [Laughter.]
               DEANN NELSON: Good for you, you get an "A."
12
13
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: I learned it the
14
        old-fashioned way.
15
               DEANN NELSON: Okay, but, instead, we break
16
        down the 54, to 30 divided by 6.
17
               We break down the 6.
18
               Then we have, 24 divided by 6.
19
               And we've had this whole thing strung out, so
        we have all of these steps to go through, when we
20
        could just learn, 54 divided by 6.
21
22
               Wouldn't that be simple?
23
               Just look at page --
24
                    [Laughter.]
25
               DEANN NELSON: I know, one more?
```

```
SENATOR FLANAGAN: Respectfully, we have --
1
 2
        you have colleagues here, and we have a very busy
        schedule.
 3
               I will say this --
 4
 5
               DEANN NELSON: Okay.
 6
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- so I want to be very
7
        clear with you:
 8
               I very much appreciate your passion; we all
9
        do.
               The information that you provided to us is
10
11
        helpful.
               In my quick review of the pages that you
12
13
        showed me, it's confusing, to say the least.
14
               DEANN NELSON: Isn't it?
15
               Yes.
16
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Now, this is valuable, not
17
        only for the members of the Committee, but for the
18
        people who will be listening, and watching, and who
19
        will be seeing what we put together as part of a
       public record.
20
21
               That's the whole fundamental point of doing
22
        this.
23
               So, make one last comment, and then we're
        going to Carrie.
24
25
               DEANN NELSON: Okay, here it is:
```

Repeal Common Core. 1 2 Return New York State to rule of law and 3 liberty: 4 New York State Constitution, our education 5 laws. 6 Create new rigorous education standards. 7 Use Massachusetts' former standards as the guide, as the model. 8 9 They were number one in the entire United States. 10 11 Sandra Stotsky, who was on the committee, 12 created those standards for Massachusetts. 13 School boards serve as our guardians. You have -- their role has practically been 14 eliminated with this Common Core and federal 15 16 takeover. 17 And my last point is that, it's unethical and 18 immoral to use New York children as guinea pigs on a 19 program that has no research validation. That's it. 20 21 Thank you. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Are you sure? 22 23 DEANN NELSON: I'm sure. 24 [Laughter.] 25 SENATOR FLANAGAN: All right, now this is

diversity live, okay, right here. 1 2 I want to just -- before Carrie speaks, 3 I just want to make a public statement, that I've had the privilege of working with her as one of the 4 5 Governor's Education Reform Commission members. She is dedicated, professional, and a 6 7 wonderful person to work with. 8 So, Carrie, with that introduction, feel no 9 pressure. 10 CARRIE REMIS: Good afternoon, 11 Senator Flanagan, and members of the Education Committee. 12 13 Thank you for the opportunity to give 14 testimony today, and to allow me to share the parent 15 perspective as you take stock of the Regents Reform Agenda moving forward. 16 My name is Carrie Remis. 17 18 I'm the founding director of the Parent Power 19 Project, a Rochester-based organization working to build the capacity of parents in the 20 21 lowest-performing schools in the state. 22 Our work is a mix of capacity building and 23 advocacy. 24 Our agenda is pretty much exactly what 25 Principal Drmacich opposes:

We support teacher evaluations, we support life over form, we support parental choice, Common Core, and parent trigger.

On a personal note, I'm the mother of a sophomore in one of state's best high schools; a point I make to say that I understand well the competing pressures that you face, from both the high-performing districts and the lowest-performing districts, because I feel them too.

That said, I'm here today to urge you to not lose sight of the agenda, and to offer some parent insight into the parent position as you move forward in most critical and challenging phase of the rollout.

First, let me say that parents are not a monolithic group.

We come in all shapes and sizes, and we rarely agree about how to educate or raise our children.

But that said, I believe very strongly that the parent opposition to the Reform Agenda that has crept into the headlines marks a minority position and does not reflect the majority of parents in this state.

I draw this conclusion based on years of

direct contact with parents, in our training, and as a former admissions counselor, as well as, because of the polls that overwhelmingly show that the public is in agreement with the goals of standards and accountability, and the need for intervention.

In my written testimony, I have included some specifics from the recent polling, and I urge you to read them.

I wanted to share some insight.

Despite this agreement, there is a disconnect that the Senator Flanagan mentioned, and some parents are loudly voicing concerns, and we cannot reform the public education system without parent buy-in, and I urge you not to dismiss us.

But I'd like to discuss some of the underlying factors underlying these parent concerns.

First, parents, in general, feel sidelined by their day-to-day interactions with their local educational bureaucracies.

We often struggle with schools that are unresponsive, that don't return our phone calls, that create hoop after hoop for us to jump through.

And for those of us who want to be involved in the school-improvement effort, we are often relegated to bake sales, and booster clubs, and sort

of advisory roles, that really make no impact if we're honest.

And these day-to-day experiences are not the region's doing, nor are they within their control to fix, but they are part of the parent experience and part of our context.

Under these circumstances, it can be very difficult for some of us to embrace an agenda that feels very disconnected from the day-to-day realities of being a parent.

I urge you to read the Public Agenda's report, "Don't Count Us Out," which talks about this disconnect in further detail.

The second underlying factor I would like to discuss today is the elephant in the room: special interests; namely, the teachers union and their locals who are strategically taking advantage of parents who feel sidelined, amplifying, and even distorting our concerns.

Although it may seem counterintuitive, my recommendation is that the only remedy is true parent empowerment.

Specifically, I urge you to consider the following three measures:

First, incentivize autonomous parent

organizing.

Last week's PTA meeting in Poughkeepsie is not unique.

In fact, in parent organizations across this state, teachers unions have hijacked our organizations.

But more troubling than these disruptive meetings is the fact that these co-opted and highjacked parent organizations are the same organizations charged with electing parent representatives to the school-based planning teams.

And if you're not familiar with Commissioner's regs, 100.11, this is where the rubber hits the road; this is where state policy is implemented locally.

The teachers union would never tolerate another stakeholder inserting themselves into their organizational meetings or influencing their representation or scripting their policy positions, but this is precisely what happens to parents.

And I believe that this is one of the reasons why parents are finding it very difficult to identify the parent interest in these very complex and noisy policy debates.

We need to find our voice, and we need your

help.

My second recommendation is to spur innovation in the parent-development space.

Unlike teacher and principal development, parent training is largely controlled by the local administration, leaving parents incredibly dependent on the local administration for information about Regents policy.

This is another one of your problems.

A recent rash of misinformation coming out of Monroe County school systems really underscores the conflict of interest inherent in this arrangement.

It's become clear to us that Common Core has become the new boogeyman in education, blamed for everything, from dismantled accelerated math programs, to denied special-education evaluations, to no recess.

While I don't think that it's reasonable to police all of these misinformation campaigns,

I think it's important to know they are happening,
and I ask you to consider opening up the
parent-engagement space to providers outside of the
system who don't have the same conflict of interest
and who might bring a more neutral and objective
perspective to the Regents agenda; namely,

Common Core.

Community-based organizations, civic groups, and community colleges are among the unbiased voices I believe we need to have in this discussion.

The successful implementation of the Regents Reform Agenda will hinge on whether or not we brought in this conversation beyond the internal stakeholders and the idealogues.

My third recommendation is to mandate increased transparency around collective bargaining.

Conspiracy theories thrive in the dark, as you've seen today.

Whether they're about Common Core, APPR, or student data, in our work with parents on these topics, we found that most of these conspiracy theories have one thing in common, and that is that the public doesn't really understand where state mandates and local bargaining begins; and as a result, the Regents and the Commissioner are routinely scapegoated decisions they did not make, but that are made at the local bargaining table.

Consider this example from Rochester:

The City school districts negotiated an elaborate system of locally-developed pretests for the student-growth measure of APPR.

When parent complaints began to surface about the pretests --

And these complaints had two parts:

One, students were reporting that their teachers were coaching them to bomb the pretests so that they, quote, looked smarter on the state tests;

And the second complaint was from some parents who were concerned about this unnecessary and additional battery of tests.

-- in response to these very legitimate parent concerns, the districts basically blamed Commissioner King in his testing mania, even though he did not choose to design these pretests, nor did he implement them.

The Regents needs the public support of their agenda, and the public needs the full story of, if we are to engage in a meaningful and productive way.

Without access to the collective bargaining agreements, which, as you may know, include more than just the contract.

It's a -- there's a whole pile of hidden side agreements, addenda, and memos of understanding.

Without this full picture, parents, taxpayers, and even members of the media, do not have a full understanding of the issues, and in many

cases, are engaging blind.

We ask you to consider mandating full disclosure of these collective-bargaining agreements so that we don't have to FOIL them.

And we ask you to mandate the public ratification of these documents so that these side agreements that we all know exist are at least aired in public.

And changing gears a bit, I wanted to make an appeal on behalf of the parents in failing schools who, as you know, do not have unions, do not have political or economic power.

They largely are living in our urban districts, and they face a terrible dilemma that I ask you to keep first and foremost in your mind.

They are desperate for reform, but they lack the political power to make it happen.

They need your help.

For the last 30 years in Rochester, the educational establishment has creatively avoided making any fundamental change.

We've had this steady churn of gimmicks and path-of-least-resistance turnaround plans that have garnered a lot of headlines but have produced no student gains.

Our only claim to fame is that we have the 1 2 lowest student-to-teacher ratio in the state, and 3 the second-to-highest spending. Today are -- only 5 percent of Rochester 4 5 students are proficient, and only 9 percent of our Black males graduate on time. 6 7 The urgent fundamental change that children 8 in persistently failing schools need and deserve is 9 impossible with many of the local players in our urban districts. 10 11 On behalf of these parents and their 12 children, I urge you to pursue in earnest aggressive 13 State intervention. 14 Thank you. 15 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Carrier, thank you very much. 16 17 And last, but by certainly no means least, 18 Eric --19 Eric, how do you say your last name? 20 ERIC MIHELBERGEL: Last name is pronounced 21 "Mihelbergel," and, it's a Hungarian name. 22 My name is Eric. 23 I am a parent of two daughters; one is in the 24 sixth grade, and the other is in the third grade. 25 About a year ago, both of my children started coming home, telling me that they were taking bubble tests in art, they were filling in bubble tests in gym, and in music class, and that prompted me to ask some questions; it prompted me to do some research.

I wrote a long letter to the New York State Board of Regents.

Received three phone calls from them; had a meeting with Mr. Bennett; and I really started to do some research.

I spent -- I remember one day, back in February, I spent 11 hours in one week on the phone with the New York State Education Department, trying to educate myself.

Now, over the last 8 months, I have gotten quite involved with advocacy.

And on behalf of thousands of parents in New York, I would like to thank you for taking the time to listen to people's concerns today.

That is a huge benefit to parents; parents want to be heard.

Since I started my advocacy efforts, I have been receiving approximately 30 to 40 communications, personal communications, with parents, each and every day.

Over the last 8 months, if you do the multiplication, that's over 8,000 personal communications that I have received from other parents: e-mails, personal phone calls, text messages.

And so I'm here today, not necessarily to give my opinions, but to give the concerns of other parents.

And I would like to start by saying that I do not think that parent concerns, such as those that have recently come to the news, I do not think those are in the minority.

I think there are still a lot of parents out there that have not been educated yet to make a decision one way or another.

Through my advocacy efforts, what I have found is that, as parents learn what's going on in education, they realize that they need to start asking questions.

The biggest concern that I have come across with parents is the high-stakes nature of testing.

That seems to be of greatest concern.

Many parents are also concerned about the privacy of their children's data, they're concerned about many other things, but the high-stakes nature

is a very large concern.

The reasons that I hear, on a regular basis, is because when we introduce the high-stakes nature, not just testing, but the high-stakes nature of testing, the focus shifts; and it shifts from learner-centered learning, it shifts then to teacher-centered teaching and administrator-centered administrating.

The pressure is on the teachers, the pressure is on the administrators, to perform on tests, and they have no choice then but to transfer that pressure to our students.

And when we transfer that pressure to our students, it creates a tremendous amount of stress for those students.

It brings that stress into the home.

We all know that stress creates fear, creates anger, it destroys education.

My third-grader -- and this dovetails off of what my friend here had mentioned earlier -- comes home with worksheets in math.

Now, my third-grader is, she's relatively intelligent.

She solves the Rubik's Cube in 3 1/2 minutes. She has a mind that is logical.

She and I sat down last week, working on a 1 2 homework assignment. 3 I have a physics degree. Neither of us could understand and complete 4 5 the homework assignment. 6 This is not just in my household; this is 7 what I hear from 30 to 40 parents, per day, about 8 what's going on in their homes. 9 The stress that these new standards, that 10 testing has brought into the home, it's changing the 11 dynamic of American homes. The tension between school boards and parents 12 13 has increased greatly, and the high-stakes nature of 14 testing falls directly between them. 15 Parents and school boards want to be united. The school boards have to follow the law; 16 17 they must. 18 And parents will do what's right for their 19 children. 20 And we've seen across the state, parents are, 21 in many cases, blatantly refusing to allow their 22 children to participate in these tests. 23 And we have awakened a sleeping giant. 24 A year ago, I was very much closed to what 25 was going on.

1 I started asking questions.

A year later, I can't tell you how many more parents are asking questions than they were a year ago.

And so to wrap it up, I have a quote that is in my written testimony as well, but this is a quote from William Bruce Cameron.

He was a well-known sociologist.

And this quote often gets quoted as a quote from Einstein, but, in fact, it is not.

It says this:

"It would be nice if all the data which sociologists require could be enumerated, because then we could run them through IBM machines and draw charts as the economists do.

However, not everything that counts can be counted, and not everything that can be counted counts."

We're doing a lot of measuring in our schools today.

And I fear that we're measuring too much and we're not focusing on the independent -- individual child enough.

This is a quote that I wrote:

"When we define the worth of our children

solely by that which can be measured, then their worth becomes the measurement itself.

Their life is no longer their own, and the owner of the measurement dictates the child's worth."

So I will wrap it up by stating, that the New York State Code of Ethics of Educators, under Principle Number 2, says that "Educators know the curriculum, they use a range of strategies and assessments to address differences."

And I ask all of us today to think about,

How can we claim to be using a range of assessments,

when my children's classrooms, and the classrooms

all across New York State, the biggest concern of

parents is the extreme focus on math and ELA tests?

And I thank you once again for listening to me, and I thank you once again for understanding concerns of parents.

Thank you.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: My colleagues don't have any questions.

Eric, I just do have one questions, and it goes back to something that's come up on a number occasions.

It's a question, and a request.

There are constant comments about the volume of testing, the nature of testing.

And in asking this question repeatedly,

I still am not getting a uniformity of response by
any stretch.

In fact, we're not even getting a response, in large part.

If you are to look and say, a child comes in to kindergarten this year, and make the assumption that nothing changes during their educational time frame, what are the tests that a child has to take as directed by the State of New York?

Now, you and I both know, you obviously pay close attention to the ELA tests.

There are certain functions that are put upon us by the federal government.

I get that.

There are certain things, like the Regents, that I get, as someone who works for the State, but, there is a tremendous amount of comments about the volume of testing.

I still have not seen something that says, if there's pre-testing and post-testing and diagnostic testing in first grade or second grade, I haven't seen any Commissioner's regulation, I haven't seen

anything, formally, that comes out of SED.

It seems to me, and I certainly want the information, if you have something that shows to the contrary, please share it with us, because one of the fundamental questions we ask is, "Well, all right, how many tests?"

And once that question gets asked, there's not always a lot of information forthcoming.

ERIC MIHELBERGEL: Yes, and we can provide you direct research on that.

But to comment on what you've mentioned here, from the New York State Education Department, we have math and ELA tests from grade 3 through 8.

We have science in grades 4 and 8.

And so the New York State Education

Department tells us that that's all they require,
but they also require APPR.

And as we know, individual school districts have some choice in that.

But what's happening across the state is, the New York State Education Department can say,
"We only require tests in 3 through 8, in math and ELA"; but, because they require APPR, there's another onslaught of tests.

And I can tell you that, my daughter has been

presented with tests in playing the recorder, as a 1 2 pretest. 3 She's been presented with tests in music, in 4 art, in gym class. 5 Not every student is tested, because they're 6 only required to assess 51 percent of the students 7 for these APPR-, SLO-type tests. 8 But I can tell you that, when we include state tests, then when we add into it the required 9 10 tests that schools are using to support their 11 APPR agreements, it's excessive, and we can provide documentation. 12 13 The latest number I've heard is, average 14 student is taking 3200 minutes per year of tests, 15 and there's documentation to support that. 16 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Appreciate that, and this 17 is probably our most -- well, certainly most 18 interesting panel to date. 19 So, come on, we have a wide range of opinions 20 right here. 21 So, thank you very much. 22 Our next panel, New York State United 23 Teachers, Steve Allinger; and, Todd Hathaway from 24 East Aurora High School. 25 TODD HATHAWAY: Thank you, Senators, for

having this meeting today; thank you for inviting 1 2 me; thank you for holding these around the state. 3 I'm gonna talk today both as a parent and as a teacher, I think what Commissioner King labels a 4 5 "special interest." 6 SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Can you move the mic a 7 little closer. 8 TODD HATHAWAY: Oh, sorry. I'm a teacher in East Aurora High School. 9 I've been there for 12 years. 10 I have taught in the city of Buffalo prior to 11 that for three years, and, I also taught in rural 12 13 Virginia. 14 I'm also a volunteer NYSUT PAC coordinator, 15 and a proud parent of three children. And, my role as a parent really transformed 16 me as a teacher. 17 It really -- it brought me into this issue 18 of -- particularly, of high-stakes testing. 19 And it did so last year as my son Jonah [ph.] 20 21 entered into kindergarten, and, Jonah is a "boy" in 22 capital letters. 23 He is energetic, he is happy, he is ready to 24 go with the world. 25 And as the year progressed, his principal and his teacher both expressed concern at that energy.

And they said to me, you know:

There's no academic need right now, your son is doing fantastic in school, but as he progresses into the high-stakes nature of the three days of testing, we have some concerns about where he'll progress.

This is in kindergarten.

This in, actually, in December of his first year of kindergarten.

And they recommended, because of that, to retain him.

They said the best place for him to be, was to retain my son into kindergarten.

And that was a hard conversation, as a teacher, as a parent.

Nobody wants to hear that about their child.

And what struck me most over thinking about that, was wondering, "Not right now" they said; it was because of what would happen long term, many years from now.

And they said, you know, "As he progresses into this arena, where you're going to be tested constantly."

