

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

+ + + + +

RACE TO THE TOP ASSESSMENT COMPETITION

+ + + + +

PUBLIC AND EXPERT INPUT MEETINGS
HIGH SCHOOL

+ + + + +

Friday, November 13, 2009

+ + + + +

The Meeting commenced in the Embassy Suites Hotel, 207 Porter Street, Boston, Massachusetts, at 1:30 p.m., Joanne Weiss, Director, presiding.

EXPERTS PRESENT:

LINDA DARLING-HAMMOND
GENE BOTTOMS
SHELLY LOVING-RYDER
LAURESS WISE

STAFF PRESENT:

JOANNE WEISS
ANN WHALEN
JUDY WURTZEL
AMY LAITINEN

A G E N D A

1:30 p.m. **Introduction**

Joanne Weiss, Director
Race to the Top, US
Department of Education

3

1:40 p.m. **Expert Presentations and follow-up
questions - High School**Panelists:

Gene Bottoms, Senior Vice President
Southern Regional Education Board
(SREB)

47

Linda Darling-Hammond, Professor of
Education, Stanford University

24

Shelley Loving-Ryder, Assistant
Superintendent, Division of
Assessment and Reporting, VA
Department of Education

7

Lauress Wise, Principal Scientist,
Human Resources Research
Organization (HumRRO)

71

3:00 p.m. **Break**

161

3:25 p.m. **Round table discussion**

94

4:00 p.m. **Public Speakers**

Preregistered as outlined in the
Notice

164

5:00 p.m. Thank you and conclusion

204

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

2 1:32 p.m.

3 MS. WEISS: Thank you, everyone. I
4 think we're going to get started. I have a
5 feeling we'll find a few more people
6 continuing to trickle in, but let me just tell
7 you -- and riotous laughter in the hallways.

8 I'm going to spare everybody the
9 big picture overview, because I do think that
10 at this point most people were here this
11 morning and heard it, and instead I'm going to
12 just focus on this particular panel, and what
13 we're here to talk about this afternoon.

14 As I think many of you know,
15 there's particular issues around high school
16 assessments, especially as we start thinking
17 about what it means to be college and career-
18 ready versus what it means to pass a
19 particular course in high school, and how one
20 should think about these different kind of
21 assessment issues that we face, which ones are
22 local, which ones might, indeed, be part of
23 some kind of state assessment program.

1 And so, we've decided that we
2 really needed to focus in in a half-day
3 session on this particular set of questions
4 around what high school assessments look like
5 in light to trying to ensure that students
6 graduate high school ready for college and
7 careers.

8 So, we have a group of panelists
9 with us this afternoon who are going to talk
10 with us about this, and in a moment I will let
11 everyone introduce themselves.

12 But let me tell you how this is
13 going to work. We're going to have just one
14 set, thankfully, for those of you who were
15 here this morning. One set of presentations
16 that we go around and then an extended round
17 table discussion around the high school
18 questions that we posed in the Notice. And
19 I'll remind you in a minute of what those
20 questions are.

21 So, each panelist will get 15
22 minutes to give their presentation, followed
23 by five minutes of clarifying questions from

1 any other members of the panel or the
2 department up here, and then we'll follow that
3 with a round table discussion.

4 I think that we might extend the
5 length of the round table discussion a touch
6 because we have fewer public speakers than --
7 than the one hour would allot, and we'll
8 finish up the round table discussion at four,
9 have about a ten-minute break and then go into
10 the public speakers for the last almost hour
11 that we're together, and we'll still end at
12 five.

13 So, that's our plan. Let's start
14 by just going around the table. Laurie, you
15 can start in just doing quick introductions so
16 you know who everyone up here is.

17 MR. WISE: Hi. I'm Laurie Wise. I
18 am a principal scientist with the Human
19 Resources Research Organization.

20 MS. LOVING-RYDER: I am Shelly
21 Loving-Ryder. I'm the assistant
22 superintendent for student assessment in
23 school improvement at the Virginia Department

1 of Education.

2 MR. BOTTOMS: I'm Gene Bottoms with
3 the Southern Region Education Board in
4 Atlanta, Georgia.

5 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Linda
6 Darling-Hammond, a professor at Stanford and
7 director of the Stanford Center for
8 Opportunity, Policy and Education.

9 MS. WEISS: I'm Joanne Weiss,
10 director of the Race To The Top Fund at the
11 Department of Education.

12 MS. WURTZEL: Judy Wurtzel, deputy
13 assistant secretary for policy, planning and
14 development at the Department of Education.

15 MS. LAITINEN: Amy Laitinen. I'm
16 in the office of the Under-Secretary of
17 Education.

18 MS. WHALEN: Ann Whalen, Office of
19 Secretary, Department of Education.

20 MS. WEISS: There we go. Great.

21 So these are the questions that are
22 in our notice and that we asked our panelists
23 to think about and engage with us: How

1 would you demonstrate that high school
2 students are on track to college and career
3 readiness, and at what points throughout high
4 school would you recommend measuring this in
5 light of all the other requirements that we
6 published in the notice?

7 And then particularly hone in on
8 this question of what your recommendations
9 would be around uses of end of course
10 assessments, in addition to, instead of,
11 comprehensive assessments of college and
12 career readiness, how we reconcile these two
13 different methods of thinking about what it
14 means to be a prepared student.

15 So, with that, we are going to
16 begin with Shelly, and turn it over to you.

17 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Good afternoon.

18 It may help if I give you a little bit of
19 background about why I believe in end-of-
20 course assessments. And can you all hear me
21 or do I need to move the microphone?

22 We had had a long history of using
23 end-of-course assessments in Virginia. In

1 fact, we've had a fairly large end-of-course
2 assessment program since 1998, and we have 12
3 of the end-of-course assessments across all
4 areas of English, history, science, and also
5 mathematics.

6 We fell into end-of-course
7 assessments because of comprehensive
8 assessments were not working for us. In 1997
9 we were developing a new assessment system,
10 and we actually planned to have a more
11 comprehensive assessment system. We were
12 going to test all of our students at grade 11
13 in algebra I, reading, writing and also
14 biology and history.

15 And one of the problems we
16 discovered in the field test year was that
17 students did not have the same level of
18 preparation by their 11th grade year.

19 At that time in Virginia there were
20 some students who, by the 11th grade, had not
21 yet had algebra, and there were others who had
22 had algebra in the middle school.

23 So, at that point we decided to

1 move towards an end-of-course assessment
2 system to provide flexibility to our students
3 and also to make sure that they had had the
4 appropriate instruction at the time they were
5 tested.

6 And so, that gives you some
7 background about why I believe end-of-course
8 assessments are very beneficial. Perhaps the
9 most important reason is that assessment is
10 then tied very closely to instruction.

11 So, if a student is taking algebra
12 I, they are tested on algebra I at the end of
13 that year, rather than waiting until several
14 years after they've had that instruction.

15 It also means that students can be
16 tested at a much greater depth when you think
17 about the content. When you think about a
18 comprehensive assessment, it's often covering
19 a fairly large content, so it is very
20 difficult to get at that deep understanding of
21 content.

22 And as you all know, in the
23 introduction to the common core standards, one

1 of the issues that's mentioned is that in the
2 United States we tend to teach and assess very
3 broadly and not do a very good job of teaching
4 and assessing deeply. So, that's one of the
5 benefits.

6 It also means that there's
7 flexibility for the students so that if they
8 are taking algebra I in the 8th grade, then
9 they can be assessed at that point, and that
10 provides motivation for students. The test
11 that they are taking is then tied to what they
12 are learning at that point, rather than tied
13 to something that they learned several years
14 before that.

15 And if, in fact, these assessments
16 are tied to graduation, it provides
17 flexibility. In Virginia they are tied to
18 graduation. Our system calls for students to
19 accrue a certain number of standard credits,
20 which means that the student has, for example,
21 passed algebra I or biology.

22 They also have to have a certain
23 number of verified credits, which means that

1 they have passed the class and also the
2 associated end-of-course assessment. So,
3 again, students can accrue those credits very
4 early in their career, and accrue those at the
5 time that they are taking the class.

6 The problem with comprehensive
7 assessments, as we see it, is that there is
8 not as close an alignment to what the student
9 is learning at the time.

10 Now, the challenges. In thinking
11 about career and college readiness as part of
12 end-of-course assessments. As you all know,
13 the standards as they are currently developed
14 are not course specific, so there is some
15 difficulty in determining how you would assess
16 the career and college readiness standards as
17 part of an end-of-course assessment.

18 But I think when we look at the
19 standards as they are currently drafted, there
20 would be a way that they could be integrated
21 into more traditional course content so they
22 could be addressed, perhaps, as part of an
23 end-of-course assessment.

1 Just as a reminder, these are the
2 English standards as they currently stand. We
3 have reading, informational and literary
4 texts, writing, speaking and listening, and
5 then there's also the application of the core.

6 And here students are expected to
7 apply reading, writing and -- reading and
8 writing skills to research and also to the
9 aspects of media.

10 So, how could we perhaps integrate
11 the measurement of these standards into end-
12 of-course assessments? One way of looking at
13 it would be to have an end-of-course
14 assessment in reading which would cover the
15 reading of the informational and literary
16 text, say, at the end of the 10th or the 11th
17 grade.

18 Writing could also be assessed at
19 the same time. And given where we are
20 currently, it would make sense that those
21 assessments would ideally be given in an on-
22 line format, because then we would be able to
23 assess some of the skills that students will

1 need as they access material more and more on
2 the computer.

3 And I think it is very true that
4 reading and searching for information on the
5 computer is very different from a paper-based
6 -- a paper-based model.

7 In addition, writing, almost all of
8 us now use a computer to write, so it would
9 make sense that an end-of-course assessment
10 might be presented in an on-line format so
11 that students would be being assessed in the
12 way that they normally would write in day-to-
13 day living.

14 The measurement of the speaking and
15 listening standards is much more challenging
16 when you think about a traditional assessment.

17 The speaking standards could perhaps require
18 a student to make a presentation and have that
19 taped, and then scores to score that using a
20 rubric.

21 If the rigor of the assessment is
22 not needed to be so great, perhaps this could
23 be done as part of a classroom assessment with

1 a teacher applying a rubric.

2 Another area of challenge, when you
3 think about traditional assessments, would be
4 application of the standards in reading and
5 media. Again, these two do not lend
6 themselves as much to what we would do in
7 traditional assessments and would require
8 innovation as we think about how to address
9 this.

10 These are the mathematics, career
11 and college readiness standards as they are
12 currently drafted. The first one is probably
13 best understood as habits of mind in terms of
14 mathematics, looking at things like patterns,
15 problem-solving, and that sort of thing.

16 And the rest of the standards are
17 content standards. Again, they are not
18 intended to be part of any particular course,
19 but when you look at them and you think about
20 the traditional high school courses, they
21 could perhaps fit into the traditional algebra
22 I, geometry and algebra II.

23 I also put other courses here. In

1 Virginia we have a course called Algebra
2 Functions and Data Analysis which is intended
3 for students who maybe aren't ready to access
4 algebra II, but it's algebra II concepts and
5 data analysis in more of a practical way.

6 So, I think it would be possible if
7 we look at the career and college readiness
8 standards in terms of more traditional courses
9 to integrate those and then the test would be
10 administered as the student completes the
11 course.

12 The benefits here may be that we
13 are assessing college readiness or career
14 readiness over time, and not assessing it at
15 any particular point. The student would also
16 have the opportunity to have additional
17 instruction if, in fact, we found that in
18 algebra I, the student isn't demonstrating
19 some of what he or should at that point.

20 It would require there to be some
21 flexibility and understanding, that we would
22 not have one sole measure of career and
23 college readiness, but instead we would be

1 looking at that concept over a period of time
2 rather than looking at a student's performance
3 on a comprehensive assessment given at the end
4 of the student's high school career.

5 Now, of course, there are
6 challenges. One is will the assessment
7 expectations be the same for all of the
8 standards. And I mentioned the difficulty in
9 assessing the listening and speaking skills.

10 It's unclear at this point whether
11 the department is expecting assessments that
12 states will develop to address just reading or
13 whether the expectation is that reading and
14 language arts will be assessed.

15 If that's the case, then we will
16 need to understand what the expectations are
17 in terms of listening and speaking. Some of
18 the standards, as they are currently drafted,
19 would be very difficult to assess by anyone
20 except the classroom teacher.

21 For example, one of the standards
22 currently asked the student to modify his or
23 her presentation based on feedback from the

1 audience. So, this would be something that
2 would be difficult to do in a traditional
3 assessment.

4 We may also need additional
5 information from the department about what is
6 meant by some of the standards. You know,
7 while I feel very strongly that the assessment
8 of writing should be in an on-line format,
9 that's not stated.

10 And to ensure that we are going to
11 have some comparability across states, we may
12 need some more specification about whether or
13 not a paper-pencil assessment for writing
14 would be as acceptable as would on-line.

15 It's likely that the
16 characteristics of what's required to produce
17 writing in an on-line format and in a paper-
18 pencil, would be slightly different.

19 And then, in terms of mathematics,
20 one of the challenges is determining which
21 standards will be addressed in each
22 assessment, and some flexibility in
23 understanding that states, using an end-of-

1 course model would not be assessing college
2 career readiness at a particular point in
3 time, but perhaps over a number of years as
4 students complete the course content.

5 MS. WEISS: Okay. Clarifying
6 questions.

7 Can I just ask one? When you said
8 the standards at this time, you were talking
9 about the common core standards?

10 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Yes, I was.

11 MS. WEISS: The consortium
12 standards that you've been working on?

13 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Yes. Yes.

14 MS. WEISS: Okay. Thanks.

15 Questions from anybody for Shelly?

16 MS. WHALEN: Can you just explain a
17 little bit more so I -- I want to make sure I
18 understand correctly, one of the ways you're
19 proposing to measure proficiency against the
20 proposed common core standards is to embed
21 certain standards within different end-of-
22 course exams so that you can pull them out
23 almost like a matrix for an individual child

1 to be -- to see if he or she is proficient at
2 whatever point in time in their high school
3 career towards college and career-ready
4 proficiency?

5 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Yes. That's
6 correct.

7 MS. WHALEN: And in your mind would
8 you see each state who is part of the
9 consortia having the same common end-of-course
10 exam attached to a certain set, still in
11 sequence or syllabi with courses, or would you
12 leave that type of flexibility from state to
13 state who are part of that consortia?

14 MS. LOVING-RYDER: It would
15 certainly be easier to develop if the states
16 in the consortium all agreed on one common set
17 of standards. I can see where there could be
18 some flexibility, depending on what guidance
19 we receive in terms of the requirements of
20 adopting the standards.

21 It's unclear to me at this point
22 whether, in adopting the standards we are
23 still permitted -- states would still be

1 permitted to have other standards outside of
2 the common course standards and still be able
3 to develop assessments that did not have
4 content beyond what we've heard of the 15
5 percent outside of the common core standards.

6 Does that make sense?

7 MS. WHALEN: Yes. I guess I'm
8 trying to -- a step further. So, assuming
9 that everybody within that collection of
10 states adopted the same common set of
11 standards, would you then think that that
12 collection of states would go together into
13 one suite of end-of-course exams, or item
14 banks that you could --

15 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Yes.

16 MS. WHALEN: -- pool to then
17 develop --

18 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Yes.

19 MS. WHALEN: Okay.

20 MS. WURTZEL: So, my question was
21 actually around -- and of course, exams in ELA
22 versus math and what the differentiation is.
23 Do you see there being multiple end-of-course

1 exams in math to capture the different content
2 of algebra I, geometry and algebra II, and
3 then one end-of-course exam in ELA or
4 multiple?

5 MS. LOVING-RYDER: In mathematics,
6 I think there would definitely have to be
7 multiple exams. Certainly, in algebra I,
8 geometry and either algebra II or some other
9 course that would cover some of the algebra I
10 content that's not typically covered in
11 algebra I or geometry.

12 In ELA, I think there would have to
13 be at least two in reading and writing, and I
14 believe in listening and speaking, we need
15 additional guidance about whether states are
16 expected to also assess listening and speaking
17 in a high -- well, not a high-stakes, but in a
18 standardized way or whether there would be
19 flexibility that those two skills might be
20 assessed by teachers, and then those scores
21 reported.

22 MS. WEISS: And why would you be
23 looking to the department to specify that as

1 opposed to saying that that's part of the
2 program that you would want to say what you
3 think is the right answer to that question?

4 Or, would you just be happy for us
5 to say that's the guidance, you tell us what's
6 the right thing to do for students?

7 MS. LOVING-RYDER: It could
8 certainly be part of the proposal. I guess my
9 concern is I'm not -- I've heard that states
10 would be asked to prepare assessments for
11 reading, but I've also heard reading and
12 language arts. And perhaps that's where I'm
13 asking for clarification.

14 MS. WEISS: So our notice does say
15 reading, language arts, so we're thinking of
16 writing, reading, but we don't -- we haven't
17 specified the format for doing any of those
18 things. That's what we're hoping to get input
19 on from folks.

20 MS. LOVING-RYDER: But is listening
21 and speaking included?

22 MS. WEISS: Well, I mean, I think
23 that what we've said is that whatever the

1 standards are that the states have adopted in
2 this consortium and believe need to be
3 assessed or that's the assessment for -- we're
4 hoping to fund.

5 So, we haven't gone -- so we're not
6 trying -- the standards are sort of your
7 standards, and we're just trying to say we'll
8 help fund the assessments that are appropriate
9 to wrap around them.

10 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Okay. So let's
11 move on to Gene -- oh, to Linda. Sorry.

12 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: I'm going to
13 take sort of an international perspective on
14 the question of assessing college and career-
15 ready knowledge and skills and ask the
16 question: How's that done in a variety of
17 places?

18 And in the course of that, I'll be
19 implicitly making an argument for something
20 that you might think of through course
21 assessments as opposed to end-of-course
22 assessments or exams, but they incorporate
23 that idea. And that might even include

1 standards-based collections of evidence.

2 I wanted to start with this
3 question about what do we mean by college and
4 career-ready, because the notion of the
5 standards approach that we're taking those to
6 identify the standards and then say --

7 (Audio disruption.)

8 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Are we okay?
9 Am I on? Okay. I'm going to just keep going
10 and you're going to fiddle with the --

11 MS. WEISS: Maybe just grab a
12 different microphone.

13 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Okay. So, I
14 think most people are thinking about a mastery
15 of a body of knowledge and skills, and from
16 the perspective of universities and employers,
17 that body of knowledge and skills has to be
18 able to be accessed and applied to new
19 problems and needs.

20 It has to transfer. That's the
21 whole point. The ability to organize and
22 express ideas and orally -- write in writing
23 and orally clearly with evidence persuasively,

1 to use mathematical and scientific thinking
2 and understanding, to frame a problem and
3 investigate, evaluate solutions, answers,
4 secure information and resources, these are
5 all things you have to do to succeed in
6 college, and increasingly there are other
7 things you have to do to succeed in careers.

