

1 GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

2 STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

3

4

5 Transcript of

6 DC State Board of Education

7 Public Meeting

8 441 4th Street NW, Suite 530S

9 Old Council Chambers

10 Washington, DC 20001

11

12 Wednesday, March 15, 2017

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

\* \* \* \* \*

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Good afternoon.  
3 The time is 5:30 p.m. on March 15, 2017. And  
4 thus, the Public Meeting of the District of  
5 Columbia State Board of Education is now  
6 called to order. The roll will now be called  
7 to determine the presence of a panel.  
8 Mr. Hayworth, please call the roll.

9 MR. HAYWORTH: Ms. Williams.

10 CHAIRWOMAN WILLIAMS: Here.

11 MR. HAYWORTH: Mr. Jacobson.

12 MR. JACOBSON: Here.

13 MR. HAYWORTH: Ms. Carter.

14 MS. CARTER: Here.

15 MR. HAYWORTH: Ms. Wilson Phelan.

16 Ms. Wilson Phelan.

17 (No audible response)

18 MR. HAYWORTH: Ms. Wattenberg.

19 MS. WATTENBERG: Present.

20 MR. HAYWORTH: Ms. Woodruff.

21 MS. WOODRUFF: Here.

22 MR. HAYWORTH: Mr. Jones.

1 (No audible response)

2 MR. HAYWORTH: Mr. Weedon.

3 MR. WEEDON: Present.

4 MR. HAYWORTH: Mr. Batchelor.

5 Mr. Batchelor.

6 (No audible response)

7 MR. HAYWORTH: Ms. Hall. Ms. Hall.

8 (No audible response)

9 MR. HAYWORTH: Mr. Dorosin.

10 Mr. Dorosin.

11 (No audible response)

12 MR. HAYWORTH: Madam President, you  
13 have a quorum.

14 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: A quorum has  
15 been determined, and the State Board of  
16 Education will proceed now with the business  
17 portion of the meeting.

18 Members, we have a draft agenda  
19 before us. I would like unanimous consent to  
20 move for the approval of the minutes and to  
21 add it to our March 22nd public meeting. Any  
22 objections?

1 (No audible response)

2 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: No objections.

3 Are there any additional corrections?

4 (No audible response)

5 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: No additions.

6 Seeing no additional changes, I would  
7 entertain a motion to approve the agenda.

8 MR. JACOBSON: So moved.

9 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Is there a  
10 second?

11 BOARD MEMBER: Second.

12 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Now that the  
13 motion has been properly moved and seconded, I  
14 will ask for the yays and nays. All in favor,  
15 say aye.

16 (Chorus of ayes)

17 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: All opposed?

18 (No audible response)

19 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you. The  
20 motion is approved.

21 Members, our colleague in Ward 5,  
22 Mark Jones, has asked to participate in the

1 votes tonight by phone. This requires an  
2 affirmative vote of the board. I would ask  
3 for unanimous consent to allow Mr. Jones's  
4 participation. Is there an objection?

5 (No audible response)

6 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Seeing none, the  
7 motion is approved.

8 Good evening. My name is Karen  
9 Williams, Ward 7 Representative, and President  
10 of the State Board of Education. In behalf of  
11 the members of the District of Columbia State  
12 Board of Education, I want to welcome our  
13 guests and our viewing public to our  
14 Wednesday, March 15th public meeting. The  
15 State Board typically holds its regularly  
16 scheduled meetings on the third Wednesday of  
17 every month in the Old Council Chambers, at  
18 441 4th Street NW.

19 Tonight the State Board will consider  
20 three important resolutions: new physical  
21 education standards, new residency  
22 regulations, and a resolution affirming new --

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 oh, excuse me -- confirming the State Board's  
2 board to the protection of all of our  
3 students. I want to commend Vice President  
4 Jack Jacobson for bringing this resolution  
5 before us. In a few minutes, I will ask him  
6 to speak about the resolution.

7           Tonight the State Board will give  
8 final approval for the new residency  
9 regulations that will ease the burden on  
10 parents, but also streamline the investigatory  
11 and review process. I want to thank  
12 Superintendent Kang -- she's not here right  
13 now -- and her team for their dedication to  
14 finding the right balance in the final  
15 regulations.

16           We will also vote on the approval of  
17 new physical education standards. These new  
18 standards will help students develop motor  
19 skills, knowledge, and behaviors for a  
20 lifetime of healthy of living. Physical  
21 education is vital to a well-rounded  
22 education, and I am glad to see the commitment

1 of Donna Anthony, Assistant Superintendent of  
2 Health and Wellness, and her team to the  
3 health of our students.

4           The State Board will also continue  
5 its work tonight related to the Every Student  
6 Success Act. We will be hearing from the  
7 public, their comments on the revised  
8 statewide Accountability Plan that OSSE issued  
9 yesterday. The superintendent and her team  
10 walked the SBOE through the changes in our  
11 working assessment yesterday. I am pleased to  
12 see that many of the recommendations made by  
13 the public and by the State Board of Education  
14 on the draft plan have been included in the  
15 final draft.

16           The final plan includes greater  
17 weight on growth and measures that I believe  
18 will help focus our goals on every student  
19 rather than just those at the top. The final  
20 plan also includes specifics on how we will be  
21 including metrics related to a well-rounded  
22 education and school climate. The

1 superintendent and her team partnered with the  
2 SBOE to hold meetings across the District last  
3 month. It is clear they listened, and I want  
4 to thank them for doing so.

5 In a few minutes, I will ask the  
6 superintendent to walk through the final plan  
7 so that everyone is clear on what it includes  
8 and what it does not. There's a lot in the  
9 plan you can be proud of. It may not be  
10 perfect, but OSSE has included a method for  
11 continued review and adjustments to ensure we  
12 are getting the information we need.

13 Before we move to our resolutions, I  
14 would like to invite --, like to invite Shana  
15 Young to speak -- to make remarks.

16 MS. YOUNG: Good evening. Thank you.  
17 My name is Shana Young. I'm the Chief of  
18 Staff at OSSE. The superintendent was  
19 speaking in front of counsel at a hearing, and  
20 she's on her way. But we thank you for  
21 allowing us to be here today. I know we have  
22 a full agenda of action and comment, and we

1 thank the State Board for there work on the  
2 policies here for vote tonight, and also for  
3 their collaborative work on ESSA and the  
4 robust conversation that you've helped us  
5 facilitate across the city.

6 As you said, as the president said,  
7 OSSE posted yesterday documented changes to  
8 our state plan, specifically in the areas of  
9 accountability. And we thank you for the  
10 robust conversations in the working session  
11 yesterday, and look forward to the comment  
12 today of the superintendent will speak again  
13 once she arrives. Thank you.

14 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.  
15 Members we have a ceremonial resolution before  
16 us. After a motion to consider the  
17 resolution, I will ask Mr. Hayworth to read it  
18 into the record before opening the floor to  
19 comments. So can I have a motion to consider  
20 the resolution.

21 BOARD MEMBER: So moved.

22 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Second?

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 MS. CARTER: Second.

2 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: All in favor?

3 (Chorus of ayes)

4 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: All opposed?

5 (No audible response)

6 MR. HAYWORTH: Ceremonial Resolution

7 CR17-2. Protecting and Supporting All

8 District Students.

9 Whereas, the protection of citizens  
10 is an essential role of government;

11 Whereas, it is the right of every  
12 student to access a free public pre-  
13 kindergarten through 12th-grade education, and  
14 it is the responsibility of the District of  
15 Columbia Government to ensure that all  
16 students who reside within the District can  
17 safely access a free public K-12 education;

18 Whereas, the Obama Administration  
19 recognized that a school's Title IX obligation  
20 to ensure nondiscrimination on the basis of  
21 sex requires schools to provide transgender  
22 students equal access to educational programs,

1 facilities, and activities, even in  
2 circumstances in which other students,  
3 parents, or community members raise objections  
4 or concerns, and the desire to accommodate  
5 others' discomfort cannot justify a policy  
6 that singles out and disadvantages a  
7 particular class of students; and

8           Whereas, 95% of the District's public  
9 schools, including District of Columbia Public  
10 Schools and our public charter schools, are in  
11 compliance with the Youth Bullying Prevention  
12 Act, which ensures that youth feel safe and  
13 supported in their school environments;

14           Therefore, be it resolved that the DC  
15 State Board of Education reaffirms its  
16 commitment that all students in the District  
17 have welcoming, diverse, and inclusive  
18 schools;

19           Be it further resolved that the DC  
20 State Board of Education applauds District of  
21 Columbia Public Schools, the DC Public Charter  
22 School Board, and our individual charter

1 schools for their support and protection of  
2 all District youth;

3           Be it further resolved, that the DC  
4 State Board of Education recommends that all  
5 public schools and public charter schools  
6 develop plans for protecting their schools,  
7 regardless of their immigration status, from  
8 deportation, harassment, inquiry, or other  
9 investigation from federal authorities seeking  
10 to undermine students' right to a public  
11 education;

12           Be it further resolved, that the DC  
13 State Board of Education recommends that all  
14 public schools and public charter schools and  
15 all District municipal buildings with six or  
16 more restrooms designate at least one as an  
17 "All Gender" restroom.

18           Be it further resolved that the State  
19 Board of Education hereby directs its  
20 Administration and Budget Committee to develop  
21 a nondiscrimination and equity policy for the  
22 State Board to be drafted, reviewed, and

1 adopted, and included in the State Board  
2 Policy Manual as soon as practicable.

3 And Madam President, may I note that  
4 Mr. Jones has joined us by phone.

5 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.  
6 Thank you, Vice President Jacobson for this  
7 resolution. Would you like to comment?

8 MR. JACOBSON: Yes. I have a  
9 comment, and then I have two amendments, I  
10 believe, that will be friendly amendments, I  
11 hope.

12 The change in the Administration has  
13 -- in the presidential Administration has made  
14 folks uncomfortable generally, in my ward, and  
15 folks have reached out to me, simply because  
16 there's uncertainty. And what this resolution  
17 seems to do is to reaffirm certainty within  
18 our jurisdiction over what DC has control  
19 over, which would include protecting all of  
20 our students, particularly our transgender  
21 students and our immigrant students.

22 The government has worked very hard

1 to ensure that all students have access to  
2 facilities and have access to learning that is  
3 uninterrupted and can ensure that a student  
4 can attend student and graduate on time with  
5 the skills they need to be successful adults.

6 All of our schools are either in  
7 compliance or well on their way to compliance  
8 with this, particularly about antibullying,  
9 which I know that the Department of Human --  
10 Suzanne Wells -- Suzanne -- is it Greenfield -  
11 - is in the Department of Human --

12 BOARD MEMBER: Office of Human  
13 Rights.

14 MR. JACOBSON: -- Office of Human  
15 Rights -- has worked very hard to help schools  
16 come into compliance with DC laws and  
17 regulations, and we've made great strides.

18 One piece that I wanted to point out  
19 in particular is DC had a trans survey  
20 recently, and 70 percent of the respondents  
21 reported being harassed, threatened, or denied  
22 access to bathrooms. This resolution

1 encourages schools to ensure that students  
2 have access to the facilities that they need  
3 and require.

4           With that, I would like to suggest  
5 two present amendments. One was suggested by  
6 Dr. Woodruff, which is in the second whereas,  
7 line 10, to simply remove the words "K-12," to  
8 just say that the District can safely access a  
9 free public education, and not limit it to K-  
10 12. Does that -- okay with Ms. Wattenberg?  
11 That will be a friendly amendment.

12           And the second, then, is authored by  
13 Laura Wilson Phelan, from Ward 1, who can't be  
14 here this evening. And I'd like to read that  
15 resolution -- that amendment into the record:

16           Be it further resolved that the DC  
17 State Board of Education recommends that all  
18 public schools and public charter schools  
19 support transgender students by developing and  
20 adopting comprehensive plans that can be tools  
21 for teachers and administrators in identifying  
22 safe and therapeutic spaces and the use of

1 unbiased language. And I would count that as  
2 a friendly amendment with—if Ms Wattenberg  
3 would as well.

4 MS. WATTENBERG: Why me?

5 MR. JACOBSON: I think you wrote the  
6 resolution. (Laughter) So if no objections,  
7 then the two amendments will be incorporated.  
8 And with that, I've finished my comments.

9 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

10 Would any other member like to  
11 comment? Would any other member like to  
12 comment on the resolution?

13 (No audible response)

14 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Members, our  
15 colleague from Ward 1, Laura Wilson Phelan,  
16 would like to join us on the phone. This would  
17 require a vote by the board, I'm going to ask  
18 for unanimous consent to allow Ms. Wilson  
19 Phelan to participate. Is there an objection?

20 (No audible response)

21 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Seeing none, the  
22 motion is approved.

1           Seeing no other discussion, the  
2 question is approval of the ceremonial  
3 resolution on the state -- on the -- of the  
4 State Board in protecting the rights of all  
5 students. All in favor, say aye.

6           (Chorus of ayes)

7           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Any opposed?

8           (No audible response)

9           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: The motion is  
10 approved.

11           All right. Our residency  
12 requirement. The current regulations related  
13 to providing residency for education are  
14 onerous and burdensome for parents and  
15 schools. I am pleased that OSSE has tackled  
16 this issue and developed a balanced revision.  
17 Is there a motion on the approval of the  
18 resolution?

19           BOARD MEMBER: So moved.

20           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Is there a  
21 second?

22           MR. JACOBSON: Second.

1           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS:  It's been  
2 properly moved and seconded.

3           Mr. Hayworth, would you now read the  
4 resolution.

5           MR. HAYWORTH:  State Board of  
6 Education Resolution to Approve the  
7 Promulgation of the Proposed Residency  
8 Rulemaking SR17-5.

9           Whereas, District of Columbia law  
10 requires State Board of Education approval of  
11 rules for residency verification;

12           Whereas, to enroll a student in a  
13 District of Columbia public or public charter  
14 school, a parent, guardian, or other primary  
15 caregiver is required to provide the school  
16 with original documents to prove District  
17 residency, including the Office of the State  
18 Superintendent of Education's Residency  
19 Verification form, supporting documentation as  
20 set forth in DC Code§ 38-309, and other  
21 primary caregiver documentation, if  
22 applicable;

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington:  202-898-1108 / Baltimore:  410-752-3376  
Toll Free:  888-445-3376

1           Whereas, the current regulatory  
2 framework for residency verification was last  
3 updated in 2008 and the education landscape in  
4 the District has changed since then, including  
5 the dramatic expansion of pre-K programs;

6           Whereas, the current regulatory  
7 framework lacks clarity, particularly around  
8 the basic definition of residency and for  
9 custody situations;

10           Whereas, there is an opportunity to  
11 improve residency verification by reducing  
12 burdensome practices while making sure seats  
13 for District schools are first available to  
14 District residents;

15           Whereas, the State Superintendent  
16 issued an Advanced Notice of Proposed  
17 Rulemaking on September 8, 2016, which  
18 intended to reduce burdens, lift barriers, and  
19 improve clarity for both local education  
20 agencies and families in the residency  
21 verification process as well as to ensure a  
22 rigorous process that discourages fraud;

                                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1           Whereas, the State Superintendent  
2 solicited feedback on the Advanced Notice of  
3 Proposed Rulemaking during the public comment  
4 period open from September 8, 2016, through  
5 October 26, 2016, including receiving comments  
6 from the public and local education agencies  
7 during engagement sessions at the Office of  
8 the State Superintendent on September 22,  
9 October 11, and October 18, 2016, and written  
10 feedback from various education stakeholders  
11 across the District;

12           Whereas, the State Superintendent  
13 thoroughly considered and amended the proposed  
14 rule based on the comments received, and  
15 therefore issued an Notice of Proposed  
16 Rulemaking in the DC Register on January 13,  
17 2017, for a 30-day public comment period at 64  
18 DCR 2 that included the following:

19           A two-part test for residency which  
20 includes establishing a physical presence in  
21 the District and submission of valid and  
22 proper documentation;

1           Protections for vulnerable  
2 populations, including students experiencing  
3 homelessness, undocumented students, adult  
4 students, wards of the District, and minor  
5 parents;

6           Residency determinations in various  
7 formal and informal custodial situations;

8           Options of, efficient and streamlined  
9 residency verification for K-12 students that  
10 meets the annual submission.

11           A three-part test for when a  
12 student's residency may be based on another  
13 primary caregiver's residency;

14           Authority for OSSE to monitor the  
15 residency verification process to offer  
16 further protections;

17           Guidelines for the enrollment and  
18 reenrollment of nonresident students

19           Detailed requirements around the  
20 investigation of a nonresident student

21           And two venues to obtain a final  
22 administrative decision on finding of

1 nonresidency;

2           Whereas, the State Superintendent  
3 solicited feedback on the Notice of Proposed  
4 Rulemaking during the public comment period  
5 open from January 13, 2017, through  
6 February 13, 2017, and received comments from  
7 one stakeholder;

8           Whereas, the State Superintendent  
9 adopted the final rules in substantially the  
10 same form as proposed with clarifications and  
11 deletions, taking into account suggestions  
12 received by the one stakeholder's comments;

13           Whereas, the State Superintendent and  
14 representatives of the State Board of  
15 Education, having engaged in an extensive  
16 period of public engagement, including  
17 receiving testimony from the public and from  
18 the Office of the State Superintendent of  
19 Education regarding the proposed and final  
20 residency rules at a public meeting held on  
21 October 26, 2016, as well as at working  
22 sessions held on October 5, November 2, 2016,

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376



1 review and actions by the State Board.

2 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you,  
3 Mr. Hayworth.

4 Is there a discussion resolution?  
5 Mr. Woodruff?

6 MR. WOODRUFF: I would just like to  
7 thank OSSE for the work on this. It's been a  
8 hot-button issue in Ward 6 and elsewhere in  
9 the city for multiple years. I'd also like to  
10 add that our work's not completely done. We  
11 need to work with the Council to update the DC  
12 Code, Section 38-309 to update the documents  
13 that can be utilized for verifying residency.  
14 I think the regs (phonetic) are a good,  
15 positive step forward, but we still have one  
16 more step to do in conjunction with the  
17 Council.

18 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.  
19 Any other comment? Ms. Wattenberg?

20 MS. WATTENBERG: Yeah. So I too want  
21 to thank OSSE for all this and hope that the  
22 tradeoff works, in an effort to ease the

1 burden on parents and assure that spots are  
2 taken by the right people.

3 I want to say that when I ran for  
4 office, my name, as you know, is Ruth  
5 Wattenberg. So all -- my slogan was all Rs,  
6 and my slogan was: Rigorous standards, Rich  
7 curriculum, Right-size testing, Research,  
8 research, research, and Reformed resident  
9 requirements. So I'm very happy to be able to  
10 vote for this today, and I'm hopeful that we  
11 will also deal with the other issues as well  
12 tonight. Thank you.

13 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you,  
14 Ms. Wattenberg.

15 Any other comments?

16 (No audible response)

17 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Seeing none, the  
18 question is approval of a resolution advising  
19 the State Superintendent to promulgate new  
20 residency requirements -- I'm sorry. All in  
21 favor, say aye.

22 (Chorus of ayes)

1 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Any opposed?

2 (No audible response)

3 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: The motion is  
4 approved.

5 Physical education standards. As I  
6 mentioned in my opening remarks, OSSE has  
7 proposed updates to our current physical  
8 education standards. The proposed changes  
9 have come to us after extensive input from  
10 experts and District teachers. Tonight we  
11 have a resolution approving the new standards.  
12 Is there a motion on approval of the  
13 resolution? A motion?

14 MS. WATTENBERG: So moved.

15 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Second?

16 BOARD MEMBER: Second.

17 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

18 The motion has been properly moved.  
19 And sorry, Mr. Hayworth, but could you read  
20 the resolution into the record.

21 MR. HAYWORTH: State Board of  
22 Education Resolution to Approve the Physical

1 Education Standards, SR17-4.

2           Whereas, District of Columbia law  
3 requires State Board of Education approval and  
4 regular review of academic standards;

5           Whereas, physical education plays an  
6 essential role in developing physically  
7 literate students who have the knowledge,  
8 skills and confidence to enjoy a lifetime of  
9 healthful, physical activity;

10           Whereas, the current District of  
11 Columbia Physical Education Standards were  
12 last revised in 2008;

13           Whereas, since 2008, new national  
14 standards have been developed that reflect new  
15 data, best practices, and changing physical  
16 activity trends;

17           Whereas, the Office of the State  
18 Superintendent of Education's Division of  
19 Health and Wellness aligned the proposed  
20 Physical Education Standards with the new  
21 National Physical Education Standards  
22 developed by the Society of Health And

1 Physical Educators;

2           Whereas, the proposed Physical  
3 Education Standards were developed by the  
4 Office of the State Superintendent of  
5 Education after a rigorous drafting process  
6 that included significant stakeholder  
7 involvement, including from the Healthy  
8 Schools Act Commission, the District of  
9 Columbia Public Schools, interested District  
10 of Columbia Public Charter Schools, the  
11 District of Columbia Public Charter School  
12 Board, and the general public;

13           Whereas, the proposed Physical  
14 Education Standards are normed against  
15 national best standards and practice, and  
16 therefore are informed by current data and  
17 emphasize the importance of daily physical  
18 activity;

19           Whereas, the District of Columbia  
20 students and teachers were directly involved  
21 in the review of the proposed standards;

22           Whereas, the State Board of Education

1 heard testimony on February 15, 2017,  
2 regarding the proposed Physical Education  
3 Standards;

4           Whereas, District of Columbia public  
5 school and public charter school students  
6 could be assessed on their knowledge of the  
7 Proposed Physical Education Standards through  
8 the health and physical education assessment;

9           Now, therefore, be it resolved, that  
10 on March 15, 2017, the State Board advises  
11 that the State Superintendent adopt the  
12 Physical Education Standards as proposed in  
13 this resolution.