My nephew was born 20 days separately than my

1 son. 2 He progressed on to first grade. 3 He has a test every Friday in math and 4 English. 5 He's in first grade. He cannot write, he can barely read. 6 7 And it's fantastic that he's able to do that. 8 And so I began to really think about, in my 9 role as a teacher, well, what are these tests that 10 are so concerning to my son's principal and teacher that would make them recommend to retain my son? 11 And, I began to understand that, and I looked 12 13 at these three days of tests. 14 And, principally, as a high school social studies teacher, I give high-stakes every 15 16 year. 17 I teach Global Regents, one of the harder 18 Regents exams in New York State; I also teach 19 advanced placement; where both of those are 20 high-stakes tests. 21 One is a high school graduation requirement. 22 The other is the test designed to challenge 23 for college credit. 24 And so I said, well, taking that knowledge, and I said, let's apply that to the three days of 25

tests, and begin to understand where this places 1 2 them. 3 Do they fit with what we're doing at the end of a child's K-to-12 career? 4 5 Does it make sense we're doing the same thing at the beginning of a child's K-to-12 career? 6 7 And, it didn't come out well. 8 I looked at these tests, and said, well, simply, first, what's the diagnostic nature of a 9 3-to-8 test? 10 And there isn't one. 11 As a high school global teacher, we give our 12 13 exams in the middle of June, they're scored, returned to the students in their form within 14 15 two weeks. I as a teacher can diagnose the issues of my 16 instruction, the areas I need to improve upon. 17 18 I can then improve that the next year. 19 Same thing can happen with my students; 20 I understand where they're going. 21 What's the transparency of these three days 22 of tests? 23 There is none. As a Global Regents teacher, I have access to 24 25 every single Regents exam given since 2003, fully

available on the SED website.

I use it constantly.

I pull off thematic essay questions,

[unintelligible] questions, and multiple-choice

questions; therefore, I can prepare my students for

the high-stakes natures of these tests.

Same thing goes for an advanced-placement exam.

The exams are available.

They're not free, you gotta pay for it, but, they're available.

I get an instructional planning report that diagnoses the nature of my teaching and my instruction, and the strengths and weaknesses of my students.

That makes them useful.

That makes my Global Regents exam scores and tests useful to me as an instructor, and useful to me as parent, potentially, in many years when my children go on the high school, that I know where they stand on these issues by these standards.

Same thing in college, for the advanced-placement exams; same thing holds.

So having high standards is good.

Having standards is fantastic.

But having high standards that are not 1 2 transparent -- or, tests, excuse me, that are not 3 transparent, that are not diagnostic, that are not 4 timely. 5 I give -- three-day tests are administered in 6 early April, but scores are returned to parents in 7 September and October. 8 Schools get them in August. 9 How can that help them inform instruction, or 10 for a parent to understand the strength or weakness 11 of their child, if those scores are not timely? As a teacher, I'm encouraged to return 12 13 student work as quick as possible to maximize 14 learning. 15 How is SED modeling that same standard? Because what students want, is to perform and 16 receive feedback. 17 18 Everyone wants the same thing. 19 Three days of tests don't provide that. And, so, the utility of these tests I call 20 21 into question. 22 How can they help prepare students for 23 college- and-career readiness when we don't receive

any meaningful feedback?

Oh, you receive feedback.

24

25

You receive a score of 1, 2, 3, or 4, but that's an empty, meaningless score, because the tests aren't transparent, they're not diagnostic, they're not timely; and, therefore, it makes them useless.

If we're gonna give tests, if we're gonna assess our students, we must make sure they meet that simple criteria: that they're timely, they're transparent, they're diagnostic; therefore, useful.

Those phrases should be underlying what we do with our high-stakes testing-assessment programs; not just scores for scores' sake.

We need to make sure we focus upon that.

So, to focus that -- and I'll back up.

Regents Bennett spoke about that earlier; he spoke about the need for data to drive instruction.

Well, SED does not provide data to drive instruction if it's not returned to district or the student in a timely manner to help inform, and then prescribe better and improved instruction.

So we must do that in terms of overall structuring.

So, to summarize, because many of our speakers went longer, and I'll be short, and I speak fast, I know -- is, that we must have a three-year

moratorium on the consequences of high-stakes
testing.

We have to understand what we've done here.

And I want to -- and I speak as a high school teacher:

As we prepare the Common Core ELA exam, and also the ELA Algebra exam -- and the Common Core Algebra exam, going forward this year, to be administered this June, if those scores hold as we progress through the year, will that number of students, therefore, be ineligible to graduate, simply because of the ELA exam, which is -- they're taking it in their junior year;

Therefore, schools are now placed under pressure of graduation are plummeting, demands for academic intervention services skyrocket?

What are we going to do then if that holds forward, and the consequences then, for school districts, for principals, and teachers remains so severe?

The testing regimen isn't helping us; it's punishing us.

We need to make sure we focus upon that.

The final issue I want to talk to you, the final point is the issue of funding.

Today, in 2008, New York State spends 1 2 \$405 less than it did in 2008. 3 If we simply return to that level of funding, we could improve supports for our students. 4 5 Each year that we distance from that benchmark year of 2008, those gaps get larger. 6 7 We close off CTE instructions. 8 Schools are being forced to choose between 9 CTE instruction, and, therefore -- and then turn to 10 supports for ELA and math because, their 11 assessments, their performance reviews, depend upon those scores. 12 13 And so we want to be college- and 14 career-ready? 15 We're closing off careers because we're so focused on test scores for college preparation 16 17 [unintelligible]. 18 The final thing I want to say, is when I sat 19 in this room, I was amazed. I've never been in the Common Hall Council, 20 21 and I looked around at the pillars. 22 I thought it was fascinating to do so, 23 because they're all inscribed with words of justice 24 and charity and philosophy, knowledge and prudence,

25

and patriotism.

1	None of those things are testable.
2	None of those things are if these are the
3	things we do value, why is it we're so overly
4	focused upon simple test scores?
5	And I'll close with that.
6	Thank you, gentlemen.
7	SENATOR GALLIVAN: I've got one.
8	Give me just a minute here.
9	Two questions:
10	Why are teachers sworn to secrecy regarding
11	the tests?
12	TODD HATHAWAY: That's an SED requirement.
13	If you look in the instruction handbook
14	that's provided to teachers, they are not allowed to
15	talk about it.
16	If they do, their certifications are removed.
17	SED's position is, it's not FOIL-able either.
18	I have seen many FOIL requests from other
19	parents, and it's been denied by SED.
20	I could not speculate as to why.
21	SENATOR GALLIVAN: What's not FOIL-able?
22	The instructions?
23	TODD HATHAWAY: The tests themselves are not
24	FOIL-able.
25	The New York State parents, teachers, and

administrators do not have access to those tests.

So, for instance, last year's tests that were administered, unless SED chooses to release them, and they've not done so.

They've released selections from there, but they have not released the entire test.

If you talk about it, you can lose your license.

And that's been threatened before.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: My other question --

STEPHEN ALLINGER: Senator --

SENATOR GALLIVAN: -- you may not know the

answer --

Oh, I'm sorry.

STEPHEN ALLINGER: -- yeah, I just wanted to add, that's why we've been pursuing legislation called "Truth About Testing," so that there's accountability for the test manufacturing -- you know, the test companies, that there's an actual arm's-length peer-reviewed study of the effects on teaching and learning, whether there is a narrowing of the curriculum, how much time is diverted from teaching and learning, and the reliability and the validity of the evaluations.

Right now, we would -- because of the lack of

transparency and accountability, we believe that 1 2 there is very little faith that these high-stakes 3 testing have reliability and validity, particularly in use for determining what students access to 4 5 challenging course work, or determining whether a 6 teacher keeps their job. 7 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Has anybody put that 8 legislation forward yet? 9 Anybody sponsored that yet, to your 10 knowledge? 11 STEPHEN ALLINGER: There's been legislation introduced in both the Senate and the Assembly. 12 13 We also have concerns on the privacy side, 14 and where Senator Grisanti had sponsored 15 legislation. 16 But we would -- you know, we want to work with -- with the Senate as a body, to address the 17 18 accountability issues. 19 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Understood. 20 The next question you may not know the answer 21 to, I know that the test results are coming back, 22 roughly, in the fall, in the next school year. 23 Is that something just because it's new, or 24 is that going to change, to your knowledge? 25 TODD HATHAWAY: That's a question better

addressed to SED. 1 2 I could speculate, but I do not know why. SENATOR GALLIVAN: You don't know the answer. 3 Okay, thank you. 4 5 STEPHEN ALLINGER: I think in a prior hearing, Senator, they raised the issue of 6 7 resources, but we should -- if anything -- students 8 and educators are in such a fragile state, in terms of their vulnerability, that we shouldn't do a 9 10 cheap, dumbed-down assessment policy. 11 I think the truthful answer that you received at the first hearing, is they didn't have the 12 13 resources to do this the right way, if I had to 14 summarize what I heard. Thanks. 15 SENATOR GALLIVAN: SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Ranzenhofer. 16 17 SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Thank you. 18 First of all, thank you for your testimony. 19 And this is more a question just out of curiosity, because they're really different. 20 21 But I would think, as I'm listening, and I've 22 listened to and read a lot about this, that between 23 kindergarten and graduation from high school, 24 there's probably no more high-stakes tests than the

25

SAT.

```
So, again, different type, but we do advocate
1
 2
        eliminating the SAT?
               TODD HATHAWAY: I would not, because I think
 3
        the issue there is timing.
 4
 5
               The SAT is administered to high school
        students who are -- and I'll say this as a
 6
7
        high school teacher -- generally more mature than
8
        elementary-school students, but, that's not an
        absolute in any respect whatsoever.
9
10
                    [Laughter.]
11
               SENATOR RANZENHOFER: I thought you said
        you're a high school teacher?
12
13
               TODD HATHAWAY: I am a high school teacher,
14
        but I --
15
               Yeah, I've seen a lot.
               9-year-olds taking a --
16
17
               SENATOR RANZENHOFER: I just wanted your
18
        opinion.
19
               You know --
               TODD HATHAWAY: No, no, not all.
20
21
               If a college requires it, absolutely, but
22
        that's the timing of it.
23
               You know, and the same thing, as a
24
        high school teacher, I teach advanced-placement
25
        world history and European history; very difficult
```

1 courses.

But that's, when they're administered, they're in high school.

They are nearing -- they can get cars soon.

And I think that's a reason for requirement:

If you can get a driver's license, you should be able to sit down and take a test, and prepare, because you're now on the road and can endanger all of our lives.

I give that same speech to students, by the way.

But when you're, nine, ten years old, stressing out, throwing up, not liking school, because you're so concerned about a test and the test score, not necessarily because you want to perform because you understand the intrinsic nature of the test, but because you want to please adults.

That's a big difference.

That's a maturity issue that high-stakes testing, you know, in 3 through 8 is inappropriate for that reason.

STEPHEN ALLINGER: It is also pseudoscience.

It's not reliable.

There's no research to support high-stakes testing in the early grades.

In fact, it's almost universally condemned by 1 2 researchers in this field and professional 3 associations. So, we urge you to proscribe it so that 4 5 you're not subjecting kids to this kind of abuse; but, moreover, you're not getting unreliable, lousy 6 7 results and making bad decisions with that information. 8 9 SENATOR RANZENHOFER: So should there be a 10 different standard then for high school students 11 versus middle-school and elementary-school students? STEPHEN ALLINGER: It should be 12 13 developmentally appropriate. 14 SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Okay, thank you. 15 SENATOR FLANAGAN: I do have a couple of questions, and, Todd, I appreciate the swiftness of 16 17 your testimony. 18 But, you made a reference to, a valuable test 19 is, essentially, timely, transparent, and 20 diagnostic. 21 TODD HATHAWAY: Yes. 22 SENATOR FLANAGAN: And then, everyone here 23 keeps using the phrase, "high-stakes testing." 24 Can you have a test that is timely, 25 transparent, diagnostic, and still high-stakes?

1	TODD HATHAWAY: That's the Regents exams.
2	SENATOR FLANAGAN: Sorry?
3	TODD HATHAWAY: That's the Regents exams.
4	Those are the advanced-placement exams
5	delivered by the college board.
6	You absolutely can, but they must be
7	developmentally appropriate.
8	You know, 15-, 16-, 17-, 18-year-olds can
9	emotionally handle the stress that comes along with
10	taking a high-stakes test.
11	They're preparing to go out into the world.
12	That's acceptable, that's rational, that
13	makes sense; that's developmentally appropriate.
14	SENATOR FLANAGAN: So do you believe that all
15	Regents are high-stakes tests?
16	TODD HATHAWAY: Absolutely.
17	They're college they're graduation
18	requirements.
19	You can't get any much higher stakes than
20	that, than by saying it's a graduation requirement.
21	SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, so are there just
22	take your district:
23	Now, you have three kids.
24	I'm listening very carefully.
25	TODD HATHAWAY: Yes.

1	SENATOR FLANAGAN: All right?
2	Do you are there any tests that are not
3	high-stakes?
4	TODD HATHAWAY: That are not high-stakes?
5	You have formative assessments that we
6	give that I give on weekly or daily basis, where
7	I'm looking for students to form my instruction.
8	Then at the end of the year, at the end of a
9	unit, I'll give some of those assessments, to
10	understand, Where are we now?
11	And I can give you a clear example for that.
12	Currently, in my regular Global 2 class,
13	I just completed the Age of Revolutions.
14	We dealt with the French Revolution.
15	And throughout there, I give formative
16	assessments: I give homework assignments, I give
17	vocabulary quizes.
18	So I do give tests of that nature.
19	At the end of the unit, we culminate with an
20	thematic essay, and it's culminated with a test.
21	Those are summative assessments.
22	At the end of the year, in June, they'll take
23	the
24	SENATOR FLANAGAN: You don't consider those
25	high-stakes?

TODD HATHAWAY: No, not at all, because they're not -- there's no consequence in the nature of -- to student.

You may score lower, but you're not going to be placed into a separate program.

You will not be labeled something.

There's room now to improve, and it helps me to understand, as I go to review for the Regents exam, how to then spiral my review throughout the entire year; and, second, how to structure my review as we approach Memorial Day, into June, how to prepare for that Regents exam.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, so in your -- so take your district, because, obviously, and you come at this from a couple of different angles --

TODD HATHAWAY: Yes, I do.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- not only as a teacher and a parent, but as a union representative.

TODD HATHAWAY: Yes.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: In your school, not to pick on them in any way, shape, or form, but do you -- as a matter of collective bargaining, do you collectively bargain, you know, We're going to now make a decision that, as part of whatever deal we come up with, that kids in kindergarten through

second grade, no tests? 1 2 TODD HATHAWAY: Do we collectively bargain 3 that? No, we've not collectively bargain that. 4 5 SENATOR FLANAGAN: You don't collectively 6 bargain tests at all? 7 TODD HATHAWAY: We bargain the requirements 8 as handed down by SED and the enacting laws. 9 We have -- I know reference was made earlier 10 to side agreements, et cetera. 11 To my knowledge, and as a former union president, that's never happened. 12 13 I never engaged in that. 14 And the speculation, so I find, just 15 speculation. 16 That's not reality. 17 Teachers in districts are forced by 3012-c to 18 engage in a new APPR regimen that does include test 19 scores; and, therefore, as part of the enacting legislation and regulation, districts and local 20 21 units must bargain the impact of that and figure out 22 how to make that work for them. 23 I've talked to a lot of good parents and 24 administrators over several years. 25 We had a -- in the first week of October, we

had the Summit for Smarter Schools, which I'm a 1 2 member of the Partnership for Smarter Schools, and 3 we had administrators up there lamenting the fact that we've turned education into data collection; 4 5 that administrators are turned from helping lead instruction to coach teachers, to become clerks, 6 7 checking off boxes. 8 So, we've had to bargain the impact of that. And I've met, I -- can't think of anybody 9 10 that thought it was a very good idea. 11 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, I want to make sure I'm properly understanding. 12 13 TODD HATHAWAY: Sure. SENATOR FLANAGAN: So, on the one hand, you 14 15 don't collectively bargain testing, but you do collectively bargain the effects [unintelligible] of 16 3012-c? 17 18 TODD HATHAWAY: Correct. 19 So we have to go through and say, the State 20 requires you use local measures of assessment for 21 your 20 percent [unintelligible]. 22 And they give you parameters in which you 23 must operate. 24 And, therefore, we have to bargain that. 25 So we have to figure out what's going to be

1 acceptable or not.

And for us in my district, we bargain that that has to be, therefore, a curriculum decision determined by the teachers, along with the local administrator -- the building administrator.

For the 20 percent that comes from the growth measures, that's, either, if you're a 3-to-8 teacher, that comes from SED, so you can -- that's taken out of there;

If you are not a 3-to-8 ELA or math teacher, what do you do with those [unintelligible] local 20 points?

And so you have to then bargain the process of which you're gonna account for that.

How are you gonna go about determining what measurement tool you're gonna to use?

How are you gonna determine -- who determines what the proper scoring is for that?

There are all things, and that's all clear -- very clearly delineated in regulation.

There's not a whole lot of wiggle room for locals to deal with that.

They have to deal with what SED comes down with.

And the regulations are very strict, and they

are -- they take a fine-tooth and comb to that. 1 2 So the idea that we have these massive latitude in APPR is a fallacy. 3 We are very constricted, not necessarily by 4 5 law, but -- in the enacted law, but by, necessarily, the regulation handed down by SED. 6 7 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay. 8 Gentlemen, thank you very much. 9 Appreciate your time. 10 And we are going to now go to 11 Scott G. Martzloff, superintendent of Williamsville Central Schools. 12 13 Scott's six-foot-eleven so he gets the whole 14 table to himself. 15 [Laughter.] SENATOR FLANAGAN: And he's also a parent. 16 17 He told us yesterday, second-, fourth-, and 18 fifth-grader, so if he runs out, you know there's a 19 good reason. SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: Well, thank you, 20 21 Senator, and I thank all of you for allowing me to 22 testify today. 23 I do have to say that I was not able to find 24 a seat that I could fit in within this venue, so, 25 perhaps that can be looked at for a future session.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There's one right there. 1 2 SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: I'm sorry? 3 UNKNOWN SPEAKER: There's one right there. SENATOR GALLIVAN: There's a big chair there. 4 5 [Laughter.] 6 SENATOR GALLIVAN: It was in the corner. 7 SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: Did you steal that from 8 my office? 9 [Laughter.] 10 SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: But thank you for 11 allowing me to present information relative to the Regents Reform Agenda and assessing our progress. 12 13 My name is Scott G. Martzloff. 14 I'm superintendent of schools in the 15 Williamsville Central School District, a suburban 16 district here in the Buffalo area of slightly more 17 than 10,000 students. 18 As Senator Flanagan mentioned, I am also a 19 parent of a second-grader, a fourth-grader, and a fifth-grader, so I have had opportunity to 20 experience this firsthand of what we are doing as it 21 22 relates to education. 23 The two major ideas about the Regents Reform 24 Agenda is, first of all, it is an unfunded mandate 25 during extremely difficult fiscal times.

If you talk to any superintendent in the state of New York, they will relay that information to you about what a challenge it is to implement all of this in a very quick time period during a time when we're trying to hold on to our math teachers, our English teachers, our second-grade teachers; whatever it may be.

And, overall, I think the second point, is that it's been relatively rushed with somewhat of a dismissiveness, from feedback from educators and feedback from parents.

That greatly concerns me, and I'll get to more about that in a moment.