8 And then, as the employers are
9 telling us over and over again, to work
10 successfully with others to accomplish goals
11 and so on.

12 So, all across the world, people
13 are dealing with this. This comes from Hong
14 Kong, China, from a presentation that
15 accompanied the changes in their assessments
16 called "Improving on being first in PESA," and
17 they talk about -- right. It's a very
18 specific goal.

19 And you'll see these kinds of
20 skills that are driving the changes in
21 curriculum and assessment in countries around
22 the world communicate, you know, work in
23 teams, solve problems, analyze, conceptualize,

1 manage one's self, et cetera.

2 If you look at the kinds of
3 assessments we're familiar with, this happens
4 to come from the NAEP, very common, what two
5 gases make up most of the Earth's atmosphere,
6 and an open-ended item, is a hamburger, an
7 example of stored energy? It's a yes or no
8 question with a one-sentence answer.

9 If you were to go back to that list
10 of skills you would see that very few of them
11 are evaluated in that form of assessment. And
12 so, I think part of the argument you will see
13 made in countries around the world is that you
14 have to go further than what we have
15 traditionally done.

16 This happens to be from the
17 Singapore Education Minister, Tharman
18 Shanmagarafnam, which is in part of their
19 reform of their assessment system, he was
20 pushing the fact that we have to depend less
21 on rote learning and more on engaged learning
22 and, you know, demonstrating that in project-
23 based census.

1 The countries I'm going to draw
2 upon in the conversation are among the
3 highest-achieving nations in the world. These
4 are the top ten in science, math and reading
5 on PESA, and the ones in red are the ones I'm
6 going to draw some of my comments from.

7 And these are from the IEA reading
8 assessment which used other countries, and
9 I've just circled the ones that I'm going to
10 draw upon only to show you that -- while I
11 wouldn't make an argument their assessments
12 drive their success, I would potentially make
13 the argument that they haven't brought them
14 down.

15 And so, one of the things you see
16 in high school assessments that's common is
17 that they are syllabus-based high school
18 examination systems common in many countries
19 and these include evidence from both what we
20 would think of as end-of-course exams and
21 curriculum-embedded assessments.

22 I just list here a number of them,
23 and I'll point out a couple of things. In

1 every single case school-based curriculum-
2 embedded assessments account for anywhere from
3 25 or 20 percent to 100 percent of the
4 examination score that is used for the purpose
5 of informing the diploma and the employer and
6 the university.

7 And I include the International
8 Baccalaureate there because many people aren't
9 familiar with it. There's 125 countries that
10 engage with that. It follows a similar
11 format, that this is a very common way to do
12 course assessments, syllabus-based in many
13 countries around the world, and some places
14 like Alberta, Canada, you have assessments in
15 four core academic subjects, and those are at
16 a sort of basic and advanced level.

17 In most places you actually -- the
18 students choose the subjects they will be
19 evaluated in and they take anywhere from three
20 exams to perhaps as many as eight, and those
21 may be vocational certificates that are part
22 of that or they may be academic.

23 And so, you'll have as many as 30

1 or 40 examinations to choose from in a system
2 like Victoria or England, you know, and some
3 others. So, you have a range of ways that the
4 curriculum is organized with examinations
5 embedded in that.

6 This is from Hong Kong's Education
7 Examinations Authority just last year and they
8 basically were making the rationale for
9 increasing the amount of school-based
10 assessment in their examination system, and it
11 is common to the rationales you'll see around
12 the world, that you're enhancing the validity
13 of the assessment by including the assessment
14 of outcomes that cannot be readily assessed
15 within the context of a one-off public
16 examination to promote a positive impact on
17 teaching and learning, to motivate students by
18 engaging them in meaningful activities, for
19 teachers to reinforce curriculum and good
20 teaching practices and provide structure and
21 significance to the assessment they do,
22 anyway.

23 And the kinds of activities -- this

1 is common across the countries that I've
2 listed -- include things like oral
3 presentations, a portfolio of work, field
4 work, investigations, almost every country
5 does -- has kids designing, conducting,
6 evaluating scientific investigations as part
7 of the science courses, practical lab work,
8 design projects, et cetera.

9 So, that's sort of the framework.
10 The rationale has a lot to do with the fact,
11 as he says -- as they say at the end, that the
12 outcomes are valued by tertiary institutions
13 and employers.

14 But if you think about assessment
15 systems, they can kind of go from on-demand
16 tests which, at the top of that yellow bar
17 includes selected response or multiple choice
18 items all the way through to short answer,
19 extended response and student-designed
20 response to items.

21 And then there are curriculum
22 embedded assessments which can be relatively
23 bounded tasks in which the student responds to

1 a prompt all the way over to open-ended
2 challenges where the students are creating
3 knowledge or products.

4 All of these elements are part of
5 the assessment systems of other countries. We
6 tend to locate in the upper left-hand corner
7 of the yellow box, but not exclusively. We do
8 have systems that go up and down that yellow
9 corridor, if you will, and some that have
10 experimented in Vermont and Maine and Kentucky
11 and other places with a curriculum-embedded
12 piece.

13 Just to give you a sense, England
14 is the mother of all of this. A lot of the
15 systems, including the New York State Regents
16 System derived from the British examination
17 system with the blue books that used to be all
18 open-ended essays and so on.

19 Now they have 25 to 60 percent of
20 the exam score in various areas, and this
21 gives you a sense of the range of exams that
22 they offer that are what they call controlled
23 assessments that are in the classroom under

1 supervised conditions.

2 And to give you a sense of what
3 those consist of, in GCSE, which is the high
4 school exam taken by most students in English,
5 in addition to an end-of-course exam, in the
6 classroom, scored in a moderated context by
7 teachers, there will be a whole set of tasks
8 that have to be done around reading and
9 responding to texts, imaginative writing,
10 speaking and listening, information and ideas,
11 and they sort of describe those.

12 The assessments are either
13 specified and handed to teachers and then
14 delivered in the classroom or the
15 specifications are outlined and teachers
16 develop the tasks to the specifications, and
17 then they're delivered.

18 If the teacher develops the task
19 it's scored externally. If the external body
20 develops the task it may be scored internally
21 with moderation. So, it's just an interesting
22 aspect.

23 ICT, interactive computer

1 technology, that's a design task. Kids in
2 groups have to basically create a solution to
3 a problem of how to -- they have to create a
4 piece of software and test it to solve a set
5 of problems around managing a bunch of rock
6 bands.

7 So, you know, that's the kind of --
8 that's a more ambitious task. Same thing in
9 Singapore, at the A-level exam they have both
10 O and A level examinations. You'll have time-
11 based written papers. They are almost
12 exclusively open-ended with structured
13 questions, case studies and source-based
14 questions, and in every case you'll have
15 school-based course work which may last as
16 long as six months, may include a design task,
17 oral presentation, independent study, very
18 extensive moderation system for those tasks.

19 As in many countries, one of those
20 will be science, practical assessments in all
21 the science classes. Now, to show his point
22 about the fact that you can't do everything
23 within course assessments, they've added, in

1 Singapore, in England and in the International
2 Baccalaureate the requirement that students do
3 a project work that is interdisciplinary.

4 That piece of project work results
5 in an essay based on extensive research,
6 usually about a 4,000-word essay with
7 references, et cetera and oral presentation.
8 And in Singapore they require collaborative
9 learning through group work because they
10 believe it's an essential skill, and they've
11 been doing it for six or seven years now and
12 scoring it again with moderation.

13 So, to cut across this, common
14 practices across countries, you'll find that
15 the assessments are part of a tightly-
16 integrated system of standards, curriculum,
17 instruction assessment and teacher
18 development, and it can be done at the state
19 or in small countries at the national level.

20 The assessments include evidence of
21 actual student performance. Their teachers
22 are integrally involved in the development and
23 scoring of the assessments and in many

1 countries college faculty also write the exams
2 with the high school faculty because they are
3 substantially used as information for college.

4 The assessments are typically used
5 to inform course grades and provide
6 information to colleges and employers. Almost
7 never are they used to determine whether a
8 student receives a diploma or not. They are
9 given as additional information on the diploma
10 that the student receives, and they are
11 designed to continuously improve teaching and
12 learning.

13 I just want to point out the ways
14 in which folks from these countries will argue
15 that assessment improves teaching and
16 learning, that together the range of
17 assessments evaluates the full range of
18 standards, so that's improving the incentives
19 to teach the full range of standards.

20 Second, the teacher scoring
21 supports professional learning, about the
22 assessments, about what the standards mean,
23 about the teaching -- act of teaching, and it

1 produces more common instruction and grading
2 across the jurisdiction.

3 So, people are engaged in doing
4 more of the same rich work. They usually, in
5 many countries, use learning progressions from
6 K through 12 as a way to guide instruction and
7 assessment throughout the grades. That also
8 allows teachers to see where the students are
9 going and how to help them get where they're
10 going.

11 And finally, the assessments
12 actually provide models of good instruction.
13 They enhance curriculum equity because all --
14 and I'll give you one more example of that,
15 and they allow teachers to see and evaluate
16 the student learning that informs their
17 teaching.

18 Now, how does this work in terms of
19 informing the learning? This is an item from
20 the high school biology exam in Victoria,
21 Australia. Kids are shown the way a virus
22 operates, they are asked to design a drug that
23 would be effective against the virus and to

1 explain that with diagrams and in a couple of
2 pages and then they are asked to design an
3 experiment to test the effectiveness of the
4 drug.

5 It's a very challenging task. When
6 I asked people how many kids in this country
7 would be able to do it, I usually get
8 estimates from one to five percent. Who knows
9 that the real answer is, but in the school-
10 based course work that is graded as part of
11 the examination score, there are six pieces of
12 work that all of the kids have to undertake,
13 one of which is a research report on
14 characteristics of pathogenic organisms and
15 mechanisms by which they defend against
16 disease that sets you up to understand how to
17 answer that question.

18 So, there's an integration between
19 the end of course exam and the through-course
20 assessments that enable kids to be successful
21 in more ambitious work.

22 In terms of costs, we've done some
23 cost analysis and they sort of range from

1 about \$12 per person per exam to close to
2 about \$30, which is not unlike what some US
3 studies have estimated.

4 You might make a comparison to a
5 similar syllabus-based system which is the
6 Advanced Placement Exams, but the \$86 per exam
7 that is used here is really the price, not the
8 cost.

9 But one of the things that's
10 critical is that much of the scoring of these
11 exams which is, as I said, highly-moderated
12 and audited, takes place as part of
13 professional development time for teachers.

14 So, it's embedded in the work and
15 funded and rationalized, in part, for that
16 reason.

17 And they will argue that the
18 benefits of this teacher involvement in
19 scoring is actually that there's more learning
20 going on, so that some of the costs are
21 actually also a benefit. So, instead of
22 wasted time, it's really instructional time
23 that's providing formative feedback as well as

1 some of the feedback.

2 I just want to mention that there
3 are interesting uses of technology-based
4 scoring, particularly in Hong Kong and the
5 International Baccalaureate where examiners
6 are trained and calibrated on-line so that
7 there are benchmarks to be able to do this
8 consistently, the assessments can be conducted
9 on-line, papers are delivered on-line for
10 marking by the teachers with moderation
11 student results can be tracked on line and you
12 can then do research and aggregate the data.

13 You could also imagine blending a
14 system like this with some machine scoring of
15 more limited open-ended tasks like what is
16 being experimented with on the college
17 Collegiate Learning Assessment, college work,
18 learning readiness assessment, the new ETSC
19 initiatives and others.

20 Final point, that if we were going
21 to create internationally benchmarked teaching
22 and learning systems, we would work with
23 common course standards and curriculum

1 expectations.

2 The curriculum guidance would be
3 lean, but clear, and it would include the kind
4 of guidance aimed at these skills that we
5 really care about. There would be exemplars
6 of curriculum units and assessments. There
7 would be state assessments at key junctures
8 that include on-command or on-demand as well
9 as curriculum-embedded components.

10 There would be teacher involvement
11 in development and scoring, and preparation
12 and in-service that includes extensive
13 training in both assessment and in learning
14 and development and teaching of students, and
15 that we may want to think about how to use the
16 new NAEP benchmarks, or blueprints that are
17 moving in this direction as a way to then
18 benchmark some of the state assessments,
19 support multiple state consortia that would
20 work toward this, and that would integrate
21 school-based performance assessments in some
22 fashion into testing and reporting systems
23 throughout the grades, because if you wait

1 until kids get to high school to say you now
2 have to think and apply your knowledge and
3 write extensively and do research, you'll have
4 a very sad outcome for kids at that moment.

5 And I'll stop there.

6 MS. WEISS: Thanks. Questions.

7 MS. WURTZEL: This morning Randy
8 Bennett -- sorry. Can people hear me?

9 This morning Randy Bennett had a
10 very useful image for us, advice to say one of
11 the things we should be doing is building an
12 image of where we want to be ten years from
13 now and then think about what are the
14 incremental steps to get there so we can start
15 off going in the right direction.

16 So you've sketched out an image
17 based on international examples that is very
18 far away from where we are today in this
19 country. So, if you were to want to go in
20 that direction, what would be the first
21 incremental steps to get you there.

22 MS. WEISS: Can I ask that we hold
23 that for the round table, because that's a

1 giant question, that I think is a great one,
2 that I would love to engage on.

3 MS. WURTZEL: Absolutely.

4 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: So we'll all
5 be ready to talk about it.

6 MS. WEISS: Yes, because, I mean,
7 that's like that's the question that I have,
8 as I'm listening, too, but I think it's maybe
9 longer than we have in the couple of minutes.

10 MS. WURTZEL: Okay. To clarify --

11 MS. WEISS: Are there any other --
12 more clarifying -- can I ask one?

13 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Yes.

14 MS. WEISS: You kept referring to
15 syllabus-based.

16 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Yes.

17 MS. WEISS: What does that mean?

18 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Syllabi --
19 the curriculum guidance in most of the
20 countries I mentioned there is pretty lean.
21 That is, all of the curriculum guidance in
22 Finland from grade K to 12, same in Japan, for
23 math, is in ten pages.

1 Now, -- and it says what you're
2 going to teach at certain junctures, but it
3 doesn't go into, you know, very prescribed
4 activities.

5 From that teachers develop syllabus
6 -- a syllabi particularly at the high school
7 level that give examples of the kinds of
8 assessments that are expected during the
9 course, the content that should be taught, the
10 kinds of assessments that should be covered,
11 and then sometimes those are elaborated with
12 examples of teaching activities, et cetera, et
13 cetera.

14 Those are also pretty lean. They
15 would be, for a given course, perhaps ten to
16 20 pages, but enough that there's some
17 commonality and then work that teachers can
18 work around in the syllabus.

19 In the United States, the closest
20 system we might have is the New York State
21 Regions Systems, which is a couple of hundred
22 years old, and which until a few decades ago
23 was almost entirely open-ended and included

1 classroom-based components like lab work, and
2 has since moved back to include much more
3 open-ended work in a later revision. And
4 there are syllabi that guide that system as
5 well.

6 MS. WHALEN: Can I ask another
7 clarifying question?

8 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Yes.

9 MS. WHALEN: How would student
10 growth fit into this portfolio?

11 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: I didn't
12 describe it as a portfolio because it's really
13 --

14 MS. WHALEN: I'm sorry. That's
15 fine.

16 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: -- a course
17 assessment system.

18 MS. WHALEN: Okay.

19 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: And I think
20 you have the same question about student
21 growth with any end-of-course system. A
22 standards-based course examination system is
23 not designed to be vertically-scaled.

1 So you'll have to make inferences
2 about students' growth and learning from their
3 performance on prior tasks, you know, in prior
4 courses or in prior assessments, and in
5 earlier years.

6 You can, however, design a system
7 such that you could -- as many districts do,
8 where you give an assessment at the beginning
9 of the year that tests the students' knowledge
10 in that course in a useful way.

11 It does not have to be just a
12 selected response assessment. It can include,
13 you know, more open-ended items, and then you
14 can use that as a benchmark for sort of the
15 accumulated final assessment evidence that you
16 have at the end of the course.

17 MS. WEISS: Great. Gene, do you
18 want to take it away.

19 MR. BOTTOMS: Take it away.
20 Thanks. Each of our settings probably
21 influence a little bit what we're going to say
22 for the last --

23 MS. WEISS: Sorry. We need the

1 next presentation.

2 MR. BOTTOMS: The last --

3 MS. WEISS: Or do you have -- you
4 have a presentation, right?

5 MR. BOTTOMS: I do have one.

6 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Oh, just go
7 through all of that. Those are extra slides I
8 didn't use. Sorry.

9 MR. BOTTOMS: Oh.

10 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Thank you.
11 Sorry.

12 MR. BOTTOMS: Okay. Do we have it
13 up?

14 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: It's going to
15 come in just a second. Just keep -- here,
16 I'll get you there.

17 MR. BOTTOMS: Okay. All right.

18 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: I didn't
19 realize that was on there.

20 MR. BOTTOMS: You have nice
21 pictures. I probably should have kept those.

22 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Is that you?

23 MR. BOTTOMS: Yes, that's me.

1 MS. WEISS: They were nice
2 pictures.

3 MR. BOTTOMS: Probably where we set
4 determines to a large extent some of the ideas
5 we're going to share. For the last two
6 decades, plus, I've been involved in trying to
7 improve high schools across the country now,
8 in about 31 states, or about 1500 schools in
9 the network.

10 And we have worked with EGS to use
11 a NAEP-like framework in reading, math and
12 science over the year to try to get a kind of
13 a continuous school improvement framework.

14 So, that's the context. And I work
15 with states that have high-stake assessments
16 and low stakes, or no stakes. And just one
17 fact up front, in high-stakes assessment
18 states, about 14 -- about 12 students out of
19 every 100 who make the 12th grade do not
20 graduate.

21 In non-stake assessments, it's
22 about four out of a hundred. So, those are
23 some issues, if you think about this.

1 The first issue I'm going to raise,
2 are college and career-readiness the same
3 thing. I can argue it both ways. Basically
4 we have said in many ways some of the
5 cognitive level skills you need to go into
6 some of the mid-level jobs that require
7 certification may not be too different from
8 those that you need to go and succeed in
9 college without having to take remedial
10 courses.

11 But we've done that in the context
12 of a continuous school improvement design
13 where we're trying to lift more students up to
14 have options available to them. If states are
15 going to use this new college and career-
16 readiness assessment to be high-stakes exams,
17 I don't think we've done enough work to be
18 clear about what are those career-readiness
19 standards for those 45 percent of the jobs in
20 California, Linda, that they now call mid-
21 level jobs that's going to require some kind
22 of certification.

23 I'm not quite sure that they're the

1 same as what it means to be ready for college
2 in that kind of context, so I'll leave that
3 with you in terms of how that moves.

4 The other issue -- there's
5 certainly an issue about the readiness for
6 college and careers and graduation. We need
7 to be careful and decide that readiness for
8 college is not all of a sudden going to become
9 the standard for graduating from high school
10 would be one, I believe.