14           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you,  
15 Mr. Hayworth.

16           Any discussion on the resolution?

17           (No audible response)

18           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Seeing none, the  
19 question is of approval of a resolution  
20 advising the State Superintendent to adopt new  
21 Physical Education Standards. All in favor,  
22 aye.

1 (Chorus of ayes)

2 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: All opposed?

3 (No audible response)

4 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: The motion has  
5 been approved.

6 Every Student Success Act. For over  
7 a year, the State Board and OSSE have been  
8 soliciting input from the public, national,  
9 and local experts, students, parents,  
10 teachers, and other stakeholders related to  
11 the new statewide Consolidated Plan required  
12 by the federal Every Student Success Act.  
13 Before we hear from witnesses tonight, I want  
14 to thank OSSE for their commitment to working  
15 with the State Board of Education and the  
16 public through this process. I also want to  
17 remind residents that this work does not end  
18 tonight, or even next week through a vote.  
19 Your participation tonight and over the past  
20 year is important, and we will encourage you  
21 to keep active with us.

22 The State Board welcomes public

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 participation in activities under our  
2 authority, and every public meeting will begin  
3 with testimony from public witnesses on  
4 education-related matters. If you are a  
5 member of the public and would like to speak  
6 at a future public meeting, please contact our  
7 staff at [sboe@dc.gov](mailto:sboe@dc.gov), or by calling  
8 (202) 741-0888.

9           Tonight we have modified our regular  
10 practice to further enhance the public's  
11 ability to participate in policies. Each of  
12 our witnesses will have three minutes to  
13 speak. After the entire panel speaks, each  
14 Board member will have two minutes to ask any  
15 questions they may have for the panel.

16           Due to the number of witnesses we  
17 have, I will ask both witnesses and the Board  
18 members to keep their questions and answers  
19 brief. Please note that you must use your  
20 microphone. The microphones are already are  
21 on and if you see a green light. You will also  
22 see, on your upper right-hand side of the

1 witness table, a timer. The light on the  
2 timer will be green for the first 2-1/2  
3 minutes, will turn yellow for the last 30  
4 seconds, and then will turn red after 3  
5 minutes have lapsed.

6 Our first panel will be Marla Dean,  
7 Chantal Fuller, Mark Simon, Simona Gerhardt,  
8 and Rebecca Davis.

9 (Cross talk)

10 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: If you have  
11 copies of your testimony please give it to Ms-  
12 Thank you! We will begin to my left, your  
13 right, with Ms Dean.

14 (Cross talk)

15 MS. DEAN: Thank you for this  
16 opportunity to testify on behalf of the panel  
17 and citizens of the association on the DC plan  
18 for ESSA. I am Dr. Marla Dean. I have over  
19 25 years as a public school educator. I  
20 served as a former high school English and  
21 government teacher for 10 years, and in middle  
22 high school, turn around central office

1 administrator for over 15 years.

2           Currently I serve as the executive  
3 director and CEO of Bright Beginnings, a  
4 nonprofit organization that operates early  
5 childhood centers for children experiencing  
6 homelessness, and supports their parents in  
7 moving out of their homes.

8           I only give my background to  
9 emphasize both my longevity and expertise in  
10 K-12 education. I want to recognize the SBOE  
11 for giving ten recommendations to OSSE to  
12 improve their plan. This rightly acknowledges  
13 that the current proposal is woefully  
14 insufficient, lacks innovation, and ignores  
15 the original intent of ESSA, which was to  
16 allow states much more latitude in designing  
17 their accountability plan.

18           Unfortunately, the current plan is  
19 simply No Child Left Behind 2.0. It is devoid  
20 of innovation and ignores our DC balance. The  
21 District of Columbia is a progressive  
22 citizenry committed to the whole child. That

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 means that we are committed to every child  
2 being, healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and  
3 challenged.

4           The current culture of accountability  
5 in the District has heavily relied on high-  
6 stakes testing, which have done little to  
7 nothing to close the achievement gap between  
8 students living on both sides of the river.  
9 The current DC proposed plan doubles down on  
10 this mind-set of high-stakes testing -- I mean  
11 testing being the primary vehicle for closing  
12 gaps.

13           However, what we know, to close  
14 achievement gaps, we must first address  
15 opportunity gaps. A whole-child approach  
16 intentionally addresses issues regarding  
17 opportunity gaps. We also know that the  
18 current overreliance on high-stakes testing  
19 has created a deficit lens in how LEAs  
20 (phonetic) and schools, teachers, and many  
21 students view themselves. In fact, it has  
22 dramatically impacted the way many of our

1 students see themselves. Every child is gift  
2 in some area, and no child is gifted in all  
3 areas. Yet today's overemphasis and reliance  
4 on high-stakes testing has left some children  
5 believe they are neither gifted or talented in  
6 anything.

7           If we truly are committed to a  
8 whole-child approach by assuring that every  
9 child is healthy, safe, engaged, supported,  
10 and challenged, then we must include a broader  
11 set of performance indicators to truly assess  
12 the effectiveness of the teacher, school, or  
13 LEA. I provide three recommendations.

14           We must have a -- we have a unique  
15 opportunity to reshape education for the next  
16 generation. If we focus on a whole-child  
17 approach by ensuring every child is healthy,  
18 safe, engaged, supported, and challenged, then  
19 we will close opportunity gaps which result in  
20 the ending of achievement gaps. Or we can  
21 practice the insanity by doubling down on  
22 failed policies and practices of the past.

1           I urge you to reject OSSE's DC plan  
2 for ESSA. There's no rush to implement  
3 another failed Accountability Plan. Recently  
4 Congress has removed accountability measures  
5 for ESSA. In fact, you know as well the law  
6 itself is in flux. Let's spend this time and  
7 turn it into an opportunity where we can  
8 reimagine educational accountability and lead  
9 the nation in progressive policies that engage  
10 children and families in their learning, that  
11 uses a strength-based approach, and is  
12 committed to equity for all.

13           Do not implement this plan, forcing  
14 schools to organize themselves under its  
15 mandate when you know it is a failed plan. Do  
16 not support this plan by claiming to believe  
17 it can be improved in future years. Schools  
18 should not be left twisting in the wind. They  
19 should operate under some level of certainty.

20           Simply reject the plan, send it back  
21 to OSSE with a mandate to sculpt and design  
22 the DC plan with our values at its center.

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 Send a message that DC is committed to the  
2 whole child, DC is committed to every child  
3 being healthy, safe, engaged, supported, and  
4 challenged.

5 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Ms. Fuller?

6 MS. GERHARDT: My name is Simona  
7 Gerhardt. I've been teaching at Wilson High  
8 School for 12 years. I've seen the District  
9 go through many changes. Throughout all this  
10 transition, school achievement continues to be  
11 a challenge. But thankfully, we now have a  
12 wonderful opportunity to change that. Here  
13 are two indicators that show the need to  
14 change DCPS leadership strategy.

15 Indicator number one: the  
16 achievement gap. I'm quoting from the Council  
17 as he states, Plan Draft: "The results from  
18 PARK from 2015-2016 showed us that only about  
19 one-quarter of DC students were on track for  
20 college and career readiness. And there are  
21 serious and persistent gaps and outcomes  
22 between specific groups of students."

1           Indicator number two: teacher and  
2 preschool turnover. Michael Alison Chandler  
3 said to Kaya Henderson on the Washington Post:  
4 "If every year you are replacing a third of  
5 your staff, something is wrong."

6           My proposal to change these two  
7 negative indicators is: Create an  
8 accountability school plan that supports  
9 Chancellor Wilson's vision. Chancellor Wilson  
10 stated: "We want students to thrive. We want  
11 to make sure that they are enjoying schools.  
12 They should like it. For students to like it,  
13 adults have to like it." He also stated:  
14 "Beyond student joy and excitement around  
15 school, students must be taught to think  
16 critically. Standardized tests do not measure  
17 critical thinking."

18           Chancellor Wilson's vision can  
19 happen, and I want it to happen, but it can  
20 happen only if, one, OSSE changes the deadline  
21 to September 18th, to allow Chancellor Wilson  
22 time to give feedback; two, if OSSE reduces

1 the weight on academic achievement, and  
2 understands that academic achievement is the  
3 byproduct of school environment; three, if our  
4 educational leaders learn from the corporate  
5 and the military world how to hold people  
6 accountable based on the values, vision, and  
7 mission of your organization, and also if they  
8 learn how to measure an effective school  
9 working environment.

10 Our students need an accountability  
11 plan that supports and reflects the importance  
12 of school environment, and supports Chancellor  
13 Wilson's vision. Thank you.

14 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

15 MR. SIMON: Members of the State  
16 Board, my name is Mark Simon, Ward parent,  
17 public education advocate, and education  
18 policy analyst affiliated with the Economic  
19 Policy Institute. You have my written  
20 comments focused on your excellent consensus  
21 recommendations. I made some suggestions for  
22 improvements and will be happy to respond if

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 you have questions about that testimony. But  
2 with just three minutes, I'd like to focus  
3 here on OSSE's response yesterday, and whether  
4 it treats your recommendations.

5           What I appreciated most about your  
6 recommendations is that although they are a  
7 compromise from what I and most of the dozens  
8 of parents, community, and educator  
9 representatives wanted, your recommendations  
10 still would have brought a shift in emphasis  
11 from a single-education, culture-distorting,  
12 test-driven metric being the entire focus.  
13 You recognized that the learning climate needs  
14 to be captured with other significant  
15 measures. While OSSE lowered the rate -- the  
16 weight of the test from 80 percent to 70  
17 percent, that reduction will not change one  
18 iota the test prep emphasis in schools. It  
19 will not accomplish what you and we wanted.

20           The slight shift -- a good one --  
21 towards the growth metric in elementary  
22 schools was inexplicably rejected for high

1 schools. While OSSE heard you about the need  
2 for a beefed-up school climate and "well-  
3 rounded education," in quotes, component --  
4 that was your language; it was good language -  
5 - they renamed it "access and opportunities,"  
6 and reduced the weight from 10 percent to 5  
7 percent. That leaves the lion's share of  
8 school environment to be measured primarily by  
9 attendance and reenrollment. Attendance  
10 hardly captures anything about the quality of  
11 the learning culture in the school.

12           While I felt that your  
13 recommendations of a climate survey needed to  
14 be expanded to include a survey of educators  
15 in each school, OSSE has not committed to the  
16 concept of using a climate survey at all, but  
17 only to exploring the idea for two full years.  
18 Once you give your approval to your plan now,  
19 they are not even committing to allow you to  
20 vote on whether it must be included at all in  
21 Year 3.

22           OSSE's plan revisions seem to have

1 rejected your notion that time on science,  
2 social studies, and other subjects not tested  
3 by PARCC should be measured at all.

4           In summary, your attempt to get at  
5 the richness of the learning culture in each  
6 school has been rejected. They seem to have  
7 heard you, but in failing to commit to having  
8 any factors other than the PARCC test and  
9 attendance count significantly, they have  
10 rejected your underlying logic. I urge you  
11 not to endorse OSSE's plan, even with their  
12 revisions, but rather to insist that in order  
13 to get your vote of approval, at the very  
14 least, they need to take a little more time  
15 and consider more seriously your and, through  
16 you, our perspectives. Thank you.

17           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

18           MS. FULLER: Greetings, SBOE's  
19 representatives, community members, and  
20 educators. I'm speaking today on behalf of  
21 the students who aren't able to advocate for  
22 themselves -- the students who are nonverbal,

1 illiterate, and who have trouble completing  
2 the most basic day-to-day functioning that  
3 many of us take for granted. I am also  
4 speaking for the students who have unmet  
5 socioemotional needs.

6 I teach sixth-through-eighth-grade  
7 students with autism, ADHD, and intellectual  
8 disabilities. These are students who are  
9 unable to take standardized assessments but  
10 are still required to, based on the demands of  
11 OSSE.

12 When -- I think about the proposed  
13 total of 70 percent of a school's  
14 accountability being standardized test scores,  
15 I cannot help but think about the inequities  
16 that this will encourage, which also would  
17 include a culture of fraud and cheating on the  
18 assessments in order to meet qualifications.

19 My students, like many students  
20 around the district, do not get their most  
21 basic needs met at home, and we spend the bulk  
22 of the day taking care of socioemotional

1 concerns and issues, which often impede  
2 learning. On any given day, we are making  
3 calls to CFSA, bringing in clothes for  
4 students who do not have access to clean  
5 uniforms, feeding them, and advocating for  
6 them when Central Office attempts to violate  
7 their rights, all in an effort to make money.

8           To make matters worse, our school  
9 shares a school psychologist with two other  
10 schools, and our social worker is overburdened  
11 with over 100 students on her caseload. And  
12 those are just the ones who have been  
13 identified.

14           Nevertheless, my wonderful staff and  
15 I press on and become whoever we need to be,  
16 in order to make sure our students can be the  
17 best versions of themselves. Standardized  
18 testing and penalizing schools who do not meet  
19 these lofty and unfounded requirements negate  
20 the work that we as special educators do  
21 daily, and it shows us who OSSE is really  
22 looking out for, which is their bottom line,

1 especially when the Smarter Balanced  
2 Assessment is more efficient and informative  
3 of student achievement. I can go on and on  
4 about the conspiracy theories regarding how  
5 much money Pearson is making off of our  
6 students at their expense, but we'll save that  
7 for another hearing.

8 I find it both unethical and immoral  
9 that an assessment that has been proven to be  
10 largely ineffective is given the credibility  
11 to track our students and slap a number on  
12 them, determining how successful they will be.  
13 What's more is that we have several children  
14 in our school significantly below grade level  
15 who must take the PARCC, when they don't even  
16 understand the materials or the assessment  
17 itself.

18 OSSE just denied a student of mine  
19 eligibility on the Alternate Assessment when  
20 he is seven years below grade level, so he now  
21 has to take the PARCC assessment. For the  
22 students taking the Alternate Assessment, some

1 of them aren't even able to be assessed, but I  
2 as a teacher must waste our time and insult  
3 their intelligence by forcing them to complete  
4 a test that they cannot access.

5           What message are we sending to our  
6 children when we will invest in an assessment  
7 that is incompetent but not in social workers,  
8 therapists, and other resources that would  
9 allow them to better perform on state  
10 assessments? We must stop putting profits  
11 over children, and fulfill the obligation of  
12 educating them by making sure that they will  
13 be productive members of society. Thank you.

14           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

15           MS. DAVIS: Good evening.

16           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Good evening.

17           MS. DAVIS: Members of the State  
18 Board of Education, my name is Rebecca Davis.  
19 I'm here representing the District of Columbia  
20 Environmental Education Consortium. For the  
21 first time, the Every Student Act includes  
22 language making environmental education and

1 environmental literacy programs explicitly  
2 eligible for federal funds, specifically in  
3 two formula grant programs that's described in  
4 Title IV of the bill: the Well-Rounded  
5 Education Opportunities and the 21st Century  
6 Community Learning Centers.

7           And yet, although our elected  
8 officials have acknowledged the importance of  
9 environmental education in various signed  
10 policies, such as the Healthy Schools Act and  
11 Sustainable DC Plan, there is no mention of  
12 environmental education in the 117 pages of  
13 the DC ESSA State Education Plan that is being  
14 submitted for public comment.

15           Research indicates that students  
16 engaged in environmental experience numerous  
17 benefits, including greater pride and  
18 ownership in their community, strength and  
19 sense of empowerment to make a difference in  
20 their community, better performance in  
21 standardized measures of academic achievement  
22 in reading, writing, math, science, and social

1 studies.

2           Moreover, environmental education  
3 embodies 21st-century skills by developing the  
4 learner's ability to ask questions, speculate  
5 and hypothesize about the world around them,  
6 connect to the places where they live, seek  
7 information and develop answers to their  
8 question. Learners engaged in inquiry master  
9 fundamental skills of gathering and organizing  
10 information, interpret and synthesize  
11 information to develop and communicate  
12 explanation and advanced solution.

13           The District of Columbia has  
14 demonstrated a commitment to the importance of  
15 environmental education by signing the  
16 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement in 2014,  
17 which has a number of environmental literacy  
18 goals, as well as by signing the Health  
19 Schools Act of 2010 and the Sustainable DC  
20 Omnibus Amendment Act of 2014.

21           The DC Council also demonstrated a  
22 commitment to environmental education by

1 mandating DC agencies to develop and  
2 environmental literacy plan and to hire an  
3 environmental education coordinator in OSSE to  
4 support the obvious implementation.

5           While OSSE has some funding to build  
6 its new environmental literacy program, funds  
7 from ESSA could be leveraged to reach even  
8 more schools to provide environmental  
9 education experiences. The District of  
10 Columbia Environmental Education Consortium is  
11 a strong network of partners and providers  
12 that share a strong commitment to  
13 environmental education and support this  
14 effort. Our members include many local and  
15 regional providers such as Clean Air Partners,  
16 the Anacostia Watershed Society, Washington  
17 Youth Garden, etcetera.

18           Members of the District of Columbia  
19 Environmental Education Consortium provide  
20 high-quality environmental education programs  
21 to District schools and support science using  
22 outdoor as a place for inquiry. But to have a

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 robust community of environmental education  
2 providers, funds need to be secured. With  
3 Title IV of ESSA, the District of Columbia has  
4 the opportunity to substantially increase its  
5 financial support of environmental education  
6 through the following two formula grant  
7 programs: The Well-Rounded Education  
8 Opportunities and the 21st Century Community  
9 Learning Centers. Thank you.

10 BOARD MEMBER: Thank you.

11 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

12 Board members, are there any  
13 questions for these five?

14 (No audible response)

15 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Mr. Weedon?

16 MR. WEEDON: Sure. I'd just like to  
17 say thank you. I don't think I really have a  
18 question. I am a little interested the  
19 testing around the students with disabilities  
20 and ensuring that we get that right. I'm not  
21 sure if it's the same question, but we can go  
22 in just a minute. But I do want to say thank

1 you for your time and all the input. I think  
2 all of us really want to hear the diverse  
3 opinions that are out there still on this  
4 proposal as we move towards a vote in the next  
5 week or two. Thank you.

6 MS. WATTENBERG: Thank you very much.  
7 And let me say, I'm very sympathetic to the  
8 point of view that this proposal does not go  
9 far enough to break from the test-driven past.  
10 As I said, I ran on the platform of right-  
11 sized testing. And I think testing is super  
12 important. Transparency is super important.  
13 Accountability is super important. But that  
14 doesn't mean it should be 80 percent, like the  
15 last proposal, or 74 percent, which is really  
16 what it is in Years 1 and 2, or 70 percent in  
17 Year 3.

18 What I want to -- I want to ask  
19 Simona Gerhardt -- I believe you're a parent  
20 at Wilson High School, if I'm --

21 MS. GERHARDT: Oh, no. I'm a  
22 teacher.

1           MS. WATTENBERG: So will you talk to  
2 me about sort of the balance in terms of the -  
3 - the effect of the testing, the effect that  
4 you think the lack of a growth factor will  
5 have at a high school like Wilson, and sort of  
6 the reliance on the testing as opposed to the  
7 climate and the broader issues?

8           MS. GERHARDT: Yeah. As a teacher --  
9 I've been teaching Italian and French for 12  
10 years -- I see how the students are impacted  
11 by this culture. That's why especially at  
12 Wilson we are trying to create a school  
13 environment where what's important is working  
14 hard, think critically, and not be so grade  
15 driven. So this culture from the top down  
16 that testing is so important is impacting the  
17 culture at our school and is making the  
18 students very passive, because what they care  
19 is really just the grade and not a passion for  
20 learning -- and as Chancellor Wilson said, to  
21 make the students think critically.

22           So if we change the pressure from the

1 top, for us, as teachers, students will  
2 benefit that and will not just talk about  
3 grading, did you put my grade in. This is the  
4 only conversation that recently I have with my  
5 students is -- no, I -- I don't see the  
6 curiosity, I don't see the passion. It's  
7 just, "Did you put the grade in?"