However, there are many positives as part of the Regents Reform Agenda.

Certainly, more rigor and challenge in the curriculum is a good thing.

Wherever you can add that in, and have higher expectations for students, I think that's very positive.

Our teachers in our school district have collaborated and planned, with our administrators, for the past three years, and have done some amazing work, as required by the Reform Agenda.

I like the greater focus on informational

texts, which demands science and social studies are 1 2 taught at a higher level at a younger age, where 3 students have to find evidence to support a claim. This helps to create better critical-thinkers 4 5 in our young people. There's, obviously, a focus here on 6 7 curriculum, instruction, and assessment, and I think 8 that's a good thing. 9 That's where our time and energy, we should 10 be spending it on curriculum, instruction, and 11 assessment. That's what we're here for. 12 13 There's more instructional conversations taking place now than ever before. 14 15 Our principals are becoming instructional leaders. 16 17 They're doing at least two observations of 18 all of our teachers each and every school year. 19 In the past, prior to the Regents Reform 20 Agenda, that would take place once every three years 21 for a tenured teacher. 22 So having that ongoing dialogue has been 23 positive. 24 In addition to that, we have a selected 25 rubric that we use.

We use the Thoughtful Classroom rubric, by Silver & Strong, that's approved by the New York State Education Department.

That has provided a common language for our teachers and our administrators in discussing instruction and discussing best practice for teaching and learning.

I also want to say that the resources from the New York State Education Department have generally been of a good quality.

We have -- we're lucky in Williamsville, we have our own network team that attends trainings in Albany, at different times, and those have been found to be positive and helpful as we look to implement the Regents Reform Agenda, as are many of the items on the EngageNY website have also been found to be helpful for our school district as we look to implement this.

Some of the areas for concern, this might seem like a petty one, but I think that it points to a bit of the sense of dismissiveness that some school leaders and teachers and parents have; is that, during the last year, NYSED changed their guidance document at least five times.

It's about 135 pages.

```
And each time they would change it, they
1
 2
        wouldn't annotate it at all to tell you which parts
 3
        had changed.
 4
               So, literally, we had to go back through the
 5
        entire document over again.
 6
               And I'm not saying this to whine or to
7
        complain, but we've brought this small point up to
8
        the State Education Department before, with no
9
        change.
               Which to me, if I did that to my school
10
11
        board --
12
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Scott, may I just inquire?
13
               SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF:
                                    Sure.
14
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: I want to make sure
15
        I understood you correctly.
16
               Did you say NYSED or NYSUT?
               SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: Excuse me.
17
18
               NYSED.
19
               New York State Education Department.
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, I just wanted to
20
21
        clarify.
22
               SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: It's their -- it's not
23
        NYSUT.
24
               It's NYSED.
25
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: There's a lot of credit
```

and blame going on around here. 1 2 I just want to make sure we're going to the 3 right players. [Laughter.] 4 5 SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: (Indicating.) So --6 7 SENATOR FLANAGAN: SED. 8 SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: Yes, SED. 9 I'll leave it at that. So this made it difficult for us to find the 10 11 changes to, let alone, implement the changes, and took a tremendous amount of hard work by our 12 13 administrators. 14 The second thing you mentioned about the 15 volume of assessments, it is quite high. 16 It's difficult to calculate from kindergarten 17 to twelfth grade because, when students get to 18 high school, they're taking different courses, different electives. 19 20 Some students take more Regents exams than other students. 21 22 But the point is, there's a lot of time being 23 spent on assessment. 24 If you look at just the 3-through-8 25 assessment in third grade, for example, those tests

got longer, slightly longer, over a three-day period; and, at the same time, students were given a shorter amount of time to complete them.

So it begs the question of:

Is this a test on what a student knows and is able to do, or is this a test on how quickly a student can find information in the text, or -- for example, and be able to complete the questions in an accurate manner?

We processed over 70,000 bubble sheets in the spring-assessment period last year alone.

We also had to create pre- and post-tests for 185 different courses or grade levels.

This also results in what is my biggest bone of contention with the Regents Reform Agenda, is a loss of quality instructional time with teachers and students.

This is also aggravated by the fact that our students miss out on instruction from their teachers due to the fact that, in order to do this right, we have to provide teachers with training during the schoolday.

So when we're doing that, we're providing our children with a substitute teacher way too much.

We need to prepare these teachers through

APPR training, professional-development opportunities related to the Common Core and the Regents Reform Agenda, rubric training, curriculum writing, assessment writing, assessment scoring, and other areas.

Our students are best taught by our first-team teachers, our best teachers, not by substitutes, and this is one of my biggest areas of concern, as I've mentioned.

The other item is the cost.

We've spent in Williamsville over a million dollars so far in implementing the New York State Regents Reform Agenda, with an offset of slightly more than \$74,000 over a three-year period.

So some of my recommendations, and I hope that you take them into account:

Is for more local control; more flexibility from these mandates, including funding flexibility for how we apply things like textbook-aid, software-aid, hardware, and library-aid categories.

The idea to eliminate the gap-elimination adjustment that the Senate put forward, over a three-year period, I think is a very positive thing for all school districts in the state of New York.

I would also encourage our Legislature to look to districts to innovate.

That's what the twenty-first century is going to demand of our young people.

Find ways to encourage districts to innovate through mobile-learning devices that better engage students.

Flip classrooms with screen casts.

Science, technology, engineering, and math opportunities at a younger age, beginning in elementary school.

A greater focus on art, music, and physical education.

I know my son, who's in second grade, would really thrive on the ability to attend physical education each and every single day.

Foreign-language instruction beginning in kindergarten.

This was recommended in 1983 as "A Nation at Risk," and 30 years later, here we are, still talking about, How come we can't make that happen?

After all, we do live in a global society, with international competition, where students from other countries graduate, 65 percent of them are bilingual or multilingual.

In the United States, it's only 9 percent.

Encourage more students to take challenging advanced-placement courses.

The U.S. Department of Education study indicated that students who merely take an advanced-placement course have a 50 percent greater likelihood of finishing college in four years, based on their exposure to a more rigorous curriculum and the confidence that that they builds in our young people.

I would also encourage you to find ways to provide our high school students with the ability to take a college course on a college campus at no cost to a student or their family.

Lastly, let's not forget about the social, emotional well-being, and the physical safety of our students.

Our students are walking through our doors with more and more needs, including family breakdowns, loss of employment by a parent, abuse, neglect, et cetera.

Our schools need to do a better job helping our students through these kinds of traumas.

I've said from the beginning, since this has all started with the Regents Reform Agenda, we are

1 building the plane while we are flying it.

I would say, let's take a year to step back, assess progress, look at our needs, and see if the plane can even still fly before making the next ill-advised, instantaneous change to our education system.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and I would appreciate any questions you might have.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Ranzenhofer.

SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Thank you,

Dr. Martzloff.

I appreciate your thoughtful comments, both pro and con, on the Reform Agenda.

And I guess the first question I have is, I mean, I guess the sense is that, I think the Common Core is good, we need to slow it down a little bit.

Are you seeing in your school districts some of the other comments about, kids in third grade and fourth grade, are they stressing out, I guess, for lack of a better term?

Do they appreciate the nature of these exams?

And are they -- are you seeing and hearing

from your teachers and your parents that these kids

are stressing out, and it's having -- obviously, if you're stressing out, it's having an adverse effect, but there's a lot of distress associated with that?

Are you seeing that in your district?

SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: We do have some of our young people who are extremely stressed in grades 3 through 8.

We've had students that have broken down, crying, upset.

I try to take the approach as a parent, with my own children, that it's not that big a deal, because at the end of the day, the 3-through-8 testing, it doesn't mean anything to the education of my children.

What will mean something to their future, is when they get to eighth grade and start taking credit-bearing courses, such as Algebra and earth science and foreign language, that lead to a transcript for a high school diploma, which will determine where they can go to college, and the rest of their life.

So, I try to advise parents, when they contact me about this, to take a more low-key approach; however, sometimes that's very challenging for our children.

SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Okay.

And, obviously, you know, before the agenda was put into place, you know, third-graders were still taking end-of-the-year exams.

Has the stress level increased as a result of these new exams, or there's just the same stress over different exams?

SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: Yeah, I don't know if I could speak to that with any type of accuracy.

I mean, anecdotally, you tend to hear more that there's a lot more stress.

Whether that means there is more stress, is difficult to measure that.

I think there are kids that do get upset with taking any type of assessment or test.

And I think the whole notion and the attention of, "These are high-stakes tests, these are very, very important," not only drives their stress level up, but that of their parents as well, and then the parent puts more pressure on the child.

And the teacher puts more pressure on the children as well, because they are now connected to the teacher's evaluation.

And so, all in all, there's a lot more pressure than there has been in the past.

SENATOR RANZENHOFER: Okay, I probably could 1 2 ask you another 20 questions, but in interest of 3 everyone else who wants to ask questions, and testify, I'll cut it off there. 4 5 But, thank you very much again. SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: Thank you, Senator. 6 7 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Scott, just one quick 8 question, following un on what I asked 9 Mr. Hathaway. 10 On the testing, do you -- what component of that, if at all, do you collectively bargain with 11 12 your teachers? 13 SCOTT G. MARTZLOFF: Well, generally, you 14 know, it's the 20 percent. 15 We've tried to go to more of a state-provided growth measure, versus having so many individual 16 SLOs within our school districts. 17 So, to your point, there is parts of this 18 that are collectively bargained, and there are parts 19 of it that are local decisions. 20 21 However, there does tend to be, in order to have a good APPR plan, a number of different 22 23 assessments. 24 For example, last year, we did do pre- and 25 post-assessments in physical education; we did pre-

```
and post-assessments in music and in art; so, in
1
 2
        those areas.
 3
               We've tried to get away from that this year,
        and for the future.
 4
 5
               We've actually eliminated 19 different
        pretests at the high school level, for example.
 6
7
               So, we are trying to be sensitive to that, to
8
        restore more balance, more instructional time for
        our teachers and our students, but that's going to
9
10
        be an ongoing challenge.
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay.
11
               Thank you very much.
12
13
               We are going to -- based on technology, we're
        gonna take a -- roughly, a five-minute break,
14
15
        because we have to change the tape.
16
               And, we appreciate everyone's continued
17
        patience.
18
                    [Pause in proceedings.]
19
                    [The hearing proceeded, as follows:]
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay, so we're going to
20
21
        get started again.
22
               All right, so our next group,
23
        Dr. Paul Vermette from Niagara University, and
24
        Preethi --
25
               Am I saying it correctly?
```

PREETHI GOVINDARAJ: 1 Yep. 2 SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- Govindaraj? PREETHI GOVINDARAJ: Yes. 3 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay. 4 5 I'm trying. -- from the partnership -- co-founder of 6 7 Minerva. 8 I apologize. 9 PREETHI GOVINDARAJ: Yes. 10 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Both affiliated with 11 Partnership for Smarter Schools. We know you had a forum up here a couple of 12 13 weeks ago, so --14 PREETHI GOVINDARAJ: We did, thank you. 15 And thank you for having us today. 16 The Partnership of Smarter Schools represents 17 a variety of individuals -- parents, community 18 members, taxpayers -- who actually have no 19 connection or relationship to the schools, other 20 than having a vested interest in seeing the 21 resources allocated in the most productive manner 22 possible. 23 And the summit that organized about 24 2700 people, who came to the Kleinhans Music Hall in 25 the city of Buffalo, was all these different

constituents coming together to voice their concern about testing.

And the partnership's position with respect to the Regents Reform Agenda is smart reform.

The partnership believes very much in having higher standards, evaluations, assessments, but we need to get it right.

Consider, for example, just assessments.

And in the interest of time, let's just look at ELA assessments, as how they're conducted in college in comparison to K-12.

Now, in college, as ELA students, we have an entire semester to study a text, and that's what we are assessed on.

In K-12, we have 60 seconds, maybe, to read a text, and then we're suddenly assessed on it.

In college, we are assessed on the actual text that we study throughout the semester.

In K-12, we are assessed on text we may never have seen before; most likely have never seen before.

In college, we read an entire text, from beginning to end, in context, which means we're reading the scholarship, the criticism, everything that surrounds the central text.

In K-12, in the assessments, it's one isolated passage from a larger text that we read and we're suddenly assessed on.

In college, when we're assessed on text, we study this with our peers, with our professors, we dialogue about it, we have discussions about it, but, in K-12, there's no talking to anybody when we're being assessed on a text, it's all individual.

So if we are saying we need assessments in the name of being college- and career-ready, we need to get assessments right so we can actually simulate the work that goes on in college, instead of taking us in a completely different path.

And to this point, humanities professors frequently lament that it takes a semester or longer to help young students undo the testing mentality because they're not prepared for college.

And so this is a very important issue that is also linked with capturing better data, and capturing better evaluations, as well as capturing professional development that is much more aligned with the kind of work we do in college.

For example, in college, when we give an assessment to students, these include various measures; sometimes writing, sometimes

presentations, and a combination of these.

But when they're given, there -- it's given in a timely manner that allows immediate feedback from practitioner to student, so that the student can assess the work that they have just done, and improve it through the course of a semester or the course of a whole year.

In K-12, there is no immediate feedback given from teacher to student, sometimes there's no feedback at all given from practitioner to student, simply because the teachers don't have the data themselves to be able to share with the kids.

And, so, there is no opportunity for the student to improve their performance based on what they have just given or created.

So this is another important issue.

As well as, capturing better evaluations, better professional development, in college, we frequently evaluate college professors based on their analysis of a text, the way they teach the text to the students.

It's never based on a standardized test score.

But this allows the college practitioner much more high-quality data, as well as immediate data,

so that they understand how they are teaching the 2 students at the college level.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In K-12, if we're giving teachers data based on the test score, it's actually very disconnected from what the teacher is doing on a daily basis.

So this is another area of reform that we believe in.

Most importantly, as well, that all of these issues come back to how we support the practitioner at the college level in comparison to the K-12 level.

At the college level, we give our professors time and resources to study their content areas deeply and effectively.

So if you have a college professor who is teaching, for example, a text on Nathaniel Hawthorne, they have the resources to go and attend conferences that discuss Nathaniel Hawthorne or that text.

But in K-12, even though we are expecting, with the new standards, teachers to understand their content areas deeply, the professional development is usually test-based.

So, we are helping teachers understand how to administer a test and how to collect data; whereas,

we are not really supporting their learning needs, even though this is what they are supposed to be evaluated on.

And, so, we think that all of this impacts their college-readiness, which it does, but what a lot of us don't realize is that it also impacts their career-readiness.

Now, we polled executives from many

Fortune 500s -- General Motors, American Airlines,

International House of Pancakes, a variety of

different multi-national corporations -- asking

them, "What are the most useful skills that incoming

employees can give to you?"

And, the number one response, was the ability to develop an argument, and persuade.

And how this is accomplished is through writing, through presentation, through other research-based means.

Not one named standardized test scores.

In fact, not one said you take standardized tests in one of these professions.

And they said the standardized-testing mentality actually undermines the ability of the incoming employee to perform in the most optimal way.

So they're echoing what humanities professors in college are echoing, and now we've had decades of research telling us this as well.

So, our position, just to reiterate, we believe in a Reform Agenda; we just believe in smarter reform, and so that means aligning assessments much more closely with the work that is actually performed in college, not taking us away from that.

We believe in supporting professional development to help the practitioner with the daily needs of the classroom, that is, learning and content; not testing-related.

We believe in capturing evaluations based on the work that takes place throughout the year; not a disconnected standardized test that has nothing with what was taught during the year.

And we also believe in capturing the data that is aligned with the work that is taking place through the months, so that we use that to inform our instruction and assessment, and that's what we share with the parents.

Now, I'm a parent of a 3-year-old and a 2-year-old, and, it matters not to me, what my teacher -- how my teacher performed on a

standardized testing evaluation, how my students 1 2 performed, how my kids perform on standardized 3 tests. It matters much more to me what my kids were 4 5 learning on a week-to-week basis, so that I can help them on a week-to-week basis as well. 6 7 So we need to support our system to allow for 8 this to happen. 9 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Doctor. 10 DR. PAUL VERMETTE: My role in the 11 partnership comes from two hats: One is, I'm supporter of good schools and 12 13 getting testing right. 14 The second is my role at Niagara University 15 where I've been preparing secondary teachers for a long, long, long time. 16 17 My written testimony starts with a semi-fake 18 multiple-choice question for you guys. And it's interesting, because if I gave a 19 20 multiple-choice question to the people in the 21 gathering here, a quarter would guess right, just 22 statistically. 23 So one-fourth of these people would get it 24 right; and there is no question. 25 So that doesn't make any sense, unless you

think, well, if there was a question, then we could 1 see what they did wrong, but it's kept secret 3-8. 2 3 The testing is kept secret 3-8, so there can be no instructional improvement. 4 5 Tests have a great value. 6 Testing, the question you asked earlier of 7 Mr. Hathaway, all of those issues, but it depends 8 on how the teacher uses the test to improve the learning. 9 10 That's absolutely out of the 3-8 system here. It doesn't exist, of course, in 9-12, but 11 it's -- even in 9-12, it's a final evaluation. 12 13 There is no reteaching of that stuff. So we get a grade, the kid gets a score, and 14 15 we go on to the next year. My second point mirrors one of Preethi's 16 17 point. 18 If you ask business what they want, they want teamwork, work ethic, punctuality. 19 "New York State Teaching Standards," which is 20 21 a great, great document, and I thank anybody, this is the best one on earth, okay, we should use it. 22 23 And it doesn't say in there, "and will 24 produce great test scores," because the tests could 25 be disconnected.

We don't know, we can't see them. 1 2 Again, 9-12 we can see them; 3-8 we can't. 3 So we have a great document to guide teachers. 4 5 And my young teachers from Niagara, we know what is good teaching, and we know what the State 6 7 thinks good teaching is, but there is a tremendous 8 disconnect between those two statements and the 9 testing. Third thing, and then I'll be quiet: 10 11 I'm a scholar, I apologize, I'm an academic; and I don't look like either. 12 13 You know, I've been around this a long time. I'm an old football coach. 14 15 Okay? 16 So you start looking at the research. 17 You would think -- I mean, no offense to the 18 Commissioner, but he thinks of himself as a 19 researcher. 20 And when you start to look at the research on 21 how formal programs of standardized testing have 22 affected graduation rates, dropout rates, success in 23 college; 24 The SAT, question earlier, only predicts fall 25 scores, first year.

If you leave high school and you go to 1 2 college, it will predict your first year. After that, it's not a predicter. 3 But things like work ethic, punctuality, 4 5 persistence on task, those predict, and we don't 6 test them. 7 So, if indeed what happens is there's a narrowing of the curriculum, because of the testing, 8 9 and then we get test data that we can't use, I'm not 10 sure why we're spending all that money, to tell you 11 the truth. And I have to come down on the side of 12 13 getting testing right, because we don't have it 14 right now. 15 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Doctor, two quick questions. 16 17 One, in your opinion, was there a point where 18 we had testing right? 19 DR. PAUL VERMETTE: Grew up in New York. Can I tell a story? 20 21 Is it okay? 22 I'm real old. 23 1971 I started teaching. 24 And I want you to think about that when you 25 look over there.