11 We're probably some distance away
12 from setting standards, both for college
13 readiness and high school graduation being the
14 same thing. We ought to work towards closing
15 that gap over time to get to a certain target
16 level, but I seriously doubt that there are
17 very few states that are ready to make real
18 college readiness standards that are high
19 school graduation standards, in that context.

20 The measuring students' for college
21 and careers, the one -- if I had a limited
22 number of exams to deal with, I would have a
23 literacy exam broad-based, reading and

1 writing, and I would give it at the grade nine
2 and grade 11.

3 And I would focus on literacy
4 because it's key both college and career
5 readiness. We have a declining reading
6 achievement in the American high school since
7 '97. It's been going down both at the basic
8 and at the professional level as measured by
9 NAEP, except in our network of schools we've
10 been going in the other direction.

11 Reading in most high schools
12 belongs to the English teacher. Many, many
13 teachers in the American high school have not
14 been prepared to engage students in the
15 language of the field they teach, neither the
16 core academics nor the career technical
17 teachers, nor the fine arts teachers.

18 So, I would create a broad-based
19 literacy exam at grade nine and grade 11 that
20 would be designed to put the entire faculty on
21 the spot. It is your responsibility. You
22 have ownership of driving up reading
23 achievement, because that is a key to

1 improving achievement overall in that context.

2 So, I would look at how we would
3 embed unique standards into the exam that
4 would assess, that would be unique to the
5 different disciplinaries. I would use the
6 senior year for those who are not ready for
7 further study but plan to go on who do not
8 have the literacy skills.

9 I would completely redesign that
10 senior English course and some others that
11 senior year, and deal with that -- deal with
12 that issue.

13 Schools can assess whether a
14 student -- whether changes in what and how
15 students were taught. If you do it grades
16 nine and 11, you could begin to see if schools
17 are changing their practices.

18 Students will tell you the truth.
19 If they're engaged more in the language of the
20 field, they'll tell you that. They are a good
21 measure of what's going on there. And
22 probably at grade 11 I would have some kind of
23 subscale on workplace literacy in some context

1 there in terms of finding information,
2 locating information that is very important in
3 the work place today.

4 And I would probably have some
5 multiple cut scores for graduation and maybe a
6 different one for advanced training. I'm not
7 sure. I think research is going to have to
8 validate that out in time, and then for
9 college readiness.

10 What might make up that exam? I
11 would have about 60 percent based on
12 expository informational text kind of reading.

13 I would have about 20 percent on nonfiction
14 and about 20 percent on fiction, poetry.

15 I would have some paratext kind of
16 analysis where they're going to have to do
17 some kind of analysis, and I would certainly
18 draw the content from the core academic areas.

19 I would begin to be assessing some
20 way to give some kind of subscale score about
21 whether or not students can read materials in
22 certain kinds of discipline areas.

23 I would have about 20 percent of

1 the items at grade level to cover some type of
2 work place literacy. And after I listen to
3 the conversation this morning, we probably
4 need digital literacy up there as I listened
5 to the conversation this morning.

6 Twenty percent would be locate and
7 recall, integrate and interpret, 45 percent,
8 critique and evaluate, 35 percent. That would
9 be my preferred balance. That doesn't mean
10 it's perfect. That's just an opinion, and
11 Joanne said I could give my opinion right
12 after this.

13 MS. WEISS: That's why we asked you
14 here.

15 MR. BOTTOMS: We have built and
16 exam very similar like this. It's kind of
17 somewhat off the NAEP framework. We
18 downloaded parts of the NAEP framework and
19 uploaded other parts of it.

20 I can tell you the students who
21 meet the performance arrows we set, there are
22 very few of them have to take either remedial
23 reading or writing as we follow students up

1 over the years who go into the community and
2 four-year colleges.

3 And many of our students are drawn
4 from what I call the career technical students
5 in high school. That's -- we focused on the
6 other 70 percent, has been our emphasis in
7 high school, and for those are who not even
8 finishing high school.

9 Now, in terms of mathematics, I
10 would have one end-of-course exam. It would
11 be algebra. And I would give it to the
12 students who stayed in grades 7, 8 or 9
13 whenever they take it. Why I'd do that,
14 because algebra is one of the poorest-taught
15 subjects in high school today, algebra I is.

16 I would try to improve the teaching
17 of algebra I to get at those things most
18 essential, that will be a foundation to move
19 forward.

20 Why do I say by the end of the 9th
21 grade? Under AYP, I have found school-after-
22 school where they wait to take algebra in the
23 11th, 12th grade. There are a whole group, a

1 subgroup of students who are not going to get
2 the math and skills needed to advance either
3 in work place or in other places, and so I
4 would begin to peg it down there in that
5 context.

6 At the 11th grade level, I'd have a
7 comprehensive math exam, and it would cover
8 sufficient range and depth, skills to
9 establish and model the cut scores. You've
10 got math fields -- you have a number of fields
11 that both two-year and four-year colleges
12 require as a load of math.

13 And almost, you need to be clear
14 about that, and you need a cut score for those
15 fields. You have other math -- you have other
16 programs of study in college that requires
17 less math, and so I'd have a different
18 benchmark there.

19 There may be -- the advance
20 training. Math in the work place. It's going
21 to be much more functional mathematics as the
22 Alberta -- as Linda pointed out, the
23 providence in Canada, they have an applied

1 math series, which is designed to get at some
2 of this, which is quite different, designed by
3 a famous publisher in this country for us, for
4 them.

5 And there be another math
6 proficiency for high school graduation. I
7 think that's an issue to look at now.

8 Why require algebra I in the course
9 exam? I look at it kind of a foundation
10 course for being on track for college and
11 career readiness, and I'd want to get that
12 through by the end of the 9th grade, and that
13 means doing what Virginia's been doing,
14 starting back in the 5th grade, identifying
15 students who are not going to be ready unless
16 you accelerate some things there.

17 I would want to improve the
18 teaching of algebra I in a whole variety of
19 ways, contextual as well as pure approaches.
20 I would encourage the best teachers to come to
21 the 9th grade and teach algebra I to some of
22 the most challenged students in that process,
23 and I want to develop early interventions for

1 students.

2 I'd certainly want to use the
3 senior year as the highest, most students who
4 go on to college who have to take remedial
5 courses in mathematics is very high.

6 So, I'd want to design a special
7 course that senior year for those students who
8 did not meet the benchmark geared to where
9 they're trying to go to next. I'd more
10 reflect the varying levels of mathematics
11 needs based on students current educational
12 goals, and I'd want to encourage greater
13 instructional connection.

14 I want to encourage mathematics,
15 science and technology teachers, those
16 technical fields that have a math-base to work
17 together.

18 We have an assumption in America
19 that you're going to discover math through
20 pure math, and we're going to get more
21 engineers that way. You're only going to get
22 that by beginning to connect the technologies
23 and math together.

1 And I can tell you lots of stories
2 there. So, if we think we're going to turn
3 people on to pure math through pure math, you
4 will -- you will a small group. But if you
5 want to broaden that base we're going to have
6 to bring in a richer set of learning
7 experiences.

8 So I'd want to certainly try to
9 hook more students into accelerated math
10 strands. I just do not think algebra II is an
11 appropriate course for college readiness. It
12 will be too narrow.

13 Most of the placement exams used
14 for community college have maybe two or three
15 items on -- that deal with algebra II.
16 They're are very few items on there, if you go
17 take those exams, that deal with algebra II.

18 They deal with other math skills,
19 so there would be some algebra II, this would
20 be my break-out of the content of that kind of
21 exam. I'll not go through that list, but
22 there would be some recalled, routine
23 procedure items.

1 There would be some moderate
2 complexity and there would be a high percent
3 of complexity items, and I kind of like the
4 new NAEP framework for mathematics as a decent
5 piece to work against.

6 And we find that students who begin
7 to meet what we've established as some
8 readiness levels for college and careers, on a
9 recent exam we've been using prior to the '08
10 one, we were looking at only about a ten
11 percent remediation rate, compared to those
12 who did not meet that, of about a 40 percent
13 remediation rate in college.

14 Now, what else would I do? When
15 you build high school assessments, what we've
16 failed to do, if assessments, standards and
17 reporting the results would solve our problems
18 in America, we ought to be good.

19 What we've failed to communicate is
20 a vision of what a great high school ought to
21 look like, and I would say as states build
22 their assessment they need to communicate what
23 -- what will make -- what kind of high school

1 will produce these results. What's the vision
2 for that high school.

3 And I think we need to ask students
4 whether or not they're experiencing that
5 vision. Ask them a series of questions. We
6 have found that seniors, what they report,
7 that experience in these schools is a very
8 good predictor of their achievement.

9 We use achievement too much to try
10 to fix kids. We need to use the achievement
11 data in high school to fix the system, because
12 it's not working well, and there's my
13 categories of questions around which I build,
14 and I can give you a series of questions that
15 ETS has validated over the years for us, they
16 are very predictive of higher achievement.
17 They hold up year in and year out.

18 I'm going to get into
19 accountability just a moment. AS you build
20 your high school assessment, you've got to
21 give equal attention to graduating folks in
22 raising achievement.

23 Right now it's one-sided -- it's

1 very one-sided. And in some way we've got to
2 start achievement levels to recognize schools
3 with higher percent of students meeting
4 college and career-readiness standards, and we
5 have to broaden the definition of regular.

6 I just want to mention one point
7 that Shelly did not mention about Virginia,
8 we've got other exams, as you build your high
9 school assessment, there are at least 200
10 employer certification exams that would be
11 reasonable to measure students' ability to
12 read very complicated materials and pass.

13 Virginia uses those to earn one
14 verified credit. We do not -- should not
15 forget the International Baccalaureate, NAEP
16 exam or else we run the risk of creating a
17 minimum college readiness exam that's going to
18 pull everything down to the minimum. We
19 already have that. We need to think about how
20 we're going to lift more folks up.

21 In terms of broaden the definition
22 of regular, we exams that encourage
23 application-based learning. This morning, and

1 Linda both illustrated a number of examples.
2 We need exams that encourage high-order
3 problem-solving kind of teaching.

4 We need exams that encourage going
5 deep in something, learning something in-
6 depth. We need a way to -- we need a kind of
7 process that blends a ready academic core with
8 career kind of studies or fine arts studies to
9 bring these two worlds together.

10 There are a group of students who
11 will benefit from very pure college
12 preparatory program of studies, but others
13 you're going to have to blend together.

14 And in some ways we need some new
15 kinds of assessments. I like the Virginia
16 approach of recognizing employer certification
17 exams. I like Maryland where they're going to
18 use a project-based learning approach for some
19 students who may have difficulty with their
20 written exams, as they now are constructed.

21 I like the idea of senior projects.

22 I like the idea of the portfolios. I heard
23 this morning, electronically-based, and my

1 final comments and my last one minute.

2 Yes, you're going to have a
3 selective response, but I'm going to tell you,
4 when you go into high schools, and we're in
5 the 150 a year, the other half of the students
6 are taught select response modality.

7 That's the nature of their
8 teaching. They are taught -- and they spend a
9 lot of time drilling on that, particularly in
10 high-stake exam states.

11 You're going to have some select
12 response, but we've insisted that our exam
13 have a number of constructive response items,
14 because it causes teachers to begin to let
15 students discover their own voices and their
16 own ideas and trying to construct answers, and
17 begin to process that information differently.

18 The piece that I would like to see,
19 and I heard some great ideas this morning. I
20 heard some examples from international, how we
21 get at the performance assessment piece, how
22 we make it possible to use problem and
23 project-based learning that will encourage

1 that kind of learning.

2 Folks, in our current assessment
3 system for high schools, we have forgotten
4 that kids have passion, that they have
5 interests, they have talents, they have goals.

6 We've got to turn them back onto learning,
7 and it's going to take a much more varied
8 approach to learning and it's going to take
9 assessment that encourages that.

10 Our current assessment system
11 stifles that kind of learning in many high
12 schools for many students. End of story.

13 MS. WEISS: Thank you.

14 Questions? Anybody? I actually
15 think this is because you were very clear in
16 what you were saying.

17 MR. WISE: I had a question. You
18 had some very specific suggestions for what
19 percentage of the exam should be this and
20 should be that. Can you say anything more
21 about sort of what's the basis for those
22 suggestions?

23 MR. BOTTOMS: That's a good

1 question. You know, creating an exam is kind
2 of like watching legislation being made.

3 MS. WEISS: Is that like sausage?

4 MR. BOTTOMS: I didn't want to go
5 there. We literally, in redoing our exam for
6 the '08 assessment, we again used the more
7 recent NAEP frameworks, and as we looked at
8 the group of students we were addressing, and
9 where we saw some of the deficits in what we
10 were trying to accomplish in terms of
11 literacy, we downloaded emphasis on -- on
12 literary items and poetry and upped the items
13 on expository text and information kind of
14 items.

15 And because we felt like there was
16 not enough emphasis across the curriculum, and
17 other teachers taking some ownership of
18 engaging students in that whole process,
19 that's how that emerged.

20 In terms of the -- the mathematics,
21 as we looked at students going both into work
22 and into the -- into advanced training and to
23 the certificate programs in community

1 colleges, and we actually looked at some of
2 the placement exams.

3 And, you know, some of the students
4 are failing the arithmetic on the placement
5 exams because they haven't had it since about
6 the sixth grade. If you go look at some of
7 those placement exams, they have an awful lot
8 of those kind of items on them.

9 So, again, the math closely
10 approximates the new NAEP framework. I
11 understand you may have to fine tune it with a
12 few additional items at the upper level since
13 we use what was the latest version.

14 But the NAEP framework basically
15 drove our ideas. And I like the NAEP
16 framework for this reason. It deals with
17 broad issues. I think, in the standards
18 movement, we've got so many standards it gets
19 learning so -- it loses context, and so I like
20 the broad framework.

21 And since I'm much more of a
22 Gestalt design behavioralist in that mold, and
23 we have found that school experiences are very

1 sensitive to those NAEP frameworks.

2 If you change the quality of the
3 experience these students are having, as to
4 what they're taught, what's expected, how
5 they're taught, you'll get big jumps on those
6 kind of exams.

7 MS. WEISS: Any other questions?

8 Yes. Sure. Go ahead.

9 MS. LOVING-RYDER: You mentioned
10 providing a comprehensive exam in the 11th
11 grade, and then using the 12th grade to
12 provide additional instruction. Would you
13 have the 12th graders take the exam again?

14 MR. BOTTOMS: Only if colleges will
15 have the students to take the exam again after
16 they teach the remedial courses to them and
17 they've passed them.

18 I would involve the colleges in
19 designing that 12th grade course, but colleges
20 today are not regiving the exam after they
21 teach their developmental course. So, I would
22 think that -- that's a bad answer I've just
23 given you.

1 I have no difficulty regiving the
2 exam at the end of the 12th grade. We've
3 tried this out in a few places. I am fully
4 convinced that for many students you can
5 redesign that senior math course in a
6 different kind of language arts course that
7 you can more than cut in half the percentage
8 of students having to take developmental
9 courses in college that senior year.

10 And I think that's something that
11 higher ed and public ed ought to work together
12 on to design.

13 MS. WEISS: Great.

14 Laurie.

15 MR. WISE: Well, I want to thank
16 you for giving me another opportunity to come
17 and chat with you all. I think you've got a
18 very challenging endeavor in defining a
19 procurement that will produce really
20 significant improvements in the assessments
21 that we're using in this system today, and I
22 wish you well in that endeavor.

23 I have a little desk organizer, so

1 I don't get too lost about some of the kinds
2 of options and the issues that I'm going to
3 talk to you about that I think need to be
4 carefully considered as, you know, following
5 the sort of mantra, "Be careful what you ask
6 for," or at least be clear about what you're
7 asking for.

8 So, first of all, I think we need
9 to start with what are the intended uses of
10 the common assessments that get developed, and
11 at the high school level, there's a wide
12 variety of things that different people talk
13 about.

14 Starting from school
15 accountability, and you know, under "No Child
16 Left Behind," we've done a great job of
17 holding schools accountable. In most states
18 we've done a lousy job of holding high schools
19 accountable because we don't measure, really,
20 what we expect the high schools to do.

21 So, in some sense, the readiness
22 test, if that's what you end up developing,
23 are more like the K-12 system accountability,

1 not a high school accountability because it
2 measures what the whole system has taught.

3 There's talk about teacher, or
4 principal, or program performance indicators
5 that we can use to evaluate how well our
6 instruction is working to coach individual
7 teachers, to hold principals accountable for
8 what their schools impart.

9 High school graduation requirements
10 have been mentioned as a way of we're holding
11 the students accountable for a certain amount
12 of learning, and then providing diagnostic
13 information about student deficiencies that
14 will actually inform improved instruction for
15 individual students.

16 These are just some of the possible
17 uses that we might have for a common
18 assessment at the high school level. The test
19 content, and we could be talking about a wide
20 range of things, and are we talking about a
21 single test covering all of reading or all of
22 math in terms of the readiness standards,
23 either as they exist or as they will be

1 revised to be, or are we talking about a
2 number of end-of-course assessments like
3 Shelly talked about as has been implemented in
4 some states.

5 Test administration, are we talking
6 about one thing that's getting toward the end
7 of high school, or maybe at the beginning,
8 maybe at the end, maybe several times.

9 Are we talking at -- or about end-
10 of-course tests that are given at the end of
11 whenever you're completing instruction in a
12 certain area, or are we talking about
13 something like that I think Linda mentioned
14 about sort of a through-course assessments,
15 not just end-of-course assessments.

16 It might be given at multiple
17 points, and provide mid-course corrections to
18 both the students and their teachers as they
19 go through the course, and allow us to
20 accumulate more reliable information about
21 student performance than we can get with a
22 single end-of-year test.

23 And then format, and I won't go too

1 much into format, although I do need to
2 correct one thing from yesterday. But we
3 heard a lot about the different things that
4 technology might offer us in terms of getting
5 beyond just paper and pencil tests.

6 And I would add portfolio
7 approaches, and I'll talk a little bit, or
8 remind me if -- ask me a question if I don't
9 about why portfolios at this level and maybe
10 not so much at earlier levels.

11 And finally, I think we need to end
12 with a discussion of what kind of evidence are
13 we going to bring for the validity of the
14 interpretations and uses we're going to make
15 of the test, so starting with the uses, and
16 ending with the validity and then talking
17 about what it is in between.

18 So, I'm going to be a little
19 contrary at this point and say that a single
20 readiness test doesn't really help us much
21 with many of the uses that -- that have been
22 discussed or described.

23 You know, high schools teach a very

1 rich and diverse curriculum. If you have a
2 verbal and quantitative test, it measures sort
3 of a narrow part of that curriculum. It
4 doesn't measure, for the most part, what any
5 teacher or at least not very many teachers are
6 actually teaching.

7 And it's inconsistent with the idea
8 that, as we get to high school, we really want
9 to give students opportunities to excel at
10 what interests them and what they're best at.