8 MS. WATTENBERG: Thank you. My two  
9 minutes are up

10 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Any other  
11 questions?

12 (No audible response)

13 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you,  
14 panelists. Thank you-all for coming out to  
15 testify.

16 And your next panel Gary Ratner,  
17 Dexter Williams, Sandra Moscoso, Sara Stone,  
18 and Nadia Moritz.

19 BOARD MEMBER: Suzanne Wells.

20 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Danica? Danica?  
21 Is Danica in the audience?

22 BOARD MEMBER: (--)

1           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS:  Yeah.  And Sara  
2 Moore Kerai?

3           (No audible response)

4           (Cross talk)

5           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS:  Mr. Ratner.

6           MR. RATNER:  Thank you.  My name is  
7 Gary Ratner.  I'm the executive director of  
8 Citizens for Effective Schools -- CES.  CES  
9 would like to commend the State Board for  
10 having submitted excellent recommendations for  
11 the Office of the State Superintendent of  
12 Education for revising OSSE's January Draft  
13 State Plan.  While OSSE's March 14 summary and  
14 responses move somewhat in the Board's  
15 direction, OSSE's current positions disregard  
16 many of the Board's recommendations.  I'd like  
17 to briefly address three issues.

18           First, although stakeholders have  
19 widely urged that the weight of test scores  
20 for ESSA accountability be greatly reduced,  
21 and weight be given to school climate, OSSE's  
22 response does not do so.  Merely reducing the

1 weight for test scores from 80 percent to 70  
2 percent from elementary and middle schools, as  
3 OSSE proposes, would continue to incentivize  
4 schools to put huge emphasis on drill-and-kill  
5 test preparation and testing -- excuse me --  
6 and narrowing the curriculum rather than  
7 changing expectations, beliefs, and practices,  
8 which low-achieving schools need to do to  
9 improve. The total weight for test scores,  
10 including ELL proficiency should be reduced to  
11 the lowest level statutorily allowed, about 55  
12 percent.

13           Second, while it's positive that OSSE  
14 reaffirmed its previous commitment to conduct  
15 a pilot survey of school climate for ultimate  
16 accountability purposes, OSSE's response still  
17 fails to provide key specifics. These  
18 include: What weight will be given to the  
19 school climate indicator? How will  
20 stakeholders be involved in selecting and  
21 evaluating the school climate pilot and  
22 accountability surveys? What criteria will be



1 reduce the weight of proficiency from 40  
2 percent to 30 percent, as the Board  
3 recognizes, it's still too much weight for  
4 proficiency and too little for growth. In  
5 addition to reducing the total weight for test  
6 scores, as discussed above, the ratio of  
7 proficiency to growth should be reduced from 1  
8 to 4, or at a minimum, as SBOE recognized, to  
9 40/60, a ratio of 2 to 3. Otherwise, schools  
10 serving high concentrations of disadvantaged  
11 students would be unfairly penalized, and  
12 those serving higher-income families unfairly  
13 benefited. Thank you.

14 MS. MOORE KERAI: Thank you for the  
15 opportunity to testify today. My name is Sara  
16 Moore Kerai, and I'm a parent of a pre-K-3  
17 child at Capital Hill Montessori at Logan  
18 School. I care deeply about the quality of my  
19 daughter's education and the need to  
20 understand the quality of our schools based on  
21 more than just a test score. I was excited  
22 and hopeful at the opportunity to create a new

1 accountability system that will value test  
2 scores alongside other important ways of  
3 demonstrating school quality and environment.

4 I read the Draft Plan and attended an  
5 OSSE Outreach Session hosted by the Capitol  
6 Hill Public School Parent Organization. I was  
7 pleased to hear and to see the deep interest  
8 in a new accountability system that looked at  
9 the whole child, shared by all of the parents  
10 who were in attendance.

11 At the meeting I was concerned by  
12 OSSE's seeming lack of motivation to make  
13 significant changes and to allow more time to  
14 think critically about these issues as a broad  
15 community. Later I was pleased when the State  
16 Board of Education released a list of well-  
17 thought-out and meaningful recommendations for  
18 changes to the Draft ESSA Plan.

19 The recommended changes are greatly  
20 supported by my community, including teachers  
21 and parents. The recommendations also  
22 demonstrated that members of the State Board

1 actually listened to the feedback from the  
2 community. That community has hoped that the  
3 State Board would not approve an OSSE plan  
4 that does not implement those changes in full.

5           However, only yesterday, OSSE  
6 released its response to public and State  
7 Board comments. This left us once again with  
8 precious little time to review and understand  
9 the response and its impact before today's  
10 hearing. As I understand it, the plan takes  
11 some meaningful steps in addressing the State  
12 Board's comments as well as parent and  
13 educator input, but it does not nearly go all  
14 the way.

15           Is the State Board indicating that it  
16 generally supports the revised plan as it is?  
17 It's disappointing to me and my school  
18 community that we are essentially backed into  
19 a corner with no additional room for revision  
20 or improvement.

21           While I appreciate OSSE's efforts to  
22 respond to some of the community input, I

1 still believe we can do better. I hope you  
2 will not stop with the plan. I hope that OSSE  
3 will continue to work with the parent and  
4 educator community every step of the way  
5 through implementation. A plan is only as  
6 good as its implementation, and the  
7 implementation will not be effective without  
8 parent and educator partnership. Thank you.

9 MS. PETROSHIUS: Hi. Thank you. I'm  
10 Danica Petroschius, parent of two at Capitol  
11 Hill Montessori. Viewing your meeting  
12 yesterday via Periscope, it appears there is  
13 State Board support for the revised ESSA Plan.  
14 I'm worried this today is a fake hearing.  
15 I've been astounded at the disregard for DCPS  
16 parent and educator engagement in the ESSA  
17 plan process, even though we support 49,000  
18 students every day.

19 OSSE has touted this as great  
20 engagement and held 50 meetings of 100  
21 organizations throughout 2016 before the Draft  
22 Plan went public. Who were those meetings

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 with? Fifty charter schools or charter  
2 organizations, 34 national education groups,  
3 only 10 local educational organizations, 4  
4 universities, and 4 DC government agencies  
5 including DCPS. This is a very unbalanced  
6 outreach plan where 84 percent of the input  
7 came from charters or national organizations  
8 that have no understanding of how DCPS schools  
9 operate and what the needs of our students  
10 are.

11 OSSE did hold one public meeting in  
12 each ward in June 2016. I can't take that  
13 seriously. Anyone that truly wants to engage  
14 parents and teachers does not do so at the end  
15 of school and summer, when communication with  
16 schools and parents is difficult. Let's face  
17 it: The DCPS parent and educator community  
18 did not help create this draft.

19 After those 2016 meetings, parents  
20 and educators did not see the draft plan until  
21 January 30th this year. We had one month to  
22 give input on a plan that will affect our

1 children's education for the next ten years.  
2 Now, again, they're being treated as  
3 expendable in this process. The revised draft  
4 came out only yesterday, but yet we have to  
5 testify on its merits in 24 hours.

6 Parents appreciated the State Board  
7 recommendations to approve the ESSA Plan.  
8 Yesterday's revised Draft Plan includes some  
9 improvements, and it is clear advocacy helped.  
10 But it has not -- it was not without a massive  
11 effort by us to overcome the reluctance of  
12 OSSE to change.

13 OSSE is not elected and so has less  
14 stake in our voice. But the State Board is  
15 elected and has power to say, "Wait, we can do  
16 better." Please stop saying September is too  
17 late. Thirty states are waiting until  
18 September to submit their plan, and they too  
19 will collect data in '17-'18, just like DC.

20 We could wait and build a better plan  
21 with deep buy-in, but OSSE says they won't. I  
22 urge you, our elected body, to vote no on the

1 plan. Based on yesterday's swift, seemingly  
2 predated (phonetic) support of the tweaked  
3 OSSE plan, it seems many of you have already  
4 decided to stand down.

5           So tonight I am standing up for  
6 parents and educators who do the daily work to  
7 build excellent DCPS schools, to say we as a  
8 community can do better. We should not make  
9 stakeholders beg for engagement. Parents and  
10 educators should not be processed out of the  
11 system by backdoor deals. Superintendent Kang  
12 has said over and over, "The plan is just the  
13 beginning." The plan is full of policies that  
14 include, "Let's look into it more," "Let's  
15 phase it in," and "Let's test it out first."

16           So I ask you to make public and  
17 articulate in the plan: One, your commitment  
18 to full transparency and ongoing engagement;  
19 two, a schedule that you will execute on  
20 engagement in each phase of implementation  
21 with the intention to continuously improve the  
22 plan; three, a process for implementing the

1 task forces recommended by the State Board;  
2 and four, a process for sharing all results of  
3 the pilot and hosting engagement meetings to  
4 discuss how we should use the results to  
5 improve the system.

6 We hope that OSSE and the State Board  
7 support our calls for more engagement, more  
8 innovation, and more transparency. Our  
9 students deserve it.

10 MR. WILLIAMS: Good evening. I'm  
11 Dexter Williams, a resident of Ward 7 and  
12 member of the Hillcrest Civic Association's  
13 Education Committee. I want to thank the  
14 members of the State Board of Education for  
15 the opportunity to testify about OSSE's State  
16 Education Plan. And I also want to  
17 acknowledge the hard work that you-all have  
18 done over the last several months on this  
19 State Education Plan.

20 Over the last several months, OSSE  
21 has conducted several community engagement  
22 forums across the city. Many of us who

1 attended their Ward 7 forum left the  
2 engagement forum confused about some aspects  
3 of their plan and concerned about its  
4 potential impact.

5           While I understand that OSSE's role  
6 is to provide an overarching framework for  
7 public schools to implement, I am concerned  
8 that the proposal lacks clarity on key points  
9 and does not fully consider the implications  
10 for the community.

11           In regards to family engagement, the  
12 relationship between a student's family and  
13 school is critical for educational success.

14           ESSA encourages and incentivizes  
15 engagement activities, and I strongly  
16 recommend that the Board encourage OSSE to  
17 develop a framework for rating schools based  
18 on their love of engagement with families.

19           During OSSE's Ward 7 forum, many of  
20 us expressed concern over the stability of  
21 teachers, particularly at underperforming  
22 schools. These schools have often seen high

1 staff and teaching turnover, critically  
2 undermining the school's ability to improve  
3 every year. These professionals are pillars  
4 of the education system, and their consistent  
5 presence among students is critical to  
6 students' success and should be measured.

7           ###

8           In regards to high school metrics, I  
9 urge the Board to encourage OSSE to include  
10 college enrollment through completion as a  
11 measure. While I appreciate the challenges  
12 with this kind of undertaking, although there  
13 are companies that provide this information  
14 for many districts across the country, the  
15 high school experience should give students  
16 the tools that they need to succeed in all  
17 aspects of higher education.

18           It's important that high schools not  
19 only prepare students for the academic rigors  
20 of college, but also provide them with the  
21 resources that would help them complete their  
22 degrees. There are some schools in the city

1 and across the country that are working toward  
2 this goal, and I strongly recommend that  
3 schools be required to develop systems to  
4 track this information.

5           As you know, OSSE's proposal sets an  
6 ambitious goal of reaching 85 percent  
7 proficiency in math, science, and language for  
8 all grade levels being tested, by 2039, which  
9 should be applauded. However, the proposal  
10 doesn't offer guidance on how schools should  
11 achieve this goal. OSSE should revisit this  
12 and provide schools with more direction in  
13 reaching 85 percent proficiency.

14           I appreciate your consideration of my  
15 concerns and look forward to working with  
16 y'all in the future. Thank you.

17           MS. WELLS: My name is Suzanne Wells,  
18 and I am the parent of a sixth grader at  
19 Eliot-Hine Middle School. Thank you for the  
20 opportunity to speak this evening on the  
21 Office of the State Superintendent's School  
22 Accountability Measures State Plan that has

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 been developed to comply with the Every  
2 Student Success Act.

3           The Act provides us a welcome  
4 opportunity to make meaningful changes in how  
5 schools are held accountable. As has been  
6 said before, what gets measured gets done. So  
7 how schools are measured has profound impacts  
8 on what students are taught in the classroom  
9 and how teachers spend their time, and then  
10 how schools serving their most vulnerable  
11 students are evaluated.

12           There's been considerable public  
13 interest in the school accountability measures  
14 precisely because they are so important. I  
15 commend the State Board of Education for  
16 informing our community over eight months ago  
17 about the school accountability requirements  
18 under ESSA, and seeking our input on what we  
19 believe should be measured. I commend the  
20 State Board for developing a set of  
21 recommendations on OSSE's Draft Plan. And I  
22 commend parents in my community for taking the

1 time to become knowledgeable about the School  
2 Accountability Measures Plan and for  
3 thoughtfully developing comments on the Draft  
4 Plan.

5           A little more than 24 hours ago, OSSE  
6 released its summary of the comments it  
7 received throughout the public comment period  
8 and the decisions it made in the updated state  
9 plan based on that feedback. I'm sorry to say  
10 that OSSE did not begin to meaningfully  
11 address the substantive comments it received  
12 from the public or the State Board of  
13 Education.

14           OSSE's tweaked its initial proposal  
15 in minor ways -- for example, a lower weight  
16 afforded to testing, from 80 to 70 testing.  
17 At first glance, that might seem like a lot,  
18 until you understand that virtually every  
19 public commented asked that the weight  
20 afforded to testing be dropped to the lowest  
21 allowable by law.

22           OSSE continues to want to use

1 attendance as a proxy measure for school  
2 satisfaction, and their final plan increases  
3 by 1 percent the weight going towards  
4 measures. While attendance is undoubtedly  
5 important, it's truly hard to understand why  
6 attendance, which is compulsory for students  
7 between the ages of 5 to 18, can be viewed as  
8 a meaningful measure of school satisfaction.  
9 The public repeatedly commented that school  
10 climate surveys would be better measures of  
11 school satisfaction and would provide  
12 actionable data upon which schools could make  
13 meaningful improvements.

14 OSSE is afraid to use school climate  
15 surveys, which they believe are not adequately  
16 tested. But they are fearless about using  
17 PARCC tests, which is an imperfect measure of  
18 academic success at best.

19 The public asked that measures on a  
20 well-rounded education be considered. In  
21 response, OSSE put a vague, yet-to-be-  
22 determined measure of access and opportunity

1 that they want to test two years down the  
2 road, and under school environment, they gave  
3 it a 5 percent weight, where still that 5  
4 percent might also have to cover whatever is  
5 decided regarding school climate surveys.

6           So what does the OSSE state plan look  
7 like now for an elementary school? We've got  
8 70 percent being dedicated to a test given  
9 once a year that is an imperfect measure of  
10 academic success, 12.5 percent going to  
11 measure compulsory attendance rates, 7.5  
12 percent to reenrollment, 5 percent to a yet-  
13 to-be-determined well-rounded education and  
14 school climate assessment, and 5 percent to an  
15 ESSA-required English language learner  
16 proficiency. I'd be hard pressed to say that  
17 sounds like a solid path forward for making  
18 educational progress for our students.

19           I suggest that the State Board of  
20 Education's work on the state plan is not  
21 done. I urge the State Board of Education to  
22 vote no on the OSSE state plan.

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you,  
2 panel.

3           Do the State Board members have any  
4 questions of these panelists?

5           MS. CARTER: I just had one quick  
6 question.

7           Thank you, panelists, for your time.  
8 It looks like all of you have done your due  
9 diligence. Thank you for tuning in to our  
10 working session.

11           Suzanne, my comment was just to  
12 clarify. You said that -- in your testimony -  
13 - virtually every public commented asked that  
14 the weight afforded re testing -- to testing  
15 be dropped to the lowest level by law. Can  
16 you clarify which public comments? Is that  
17 just the CHPSP0 for Ward 6 or --

18           MS. WELLS: I went to both the OSSE  
19 Ward 6 meeting and the CHPSP0 meeting that  
20 OSSE also arranged.

21           MS. CARTER: Okay. Thank you. That  
22 -- I -- just wanting to know, because we have

1 seen a wide range of comments -- public  
2 comments before, and against the plan. Thank  
3 you.

4 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Any other  
5 questions?

6 (No audible response)

7 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Ms. Wattenberg.

8 MS. WATTENBERG: Yeah. Thanks. I'll  
9 just say, I went to all of the public  
10 meetings, and I looked at all the comments,  
11 and while it's not that there were zero who  
12 asked for 80 percent or more testing, I think  
13 I could count them on one hand. And I will  
14 note that I did this a couple of meetings.

15 But what I want to say is, to me, one  
16 of -- a number of you mentioned the climate  
17 surveys -- and to me, one of the great lost  
18 opportunities in that -- so I really appeal to  
19 OSSE to maybe shift this -- is there was this  
20 idea that came out on the State Board to have  
21 these task forces, because there was a  
22 definite sense that the engagement of the

1 public was inadequate. And this was really a  
2 way to pull people in and get some real  
3 school-level knowledge. And I just want to  
4 sway, I've had some excellent conversations  
5 with people from both sectors on to leaders of  
6 the institutions, school leaders, and parents  
7 from both charter and DCPS around the climate  
8 survey issue. And there's such a lot of  
9 interest in this. There are real issues  
10 related to it, because lots of -- there are  
11 lots of schools, and many of them have their  
12 own surveys already, and they are not the  
13 same. This isn't something that can just  
14 simply be imposed from the top and just say,  
15 "Here's the survey. We want everybody to use  
16 it." That would not work.

17           But there are a lot of ways, and I  
18 heard a lot of interest in creating cross-  
19 conversations where people at the school level  
20 could talk about these different surveys,  
21 which ones worked, which ones didn't, and why,  
22 and work together to figure out some common

1 way to use them that would be appropriate for  
2 them perhaps to agree on a set of different  
3 surveys, all of which would be okay. Or it  
4 might be a way of figuring out some anchor  
5 indicators across different surveys. There's  
6 a lot of ways -- lot of ways to skin the cat.  
7 And I'm really very sorry that that didn't  
8 come out. And a number of you were some of  
9 the people that I had some great conversations  
10 with. So I hope we'll still get that way --  
11 get there.

12 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Mr. Weedon.

13 MR. WEEDON: So thank you. It's  
14 always great to see our Ward 6 friends. I  
15 hear you, and we've had many conversations  
16 over the last few months on many of these  
17 things. But one issue that didn't come up in  
18 any of the testimonies of this panel or the  
19 other one is the difference between growth and  
20 implementation (phonetic). And I'd love to  
21 get your thoughts on where we should land  
22 there. OSSE has made some movement. And

1 again, as I did last night, I'd like to  
2 commend OSSE for taking two steps. Should we  
3 take more? That's the question that's on the  
4 table. And we took a few steps from 80  
5 percent and 70 percent, and that was taken  
6 completely on proficiency, leaving growth a  
7 wee bit higher. Where do you-all stand on  
8 that issue?

9 MS. WELLS: I can start. I  
10 definitely support considering growth. I can  
11 tell you, at Eliot-Hine Middle School, there  
12 are a number of students that have come in at  
13 the second-grade reading level. And you know,  
14 to expect that a student coming in, reading at  
15 the second-grade level is going to be  
16 proficient by the time they, you know, get  
17 done with sixth grade is not fair. And so to  
18 look at growth and see how the school can take  
19 a student who's far below grade level up one  
20 or two or three grade levels would make a big  
21 difference.

22 MS. PETROSHIUS: I can just answer

1 quickly that the CHPSPO meetings that Suzanne  
2 attested, and the many conversations in our  
3 school community alone, the parent support and  
4 teacher support for as much growth as possible  
5 is as strong as I've seen it. Not to take  
6 away all proficiency, of course, but I think  
7 people want to see that robust measure in  
8 there for all the reasons Suzanne said.  
9 That's been my experience.

10 MS. MOORE KERAI: I agree.

11 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.  
12 Thank you for coming out here tonight.

13 MS. WELLS: Thank you.

14 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Next panel is  
15 Sara Stone -- all right. Erica Russell, Scott  
16 Abbott, Dana Hall, Allyson Criner Brown,  
17 Stephanie Beer, Nancy Smith, Sheila Carson  
18 Carr, Anne Fitzpatrick, Savanna Sammis.  
19 Coming up is Mr. Abbott.

20 MR. ABBOTT: Good evening, members of  
21 the State Board of Education. My name is  
22 Scott Abbott. I am a Ward 4 resident, Ward 6

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 school parent, and the director of social  
2 studies for DC Public Schools. I'm here to  
3 testify on behalf of the many people in our  
4 district and community who believe public  
5 school students in DC deserve a well-rounded  
6 education. I'm testifying tonight to urge the  
7 State Board to reject the current ESSA plan  
8 unless OSSE revises it to include the all the  
9 recommendations the State Board offered last  
10 week.