I'm teaching high school in New York in 1971. 1 2 The only year I left, I defected, I went to 3 New Jersey to be a social-studies supervisor, and I found out later I got hired because New York had 4 5 its rigor. Isn't that kind of nice. 6 7 "You guys have those tests, we borrow them." 8 So, I can make a case for my secondary 9 candidates. 10 Mostly, the Regents exams are spot on. 11 They're tough, they're high-stakes. You can look at what Mr. Hathaway said, you 12 13 can look at the previous years. 14 They align with the objectives. 15 That's a big thing in my world, okay: 16 Here's what we're supposed to be doing; 17 here's what we're measuring. 18 So, yeah, and the 3-8 has just -- it's part 19 of the corporate reform movement to put a number. If we could do away with the 20 percent of 20 the APPRs on the test scores, we still have the 21 22 80 percent based on this. 23 The other 80 could be expanded. 24 That's a plan. 25 It's kind of interesting, we know, meaning

SED, and the Board -- the Board of Regents, put this 1 2 out. 3 It's a pretty good document. 4 Again, it doesn't align, in my judgment, 5 today. I don't know about forever, but, for today, 6 7 it doesn't align with the testing. PREETHI GOVINDARAJ: And if I could echo that 8 9 as well, I know from talking with humanities 10 councils and humanities professors, that when it 11 comes to standardized testing, they almost always advocate for something like the SAT II which is 12 13 content-based. 14 And, so, you have expectations of what 15 content you will be tested on, and it tests your 16 content knowledge, as well as the skills application 17 along those tests; whereas, the 3-through-8 is 18 purely skills-based. 19 There's no content application at all. And that is a huge disconnect, because we're 20 21 preparing kids in K-12 to be content learners. 22 And that's what we're doing in college: 23 We're testing them, we're assessing them, on 24 content in college. 25 So a pure skills-based-application approach

in 3-8 is actually ill-preparing our young ones to 1 2 go into college for tomorrow. 3 SENATOR FLANAGAN: All right, thank you very much. 4 5 Appreciate it. DR. PAUL VERMETTE: Thank you. 6 7 Thank you for listening. 8 Next, the Empire State Supervisors Administration Association; Mark Beehler and 9 10 James Spanbauer, Ryan Schoenfeld. MARK BEEHLER: Good afternoon, and thank you. 11 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Good afternoon. 12 13 MARK BEEHLER: I'm joined, as you mentioned, by Dr. Schoenfeld here, from North Park Junior 14 15 High School in Lockport, and, Mr. Spanbauer from LaSalle Preparatory School in Niagara Falls. 16 17 On behalf of our -- the Empire State 18 Supervisor and Administrators Association, we'd like 19 to thank you for this opportunity to provide 20 testimony. 21 Mr. Chairman, when you started out this morning, you mentioned that you had a broad range, 22 23 or anticipated a broad range, of testimony from a broad cross-section, and I think something 24 25 interesting is going to happen, or has happened in

the past hour, which is that you're going to hear testimony from the administrators association, which is very similar to that from the teachers association, and very similar to what you heard from a superintendent.

And I think that that's very interesting because, typically, we don't always have the same views on things, to say the least.

But I would like to take a moment, and in the sake of time -- or, for the sake of time in the testimony, simply abbreviate some of my messages to reinforce what Mr. Hathaway had mentioned.

Assessments, they need to be produced timely, they need to be diagnostic and useful.

We are not opposed to high-stakes testing, but they're high-stakes, as your question referred to, occurs within a continuum.

And we understand that, in some cases, students must be taking high-stakes tests.

Regents exams, SATs, those are high-stakes tests.

Sometimes they're developmentally appropriate, but we need to be administering these at an appropriate level.

And I think what's happening is, that we have

exceeded the threshold of appropriateness in some cases.

And we're seeing that.

We're seeing that with my own children; as Dr. Martzloff stated, with his children; and we're seeing that in our schools, where kids are coming in exceptionally anxious.

Dr. Martzloff would probably not want to be quoted as saying to his daughter, "The tests don't mean anything," but I said those exact same words to my fifth-grader who was, quite literally, sick on the day of her fourth-grade ELA, and I had to sit down because she's a 95 percent student.

She wants to be a 100 percent student.

And when she came back after the first day of the ELAs, I, quite literally, had to say to her, "Look it, honey, I just need you to relax.

This test isn't that" -- "isn't" -- excuse

me, it's even hard for me to say an as educator -
"it isn't that important."

In addition, you have some very positive things that have come about.

You're not going to hear us say, throw out the Common Core.

You're not going hear us say, that all of the

components of the APPR are ineffective.

As a matter of fact, one of the components, which we haven't really talked about, but have been used sometimes as -- in what I would suggest is an inappropriate manner, are the growth scores.

Teachers in New York State are used to working under No Child Left Behind.

We have an assessment, we -- our goal is to have our students achieve a level of proficiency.

Typically that's a Level 3, it's passing the exam.

It realistically goes back to the beginning of time when teachers taught and students took tests, and the goal was for the student to pass the test.

Growth scores are a brand new metric, and their usefulness is being sort of polluted in the fact that they are being assigned to teachers as a measurement of their effectiveness.

A growth score doesn't necessarily measure achievement.

It measures learning.

And those are two different metrics.

We're not used to that in education, to be honest with you.

As a matter of fact, in the testimony, you'll hear me give the example of the difference.

If I were to ask the three of the Senators to arrange themselves according to height, I may come to the conclusion that Mr. Chairman is taller than Senator Grisanti, but that does not in any way tell me how tall Mr. Chairman is.

Our system, with the APPR and the use of growth scores, is designed to -- no matter what the level of achievement; in other words, how well the students do, we will always have teachers who are going to be developing and ineffective.

That growth measurement, which we're saying measures teachers' effectiveness, in fact, does not.

It simply ranks the teachers.

And while that seems like it's a trivial difference, it's exceptionally important.

The other component of my written testimony that I would like to touch base on, is simply the loss of local control that local education agencies and school boards are beginning to experience.

As a part of the network team for West Seneca schools, in Albany, we've been told, that in the past, we have always had tests that held students to high expectations, and that State Ed has high

expectations.

And now, with the development of the modules which meet the expectations, or they'll tell us that, of the Common Core, they're also high support.

But what we're finding is that, this level of high expectations and high support, is, in fact, causing districts, especially districts who are tight on resources, to simply say:

I need to have something that's aligned to the Common Core.

I'm taking this module, and I no longer have the control that I used to have over the instruction, because the modules not only tell us what to teach, but also, specifically, how to teach it, and we're losing control.

They are not required, we will acknowledge that, but, they are -- they are one of the only resources at this point in time that are aligned.

And in the process, operationally, we are beginning to lose control over, not only what we're teaching, but also how we're teaching it.

One other component that I just wanted to touch base on with regard to the APPR, is the use of those growth scores -- and my testimony speaks to this a little bit more -- with regard to the

disparity between teachers who are assigned a growth score by New York State, and those teachers who can create an SLO.

This is a significant inequity in the existing APPR.

If I have students who take the 3-through-8 -- or I should say, 4-through-8 assessments, because I have to be in fourth grade to get a growth score and the teacher gets an assigned growth score then, that is significantly more rigorous, typically, and I do not have any influence over that score.

For teachers who can develop locally a student learning objective which essentially replaces that growth score, I can establish my own metrics for determining student growth, I have input likely into the assessments which are created.

And we're starting to see this -- or, we have seen this throughout the state, where teachers who have growth scores assigned by the State are being measured by a different metric than those who can create things locally.

And, honestly, we knew that.

Our model, which is developed based on the Tennessee model for value-added or growth, the

Tennessee value -- or, the Tennessee value-added assessment system, the governor of Tennessee, two years ago, commissioned a study to determine what the effects were.

And that is one of the effects that we saw in Tennessee, and we're seeing that now.

And what's happening is, it's invalidating some of the APPR results and causing, essentially, a significant degree of mistrust, and, like I said before, an inequity between the measurements by which our teachers are being measured.

The other piece that --

SENATOR FLANAGAN: You know what?

Let me interrupt you on that point.

Who's coming out ahead: the people who are getting measured on the growth scores or the people who are getting measured based on the SLOs?

MARK BEEHLER: Typically, the people measure on SLOs, because they have input into the development of their own assessments which are being created.

You know, one of the questions that we talked about -- or, that came up with regard to 3012-c and the APPR, is all of the tests.

And you've had a difficult time,

I understand, getting an answer to that question, 1 2 "How many tests are actually being administered?" 3 And that's difficult because, 3012-c requires -- or, up until last year, it required a 4 5 pretest and a posttest for every single teacher, who -- every single teacher, and then those tests 6 were administered to at least 50 percent of that 7 teacher's work -- student load. 8 9 So, in other words, if I'm a physical-education-teacher, I had to have pretests 10 11 and posttests that were administered to at least 50 percent of my students, likely in September, and 12 13 then again in June. 14 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Let me just, on that 15 point, because I think I had part of this dialogue with Mr. Hathaway: 16 17 Are you talking about the statute, or are you 18 talking about a regulation promulgated by SED? 19 MARK BEEHLER: I'm talking about an SED 20 regulation. 21 SENATOR FLANAGAN: That says it requires you to do pre- and post-testing? 22 23 MARK BEEHLER: Yeah, up until this year, it 24 did. 25 And I will acknowledge this fact:

This year, in August, a new regulation -- or, guidance document came out, that stated we no longer have to give pretests, but we do have to establish targets.

And in some subjects, while it states that we don't have to administer a pretest, we need to have a benchmark.

In other words, we need to set a target for the students' growth.

Well, it doesn't tell us that we have to create a pretest, but I need to have some form of measurement to set that target.

So, if I'm a phys-ed teacher, if I'm a music teacher, if I'm a health teacher, especially if I'm a kindergarten, first-, or second-grade teacher who doesn't have much data on my students, I need to administer some type of an assessment so I know where they are when they're walking in.

So it doesn't -- this year, it does not specifically say that it does, but, operationally, we need to begin to administer pretests.

So, in West Seneca, 46,000 pre- and post-tests that we administered last year to about 7700 students.

Those are created in the district at an

1 exceptional cost.

They cannot be created or corrected by someone who had a vested interest, so, the teachers could not actually correct them themselves, nor could they create them.

So, logistically, and, obviously, for the -you know, that sounds great on paper, that we don't
want the test creating them -- or the teachers
creating their own tests or correcting them, but,
operationally, that becomes an administrative
nightmare when that happens in every single subject
for virtually every teacher.

Senator Grisanti had mentioned earlier about the collection of data.

And one of the points with regard to loss of local control, especially being the chief information officer, that I would like to bring up, is that we have inBloom.

We've heard about inBloom.

There's been a relatively significant amount of discussion amongst some of the data folks in the state about inBloom.

We see it on some of the blogs.

I'm not going to speak, one way or the other, but I do just want to bring up some interesting

facts about what's happening. 1 2 The information from schools transfers from 3 local schools, it works its way to regional information centers. 4 5 This is a process that has been going on for 6 years. 7 Let's see, 11 years ago, I was the chief information officer for West Seneca schools. 8 9 At that point in time, I had a simple 10 database that I needed to send for elementary and 11 secondary reports. Right now, it has become significantly more 12 13 sophisticated. 14 Our student management system, which houses 15 everything from student demographic information, attendance, discipline, schedules, that's referred 16 17 to as our "student management system." 18 Periodically, usually once a month, data from 19 there goes up to our regional information center, which is a -- well, they refer to it as a "RIC." 20 21 How many are there? 22 It's a -- well, and then it will transfer 23 from there, up to what's called the 24 "data warehouse." 25 And this gets kinds of technical, but it's

kind of important, because the question about where inBloom and, essentially, 5 to 15 million dollars goes, is key in understanding of where this information is coming from, and the fact that we already have it.

So we take our information from the student management system, it goes up to the regional information center into a collection port called "level zero."

At that point, we reconcile all sorts of other data.

Special-ed data comes in.

Family -- or, food-service data comes in so we can identify students who have free and reduced lunch.

I know this is boring, but this is actually what I have to do every day, so, to me, it's kind of exciting.

[Laughter.]

MARK BEEHLER: All right, it all comes in,

I have to reconcile this data, as do CIOs and

district data coordinators in every single district.

From that point, it goes on to a data warehouse.

These are regionally controlled in a regional

information center, that then pulls in assessment 1 2 data. 3 So I have the ability to take those assessments that you've heard that we have issues 4 5 with, in many cases, and take and be able to pull 6 out reports that are instructionally illuminating, 7 is what I like to say. 8 It helps me guide instruction in the classroom, and it helps me make curriculum changes 9 at a district level. 10 All of the information that I need is already 11 there. 12 13 Several times throughout the year, though, 14 the State requires reports. 15 Tomorrow is a big one. All of the staff evaluation data for our 16 17 teachers are required to be submitted to the State. 18 So they're gonna come in, data from Level 1 19 goes up to Level 2, our state reporting system. InBloom, which is a -- I understand it's a 20 21 501(c)(3) organization -- has -- or it has been 22 collecting data from this Level 2. 23 So all of this data fills up, filters up; 24 it's coordinated in a line throughout the entire

25

states.

It filters up, inBloom takes this data. 1 2 Now, part of the Race to the Top agenda 3 items, is that we are going to be getting a data dashboard. 4 We've heard about that. 5 Many districts already have data dashboards. 6 7 It's paid for, and it's promised to be paid 8 for out, of the Race to the Top grant for the next two years -- well, one year, one year conditional --9 10 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Mark, you know what? MARK BEEHLER: 11 Yep? SENATOR FLANAGAN: Are your colleagues going 12 13 to testify? Because you need to --14 15 MARK BEEHLER: Wrap it up? SENATOR FLANAGAN: -- wrap it up. 16 17 MARK BEEHLER: Got it. 18 Okay, so here's the point: 19 We're being forced to pay, the Race to the Top funds are being expended at a range of between 20 21 2 and 5 dollars per pupil for inBloom to give back 22 the data that we as a district already have. 23 I have already taken the data, accumulated 24 it, cleaned it -- cleaned it up. 25 The same information that a data dashboard

can present to me at a district level from my Data 1 warehouse, now has to go up through inBloom, we have to pay inBloom to get that money -- or, that information back, it's already my information, and then have it be presented to me.

The other piece of this is, that information was never -- we as a district, and I as a parent, have never provided consent, nor have we been disclosed, that that information is going to be leaving our district or the state, to be going to another entity.

So those are two relatively significant issues that people like myself, who take data stewardship and data custodianship, look at as relatively significant.

It's also another example of our loss of local control.

All right.

JAMES SPANBAUER: I'll speak briefly on a -- a little bit about the high school level.

I spent --

SENATOR GRISTANTI: Just a question on that point, though.

But -- so -- but the testing data that we just had with the Common Core tests, and it was just

done, you didn't receive any data back? 1 MARK BEEHLER: 2 No. 3 SENATOR GRISTANTI: And you don't have the ability -- you don't have the ability under Race to 4 5 the Top, where you're collecting data as you were 6 before, you couldn't do anything? 7 MARK BEEHLER: Right. 8 So -- and to answer Senator Gallivan's question from earlier, this year we received the 9 10 information later than in the previous years, but we 11 were required to have a much shorter turnaround time, from the time it was actually scored to the 12 13 time that it was submitted to the State. So the length of time that the State had that 14 15 data before they gave it back to us was longer. The parent reports actually took longer. 16 17 And if you've seen a parent report, it says, 18 "This is the student level achievement level," and 19 that's about it. 20 It is not diagnostic, it's not prescriptive, 21 it's not instructionally illuminating. 22 Regional information centers, though, take 23 that information that's provided at the data -- in

the data warehouse, and then they develop reports.

So at a regional level, we have the

24

25

mechanisms in place, we have the framework in place, to be providing, and have been receiving from them, instructionally significant data reports back.

But what we're lacking is that information from the State.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: Gotcha.

Okay, thank you.

JAMES SPANBAUER: From the high school level -- and this is in no disrespect to the 4-to-8 teachers and parents, we hear about high-stakes testing quite often, and I think the point was made by -- well by him as a parent, and Dr. Martzloff, that it's high-stake if you think it's high-stake, but there's only one person it's high-stake for at the elementary and the middle level, and that's the teacher, because that test that student takes has no significance whether they're moving on to the next grade level.

Alls it does is place them in AIS services and provides an evaluation of the teacher.

At the high school level, where the Common Core is just beginning to be implemented this year in testing, is when we'll really see what the high-stakes effect is on students.

What's going to happen is, you're gonna have

students who take the first Common Core exam this June, so we're going see the reaction of those students.

And I think, Senator Gallivan, you mentioned it earlier about college- and career-ready.

One of things I don't know if we've accommodated completely, is multiple pathways and alternative pathways.

No matter who goes through the high schools now, every student has to take the -- pass the same five Core Regents exams to earn that diploma; whether it be special education, whether it be the highest achiever in that building.

We have students who have different aptitudes.

We talked earlier about someone who might be the best electrician in the world.

We, unfortunately, at the high school level, are forced to pull students out of BOCES programs to provide them with technical training -- or, AIS services instead of their technical training in their senior year of high school; therefore, the career that they might have found after high school has been put on hold so we can try to get them through a testing system that we're forced to

implement.

So I think those are some of the things.

We're going to see high-stakes testing at the high school level as we move forward, so I think it's important that we consider a look at multiple pathways, not only with the vocational system, but with special-education students, which I don't know if we've accommodated fully with this program.

SENATOR GRISTANTI: Okay, thank you.

RYAN SCHOENFELD, Ed.D: I just want to share a couple points, and I appreciate the opportunity.

I'm from a small city school district, Lockport.

I've been there for 20 years.

I've been a practitioner.

I've been an assistant principal of an elementary building.

I'm the coordinator of kindergarten through sixth-grade mathematics for the teachers within our large school district.

So part of this Common Core, and any of the work and efforts we're carrying out for State Ed and for the best interests of the children, I'm helping to lead that; and it started off by Regent Bennett talking about administrators being important to

1 students' success.

We're carrying that.

We are doing what we need to do.

In a small city school, and others around, administrators are stepping up to do the types of things they can do to carry this out in the best interests of children, based on what we know about what we're doing.

So these things are rolling out.

And we appreciate the assistance, because what we were doing, when you compare us on a global market, and I've attended national, international, conferences, it's true, we don't compete at that higher level.

So what we're doing doesn't exactly work.

People might not fully agree with it, but we need to do something that's going to help our kids prepare for this global network.

The one thing I've learned through my research, and I see it today within you up there, as well as our contingent here, it's about relationships; it's about working with people.

We appreciate you taking the time to be with us, to listen to us.