11 Everybody in this room is probably
12 too young to remember Malvena Reynolds and
13 Little Boxes on the Hillside, and they are all
14 made out of ticky-tacky and they all look just
15 the same.

16 I think most of us have at the high
17 school level, different from the earlier
18 grades, a goal of not having a cookie cutter
19 curriculum, but of having opportunities for
20 students to excel at something, but not
21 necessarily all the same thing.

22 And we want to -- if we really want
23 to assess the contributions of high schools

1 and high school teachers are making, we need
2 to capture what students excel at as well as
3 sort of capturing some common notions of
4 readiness for what comes after.

5 So, end-of-course tests do support
6 most of these goals. They cover a lot of what
7 -- I mean, what the high schools teach, that
8 provide better and more immediate feedback on
9 courses and on teacher performance.

10 And in some -- in some ways you
11 could use -- as certainly others have
12 mentioned -- sort of a high school course test
13 to say well, there's certain tests that cover
14 basic verbal and quantitative skills that we
15 want all students to pass.

16 And then there's other ways that
17 students may demonstrate exceptional
18 performance in an area or several areas of
19 their choosing.

20 So, let me say a little bit about
21 test administration, and I would echo consider
22 midterm assessments, just not end-of-course
23 tests, so provide more comprehensive

1 information and can be used diagnostically to
2 measure what students, you know, need to do to
3 complete the course successfully.

4 And in some assessments could,
5 then, include sort of how the student has
6 progressed through the course, as well as sort
7 of their end-point giving some modest
8 component of growth if growth is a major
9 thing, and then give a summative assessment of
10 what students know at the end.

11 Now, the test format, first a point
12 I would make, at the high school level,
13 increasingly students are expected to do sort
14 of complex coordinated pieces of work. I
15 mean, the term paper comes up, science
16 projects, something more than just little
17 pieces.

18 So, that's where, when I mentioned
19 portfolios earlier, the way that the classroom
20 teacher is evaluating student work includes
21 really assessing these more sustained pieces
22 of work.

23 So, if there is some way through

1 technology and so on to embed them in the
2 assessments as well, it both sends a message
3 back to the teachers as to what's valued in
4 teaching, and it provides a set of the kinds
5 of skills that are more sustained effort as
6 opposed to just the little knowledge and
7 factoids.

8 So, I talked yesterday a little bit
9 about a short and challenging machine score
10 test. The other idea about a portfolio of
11 student work that might then be tailored to
12 wherein Eva Baker's Ontology, you know, you
13 think the students are current at, is that if
14 you can release the open-ended items, the
15 essays or the performance tasks, you could
16 give back to the teachers not just a numerical
17 score from a mid-term assessment, you could
18 give them a numerical score and the example of
19 the student's work that really allows them to
20 get involved and engaged in looking at and
21 evaluating the essay that was written in
22 response to a challenging question they way
23 they went about solving a problem in a

1 performance task, and provide much richer set
2 of information and feedback to teachers that
3 is sort of useful and that moves instruction
4 along in ways that just providing them a
5 numerical score on an arbitrary scale or a
6 simple pass-fail can't possibly do.

7 So, you know, I continue to say
8 it's one way of getting teachers both engaged
9 and providing models and providing feedback is
10 to get them involved in the scoring of some of
11 these open-ended tasks.

12 It also allows a sort of multiple
13 lenses on what students know and can do. So,
14 it's not just the multiple test or the -- you
15 know, after the technology panel, I would say
16 that the machine scorable test, which might be
17 quite a bit more than open-ended, but it's a
18 variety of ways that the students can
19 demonstrate their ability and their competence
20 if we have these embedded, open-ended
21 performance tasks or essays or extended
22 response questions that, with an adaptive test
23 could be tailored to sort of the area where

1 the student is at the moment and not things
2 that are way beyond or way beneath where the
3 students' current level.

4 Validity evidence. So, I think
5 here, if we're talking about readiness, we
6 have much higher demands on how we provide
7 evidence for the validity of inferences made
8 about readiness measures than we would if we
9 just said they've mastered the course content.

10 And I would hope and I would
11 encourage you to support some work up front
12 but, you know, I think there is a leap from
13 the readiness standards on the one hand to
14 end-of-course standards.

15 I do think that it really would be
16 advantageous to measure thinking, higher-order
17 thinking skills, inquiry problem-solving, you
18 know, evaluation synthesis and so on in a
19 variety of contexts.

20 So, in the context of working in
21 the social studies or science course, not just
22 evaluate them in an English course or a math
23 course. We could then do a mapping of what we

1 expect students to do in each course to see
2 that it covers, but extends beyond the notions
3 that have been adopted for readiness.

4 And here I would bring us back to a
5 point, again, that I think somebody made
6 yesterday, the question is whether you're
7 expecting states to adopt a common set of
8 standards or the common set of standards, and
9 I would encourage you to be open and let
10 states propose different things.

11 And the common set of standards
12 might be a set of end-of-course standards that
13 cover the readiness standards, and not just
14 the readiness standards themselves.

15 With readiness, of course, we can
16 ask for convergent validity studies, agreement
17 with AP results as an example, the NAEP
18 preparedness measures, I think, provide
19 another benchmark against which we might want
20 to compare anything more specific.

21 NAEP, unfortunately, doesn't give
22 student level scores, and we're going to build
23 a test that's going to give student level

1 scores.

2 Predictive validity studies, now
3 that you're saying they're ready, you've got
4 to, I think, show some evidence that scoring
5 at a certain level really does have
6 implications for their being -- it does
7 predict their success in the subsequent things
8 that you're claiming that they're ready for.

9 And then finally, consequential
10 validity studies. So, after you've adopted
11 this assessment how has it impacted the way
12 teachers teach, how is it -- what have been
13 the consequences of implementing this new
14 common assessment system.

15 So, just in the couple minutes I
16 have left, a few recommendations. Fund
17 multiple approaches to see what works. Don't
18 put all your eggs in just a single high school
19 assessment basket.

20 At least one of the approaches
21 really ought to look at end-of-course tests as
22 a possible way of building common assessment.

23 You've already got a model with the Achieve

1 Pearson, whomever, algebra II test, so if
2 states that were willing to adopt the content
3 standards for algebra II that are in that
4 test, you can check one off, and then go on
5 from there.

6 And I think the model is a
7 demonstration that it's feasible to do this.
8 I think it will get much tougher if you do
9 algebra I, because not everyone agrees on
10 algebra I, but it will also be much more
11 valuable.

12 So, in California, they implemented
13 the requirement that all students had to take
14 algebra, and a variety of algebra I courses
15 sprang up, not all of which were the same.

16 But if there were a common set of
17 standards and a common end-of-course
18 assessment for algebra I, you'd quickly see
19 that some students are being cheated by giving
20 -- by being given a watered-down course with
21 lower expectations while other students are
22 getting a much more advanced course, even
23 though it's all called algebra I.

1 So, I think there is a
2 consequential validity to the common
3 assessments in terms of leveling the playing
4 field on what constitutes a specific course
5 that would be highly advantageous.

6 Second recommendation is consider
7 multiple ways that students might demonstrate
8 their readiness for college and work and they
9 might demonstrate it in the context of
10 different courses.

11 At this point I also think that we
12 need, in demonstrating readiness, to promote,
13 emphasize, strengthen the variety of courses
14 that high schools offer.

15 You know, the business community is
16 really concerned about international
17 competitiveness, and verbal and quantitative
18 skills frankly are pretty important, but so is
19 a lot of cultural knowledge.

20 NAEP has three or four times now
21 put off the assessment of world history, and
22 so we don't seem to value knowing something
23 about how the rest of the world works, but if

1 you're in a global situation, you know, that
2 might be important.

3 And I even only somewhat
4 facetiously put up PE. Again, the business
5 community says teamwork, collaboration skills
6 are really important, and they are part of our
7 readiness, but what course do we teach that
8 in.

9 Well, maybe PE. You know, in phys.
10 ed., but that's not as serious, because I
11 think we are focused on cognitive components
12 and not physical ed., but if you really want
13 to evaluate the contributions made you have to
14 look at wherever those contributions to
15 readiness might come from.

16 And then, writing is a particular
17 one that you can assess writing in the
18 abstract. There's an essay test, you know,
19 but most students aren't going to use writing
20 primarily for creative writing.

21 They are going to use it to explain
22 solutions to problems within the context of
23 specific course content. They are going to

1 write, so why not assess it across a variety
2 of courses, and include some essay questions
3 in your science courses, your social studies
4 courses.

5 And -- you know, in addition to
6 providing rich diagnostic information about
7 content knowledge, it also allows you multiple
8 opportunities to assess writing skills in ways
9 that might be important.

10 Diagnostic as well as formative,
11 the interim measures, student progress and --
12 could be measured in terms of the number of
13 courses you've passed, if you want a growth
14 model.

15 And then finally, fund the
16 collection of validity evidence.

17 MS. WEISS: Right on the wire.

18 MR. WISE: Well, I was here
19 yesterday. They were really vicious
20 yesterday. I mean, aggressive --

21 PARTICIPANT: Assertive.

22 MR. WISE: Fair about cutting
23 people off.

1 MR. BOTTOMS: They sent the
2 benchmarks yesterday.

3 MS. WEISS: Any questions for
4 Laurie?

5 (Off-mic comments.)

6 MS. WURTZEL: So, Laurie, you
7 talked about end-of-course exams providing
8 more flexibility in the correct field, or in
9 more choices.

10 Can you speak to that a little bit,
11 particularly in light of the fact that we
12 would be supporting consortia states and, as
13 Joanne said earlier, focusing at least at
14 first where there are common standards which
15 is, at this point, English language arts and
16 mathematics, and how does that -- how do you
17 think about building something that over time
18 does allow for flexibility?

19 MR. WISE: Well, you know, in my
20 ideal world, consortia states would get
21 together and let's name six to twelve courses,
22 develop common content standards and these are
23 key courses taken by a lot of people, and they

1 might include foreign language or world
2 history and not just --

3 Now, I understand that it's your
4 intention to focus primarily on reading and
5 math and there's been a lot of work in
6 developing the readiness to focus on language
7 arts and quantitative or mathematical skills.

8 So, what you might do is allow
9 states to at least develop end-of-course tasks
10 for some other subjects in addition to just,
11 you know, 9th, 10th grade English and algebra
12 I and geometry as a proof of how this could be
13 expanded, even if they can't, you know, all in
14 one step develop end-of-course tests for every
15 single high school course.

16 MS. WEISS: Linda, did you have a
17 question?

18 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Yes. As I
19 was listening to you describe what you were
20 talking about as end-of-course test, and
21 perhaps having those in ELA and math, just as
22 you just described them, and then maybe
23 bundling that with some other choices that

1 students would take, which is very European,
2 you know, European, if you will, or Asian.

3 I think that they allow students to
4 select areas in which to be examined beyond
5 that, and maybe a portfolio or collection of
6 work or performance systems.

7 That didn't sound so different to
8 me from what Gene was proposing, which was
9 sort of a math course through algebra I and an
10 ELA exam.

11 So, I -- and possibly coupled with
12 some other elements of senior project or
13 portfolio. So, I wasn't sure that we weren't
14 actually -- while we're talking about
15 comprehensive tests, and of course it assumes
16 whether they weren't actually beginning to
17 sound very similar.

18 And I did -- I actually wanted to
19 ask both of you whether I heard -- whether I
20 heard those similarities accurately, or how
21 you would draw distinctions.

22 MR. WISE: Yes, and my point would
23 be, don't just stop with the math course or

1 assessing math with a single test in the
2 general context or the context of the specific
3 math course, assess quantitative skills within
4 science courses and within a variety of
5 courses, and similarly assess language art
6 skills, not just in the English II or English
7 III course, but within the context of, you
8 know, a wider variety of courses that
9 demonstrate the generalized ability of these
10 skills beyond, you know, beyond very narrow
11 settings in which they are taught.

12 I also didn't emphasize Shelly's
13 main point about tying the assessments to the
14 instruction as closely as possible and end-of-
15 course tests, of course, do that.

16 MR. BOTTOMS: I think what I was
17 trying to say in terms of the comprehensive
18 reading, literacy exam, you would, in fact,
19 begin to pull into that exam the kinds of
20 items that would be reflective in science and
21 social science and maybe that the 11th grade,
22 even in some -- compared to some of the
23 technical areas because I find even there if

1 you engage these students in the language of
2 that field, you begin to impact -- impact
3 achievement there.

4 And in terms of mathematics, I
5 would hope we could have some items in the
6 more comprehensive math exam that would be
7 illustrative of the kind of math that you will
8 be doing in some of the science areas, as well
9 as in some of the technology areas.

10 That begins to hold a group of
11 teachers accountable for beginning to begin to
12 focus on more than one teacher have a
13 responsibility for accelerating math
14 instruction, begin to see math as a tool for
15 learning in a variety of fields, and reading
16 and writing are literally tools for learning
17 in a host of areas.

18 That, in a sense, these are
19 comprehensive exams different from most
20 comprehensive exams. One would be a deep exam
21 in reading and writing and one would be a
22 deeper exam in mathematics, but not pitted
23 together in a comprehensive exam format, as

1 most states have used comprehensive high
2 school graduation exams.

3 But you would pull some items from
4 the other areas. The intent would be to begin
5 to get strands of teachers across disciplines
6 feeling some ownership for building
7 mathematics into their curriculum as tools and
8 for building literacy strategies and standards
9 into their curriculum.

10 MS. WEISS: So this seems like a
11 good segue into the round table discussion,
12 because I think we're having it.

13 So, I still -- so the sort of first
14 question that we asked that's almost a
15 prerequisite to the one that I think Judy was
16 starting to ask is that we said if you were --
17 if you were us, what does the ideal system of
18 high school assessments look like, and people
19 have sort of started answering that.

20 I mean, I sort of heard Shelly say
21 it's end-of-course, and I sort of heard Gene
22 say it's more comprehensive, and I heard Linda
23 describe international, but not say what you

1 thought we should do in this country that
2 would be appropriate to our context, but
3 learning from what they've done.

4 What -- why don't you just jump in
5 first and say -- what do you think is the
6 right thing to do from your point of view.

7 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: I would say,
8 first of all, there are ways in which you can
9 configure this where they begin to sound very
10 similar, and that was partly what I was
11 hearing.

12 And so I think there's a good
13 rationale for going either way. Let me say
14 what I think the pro's and con's are.

15 In a comprehensive approach you
16 have more opportunity to be integrative
17 across. You can measure growth better,
18 actually, because then of course exams create
19 a real set of concerns about measuring growth,
20 because the course you took the year before is
21 different content, so there's no vertical
22 scale necessarily evident.

23 And so there are some -- there are

1 some things to recommend a comprehensive
2 approach, but it may be less loosely coupled
3 to instruction, and that's a down side, if
4 that's the case.

5 The course assessment approach, and
6 I'm calling it course assessment rather than
7 end-of-course exam because in most countries
8 it is not just an end-of-course exam. It is a
9 set of assessments throughout a course plus an
10 end-of-course component.

11 MS. WEISS: So, what did you call
12 it?

13 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: I called it
14 course assessments, or you could even call it
15 through-course assessments, but it has an end-
16 of-course component, and it has performance
17 components during the course, and they add up
18 together to a score, and to a set of tests and
19 standards.

20 The benefit of it is it's tightly
21 linked to instruction. The downside of it is
22 that you could rigidify your curriculum in
23 ways that do not move us forward into the 21st

1 Century.

2 Let me give you an example of that.

3 In many cases, the high school curriculum is
4 still built off of the committee of 10, 1893
5 recommendations for curriculum.

6 And so, a lot of the things that
7 you might want to be doing around technology,
8 around design, around engineering, around
9 marine biology, around -- you know, are
10 actually -- they don't count in systems that
11 are constrained by end-of-course exams unless
12 there's a continual rethinking of the courses
13 all the time, what they are and what's in
14 them.

15 Some of the systems I described
16 offer 30 or 40 courses and examinations and
17 allow you to take marine biology or technology
18 and engineering instead of algebra I, II, III
19 or, you know, algebra, geometry, algebra II,
20 et cetera.

21 So, you have to worry about that a
22 little bit because we are -- the world is
23 changing very rapidly and we're not changing

1 as rapidly as other countries are in
2 responding to the way the world's changing.

3 That's really obvious in
4 mathematics because most of the high-achieving
5 countries do not use the sequence of algebra
6 I, geometry and algebra II, precalculus,
7 calculus.

8 They have an integrated data set of
9 strands and they integrate algebra, geometry
10 and probability statistics in a set of courses
11 that look more like what New York State
12 offers, which they call Math A, B and C, or
13 sequential math, one, two and three, or
14 something like that, but it's an integrated
15 math sequence.

16 So, we have to think hard if we're
17 going to do end-of-course exams about what the
18 curriculum ought to be, how to keep it
19 flexible, how to keep it moving forward into
20 the 21st Century, how to be sure we're letting
21 kids integrate their knowledge so that they
22 can apply it.

23 One of the downsides of the way we

1 teach math is you don't think about those
2 things together as much as you would to apply
3 them.

4 So, there are good things about
5 both, and what's more important from my
6 perspective is that if you think about college
7 and career-ready, kids have to be ready to do
8 things that professors will expect them to do
9 and then employers will expect them to do, and
10 whatever bundling you accept for that
11 performance elements are the most, to my mind,
12 are one of the most important things to
13 accomplish, that kids need to be able to do
14 research, to find information, to integrate
15 it, to synthesize it, to write about it, to
16 analyze it, to critique it, to evaluate, to
17 weigh and balance, to use their minds in that
18 way, and they are not going to learn to do it
19 if the assessment system doesn't demand it,
20 evaluate it and value it.

21 So, I think you could allow
22 multiple approaches in states. There are some
23 states that are already, and some charter

1 groups -- I'm thinking of High-Tech High, a
2 New Tech High, and envision, in Asian society
3 schools, as well as states like Rhode Island
4 have a senior portfolio in which you have to
5 do a science investigation that's juried and
6 moderated with common rubrics. New York's
7 Performance Standards Consortium does this,
8 too.

9 You have to have a mathematical
10 model. You have to have a literary essay.
11 You have to have a history research paper.
12 You have to have a community service
13 internship, experience and analysis and you
14 have to have an arts exhibition.

15 And they have common rubrics and
16 they moderate it and they jury it and they do
17 that in addition to what you would call a
18 comprehensive exam, you know.

19 That's -- that's a model. People
20 might do things with that. There's another
21 model that's an end-of-course exam model that
22 some states are adopting and they could put
23 performance components into that model very

1 easily.

2 Fed VAP is looking at doing that.
3 The International Baccalaureate already does
4 it. New York State has done that, and is
5 thinking about revisiting that. Ohio is
6 developing performance components that would
7 be in end-of-course exams.

8 That's actually not hard to do
9 within an end-of-course system. So, that
10 might be another approach.

11 MS. WEISS: Thank you. I think
12 that you made -- you said much more eloquently
13 than has been sort of going around in my head
14 as I've been mulling over this problem.