11           On the specific changes proposed, I'm  
12 glad to see the shifts towards more emphasis  
13 on growth and academics and attendance. Thank  
14 you to OSSE for hearing these concerns and  
15 taking them into account. I wish I could be  
16 hear testifying in support of the final plan,  
17 but these changes alone are not sufficient to  
18 merit approval. The proposed Access and  
19 Opportunities measure does not address the  
20 concerns raised by those supporting a well-  
21 rounded education indicator.

22           Grouping well-rounded education under

1 school environment with the school climate  
2 survey misses the point. Well-rounded  
3 education is about providing students with  
4 academic experiences and opportunities related  
5 to history, civics, science, the arts. These  
6 subjects are not nice-to-have components.  
7 These are rigorous academic disciplines that  
8 have been ignored and denied to our students,  
9 especially those in most need.

10 This is an issue of civil rights for  
11 our students. If we do not guarantee our  
12 schools offer even a minimum of time for  
13 teaching these subjects, we will continue to  
14 reinforce that ELA and math are all that  
15 matter.

16 On the details of the Access and  
17 Opportunities measure, it's proposed to allot  
18 5 percent, not the 10 percent recommended by  
19 the State Board. It's proposed to take effect  
20 in Year 3, more than two years from now.  
21 That's too long for our students to wait.  
22 It's proposed to be created as part of a pilot

1 during Year 2, but there seems to be no  
2 guarantee this indicator would definitely be  
3 included in school year '19-'20. And it's  
4 unclear whether the State Board would approve  
5 the addition after that pilot.

6 As Jack, Marcus, and others mentioned  
7 at last night's meeting, the State Board  
8 should not provide a blank check to OSSE to  
9 craft this measure up with no details  
10 provided, especially after last night's  
11 meeting makes clear OSSE's intention to  
12 provide only flexible options within the  
13 measure.

14 The process for this plan has been  
15 rushed and lacking the details needed for  
16 transparency. On Monday, the Department of  
17 Education changed the ESSA regulation guidance  
18 and templates. Yesterday afternoon, OSSE  
19 released proposed updates, though still not  
20 the full plan. Today constituents are being  
21 provided a final chance to testify on the  
22 adoption of the updated plan. This window

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 provides little opportunity for constituents  
2 to informed, understand, and ask questions of  
3 the revisions, and share their feedback with  
4 State Board members. Clearly, this plan still  
5 has problems that need to be addressed. If  
6 you vote to approve the current plan, how will  
7 you explain to your constituents why you  
8 rushed approval of a problematic plan?

9           In conclusion, I ask the State Board  
10 members to reject the current plan, unless  
11 OSSE fully implements all the Board's  
12 recommendations. Advocates of well-rounded  
13 education indicators were thrilled to see the  
14 Board recommendations released last week, and  
15 excited that you heard and understood the  
16 voices of the community on what this plan can  
17 and must include. If OSSE is unwilling to  
18 implement your very reasonable suggestions  
19 before next Wednesday, you should feel  
20 confident that your "no" vote is justified.

21           During last night's meeting, Joe  
22 mentioned the importance of doing what is

1 right, not just what is easy. Your  
2 constituents are behind you in pushing OSSE to  
3 live up to that standard. Let's take a few  
4 more months to get this right. Our students  
5 deserve it.

6 MS. BEER: Okay. Hi. My name is  
7 Stephanie Beer, and I'm a social studies  
8 teacher at Cardozo Education Campus, and a  
9 resident of Ward 7. At Cardozo Education  
10 Campus, 42 percent of our student population  
11 are English language learners, or ELLs. The  
12 majority of the ELLs at Cardozo have arrived  
13 within the last two years. The number of ELLs  
14 at Cardozo is growing weekly as well as new  
15 students continue to arrive.

16 Under the current OSSE proposal, our  
17 school score would be 70 percent dependent on  
18 students' PARCC scores for ELA and geometry in  
19 the tenth grade. The current practice is that  
20 ELL students who have been in the country for  
21 under a year do not test in ELA, but everyone  
22 tests in math regardless of time in country.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 I agree that students should not have to take  
2 the test if they have been in the country  
3 under a year. And I argue that they should  
4 also not have to test in math, because the  
5 PARCC math test is language-heavy.

6 I also agree with the recommendation  
7 that these students' ACCESS growth scores  
8 replace their PARCC proficiency or growth. I  
9 believe that we should be accountable to  
10 helping these students grow in their English  
11 language proficiency. However, it is against  
12 all research on language acquisition to expect  
13 students to perform at grade level in ELA or  
14 math in only one year. It takes from five to  
15 seven years for students to achieve academic  
16 proficiency in English. And even then, the  
17 PARCC test would still be difficult for them  
18 due to the reading levels. Being proficient  
19 in English on ACCESS does not mean students  
20 will read at grade level.

21 Many of our ELL students have limited  
22 to severely interrupted formal education,

1 which often means that they are not literate  
2 in their first language. These students face  
3 additional challenges to learning a second  
4 language. They need extra support and extra  
5 time to be proficient in English and to be  
6 able to meet graduation requirements. I see  
7 no recommendations on changing the weight of  
8 graduation rates in the OSSE plan. I ask that  
9 the State Board of Education recommendation  
10 that OSSE change the graduation requirements  
11 for ELL students, and especially students with  
12 interrupted formal education.

13           The criteria for this should be that  
14 ELLs with ACCESS levels 1 through 3 placed in  
15 high schools should be exempt from the four-  
16 year graduation cohort and allowed at least  
17 five years to prepare for college and career  
18 readiness before graduation. Placing these  
19 students in a five-year graduation cohort  
20 should not penalize the school score in any  
21 way.

22           The current practice of encouraging

1 these students to graduate within four years  
2 is doing them a severe disservice. They often  
3 have to pay to take remedial classes at  
4 college that are non-credit-bearing courses.  
5 This means they have to spend more money, and  
6 it will take them even longer to earn a  
7 college degree, thus putting up even more  
8 barriers for them to achieve their dreams.  
9 Under the current OSSE proposal, schools like  
10 Cardozo would be penalized due to our high ELL  
11 and SpEd (phonetic) populations. I believe  
12 that our school should be rewarded for opening  
13 our doors to these students.

14 I also believe that school climate  
15 and culture should play a role in a school  
16 score card. However, I think more research  
17 does need to be done in order to accurately  
18 measure climate. I think the superficial ways  
19 of looking at suspension (phonetic) numbers or  
20 what is displayed on the walls of a school is  
21 not a useful way to measure climate. Also, if  
22 surveys are to be used, they must be available

1 in all of the home languages of the students  
2 at a school, and they should be piloted to  
3 make sure that translations make sense and  
4 that students understand what they're being  
5 asked in order to ensure accurate results.  
6 Thank you for your time.

7 MS. SMITH: Nancy Smith. I'm a 49-  
8 year Ward 4 resident. I've had nine kids and  
9 two grandchildren in the DC system, almost  
10 continuously since 1971. I have a  
11 granddaughter now at Takoma and one in the PTO  
12 and the LSAT there. I'm a member of the  
13 Coolidge Community Working Group, Ward 4  
14 Education Alliance, and SHAKE I'm not  
15 representing any of those organizations, but I  
16 am speaking for the insights provided by the  
17 many years' involvement in DCPS.

18 I submitted written comments on the  
19 original OSSE proposal and expressed a range  
20 of concerns, and am please -- delighted,  
21 actually -- to recognize that those concerns  
22 were almost entirely addressed by the State

1 Board's recommendations. I applaud the Board  
2 for its thoughtful approach that represents a  
3 more wholistic approach to assessment of  
4 school quality. I'm extremely disappointed to  
5 see how little of your recommendations were  
6 adopted.

7           It's my extremely strong  
8 recommendation that this Board not approve  
9 OSSE's draft until further revisions are made  
10 in alignment with your proposals. And I'm  
11 particularly concerned not only about the  
12 overreliance on test scores -- I prefer growth  
13 to proficiency. I'm glad there's been some  
14 change, but it's still -- 70 percent is  
15 ridiculous. And I could not support Scott  
16 Abbott's testimony more on the importance of  
17 including indicators of a well-rounded  
18 education. And what they're proposing is not  
19 acceptable.

20           I have one issue that was not  
21 addressed by the Board, and that is the  
22 proposed star system that reduces a school

1 performance to a single rating based so  
2 heavily on scores on a single test, even  
3 under, you know, the changes that are  
4 proposed. Such a system is highly misleading  
5 to parents and should be replaced by a  
6 dashboard that describes the strengths,  
7 challenges, and unique characteristics or  
8 specialties of the school. While more in-  
9 depth information may certainly be available  
10 with the star system, the reality is that  
11 parents will quickly discount a school with a  
12 small number of stars without delving into  
13 that information. And as you know all too  
14 well, that single score is biased toward  
15 schools that serve predominantly high SES  
16 students and against those that serve high  
17 populations of ELL and SpEd students, or  
18 students facing poverty and homelessness and  
19 trauma.

20           The latter schools may be doing a  
21 superb job of meeting the need so their  
22 students who face serious challenges while

1 simultaneously serving its high-achieving  
2 students well. But that single score will  
3 never let us know because it's so weighted by  
4 the kids facing so many challenges.

5           Again -- one other thing I wish could  
6 be included, by the way, on climate is a  
7 measure of teacher retention -- schools with  
8 high churn. I think that's a problem, and I  
9 think that that's more meaningful than  
10 attendance of students -- oh, and reenrollment  
11 of students.

12           Again, I'm delighted the Board has  
13 made excellent recommendations that would  
14 result in a much-improved, more flexible, and  
15 more realistic accountability system. But if  
16 your recommendations are not adopted by OSSE,  
17 I hope you'll vote no and delay submission of  
18 the plan. This is the one power the Board  
19 has, and through the one power the community  
20 has to shape the mechanisms of accountability  
21 for our schools. I hope OSSE responds  
22 favorably, but if they don't, I sincerely hope

1 you will exercise your power.

2 MS. FITZPATRICK: My name is Anne  
3 Fitzpatrick. I'm a parent of two kids at  
4 School-Within-School @ Goding, which is a DC  
5 public school. And I'm here speaking not only  
6 for myself but for a group of parents and a  
7 teacher at school as well as some LSAT reps  
8 and the LSAT chair. I'd like to thank you for  
9 the opportunity to provide input on OSSE's  
10 Accountability Plan today as well as at the  
11 community meetings you cohosted across the  
12 district in February.

13 We were pleased to see in your  
14 recently released recommendations that you had  
15 been listening. Your recommendations include  
16 some key steps to address the significant  
17 concerns we have with OSSE's plan, and we urge  
18 you to hold your ground on them. You have a  
19 vital role as the voices of our community. We  
20 also urge you to tell OSSE that submitting the  
21 plan in April is not reasonable or realistic.  
22 It was clear at the community forums that

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 parents and teachers do not think the draft  
2 plan is at all adequate. Let's take the time  
3 to put together a thoughtful plan that  
4 reflects our values.

5           We want to share some specific  
6 concerns from our school's perspective.  
7 School-Within-School @ Goding is a pre-K-3-to-  
8 5th-grade DC public school with citywide  
9 enrollment. It exemplifies DCPS commitment to  
10 innovative, high-quality education. The  
11 school was founded in 1995 by four teachers  
12 who wanted to apply the Reggio Emilia  
13 education philosophy, first developed in  
14 postwar Italy by a psychologist, as it has  
15 evolved through continuous research on  
16 education. Central to our school's approach  
17 is that teachers listen to children, observe  
18 them, understand their thinking, structure  
19 activities in the environment to support and  
20 extend their thinking, and draw from their  
21 interests to plan for future learning.

22           We have found these methods to be

1 extremely effective for our students, and our  
2 school is drawing families from all over the  
3 city who want this progressive approach to  
4 education for their own children. The success  
5 of our school is due to enthusiastic teachers  
6 and engaged parents dedicated to seeing our  
7 children as individuals. This is the kind of  
8 innovation that is jeopardized by a top-down,  
9 narrowly focused, testing-driven  
10 accountability system. We are deeply  
11 concerned that OSSE's Draft Plan does not do  
12 enough to move us away from that.

13           Tying 80 percent of a school's  
14 assessment, or even 70 or 74 percent, to a  
15 single test guarantees the teachers will feel  
16 pressure to teach to that test. When parents  
17 raised at the community meetings -- at which I  
18 was at CHPSP0 as well as Ward 5 -- that about  
19 this emphasis on testing, Superintendent Kang  
20 and her staff repeatedly noted that half of  
21 the weight, 40 percent, measures growth rather  
22 than proficiency. It's unclear why we would

1 weigh proficiency so heavily when weighting  
2 growth is the answer to so many concerns.  
3 Regardless, whether we weight growth or  
4 proficiency, it's all still based on a single  
5 test. We must think carefully about the  
6 incentives we create when we set up these  
7 accountability standards. Accountability that  
8 undermines a teacher's ability to meet student  
9 needs is not worth the price. In light of  
10 these concerns, we support your  
11 recommendations to expand the weight of non-  
12 test factors and to include a well-rounded  
13 education measure.

14 I spent a few minutes on my phone  
15 trying to get up to speed on the changes  
16 proposed yesterday, and it is clear that they  
17 don't go far enough. Your recommendations  
18 were already enough of a compromise, and we  
19 urge you not to adopt the plan as proposed to  
20 be changed. We continue to support you as you  
21 stand your ground. Thank you.

22 MS. SAMMIS: Good evening. My name

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 is Sevanna Sammis, and I'm an instructional  
2 coach at Cardozo Education Campus and a  
3 resident of Ward 1. As an instructional coach  
4 at Cardozo, I work predominantly with our ELLs  
5 and teachers who are servicing ELL students.  
6 And I've been working with ELLs for the past  
7 six years, and my comment will be short about  
8 testing and accountability for our school.

9 I strongly urge that OSSE use ACCESS  
10 scores as a growth measure instead of PARCC,  
11 especially for our beginning English language  
12 learners. As Stephanie Beer testified, our  
13 school is almost 50 percent ELL. And I want  
14 to give you a little bit about the context of  
15 how our school operates under all the testing.

16 We spent all year preparing for  
17 PARCC. Students take numerous interim  
18 assessments leading up to PARCC, and our  
19 teachers spend countless morning special  
20 development sessions analyzing PARCC questions  
21 instead of preparing and addressing the real  
22 needs of their students, such as writing

1 curriculum for our students with interrupted  
2 education. None of our DCPS curriculum meets  
3 the needs of students who have four, five, six  
4 years of gaps in their education.

5           As an instructional coach, I've had  
6 to change my work with teachers to focus on  
7 preparing for PARCC. I'm not able to support  
8 teachers or students the way I know is most  
9 effective for student learning. And as a  
10 school, when we get into testing PARCC, we  
11 have to dedicate a great deal of resources to  
12 actually minister the PARCC exam. We have no  
13 laptops available in our entire building,  
14 where we have 800 students. About 500 take  
15 the test. At any given time, we have one to  
16 200 students testing. That means no resources  
17 are available for the rest of our students.  
18 Our teaching schedule is completely  
19 interrupted for the students and the teachers.

20           And I really urge you to consider the  
21 impact of testing, especially on schools with  
22 such diverse populations at Cardozo. Thank

1 you.

2 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you for  
3 your testimony.

4 Are there any questions by the  
5 members? Mr. Jacobson.

6 MR. JACOBSON: Thank you. I'll try  
7 and be brief.

8 Mr. Abbott, I think I've asked you  
9 this question before, but you keep using your  
10 DCPS email address and title, but your  
11 comments are your own, not DCPS's? Is that  
12 correct?

13 MR. ABBOTT: I'm here speaking on my  
14 own behalf, not necessarily on behalf of DCPS,  
15 that's correct.

16 MR. JACOBSON: Okay. Great. Thank  
17 you for clarifying that.

18 Ms. Beer?

19 MS. BEER: Yes.

20 MS. JACOBSON: You talk about the  
21 importance of piloting metrics before they're  
22 incorporated into a plan. But we're hearing

1 from a lot of advocates that just want us to  
2 put things into a plan without piloting them.  
3 Can you talk a little bit to the importance of  
4 why pilots matter?

5 MS. BEER: Yeah. So our school was  
6 actually part of a pilot for student surveys  
7 last year that are now used as part of the  
8 teacher evaluations system at DCPS and impact.  
9 And we found that in piloting the surveys with  
10 the ELL population -- it's a survey that's  
11 taken on a computer -- the translation was  
12 very terrible in Spanish. The kids didn't  
13 understand the questions. And so I think that  
14 DCPS took that into consideration, because ELL  
15 teachers are not required to have that survey  
16 as part of their evaluation. I'm not sure if  
17 I agree with that, because the students could  
18 be asked in another way, or they could have  
19 improved the survey so that the students could  
20 still have -- give feedback on their teachers.  
21 But I think it's important that the pilot took  
22 place to make sure that it was an accurate --

1 that it showed accurate results.

2 MR. JACOBSON: Great. It helps work  
3 out kinks and make sure that the entire  
4 process runs better after the pilot's  
5 completed. Excellent.

6 And then, finally, in my last 20  
7 seconds, Ms. Smith, I believe, noted that this  
8 is our only power, only authority. What I'd  
9 just say to you and the rest of the advocates  
10 in the room is, your elected education  
11 represents can have more authority. We need  
12 you to go to Council. We need you go to the  
13 mayor. We need you to advocate for us to be  
14 able to have that power to do more and to  
15 propose changes and not just be given a "yes"  
16 or "no" option.

17 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: How do you do  
18 that?

19 MR. JACOBSON: So I would encourage  
20 you and everyone else in this room and  
21 everyone who's watching on television to  
22 engage with the DC Council, engage with the

1 mayor's office, and empower your elected  
2 education representatives with power to really  
3 represent you. So with that, thank you.

4 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Any other  
5 comments? Ms. Wattenberg.

6 MS. WATTENBERG: Yeah. I just want  
7 to -- two things -- one, acknowledge the  
8 interest in the well-rounded education index,  
9 which got an enormous amount of interest, and  
10 also again on the interest in the climate.  
11 And I want to just acknowledge that in the  
12 Board's recommendation, there were 10 points  
13 for climate and 10 points for well-rounded  
14 education. Because as Mr. Abbott said, they  
15 are not the same thing, but they're both super  
16 important. And the climate proposal was 5  
17 points for both of them. And as has been  
18 noted, they're on decline.

19 The other point I just want to make  
20 to -- I don't --

21 MS. BEER: Beer.

22 MS. WATTENBERG: -- Ms. Beer - is my

1 understanding -- it might be that Ms. Kang  
2 wants to comment -- is that with regard to  
3 giving the PARCC test -- because we raised  
4 this -- with regard to giving the PARCC test  
5 to new immigrant students, that that is a  
6 federal requirement. And while, as you can  
7 tell, I'm very critical of a number of things  
8 in this proposal, I want to be fair and say, I  
9 don't think that is the result of OSSE.

10           The same I believe to the previous  
11 comment where there was a concern which a  
12 number of shared greatly -- I think all of us  
13 -- that the PARCC tests have to be taken by  
14 students with a wide variety of disabilities  
15 that make them completely useless and  
16 inappropriate. That also is a federal  
17 requirement, in the sense that 1 point -- we  
18 can only exempt 1 percent of like -- if I'm  
19 correct on that -- so I just wanted to note  
20 this.

21           MS. BEER: Can I respond to that? I  
22 know it wasn't directed to me.

1           That just speaks to the fact that we  
2 shouldn't emphasize this test so much.

3           (Cross talk)

4           MS. WATTENBERG: I would agree with  
5 you, and I think it is a really good reason to  
6 emphasize more the growth and less of the  
7 test. I totally agree with you on that, but  
8 that is (phonetic) within the power of this  
9 proposal. Thanks for nothing that.

10           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you,  
11 panel. Thank you.

12           UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do you want us  
13 to just leave the testimony there?

14           (Cross talk)

15           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Mr. Badu Miah,  
16 Mary Levy, Alexandra Pardo, and Jessica  
17 Papalia, Andrea Tucker, Maya Martin.

18           (Cross talk)

19           MS. PARDO: Good evening. I'm  
20 Alexandra Pardo of Town Square. I'm here with  
21 Jessica Enes, who's the former director of  
22 assessment at OSSE. And together, with

1 empower creek 12, we submitted public  
2 testimony to OSSE on behalf of our schools.  
3 We want to highlight for you tonight five key  
4 priorities which we believe will improve the  
5 alignment of the accountability system and  
6 state of priorities.

7           Priority number one: Reduce the  
8 unnecessarily long time lines. The Office of  
9 State Superintendent's plan seeks to reach  
10 commendable goals for all students and  
11 subgroups. However, the time line is  
12 unnecessarily long with overall stated goals  
13 set for 2039 -- 22 years from today, and 7  
14 years longer than any other state submitting  
15 in April. We strongly encourage OSSE to build  
16 a sense of urgency in our schools, work to  
17 close the achievement gap and threaten  
18 (phonetic) the proposed time line, creating a  
19 system better aligned to expectations set by  
20 other states.