Again, you facilitated and worked through

masterfully, with different contingents sharing their things, but that's important.

Trust is important.

And we're trusting that the direction we're going will do better for our children.

Bryk and Schneider did a study in Chicago, looking at 200 schools, this was in the late 1990s, for 5 years.

The schools that had relational trust between teacher and teacher, teacher to student, student to teacher, principal to teacher, principal to parent; in all those different manners, the 100 schools that showed higher performance on test scores were the ones that had relational trust built into those environments, and that I think is important to note.

We've talked about all these different things.

It really comes down to the local establishments and the districts working with their people, building upon that trust, so that we can help our students to be successful.

We're going to carry it out and do what we need to do, but, for sure, trust is important, and, obviously, people care.

You know, we don't say it enough in

```
education, but as politicians, educators, parents,
1
        we all care, so this conversation is great.
 2
 3
               It's trying to come together to do better
 4
        things.
 5
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Maziarz would, I'm
        sure, associate himself with your comments, and he
 6
7
        is an ardent advocate for Lockport.
8
               MARK BEEHLER: I'm sure.
9
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Trust me.
10
               MARK BEEHLER: I know he is.
11
               So if there's any Q&A?
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Senator Gallivan.
12
13
               SENATOR GALLIVAN: Mark, going back to the
14
        data flow, is this the same process throughout the
15
        state --
16
               MARK BEEHLER: Yes, it is.
               SENATOR GALLIVAN: -- as it moves up?
17
18
               MARK BEEHLER: Yes.
19
               SENATOR GALLIVAN: So there's nobody lacking
20
        those --
21
               MARK BEEHLER: Nope.
22
               SENATOR GALLIVAN: -- I guess, those
23
        technology resources?
24
               MARK BEEHLER: Exactly.
25
               SENATOR GALLIVAN: Okay.
```

```
MARK BEEHLER: So -- and that's -- you know,
1
 2
        that goes to the heart of one of the questions,
 3
        "Why is it that we're required to have a statewide
        selection process for information that we all, every
 4
 5
        single district, already has access to?"
 6
               SENATOR GALLIVAN: I get the question.
7
               MARK BEEHLER: Right.
 8
               SENATOR GALLIVAN: But I just wanted to make
9
        sure that --
10
               MARK BEEHLER: Absolutely.
11
               SENATOR GALLIVAN: -- this was similar across
        the state, and not just some -- something that
12
13
       you're doing in West --
14
               MARK BEEHLER: No, it is the same -- it is
        the process by which we file reports to
15
16
       New York State Ed.
17
               SENATOR GALLIVAN: All right, thank you.
18
               MARK BEEHLER: Certainly.
19
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Gentlemen, thank you very
20
        much.
21
               SENATOR GRISTANTI: I've got a quick --
22
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: Oh, I'm sorry.
23
               Senator Grisanti.
24
               I apologize.
25
               SENATOR GRISTANTI: That's okay.
```

And speaking about Senator Maziarz, he's 1 2 actually taken World War II veterans to the monument 3 in Washington today, and you may have saw that, but he told me to say, you know, thank you for being 4 5 here and testifying, and wish he -- he can't be in two places at once, but that's a trip that he had 6 7 planned, and, thank God they crashed the gates and 8 they were able to get in to see the monument. 9 That's a good thing. 10 SENATOR GALLIVAN: It was open? SENATOR GRISTANTI: It is. 11 You had mentioned, Ryan, about, you know --12 13 when did you get the instructions on the 14 Common Core? 15 Was it in the 2011-12 year, and then you were given the materials in 2012? 16 17 Is that when that happened? 18 RYAN SCHOENFELD, Ed.D: I think New York's 19 ahead of the game by a year. 20 We're looking to implement the Common Core 21 before we need to. 22 But, two years ago, we were first with 23 Race to the Top, understanding that we have the 24 Common Core, and that first phase was where you did

get an allocation, and that's where the substitutes

25

and training teachers, and the financial burden associated with the Common Core to train the teachers on the deconstruction, to understand each specific piece of the standard, standards in English or math.

So that happened two years ago.

This year, within our district and others, they're deciding to roll them out.

And with ELA, in my particular district, we're doing kindergarten through eighth grade, Common Core English.

We still have to obtain the resources, the textbooks, again, printing, and everything else.

The mathematics we have rolled out.

And tomorrow morning, actually, I'm meeting with the rest of our teachers that are not doing the math yet, but, we're planning on, in the second quarter of this year, meaning, coming up in five weeks, to roll out the mathematics for the Common Core for K through 6, so that everyone will be, again, setting our kids up to know the foundational skills for the concepts of mathematics.

If we don't start doing this, when we send a third-grader to fourth grade, they won't learn that skill, and it will be more difficult to teach that

child the increased rigor of mathematics. 1 2 SENATOR GRISTANTI: Now, you had said that 3 there were resources available to your district or to your school to get this rolling. 4 5 Was it done on a voluntary basis, or was it 6 just -- was it something that your district 7 implemented that has to be done? 8 RYAN SCHOENFELD, Ed.D: We had to decide how 9 within our district we would do that, so we brought our Core teachers in and started it with 10 11 mathematics. We did training in ELA over the summer with 12 13 all of our teachers. 14 So we had about 120 teachers trained, with a 15 consultant that works specifically on how to work through these, and it's a work in progress. 16 17 It's not perfect, but it is a program that 18 we're using. 19 You have to make the copies, you have to 20 filter through. 21 We're trying to withhold the integrity, which 22 I say, of the Common Core, but there is professional 23 judgment.

And I agree with some colleagues, that, yes,

we do need to interact and engage with kindergarten

24

25

children; that I do have parents that are saying "My 1 2 kids are crying about," you know, "some of this stuff." 3 We need to work through that, and we're 4 5 working through that together. 6 But, you do have to purchase textbooks for 7 ELA. 8 You have to purchase certain manipulatives, 9 like the Unifix Blocks, or a certain type of style scale. 10 So we're obtaining that through our district 11 funds. 12 13 And then we're printing out modules. 14 Or, we bought iPads to utilize, so you can 15 just pull up Module 2 and use that as your teacher edition. 16 So not all districts can do that. 17 18 We've been able to invest some of our money 19 into that, instead of making a pile of modules for teachers to use as their curriculum guide. 20 21 SENATOR GRISTANTI: Thanks, Ryan. 22 Appreciate it. 23 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Gentlemen, thank you very 24 much. 25

Patiently waiting in the on-deck circle is
the ever-present but assertive Bruce Fraser.

DR. BRUCE FRASER: I'm very pleased I have an opportunity to be able to provide testimony on behalf of the rural school members.

We represent about 280 school districts and 30 BOCES.

They're from all over the state: the tip of Long Island to the furthest, West Point, of the state, the Quebec border to the Pennsylvania border.

Our districts represent 40 percent of the state's school districts, and we represent about 1 out of every 8 students educated in New York State.

And I point out one fact that's sometimes overlooked:

New York educates the eighth-largest number of rural students of any of our 50 states.

We are a diverse and large state, and we have that big a population of people considered rural.

Again, the opportunity to testify here,

I feel very comfortable, because we have

two gentlemen, Senators, who were recognized last

year as "Friends of the Rural Schools Association,"

and we do appreciate the role that they played on --

working on behalf of rural schools.

The overview I would give is, we're a member-driven organization, and we have the advantage of following on two other hearings.

And I really asked members, before they provided me any input, to try to read some of the testimony from the first hearing.

And I'm going to try to avoid that, but the one thing that came out in our testimony, smaller schools sometimes have an advantage in implementing change.

We didn't hear all the pushback about, "We can't do this, this is difficult."

We heard testimony expressing regrets that communications from State Ed had been unclear, and at times, not timely, but we also know that, again, in smaller organizations, we're a little more nimble and can make some of the changes.

The concerns we kept hearing, were that this is an unfunded mandate, and it's beyond what we can afford, and that implementing these two major changes, APPR and conversion to the Core curriculum simultaneously in the face of very difficult economic circumstances, have really pushed our districts to the limit.

Again, their reservations about the way the reforms have been rolled out and handled, but, people are pretty much on board, to the extent that I'd to have say, we can't go back.

We are in the midst of things.

And I'll give you an example.

We have begun the purchase of materials that support the Common Core in small districts, and, you know, that -- those are major commitments that are going to be difficult to back away from.

So I think we have to move ahead from here.

I think what happened last Thursday is very unfortunate, but I think it calls upon us to make a commitment to move forward, and to do so with the understanding, the only way we have a chance to be successful is if all the parties involved in education put their head down, vow to work together, and forge ahead.

The concerns I hear from our members, they're about funding, and many of these districts received less than \$20,000 of Race to the Top money.

And the current status of our districts is that, we are funded by the State \$184.4 million below what our districts received in 2008-2009.

That's 7.1 percent below where we were

5 years ago in terms of State support.

And the other thing we constantly point out, is our cumulative multi-year GEA adjustments have been over \$1.175 billion.

That's taken the toll out of the ability of rural school districts to maintain programs.

And we point out, disparities exist.

There are disparities in student performance across this state that are wider than they should be.

There are disparities in resource availability, partly because we have 700 school districts with very different tax bases.

And there are disparities in tax burden.

And for our communities to remain viable, it really requires that we have a good, solid level of State support.

Our school districts have been hurt tremendously as State aid has been pulled back during the difficult economic times.

The prospect for rural schools right now, and rural communities, do we have a chance for economic development under the current circumstances?

And I'd turn that around and say, What business, large or small, would relocate to, or even

remain, in areas of the state where the education system has been taken from a relatively healthy one to a bare-bones one, and, second, where there's a very high tax burden being borne by the local taxpayers?

So those are concerns that we have.

And the concerns we have, I think understanding the school funding, and Senator Flanagan, I've particularly seen it from your perspective, a person who has to try to deal with your colleagues in the Senate, and take a big-picture perspective, while still representing some very demanding constituents.

We don't believe the changes that need to be made in the school-aid formula can be made under the guise of -- under the direction of the Senate.

And that is, with the greatest respect for the job that you do, we just believe that the current formulas, if you look at the current GEA adjustments for this year, we went from four tiers to ten tiers.

Beyond that, we have bullet money that's only available to people in the majority caucus, that is handed out.

And all those things make us skeptical that

things can be changed and improved under the current environment.

What we propose is something along the lines of the hospital reforms, where, literally, you turned it over to the hands of experts, and we would say out-of-state experts, would come in and study the diverse districts that exist in New York, and come up with a plan for how schools should be funded in this situation.

We would not minimize the important role of the Legislature in terms of school funding.

You still would be involved, to the extent that you look at the entire state picture, the fiscal condition of the state, the other demands placed upon you as legislators by the State, but, literally, how money is allocated is critical.

In my testimony, I refer to Dr. Baker's study.

We're 4th in the nation in adequacy when you look at the 50 states.

We're 44th in terms of regressivity and progressivity.

To give out large amounts of money based on flawed formulas is, in our eyes, nothing more than folly.

And, when we talk about the system, we've seen political changes of the majority.

We'll say this, rural schools certainly didn't fare well when there was a different party running the Senate.

But we are also aware that, that in a system where every legislator is virtually called upon to go back home and campaign, "I did a good job taking care of my constituents in my districts," that's not going to get us to where we need to be in terms of a fair and equitable funding system.

So we really ask that the consideration be given by the Senate Committee, and effort be made, working with the colleagues in the Assembly, to move in a different direction: to depoliticize allocation of school funding.

We feel like, again, the tremendous diversity of our state demands that reform be looked at in that light, and we understand the pressures placed upon you as senators, to advocate, and bring home the bacon on behalf of your constituents, but that leads to kids elsewhere in the state having less opportunity, and citizens elsewhere in the state having higher tax burdens.

There are better ways to operate, and I think

it is a technical enough subject that I'd ask you to consider giving up one of your major responsibilities.

As I conclude my written testimony, I ask you this to think about:

Wouldn't your time be spent better in other ways than meeting with the superintendents and members of interest groups who come in and visit you on "Tin-Can Tuesday," with their hands out, saying, You need to do better on our behalf?

And wouldn't education be served better if those superintendents and leaders were back in their district working to implement the reforms that have been initiated?

Now, again, as a member organization, that's one message that was transmitted to me loud and clear.

There were two or three other things that I mentioned in the testimony.

One of them is, that our rural schools, under the tax cap, we have 38 member districts whose tax levy is under \$3 million.

Very small allocation for growth under a 2 percent tax-cap limit, lower at a 1.5 that we're anticipating this year.

I give the example of a district with a

1.5 million levy.

They had \$20,000 of costs negotiating their APPR agreement.

That's almost -- that's over 65 percent of their allowable growth in their budget under the 2 percent tax levy.

With small districts, small budgets, and small levies, our districts are particularly sensitive to any mandate that's instituted or any new costs related to these -- the series of reforms.

The second thing I'd ask you to think about that troubles us a little bit:

When districts have experienced turnover, either as a superintendent, or a building-level principal moves on to another job, has a health issue, we've always been able to bring in experienced administrators and put them into the circumstances.

In small school districts, that no longer works.

The use of interims, even very experienced and capable administrators, the models that have been written for APPR require very specific training.

And if an administrator has not been really 1 2 brought up to speed on that district's model, it's very difficult for our district to bring someone in 3 for a month or two while they complete a search. 4 5 So those are things that I think come to us, through our members, that we'd like to point out 6 7 that are particularly troublesome for small rural 8 districts. 9 But, again, the biggest amount of feedback we 10 had dealt with the concerns about funding. 11 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Bruce, thank you very much. 12 13 SENATOR GRISTANTI: Thank you. 14 I've got to take off, gentlemen. 15 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Thanks, Bruce. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Appreciate the time and 16 17 the energy. 18 DR. BRUCE FRASER: Thank you. 19 SENATOR FLANAGAN: All right. Next, Cheryl Oldham from the U.S. Chamber of 20 21 Commerce. 22 Cheryl, you came from Washington; right? 23 CHERYL OLDHAM: Thank you. 24 Thank you so much for inviting me to be here, 25 and for allowing me to share with you our support

for the Reform Agenda, and specifically speak a bit about Common Core.

As you mentioned, I'm from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

The U.S. Chamber is the largest federation organization representing the interests of the business community in the country.

We represent 3 million businesses of all size, sector, and region, and we have been in this business of education reform and engaged in these issues for some time because our membership asked us to be.

The most important asset they have is their human capital, and what they're telling us, almost daily, is they're having difficulty hiring individuals with the skills and the education required for the jobs of today.

And, so, I'll just be really brief, and talk sort of about three big things:

Frame a little bit for you some of the data points that I think are important, and talk about why we support Common Core, and talk a little bit about what Common Core is not, in our opinion.

So, framing a few data points for you:
Of 34 industrialized countries, the

U.S. ranks 14th in this literacy, 17th in science, and 25th in math.

Half of all undergrads, 70 percent of community-college students will take at least one remedial course.

If we think about that, and these are the students that have actually graduated.

They've come out of school with either a diploma or the equivalent, and they're going on to some level of post-secondary education, and they have to take non-credit-bearing remedial courses that costs us money as taxpayers, it costs them money, obviously.

And, oftentimes, those who do take those -- have to take those remedial courses will have more difficulty, actually, getting that end credential.

We know that jobs are more specialized and technical today than ever before.

We're seeing now, 3.9, up from 3.1 million, jobs going unfilled right now in this still difficult economic time.

And 90 percent of the fastest-growing professions will require some post-secondary-education training, and by 2020, 120 million high-skilled, high-wage jobs we'll have

1 in this country.

And by all indications, we will fall short of the skilled and educated workers to fill those jobs.

We can't afford to only focus on the elite.

What is great about the Common Core, and I'll talk a little bit about this, is that it's high rigorous standards for all students.

We can't afford to focus on the elite, and we can't afford to wait until high school for that high-stakes exam to say that you're ready, or you're not.

That we can't -- 70 percent of

African-American males in Buffalo who are dropping
out of high school and not graduating, that's too
late for them.

We have to start early.

It's clear that the current system, based on all of those sort of alarming statistics I just talked about, is not preparing students to succeed in college or the modern workforce.

And from our perspective, we really feel like the Common Core state standards are a key -- key component to sort of addressing that challenge.

And so I'll talk about three things, very briefly, that are key to Common Core, and why the

business community supports it.

Number one, as I said, elevated set of standards rigorous for all students.

Second, nationwide clarity and consistency.

Shockingly, I mean, as mobile as our economy is, as mobile as our businesses are, as our families are, standards vary across the state.

Some are very low, some are very high, some in the middle.

And then, third, internationally benchmarked.

These standards will rise to a level that will be comparable with our competitors overseas, most of whom are outperforming our students today.

What is critical, though, to Common Core,

I think, as important as these high standards, is
without rigorous, quality assessments aligned to
those standards, they're really meaningless.

How do you know where your deficiencies are if you don't measure outcomes?

And I think that's what's important to think about.

I know, as you're considering sort of the consortia PARCC, the consortia assessment that's being developed, I would encourage you to spend some time looking at that.

I think what they really are trying to do, is 1 2 make that very quality, quality assessment that 3 anyone -- I've heard a teacher say, "I would be proud to teach to that assessment." 4 5 It's not just fill in a bunch of bubbles. It is very, very, a quality piece. 6 7 And what is unique about it, is that you do 8 have a number of states coming together, and experts 9 from across all of those states that are 10 participating, that are helping to develop the 11 assessment. It's not just, Oh, here's the testing 12 13 company. 14 Go develop an assessment on [unintelligible] 15 standards. These are professionals that are spending 16 every day, going back to the testing company saying: 17 Is this aligned to the standard? 18 Is this rigorous? 19 Does this really meet the --20 21 And so I think that's what is unique about 22 that. 23 Just briefly, as some of these things have 24 been said already today, or raised with you today, 25 some of the myths I think about Common Core:

One, that it's centralized authority over our 1 2 schools. That it's somehow a federal --3 federally-driven prospect. 4 5 And that's just not the case. Governors, state chiefs, came together to 6 7 developed this. 8 The federal government really doesn't have 9 anything to do with it, although I would say, I can 10 see where people would make that connection. 11 And the more that, you know, folks in Washington talk about it, in terms of the secretary 12 13 or the President, it's actually not helpful. 14 It is a state-driven process. 15 States are not required to participate. And, so, I think that's key. 16 17 Secondly, that it dumbs-down existing 18 standards. 19 Someone here mentioned that you all ought to scrap the Common Core and look to Massachusetts 20 21 because they're number one in the country. 22 Well, Massachusetts went through a very 23 rigorous process to decide whether to adopt 24 Common Core, because they did have really high 25 standards.

And we've studied this, and the business community was actually key to coming forth and saying, We're not gonna -- we're not gonna just to go Common Core.

We know we're really good, we know we've got high standards.

We're going to study this.

We're gonna ask an independent evaluation to come and look at it.

And what they found was, it's pretty much a toss-up.

You could go with your current assessments -your current standards or you could go with
Common Core.