15 The basic fear I have that, while
16 end-of-course tests make a tremendous amount
17 of sense in many ways, they may rigidify
18 courses that we actually are not the right
19 courses for the future than what we did in the
20 past, but may not be the right things for the
21 future.

22 And yet, college and career-ready
23 comprehensive assessments don't tie very

1 closely to instruction, and that is sort of a
2 much better way of putting the question that
3 we put before you and the concerns that we've
4 had as we've been doing this.

5 What's a way that we can write this
6 notice so that it incents states to do the
7 right kinds of innovations and not have these
8 unintended consequences that I think we all
9 think would be bad for instruction?

10 And also, you know, we got a
11 question here, how do you build an assessment
12 system that takes into account the differing
13 passions and needs that high school students
14 have as they start entering their post
15 secondary lives?

16 So, how do we allow for that sort
17 of diversity and passion to express itself and
18 for schools to be incented to meet those?

19 MR. BOTTOMS: Let me just build on
20 a little bit what's been said. What I was
21 trying to say in my comments, that there's --
22 we'll expect students to have a certain amount
23 of literacy skills and a certain amount of

1 numeracy skills.

2 Those are fundamental and if you --
3 you may can build these in the end-of-course
4 exams, you may can build it in end-of-course
5 math exams, but per my, kind of where I would
6 go with that, and one of the reasons for that,
7 I guess I've seen bad use of end-of-course
8 exams where they've used them for high school
9 graduation.

10 And what happens, they become so
11 low they lower the standards because
12 everybody's got to pass them. And so that --
13 that gets to be the consequences there.

14 They have been better used where
15 they count as a part of your course grade, and
16 they do not carry the whole weight as they do
17 in some of the Canadian province, in that
18 context.

19 The Virginia has been very smart.
20 They've said there's a couple of these you've
21 got to pass, but then you've got some choices
22 beyond that. And if I could build on the
23 Virginia kind of notion of what I outlined in

1 terms of getting at that fundamental literacy
2 in reading and writing and mathematics, build
3 from that, I would urge states to build some
4 optional ways that students could demonstrate
5 depth of knowledge in areas of interest, where
6 their special talents are.

7 And that may be in a special
8 project that may be going deep into science
9 area. It may be in one of these national
10 certification exams that -- if you read some
11 of those they are fairly complicated exams,
12 very complex material you have to analyze and
13 deal with.

14 I'd open up a whole range of
15 options for students to begin to demonstrate
16 what they could do and the intent is to get
17 students turned on to learning in high school
18 and to activate not only intellectually, but
19 their emotions and behavior and socially in
20 that learning process.

21 And a lot of our high-stake
22 assessments, when this turns out to be, they
23 go in the opposite direction of doing that.

1 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Could I just
2 underscore one thing you said which is that if
3 we think about a lot of this assessment work
4 is being information on the diploma, not the
5 decision whether or not to grant the diploma,
6 which is the way most countries do it.

7 MR. BOTTOMS: Yes. I like that.

8 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Then you
9 could allow for, once you've got some estimate
10 of the English and math basic, you know, the
11 ELA and numeracy skills, you could either do
12 what many of these countries do which is you
13 take -- you take examinations which include
14 performance components and anything -- you
15 know, any range of things, which are
16 vocational and academic.

17 And some of -- some kids might
18 take, you know, six things in science after
19 they've done that, and others might, you know,
20 do a lot in the arts.

21 Or, you could use a portfolio
22 strategy. You could use any number of
23 strategies to allow kids to give information

1 that is rigorous and moderated and consistent.

2 MR. BOTTOMS: Intellectually
3 demanding.

4 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: And
5 demanding, but differentiated on the diploma
6 beyond the core that's needed for -- in the
7 way that Virginia does, as I think is one --
8 one strategy.

9 MR. BOTTOMS: And if you looked at
10 last week's Fortune Magazine the top 40 people
11 under 40 who are new billionaires, one only
12 finished junior high school, six only finished
13 high school, but somewhere these folks went
14 very deep in an area with a passion, and --

15 MS. WEISS: What exactly are you
16 advocating?

17 MR. BOTTOMS: I am suggesting that
18 we've got to turn some students loose to find
19 an area of interest and once they begin to
20 delve deep in that area a lot of those --
21 there's a foundation level you have to get,
22 and I like this kind of -- it could be in the
23 fine arts, it could be in entrepreneurship, it

1 can be -- has to be intellectually demanding
2 in that kind of context.

3 MS. WEISS: Laurie.

4 MR. WISE: One part of your initial
5 question, at least the part that I heard was
6 how can you be sure that states don't do
7 things that will make course content more
8 rigid or block sort of openness to change and
9 continued improvement.

10 And sort of -- if I can just back
11 up to very general things, you know, we need
12 to ask the states who propose this to be real
13 specific about the theory of action, sort of
14 how -- what -- what are their expected
15 outcomes, how -- what is the evidence to
16 support the chain of logic or the rationale
17 that what they're doing will lead to those
18 outcomes.

19 And then second, you need to see if
20 -- encourage them to put in systems for
21 monitoring unintended consequences that may
22 come out.

23 But I would say science is an area

1 where NAEP, every few years, refines and
2 updates its content standards and there's no
3 reason why we couldn't, you know, -- you know,
4 we teach a lot more earth science than we did
5 in 1893 when the committee of ten, whatever.

6 So, there has been an evolution of
7 the content. What there needs to be, I think,
8 is an evolution in thinking about some of
9 these higher-order skills that aren't well-
10 specified in the current content specs.

11 And what I would do is encourage
12 states to think not just of content written
13 narrow, but to think of the larger range of
14 skills that they hope students will acquire
15 along the way to learning the material in a
16 particular course.

17 MR. BOTTOMS: Let me just, I had an
18 idea I want to share. As you think about what
19 you would ask states to do, I'd ask them to
20 think seriously about what will a high school
21 look like that's high-performing for all
22 groups of students.

23 The current AYP concept in high

1 school, in high-stake assessments for our
2 lowest-performing high schools pushes the
3 worst kind of instruction. And states have
4 done a very poor job of articulating what does
5 good teaching and learning look like.

6 What kind of learning will have to
7 take place that will energize students that
8 would get them engaged in the learning
9 process. Then begin to think about how
10 assessment may help enhance that, can be a
11 part of that solution and not part of the
12 problem.

13 When you -- most of these very low-
14 performing high schools are not getting better
15 because they are being pushed to do the wrong
16 things better.

17 And until we shift that vision that
18 comes down from the district office and from
19 the state, you're not going to get a lot of
20 change.

21 MR. WISE: Go ahead. I've had more
22 than my turn.

23 MS. LOVING-RYDER: I hope that we

1 won't lose the benefits of end-of-course
2 assessments in that they are time assessment
3 to instruction. From some of the
4 conversations it sounds like maybe the problem
5 is not the concept of end-of-course
6 assessments, but what the course itself is
7 teaching.

8 And I really liked Linda's comment
9 about through-course assessments, because I
10 think that could be one way of holding
11 teachers and students accountable for college
12 and career-readiness throughout their careers,
13 rather than just incorporating this into one
14 class.

15 I also understand what Gene is
16 saying in terms of when you use an end-of-
17 course assessment for graduation, then the
18 danger is that you're going to have a very low
19 level cut score.

20 But there's no reason, as we build
21 new assessments, while we can't build them to
22 ensure that we also have a college-ready cut.

23 I think states also need to look

1 carefully at what -- what really is needed to
2 be college and career-ready. You know, we
3 have the common standards now, but those are
4 still judgments from someone about what is
5 needed.

6 I think we do need the validity
7 studies that Laurie mentioned to continue and
8 check and see. Okay. This student did score
9 this particular score, which we determined to
10 be college-ready. Was that student really
11 successful?

12 And then there needs to be a
13 continual way of monitoring whether or not
14 what we believe to be college and career-ready
15 really is based on the outcome of the student.

16 MS. WEISS: Well, let me ask a
17 follow-on question to that. So, what's the
18 role that our institutions of higher education
19 and employers play in sitting at the table
20 with this?

21 One of the things that we've heard
22 over the last few couple of weeks, I guess, as
23 we've been starting to talk about this more is

1 whether, as part of this states might have to
2 get their basic four-year colleges and/or
3 community colleges at the table with the K-12
4 institutions to say, not that these test are
5 going to be admissions tests to those select
6 -- the ones that are selective, but maybe they
7 are placement tests that place students out of
8 remedial work.

9 So, college and career-ready at
10 high school means you're not going to be
11 places into remedial work when you get into
12 college.

13 What are -- what do you think of
14 the role these organizations should play and,
15 more specifically, what we might want to do in
16 our notice to codify those roles?

17 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Well, I think it
18 is important that institutions of higher
19 education are at the table in determining what
20 is going to be considered to be college-ready.

21 But, I think in addition, they also
22 be -- need to be willing to partner with the K
23 to 12 institutions to provide data, because

1 again, they are just giving us a judgment
2 about what they believe is college and career-
3 ready.

4 What we really need is data about
5 those students, and how successful they are,
6 and I think while many states have attempted
7 to go down that path, I know in my own state
8 we've had difficulty sharing data across the
9 two systems.

10 So, I think that's really
11 important, to be able to have a partnership.

12 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Could I add
13 to that, I think it's important, not just for
14 people to be at the table to talk generally
15 about what kinds of things do we want to see
16 or to respond to tests that are developed, but
17 actually to be engaged.

18 Again, if we look at what other
19 countries do routinely, they are involved in
20 writing the items and writing the tests and
21 writing the prompts that they are under expert
22 guidance of people who know how to create
23 tests, you know, who routinely do it, but that

1 there is accessing of college faculty as well
2 as high school faculty.

3 And in the certification for
4 vocational fields, there's accessing of the
5 people who work in those fields as part of the
6 test development process, so that you've got
7 strong validity at the beginning, again,
8 managed by people who know how to develop
9 assessments, but that there's a real
10 thoughtfulness about what do we learn about
11 what this person can do from this assessment,
12 which is a different process than having an
13 item writer look through a textbook and pull
14 out pieces of information and throw it on a
15 test and say, well, this represents that, you
16 know, that chapter or that concept.

17 It's a deeper process of
18 development around the -- a challenge to be
19 clear about how this relates to what the
20 person will need to be able to do in college
21 or in that vocational field.

22 MR. WISE: I first would say that
23 the -- both the higher ed community and the

1 business community has had significant input -
2 - impact -- input to the readiness standards
3 as they are evolving.

4 But they need to have a continued
5 involvement.

6 MS. WEISS: Right.

7 MR. WISE: It goes all the way
8 through, at the very least, as we are
9 assembling validity evidence. They have some
10 of the data that Shelly and others need to try
11 and do this.

12 But also, the dialogue between the
13 education community and the business community
14 really needs to continue and get better. In
15 many state legislatures they're quite at odds
16 over who controls and they manage the say over
17 what the content of high school courses should
18 be.

19 And only through collaboration, I
20 think, can we get to a higher level where both
21 groups understand each other and help each
22 other in improving our systems.

23 MS. LOVING-RYDER: I think there's

1 also an importance aspect here of there being
2 a system. It's not necessarily just a score
3 on a test, but maybe it's looking at a profile
4 of a high school student who then ends up
5 being successful in either college or in a
6 particular career.

7 We may be thinking too narrowly
8 when we think just about a score on a
9 particular assessment, but are there course-
10 taking patterns that tend to be associated
11 with students being successful or are we
12 finding that students who take algebra I in
13 the 8th grade finish algebra II in the 10th
14 grade, and then never take math again. You
15 know, is that a problem?

16 So, it's not -- it's not just
17 looking at scores on an end-of-course
18 assessment or a comprehensive assessment, but
19 also what -- what experience has that student
20 had within the high school. And it might
21 include, as Gene mentioned, and Linda, the
22 projects, and other types of activities that
23 they would have to do.

1 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: And those can
2 be scored reliably if you have the right
3 system of scoring, if they are structured and
4 standardized enough in their expectations and
5 be part of what counts.

6 And I think if they don't -- if
7 they're not part of what counts, we aren't
8 going to get people to do it. And there's no
9 -- not high-achieving country I've visited
10 where kids are not doing a designing and
11 conducting a science investigation as part of
12 the examination system, you know, kind of
13 routinely, writing extensively, routinely, and
14 scored as part of the system.

15 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Is the teacher
16 of record scoring those performance
17 assessments or do they go somewhere else for
18 central scoring?

19 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: There's a
20 variety of strategies, so sometimes it is a
21 moderated system where teachers come together.

22 They are benched, they learn to score against
23 benchmarks, and they don't score their own

1 students, but they score the -- the score
2 blind -- that is to say, they can see, but
3 they don't know --

4 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Yes.

5 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: There are
6 systems of double scoring, so Hong Kong tends
7 to use double scoring which is a little more
8 expensive, but they believe that the benefit
9 of being involved in the scoring comes back
10 right back into the teaching, so they're
11 willing to make that investment in the--

12 MS. WEISS: Double scoring means
13 two scorers?

14 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Two scorers,
15 and it's typically not your own student. In
16 some places teachers are involved in the
17 scoring, but there's a moderation system, so
18 they have to demonstrate -- they have to
19 moderate that internally to the school.

20 And then there's an audit system
21 from outside, and then that comes in and both
22 samples of work are taken, but also samples of
23 work may be sent out to a panel that does

1 calibration.

2 So, there's a variety of strategies
3 that are used to get reliable and consistent
4 scoring. But the point is that they've put a
5 lot of effort into figuring out how to do that
6 because they think it's so important to have
7 kids doing the work that matters and to have
8 teachers involved in looking at work in ways
9 that they get smart about how to teach to that
10 kind of work and how to support that kind of
11 grading also.

12 It then evens out the grading
13 across a province or a state because people
14 are looking at the same standards and
15 calibrating work standards over and over
16 again.

17 MR. BOTTOMS: Just one point I
18 would add that I've heard, in terms of getting
19 agreement on a threshold level for college
20 readiness, at least for transferred programs
21 out of community colleges, and maybe a reason
22 a university is not nearly -- some way the
23 state needs to work --

1 MS. WEISS: Just get the
2 microphone.

3 MR. BOTTOMS: Some way the state
4 needs to work with a system, and insist that
5 higher education come to some agreement,
6 because one of the problems high schools have,
7 every community college can have a different
8 set of cut scores, and you never quite know
9 what -- what readiness means.

10 It varies from college-to-college
11 often. And so, I think it's important that
12 the system of higher education, at least
13 transfer programs out of community college,
14 and the universities reach some kind of
15 threshold, at least in reading, writing and
16 mathematics.

17 MS. WEISS: So is -- I am still
18 struggling with how much -- how open-ended we
19 should be in these requests versus how
20 specific we should be, and it almost sounds,
21 from listening to this, like there is this
22 emerging sense that there is a role for both a
23 comprehensive college and career-ready

1 assessment or set of assessments, at least in
2 reading, writing and math that is not the same
3 as a high school exit criterion, nor is it
4 necessarily something that happens at the end
5 of school. It might, for some kids, happen in
6 9th or 10th grade, but that there's some tests
7 that happens that is maybe a little
8 disconnected from all of the instruction,
9 because it's somehow cumulative across the
10 different things a kid has learned.

11 But in some ways, it's high stakes
12 for a kid, because it's going on their
13 diploma, that they are or aren't college or
14 career ready, and at the same time a series of
15 end-of-course tests that are -- or through-
16 tests or course assessments that are developed
17 externally to a school maybe statewide around
18 courses that have some kind of way of
19 continuously refreshing themselves, and that
20 serve as a benchmark for sort of key points of
21 instruction and expectations in those courses.

22 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: I think
23 that's one model that some states could --

1 might be ready to do well. I think there are
2 other models that I've seen that are also
3 highly valuable, and I think one might be on
4 to saying that there is some, whether it's
5 constructed as an end-of-course exam in ELA
6 and math, or constructed more as a
7 comprehensive look, which includes algebra
8 through -- at least through algebra I.

9 I think those are going to end up
10 not being so dissimilar in what they look
11 like, but beyond that we ought to let people
12 figure out different ways to demonstrate
13 competency in the disciplines and in areas of
14 interest or expertise or passion.

15 And I'm reminded again of -- I
16 mentioned this briefly, but a lot of the
17 charter management organizations are
18 developing these, what Asian society calls
19 this GPS system. It's graduation portfolio
20 system, which is very similar to what high-
21 tech high and new-tech high and envision.

22 And so these are places that are
23 pushing the edge of the envelope on what do we

1 mean by courses and learning, but they have a
2 standard in which kids have to in science,
3 they have to demonstrate that they can design
4 and conduct and evaluate a science
5 investigation, have it scored in a reliable,
6 consistent way with a rubric, with moderated
7 scoring across multiple adults.

8 And that could happen in any
9 science course. It doesn't have to happen in
10 a specific science course, and they have to do
11 a history research paper so, you know, a 20 or
12 30-page paper with referencing.

13 That's going to be very college-
14 ready applicable. It doesn't have to have it
15 in a particular course for them because they
16 are conceptualizing education in ways, you
17 know, that are more technology-based
18 sometimes, more hands-on and so and so on.

19 So, I would allow people to
20 experiment with that -- with different
21 systems.

22 MS. WEISS: So, but this takes us
23 back to Judy's question, then, which is, well,

1 what are we funding.

2 MR. BOTTOMS: I would answer your
3 question -- you gave two options there. I
4 would add a third leg to that, and folks could
5 go either way or with a hybrid of those two,
6 as I think Linda said.

7 I really thing you ought to
8 encourage them also to add a component
9 assessment that's going to be more like
10 Linda's been talking about, more project-
11 based, more opportunities for kids to design,
12 to create, to experiment, to develop those
13 habits of mind in-depth in an area that the
14 nation really needs.

15 And I would urge every state to
16 have some kind of component for that type of
17 assessment, in addition to the foundational
18 kind of scales you're measuring in their
19 reading and math, whether it's in the course
20 or comprehensive.

21 MS. WEISS: I guess I was thinking
22 that those had performance tasks embedded in
23 them. I wasn't think that they are today's

1 version --

2 MR. BOTTOMS: Yes.

3 MS. WEISS: -- of multiple choice,
4 anything, I was --

5 MR. BOTTOMS: Yes, I just wanted to
6 make sure. Okay.

7 MS. WEISS: Yes. Yes.

8 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: But there are
9 actually probably two models. One is
10 standards driven and one is course driven.

11 MS. WEISS: Yes.

12 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: And if you
13 look across the innovative work that's going
14 on in the field around assessment and
15 learning, some people are taking a standards-
16 driven approach which ends up with a
17 collection of work evidence that is validated
18 and defended against the standards and others
19 are using a course assessment or course exam
20 system, whether it's end-of-course, or you
21 know, however you characterize it, and they
22 are using the course as the organizer.

23 But often the work that kids do

1 ends up in very similar places, that they're
2 exhibiting similar abilities, similar
3 standards of learning, but they're coming at
4 it in slightly different ways, and I -- my
5 only -- I think there's a lot of value in end-
6 of-course or course assessment systems.