21           Priority two: Create a governing  
22 structure of external stakeholders to steward

1 the plan. We are concerned about the absence  
2 of meaningful stakeholder engagement in the  
3 development of policy and business roles as  
4 the plan is refined. We recommend one,  
5 removing the details not required by the  
6 Department of Education from the plan; two,  
7 publishing the data used to create the plan,  
8 so stakeholders may better understand the  
9 policy implications and predict their scores;  
10 and three, codifying a governing structure of  
11 external stakeholders for refinements to the  
12 plan. It is critical that those held  
13 accountable have a meaningful voice.

14           Priority three: Refine how growth  
15 and subgroups are weighted in this plan. We  
16 concur with the State Board that a successful  
17 accountability system must identify  
18 appropriate measures and weights based on key  
19 elements of school quality. We are concerned,  
20 however, that growth and subgroup weighting in  
21 the plan are not aligned with those key  
22 elements. OSSE's plan focuses on the

1 identification of low-achievement, low-growth  
2 schools over recognition of high growth,  
3 creating a bias against schools serving large  
4 at-risk populations. We urge OSSE to adjust  
5 how growth is incorporated in the plan, so  
6 high-growth schools can achieve high ratings.  
7 The framework focuses on subgroup performance,  
8 but the formula masks major gaps. An extreme  
9 within school gaps may result in just one-  
10 point differences in overall scores. We  
11 recommend that OSSE revise this approach to  
12 subgroups to more strategically address this  
13 issue.

14           Priority four: Revise ELL metrics to  
15 align with research and programmatic  
16 offerings. Research shows that language  
17 acquisition is not linear, and varies based on  
18 proficiency and grade level. The current plan  
19 is built on the assumption of linear growth,  
20 rejected by WIDA. We recommend that OSSE  
21 align its plan with WIDA's research and  
22 recommendations for measuring growth. Two, DC

1 has many wonderful language immersion  
2 programs. The goal of immersion is for  
3 students to be bilingual upon program  
4 completion, and thus, the rate of language  
5 acquisition is different. We urge OSSE to  
6 consider unintended adverse impact of unique  
7 high-value programs such as immersion  
8 programs.

9           Priority five: Inclusion of early  
10 college access programs. High schools are the  
11 final steps for preparing students for  
12 colleges and careers. It is essential that  
13 their measures focus on college and career  
14 readiness. Therefore, we recommend, one,  
15 including dual-enrollment participation  
16 measure. Research indicates that exposure to  
17 early college coursework is among the most  
18 effective strategies to increase college  
19 readiness. Yet dual enrollment is absent from  
20 the plan, although OSSE recognizes that over  
21 300 students in our high schools participate  
22 in dual enrollment. Two, broadening the

1 definition of college and career to include  
2 dual enrollment. OSSE's plan disadvantages  
3 high schools with limited APIB programs and  
4 dictates unfunded mandates. These programs  
5 are expenses, and schools without them are  
6 adversely impacted. We ask OSSE to define how  
7 costs associated with the APIB mandate will be  
8 mitigated, or to include the dual-enrollment  
9 options.

10 We commend efforts by OSSE in its  
11 first draft. We believe that a final plan  
12 that considers these concerns will create a  
13 national model for accountability that drives  
14 rapid improvement and guarantees educational  
15 equality for all. But we don't believe we  
16 need to wait 22 years for that.

17 MS. LEVY: Good evening. I'm Mary  
18 Levy. For those of you who don't know me,  
19 I've studied the DC Public Schools for the  
20 last 25 years. I collect data. I've also  
21 participated in every major reform effort in  
22 DC Public Schools, including directing a

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 couple of plans. And I've had a great deal of  
2 opportunity to become disillusioned with  
3 accountability schemes.

4           On the basis of months of study and  
5 public and expert comment, this Board recently  
6 prepared ten consensus recommendations for the  
7 improvement of the ESSA Draft State Plan that  
8 OSSE issued on January the 31st. I mean, I  
9 found those recommendations to be well thought  
10 out, to be well grounded in expert knowledge  
11 and research, and happily, to be reflective of  
12 what parents and community have been asking  
13 throughout the process.

14           Unfortunately, the very minor changes  
15 proposed in yesterday's summary responses to  
16 public engagement come nowhere near meeting  
17 the Board's recommendations. I think that the  
18 heart of the problem is overreliance on  
19 testing, by which I mean on a pair of tests --  
20 ELA and math -- and underuse of other  
21 important measures of educational quality.  
22 And I think this creates an accountability

1 system that is actually counterproductive to  
2 other measures -- I mean -- I'm sorry -- to  
3 effective education.

4           You've heard some of the reasons for  
5 this tonight. You've heard it in other  
6 meetings, and I put them in, in earlier  
7 submission. I've repeated them below. I'm  
8 not going to go through them now, but I would  
9 like to add -- listening to what people have  
10 said before -- that teacher turnover of one-  
11 third of the faculty at high-risk schools  
12 makes it virtually impossible for them to get  
13 the kind of stars that we wish they did.

14           The plan, as it now stands, simply  
15 maintains the flaws of No Child Left Behind:  
16 limited range of metrics and punitive  
17 pass/fail measures. And I think part of the  
18 problem there is that it's all punitive. And  
19 yet we have never addressed collectively the  
20 major disparities in opportunity for students.  
21 That really needs to be part of it -- needs to  
22 be more than just part of this plan -- but we

1 need to do it.

2           So I hope you will act as we want  
3 good educators to do and stand by the  
4 standards that you set in the recommendations.  
5 It's what we elected you to do, and we're  
6 counting on you to do it. Thank you.

7           MS. MARTIN: Good evening, State  
8 Board of Education members and State  
9 Superintendent Kang. My name is Maya Martin,  
10 and I'm a Ward 6 resident as of a week ago.  
11 I'm also the founder and executive director of  
12 PAVE, Parents Amplifying Voices in Education,  
13 whose mission is to empower, connect, and  
14 train charter parent leaders to give families  
15 in DC a voice and a choice in the vision for  
16 education in our city.

17           At PAVE, we believe that parents are  
18 partners and leaders in developing a diversity  
19 of safe, nurturing, and great schools for  
20 every child and every ward in the community,  
21 and that for too long parents have been  
22 informed of our education policy decisions

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 after they've already been made instead of  
2 being invited to the table to help make them.

3           On Thursday, March 9th, the Senate  
4 voted 50 to 49 to block the accountability  
5 rules for the Every Student Succeeds Act --  
6 ESSA -- created by the Obama Administration.  
7 According to education policy and analysts,  
8 without the rules, states will now have to  
9 look to the text of ESSA alone to determine  
10 what types of accountability measures are  
11 allowed under the law.

12           Contrary to what is being said, the  
13 regulations actually gave state education  
14 agencies additional flexibility that was not  
15 founded in the earlier version of ESSA. It is  
16 extremely unfortunate that Congress has taken  
17 this step, especially given that the  
18 Congressional Review Act will keep the  
19 Department of Education from making  
20 regulations like the ones that they just voted  
21 to repeal.

22           I am concerned that some opponents of

1 accountability will use this opportunity to  
2 try and take control over DC's state education  
3 plan, just as they have insinuated a desire to  
4 control other things, like vouchers and  
5 legalized marijuana that should be our  
6 autonomy as a state and as voters. It's  
7 extremely unfortunate as well that Congress  
8 has taken this step, but I want to encourage  
9 the DC State Board to approve the new plan's  
10 weight for student growth and achievement,  
11 which advances equity by being open about how  
12 students are performing across all demographic  
13 groups.

14 I've been highly impressed as a  
15 resident and as an education leader with the  
16 thoughtfulness with which State Board members  
17 have taken their role in reviewing the plan,  
18 and OSSE has taken in creating and revising  
19 the plan, as you are all doing critical work  
20 to invest towards approving a quality rating  
21 system for all public schools on March 22nd.

22 DC's state education plan includes

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 the type of thinking that is lauded and  
2 supported by many civil rights groups, who  
3 believe states should create ratings that are,  
4 in large part, focused on academic growth and  
5 sufficiency. And the plan was initially  
6 drafted with the Obama Administration's focus  
7 on transparency, state autonomy, and  
8 accountability in mind, things that I think we  
9 can all agree are important values in a state  
10 with taxation without representation.

11 As the executive director of PAVE, my  
12 staff and I frequently encounter parents who  
13 are frustrated by the inability to determine  
14 how their children's charter school is  
15 performing in comparison to all the other  
16 district public schools across the city.  
17 They're excited about the prospect of a new  
18 uniform accountability system, and they want  
19 to make sure that their children attend  
20 schools where academics are at the forefront  
21 of the decision making. The current plan  
22 allows for just that, with the largest share,

1 40 percent of the measure, focused on growth,  
2 with 30 percent for elementary and middle  
3 school focused on proficiency, and with 25  
4 percent focus on the school environment.

5 I understand concerns that some  
6 parents have expressed about the potential of  
7 overtesting and pressures teachers face when  
8 they work with students who are well behind  
9 academically. However, the parents and  
10 community leaders that we work with that sit  
11 on our board of directors, and that we talk to  
12 on a daily basis, want us to be honest about  
13 how our students are actually performing.

14 I have high ambitions for what  
15 students can achieve with the right amount of  
16 support, caring teachers, and a well-designed  
17 curriculum. And as a fifth-generation  
18 Washingtonian whose grandparents attended  
19 Dunbar High School when it was known as one of  
20 the best high schools in the country, at a  
21 time when DC did not expect black children and  
22 youth to perform at such high levels, and I

1 know that our DC schools and our DC kids can  
2 all achieve and succeed. Thank you for all of  
3 your hard work in getting a plan that  
4 incorporates the voices of all of our parents  
5 and that keeps us focused on the power and  
6 promise of the public education of our kids.  
7 All children deserves to go to great schools,  
8 and we support DC's accountability framework  
9 and make sure that we hold everyone  
10 accountable for great schools made up of a  
11 positive school culture and climate and high  
12 academic growth and achievement.

13 MS. TUCKER: Good evening, members of  
14 the State Board of Education, and thank you  
15 for allowing me to testify here today. My  
16 name is Andrea Tucker. I'm a native of  
17 Washington, DC, a Ward 8 resident, and a  
18 parent of three at JO Wilson Elementary  
19 School, a title one school in Ward 6. I am  
20 also the PTA president, a member of the LSAT,  
21 and a proud graduate of JO Wilson Elementary  
22 School. I want to first thank you for your

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 ten recommendations on how to improve the  
2 accountability plan. Your recommendations  
3 reflected many of our -- my concerns and those  
4 of other parents I heard at the community  
5 meeting last month, where OSSE presented on  
6 the plan and took questions.

7           Prior to the meeting, I thought that  
8 the plan would represent a new way of thinking  
9 in DC. I thought it would be an opportunity  
10 to look at our unique city and create an  
11 accountability plan that would work for our  
12 schools and for our children. That was not  
13 what I heard then. Instead, I heard about an  
14 accountability plan that rates schools almost  
15 entirely on reading and math scores. Making  
16 sure students have access to arts and science  
17 and social studies and technology is important  
18 to having a well-rounded education. It is  
19 something we should encourage in every school  
20 across the city. So I was glad to see your  
21 recommendations on the need to evaluate to  
22 evaluate our schools based on our well-rounded

1 education and not focused so narrowly.

2           We know that all schools are equal in  
3 their course markers -- are equal in their  
4 course markers now, and this plan should be  
5 one way to push the system towards equity, not  
6 create wider divisions in quality. If all  
7 schools are judged by not just reading and  
8 math but other subjects, wouldn't that be one  
9 way to encourage all schools to offer them?

10           I hope that you will make these  
11 changes towards a well-rounded education view  
12 now and not wait and revisit it and the need  
13 for it later. My concern is that once the  
14 plan goes through the approval process, we may  
15 not have a chance to revisit it. I have not  
16 sign the final plan to know whether or not --  
17 or how much has been included in there. As a  
18 proud DCPS alumni and a current parent with  
19 children in DCPS, I have been a witness to  
20 what makes a great school. While test scores  
21 are one factor I use to judge a school, it is  
22 definitely not the only one. I also care a

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 lot about the culture and climate of the  
2 school. It's important that kids are safe,  
3 and the environment in the school is conducive  
4 to learning. I was glad to see your  
5 recommendations address culture and climate  
6 and understanding the quality of the school.  
7 I am hopeful that is now a part of the plan  
8 and not one to put off for the future.

9 I also care about holding teachers  
10 and staff accountable for children's learning  
11 or lack thereof. No child should go to middle  
12 or high school reading on the second-grade  
13 level. I do not believe that the State Board  
14 of Education should approve this plan without  
15 having OSSE make these changes first and  
16 allowing the public to have one more  
17 opportunity to review it. We have done our  
18 part by attending the meetings and reading the  
19 plan. OSSE has not done its part in sharing  
20 about changes in a timely manner, so I have  
21 not time to understand any of the changes.

22 I would close by saying that the

1 community meeting I attended in Ward 6 was a  
2 large gathering of parents who were diverse in  
3 every way. But we are united in our  
4 questions, concerns, and goals. That was very  
5 reassuring to know that we are all pushing in  
6 the same direction for our children, and I  
7 hope city leaders are listening and will make  
8 necessary changes. Thank you for your time  
9 and inviting public testimony -- I'm sorry --  
10 testimony on this issue.

11 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you,  
12 panelists, for coming out and testifying.

13 Does the Board have any questions?  
14 Mr. Weedon.

15 MR. WEEDON: So I want to return to a  
16 question I asked earlier of this panel as  
17 well. Where do you-all stand on the issue of  
18 proficiency versus growth? I heard that a lot  
19 and that was touched upon, but I'd love to  
20 hear a little bit more.

21 MS. PAPAIA: So we think both  
22 measures are important. But I think one thing

1 that's, I think, lost a little bit in this  
2 conversation is that growth can be a  
3 methodology and not a distinct measure.  
4 Everything can be measured in achievement and  
5 growth if you look at things year-over-year.  
6 For example, if you look at attendance, you  
7 can look at how a school performs on  
8 attendance in one year, and their in-seat  
9 attendance rate. You can also look at how  
10 that moves attendance year-over-year. So you  
11 can look at every measure as both an  
12 achievement and a growth measure. And so I  
13 think, as part of our public comments, we'd  
14 love to see more domains incorporate growth,  
15 in addition, as a methodology.

16 MS. LEVY: Okay. I think growth is  
17 much more important, and particularly, when  
18 you think about the second year at schools.  
19 They get -- they take their students as they  
20 get them. And if all you -- you put too much  
21 on proficiency. And I think that was well  
22 illustrated by talking about the students who

1 arrive from other countries, with interrupted  
2 educations. Why should you punish the school  
3 and the teachers because they may be in the  
4 ninth grade and reading, if at all, at a  
5 second-grade level.

6 MS. PARDO: I think the only other  
7 thing I would add is it's really important --  
8 as I said in my testimony. So WIDA, which is  
9 the consortium that DC works with to measure  
10 ELL students, has methods of measuring growth  
11 that are based on skill scores. The current  
12 plan, as proposed, wants to use proficiency  
13 levels, which WIDA actually says you cannot  
14 use to measure growth. And so we'd really  
15 urge OSSE to go back to the WIDA research on  
16 how to measure growth for ELL students and use  
17 that proposed methodology rather than  
18 proficiency levels.

19 MS. LEVY: I didn't realize that OSSE  
20 had been talking about using proficiency  
21 levels as opposed to just proficiency. I  
22 mean --

1 MS. PARDO: For ELLs only.

2 MS. LEVY: Well -- oh, for ELL.  
3 Okay. Because scaled scores tell us much,  
4 much more.

5 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Mr. Jacobson.

6 MR. JACOBSON: Thank you.

7 Ms. Martin, I was hoping that you  
8 might talk a little bit more of why academics  
9 needs to be at the forefront according to  
10 PAVE?

11 MS. MARTIN: Yeah. I mean, I think -  
12 - so one of the things that we've had a lot of  
13 conversations with parents about is that in  
14 terms of their qualitative understanding of  
15 school performance, they get a lot of that  
16 from other parents. So they do a lot of their  
17 homework in their -- going on school tours,  
18 going on school visits, talking to parents --  
19 some parents get it from website, like DC  
20 Urban Moms and Dads. Some parents are getting  
21 it from the My School DC website or from, you  
22 know, conversations that they're having with

1 different stakeholders. But parents have  
2 communicated that, like look, we get that  
3 information from other families, and we  
4 understand some of those qualitative measures.

5           What is much harder for families to  
6 understand are the quantitative measures that  
7 right now are not consistent across the  
8 sectors. And so parents bring up that like  
9 when they look at a DCPS school, they're  
10 seeing something different from when they're  
11 looking at a public charter school. And  
12 that's really hard for parents to understand  
13 the differences between those two systems.  
14 And so I think what parents would like to see  
15 is what are the academic measures that we can  
16 use and we can make transparent across both of  
17 the school systems and our entire education  
18 system. So I think that's one of the things  
19 that parents have talked about.

20           And to go back to Joe's question  
21 about growth, I think that this plan has 40  
22 percent being growth and 30 percent being

1 proficiency. And that is something that I  
2 think reflects the concerns that parents have  
3 made about making sure that it's reflecting  
4 the progress and the growth that students are  
5 making year-over-year. And so I think parents  
6 want to also put that at the forefront, which  
7 I appreciate that this plan has been able to  
8 do.

9 MR. JACOBSON: Great. And then in my  
10 last 30 seconds, another question for you:  
11 Does PAVE object to any qualitative measures  
12 that are included in OSSE's plan?

13 MS. MARTIN: So I mean, I think one  
14 of the -- like we don't object to the  
15 attendance or the reenrollment rate. I think  
16 that's partially because we've been working  
17 with the PCSB performance management framework  
18 that parents understand and that they've been  
19 using to help them inform decisions. I think  
20 the other part about the climate is not  
21 something we object to, but it's also  
22 something that hasn't been totally ironed out

1 yet. So it's not something that we object to  
2 -- the parents object to at all. It's just  
3 something that we've love to see more  
4 information about what that will wind up  
5 looking like.

6 MR. JACOBSON: Thank you and the  
7 entire pannel.

8 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Ms. Wattenberg.

9 MS. TUCKER: Excuse me. Can I have a  
10 chance to respond to Mr. Weedon's question?

11 Okay. Mr. Weedon, as far as growth,  
12 I would like to say that not -- just as all  
13 children don't learn the same, all children  
14 don't test the same. So you can't really get  
15 the true essence of who a child is by taking a  
16 test, because so many different factors can  
17 come into play that day they take a test. So  
18 you can't say whether they are truly  
19 proficient in that subject or not by just one  
20 test.

21 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

22 Ms. Woodruff.

1 MS. WOODRUFF: I just one question.

2 I actually wanted to ask Ms. Martin a  
3 question that goes to growth. You spoke of  
4 that -- of growth, and I want to -- I would  
5 just like to know, does it -- do the parents  
6 you speak to have children? Do any of the  
7 parents have children that are in high school?

8 MS. MARTIN: So most of our families  
9 have kids that are in middle -- elementary and  
10 middle school, and a lot have students that  
11 are in middle school, and fewer have students  
12 that are in high school. We do have some who  
13 are at -- like Thurgood Marshall and some of  
14 the high school -- charter high schools, but  
15 most have children that are in elementary and  
16 middle school.

17 MS. WOODRUFF: So in terms of growth  
18 for high school, you haven't heard of any  
19 communication about that one?

20 MS. MARTIN: Yeah. I mean, and that  
21 one's a little bit harder, simply because the  
22 high school testing is very, very different

1 from the elementary middle school testing. So  
2 that one is harder to kind of step out in  
3 terms of what grade levels are tested and  
4 when.

5 MS. WOODRUFF: All right. And so I  
6 would like to ask anyone on the panel that has  
7 some experience with growth if you could speak  
8 to it for high school.

9 MS. PARDO: Sure. So in my former  
10 role, I was the executive director of Thurgood  
11 Marshall for nine years, which is a high  
12 school, a charter high school in the district.  
13 And so for high schools, I think growth is  
14 critically important, because as you've heard  
15 tonight, students come into high school  
16 throughout the district many, many years  
17 behind -- not all students, but some of our  
18 students. And so having a measure that  
19 recognizes when I get you in ninth grade and  
20 you are in the fifth grade, how much have I  
21 moved you by tenth grade, is critical.

22 But simultaneously, I think OSSE

1 should be commended, because the other part  
2 we're not telling you about is how do you  
3 measure growth for SAT or ACT, and they're  
4 including none in our high school measures  
5 because students also grow on other college-  
6 bound metrics. And so having both a measure  
7 that is going to look at high school growth  
8 from ninth to tenth grade or eighth grade, and  
9 then looking at that PSAT which is down the  
10 pipe, I think, is essential for schools  
11 because that is the last time. When a student  
12 is not on grade level in fifth grade and  
13 eighth grade, you get to move them on. But  
14 high schools is that stop gap. If we don't do  
15 it right in high schools, we fail those  
16 students. There's not a second opportunity  
17 after that.