But the business community ultimately decided to throw their weight behind Common Core

Massachusetts because there was a few things that they -- that Common Core stressed that the current

Massachusetts standards did not, and that was critical-thinking, reading complex text, and persuasive writing; all of the things that the business community said, Those are important to us.

And then I guess -- what's the third thing?
Oh, the data piece.

So, sort of, the big government snooping on

our children and collecting data, it's just not true.

There's nothing about Common Core that requires some sort of additional data.

There's actually a federal prohibition on identify -- uh, collecting -- uh, identifiable -- student-identifiable data.

And so I think, you know, if there's issues about data that you all are considering, I think it's important to make sure that they are -- that it's very clear that one is not connected to the other.

And in conclusion, I think I'll just say that, you know, for years and years and years we've been telling our students and our parents and everyone, "You're on track."

You're on track, you're doing fine.

And it's clearly not the case.

I mean, you can look at the NAEP scores and how students do on the national report card, versus how they do on state assessments, and the gap is huge.

The remedial data points that I mentioned earlier, those that are having to go on and take remedial courses before they're prepared, we're

```
just -- I think Common Core injects a level of
1
 2
        honesty into all of this.
               And so I would -- I know that you all are
 3
        struggling, obviously, with a lot of this, and want
 4
 5
        to do the right thing.
 6
               I would just urge you to sort of stay the
7
        course on this.
8
               And, I would be happy to answer any
9
        questions.
10
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: I just have one question
11
        on -- in the beginning of your testimony, you cite
        some facts.
12
13
               CHERYL OLDHAM: Yep.
14
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: 14th in literacy,
15
        17th in science, 25 in math.
16
               Would you just forward to us the sourcing on
17
        that?
18
               CHERYL OLDHAM: OECD.
19
               I'll be happy to.
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: And [unintelligible]
20
21
        something else, quickly.
22
               Your members, you, obviously, it's the
23
       U.S. Chamber.
24
               CHERYL OLDHAM: Uh-huh.
25
               SENATOR FLANAGAN: General assessment, how
```

are they viewing New York? 1 2 Are we considered a leader? 3 Are we considered a laggard? Are we, you know, just going through the 4 5 process? 6 What would you say is the general assessment? 7 CHERYL OLDHAM: I think you're probably --8 I think you all have a reputation of being pretty 9 good, and I think that was -- I think that's 10 evidenced by sort of research and analysis of your 11 standards before you adopted the Common Core, which were, you know, I think on math, like, right in the 12 13 middle, and, reading, a little bit higher, or maybe 14 it was reversed. 15 I can't -- I have it here somewhere. But I think, when you -- I mean, I just 16 17 think, generally, across the board, we're not 18 meeting the grade in terms of what employers need. 19 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay. 20 Thank you very much. 21 Appreciate it. 22 CHERYL OLDHAM: Thanks. 23 Next, the Niagara Region PTA, 24 Dr. John McKenna. 25 DR. JOHN McKENNA: Thank you very much for

having me here today and representing the 1 2 Niagara Region PTA. On behalf of the 33 school districts that the 3 Niagara Region represents, I thank you. 4 Today what I'll do is, I'll just share a 5 6 little introduction, and then what I'll do is, what 7 we had the opportunity to do this year was, we wrote 8 three statements of concern, as a region, and we 9 presented these this past year. And we feel that it's more relevant now than 10 11 ever that you hear the message from our region again regarding the high-stakes testing. 12 13 So, again, at the opening: 14 My name is John McKenna. 15 I've been an elementary principal in the 16 Tonawanda City School District for the past 17 19 years. 18 During that time, I've had the privilege of 19 being actively involved in Niagara Region PTA. First and foremost, I'm a parent of three 20 21 boys. 22 In addition, I have served in the Region 23 executive board as the educational chairman and as a 24 legislative chairman.

I've also received the honorary lifetime

25

member for over 25 years of service in the PTA, so,

I'm no rookie in the PTA.

We've worked together for many, many, many years.

In my various experiences, I have never witnessed so much parental frustration, confusion, and anger over the current high-stakes-testing policies being implemented across New York State.

Due to the outpouring of parental concerns, the Niagara Region PTA adopted a resolution against high-stakes testing, and developed three statements of concern that we read at the New York State PTA Convention in November of 2012.

Since then, our concerns have only multiplied and our fears have come true, as thousands of students have failed and have been considered ineffective in the last round of testing.

We are thankful now to be given this opportunity to testify and share our statements again, in the hope that someone will listen to the voices of our parents across the region.

These statements were put together by, probably, two or three dozen parents that got together and wrote these.

We are all here today because we care deeply

about our children and want to ensure that they receive the best possible educational experiences.

Based on research and direct evidence from our membership, we, the Niagara Region PTA, believe the State Education Department's high-stakes testing of our students and teachers is harming our students and our schools.

More than two decades of scientific research demonstrates that the current testing regimes yield unreliable measures of student learning and have a negative effect on both students and teachers.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: John, if I may, I'm not sure if you were here all long, but, I would prefer if you would just summarize your testimony.

It's pretty straightforward, and you're a pro at doing this.

So, just hit the high points, because we have -- all this is made part of the written record already.

DR. JOHN McKENNA: Sure, absolutely.

Well, I think the thing that worries us most is what we've seen with our children.

And there have just been so much angst about what we've seen with our students: the stress, the anxiety, tears. Students that don't want to go to

1 school.

And, it's welled up to be quite a crisis.

A lot of parents now even have decided that they want to opt out, which we as -- in public school, we don't believe in that, but, that's how serious it's gotten with some parents.

So something, we really believe, needs to be done, and it has to stop, because students deserve the right to have an education based on their own individual needs.

And what we're seeing right now is, for example, with the new testing, it's at such rigorous high levels that it's causing frustration in students, and they're written in such a way that's going to cause that.

For example, if you're familiar with some of the new modules and work, I'll give a fifth-grade example to you:

Right now, students, for example, in fifth grade are working on an exam, a UDHR.

Are you familiar with what that is?

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Yes, sir.

DR. JOHN McKENNA: "Universal Declaration of Human Rights."

It's written at a 1,650 Lexile level.

I know that probably doesn't mean that much 1 2 to you, but the average fifth-grader --3 SENATOR FLANAGAN: That part I don't know. DR. JOHN McKENNA: Well, I'll try to explain, 4 5 because, hopefully, this will bring this to you. You see, the average fifth-grader reads at 6 7 about an 800 to 900 Lexile level, so that's at a level almost twice as much. 8 9 So that's not rigorous, that's frustrational. 10 And that's why when you see kids becoming 11 upset, not wanting to come to school, it's not because they don't want to come to school or be 12 13 successful; it's because the work is at such 14 frustrational levels that it's very difficult for 15 them. The tests also have been written at very 16 frustrational levels. 17 18 There are distracters built right into the 19 questions, which are designed to have kids multiple -- to give multiple answers. 20 21 There's also field-test questions embedded in 22 these tests as well, which are very confusing. 23 So a lot of times, we have some of our 24 smartest children who have come across these 25 questions, that are not proven, and what happens is,

they get so stuck on these questions that they can't get through the test.

Time runs out.

And some kids that we know, that got 4s before now, got 1s ands 2s, not because they're not smart or intelligent, but because of test design.

And that's caused a lot of serious stress in our students, and with our parents.

Because parents just got the letters home within the -- all the districts across the state over the last, you know, few weeks, and opened up those envelopes, and parents were very shocked when they saw students who, at one time, were getting 3s and 4s, now getting 1s and 2s; and so trying to explain it to parents, like, why, and what happened.

And then when you see part of construct of the test that we're allowed to see, well, we saw pineapples and hares, and things like that, and some of those inappropriate questions, but those are the types of things that are prevalent on these tests.

And another thing that came up in some of the previous testimony is, so now the school officials and folks, we're not allowed to look at these tests, we're not allowed to dissect or do item analysis with these tests, so that we can really see what

exactly what happened and where the breakdown was, so that we can fix it, because, supposedly, I don't know, they're secretive questions.

So, it's hard for us to even prepare in schools, and even help parents prepare, because we're not sure of all the content.

All we're given is the Common Core and the modules, which is, we can see, are at incredibly frustrational levels that's causing this frustration.

It's very simple:

If you look at -- we talked a lot today about learning theory.

If you individualize and differentiate instruction, what you do then, is you meet the child at their needs.

Right?

That's called a "zone of proximal development."

So if you can develop instruction to meet their needs, which we know how to do, given running records, qualitative reading inventories, there's ways that we can assess students at those levels, and then what we can do is, scaffold students to success.

So if we keep going to their instructional levels with smart assessments, we then can scaffold students to all kinds of high levels of achievement.

If we teach and test at seriously high levels of instruction and testing, what it does is, it causes that big gap, where kids feel they can't make it.

That's what perpetuates dropouts.

That's what perpetuates kids feeling not successful.

And, it's those things that cause our parents to have such angst, because kids go home, that's how those -- the kitchen tables turn into places of frustration and anger, because people don't know and understand this work, and why their children are so frustrated with it.

And you saw what happened in Poughkeepsie.

And, it's very disheartening to us in the Niagara region that the other forums have been canceled, because we have a lot of parents that really want to voice concerns, that want to hear themselves -- they need to be heard in this because they have legitimate concerns.

And I hope that you will -- I know we're looking, in some ways, in Niagara region, to

continue to have, even though, if the Commissioner can't come, we're trying to work with state PTA to still offer forums, even if the Commissioner can't come, because we feel there's a real need; that people need to be able to express their concerns, in a democratic fashion, which we feel they're not given that opportunity to do so.

So that's it in a nutshell, some of the concerns that we have.

I guess that summarizes my --

SENATOR FLANAGAN: No, it does.

And, obviously, we have -- we've heard a lot of comments relative to the event, and the scheduled events.

And one of the things that I will reiterate is, that's why we're doing -- that's one of the primary reasons we're doing these hearings.

And we had -- you know, I consider you to be a representative of parents and educators, obviously, in conjunction with the PTA.

DR. JOHN McKENNA: Well, I'd also like to say, too, about special interests, I know the one person from Rochester mentioned, you know, special interests, and that's another thing that parents, teachers, work together, and administrators.

They're not special.

Principals and teachers work with parents, and we have for years.

And the fact that -- I think that when people make claims that there's groups that might be special interests, I think that's misleading and disingenuous, because, see, I've been a PTA -- I'm a principal, but I've been a PTA member for 26 years.

I have not missed one PTA event in 26 years.

And I was at a PTA meeting last night, and will continue to always work cooperatively and collegially with my PTA, as do the teachers I work with.

I'd always say, we were a team, a united front.

And some of the things that are going on out there are very divisive and starting to pit people against each other, which I think we really have to be careful of.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: No questions.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you very much, sir.

DR. JOHN McKENNA: Thank you.

All right, now I think we've got the "A" team coming.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: Now we've got everyone

else. 1 2 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Lady, and gentlemen. 3 A rose between two thorns, perhaps. WILLIAM BOATWRIGHT: Well, good afternoon. 4 On behalf of the Buffalo Council of 5 Supervisors and Administrators, we'd like to welcome 6 7 you to Buffalo. 8 Thank you for taking the time to hear our 9 perspective today. 10 SENATOR FLANAGAN: I just want to make sure, 11 we had several names. I just be want to make sure who is here, please. 12 13 WILLIAM BOATWRIGHT: So I'm 14 William Boatwright, elementary principal. 15 GENELLE MORRIS: I'm Genelle Morris. I'm assistant superintendent of Shared Accountability, 16 and the chief information officer for Buffalo. 17 18 KEVEN EBERLE: I'm Kevin Eberle, a building 19 principal. 20 Actually on the list, represented as 21 secondary principal, as I've just recently acquired, 22 we're the only one in the state that took over a 23 charter school back to the Buffalo schools, a 24 pinnacle closure to, now, PS 115. 25 SENATOR FLANAGAN: And, Mr. Boatwright, do

you work in the Buffalo School District as well?

WILLIAM BOATWRIGHT: Correct.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Okay.

WILLIAM BOATWRIGHT: So given the lateness of the hour, and the fact that there's about ten people left in the room, I don't think there's a danger of what happened in Poughkeepsie happening this afternoon, but I thought what we would try to do is, try to frame the conversation a little bit and pick up a thread of the discussion heard today.

One of the things that you've heard a lot about are a set of unintended consequences as a result of the Regents reform movement.

I wanted to start with an unintended benefit.

What you see right now across the state, and I see it as a unifying concept, whether urban, rural, suburban, that, for the first time in a long time, we're having some very serious and deep conversations about standards, about reform; so that is a very good thing.

But as you know, with any change process, this is an uncomfortable time.

What we're hoping is a result of forums today, is that through all the confusion and ambiguity, that we'll reach a place of clarity.

So, it's important that you gather all the feedback and you listen, and you take it back and, hopefully, put it to good use.

Where I'd like to pick up is also by stating that, as a school leader and teacher who's worked for the past 15 years in urban settings, we're a believer in standards and the importance of assessment.

And, standards and rigor certainly have their place, but nothing -- nothing beats having great teachers and great leaders in schools.

That's definitely the case there.

So one of the places that I want to start in my comments today is talking about capacity, but in order to talk about capacity, I need to go back to a metaphor that Dr. Martzloff referred to earlier, this concept of changing the plane, or refueling the plane, as it's flying in the air, because that's what we're being asked to do right now.

But, I want to extrapolate that metaphor a little bit further.

We're not only being asked to refuel the plane right now, we're being asked to maintain the altitude and also make the plane fly higher.

Let me further complicate that.

The pilots that we currently have flying the planes right now have been trained to be bus drivers their whole career.

So, we have to address the capacity issue at the teacher and school-leader level as well, so this means that it has to be replicated at what's happening at the preservice level and at the professional-development level.

For years, we've been asking teachers to operate like bus drivers.

Now we want them to be pilots, and not just any pilots, but G4 pilots, if you will.

So we have to go back and take a look at what we're doing to train teachers, and understand that, heretofore, they're utilizing skills that they never have had to use before.

We're asking teachers to not only know the standards, but be familiar with them in an intimate and deep way.

We're asking them to be able to identify data sources, and once they've done that, to be able to accurately analyze those data sources to actually make good instructional decisions that align the standards, and to correctly identify the appropriate strategy to remediate student-learning deficiencies.

These are all new skills that we're asking teachers and school leaders to take on in a very constrictive period of time.

So, as much as we're addressing the standards component and the assessment component of the Regents reform, we can't lose sight of what's happening at the capacity level.

Talking about unintended consequences again, this has unintended consequences in terms of how these high-stakes tests are used, because, unfortunately, for teachers that are working hard, they have been the recipient of unintended consequences as a result of how their scores are calculated.

And we've also seen situations where teachers who aren't working hard have been able to benefit, because, already, anytime you have a new system, there's always people that are able to game it somehow.

So these are the things that we need to take a closer look at, knowing that there's an important place that we need to get to as part of this important reform movement, but we need to sort through all of these unintended consequences and make sure that we're addressing all components of

the plane if we want to fly straight and we want to fly high.

Thank you.

GENELLE MORRIS: I'm going address the data and the assessment issue, and I say "issue," because you've already heard lots of information about how we move data along the chain to meet the state reporting requirements.

But one of the things that are very important to understand, is that we have this evaluation system that's been established for teachers and principals, to evaluate their effectiveness, and it's linked directly to their performance on state assessments, as measured by the Regents and the state assessments at 3 through 8; but, also, there are plenty of state assessments that have been created at the local levels.

In 697 districts, that's very difficult to measure the validity and the rigor of each one of those assessments that are then being used for high-stakes decisions.

So one of the things that our organization is asking for is an independent review of the evaluation system, a meta-evaluation, if you will, where we're going to -- you would actually able to

evaluate how well that system is working.

If some people are being evaluated using a reasoned sort of state assessment for 3 through 8, and then some others are being evaluated with a locally-developed assessment, how well are we able to determine a teacher or a principal's effectiveness based on those data that are generated via that system?

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Can I ask you a question on that, though, because you get to the heart of something that is a legitimate and real issue, but one that's quite controversial as well.

You heard a lot of speakers before you talk about the concept of local control, and the loss of local control.

Part of what it sounds like you're advocating, is the State basically coming in and saying, Here's going to be the standard. Whether it's a local assessment or it's a state test, in essence, we're not going to have this whole patchwork. We're going to have maybe two or three.

And, you know what would happen; not only would the principals and the administrators be unhappy, but the teachers would be very unhappy, because that would take away their ability to

negotiate these things locally.

So are you advocating a broad statewide approach with no local input?

GENELLE MORRIS: No, actually, I'm not. I'm not actually advocating that at all.

What I'm seeing is, is that we've designed a system. The system, it works with a percentage of state assessments that are used to determine a teacher's effectiveness, and a percentage that's based on an observation of a teacher's practice or a principal's practice.

What we're saying is, that an independent evaluation, as to the effectiveness of that actual system, did we design it right?

Is 20/20/60 the right way to measure teacher's effectiveness, using a certain percentage of teacher's scores based on their students' performance on the assessments?

And what you also have to remember are, the state assessments are measuring something entirely different from what would be measured on a locally-developed assessment.

So, you have two different ways of determining student performance.

You have one that's developed locally based

on local educator input, and then you have one that's developed nationally from an independent vendor.

How are we able to compare those methods of evaluation and then come up with a score at the end that says, that this teacher is effective, and this one isn't?

So what we're saying is, an independent evaluation of the actual system itself is probably needed to make sure that we're doing this properly.

If we're supposed to be evaluating the effectiveness of educators, we need to be able to say that we're doing it right.

If you use a state assessment to come up with an evaluation score, it's just as valid and reliable as a score that's generated based on an assessment that was drawn based on student performance on locally-developed assessments.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: So if you -- which one would you choose?

GENELLE MORRIS: Well, I would want to know -- I'm thinking right now, with the state assessments, you have lots of test data that allows to you see how the tests behave, and how students are taking each assessment, and you're able to see

lots of data to say, this particular test behaves this way when students take them.

With locally-developed assessments, you don't have that type of information.

You have no data that tells you about the performance of a student's behavior on a test.

So when you have those two different types of tests, the types of comparison of rigor, it's not comparable.

I develop a test based on a conversation with my fourth-grade teachers, we're gonna develop a test that we feel best reflects our curriculum; versus, we have another test that's developed by a vendor, they're coming up with a test that's totally different, but their test items have been tested.

So that's the difference.

If I'm going to develop a test item with a group of educators, versus, one that's been actually field-tested, then you have comparability issues.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Thank you.

GENELLE MORRIS: That was that one.

So then, also, you've heard a lot of information about resources in the system, and how we are asked to create multiple pre- and post-tests that will be able to provide the data for this APPR

system.

So, we had to create over 300 pre-imposed tests to make sure that we were able to assess all areas, including career and technical education.

We had varied areas that we needed to make sure that we had pre- and/or post-tests, so that we were able to generate these types of data for the system so that we could accurately give information about a teacher or principal's evaluation score.