7 But my only concern is to say that
8 if everybody has to do that, some of the
9 innovation that's going on that's getting kids
10 to a similar place in a different way might
11 not be supported.

12 And if you look at various
13 countries they're playing with both of these
14 approaches, the standards-driven approach and
15 a course-driven approach.

16 MS. WURTZEL: So, I want to ask a
17 follow-up question. If you were here this
18 morning, by the end of the morning you might
19 have thought you can do everything by
20 technology, and that we would never need to
21 have a teacher score anything.

22 At this moment, after this
23 conversation, you would be thinking sort of

1 the reverse. And so, I want to ask the
2 question about what -- you know, you think
3 particularly at the high school level is the
4 right balance, or should we specify that?

5 Do you have a sense of what the
6 right balance is? And also to ask, obviously,
7 the human -- the teacher scoring element has
8 lots and lots of strength, but also has lots
9 of cost.

10 And if you think about the cost
11 across the grade spans, is it particularly
12 important to do that at some point in the
13 grade span, because of the influence of
14 instruction in our practice?

15 MR. WISE: Well, I think there's
16 cost and there's value. And having the
17 teachers intimately involved in developing
18 exercises and scoring exercises really sends a
19 message as to what's valued to be taught, and
20 this form of professional development that
21 helps them think more deeply about their own
22 instruction that has value far beyond just the
23 scores that get assigned.

1 I did want to say one thing that
2 was partly on the previous question and that
3 is, I think it would be presumptuous at this
4 time to think that we know the one best way of
5 doing this.

6 And so I will repeat --

7 MS. WURTZEL: Yes, I hear that.

8 MR. WISE: Yes. I will repeat my
9 recommendation of consider the possibility of
10 funding at least a couple of things of people
11 that are coming at it from different
12 approaches.

13 And I would also say consider, you
14 know, whether there can be some merger of the
15 standards-based approach and the course-based
16 approach, because the courses all have
17 standards of their own.

18 It's just a question of can you
19 integrate the standards across courses into a
20 coherent whole that goes beyond just, you
21 know, what's in a geometry course or what's in
22 a world lit course.

23 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: The only

1 difference is really the standards-based
2 approach allows you to play around more with
3 the courses, which courses you're going to
4 offer and it's a little more flexible around
5 that.

6 But they can end up being very
7 similar, yes.

8 MS. WEISS: But so which things
9 ought to be standardized across a consortium
10 of states, and which things are properly just
11 school-based decisions?

12 I'm asking this from our point of
13 view of what do we fund and what do we stay
14 out of.

15 MR. WISE: Well, typically the
16 concept under No Child Left Behind is one that
17 you find ways of assessing whether students
18 have mastered the skills and you stay out of
19 how to teach those.

20 MS. WEISS: Right.

21 MR. WISE: But hope to influence
22 improvement in how they're taught by providing
23 good feedback data on the effectiveness of

1 different strategies that are being used.

2 MS. WEISS: Right. but I'm asking
3 this because if we go the approach that says
4 whatever course you have in your high school,
5 just make a good set of assessments. That's
6 not something that is standardized across
7 anything other than maybe a school or maybe a
8 district unit, and therefore it might not be
9 something that -- that we ought to fund with
10 these funds.

11 So, I'm trying to sort of figure
12 out where the standardization begins and ends
13 in some of these models so that we don't,
14 again, inadvertently -- or is my question --

15 MR. WISE: There are a core set of
16 courses that are taught in almost all high
17 schools, and part of the value of what might
18 be done within the course test is to try and
19 get some common agreement about what the
20 objectives or what the standards are for
21 mastery of the materials taught in those
22 courses.

23 And maybe at the same time, and how

1 those standards relate to your overall
2 readiness standards. So, I wouldn't take,
3 really obscure courses, and you probably can't
4 afford to fund development of 50 end-of-course
5 tests because it's not just the test, it's
6 building the agreement across the states and
7 the consortium about what should be on the
8 test.

9 And they walked a very delicate
10 tight line with the algebra II test, but
11 they've made a lot of progress, and there's a
12 model for how that might be done that could
13 then be applied in other subjects.

14 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: I think
15 there's also the possibility that probably in
16 a modest number of content areas people would
17 be prepared to start to look at that
18 developing common assessments.

19 There also is the possibility that
20 one could develop sort of a bank of assessment
21 items, tasks, whatever, that are common, that
22 in some schools would be embedded in specific
23 courses, and some states are now talking about

1 how could you even use assessments to get away
2 from Carnegie Units and have competency-based
3 movement through school.

4 You could imagine that if you say
5 this is the standard, these tasks illustrate
6 what you have to be able to do, that those
7 could be embedded in specific courses or used
8 to get out of that course or used to
9 demonstrate the competency if you're at the
10 med school and you're doing most of your work
11 in internships.

12 In other words, the way things --
13 the key is to figure out what the common sort
14 of standards or elements might be, and most
15 high schools do organize their curriculum in
16 the same way and would use them in a common
17 way, but some high schools might demonstrate
18 competency in a different context, you know.

19 I don't know if that's -- I don't
20 mean that to be as confusing as maybe it
21 sounds, but we -- we're at this moment where,
22 on the one hand, we're encouraging innovation,
23 we're encouraging people to have new school

1 designs.

2 We're encouraging innovative
3 autonomous schools and we're encouraging
4 charter schools and so on, and they really are
5 innovating in some cases.

6 And at the same time we want to
7 figure out how to assess to a higher standard
8 in ways that are also deeper, and we just need
9 to find a balance between the amount of
10 standardization -- what do we want to
11 standardize around that is essential to the
12 core, you know, competencies or -- or
13 abilities, but that is not so rigid that we
14 are, you know, kind of taking away the
15 innovation that we're trying to encourage with
16 the other hand.

17 When you were asking about the
18 technology piece and how much -- I think the
19 idea of a mixed model would be very good,
20 which is that there are ways to use technology
21 to go further both in terms of computer
22 adaptive testing that gives you an ability to
23 evaluate kids more along a range, to score

1 some open-ended prompts that way.

2 But also, you need teacher
3 involvement so that they understand what's
4 going on. So, involving teachers in
5 developing items and reviewing them to a
6 greater extent, even you could imagine a
7 system where if you're doing a lot of machine
8 scoring of some items on the tests, some of
9 them are actually being scored by teachers as
10 well, but they don't have to score every item,
11 they don't have to score every test in order
12 to get the benefit of looking at work and
13 thinking about work.

14 And then you can imagine some
15 elements which really have more ambitious
16 performance tasks that kids are asked to do
17 that are part of a much more ambitious
18 teacher-moderated system, because you can't
19 use machine scoring for those tests.

20 So, a mixed model system that
21 understands the benefits of the efficiencies
22 that you can get on the one hand and the
23 improved instruction that you can also

1 generate with teacher involvement would in
2 some ways be, I think, ideal.

3 MS. LOVING-RYDER: And in terms of
4 technology, technology can also assist in
5 teachers' scoring. One of the issues that was
6 mentioned this morning was the use of
7 technology to distribute scoring.

8 So, when Linda talked about
9 moderating the scoring, that could occur
10 electronically instead of having to convene
11 all of the teachers in a room, Linda and I
12 could be scoring each other's students'
13 papers, but we could be at our own computer.

14 So, I think it's not -- it's not an
15 either/or, but the technology can also assist
16 in teachers being more involved.

17 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: You could
18 also benchmark assessments in there that
19 teachers are scoring, so you can see if they
20 are calibrating properly.

21 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Exactly, so --

22 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: So there's
23 all kinds of --

1 MS. LOVING-RYDER: -- for the
2 validity papers in there.

3 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Although I
4 would like to see you sometime so that we
5 could talk together about our students' work,
6 so that would also be part of my model.

7 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Well, that's
8 true. But I guess we get a web cam or
9 something.

10 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: I would like
11 to be in my pajamas doing scoring by machine
12 sometimes and then periodically I'd like to
13 get together and have a chance to really look
14 at it with you, in our system, though.

15 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Okay. Another
16 way in which technology could be helpful to
17 teachers is that if they could be provided
18 with the platform that's being used for the
19 standardized assessments so that they could
20 use some of those innovations and those
21 templates in their own classroom assessments.
22 Then that provides integration as well.

23 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: And Hong Kong

1 is really far along in creating these
2 assessment banks of performance tasks that get
3 downloaded by teachers linked to the standards
4 used in their instruction as well as used for
5 the examinations that count.

6 And they've really built up
7 platforms along with the scoring kinds of uses
8 of technology. Twenty provinces in China are
9 now doing most of their scoring of open-ended
10 tests and items by, you know, by computer.

11 MS. WHALEN: So this may not be
12 fair since this is a high school assessment
13 panel, but just thinking about how this fits
14 in with the K-8 sphere and how we've kind of -
15 - we've never really talked about it, at least
16 not yet.

17 Does this begin in 9th grade?
18 We've kind of talked about pulling down
19 potentially algebra I in an earlier grade if
20 students are ready, but in your mind, is this
21 a grade specific, or is this just when kids
22 are ready, competency, proficiency and when do
23 you start integrating these ideas about

1 assessment and kind of through-course tests
2 for proficiency?

3 MS. WEISS: And let me just even
4 add to that, because it's a perfect segue.
5 One of the questions that we got from one of
6 the states is, where do middle schools fit in
7 all this? Do they fit at the top of the
8 bottom part or the bottom of the top part?

9 MR. WISE: Well, I mean, I think
10 you want to look at what's the point at which
11 different students start taking different
12 courses. And up through, in most states up to
13 7th grade math is grade-specific. And then
14 starting in as early as 8th grade some
15 students will take algebra. Some students
16 aren't quite ready and they defer another
17 couple of years.

18 So, it begins to diverge. And at
19 that point is when you need to sort of
20 transition from sort of grade-specific tests
21 to think about course-specific tests.

22 I also think, you know, while it's
23 useful and important that ultimately we have

1 an integrated system that goes from
2 kindergarten all the way through 12th grade,
3 you might consider sort of funding one
4 approach for the point at which the curriculum
5 starts to diverge for different students.

6 And finding another approach that
7 focuses just on the curriculum up to that
8 point where it's pretty much grade-specific.
9 And while they might not initially fit
10 together quite as nicely as you would like,
11 you've sort of explored the unique demands of
12 both kinds -- both parts of the grade
13 spectrum, and I think to fit it together, or
14 you fund multiple things to see how it would
15 best fit together.

16 So, I wouldn't say you necessarily
17 wanted to require that states propose a K-12
18 system as part of assessments, but you
19 consider whether you would fund high school,
20 you know, one consortium to work on high
21 school and one consortium to work separately
22 on K-7 or K-8.

23 MS. WHALEN: Didn't you give a

1 different answer yesterday?

2 MR. WISE: No. Everyone else did
3 and my -- I got outvoted yesterday, so I'm
4 going to try again.

5 MS. LOVING-RYDER: I think the
6 danger in having grade-specific assessments is
7 you are then tying students to the particular
8 content in a grade level.

9 I am of the opinion that the
10 assessment system should be --

11 MS. WEISS: Well, or to a
12 particular course. It might not be a grade
13 level.

14 MS. LOVING-RYDER: Well, I thought
15 the point you were making was whether a 7th
16 grader would take 7th grade math. I'm sorry.
17 Maybe I misunderstood.

18 (Simultaneous speakers.)

19 MS. WEISS: Or when do start
20 introducing that dynamic.

21 MS. LOVING-RYDER: I believe that
22 the students should be able to take the
23 assessment whenever they are ready. If they

1 are taking algebra I in the 5th grade, then
2 they should take the algebra test then.

3 Otherwise, we are encouraging
4 mediocrity and we are not encouraging students
5 to accelerate at the level they can. So, I
6 would be in favor of allowing an end-of-
7 course, whatever that course might be,
8 assessment to be given whenever that student
9 has mastered the content.

10 And one of the points you made was
11 about testing out of the content. We do
12 actually have that flexibility in Virginia. A
13 school superintendent can certify that a
14 student has learned the content and then they
15 can sit for the end-of-course assessment. And
16 if they do, then they get the verified credit
17 for that particular course.

18 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Yes, the
19 verified credit idea is a nice -- has some
20 flexibility associated with it.

21 MR. WISE: That was -- in terms of
22 the algebra I, my suggestion had been that
23 whatever grade you take algebra I, you take

1 that exam, if you're still in an algebra I
2 system, or when you have -- if it's an
3 integrated math system, at whatever point
4 you've got -- have had -- received most of the
5 algebra I, you would take an exam at that
6 point in time.

7 The reason I suggested the 9th
8 grade as kind of the final point, as I've
9 watched certain state policies unfold, I have
10 seen a high percent of minority students to be
11 pushed on the 10th and 11th grade before they
12 get algebra I.

13 And that literally means you're
14 capping those students' future. You're short-
15 changing them, and rather than trying to do an
16 accelerated approach and do what's needed to
17 get them through algebra I, at least by the
18 9th grade.

19 The middle grades -- you have to
20 deal with middle grades as you work on high
21 school. They are really coupled together, and
22 you -- so, as you think about K-8, you have to
23 start thinking about what -- what -- what does

1 it mean to be ready for high school?

2 What does it mean to be ready for
3 algebra I if that's the threshold level? What
4 does it mean to be ready for solid language
5 arts course? What does it mean to be ready
6 for a solid lab-based science course in the
7 9th grade?

8 And you have to back up, it seems
9 to me, in the middle grades and begin to ask
10 the question: What -- how do you begin to
11 accelerate, because, as we've looked at some
12 of the work in middle grades, that the longer
13 you stay in school after about grade 4, the
14 wider your assignment gaps get and grade level
15 standards.

16 And about half of the states that
17 I've worked with have benchmarked their 8th
18 grade assessment to somewhere between the
19 midpoint between basic and proficient on NAEP.

20 That's kind of their cut point.

21 But for the other half, they're
22 benchmark is still below basic, and so you
23 have to think about accelerating that middle

1 grades curriculum if you're going to -- if
2 you're going to make this work.

3 And I don't know how you're going
4 to deal with high school. And that's the
5 reason I dropped down with -- you know, you
6 have reading in grade 8. The reason I
7 proposed reading -- one of the reasons I
8 proposed reading in grade 9, kind of a
9 comprehensive exam, if it was given in grade
10 8, the high schools won't own it, you know.

11 I wanted them to own the results.
12 I want them to see kids saying they read very
13 little in the 9th grade, that they were
14 engaged very little in certain discipline
15 areas.

16 I'd like to ask a series of
17 questions, how you were engaged in reading in
18 each of your different courses, and what kind
19 of writing -- how often did you have to write
20 a paper, and that's the kind of thing in grade
21 -- grade 9 to begin to show that -- that we
22 just simply are failing to engage students in
23 the language of their discipline.

1 And that was the reason for that
2 reading exam in grade 9, to get high schools
3 to take ownership of their problem, because
4 you have reading sliding from about grades 4
5 and 5 forward.

6 And we never shift from reading to
7 learn. I mean, learning how to read, reading
8 to learn across the discipline. It's an
9 emphasize that -- so you can't solve that
10 problem just in high school. You have to back
11 up in middle grades.

12 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Well, and
13 that really speaks to how important it is,
14 whatever it is we're talking about what is the
15 composition of the assessment.

16 Because, if you were to design an
17 end-of-course exam in an English class which
18 doesn't adequately evaluate the range of
19 reading across content areas in genres,
20 writing across genres, you know, listening,
21 speaking.

22 Again, most countries have oral
23 examinations as well as written. Then, it

1 might be an end-of-course exam, but it might
2 not really be helping us move forward in terms
3 of what -- and if you just said to 9th grade
4 teachers, what do you want on the exam, it
5 will be literature.

6 And that's it. And that won't
7 really be their -- it's obvious it's got to
8 hit the range of standards.

9 If we think about the common
10 standards are trying to do, and again, looking
11 at how that maps onto international
12 benchmarking, we should end up with learning
13 progressions from K through 12 that actually
14 describes, particularly in English language
15 arts and in mathematics, the gradual
16 acquisition of skills that you can benchmark
17 along a learning progression, and you ought to
18 be able to develop assessments that move along
19 those progressions.

20 And that's what ought to be going
21 on, I think, in grades 3 through 8, 9,
22 whatever juncture one might then move to more
23 differentiated assessments. And we ought to

1 be thinking about those in terms of learning
2 progressions.

3 Now, some kids, when you evaluate
4 their learning in 5th grade will be here, and
5 some kids when you evaluate their learning
6 will be here, and some will be along multiple
7 dimensions in somewhat different places.

8 And that's information that we can
9 use. I think about the Vermont portfolio
10 system that they have had in place in that
11 district still used to a great where you
12 really could begin to see sort of how kids
13 were moving along some notion of a continuum
14 in their reading, writing and mathematics.

15 And I think that that should be a
16 major goal, building the lower grades
17 assessment system. And if those progressions
18 are defined clearly enough along the
19 dimensions of learning, you ought to be able
20 to incorporate both school-based assessments
21 and external sit-down in two-hour exams in a
22 variety of ways to be able to show where kids
23 are moving along those learning progressions.

1 You know, England uses tests and
2 tasks that are essentially developed by the
3 examination board and teachers that are
4 administered in the elementary grades on a
5 continual basis to see how kids are moving
6 along the learning progressions.

7 And you can aggregate them up and
8 report them and moderate them and score them
9 reliably, but you have to have that sense of a
10 continuum, and I don't think that's going to
11 be a course-by-course, that's going to be
12 really a skills progression.

13 MR. WISE: And if I could add, I
14 think there's been, under No Child Left Behind
15 in more states sort of a grade-by-grade
16 emphasis on what's the content that's
17 relatively disconnected across the grades.

18 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Yes, it is.

19 MR. WISE: And we have had this big
20 prohibition against out-of-grade testing,
21 whereas, if we had a model of the learning
22 progressions like what Linda is talking about,
23 with an adaptive test, you could go at any

1 grade and then pave where the student is in
2 that whole progression from K to 12, not just
3 in sort of a narrow group of content that
4 somebody has decided is terribly --

5 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: And much more
6 valuable for teachers.

7 MR. WISE: Yes.

8 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: And it allows
9 us --
10 yes, and for kids, and we should be thinking
11 not in terms of pass/fail or just proficiency
12 benchmarks, but scale scores.

13 That is, we need to be thinking
14 about where kids are along a continuum with
15 information that is both descriptive and
16 qualitative as well as, you know,
17 quantitative, what that score might be along
18 the dimension.

19 MR. WISE: And you've heard that
20 twice because you heard that again yesterday
21 also.

22 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Just
23 reinforcing.

1 MR. WISE: Yes.

2 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: And it would
3 be so much more information for everyone in
4 the system.

5 MS. WEISS: So let me ask whether
6 any of you guys, Ann or Amy or Judy have any
7 questions that you would like to ask, or
8 anything that you would like to ask one
9 another? Go ahead.