18 MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you.

19 MS. WATTENBERG: To Ms. --

20 MS. PARDO: Alexandra Pardo.

21 MS. WATTENBERG: Alexandra Pardo. So  
22 I want --

1           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Turn your mic  
2 on.

3           MS. WATTENBERG: I want to go back to  
4 something yet that you raised about the growth  
5 issue, where you talked about -- I don't know  
6 if it was a concern or a question or an issue  
7 related to how the current plan addresses high  
8 growth for schools and whether or not the  
9 current plan would adequately recognize them.  
10 So I just wanted to hear what you had to say  
11 about that.

12           MS. PAPALIA: Yeah. I'll just  
13 actually talk about that. Sure. So we did a  
14 little bit of modeling. And where our concern  
15 is, is that when we look at -- modeled out  
16 using the framework details that were  
17 available to us -- we look at a huge-gap  
18 school, a no-gap school, and two schools that  
19 are very homogenous, and we see that -- you  
20 know, all students -- you get a score for all  
21 students. Then you get a score for each  
22 subgroup of students based on the subgroups

1 that are in your school.

2           When we did that modeling out, we  
3 found that a huge-gap school, based on the  
4 fake data that we put in there -- if all  
5 students had one score, and there was a giant  
6 gap between two subgroups, they would only  
7 score two points lower in their overall school  
8 score than a score with -- than a school with  
9 no gap or two different homogenous schools,  
10 regardless of how those schools performed --  
11 or how students in those schools performed.  
12 So we're really concerned that that gap -- a  
13 no-school gap versus a huge-school gap could  
14 really so poorly.

15           MS. WATTENBERG: So that's one issue  
16 is that the way that the subgroups are  
17 calculated --

18           MS. PAPALIA: Uh-huh (affirmative).

19           MS. WATTENBERG: -- could mean that a  
20 high-gap school does not get flagged.

21           MS. PAPALIA: Correct.

22           MS. WATTENBERG: And what about the

1 school that is low scoring and high growth?  
2 Is that something else that you would  
3 addressed?

4 MS. PAPALIA: Absolutely. I  
5 apologize. A low- -- a high-growth school  
6 would have to score almost perfect on every  
7 other metric in order to get a high-star  
8 rating. On every other metric, they would  
9 have to score almost perfectly.

10 MS. WATTENBERG: If they were low, or  
11 if they had low scoring proficiency --

12 MS. PAPALIA: Uh-huh (affirmative).

13 MS. WATTENBERG: -- they'd have to  
14 score almost perfect in everything else to get  
15 a high-star rating.

16 MS. PAPALIA: Correct.

17 MS. WATTENBERG: Thank you. And  
18 you're modeling -- you said that was based --  
19 did I hear you say fake numbers or real  
20 numbers or --

21 MS. PAPALIA: It's based on the rules  
22 in the plan, but it's based on data that is

1 publicly available, sample data -- you know,  
2 if all students score 75 percent.

3 MS. WATTENBERG: So I guess my time  
4 is up. Has someone got data available for us  
5 to look at?

6 MS. PAPALIA: We have historical  
7 school data, but in terms of --

8 MS. WATTENBERG: Or not the data, the  
9 modeling, because that's where that we could  
10 touch base --.

11 MS. PAPALIA: I mean, we'd be happy  
12 to share that with you.

13 MS. WATTENBERG: Thank you.

14 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you,  
15 panelists. Thank you very much for  
16 testifying. Amber Schlick, Erich Martel,  
17 Cathy Reilly, Emily Gasoi, and Emily Mechner.

18 MS. SCHLICK: Yeah? Hello. My name  
19 is Amber Schlick, and I'm the strategy and  
20 policy manager for E.L. Haynes Public Charter  
21 School. On March 3rd, we submitted public  
22 comments to OSSE in response to the Draft



1 floors and targets included in the plan are  
2 too specific at this point in the process, and  
3 OSSE needs to conduct more modeling and  
4 facilitate additional feedback sessions before  
5 establishing final floors and targets.  
6 Additionally, OSSE should consider creating a  
7 minimum range for metrics where the 10th and  
8 90th aren't too close together.

9           For example, on the performance  
10 management framework, the Public Charter  
11 School Board's established a minimum range for  
12 in-seat attendance because the 10th and 90th  
13 percentiles are less than 10 percentage points  
14 apart. Without a minimum range, the point  
15 fluctuation with even an immaterial change in  
16 attendance would be large.

17           Growth to proficiency. The  
18 description of growth-to-proficiency metrics  
19 should be revised to focus on the goals,  
20 including growth to proficiency as a metric  
21 instead of already specifying the actual  
22 growth targets. IA (phonetic) students who

1 start in levels 1, 2, and 3 must grow at least  
2 one-third of the gap each year. For example,  
3 OSSE could revise the language at the end of  
4 page 42 by saying, "To complement median --  
5 the median growth percentile and address some  
6 of these limitations, OSSE will also include a  
7 measure of growth to proficiency in the  
8 accountability framework. Growth to  
9 proficiency is the percent of students who  
10 need a scale score growth target. We will  
11 continue to research absolute growth targets  
12 and will establish targets before the 2017-18  
13 school year."

14 ACT, SAT, DC 50th percentile  
15 threshold. We support that OSSE is  
16 intentionally including a metric that will  
17 show progress schools are making with students  
18 who have not yet met the college-ready-by  
19 chart on the SAT. However, given the  
20 uncertainty of how the SAT and ACT metrics  
21 will be calculated in the new accountability  
22 framework, we strongly recommend OSSE remove

1 the 50th percentile threshold and revise the  
2 description of this measure to say, "ACT, SAT,  
3 intermediate benchmark metric."

4           Alternative graduation rate. The  
5 audience appreciates OSSE's effort to ensure  
6 that schools who graduate students beyond four  
7 and five years receive credit within the  
8 accountability framework. However, our  
9 concern is that the current metric may not  
10 accomplish this goal. As it stands, schools  
11 at the high four-year graduation rate will  
12 still have a high alternative graduation rate.  
13 They will therefore raise the targets in the  
14 framework and make it difficult for schools  
15 with low four-year graduation rates to earn  
16 points, even if they graduate significant  
17 numbers of students who complete their degrees  
18 in five years or more.

19           For each of the above metrics, we  
20 recommend OSSE look at the detail outlined in  
21 this section and establish a technical working  
22 group to solidify the details before the 2017-

1 '18 school year. Thank you for the  
2 opportunity to testify.

3 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you so  
4 much.

5 Mr. Martel.

6 MR. MARTEL: Thank you. My name is  
7 Erich Martel. I'm a retired DCPS high school  
8 teacher. You can only fairly and validly  
9 evaluate individuals. You cannot evaluate a  
10 collective entity such as a school staff. Two  
11 or three whole-school averages derived from  
12 tests, climate scores, or graduation rates are  
13 inherently unethical and invalid. Student  
14 tests that have no consequences for students,  
15 which are -- but are used to evaluate teachers  
16 and staff, and even excess staff in closed  
17 schools are unreliable. They don't describe  
18 the strengths and the needs of the teaching  
19 staff.

20 These so-called school accountability  
21 criteria infantilize students and disempower  
22 teachers. Students are informed that they are

1 not responsible for their learning, their test  
2 results, their attendance, their behavior, and  
3 their school's atmosphere; only their school's  
4 teachers and staff are. And it seems like  
5 many of the schools in the city have not been  
6 visited by people who write these rules. And  
7 I realize that these are -- many of them come  
8 from the US Department of Education and from  
9 OSSE and that this body does not have a lot of  
10 authority. And everyone, as Mr. Jacobson  
11 said, needs to try to get more authority so  
12 that -- but nonetheless, you do have the power  
13 of the pulpit.

14           A good example of this was what  
15 happened at Wilson High School last year where  
16 students acted in their own self-interest and  
17 did not -- some of them skipped the PARCC  
18 test; some of them deliberately went through  
19 it very quickly. So they could do what?  
20 Study for something that meant something: AP  
21 exams.

22           All right. So what are the

1 recommendations? I would -- I'm suggesting  
2 that you add is that in all publicly funded DC  
3 schools, students who receive Level-1 scores  
4 on the PARCC ELA and PARCC mathematics test be  
5 retained in grade. How many were there last  
6 year? Quite a few. And -- well, I'm just  
7 talking about Level 1. Level 2 is also a  
8 failing level. 1,300 high school students on  
9 the geometry exam got Level 1; 6,300 -- 6,300  
10 on the math exam, Grades 3 through 8, and  
11 7,200 3-through- students on the ELA portion  
12 of the test.

13           Let's see. And to get an idea of the  
14 unethical aspect of this, just imagine if  
15 teachers were told that they could only give a  
16 single grade to all the students in their  
17 classes. Consider what the impact of that  
18 would be. Yet we can give single grades to an  
19 entire school staff, as if everybody had the  
20 same effect on students' performance without  
21 the students being held responsible for any  
22 aspect of it. Or not just the students. What

1 about evaluating the effectiveness of the  
2 various mandates that teachers are required to  
3 follow? All the time spent on meetings? Or  
4 even the questions on how effective Common  
5 Core is.

6           And I'll just finish by saying that  
7 the DCMR says that there are only so many --  
8 that after ten unexcused absences, there needs  
9 to be a whole series of procedures that are  
10 followed other than to have the student's  
11 grade lowered. You should find out from the  
12 State Superintendent whether or not any -- if  
13 she has any records of the many students --  
14 there were 862 students who had over 21  
15 unexcused absences in the 2016 graduation  
16 class.

17           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

18           Ms. Reilly.

19           MS. REILLY: Thank you. My name is  
20 Cathy Reilly, and I'm the director of the  
21 Senior High Alliance of Parents, Principals,  
22 and Educators, and a Ward 4 resident, and part

1 of Ward 4 Education Alliance. Thank you for  
2 this opportunity.

3           This is a quote from the final  
4 regulations of the FFA: "The bipartisan law  
5 in the EFFA regulations gives states and  
6 districts the opportunity to move beyond No  
7 Child Left Behind, rely upon a limited range  
8 of metrics and punitive pass/fail labels for  
9 schools, and use their planning and  
10 accountability process to reimagine and  
11 redefine what a high-quality education should  
12 mean for their students. To that end, the  
13 final regulations use multiple measures of  
14 school success, reinforcing that all students  
15 deserve a high-quality and well-rounded  
16 education that will prepare them for success."

17           This is the vision we are working  
18 from. Whatever is approved will be  
19 operational across both specters and become  
20 the common metric. We do not view this as  
21 primarily an instrument to facilitate school  
22 choice. Our read on what parents and citizens

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 would like is a high-quality for all students  
2 at all of our schools. The recommendations by  
3 the Board and the feedback from the community  
4 meetings affirm this. What is measured is  
5 what is prioritized and taught.

6 This is an opportunity. You, as the  
7 Board of Education, have given OSSE a road map  
8 to a much better definition of a high-quality  
9 education. It is our best hope that you will  
10 use your authority, as our representatives, to  
11 ensure that your road map is followed. It was  
12 reasonable and well thought out.

13 For the high school, while  
14 adjustments for improvement in attendance and  
15 expansion to 9 percent for the alternative  
16 graduation rate are welcome, the failure to  
17 include a growth metric or school climate  
18 survey is still a big problem. We don't want  
19 you to just include it without a pilot if the  
20 two years was too long. OSSE has said that  
21 they share this concern; however, they are not  
22 committed to it in the policy.

1 I see students who may not be getting  
2 a 3 on the AP or PARCC still getting an  
3 education that is moving them forward. I see  
4 them as Winston students argue a court case at  
5 the district court or Ballou students be  
6 accomplished members a band. The whole  
7 purpose of ESSA was to allow school districts  
8 to show this and encourage these pursuits as  
9 part of a quality education.

10 While the aim is to continue  
11 improving test performance and attendance and  
12 grad rates, this is not the sole focus of the  
13 professionals in our high schools, nor should  
14 it be. My concern is that I don't see school  
15 quality adequately reflected yet, and I see  
16 schools that are working with young people  
17 that come in with significant challenges,  
18 unfairly evaluated. The five-start rating  
19 system contributes to the inequality embedded  
20 in the current draft.

21 So even with the best intentions of  
22 OSSE, your recommendations have to be better

1 reflected in the policy you vote on. We just  
2 see too much turnover and change and too many  
3 broken promises to not need it in the policy  
4 before you vote. So I went on to say what --  
5 you know, what's not right yet for the  
6 elementary and middle schools. And I just  
7 want to say in closing, our passion on this  
8 comes from a belief that the work you do here  
9 is very important, and it will have a large  
10 impact on the education of our young people.  
11 A poor blunt instrument actually does harm.  
12 So by March 22nd, you still have time to make  
13 changes. And if not, I think you should vote  
14 it down and go back to editing. We believe  
15 you can get it right. Thank you.

16 MS. GASOI: Good evening, and thank  
17 you for this opportunity to testify. My name  
18 is Emily Gasoi. I'm a Ward 1 resident. I'm a  
19 parent of a pre-K-4 student in DC, and I'm a  
20 educator of -- I've played many roles,  
21 including being a classic teacher for almost  
22 ten years. I've been a new-teacher mentor

1 here in DC. And first of all, I just want to  
2 echo a lot of what I've heard tonight,  
3 including to commend the State Board of  
4 Education for including what I heard at the  
5 two forums that I attended, reflected in the  
6 recommendations.

7 I want to focus on two really good  
8 points. One is, again, echoing what I've  
9 already heard, which is that the emphasis on  
10 student test scores, that reducing it from 80  
11 to 70 percent really doesn't do anything to  
12 address the many, many concerns that we've  
13 heard, the wide range of concerns. And I'm  
14 not going to repeat them because they've been  
15 already talked about both at the forums and  
16 here.

17 But at both forums I attended, the  
18 primary obstacles that I heard OSSE  
19 representatives cite was that the thing that  
20 was preventing them from considering  
21 alternatives to standardized testing were the  
22 lack of adequate stretches in knowledge about

1 how to collect alternate data. And I think  
2 this is a really serious issue, and it's not  
3 something that can be addressed quickly. And  
4 so what it made me realize is that there's  
5 really no way for OSSE to truly address the  
6 concerns they've been hearing in the short  
7 amount of time that they are giving themselves  
8 to put this plan into place.

9           So my second point is related to  
10 this, which is that I strongly urge all of you  
11 to vote "no," unless OSSE agrees to take the  
12 time necessary to, for instance, do the  
13 research it would require. And I know one of  
14 the recommendations was to have a team that  
15 would advise -- give advice about, you know,  
16 how to go forward. I think this should  
17 actually be expanded into either a semi or a  
18 permanent team that would offer research --

19           So I therefore urge you to recommend  
20 that the date of completion for the plan be  
21 deferred at least until September. But  
22 really, if possible, I recommend putting off

1 implementation of the plan for at least a year  
2 in order to put the level of research,  
3 thought, creative energy, and effort that a  
4 meaningful revision of this plan truly  
5 requires. At the very least, I suggest that  
6 OSSE include an amendment to the current plan  
7 that would include a gradual reduction of the  
8 weight tests have and the introduction of  
9 alternative assessments over the next several  
10 years. I would also recommend that the task  
11 force proposed become a permanent research and  
12 development team that would help create and  
13 sustain the necessary support for alternative  
14 assessment systems. Thank you.

15 MS. MECHNER: Hello. Good evening.  
16 My name is Emily Mechner. I'm a Ward 1  
17 resident, DC parent of three kids in  
18 elementary and middle school, and LSAT member,  
19 and I'm also an economist. I urge the SBOE to  
20 reject the Superintendent's proposal, which I  
21 believe was doomed by his failure at the  
22 outset to coherently define the purpose of the

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 measurement he was setting out to create.

2           The State Board's suggested  
3 revisions, while slightly diminishing  
4 overreliance on test scores, nonetheless -- I  
5 apologize -- perpetuate the muddled overall  
6 approach that OSSE began with, and will  
7 satisfy nobody and serve no goal well. The  
8 purpose of school assessment is to provide a  
9 tool for evaluating the success of education  
10 agencies and achieving educational outcomes.  
11 How well does the school serve the educational  
12 needs of its students?

13           Measurement is powerful. It guides  
14 educational practice and strategy by providing  
15 incentives for education professionals to  
16 channel their energies for the greatest impact  
17 on what is measured. As such, it is very  
18 important to align your measurement tool with  
19 the goals you intend. But once you start  
20 measuring and generating data, people will  
21 take the information you give them and try to  
22 bend it to their own needs. Once you put out

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 ratings, people will try to read into those  
2 ratings what they want to know. For example:  
3 What's the best school to choose for my child?  
4 That is a very different question.

5           It is a question so different, in  
6 fact, that it is impossible to construct a  
7 single univariate measure that answers both  
8 questions. In key respects, the two have  
9 opposite implications for what you want to  
10 measure. For any parent confronting the  
11 question of school choice, interesting things  
12 to know are: What kind of kids and families  
13 go to this school? Will my child fit in?  
14 Will the school leaders understand my child's  
15 needs? Will the teachers be attuned to my  
16 child's challenges?

17           It's easy to understand why parents  
18 would care about measures of the level of test  
19 scores like proficiency rates. They will  
20 similarly want information about demographics.  
21 Fair-minded people who are interested in  
22 constructing a rating to answer this kind of

1 school assessment question will disagree over  
2 how much weight to put on test scores versus  
3 socioemotional, intangibles, curriculum,  
4 diversity. Indeed, the right weights may  
5 differ from one child to another. The best  
6 approach is to provide undigested information  
7 about interesting school characteristics, and  
8 let people apply their own weights in the  
9 matter of evaluation.

10           However, the question from the point  
11 of view of the educators and what they spend  
12 their scarce time, effort, and money on is  
13 quite different. Public schools take the  
14 students they get, regardless of demographic  
15 characteristics, with whatever challenges and  
16 resources they bring, and must do their best  
17 to promote the academic, socioemotional,  
18 artistic, and moral growth of all, from  
19 wherever they begin, to the next level. They  
20 should be rewarded for being effective at  
21 this. Why any weight at all should be given  
22 to test score levels as opposed to growth is

1 unfair. Why should a school get credit for  
2 the skills the child walks in the door with?  
3 The interest of the state is in evaluating the  
4 ability of a school to educate its students --  
5 to produce growth.

6           Again, fair-minded people will  
7 recognize that there is more -- I and many  
8 people here argue a lot more -- to measuring  
9 educational achievement than PARCC test  
10 scores, and that there is some subtlety in  
11 finding the right way to aggregate individual  
12 growth results into a simple score or rating.  
13 These are the key questions one must address  
14 in formulating a fair and useful measure of  
15 school performance. But it is incoherent to  
16 try to split the difference between measuring  
17 educational performance on the one hand and  
18 school characteristics on the other hand by  
19 combining elements of the two. The resulting  
20 ratings would be less useful than any of its  
21 components.

22           The effort that's been made thus far

1 by all involved has not been wasted. To align  
2 the measure of school effectiveness with its  
3 purpose, focus on measuring student growth.  
4 Use test score growth in the areas of  
5 educational achievement that can be measured  
6 with standardized tests, and continue  
7 developing valid and reliable instruments to  
8 measure growth in areas that defy test-based  
9 quantification. Be very thoughtful about how  
10 you aggregate, and what those choices imply  
11 about which children's achievements matters  
12 more than who else's. For example,  
13 overweighting the growth of those who cross an  
14 arbitrary proficiency threshold, as OSSE's  
15 original proposal does, should not survive  
16 scrutiny.

17 Separately, think about the most  
18 informative way to provide families making  
19 their school choice decisions with the  
20 information they want. But do not conflate  
21 this objective with the other. And do not  
22 allow the primary goal of school performance

1 evaluation, required by federal law, to be  
2 subverted by other purposes. Thank you very  
3 much.

4 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

5 Are there any questions from the  
6 Board members? Mr. Jacobson.

7 MR. JACOBSON: Ms. Mechner?

8 MS. MECHNER: Yes.

9 MR. JACOBSON: Is that correct?

10 MS. MECHNER: Yes. Thank you.

11 MR. JACOBSON: Excellent. You talk  
12 about growth. Is there a way to understand  
13 how a student has grown without assessing the  
14 student?

15 MS. MECHNER: I do mean to make  
16 assessments and then measure the growth of  
17 their performance on that assessment, whatever  
18 it may be.

19 MR. JACOBSON: So you agree that  
20 there needs to be assessment to understand a  
21 student's growth?

22 MS. MECHNER: Absolutely.

1           MR. JACOBSON: Great. On the  
2 proficiency point, I'm wondering if we could  
3 talk about that for a second.