So, even though we complied with that, there's questions about the validity.

If you're creating such tests in such volume to meet a mandate, how reliable and how rigorous are those tests?

So once again, an outside evaluation of the system itself, and how it's being used, and the components within it, the research still needs to be collected to develop whether -- I mean, to determine whether this data are actually supporting what we're actually trying to ask the system to do.

And then, lastly, I wanted to speak to the inBloom system.

The inBloom system has been mentioned before as a method that we're collecting data on students around the state.

And, yes, in small districts where there is little transiency and there's little movement, then this may seem to be a burden.

But for a district such as Buffalo where we have a lot of students moving in and out of the district from other districts, it's a method for us to be able to get data from our other districts; whereas, before, we had to wait, hopefully, we got a transcript from another district.

So this allows our educators to get that information quickly, when it's up and running, and we're actually looking at it as a benefit; that it will allow us to get that type of information that we're looking for.

So, that's my humble opinion from the assessment side of the room.

KEVEN EBERLE: I'll be brief. It's been a long day for all of us.

So I appreciate, we all appreciate, you being here, Senators, and I just wanted to give a little background of myself.

I'm probably one of the veteran administrators in the room.

I'm 20 years as a building principal in 5 school districts, from Ellicottville, all the way

to the city of Buffalo. 1 So, Mr. Grisanti, if he was here, out in 2 3 Hamburg, and all the things, and part of his district. 4 5 And you guys, I've seen. 6 Actually, I actually had you speak at our 7 Lakeshore Breakfast of Champions when you were sheriff, Senator. 8 So, I've been around, and I've seen a lot. 9 10 And you alluded to something, Senator Flanagan, earlier, what was working back 11 when? 12 13 And I go back to from the frameworks first started in 1989-1990, turning into the 14 15 New York State Standards, and we had teachers sitting down in Cattaraugus-Allegany BOCES, sitting 16 17 there saying, Okay, this will be fully implemented 18 by 2005, then, 2012, or something. 19 Then one guy sitting next to him saying, My God, and not only will I be retired, but I'll 20 21 probably be dead by then. 22 From 1990 to -- and here we are, 20 years 23 later, going into --24 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Yeah, but we're still 25 here.

It's amazing. 1 KEVEN EBERLE: 2 SENATOR FLANAGAN: The good part is, we're 3 still here. KEVEN EBERLE: 4 Yeah. 5 So, basically where we are in the city of 6 Buffalo, a lot of things I'm going to allude, what 7 William was talking about, about building capacity. 8 And where we really are, especially in the Big Five, is that we have populations in the 9 10 Big Five, and I'm not an excuse person. 11 I was, as Naomi Cerre, the principal of at Lafayette, was talking, I was actually with her when 12 13 Grover Cleveland was the International High School. 14 Our population here in Buffalo has grown, 15 literally, leaps and bounds in the ELL population. 16 We have over 4500 ELL students 17 (English-language learners) in the city of Buffalo 18 right now. 19 That's doubled in the last six years alone. We're one of the highest relocation cities probably in 20 21 the country because we have four relocation centers. 22 A lot of people ask that, why so many 23 immigrants come to Buffalo? 24 It's because of the capacity we have here for 25 International Institute and Journey's End, Catholic

charities.

We have many.

Many states only have one; we have many.

So the growth of that is huge, but we really haven't gotten an answer from State Ed, or anyone, to say, How do we actually account for these students?

And they've been built right into the four-year cohort with everyone else.

I'm a product of one of the principals.

Being a 20-year principal, of being under of the federal regulation, No Child Left Behind, of actually being moved because of the actual non-movement of an international school.

You're in a catch-22 of actually having
30 percent of your population that can't speak
English, and they're absolutely not going to pass
the five Regents exams and all the assessments
necessary to graduates in a four-year cohort, even
with a fifth year for the ninth-graders.

Impossible; it's just not there.

What we have to do, as Naomi was speaking of earlier, build more capacity, and more knowledge, where we get in front of the legislative group to sit there and talk about this dilemma in New York.

New York City's been fighting this for 1 2 20 years. 3 We are one, you know, of the Big Five that it's been a difficult piece to that. 4 5 So what we're really asking is to say, where -- and, again, it comes back to funding. 6 7 I'm not talking about funding; I'm saying 8 more money. 9 How do we really look at sustainability of 10 the funding we have and the money that we're using right now? 11 Right now, we're built, and the Big Five are 12 13 built off, a good portion of it is grant money. 14 Many people alluded to it earlier, about 15 using grant money to have the SIG grants continue. 16 That should be part of the General Fund. I mean, that should be, actually, something that's 17 18 going on all the time. 19 We should have teacher aides, we should have assistant principals, we should have all of those 20 21 forces to continue. 22 Terry Schuda has changed 23 South Park High School around, from 40 percent 24 graduation rate, over 62 percent graduation rate. 25 Now, that sounds low, 62 percent, but when

you've been under 50 percent all those years, that 1 2 was huge over 4 years. 3 Well, now that the SIG grant's gone, where is the sustainability of that? 4 5 We have to figure a way to look at sustainability, and I think it's through 6 7 transparency, and actually building that local 8 capacity with who we have. 9 We have brilliant administrators and teachers in this district. 10 11 It's just because of the scores and the federal regulation trickling down to the state, 12 13 saying, Wow, we have some ineffective administrators 14 and teachers in this district. -- because of 15 assessments, and the outcomes of these assessments. SENATOR FLANAGAN: Let me ask you, though, 16 17 you just used the word "transparency." 18 KEVEN EBERLE: I'm sorry? "Transparency"? 19 SENATOR FLANAGAN: How do you -- I mean, conceptually, it's easy to figure out, but what does 20 21 that mean in practical terms? 22 Because I'll just tell you, as someone who 23 I'd like to think pays attention, "transparent"; 24 okay, I want to have access to information, and

I want to make sure that whatever's going on in the

25

district, as a parent or as a taxpayer, that I can 1 2 find that out. 3 I'm not sure your point. KEVEN EBERLE: You're in the world of 4 5 non-transparency between Democrats and Republicans. 6 I mean, we're in the world of 7 non-transparency. 8 We don't talk to each other in any way, 9 shape, or form. 10 There's very few people that really 11 understand what's going on in the Big Five in New York State. 12 13 You can go to Pennsylvania right now, there's 14 one assessment that has to be given, and it's not 15 about graduation rates; it's about school 16 performance. 17 Now, they're catching up with the 18 Common Core, but it's still only one assessment for 19 them to graduate. Those students can still to go 20 21 Penn State Baron, Altoona, Penn State. They can go 22 to Pittsburgh. 23 They're all citizens, they're kids from 24 Pennsylvania. 25 New York State, you have an African-American

male that, basically, has a 25 to 30 percent chance in Buffalo to graduate.

They say, Well, why is that?

Well, a lot of them are 16 years old starting in ninth grade.

We're taking chunks of time, and as William was alluding to, trying to build a plane as we're flying it, instead of starting from a starting point.

And each year, we're going along with these assessments and saying, Look, it, you have four years to turn this school around, you have three years to turn this school around, in a four-year cohort, when you have a percentages of your students that are already 16 years old.

I've lived that for ten years in the city.

I've seen it out there with the

Native Americans in Lakeshore. They're coming off
the reservation, brilliant kids, but they're 16
years old.

Building transparency is being honest with it and saying, Hey, who are we? where are we? -- and let's really start talking, get in front of the whole legislative body.

We don't have that.

We'll have things on corruption. 1 2 We'll have things about, you know, really 3 talking about the things that are out there. There are lobbying -- there's lobbyists out 4 5 there right now dealing with Pearson right now, and they're, basically, making billions of dollars on 6 7 textbooks. 8 We can't even go that way and talk about money, when you talk about what curriculum is, 9 10 because, now, what is everybody doing? 11 They're getting to the bandwagon, talking about, Let's write books that say "Common Core" on 12 13 it. There's another billion dollars. When you really want to be transparent, let's 14 15 talk about the stuff that's really out there. 16 She's our data person; she's our girl for data. 17 18 We have all the data there. We know what it 19 is. 20 We don't need testing three-quarters of the 21 year to talk about a kid being at a reading level 22 three grades below. 23 We need to them get in the classroom, get the 24 right instruction going, and we're spending too much

25

time on the testing.

I'm not saying that we shouldn't have the
Common Core, we shouldn't have testing.

But not the amount that it's -- where we're at right now.

And that's not being transparent.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: So within reason, and

I would pose this question to each of you, if you

could direct State Ed, say, I've got one shot, we're

each going to get one bite at the apple here --

William, I'll start with you.

-- what would you say, "Here's what I would like to see changed"?

WILLIAM BOATWRIGHT: I really think it's about the practitioner.

I think we have to ensure that every teacher that's coming out of college with a teaching degree goes in with the understanding that their role, as an educator, is completely different. There's a completely different set of skills, a different knowledge base, that's required.

Regardless of testing, regardless of standards, we have to have a teaching core that is at the level of the twenty-first-century standards and skills that we want to introduce and produce in our students so that they can compete again

1 internationally.

So, to me, that's the key leverage point.

GENELLE MORRIS: For me, I would be in support of a phased-in Common Core initiative.

So, I think Colorado did it best, where they phase it in over a five-year period.

So as a parent, I have a student who's now, she just entered in fifth grade, I received her parent report just like every other parent across the state.

If I had seen that this is how she performed on the Common Core assessment, but when we transition, here's where she will be, then that prepares me as a parent.

I see, year one, here's where she is, and then next year I can have a conversation with her teacher, How can we best prepare her?

And then as we work together, year two, we can see, okay, now, this is the type of progress, so that when it finally gets fully implemented, as a parent, it's not a shell-shock for me, it's not a shell-shock for students.

And, also, when you look at the systems, the systems are buckling under the capacity that we're

asking them to assume. 1 2 So, we're creating 300 tests because we're 3 told to do that. Are they good tests? We don't know. 4 5 Are they reliable tests? Who knows? And, yet, we're using them to make 6 7 high-stakes decisions. 8 So if I were in charge of the world and 9 everything in it, I would just say I would want to 10 phase this in so that we can do it, and do it right. 11 Why do it if we're not going to do it right? KEVEN EBERLE: There's 697 school districts 12 13 in the state of New York, and one governing body 14 controls them all, and I'm an advocate of small 15 learning communities. 16 My dissertation was on small learning communities. 17 18 We need to make it smaller, and we need to 19 bring it back to local capacity. 20 Right now you have basic exams and tests that 21 are out there in sort of cyberspace that no one 22 knows about, and they can't really -- and, again, we

People don't know what "rigor" is.

heard it earlier: Don't teach to the test; teach

23

24

25

rigor.

But if you bring it back to the local, like it was back in the '70s, '80, '90s, I mean, there's a whole bunch of doctors and lawyers and senators, State Senators sitting here, that were educated back in the '70s, that did not have the assessments that we have today.

And I just want to make it clear, that there's a lot of stuff that did go well, and right now it's going to the extreme.

And I think local capacity was where it was, and it was local control.

Right now, with the state control of one system, brings a lot of lobbyists and a lot of control to book companies into the picture.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Questions?

Thank you very much.

Really do appreciate your patience.

And we are coming up to our last group, and our sheet has on there, David Hursh, who's a professor from the University of Rochester, but we're going to have him joined by Mr. Radford.

Mr. Radford, I know there's a proper title for the council you're involved in, and I am going to have you say it so I don't mess it up.

SAMUEL RADFORD: Okay.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: But we're going to let 1 2 Professor Hursh go first; all right? 3 So what's the name of the -- it's the Parent...? 4 5 DAVID HURSH: District Parent Coordinating 6 Council. 7 SENATOR FLANAGAN: "Coordinating Council"? 8 SAMUEL RADFORD: Yeah, DPCC. 9 Yeah, District Parent Coordinating Council. DAVID HURSH: Hi. 10 So, first of all, we are the last group, so 11 I want to thank everyone who's still here, for being 12 13 here, and especially the two folks who are giving me 14 a ride back to Rochester. 15 And I want to thank you for holding these hearings, because I think it's really important that 16 we return education to the state and local level. 17 18 One of my concerns is that the federal 19 government, and also wealthy foundations, particularly, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 20 21 are the foundations that are funding the 22 Common Core, and other organizations that are 23 supporting it, and that we really need to look into 24 how -- what kind of education we want, and have the 25 discussion about what we want schools to do, and not

leave it up to those people who are wealthy determining what we should be doing.

I will try to be very brief.

So, I've been in education for over 40 years.

I've been studying, as a professor of education, the consequences of standardized testing in New York for -- as I said, for 25 years.

And in my testimony that I sent you, which I'm not going to go into in any depth, but I just want to give a hint of it for the rest of the people that are here, is the one thing that I was trying to persuade you about, is that we cannot believe -- or the standardized test scores that we receive are not objective, and they are not valid.

They have -- in fact, when I have talked to the State Education Department and tried to get results from them, they say they run no tests of validity on their exams.

So I wanted to call into question the exams themselves and the test scores, and that we should not be driven by those test-score results.

I gave some examples of how the test scores are manipulated.

And at the secondary level, we've seen the Physics and Living Environments exams, the scores go

up and down, basically, dependent on the cut score that's been set by the commissioner, so that we have -- in order to pass the Living Environments exam, you only need to get 39 percent of the questions right.

Then the commissioner changed his mind and wanted to have a rigorous exam, and gave a physics exam in which -- in fact, 39 percent of the students who took the physics exam failed.

And then after declaring that, and this was Commissioner Mills, he said that that was objective, and he stood by it.

Eventually then pressured, actually by state superintendents, to rescale the score so that more students would pass.

And so we've seen that.

We've also seen that the scores on the elementary tests have gone up.

I've talked to superintendents who tell me that, in fact, they know that the scores are going up unrealistically, and that they really don't represent what's going on in schools.

And just to -- at least one thing I agree with Chancellor Tisch about, is that, last year, she said, in fact, the test scores were ridiculously

inflated and not believable, and she rescaled the scores and they came down to about two-thirds of where they were.

So test scores are something that we should not be setting policy by, we need to question those.

So now we have the Common Core exam, and we find out that 31 percent of our students are proficient, and one of the questions I want to ask is, What does that mean?

On one hand, I know that students often weren't getting -- the teachers weren't getting the curriculum that they're gonna be tested on, the teachers didn't have time to implement the curriculum that they're gonna be tested on, and the teachers didn't know what the tests would be covering.

So maybe 31 percent is pretty good, or, maybe it's not. We really have no way of knowing.

Commissioner King decided that -- or declared that, in fact, 31 percent was a good thing, and that this would provide us, and I'm quoting, a baseline.

And one of the questions I want to have is, In what way is it a good thing?

And, we've had 20 years of standardized tests.

We've always had standardized tests, but high-stakes tests in New York.

And I want to question that we've had, in fact, a Reform Agenda based on standardized testing, and if, after 20 years of standardized testing, it really is the case that only 31 percent of our students are proficient, then maybe that reform movement is not really working.

Secondly, I know that Commissioner King and Merryl Tisch said that they guaranteed test scores would improve next year, and not to worry.

And the concern that I have is, well, we know that they can manipulate the test scores -- the cut scores, and, in fact, I would give you 100 to 1 odds that, in fact, their test scores will be going up next year, because they're gonna make sure they do go up and they look good.

And we've seen this, historically, that test scores have gone up and down, often to make commissioners and others look good.

Let me cut to the last half of this:

I'm concerned about, then, how tests drive curriculum.

I've worked in schools doing many interesting things over the years.

I had a grant from the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, where I was working with students in a school district on issues of environmental health: air and water pollution.

Students were doing research on herbicides and pesticides.

They also decided to do research on pet waste, which was, at first, a research topic that I originally pooh-poohed. I didn't think pet waste was really that important, but, in fact, it was.

And students were doing -- creating websites, doing research, finding alternatives.

And then, when I came back the next year to do that with students, this was about the third or fourth year, told that I -- that this was before we had as many tests as we do now, that the school could no longer support having anybody else come in because they have to prepare students for English-language arts exam, and then a math exam, and then social studies.

Lastly, I've been in this business for 40 years.

I've never been as pessimistic as I am now, because the tests are really driving out of schools really excellent teachers.

The best teachers that I know of have been leaving schools in droves.

And student teachers, while we know -- I did research about, "What was the enrollment in the teacher education programs in the Rochester area?" and it's down about 50 percent from 3 years ago, because people are no longer seeing teaching as a profession that they should enter, and when they go in and they do student teaching, and they go into the schools, the cooperating teachers tell them:

Don't come here. Change your mind, go do something else as a profession. Don't become a teacher, because it's not something that you'll be respected for, and it's not something where you'll be able to use your mind and intelligence.

So people are not entering, and people are leaving it, and we're losing the best minds of a generation.

Lastly, my recommendations would be:

That we try figure out, and I agree with much of what's been said in the previous presentation, we need to develop schools, not based on test scores, but on trust.

We trust teachers and we work with teachers to make sure that they're good. We work with

schools to ensure that they're good.

We should follow -- and this would take a long time to get to -- I would recommend the book "Finnish Lessons," which talks about the education program in the nation of Finland.

It took them 20 years to do this -- and I'm planning to be here for 20 years to help you do this -- but what they've done is, they do not have -- they have one standardized test: the SAT.

They have a standardized test that's similar to our NAEP exam, which they give to a cross-section of students, just to get a sense of how the country's doing.

And, they have no other standardized tests throughout the history of the students' career in education.

And what they focused on, is having teachers develop curriculum, develop pedagogy, develop reports, and really just learn what's going on, and support teachers to do their best.

The last one is, Dan -- I know Dan Drmacich was here earlier.

He was the principal at School Without Walls in New York City, part of the Performance Consortium of Schools, and they, for years, only gave one test,

and had 90 percent of their students going on to 1 2 college, where 50 percent of the students in the 3 districts in which they're located, most of them are New York City, only graduated from high school. 4 So we have examples of schools that don't use 5 a lot of -- that don't use, in fact, any 6 7 standardized testing, and have been very successful. 8 So thank you for your time, and I hope you 9 still have energy to ask a question or two. 10 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Mr. Radford. SAMUEL RADFORD: Sam Radford, president, 11 District Parent Coordinating Council. 12 First of all, Senator Flanagan, and Senators, 13 thank you very much for this opportunity. 14 15 I've been here all day, and with the exception of Carrie Remis, I don't know that anybody 16 17 has represented the parents that I represent. 18 I'm the president for the District Parent Coordinating Council. 19 We have representatives from all 60 schools 20 21 in Buffalo public schools, most of which are failing 22 schools. 45 of them are failing schools.

And I've heard a lot of people's vested interests talked about here, but I didn't hear it from the urban schools' context that affect the

23

24

25

parents that I represent.

I'm also a parent. I have three children in Buffalo public schools.

And, you know, there -- right now, I think is the greatest time in the history of Buffalo public schools to be a parent in Buffalo public schools.