10 MS. WURTZEL: I just have one last
11 question which is, what advice do you have for
12 us when we draft this RFP about the crucial
13 questions we should be asking states to
14 consider, particularly around the high school
15 assessment that create the kind of thinking in
16 the states and ask participant evidence we'll
17 needing to look at proposals.

18 MR. WISE: Well, you know, before I
19 already said theory of action, evidence to
20 support it, some evidence of the feasibility
21 that what they're doing has some likelihood of
22 paying off.

23 You also, I think, need to have --

1 be fairly specific about the criteria for
2 looking at how it's going to be managed and
3 the likelihood that you actually will get
4 continued buy-in from the states that agree to
5 go in together initially.

6 So, there's some management things
7 and there's some content things, and then to
8 the extent you can require them to have
9 quality control or some sort of ongoing
10 monitoring that allows them to make midcourse
11 improvements in the development of the plans,
12 I think it will be more likely to be
13 successful than if they haven't sort of
14 thought through what kind of checks are they
15 going to have along the way.

16 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: I would say
17 yes to all of that, and add a couple of other
18 points. How will they evaluate the whole range
19 of standards that is the -- and include
20 performances that evaluate standards in their
21 mixed-model system, whatever that is, and how
22 would they be strategic about what I would
23 expect would be some kind of a mixed system of

1 delivery and scoring, that is that can use
2 technology strategically, that can use
3 teachers strategically, that can, you know,
4 think about the different purposes in the
5 theory of action and be very, very strategic
6 about the choices that are made there.

7 MR. BOTTOMS: In addition to the
8 points they made, I'd come back to the point I
9 made earlier. I'd ask the states what -- what
10 will the high school -- what is your vision of
11 a high school that's going to produce students
12 who are college ready, are career ready, are
13 both and responsible -- what kind of
14 experiences in high school will it take to get
15 there, what kind of learning experiences do
16 you hope to have at a high-performing high
17 school that's graduating most students,
18 graduating them prepared for further study,
19 for advanced training, become responsible
20 citizens.

21 I think we've short-changed the
22 vision piece. Most states just do not have
23 that. Secondly, how will assessment help you

1 see if that's occurring, both in terms of
2 student learning and whether or not the
3 students are receiving the kind of experiences
4 you envision.

5 MS. LOVING-RYDER: I would
6 encourage you to allow states to be -- to have
7 as much flexibility as possible because I
8 think, as we've talked today, it's apparent
9 that there are many different ways of
10 approaching this that are all valid.

11 I think it would be important for
12 states to have something in their proposals to
13 discuss how they would continue to evaluate
14 the validity of what they are proposing as
15 college and career-ready standards, in terms
16 of unintended consequence and also ensuring
17 that they are working with business and with
18 colleges to make sure that what has been
19 identified so far as readiness is really true.

20 It's also going to be important for
21 states to specify what standards they are
22 measuring. And I know we've had a lot of
23 discussion here about whether we are talking

1 about the common standards or some common
2 standards that states then adopt.

3 If the answer is that states can
4 adopt a set of common standards that's not the
5 common standards, then they're going to need
6 to specify how they are agreeing across the
7 consortium as to what those -- those standards
8 are.

9 And lastly, there needs to be some
10 assurance that whatever is in the assessment
11 is going to be tied closely to instruction.

12 As I've said previously, I think
13 the danger in having a comprehensive exam is
14 that it's not closely tied to the instruction
15 that's occurring in that year.

16 I think there are two dangers. One
17 is that the preparation for that test will be
18 put off until the year in which it is
19 administered. And secondly, that it will be
20 very broad in nature when, in fact, I think
21 the intent of these standards was to ensure
22 that students are tested in a very deep way.

23 MS. WEISS: Any final words from

1 any of you, final bits of wisdom as we sort
2 our way through this?

3 MR. WISE: I think you have a
4 monumental challenge.

5 MS. WEISS: Thank you.

6 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: I also think
7 states have done -- a lot of states have done
8 a lot of things that get them down this road.
9 And so, while it's a monumental challenge
10 letting people build on some of the successes
11 they've had is going to be very important.

12 MR. WISE: But let me add,
13 extremely important one. I think we have a
14 huge fairness issue in this country because
15 the expectations for what students need to
16 know and be able to do sort of changes with
17 state boundaries in ways that makes no sense.

18 And we need to develop both high
19 and common expectations. And the only way we
20 can tell that we are doing that is to build
21 these kinds of common assessments that you
22 want to fund, and then we'll know.

23 So, I think this is a very critical

1 endeavor.

2 MS. DARLING-HAMMOND: Yes, and
3 emphasize validity at least as much as
4 reliability. And, you know, as we've been
5 talking, I've just been going over in my mind
6 a memory that we moved to New York State when
7 my daughter was -- my oldest daughter was in
8 8th grade and she went through the New York
9 States Regents curriculum at a time when the
10 state university system was saying, these
11 regents tests do not tell us what we need to
12 know. They are not useful for college.

13 They had become almost entirely
14 multiple choice tests over time and much of
15 the experimentation was taken out, much of the
16 writing and so on.

17 She got through that curriculum,
18 memorized and spit back all the pieces of
19 data, did well enough, got into a good
20 college, was completely unprepared for
21 anything she encountered in college.

22 She had never written a term paper.

23 She had never done a science investigation in

1 all the years she was in that state. She had
2 never done a serious piece of research.

3 So, think validity. Think about
4 what do people have to do when they get to a
5 good college, what do they have to do when
6 they get into a career situation where they
7 are problem-solvers and active and be sure
8 that we honor that as much as other countries
9 are in their assessments.

10 MR. BOTTOMS: And my last point
11 will simply be, as states establish that
12 threshold, for college readiness, for career
13 readiness, for graduation, also ask them to
14 establish thresholds that exceed that, and to
15 show evidence that they're moving people
16 beyond just a threshold.

17 We've had too much focus on the
18 minimums and it's pulled things down to a
19 lower common denominator.

20 MS. WEISS: Well, thank you all so
21 much. I know some folks in the room probably
22 have to run for planes, so let's just take a
23 moment now to thank very much the experts who

1 have shared their time and their expertise and
2 their thinking with us in ways that I truly
3 hope will get us through this monumental task.

4 So, thank you so much.

5 So we'll reconvene at about five
6 minutes past four to start the public speaking
7 section, and we'll move the podium up and be
8 ready for that in about ten minutes. Thanks.

9 (Whereupon, a short recess was
10 taken, from 3:53 p.m. until 4:04 p.m.)

11 MS. WEISS: So, thanks. We are
12 going to take our public speakers in order.
13 These are people who rsvp'd ahead of time and
14 requested time to speak to us, and we're
15 delighted that you have persevered through the
16 day.

17 And let me just tell you as the
18 first person, I guess John comes up, that
19 there's lights on your podium that will go to
20 -- start green, go to yellow when you are at
21 two minutes, and then blink red when you are
22 out of time.

23 Everybody's got five minutes to

1 speak, and with that we will get started.

2 Please start by introducing
3 yourself.

4 MR. WINN: Thank you, Dr. Weiss.
5 My name is John Winn. I'm chief program
6 officer with the National Math and Science
7 Initiative in Dallas, Texas, and Dr. Weiss,
8 thank you and thank you to you and your
9 colleagues for -- not only for providing the
10 opportunity for public input, but also for the
11 very engaging and interesting and enlightening
12 two days.

13 Also, I want to thank your staff
14 out in front in the registration desk. They
15 have been very helpful and very kind and
16 keeping all of us orderly and informed.

17 I am not an assessment expert. I
18 do have some experience in the use of
19 assessments within accountability and school
20 improvement. I know what a scale score is and
21 an anchor item. But that's about the limit of
22 it.

23 But I would like to talk about, and

1 none of my comments are going to be brand new.

2 I'm sure you're thinking about them and some
3 of the presenters, some of the panelists have
4 talked about them.

5 But I would like to comment on the
6 bigger picture or the context, the use of end-
7 of-course assessments in thinking about
8 developing the guidelines for this important
9 program.

10 I do believe that end-of-course
11 assessments can be very effective in obviously
12 the core purpose of measuring student mastery
13 of course content. And that doesn't mean a
14 whole list of factoids. That can mean,
15 certainly, in a deep understanding way where
16 they understand and apply concepts within that
17 subject area.

18 I think they can also be a part of
19 an overall student profile for college ready.

20 When I think about college ready and the fact
21 that we've reduced it to two words and what
22 really a complex situation it is, and also
23 keeping in mind that college is a process, a

1 four-year process for undergraduates -- well,
2 it used to be four years. It may be a little
3 longer now.

4 But -- and so, there's a lot of
5 development that's expected to go in terms of
6 forming those higher -- higher cognitive
7 skills and honing those skills as they move
8 through college.

9 So, I wouldn't say that college-
10 ready is the end of the game in terms for high
11 schools in terms of making that happen. I
12 think it can play a role in identifying
13 teacher effectiveness, and I think, finally,
14 can play a role in improving instruction and
15 learning.

16 I know that it can play a role in
17 improving student learning. I think it can --
18 I think it can certainly help drive
19 instruction in the right ways if they're
20 constructed in the right ways and have the
21 right kinds of assessment items.

22 I'm not sure that we ought to rely
23 on assessment to transform instruction because

1 I think that transcends assessment, but I do
2 think that it can have an important influence
3 on that.

4 So, thinking about those different
5 potential uses, though, I think it's
6 critically important, as Scott said yesterday,
7 that there be a coherent plan of action that
8 states should be required to address within
9 their applications for these assessments.

10 And that coherent plan of action
11 should be geared towards making a difference.

12 I know that the Department of Education wants
13 to make a difference, not just to develop, how
14 the quality assessments develop, but also
15 making a difference with those.

16 So, I have four recommendations.
17 That those requirements that state
18 applications be required to identify how end-
19 of-course assessments could be used within
20 their broader accountability in school
21 improvement initiatives, how the end-of-course
22 assessments could have -- should have the
23 capacity to play a role in assessing teacher

1 effectiveness and teacher performance along
2 with other indicators, how states plan to set
3 their cut-off scores, because we know that in
4 many cases the impact analysis, there's a
5 tendency to be overly sensitive to the number
6 of students that don't demonstrate efficient--
7 that don't demonstrate proficiency, and I
8 think it's important to hold states to those
9 very high standards.

10 And finally, in terms of
11 assessments, they ought to be a coherent link
12 between the other components of the education
13 system, not the least of which being teacher
14 certification.

15 There should be consistency across
16 teacher certification. There should be
17 consistency across professional development
18 and the other components of the system.

19 So, I do believe that if -- if
20 states are required to develop, show how their
21 assessment plan is to be used and it fits into
22 their overall mission for states, then I think
23 that that would give the department a really

1 good idea of what different -- potential
2 differences would be made from their
3 application.

4 Thank you.

5 MS. WEISS: Thank you.

6 MR. CAMARA: Hi. I'm Wayne Camara
7 from the College Board. I'm a vice president
8 of research and development, and my training
9 is an industrial psychologist, and so I know a
10 lot of the folks who have been on the panels,
11 and I'm pleased to be speaking.

12 I just want to make a few points,
13 and I have some written testimony and we'll
14 have some more detailed written testimony
15 following this.

16 Nothing new, but I want to echo
17 some of the themes we've heard. First of all,
18 what are the purposes of the assessment. And
19 as I was reading the comments, it talked about
20 at least I found nine different potential
21 purposes, and that's very dangerous.

22 When assessment systems in the
23 country have failed, when they failed in

1 states it's because we have assumed that they
2 can do much, much, much more than they can,
3 and I would really urge the department, as
4 difficult politically as it is to specify the
5 primary one or two purposes of the assessment
6 sector.

7 Frankly, you cannot use the same
8 assessment system -- some of the assessment at
9 least to inform instruction, to evaluate
10 teacher performance, to inform students about
11 college readiness, to make placement
12 decisions, to measure growth.

13 It's just not -- it's not feasible,
14 and it's really not credible and I think we
15 need to be -- it's a difficult thing to say,
16 but we need to say that this cannot be all
17 things to all people.

18 And similarly while I do agree with
19 a lot of the comments in the last section
20 about alternative approaches and flexibility
21 in states, at the end of the day, if you want
22 to compare students across state lines in
23 terms of college readiness, that flexibility

1 is perfect for research in terms of
2 educational, math education and in terms of
3 different approaches to curriculum, but it's
4 not a good method to develop an accountability
5 system.

6 Maybe you cannot have just one set
7 of standards and one assessment system, but
8 you certainly should not have five or six.

9 The last thing we want to do is to
10 take the model, which has really allowed
11 states and districts and parents to believe
12 that there are 50 different standards of
13 proficiency across the country, and translate
14 that to college readiness.

15 We've done lots of validity
16 studies, and success at the University of
17 Massachusetts, honestly, is not much different
18 than success of cut students who go to
19 Northern Arizona State. And the success at
20 Stanford is not much different than students
21 who go to the University of Virginia.

22 The differences in terms of college
23 success have much more to do with whether

1 students are in STEM or non-STEM majors than
2 what state they live in, and we don't want to
3 create systems that imply that students are
4 college-ready in Rhode Island, and then when
5 that student goes to Michigan they are told,
6 when we translate your score to an ACT
7 equivalent or an SAT equivalent, we find that
8 you would not be college-ready in Michigan, so
9 Rhode Island gave you bum advice.

10 So, I think those are the kind of
11 things in potential misuses we want to avoid.

12 We do want to prioritize the uses of these.

13 In terms of college-readiness, I
14 want to emphasize that we need to move away
15 from just basing validity on judgments. We
16 have good empirical data, many organizations--
17 mine is one of them.

18 We have data on college students
19 across 150 colleges and 250,000 students and
20 we can tell you that college-readiness is not
21 best predicted by a test score, but is best
22 predicted by test scores, grades in courses
23 and the academic rigor of the courses

1 completed.

2 And if you want to provide students
3 in schools with accountability measures of
4 academic -- of college-readiness, I would
5 suggest, in addition to a summit of
6 assessment, you develop a standardized
7 transcript where we evaluate the rigor of the
8 courses taken.

9 Students who are taking an honors
10 algebra course are performing much higher than
11 students who have taken a regular honors
12 course. Students in honors courses actually
13 generally are doing better than students in
14 dual enrollment courses.

15 AP makes a difference but not
16 uniformly. AP calculus is not resulting in a
17 bigger bang for the buck than -- that honors
18 calculus would, quite frankly. These are the
19 kinds of differences, nuances, in terms of
20 academic rigor that will have to do as about
21 student successes as a test score, and I
22 really hope that we look at a system rather
23 than a single score.

1 Finally, I want to mention
2 something about innovation. I think there was
3 a lot of good ideas talked about innovation.
4 I want to talk about the ideas that I heard
5 Randy Bennett and Linda Darling-Hammond talk
6 about.

7 We want to get to a position where
8 the summit of assessment integrates
9 performances over time and the kind of
10 activity students do over time. It honestly
11 should be part of the AP program and it should
12 be part of what we -- what goes on in high
13 school.

14 It's difficult to do that, and the
15 way to get there is by having performances and
16 assignments, as Linda was explaining, serve as
17 part of an interim assessment. Figure out how
18 to do it.

19 Now, they have to be standardized.

20 We can't allow students to write any paper on
21 any topic graded by any teacher or do various
22 laboratories if we want to grow with
23 accountability, but there's a lot of research

1 that can be done there. I want to encourage
2 innovation.

3 And finally, I want to make a pitch
4 for the standards for educational and
5 psychological testing which Laurie Weiss is
6 the co-chair of, and I'm hoping that the
7 department will strongly recognize these in
8 terms of establishing the validity,
9 reliability and fairness of these tests.
10 Thank you.

11 MS. WEISS: Thanks.

12 MR. LEWOLT: Thanks for seeing me.

13 My name is Bruce Lewolt, and I am the CEO of
14 Brainex. I'm going to tell you just a little
15 bit about our technology to illustrate what I
16 think is an incredibly important point.

17 The Brainex on-line assessment
18 system and learning platform is used to assess
19 adults and students across a broad spectrum of
20 assessment and learning needs.

21 And in addition to assessing
22 knowledge and skills we also assess key
23 emotional and belief factors that affect

1 academic performance, along with the all-
2 important personal forgetting curve.

3 After the initial assessment, our
4 system produces individual education plans for
5 each student, class group plans for teachers
6 and track student progress through both
7 teacher input and dynamically-generated
8 periodic reassessments.

9 The assessment is also used to
10 personalize instructional strategy, for
11 example, different learning strategies are
12 suggested to fit the unique needs of English
13 learners and special educational students.

14 My point in telling you this is
15 that the technology we use today would have
16 seemed inconceivable just a few years ago, and
17 the technology we're already working on for
18 the future will make today's technology seem
19 like VHS tapes in a world of definition, Blue
20 Ray Players.

21 Therefore, if you make the mistake
22 of having the consortiums try to develop their
23 own assessment platform or even just write a

1 specification today, for technology they want
2 a vendor to provide an assessment platform.

3 By the time the award is made the
4 technology and the technologies developed, it
5 will be grossly outdated on the day of
6 arrival. Why not, instead, have the educator
7 in the consortium do what they are great at
8 doing, which is developing the standards and
9 test items, limit the initial technology
10 platform requirements to standard and item
11 creation only.

12 Then, make the items available to
13 any technology company who wants to use them
14 in order to provide the states with an
15 innovative technology platform for delivering
16 the actual assessments with the option of
17 providing value-added services.

18 If you do this, companies like mine
19 will compete with one another to provide
20 schools with the most innovative and useful
21 technology at the lowest possible cost.

22 In addition, we'll have an
23 incentive to continually improve our

1 technology and lower our cost in order to stay
2 competitive.

3 If you separate the standards and
4 assessment item development from the
5 technology, you save time and can have a
6 system up and running years earlier than if
7 you force the consortiums to figure what
8 technology to build or to specify for third-
9 parties to provide.

10 You also eliminate the technology
11 risk because if one company goes out of
12 business, another company can step right in
13 their place because everyone has access to the
14 same assessment items.

15 The huge amount of money you save
16 by separating the standard and item creation
17 from the technology can be given to the states
18 to purchase the best technology available at
19 the time.

20 Now, I recognize that it might be
21 for political reasons that you can't get to
22 this kind of common sense approach. If so, at
23 the minimum, I recommend that you force the

1 consortiums --

2 MS. WEISS: You're done.

3 MR. LEWOLT: All right. Thanks.

4 Anyway, you know, I recommended that you get
5 the consortiums to develop technology
6 separately from the items because when you do
7 that, or when you don't do that, what happens
8 is that the technology always takes second
9 place, and there really isn't any competitive
10 reason to develop great technology.

11 So, anyway, that's my primary
12 comment. My second comment, I have things
13 that are in the written testimony about the
14 importance of changing the concept of how
15 technologies are done to make the truly be
16 student first and serve the needs of teachers
17 and of administrators second.