4           MS. MECHNER: Sure.

5           MR. JACOBSON: My understanding, from  
6 my own experiences in college and employment  
7 is that my employer expects me to be  
8 proficient at a certain level to be able to  
9 get a job and maintain that job. Or to get  
10 into grad school and things like that, I have  
11 to reach a certain threshold, which is a  
12 proficiency level. Why would that not be  
13 important for students to be at a certain  
14 proficiency level?

15           MS. MECHNER: Well, it is. That's  
16 what grades are for. Kids have transcripts.  
17 But we're talking about something different,  
18 which is to evaluate the school's performance  
19 in helping students achieve -- not just  
20 proficiency, but for kids who are already  
21 proficient, to help them achieve beyond.

22           So when I disparage this

1   overweighting the kids who pass from below  
2   proficient to just above proficient, so  
3   passing that threshold, what that means is  
4   that you have a kid who's -- say your  
5   threshold is 50th percentile, right? -- you  
6   have a kid who starts at the 49th percentile,  
7   and they gain ten points -- ding, you pass 50.  
8   You start -- consider a second child, who  
9   starts out measured at 51 percentile, right?  
10   So they're already proficient, and then they  
11   gain ten points. What you're saying is these  
12   two ten-percentage-point gains from somebody  
13   who started out really close to the middle are  
14   not really the same; one of them is much more  
15   important than the other. I think that's a  
16   real mistake.

17                   MR. JACOBSON: Thank you for sharing  
18   those thoughts and that experience. Very  
19   helpful. Thank you, Ms. Mechner.

20                   PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: If there are no  
21   more questions, thank you, panel for coming  
22   out today.

1 MS. WATTENBERG: I have one. They  
2 are out here, and I'm going to ask the  
3 questions. So a couple of you mentioned the  
4 idea that maybe it's plausible that we can't  
5 have well polite metrics immediately, but that  
6 one thing that could make a big difference  
7 would be if the proposal included a very  
8 serious process and time line and commitment  
9 for how we would get to some new places -- for  
10 example, how would we do high school growth,  
11 or how could we measure school climate and for  
12 how much, and how could we measure well-  
13 rounded, and for how much. I'm just wondering  
14 if there was anything more than anybody wants  
15 to say on that.

16 MS. REILLY: I think the E.L. Haynes  
17 proposal for a technical working group on a  
18 piece of it, and the task force proposals of  
19 the board, I think they have to be embedded in  
20 order to actually happened, and that -- that  
21 your proposal -- Emily -- on the -- it -- more  
22 thought into how we divide these things.

1           And -- but I think what we had  
2 concern with was the two years before it was  
3 even implemented, so that there's no -- we  
4 understand there has to be a pilot, and it has  
5 to be well done -- but two years is too long.  
6 And the process wasn't outlined. So that was  
7 where the concerns were. Nobody wants to do  
8 something in a hurry that's wrong. But we  
9 have to take the time to get this right. So I  
10 think you have waiting until September on it,  
11 and you have a much shorter time line for the  
12 technical working group or the task forces to  
13 work, and then for the implementation to take  
14 place.

15           MR. MARTEL: I think there also just  
16 has to be a goal of knowing why students are  
17 doing well, why other students are doing  
18 poorly, and this should be shared with you --  
19 I don't know if you receive that information -  
20 - and with the public, rather than this goal  
21 of collective evaluation of schools, close  
22 them or, you know, impose some punitive

1 measures on them, and then as if that's going  
2 to solve anything.

3 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you. Any  
4 more questions?

5 (No audible response)

6 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you again,  
7 panel. Thank you for staying so late to  
8 testify.

9 The next panel is Erin Thesing,  
10 Jessica Papalia, Sarah Livingston, Elizabeth  
11 Davis, An Almquist.

12 Is Nancy Huvendick here?

13 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: ( cross talk)

14 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Karla Reid-Witt.

15 (Cross talk)

16 MR. HAYWORTH: We'll call you again.

17 (Cross talk)

18 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Sorry. Ms. --

19 MS. REID-WITT: Oh, I'm first. I'm  
20 sorry.

21 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: No problem.

22 MS. REID-WITT: Hi. My name is Karla

1 Reid-Witt. I fully support all of the State  
2 Board's recommendations regarding DC's ESSA  
3 Accountability Plan. I have three kids. The  
4 first and the last are eight years apart. My  
5 youngest is not a ninth grader, my middle  
6 child is a twelfth grader, my oldest is 22  
7 years old. All three attended the same middle  
8 school. Within the eight years between my  
9 oldest entering middle school and my youngest  
10 entering middle school, public education  
11 completely changed. I blame overemphasis on  
12 testing for this great downfall.

13           When my oldest entered public school,  
14 I knew the school system was struggling, but I  
15 thought, "We can pull this off." As I look  
16 back, I liken public education to the Titanic.  
17 When my oldest came along, he knew the ship  
18 was struggling, but we were still afloat.  
19 When my middle child came through middle  
20 school, the boat was at 45 degrees. And when  
21 my youngest hit middle school, we were fully  
22 vertical; she was hanging on to the rails with

1 her legs dangling.

2 I don't think the downfall is  
3 teachers. In fact, I know it isn't. I don't  
4 think it's principals or school district  
5 leaders. I think the downfall is behavior.  
6 Behavior driven by an accountability system  
7 based almost entirely on test scores. When  
8 you design an accountability system, in effect  
9 you create an adult behavior plan. Teachers,  
10 principals, system leaders, and even parents  
11 are trapped into behaving in ways which  
12 optimize numerical outcomes favored by the  
13 accountability system, whether or not they  
14 feel their decisions are in the best interests  
15 of students.

16 The current plan does not contemplate  
17 this. Nor does it contemplate diversity  
18 within racial, ethnic, geographic, disability,  
19 or income groups. For example, the current  
20 plan includes different growth rates goals  
21 based on race. Let's pretend it's school year  
22 2017-'18, and I am the school district leader.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 According to the current version of the plan,  
2 the percentage of black students who must  
3 score Level 4 or higher in ELA is 25.2  
4 percent. And the number of white students who  
5 must score Level 4 or higher is 79.8 percent.  
6 Black students in my school will easily meet  
7 the 25.2 threshold goal. In fact, I could  
8 push them far beyond that goal. However, a  
9 number of my white students are struggling.  
10 I'm worried that they won't meet the 79.8  
11 percent white student goal. Where do you  
12 think I'll focus my resources. How do you  
13 think I'll behave?

14 We need a new plan. I would like  
15 OSSE to wait to submit the plan until we can  
16 get it right. We need to design a child-  
17 centered plan focused on maximization of adult  
18 behavior, not for the purpose of improving  
19 test scores but rather for the purpose of  
20 achieving good life outcomes for all students.

21 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

22 MS. LIVINGSTON: Hi. I'm going to

1 just let you know that my name is Sarah  
2 Livingston. I'm a citizen of DC, and I live  
3 in Ward 6. And I do want to quickly thank  
4 everyone who's been involved in formulating  
5 DC's State Accountability Plan, for the  
6 enormous amount of work that's gone into it.  
7 And I appreciate OSSE's responses to several  
8 public comments, and I support the Board's ten  
9 recommendations to improving the plan.

10           Regrettably, though, it appears to me  
11 that we have come to yet another impasse  
12 between the will of the people, as represented  
13 by the elected board, and the will of the  
14 unelected OSSE. Judging by how impasses have  
15 been resolved in the past, such as on high  
16 school credit flexibility last year, I am  
17 deeply concerned that the current impasse will  
18 be resolved by OSSE as it was before, by  
19 overriding the will of the people and DC's  
20 plan winding up not being one that is by and  
21 for the people.

22           I believe these impasses and their

1 resolutions in favor of OSSE are rooted in the  
2 relationship between the two State education  
3 entities that was created in the Public  
4 Education Reform Amendment Act of 2007,  
5 whereby the elected body was made subordinate  
6 to the appointed State Superintendent rather  
7 than the other way around. In the states, the  
8 state board of education, whether elected or  
9 appointed by the governor, is a decision-  
10 making body on state policy, and the state  
11 superintendent, whether elected or appointed,  
12 is subordinate to it, serving as the  
13 implementer and administrator of the board's  
14 decisions.

15           Fortunately, the writers of the  
16 Constitution for the State of Washington, DC,  
17 recognized that having an elected State Board  
18 with only the power to advise the State  
19 Superintendent does not conform to the  
20 authority and structure of a State government,  
21 and they made a correction in Article 2, Part  
22 3, Section 3. That provision gives the Board

1 the responsibility of advising the government  
2 on matters of State educational policy, and it  
3 would make DC's State education governance,  
4 structure, and process much more democratic.

5           The will of the people, as expressed  
6 in their vote for Board members, and the  
7 Board's representation of the people's voice,  
8 would flow directly forward to the governor  
9 rather than backward into an appointed office  
10 that has the power to override and negate it.  
11 We do not have to wait for Congress to admit  
12 DC as a state to have the benefit of this  
13 provision. We can have it now by calling on  
14 the Council to amend the Para (phonetic) so  
15 that the Board has the responsibility for  
16 advising the mayor.

17           To that end, I testified to the  
18 Committee on Government Operations week before  
19 last that Para should be amended to allow this  
20 provision of the State Constitution to be  
21 implemented now. I encourage everyone who  
22 feels cheated by having a vote for

1 representatives that means next to nothing,  
2 and who feels that it is highly hypocritical  
3 for DC to demand statehood as the surest way  
4 to gain full democratic rights while its own  
5 laws insult and prevent full democratic self-  
6 determination on education matters to also  
7 speak up. The provision is by no means a  
8 cure-all for everything that ails democratic  
9 governing of education in DC, but it is a step  
10 in the direction of restoring meaning to the  
11 vote that millions of Americans have died to  
12 protect or to obtain, for the Board to play a  
13 more State-like role in education governance,  
14 for the mayor to have the benefit of the  
15 people's voice and ongoing right through the  
16 Board, and for the conditions that lead to  
17 impasses like the one we're facing now to  
18 finally be cleared out from our government's  
19 operations, leaving it both more democratic  
20 and efficient.

21 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

22 MS. DAVIS: Thank you. Good evening.

1 I'm Elizabeth Davis, a Ward 5 resident and  
2 president of the Washington Teacher's Union.  
3 And of course, I have axed my testimony by  
4 about one-half, because I've heard everything  
5 that I wanted to say, said here, and I'm  
6 excited about it.

7           One of the things that our members  
8 encouraged me to speak to was, of course, the  
9 great weight that this plan has given to  
10 testing. And of course, if states choose  
11 robust services (phonetic), they have school  
12 climate as their school quality indicator --  
13 something that we have not talked enough about  
14 -- they can shift schools' attention from  
15 raising test scores to making changes that  
16 improve school climate, teaching, and student  
17 learning.

18           In addition, such a climate survey  
19 would provide invaluable information to  
20 parents about the environment and learning  
21 conditions of each school, to help them choose  
22 the best school for the children. DC

1 educators and parents are excited about the  
2 opportunities ESSA offers our school district  
3 to select school climate measures to enhance  
4 school accountability, school improvement, and  
5 parent choice. However OSSE's school  
6 accountability proposal to give standardized  
7 test scores 80 percent of an elementary  
8 school's overall rating, with there remaining  
9 20 percent primarily on attendance and  
10 reenrollment rates, give zero weight to  
11 comprehensive school climate measures that are  
12 known to help schools improve -- by so doing,  
13 OSSE's draft gives zero percent weight to  
14 comprehensive school climate measures.

15           Under the current OSSE accountability  
16 proposal, there is no credit for growth in our  
17 schools in this proposal, and this is a  
18 serious problem for educators. Parents and  
19 teachers have urged OSSE and the State Board  
20 of Ed. to reduce the weight of test scores to  
21 the lowest percent legally allowed -- around  
22 55 percent for elementary grades and less for

1 high schools. Giving equal weight and rating  
2 to proficiency and growth unfairly favors  
3 schools in high-income areas, where the vast  
4 majority of students have family and economic  
5 advantages and are proficient. Moreover, it  
6 unfairly penalizes schools in low-income  
7 areas, where the vast majority of students are  
8 often disadvantaged in their low proficiency.

9 OSSE's proposal needs to be revised  
10 to give more weight to the test score  
11 indicators to growth and to proficiency -- for  
12 example, giving 40 percent of total weight to  
13 growth and 10 percent to proficiency. Parents  
14 and the 4,800 teachers -- those who work  
15 closest with students on a daily basis --  
16 understand that reducing measurements for  
17 school quality has had a negative impact on  
18 learning environments. It has grossly failed  
19 to close the achievement or opportunity gap,  
20 and it has contributed largely to the growing  
21 educational disparities in our school  
22 district.

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1           What we hold schools accountable to  
2 is what gets prioritized in our students' day-  
3 to-day life. If 80 percent of a school's  
4 accountability measure is based on test  
5 scores, than that is what the vast majority of  
6 the time will be spent on. When we measure  
7 academic performance solely on proficiency,  
8 we're negating the important work that schools  
9 are doing with students who enter  
10 significantly below grade level.

11           ESSA implementation and consequences  
12 have effects on our students' overall  
13 educational experience. When high-stakes  
14 accountability measures are tied to student  
15 performance without adequate school support,  
16 schools that serve our highest-needs students  
17 will have trouble maintaining staff and  
18 resources. ESSA regulations allow OSSE to  
19 submit an accountability plan by either  
20 April 3rd or September 18th, yet OSSE is  
21 trying to submit the plan by April 3rd. This  
22 rushed schedule undermines the ability of

1 educational stakeholders to collaborative on  
2 developing robust school accountability  
3 measures that can help schools improve, and  
4 would severely restrict the new chancellor's  
5 capacity to close the achievement gap.

6           By August 2017 the task force, that  
7 we have encouraged in a current letter to the  
8 State Board members, basically would serve as  
9 a pilot, which could be conducted in the fall,  
10 which would allow time for revision to the  
11 plan and also time to administer an  
12 accountability to spring of 2018. The way  
13 OSSE would be able to publicly report the  
14 results for ratings before the beginning of  
15 the 2018-'19 school year, as required by  
16 Department of Ed., would be also satisfied.  
17 This task force would advise what best weights  
18 to give to the school climate and other  
19 indicators of success in OSSE's January 30th  
20 Draft State Plan.

21           In summary, OSSE should heavily  
22 reduce the weight of test scores in school

1 ratings, replace to reduce with weight for  
2 robust school climate measures within test  
3 scores, shift much more weight to growth and  
4 deficiency. Defer submitting an  
5 accountability proposal to DOE until  
6 September 18th, and create an advisory task  
7 force representing all key stakeholders --  
8 DCPS, the union teachers, charter school  
9 stakeholders, and others -- to collaborate  
10 with OSSE on advising its accountability plan.

11           If we fail to take advantage of every  
12 opportunity ESSA offers to fix our schools,  
13 then we've basically failed our children. The  
14 4,800 members of the Washington Teachers'  
15 Union -- again, those I respect most in terms  
16 of having a thought about what improves  
17 achievement, what counts for school success --  
18 the teachers that are now working with our  
19 kids on a daily basis urge you to send this  
20 plan back for revision, and until they have --  
21 the community's had an opportunity to advise,  
22 revise, and also have input from other

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 stakeholders that have not had a chance to  
2 weigh in. Thank you. And I am available to  
3 answer any questions any of you may have.

4 MS. THESIS: Good evening. My name  
5 is Erin Thesing. I am a Ward 1 resident and  
6 also a fifth-grade teacher at Lowry Elementary  
7 School. I also will try to trim things based  
8 on hearing repeats tonight. But I come from  
9 having a range of diverse schools, including a  
10 no-excuses turnaround charter school, a  
11 project-based learning charter school, and now  
12 a traditional DCPS elementary school. And I  
13 think my experience along the way has really  
14 allowed me to meet people from across the  
15 spectrum and -- teachers, parents, school  
16 leaders, community members -- I think we all  
17 agree that, you know, we're all coming here  
18 wanting good schools for our students.

19 For me, though, that's why I'm asking  
20 you to vote "no" on the OSSE -- the proposed  
21 State Accountability Plan. When PARCC scores  
22 are the primary metric of school success, less

1 time is reserved for useful assessment and  
2 meaningful learning experiences. Instead,  
3 test prep occupies classroom and planning  
4 time. Where once teachers gathered to study  
5 student writing and math problem-solving to  
6 craft teaching points together, we now are  
7 dedicating meetings every week for -- over how  
8 we can move students a few percentage points  
9 on the PARCC and reviewing the most recent  
10 predictive standardized test data.

11           Our students feel it even acutely.  
12 This year during predictive assessments,  
13 computers shut down midtest. Essays that were  
14 painstakingly typed finger by finger --  
15 suddenly deleted. Last year my second-grade  
16 class trackpads and laptops proved difficult  
17 to use by seven-year-old fingers that tried to  
18 drag-and-drop a ruler to measure an apple on  
19 the screen. And then our children cried, and  
20 some even banged their heads against desk,  
21 saying hurtful things about themselves. All  
22 of this for a test that provides only, really,

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 a small snapshot of what our children can do.

2 Teachers know that good teaching  
3 requires useful assessments that show us what  
4 our children can do and what we need to teach  
5 next. When I taught second grade, I created  
6 an assessment in which I observed my second  
7 graders use actual rulers and meter sticks,  
8 not one they had to drag across a computer  
9 screen, to measure the distance of a real toy  
10 car, and to discuss their mathematical process  
11 and thinking. This revealed their process,  
12 not just their answer. And I could see when  
13 they left a gap between the ruler when  
14 interrating it, or look at the wrong side and  
15 report it centimeters instead of inches, and I  
16 knew exactly what to teach next.

17 This year my fifth-graders read  
18 research studies and newspaper and journal  
19 articles to research the benefits and  
20 consequences of serving chocolate milk in our  
21 school's cafeterias, and they formed  
22 arguments, developed thesis statements, found

1 evidence to support their reasons, and  
2 acknowledged and rebutted counterarguments.  
3 They then organized this information to  
4 present panel presentations, much like we're  
5 having here tonight, to our school  
6 administrators, the PTA, cafeteria staff, and  
7 central office nutrition administration team -  
8 - buttoning up their school uniform shirts to  
9 the top collar and confidently making their  
10 case.

11           These are the same students who, a  
12 week before, cried during standardized  
13 testing, and being that they walked away from  
14 this assessment, patting each other on the  
15 back, saying, "I had no idea we could do that.  
16 We sounded so smart!" And they did. Using a  
17 rubric, I then evaluated their work against  
18 the Common Core Standards, and knew exactly  
19 what to do next to strengthen their argument  
20 writing.

21           Creating rigorous assessments like  
22 these that ask students to synthesize skills

1 is the first step in our planning process as  
2 teachers. When we backwards-plan, we ask:  
3 How will we know if our students can do this?  
4 And then, what skills do we need to teach so  
5 they can do it? But when a computer-based  
6 test like the PARCC is the final assessment,  
7 we're going to try to ask to teach the skills  
8 for that teach.

9           School accountability measures need  
10 to make room for assessments that provide  
11 useful information for parents and teachers to  
12 know how to best support their children. A  
13 PARCC score alone does not do this. Relying  
14 on PARCC as our primary measure of school  
15 success is the convent choice. Creating  
16 useful and comprehensive assessments that  
17 truly measures a student's growth and  
18 achievement is challenging work, but that's  
19 essential to good teaching and good schools.

20           I urge you to vote no to the proposed  
21 plan because it places too much weight on  
22 standardized testing, and it will leave little

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 room for teachers to create useful assessments  
2 that will actually guide student learning.  
3 Thank you.

4 MS. PAPALIA: Hi. My name is Jessie  
5 Papalia. I'm a resident of Ward 1 and a  
6 third-grade teacher at Capitol City Public  
7 Charter School in Ward 4. I want to start out  
8 by saying thank you to the State Board for  
9 listening and responding to our -- to public  
10 feedback on ESSA. And I'm here to request as  
11 well that you vote "no" on the OSSE proposal  
12 unless the weight of testing in schools is  
13 reduced.

14 I think one thing we can all agree on  
15 is our end goal is a high-quality education  
16 for every student in DC. Everyone -- OSSE,  
17 State Board, teachers -- envelope agrees on  
18 that -- family members. To your question is:  
19 How much do PARCC scores reveal about the  
20 quality of education that the school is  
21 providing? How much does technological access  
22 and capability get tests by the PARCC? I

1 teach the earliest grade that is tested by the  
2 PARCC, and they're for the youngest students  
3 who are assessed using standardized testing.

4           For my students, the PARCC tests many  
5 things. The PARCC tests how quickly a student  
6 can type. It tests whether an eight-year-old  
7 has the stamina to complete more than a dozen  
8 complexly worded multistep math problems in 60  
9 minutes. It also tests whether a student  
10 knows how to use a touch pad, similar to  
11 Erin's experience to drag-and-drop items.  
12 PARCC does not just test whether a student has  
13 mastered a standard. We have so many  
14 assessments that we do all of the time. We  
15 have school-based assessments.