I've been a parent in Buffalo public schools for 20 years, and right now is the best time in the history of it, and there's two reasons why it's the best time.

The first reason why is, because of the Say Yes to Education opportunity.

Right now, every child that graduates from a Buffalo public or charter school has a guaranteed college education paid for.

That's an opportunity that we have to seize the moment on and take advantage of, because that opportunity is not one that we've had, and it can -- and it's a game-changer, it can make the difference for all of our children.

The second reason why it's the best time for education, for children and for parents in Buffalo public schools, is the Regents Reform Agenda; and the reason why the Regents Reform Agenda is so important to urban school districts is because it

challenges the status quo.

Almost -- a lot of this testimony here we heard today, basically, all it's talking about is how we maintain the status quo.

And the reality, as far as I'm concerned, everybody's right.

Everybody's subjectively right. They're right from their perspective.

Right?

But the reality is, people who have a -- who have an education system that's working for them now, they're not interested in all this change.

They're saying, Slow down, slow down. You know, don't do so much. You know, give us more time.

They don't want a lot of change, right, because they don't have to have a sense of urgency.

By and large, most of the teachers and administrators that came down here and presented, their children go to great schools. Their children go to suburban schools where they have 70, 80, 90 percent graduation rates.

That's not what's going on in the urban school districts. We have 30, 40, 50 percent graduation rates, and we need the sense of urgency.

We need what the Regents -- the Board of Regents is doing, we need what the Commissioner is doing.

And, so, we support the Regents Reform Agenda 100 percent.

We're asking that the -- that their goal of graduating all students become what we as a whole state buy into.

Not buy into the fact that some of our children are getting by right now, and let's slow down, let's keep getting them through, but let's all of us all sit back and say, Wait a minute. We have a very good employment system. We provide job security for a lot of people, you know, within this educational system.

But if we are measuring objectively our capacity to educate all children, especially in light of the fact that we spend more money than any other state in the country, objectively, how are we doing?

Objectively, should we be moving slow?
Objectively, what is going on?

Objectively, we need to be doing way better, particularly in urban school districts.

As far as I'm concerned, the Regents Reform

Agenda, where it says, "Graduate all students, and turn around the lowest-achieving schools," all of us have a collective responsibility to support that, to invest in that.

There is a fundamental difference, as far as I'm concerned, to the extent, between suburban and urban school districts.

And to the extent that they want to us slow down in the suburban school districts, we're asking you to double the pace in the urban school district.

People say we're ignoring the research.

What I suggest is, that we're ignoring the results.

I mean, at the end of the day, to talk to me about research, when the reality is, you judge a tree by the fruit that it bears, the fruit that we're bearing is not a good -- we're not getting the best bang for our buck.

So what do you want us to research?

The reality is, let's look at the results.

If you were doing such a great job, we wouldn't even be having this conversation.

You're only vulnerable to people being critical of what you're doing because you're not doing such a good job.

So the question is: Stop defending a bad 1 2 job. 3 So why don't we all come together and say, Listen, we can all do better. 4 5 I'm not saying that somebody's at fault. I'm saying, collectively, we can do better, 6 7 we should do better, and we should not make excuses 8 for the fact that we have not done better. 9 So what ultimately we're supporting at the 10 end of the day -- well, let me just make this point: 11 Earlier it was said that poverty is the issue. 12 13 And I just want to make that clear: I don't 14 see that poverty is the issue at all. 15 People who try to justify our failure, based on poverty, I think is an insult. 16 17 I was a detention-center director. 18 We had a teacher that came in there, her name 19 was Mrs. Holmes [ph.]. And I don't want to take up a lot of time 20 21 with this point, but, Mrs. Holmes came into the 22 detention center after three teachers had been run 23 out of this place. 24 Right? 25 Mrs. Holmes came in, for two days she didn't

1 teach at all.

For two days, she sat down and she asked these children --

Now, you understand, that this is a detention center, so these are the children that are challenged, they're in trouble, behavioral issues...all the stuff that we talking about.

Mrs. Holmes sat there for two days and she just listened to kids.

She said, "What do you like to do?"

"What do you like to do?"

One liked cooking.

One liked to do race cars.

One liked sports.

And she went through the process of finding out what they liked to do.

And after two days, she came in with an individualized education plan for each one of those students, and she -- basically, she found -- she got one reading the comic books, she got one reading the sports page, she got one reading cookbooks.

And what I'm telling you is that, before that, I would go -- I would get called on a regular basis over to the school.

Then the third day, when Mrs. Holmes was

there, we had kids sitting down, quiet, waiting to 1 go school. 2 3 I said, "What's going on here?" They said, "We got to do our report for 4 5 Mrs. Holmes." 6 They were excited about learning again. 7 They would come back from the detention 8 program and they would be doing homework. 9 I'm like, "What happened to those children?" What happened was, somebody knew what they 10 11 was doing. She cared. 12 13 She didn't make no excuses about their 14 behavior, about their race, about their poverty; she 15 didn't make none of them. 16 She found out -- she said, If the child can 17 learn anything; they can learn to play the game, 18 they can learn to read the comic books, they can 19 learn to play the sports, they can learn anything. And she committed to teaching those children. 20 21 So what I'm saying is, that I'm tired of 22 hearing all excuses. 23 If the teachers that don't want to do it, 24 don't want do it, let them not do it. 25 Let the ones who are passionate about

teaching, who ain't making excuses about people's poverty, who ain't making excuses about where people come from; who are saying, "We can do it," let them teach.

If you let us all get to it, we'll get a better out.

And let me just make this the closing statement: That there is -- there was a conversation earlier, talked about the rule of law.

You know, and I thought that was a very interesting conversation, especially in light of the fact that we, as the parents of the Buffalo public schools right now are facing the fact that we had 2,219 parents.

And, now, you know, the demographic of our parent, we talk about, 70 percent of our parents are single parents. We're talking about 50 percent of them don't have transportation. We talk about the vast majority of our parents have an hourly job.

2,219, over -- almost 10 percent of the eligible parents had the option to transfer their children out of failing schools into schools in good-standing, based on the law.

The local school district told us, when we went and asked them to be comply -- to be compliant

with the law, you know what they said? 1 2 They said, "No, we won't comply with the 3 law." If it had not been for the State Education 4 5 Department coming in and ruling that, No, you can't violate the law. You are out of compliance with the 6 7 law. You, by law, must move all 2,219 of those 8 children. 9 After State Education Department came in and 10 told them me must move them, you know what they 11 said? They said, "We can't move them." 12 13 It went from "we won't move them" to 14 "we can't move them." 15 So now, here we are -- and that ruling came out on May 29th. 16 17 We, in October -- mid-October, all -- 200 of 18 the 2,219 parents have been moved. 19 So when you got over 2,000 families who have made a decision that they want better for their 20 21 children, who have been denied the right to move 22 their children, against the law. 23 We have a law that says you're supposed to 24 have 120 hours of physical education in this 25 district.

We get 80 to 90 -- I mean, 120 minutes of 1 physical education. 2 3 We get 80 to 90. So laws are being broken as it relates to 4 5 parents, all day, every day. 6 The 100.11 say, you're supposed to have school-based planning, shared decision-making. 7 8 Parents are supposed to be at the table, part of the 9 decision-making. We had to go to the State Education 10 11 Department to force the local school district to give us the right to be at the table to be part of 12 13 decision-making. 14 And they had to send them back three times to 15 have them consult with us. 16 So this stuff about some kind of way the rule 17 of law should be governing what we do is, as far as 18 I'm concerned, disingenuous by the people who's 19 sharing it, because that's not -- it's not happening for the people among us who need it the most. 20 21 In summary, I'm asking you to -- we support 22 charters; 23 We support APPR; 24 We support the Common Core; 25 We support John King;

We support the Regents Reform Agenda. 1 2 We're asking to add to this conversation, 3 vouchers. We -- at the end of the day, if you ask for 4 5 one thing that will make the difference, put the power in the hands of the parent to make the choice. 6 7 Don't impose, don't require us. 8 We literally have, right now what's going on, the BTF is looking to repeal the law that gives us 9 10 the right to move our kids out of failing schools. Don't worry about repealing the law. 11 Just give us the right to send our children 12 13 where we want to send our children. Put the money in our hands and let us send 14 15 the children, wherever. Don't condemn them to be in failing schools, 16 against their will, because that's what's going on 17 18 right now. 19 We are condemning children to being in failing schools, against their will, and listen to 20 21 the people rationalize that. 22 They got a rational justification why we 23 should keep these children in failing schools. 24 So we're asking for the LPO [ph.] reform, 25 we're asking for parent trigger; all these things we

think will go a long way in resolving the problem. 1 2 And the last point is, that money cannot be 3 the issue. Money cannot be the issue. 4 5 The whole idea -- the superintendent of Buffalo public schools sat here today and said, For 6 7 those schools who we gave the additional \$2 million 8 to for a year to three years, that we need to continue to give them the money? 9 10 Do you know what the intention of that money was? 11 The intention of the funds were to say, that, 12 13 Listen, this was already a failing school. 14 What we are trying to do is give you additional money so you can turn the school around, 15 so to see if money is the issue. 16 Three out of the four of them schools didn't 17 hit the AYP, even when we gave them additional 18 19 money. 20 So don't keep giving them more and more 21 money. 22 I don't think giving more money is the 23 solution. 24 At the end of the day, what should have 25 happened, according to the rules, according to the

law, was that we should have shut the school down. 1 2 Give them the money for three years, and then 3 shut the school down if they cannot turn it around. We got to stop making excuses for failure. 4 5 I think we as a state can do better. 6 We as the parents want to be part of a 7 process of doing better. 8 We thank you for giving us this opportunity to put our position on the record, because we don't 9 10 often get this opportunity. So, thank you again. 11 SENATOR FLANAGAN: All righty then. 12 13 SENATOR GALLIVAN: That was a good way to 14 end. 15 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Sam, you certainly did not lack clarity. 16 17 Senator Gallivan. 18 SENATOR GALLIVAN: A couple questions. 19 The first has to do, we heard from a number of different people who testified today, and then, 20 21 of course, the public accounts of it. 22 The language barriers; I mean, we've seen the 23 demographic of Buffalo change, different populations 24 come in. 25 What are your comments or thoughts about the

challenges provided, in the short term, with these language barriers?

SAMUEL RADFORD: Yeah, we actually went to Washington and we looked at models all across the country where people are not making excuses about the language barrier.

Part of the reason why we struggle with the language-barrier issue, is because we're trying to protect the teacher who is not prepared to teach that child with the language -- that has a language barrier.

If we start taking people from those countries and those communities and we make them teachers and teacher's aide, you don't necessarily have to have a certified teacher, who may be certified to teach, and she may be -- he or she may be certified, but they're not necessarily qualified to teach this person with this English-language learner.

So you have to get English-language learners, people who have experience, people who can speak the language, who can get that child through, because that certified teacher who has no relationship to the language is not the best person to be teaching that child.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: Second question, not to --1 and this is not asking for your comment or opinion 2 3 about any one individual, current or former: I have seen different people in Buffalo put 4 5 the idea of mayoral-control forward. We see in it New York, we see in it Yonkers, 6 7 out of the Big Five. 8 While the results are not great, the tests --9 the results of the tests -- I guess -- how do I say 10 it -- they have better scores, better results, in 11 New York and Yonkers than the --SAMUEL RADFORD: Right, I think --12 13 SENATOR GALLIVAN: -- the cities without 14 mayoral control. 15 SAMUEL RADFORD: Yeah, I think the issue raises the governance model. 16 17 Right now, the evidence shows us the 18 governance model that we have don't work. 19 Look at, historically, has Buffalo's 20 graduation rate ever been over 60 percent? 21 We're talking about a state average of 22 80 percent. 23 Tell me, in the history of Buffalo public 24 schools, has it ever been over 60 percent? 25 And the answer is "no."

So the governance model we have don't work. 1 2 So I agree with you, whether it's mayoral 3 control, whether it's some combination of mayoral control/elected school board, I mean, whatever it 4 5 is, the important thing is, we can't do -- we can't continue what we're doing right now. 6 7 As a matter of fact, the very design that we 8 have now, right now, we elect -- I live in the 9 east district. 10 My children go to school in the west district and in the north district. 11 Right? 12 13 So if I have an issue, the person who I elected to office is not the person who I go talk 14 15 to. So we -- so even the system is not aligned 16 with the process by which we elect the people to the 17 18 position. It's based on the old district model. 19 Now we have a school-choice model. 20 Now you can go -- supposedly, you're able to 21 go anywhere in the district for school. 22 So I think the governance model is outdated. 23 I think the evidence shows that it don't 24 work.

And I think that anything that moves us

25

forward is better than doing what we know for sure don't work.

And I think mayoral control should be considered seriously.

SENATOR GALLIVAN: And the other leads into the -- the question is really connected.

The model that you see in the suburban schools, the central school district, where the budget is put forward before the citizens, the citizens vote. It's laid out there for everybody to see.

SAMUEL RADFORD: Yeah, on two levels.

I mean, I think that is a great question, because part of our problem right now in Buffalo, is that we actually -- when we're talking about statewide, actually, Buffalo is a microcosm of that.

Some of our children in Buffalo get a great education.

You know, we have 45 failing schools, we got 12 schools in good-standing.

Some of them get a great education.

I mean, when it's all said and done, if we set up more of a suburban model, which is that, if you live in a suburban community, there's no way you gonna to take my tax dollars and give some of my

children a high-quality education and the rest of them get a crappy education.

There's no way you're gonna do that.

You do that in Buffalo because we don't get to vote on our budget. We don't even get to see our budget as parents, being real frank about it.

So we need the right as a -- and I know -- I -- we've researched this, we know this wall is over 120,000, all that stuff, we get that.

But at the end of the day, we need the right to be able to see the budget and vote on the budget.

I mean, if you've been following the news, you know better than most, that we get this whole appearance that we're saving money, when we're actually spending more money.

And there's no way to vet that, except to believe the people who, you know, are on the school board.

So I think that (a) we should, you know, get the right to vote our school budget, (b) that we should change our school system from this criteria-based system where some kids get a great education, and we have this two-tiered education system, to a school system more like the suburban model where you have advanced placement,

vocational ed, art, music, all that, in every 1 2 building, and every child gets a great education. 3 SENATOR GALLIVAN: Thank you. Thank you, Chairman. 4 5 SENATOR FLANAGAN: Two quick things. Dr. Hursh, I do think that we should have 6 7 more focus on the NAEP test. 8 There is a -- I think one of the challenges 9 with that is, it's hard enough to get people to 10 understand all the other things. But I just, at some point, maybe we can have 11 some more focus on that. 12 13 And, Mr. Radford, we appreciate you showing 14 up. And, in retrospect, I probably would have had 15 a couple of other questions for people who testified 16 earlier had you testified sooner. 17 So --18 DAVID HURSH: Well, the issue with the NAEP 19 test, in fact, is that -- which is a standardized 20 21 test that's given to samples of population across -in states, and across the country, and in cities. 22 23 And, in fact, our NAEP scores have been 24 improving for years leading up to this -- to the

rise of standardized testing.

25

312 And, in fact, they've been going down. 1 2 And New York City has been going down 3 substantially, with the increased emphasis on 4 testing. 5 And I think the one place we might agree, the two of us, is you mentioned an example of a teacher 6 7 who was able to build on what the students were 8 interested in. 9 And one of the things that I'm concerned 10 about is, under the more standardized tests and the 11 standardized curriculum, is, do teachers have the ability to actually respond to students' interests, 12 13 build on those, and build unique curriculum for their districts? 14 15 So I think we need to think about more creative ways that we can do that. 16 17 Thank you. 18 SENATOR FLANAGAN: You know what? I'll just 19 close on a couple of very basic things. First of all, I really want to thank 20 21 Senator Gallivan for joining us for the entire day. 22 And, thank the people in Buffalo for their 23 hospitality.

> And I think I failed to say this earlier today:

24

25

There is nothing -- going back to your example -- there is nothing more effective and more important than having a good-quality teacher in front of the classroom.

As a parallel, and a very close second, there is nothing equally as important than parental involvement, and parental support, and parental leadership, even when things aren't always going so well.

So, those two things alone make a huge difference.

We can come up with money, and that's one of our primary functions.

But, this is going to conclude our third hearing.

We have two more, as you all heard.

We have one in New York City on the 29th of October, and then we have one in Albany on November 13th.

We will be -- just for everyone's edification, we will receive written comments through November 15th.

So, if people want to comment after the last hearing, we want to make sure that those who want to be heard have that opportunity.

And, I hope everyone has an enjoyable --

SAMUEL RADFORD: Can I make one more point,

just about the last thing you said?

I mean, it's real short.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: Go ahead.

SAMUEL RADFORD: Okay, real short.

Because I know Carrie Remis brought it up earlier, and people before said it wasn't really special interests, but we really have no way to have a unfettered parent voice in this conversation, because, obviously, the teachers have a union, the administrators have a union, superintendents, you know, have their own representation, school boards have their representation.

Generally, when we hear from parents, we hear from parent-teacher associations, which means that you can get down what you had down in Poughkeepsie, you can get that, because the teachers can highjack the part of the parent-teacher association.

You don't have a protected parent voice that reflects, especially in it's -- especially important in urban school district, where the vast majority of teachers don't live in the community.

So in a suburban school district where they live, and teachers and parents are the same people;

but, in an urban school district, where the parent's voice may be very different from the teacher's voice, there's no -- there's no process.

We have something close in Buffalo, because our District Parent Coordinating Council does not have teacher votes on it. We -- only parents vote in that.

You know what I'm saying?

But that doesn't necessarily happen at the building level. That's just our district process.

So in the state, thinking about that, if we could come up with a process that protects the parent interests as an independent body, separate from the parent-teacher association, so that we don't get the clouded voice of the teachers mixed in with what may be specific parent interests, because teacher interests, in this particular case, is very different than what parent interests are, as far as I'm concerned.

SENATOR FLANAGAN: I would say this in response, and take this with a measure of affection:

I am fairly confident that whether you live in Buffalo or you live in Huntington where I live, your voice would be heard. You're not shy.

[Laughter.]

SENATOR FLANAGAN: But we also -- look, we 1 2 have a democratic process. We have duly elected 3 school boards. One of our newer colleagues from the school 4 5 board was here today, Jim Sampson; obviously has a breadth of experience. 6 7 And, people don't always to have agree with 8 him, but he was duly elected. 9 Linda Hoffman is still here, and patiently 10 staying all day. And one of the great equalizing factors for 11 us, whether we're doing things well or not, is that, 12 13 every two years, we have to stand for election, and, frankly, every four years, so does the Governor. 14 So that alone should be a good indication of 15 how things could be. 16 17 Certainly, I respect your frustrations, but keep at it, because I'm sure you make a difference 18 19 every day. 20 Gentlemen, thank you very much. 21 (Whereupon, at approximately 4:26 p.m., the public hearing held before the New York State 22 23 Senate Standing Committee on Education concluded,

---000---

24

25

and adjourned.)