16           We have assessments used from really  
17 rigorous curriculum, like EngageNY. We have  
18 assessments that are constantly being used,  
19 but they are not the PARCC. And yet when we  
20 look at PARCC scores, they're not aligning  
21 consistently. This is something teachers have  
22 found again and again, and I think the

1 question really is: Is PARCC an accurate  
2 measure of what a student knows? We know that  
3 if we base 80 percent evaluation of a score on  
4 inaccurate data, we're going to have a serious  
5 issue. If we base effectiveness of teachers -  
6 - if we base it on inaccurate data, we will  
7 lose great teachers, and we already are.

8           So I think my question for today  
9 really is about: Do we know how accurate this  
10 data really is? And we -- and basing 80  
11 percent of our school evaluation on something  
12 that perhaps is not aligning to what teachers  
13 are seeing every single day is a real concern  
14 for educators. And this is what I've heard  
15 from dozens of educators across the board.

16           I am a part of a group of educators  
17 and community members in Ward 1, several of  
18 whom are here today, and we've been meeting to  
19 discuss this issue. I would like to invite  
20 any Board member who would like the experience  
21 of taking a PARCC practice test and discussing  
22 it with us to join us for our next meeting on

1 April 4th. We feel the experience of taking  
2 the test itself will help us, as well as  
3 anyone who join us, to become better-informed  
4 citizens on this issue.

5           Finally, in closing, I just want to  
6 say DC really must be a -- and can be, and  
7 should be, a model for this country in  
8 choosing what is right and not what is easy.  
9 It is easy and quick to look solely at  
10 standardized testing to evaluate a school. It  
11 is much harder and more time consuming to  
12 create a more accurate evaluation system that  
13 assesses the many factors that create a high-  
14 quality school. We really must ask ourself if  
15 the PARCC does that, or at least contributes  
16 80 percent of that evaluation. We owe it to  
17 the kids of this city to accurately evaluate  
18 their school, so we can ensure all students  
19 receive a high-quality education. Thank you.

20           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Again, thank  
21 you, panel, for testifying.

22           Are there any questions from our

1 board members?

2 MR. WEEDON: I'd be remiss if I  
3 didn't ask Ms. Thesing a couple of questions  
4 my son found out you were in one of our last--  
5 oh-- She ran with me to the Capitol and back,  
6 and she pushed me so hard. So I'm going to  
7 push you a little bit. First you talked a  
8 little bit about the amount of time that you  
9 spend in test prep. How much of your day or  
10 the students -- or the students in a day are  
11 on test prep?

12 MS. THESIS: Well, I think I would  
13 probably --

14 MS. WEEDON: And I know it varies a  
15 little bit, but --

16 MS. THESIS: Sure. I think depending  
17 on what -- the time of year, what we're doing  
18 -- schools are giving -- and I can only speak  
19 from my experience from working in two DC  
20 schools -- but many of the schools were using  
21 predictive assessments throughout the year to  
22 see how our students would perform on PARCC.

1 And DCPS -- many DCPS schools uses the ANAT  
2 (phonetic). Other schools use MAP. And it --  
3 I can't even -- I'm just -- I'm like blanking  
4 out even more, because I only teach ELA, but  
5 they're even more than they're using during  
6 math as well. We're getting those assessment  
7 at least like almost every six weeks.

8           And so what we're doing is students  
9 are sitting down and taking a standardized  
10 test in math, in ELA, you know, during these  
11 cycles. And then, after the cycle, we are  
12 looking at the data, assessing the data,  
13 having planning meetings to plan intervention  
14 groups, planning -- reteach tests -- excuse me  
15 -- reteach lessons based on the ANAT data.  
16 Most recently the one I gave wasn't aligned to  
17 the unit we had just finished. And so the  
18 ANAT assessment that I gave was something I  
19 was teaching in -- six weeks later. And so  
20 the assessment was something we hadn't even --  
21 was content we hadn't taught yet. And then  
22 I'm planning reteach lessons on an assessment

1 for content that hasn't been taught yet.

2 And so time is going into looking at  
3 a data for those predictive assessments a lot.  
4 And then this week I'm starting my writing  
5 PARCC test prep for the assessment in May.

6 MR. WEEDON: All right. And the  
7 reason I want to ask is that we're in this  
8 debate about how do we get to the outcome as  
9 we want in policy versus practice. And I  
10 think what I've heard time and time from  
11 teachers is -- and we heard it today -- what's  
12 measured is what we do.

13 MS. THESIS: Uh-huh (affirmative).

14 MR. WEEDON: So when you measure with  
15 the test date, we put a lot of time towards  
16 this date, at the neglect of the other things  
17 that I truly believe pulsates the work. And  
18 we can -- about taking the test. It's  
19 important. The PARCC test is important to  
20 produce kids who are efficient. I'm over my  
21 time, but then one of my colleagues granted a  
22 little bit of extra time. I'd love to get

1 your thoughts on how we can have project-based  
2 learning that is disaggregated (sic) --  
3 disaggregatable (sic) across demographics? And  
4 how would you ensure standards across the city  
5 so that something like that could truly be  
6 used in an accountability system. I'm not  
7 necessarily convinced it can be.

8 MS. DAVIS: It has been, and they're  
9 all standards that are aligned with project-  
10 based learning. They're applied learning  
11 standards. And of course, it requires  
12 multiple ways of measuring achievement. And  
13 of course, we have -- you've heard here  
14 repeatedly that students learn in multiple  
15 ways, but we are assessing what they learn in  
16 one way. So there are school districts that  
17 have successfully used standards and  
18 evaluation tools. Portfolio Exhibition is one  
19 example, but there are many that have been  
20 successfully used by school districts in other  
21 parts of the country. Seattle, Washington, is  
22 one that comes to mind that's been doing it

1 for years. It's just a matter of having the  
2 will to decide that we have more than one way  
3 of measuring students' success.

4 MS. THESIS: And if I may, at the  
5 school I taught at previously, we used  
6 Portfolio-based assessments for our students  
7 for the entire school year that students at  
8 conferences at the end of the year. We also  
9 used teacher-created rubrics and school-based  
10 rubric for assessing all that. And the math  
11 experience that I described was something that  
12 a committee of teachers worked on for over  
13 three years developing those assessments to  
14 align with Common Core when we adopted the  
15 Common Core Standards, to create tasks that  
16 were Common Core-aligned and were -- we had a  
17 group of teachers from pre-K through eighth  
18 grade working on just the elementary  
19 assessments to create that. But that was then  
20 -- you know, then our schools were assessments  
21 that weren't excepted under OSSE to be  
22 considered, since that's when we had to then

1 adopt assessments like the math in order to  
2 have a standardized assessment that was  
3 acceptable under federal law.

4 MS. WATTENBERG: So one change from  
5 the previous OSSE draft to this one is that  
6 the weight on testing did drop from 80 percent  
7 to, in effect, 74 percent in Years 1 and 2,  
8 and then down to 70 percent in Year 3. In  
9 Years 1 and 2, all of the points that are  
10 taken away from testing are put towards  
11 attendance and reenrollment, and the final  
12 year - that is true, that 5 points, arithmetic  
13 is right.

14 One of the arguments that we heard  
15 all the way through this process and tonight  
16 was that one reason for dropping the weight on  
17 testing is to drop the weight on testing, for  
18 all the reasons that people discussed. The  
19 other reason to drop the weight is to make  
20 room for a much richer, more appropriate,  
21 accurate assessments metrics. And so my  
22 question is really to anybody.

1           To what extent do you think the  
2 increased weight on attendance and  
3 reenrollment is a useful way of measuring  
4 school climate, which I know we're all  
5 interested in? And also whether or not it --  
6 well, whether we'd be -- whether it would have  
7 incentive the schools in a good direction,  
8 which is another purpose of our school  
9 accountability system. Anybody want to --?

10           MS. DAVIS: Sure. And I do  
11 appreciate the -- having the reduction in the  
12 weight given the test. However, giving that  
13 to attendance and enrollment, I do not  
14 consider that the answer. I think that there  
15 are some other indicators that have not even  
16 been discussed yet that we need to explore.  
17 The plan needs to look at some of the other  
18 climate indicators that have been used that  
19 not only indicate achievement, but it also  
20 lends itself to helping schools determine  
21 where students are weak, where any part of a  
22 school's academic is weak -- need assistance.

1           As we recommended to Superintendent  
2 Kang and to the mayor -- a school climate  
3 indicator that would dig much deeper than the  
4 superficial ones that's some of the ones that  
5 I reviewed that are basically Likert scales  
6 that don't give you a lot of information below  
7 the surface. But we have recommended a  
8 climate indicator that would allow students,  
9 parents, teachers, administrators, community,  
10 support staff to weigh in on. And it actually  
11 -- in analyzing the data that is collected  
12 from such indicators, it actually will help  
13 schools to determine what areas they need to  
14 improve in.

15           But it will also identify other areas  
16 where students show achievements that we don't  
17 consider or measure. Another -- actually  
18 several people spoke ahead of me that talked  
19 about the importance of recognizing successes  
20 that teachers have made with students and that  
21 students make who are not proficiency, and how  
22 in the past, because our focus has been on the

1 test score and proficiency, that we basically  
2 have ignored successes of students and  
3 teachers and schools, which has led to a lot  
4 of frustration -- high teacher turnover, low  
5 morale. And student frustration, because it  
6 basically says to students and schools, that  
7 even though you've moved on the scale, we  
8 don't care. It doesn't mean anything. It's  
9 not worth anything, unless you're proficient.

10           And some of -- one of you asked  
11 earlier about proficiency versus growth.  
12 Proficiency is unrealistic if we are looking  
13 at some of those issues that students come to  
14 school with -- issues around poverty, because  
15 poverty does matter. And we can't ignore  
16 that. School climate indicators that dig  
17 deeper than just what we're accustomed to  
18 seeing is important, and we need to explore  
19 what some of those are. Taking a look at  
20 other measures of success other than a PARCC  
21 test on a computer that most schools don't  
22 even have, which has basically frustrated

1 students. Some of them are actually  
2 protesting by simply not caring. They  
3 purposely just come and bubble in any answer.

4 So there are so many obstacles that  
5 get in the way of learning -- the focus on  
6 testing and less focus on instruction. I  
7 taught for 40 years. And so I think if  
8 teachers are allowed more time to teach the  
9 content in ways that students learn, we will  
10 see the successes that we're looking for.

11 MS. REID-WITT: I think that both  
12 those measures disproportionately impact  
13 schools with high churn -- things that the  
14 teachers and the principals have no control  
15 over. In my testimony I talked about  
16 behavior. I think that we have developed a  
17 school choice system that impacts parent  
18 behavior. And parents move schools -- I mean  
19 move kids around a lot more than they used to.  
20 And I don't think -- you know, reenrollment's  
21 a good idea. When I first read reenrollment,  
22 I was thinking in terms of schools which sort

1 of harass kids out -- like you should take  
2 care of the kids so they come back. But  
3 because we have so much school choice, and  
4 because our parents don't invest in our  
5 schools because of that, even kids that are  
6 doing well where, you know, you don't have  
7 issues of mobility, people are moving kids  
8 from school to school. And so I don't think  
9 you should charge schools for that.

10 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

11 Mr. Jacobson:

12 MR. JACOBSON: Thank you, Madam  
13 President. I'm going to take a little license  
14 here. And while I appreciate everyone's  
15 testimony -- I've listened to it very  
16 carefully -- Ms. Livingston, you're such a  
17 terrific advocate for yourself and for this  
18 Board, and I can't thank you enough. Even  
19 though we disagree, found you very agreeable,  
20 so thank you for being a part of this process.  
21 And thank you all the witnesses.

22 I wanted to -- very quickly in the

1 next 90 seconds or so. We talk about churn  
2 and teacher turnover. Is teacher retention an  
3 important accountability measure to see that  
4 as school is successful and accountable? And  
5 if each of you could just do a quick "yes" or  
6 "no." I know this could be a really --  
7 there's a lot of meat on this bone.

8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, there is.

9 MR. JACOBSON: If possible, I'd love  
10 to start on my left and just have everyone  
11 take ten seconds.

12 MS. REID-WITT: Okay. My testimony,  
13 I talked about the difference over the last  
14 eight years between when my oldest entered the  
15 middle school and my youngest didn't. They  
16 happened to have attended a school that had  
17 historically had teachers that had been there  
18 a long time. And the performance of the  
19 school was degraded tremendously when they  
20 lost all the veteran teachers and then could  
21 not sustain the new teachers.

22 MR. JACOBSON: Thank you.

1 Ms. Livingston?

2 MS. LIVINGSTON: Yes.

3 MR. JACOBSON: Thank you.

4 Ms. Davis?

5 MS. DAVIS: Yes. The instability  
6 that this -- is created by teacher turnover,  
7 it wreaks havoc on students, especially a lot  
8 of the students that come to schools that are  
9 fragile and come from unstable communities.  
10 Instability in schools is something that  
11 absolutely does not work well for them.

12 MR. JACOBSON: Thank you.

13 Ms. Thesing?

14 MS. THESING: Yes. I -- just to say  
15 that trusting relationships are at the center,  
16 I think, of a strong culture, and retaining  
17 both teachers and students, and that requires  
18 people being there.

19 MR. JACOBSON: Thank you.

20 Ms. Papalia?

21 MS. PAPALIA: Yes, definitely. And I  
22 think one of the things that isn't talked

1 about as much is when -- new teachers -- we  
2 talk a lot about how hard of a time it is to  
3 be a first-year teacher and how hard that is.  
4 But when there's so many new teachers, the  
5 teachers who are not new have the bulk of the  
6 work on them. So not only does it put  
7 pressure on the new teachers who don't have a  
8 full idea of a mastery of their profession  
9 yet, but it also puts so much pressure on the  
10 people who have been there. And that creates  
11 turnover both among veteran and short-term  
12 teachers in school, really creating a toxic  
13 environment for retention.

14 MR. JACOBSON: Thank you-all all so  
15 much for coming and for being brief. Thank  
16 you.

17 (Cross talk)

18 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: All right. Sara  
19 Stone, Erica Russell, Dana Hall, Allyson  
20 Brown, Sheila Carr, An Almquist, Nancy  
21 Huvendick.

22 (Cross talk)

1 MS. BROWN: Greetings, State Board of  
2 Education members and State Superintendent.  
3 My name is Allyson Criner Brown. I'm the  
4 associate director of Teaching for Change, a  
5 DC-based nonprofit whose mission is building  
6 social justice starting in the classroom. I'm  
7 also a resident of Ward 7, a voter, and a  
8 parent of an incoming pre-K-3 student.

9 So Teaching for Change, for the past  
10 75 years, has been working here in Washington,  
11 DC. Our work involves directly supporting and  
12 engaging with educators, parents, and schools  
13 in all eight wards. Additionally, our staff  
14 represents parents and voters in Wards 1, 3,  
15 4, 5, 7, and 8, as advocates for education who  
16 -- for equity in education, who recognize the  
17 damage that high-stakes standardized testing  
18 has inflicted on teaching and student  
19 learning, both locally and nationally.

20 And as a member of the Coalition for  
21 DC Public Schools and Communities, I'm going  
22 to comment on the State Board's

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 recommendations for the improvement of  
2 accountability, and OSSE's revised  
3 Accountability Plan released March 14th --  
4 noteworthy that it was one day ago.

5           So I'm going to sort of frame this by  
6 commenting on several strengths of the State  
7 Board recommendations which, really, we  
8 applaud, and just showed an incredible amount  
9 of listening to the community and the concerns  
10 that have been echoed across all eight wards.  
11 And then particularly those are not addressed  
12 in our present, and the revised accountability  
13 plan.

14           First, we echo one of the State  
15 Board's comments that, quote, we are not  
16 satisfied with defining the measures of school  
17 accountability based on the measures that  
18 happen to exist now in the current plan. The  
19 shift from 80 percent dependence on PARCC  
20 scores to 70 percent for elementary and middle  
21 schools still places far too much emphasis on  
22 a single high-stakes standardized test that

1 only assess English, language arts, and math.  
2 At the high school level, the academic  
3 achievement measures are also narrowed and  
4 weighted too much.

5 We do support the call to expand the  
6 weight of nontest factors in K-8, at least  
7 with -- if not immediately, at least within  
8 two to three years.

9 Second, we deem the school  
10 environment measures inadequate and too  
11 heavily focused on attendance, which can be  
12 impacted by many factors outside of the  
13 school's control and is not necessarily  
14 indicative of the learning environment in the  
15 school. The weight of attendance is too high,  
16 and the access and opportunity -- or i.e., the  
17 well-rounded education weight is too low.

18 The troubling absence of subjects  
19 outside of ELA and math and academic  
20 achievement and growth means that the school  
21 environment measures must incorporate these  
22 and other critical components of a well-

1 rounded education. This must be addressed at  
2 all levels. Commitment toward a well-rounded  
3 education must be at the forefront of our  
4 discussions and decisions about how to nurture  
5 college, career-ready, and civic-minded young  
6 people in the District of Columbia.

7           We cannot overstate that the revised  
8 weight of 70 percent PARCC, MAP, and ELA  
9 scores, even with the slightly favoring of  
10 growth over proficiency, leaves inadequate  
11 room for a well-rounded education.

12           Regarding the star rating system, we  
13 reject OSSE's conclusion to utilize one  
14 overall rating with a supplemented school  
15 report card. We are supposed to be moving  
16 away from the paradigm of good and bad  
17 schools, but the star rating will continue us  
18 on that track. As a parent who recently and  
19 painstakingly went through the school lottery  
20 process and a dozen open houses, I can tell  
21 you the single score does a true disservice to  
22 many schools and families. The current

1 singular rankings that may seem to offer  
2 clarity on the OSSE, DCPS, and My School DC  
3 websites, in fact, do not. The ranking simply  
4 serves as an initial screening to many  
5 parents. Please respect that parents,  
6 students, and community members are capable of  
7 processing multiple ratings, or dashboards,  
8 and want that information up front.

9           We support, with some reservation,  
10 mainly for the need for clarity, the State  
11 Board's suggestion to replace PARCC scores  
12 with ACCESS growth for ELL students. The  
13 matter should be revisited by one or more of  
14 the task forces suggested by the State Board  
15 with heavy input from ELL educators. We also  
16 believe that insofar as possible under federal  
17 law, students with severe cognitive impediment  
18 should not be required to take the PARCC test.

19           Finally, with the absence of interim  
20 measures for desirable accountability  
21 indicators that are not yet available --  
22 namely, comprehensive school environment

1 assessments, high school growth measures, and  
2 an index of indicators of well-rounded  
3 education -- it is imperative that -- and you-  
4 all will have copies. I emailed the print  
5 copies of this.

6           So one, in the final ESSA  
7 Accountability Plan, OSSE incorporates the  
8 State Board's recommendations to establish a  
9 task force to explore these measures not yet  
10 available. Two, OSSE establishes an  
11 additional task force to study the  
12 implementation and effects of testing in DC  
13 schools, as suggested by the State Board,  
14 including impacts on and options for ELL  
15 students. And three, OSSE establishes clear  
16 and public deadlines for reports on progress  
17 towards not-yet-available measures, drafts  
18 being made available, and adequate time for  
19 public input. Finally, days for pilot and/or  
20 initial implementation.

21           My last comment, I will modify a line  
22 from the State Board's recommendations. If

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1 simulations indicate that the rating of  
2 individual schools does not change by virtue  
3 of this new accountability plan, it  
4 nonetheless makes sense to make sure that  
5 every school will be held accountable to  
6 providing each student in the district with a  
7 well-rounded education. Thank you for the  
8 opportunity to testify.

9 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Thank you.

10 Any questions from board members?

11 (No audible response)

12 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Mr. Williams?

13 MR. WILLIAMS: (No audible response)

14 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Ms. Carter?

15 MS. CARTER: No.

16 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Ms. Wattenberg?

17 MS. WATTENBERG: I was just going to  
18 say thank you very, very much.

19 PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: Mr Jacobson?

20 Thank you very much for your time  
21 today. Seeing no further questions for this  
22 panel, you are excused.

1           And seeing no further witnesses, I  
2 want to thank all of our visitors today for  
3 their input and for their patience during this  
4 lengthy hearing. Entertain a motion for  
5 adjournment.

6           BOARD MEMBER: So moved.

7           BOARD MEMBER: Second.

8           PRESIDENT WILLIAMS: The meeting is  
9 adjourned.

10 MEETING ADJOURNED

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

                  OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376

1

2

3

OLENDER REPORTING, INC.  
1100 Connecticut Avenue NW, #810, Washington DC 20036  
Washington: 202-898-1108 / Baltimore: 410-752-3376  
Toll Free: 888-445-3376