18 This means that the assessments
19 should be designed so that they can -- pardon
20 me a second here. Actually, I have one
21 example and then I'll clear out of here.

22 And that's the work done by Dr.
23 Richland at UC Irvine and others who have

1 shown that assessments can be rich learning
2 experiences for each individual student if
3 they are delivered in the right way.

4 And, given that assessments can be
5 rich learning experiences, I believe,
6 following our gentleman from Canada yesterday,
7 that you have the moral obligation to ensure
8 that if a student is asked to spend eight
9 hours in testing, that in addition to
10 providing information of teachers and
11 administrators, the tests should also be a
12 personal learning experience for the student
13 and provide benefit to them.

14 Thank you very much.

15 MS. WEISS: Thank you.

16 MR. LEWOLT: Nineteen whole
17 seconds.

18 MR. DONAHUE: Hi, there. Good
19 afternoon. My name is Nicholas Donahue. I'm
20 the president and CEO of the Nellie Mae
21 Education Foundation. Welcome to New England.

22 We are the largest regional
23 philanthropy dedicated to education in the

1 region, and we're involved in a variety of
2 interesting investments around assessment at
3 the state and regional level.

4 I also bring with me my experience
5 as a chief state school officer from the State
6 of New Hampshire, at the inception of the No
7 Child Left Behind, and as an original founder
8 of the New England Comprehensive Assistant
9 Program known as NECAP.

10 My input comes in two short parts.

11 One is that I encourage you to take the time
12 and energy to really dig into the learnings
13 from NECAP and other state collaboratives in
14 ways that aren't possible at a hearing like
15 this.

16 They are technical, political
17 issues that affect any collective effort, and
18 they will -- they would be good to learn from.

19 Second when awarding grants to
20 consortia I would recommend a set of six
21 principles to find the expectations you might
22 have. On, in summary is that you define a set
23 of core purposes and expect the collaboratives

1 to respond to these.

2 Two, expect them to pay attention
3 to variety as a principle, design principle.
4 Three, that you expect them to actually
5 deliver design principles that define and
6 support the independent components of the
7 system, a multilevel system, but also of the
8 integration of that system. And I'll say
9 something that in a moment.

10 That you obviously expect them to
11 model implementation on the ground in ways
12 that are interesting and practical, that you
13 specifically expect them to deliver cost --
14 learnings about cost and cost effectiveness of
15 a varied system, in addition to attending to
16 familiar principles around quality and
17 fairness and equity.

18 On the issue of core principles,
19 I'd like to suggest that the department should
20 state clearly a set of principles that
21 collaboratives much achieve. Those principles
22 should include that the assessment systems
23 that they design and model should, one, allow

1 meaningful international comparisons.

2 Two, should obviously equipments
3 with the knowledge, habits in line with
4 dispositions to succeed. Three, that these
5 systems promote improved schooling in ways
6 that provide students with engaging
7 educational opportunities to promote the
8 standards of the definement, and that, four,
9 these systems provide parents and students and
10 other stakeholders with the information
11 necessary about relative performance.

12 Second principle, around attention
13 to variety is rooted in the notion that if you
14 have a variety of core purposes you need a
15 variety of approaches.

16 The previous speaker talked about
17 the difficulty of achieving a wide variety of
18 purposes, however, in a well-designed,
19 intentionally designed system that included
20 national, regional, state and local
21 components, it is possible and if it's
22 demonstrated through NECAP and other ventures,
23 it is possible to bridge a variety of

1 purposes.

2 Variety also attends to our
3 commitment such as around college-ready, how
4 do we promote college-readiness without
5 actually assessing it, and it also supports
6 international comparisons as we've heard.

7 The third principle is that you
8 expect design specifications from these
9 collaboratives that they actually tell you
10 very concretely about what it takes to build
11 independent components at the local, state and
12 regional levels, and most importantly, that
13 they tell you exactly what it takes to
14 integrate these components, that they
15 demonstrate specific findings around quality
16 control mechanisms across state lines, that
17 they describe specifically professional
18 development systems that support the
19 participation of educators, and significantly,
20 that they describe the systems that promote
21 public understanding and engagement in the
22 development of the assessment systems.

23 As one of the original implementers

1 of No Child Left Behind, I can tell that this
2 was an unintended feature of our last
3 administration.

4 In closing I'd say that, you know,
5 in summary, the days of cobbling together
6 parts of a system and pretending it's a system
7 need to end. The intentional system design
8 needs to be a priority.

9 Four, I mentioned modeling a
10 system. This is obvious, I think, providing
11 core principles and demanding the
12 collaboratives demonstrate on the ground
13 examples of how you would implement this,
14 maybe in a subset of schools in and across a
15 region would seem to be sufficient.

16 And five, cost estimates need to be
17 provided. The current conversation around
18 cost are too much just about dollars. We all
19 know there are other collateral costs related
20 to assessment in terms of time and attention
21 to learning, and these collaboratives could
22 give you good information about what some of
23 those collateral costs are, and a true picture

1 of cost-effectiveness.

2 Any award out to attend to all
3 these principles are closed by saying that the
4 key is to provide guidance and specificity and
5 purposes and allow flexibility in
6 implementation and to learn from efforts that
7 have gone before NECAP and others. Thank you.

8 MS. WEISS: Thanks so much.

9 MR. DONAHUE: You're welcome.

10 MR. KING: Good afternoon. Thank
11 you for the opportunity to testify for those
12 of you who stayed this long day.

13 My name is Jonathan King. I'm a
14 long-time professor of molecular biology at
15 MIT, where I teach and carry out federally-
16 funded biomedical research. I've also been
17 involved for decades in high school science
18 education through both state organizations and
19 federal programs.

20 The former includes Citizens for
21 Public Schools, Mass Academy of Sciences,
22 Massachusetts Association of Biology Teachers,
23 Massachusetts Darwin Bicentennial Project,

1 TURK.

2 This afternoon I will be focusing
3 on one of the President's national education
4 priorities, broadening and deepening STEM
5 education for US high school students.

6 My colleagues and I who teach at
7 research universities, at least the biologists
8 and biochemists, we prepare students to become
9 biomedical scientists. We prepare them for
10 the biotechnology industry to become medical
11 school faculty, physicians, surgeons, high
12 school science teachers, college science
13 teachers, staff of Federal and state
14 environmental protection and public health
15 agencies.

16 That is, we're producing the people
17 that the national reports have called for,
18 that the economy needs.

19 In teaching introduction to biology
20 courses in biology laboratory, we of course
21 are working with recent high school graduates,
22 so their prior education and preparation sets
23 the starting line for what they can do in

1 college.

2 Now, the executive summary poses
3 well-defined questions with respect to the
4 development and design of what I would call
5 narrow classes of student assessment.

6 However, the fundamental question
7 of what kinds of knowledge, skills and
8 learning needs to be assessed are not quite so
9 clearly addressed.

10 If we are to succeed in educating
11 the next generation for this highly-scientific
12 technological world that we're entering these
13 questions needed to be answered wisely and
14 correctly.

15 I'm guess I'm addressing question
16 one of your high school assessment.

17 Now, it is possible to assess in a
18 very efficient manner the ability of high
19 school student to names the parts of a light
20 microscope, which is useful knowledge.

21 However, this is limited -- of
22 limited value in assessing the critical
23 capacities, their ability to focus the light

1 microscope to actually observe the sample and
2 to be able to describe it, especially if it's
3 a little different than what's expected.

4 Now, that requires assessment of
5 their actual performance in such tasks which
6 always requires well-trained and supportive
7 teachers. It can't be done in the
8 standardized pen and pencil and computer score
9 tests.

10 Even the simpler question and
11 answer test will not be fair and equitable for
12 students whose schools lack modern microscopes
13 or teachers trained to use them.

14 Now, in the post-World War II
15 period and up to the present, the US has led
16 and continues to lead the world in scientific
17 and engineering productivity. Our scientific
18 community has deep knowledge of how to produce
19 creative, innovative productive scientists and
20 engineers.

21 We know a lot, at least from the
22 1970-2000 about the background of these
23 creative scientists and engineers, they came

1 from all the states of the union, they were
2 educated in rural and urban high schools.

3 They went to big and small
4 colleges, public and private. They obtained
5 their Master's and Ph.D. degrees from more
6 than a hundred major US research universities.

7 The education and preparation of
8 these world's most creative and innovative
9 individuals were not driven by standardized
10 curriculum or standardized tests.

11 If you examine the investments
12 financed by the National Defense Education
13 Act, that led to the great expanse of STEM
14 education after Sputnik, you'll find
15 investments in laboratory equipment, hands-on
16 laboratory experience, better designed
17 experiments, improved textbooks, teacher
18 training and fellowships enhanced the
19 experience by teachers in actual research.

20 The investment was not in a test
21 that would measure where people were at. In
22 general, the movement was to replace rote
23 learning with authentic -- replace rote

1 learning that had dominated before with
2 authentic encounters with the natural world
3 and its underlying processes.

4 This is well-summarized in the
5 Triple AS report, science for all Americans.

6 Actually, it's quite extraordinary
7 sitting here listening to this because around
8 the world in places like -- I'm departing from
9 my text and the red light is about to come on
10 in one minute.

11 Around the world Japan, Britain,
12 Germany, France, scientists wrung their hands
13 on how come American was leading the world.
14 And one of the things they concluded was that
15 the standardized test that absolutely
16 controlled access to higher education in those
17 countries on the O levels and A levels was an
18 out-moded form of assessment.

19 And instead of bring in this
20 extraordinary richness that you need -- in the
21 modern world you need an enormous diversity of
22 talents, no one understands anything about why
23 some people become brilliant fluid dynamicists

1 and others become geophysicists, other become
2 successful biochemists and others engineers.

3 So, those who have spoken for
4 variety and diversity in this assessment
5 absolutely, and when you ask about
6 standardizing the performance assessment --

7 (Off-mic comment.)

8 MS. WEISS: Thank you.

9 MS. CLINARD: Hello. My name is
10 Jan Clinard. I am happy to be here. Thank
11 you for this opportunity to speak, and also to
12 hear from all the wonderful experts that you
13 brought.

14 I work for the Montana University
15 System. My job has been to develop policies
16 and implement those policies related to
17 college admissions, placement and remediation
18 across the whole system, two-year and four-
19 year.

20 So, you finally have someone
21 representing the admissions side of the house.

22 I would like you to imagine a test that is
23 voluntary and yet 80 percent of the high

1 schools participate, a test in which unpaid
2 high school and college faculty convene
3 together to write the prompts, to develop the
4 training materials, to field test and to plan
5 for training in which faculty from high school
6 and colleges give two full days every year to
7 score those tests.

8 They are not paid, their travel is
9 not paid, they get two free lunches, and yet
10 they line up to do it. I turn them away every
11 year to score those assessments.

12 This is a picture of schools
13 engaged in a culture of evidence. It is the
14 kind of culture that you, during the race to
15 the top want to nurture.

16 This describes, in part, how
17 Montana high school students demonstrate
18 college and career readiness.

19 Based on my experience as a
20 director and developer of this program I
21 recommend the following.

22 First of all, make strategic use of
23 the established assessment, such as ACT's,

1 EPAS program and college board programs. They
2 are good products. Use them, colleges use
3 them, we trust them.

4 However, we think that counselors
5 and teachers need to be trained to use the
6 results more than they are using them today in
7 order to improve instruction.

8 Secondly, provide avenues for
9 state-developed and locally-implemented
10 assessments that improve teaching and
11 learning. What you need to fund are common
12 assessment protocols, not common assessments.

13 Thirdly, develop performance
14 assessments that, first of all, build
15 ownership and sustainability.

16 In Montana we have problems
17 scoring rubrics and protocols that are
18 developed by teachers, college professors and
19 employers, and the student responses are
20 scored by teachers and college instructors,
21 collaboratively at accessible -- eight
22 different sites in Montana every year.

23 I spend March on the road with

1 instructors, themselves, serving as the
2 leaders. These performance assessments are
3 embedded into the curriculum and classroom
4 instructions. The tests are administered in
5 high school classes during the junior year.

6 The students use the technology,
7 word processors, that they are used to using
8 and they are submitted on line, and they use
9 formative assessments throughout the year. We
10 have something called Web-writers and Web-
11 scorers, and this type of performance
12 assessment will nurture a culture of evidence.

13 The readiness thresholds are known
14 in advance. Students know the rubrics better
15 than the teachers in some cases. The results,
16 more than just numerical scores, are returned
17 immediately to the teachers.

18 Students may retake the test, and
19 the scores are used in conjunction with other
20 college entrance exams, rigorous curriculum
21 requirements, GPA and other criteria for
22 college admissions.

23 I've directed this approach, and

1 we've had a number of powerful outcomes. High
2 school teachers own the assessment. They
3 believe it is fair, valid and reliable.

4 College instructors trust the
5 results. Participants have learned to use an
6 on-line system and we know what their
7 technological capacities are. They know what
8 level of skills are needed for college.

9 The high school and college
10 instructors engage in learning communities,
11 teachers, counselors, and administrators use
12 the test results to further prepare students.
13 Readiness levels have increased.

14 We've dropped our remediation rate
15 in composition from 14.4 percent in '01 to 10
16 percent in '09. The costs are shared among
17 all of the partners because they value it.
18 You've heard about cost and value. And in
19 this case we have an assessment that is valued
20 by all the participants.

21 I have one last question. Can
22 Montana joint Alberta in a consortium?

23 MS. WEISS: Maybe US needs to annex

1 itself for a while.

2 MS. CLINARD: Thank you so much.

3 MS. WEISS: Thank you. Next?

4 MR. LaPIERRE: Good evening
5 esteemed panel. My name is Brian LaPierre and
6 I am a teacher and I offer the teacher
7 perspective. I came from the Lynn Public
8 Schools. I drove about seven miles to be with
9 you here tonight. So, it was very convenient,
10 welcome to Boston.

11 It would not be in the best
12 interest of anyone in this room today or in
13 the educational community abroad to embrace
14 new strategies or assessment programs without
15 incorporating some key fundamentals about
16 assessment literacy and terminology, and what
17 that exactly means to the classroom teacher.

18 We need to begin any dialogue with
19 regard to high school assessment with what I
20 would deem a teacher voice, and that's the
21 perspective I hope to bring to you this
22 evening.

23 That is the ability for teachers to

1 be trained so that they will be able to create
2 authentic assessments, what we heard about
3 earlier, that will have real-life application.

4 This does not happen overnight.
5 It's taken a majority of even 20-plus years to
6 get the term rubric into our classroom and use
7 that term as a norm, a norm in the classroom
8 for both student, teacher, parent to
9 recognize.

10 This is a painstaking process and
11 it involves realizing what the value of an
12 assessment is, what the role it has in
13 education, it's functionality within the
14 classroom and most importantly its lasting
15 effects on student achievement.

16 I would echo that there was no
17 magic bullet in terms of assessment that can
18 do all of this in one course. It has to be
19 multiple-faceted, it has to be multi-pronged
20 with a variety of assessment systems in place.

21 These days you see assessments
22 being touted strictly as an accountability
23 measure. For example, our state assessment

1 system, MCAS. Now, it serves a good purpose
2 in terms of compliance within the school
3 district or the state for reporting out, but
4 what it doesn't serve is the student.

5 It is not student-centered. These
6 assessment types offer compliance as I said,
7 and it certainly satisfies the policymakers.
8 However, what happens to the students,
9 teachers and parents who are really the
10 stakeholders at the end of the day.

11 The kind of assessments that ought
12 to be considered, particularly at the high
13 school level, are a variety that provide
14 information and insight about what a student
15 has learned over the course of the school
16 year.

17 They should be based upon
18 standards-based assessments, should praise
19 teachers and not position teachers in what I
20 would deem a "got you" moment in order to
21 manipulate that data accordingly. We have to
22 be careful of data manipulation within any
23 assessment system.

1 Some of the best types of
2 assessment tools that promote learning and at
3 the same time raise standards, we need to
4 ensure that our teachers have participated in
5 meaningful and challenging profession
6 development opportunities, and I was thrilled
7 to hear that throughout today's session that
8 center around assessment.

9 My national union organization, the
10 American Federation of Teachers offers two
11 such courses dealing with this specifically,
12 making data work for you and now the new --
13 which we rolled out this summer, making
14 classroom assessments work for you.

15 And I will be an instructor in my
16 local, the City of Lynn, and also in Peabody
17 this winter, rolling that out to individual
18 classroom teachers who will understand how
19 important data is, terminology, what impacts
20 it and how to put it into practice by using
21 good assessments that work in the classrooms.

22 For teachers to have ownership and
23 feel empowered as well as to be an authority

1 on assessment, they need to participate in
2 understanding assessment literacy. This is an
3 area of weakness in all college preparatory
4 programs.

5 There also needs to be the safety
6 net within a school district that gives
7 teachers back control of their classrooms. We
8 can no longer use the top-down theory to get
9 results.

10 This method is dictatorial. It
11 encourages contempt. Instead, we must adopt a
12 model that is inclusive, that brings together
13 all the needed stakeholders, including parents
14 so that we may focus on assessment literacy
15 that works for teachers, students and parents.

16 Teachers need to be at the
17 forefront driving assessment to exhibit
18 demonstrable results. Another component that
19 should not be left out of the high school
20 category is the notion that students can offer
21 a self-assessment on a given discipline of
22 subject of subject matter.

23 By making students more accountable

1 to the process of assessment, they have a
2 greater buy-in and investment. For years I'd
3 have my students develop a rubric for which
4 they'd be assessed on.

5 I wanted them to gather and present
6 evidence that they located. Each student
7 would make an oral presentation to my class on
8 their findings. Other students offered a
9 critique that focused on their strengths and
10 weaknesses.

11 As a result I saw the efficacy of
12 my students increase and their motivation for
13 future projects were set in motion.

14 I also found that those students
15 who did not feel well, improved greatly on the
16 next task due to, in large part, that they
17 were informed, eager to learn and reflected
18 more which enabled them to predict a better
19 outcome for themselves.

20 I would leave you with this quote
21 by Douglas Reeves from the book "Bell Curve to
22 the Mountain, a New Vision for Achievement,
23 Assessment and Equity."

1 As educators, school leaders and
2 policymakers, we exist in a world where too
3 often assessment equals high-stakes test.
4 This is a very limited view of assessment. We
5 call for a redirection of assessment to its
6 fundamental purpose, the improvement of
7 student achievement, teaching practice and
8 leadership decision making.

9 These stakes could not be higher.
10 We have two alternatives before us. Either we
11 heed the clarion call that there is an
12 unprecedented opportunity for achieving
13 results now or we succumb to the complaints of
14 those who claim that schools, educators and
15 leaders are impotent compared to the magnitude
16 of the challenge before them.

17 Thank you so much.

18 MS. WEISS: Thank you. And I think
19 on that note, that was our last speaker,
20 taking us out on a high note. I want to thank
21 everybody for coming, for sticking with us for
22 a couple of days.

23 We really appreciate it. We hope

1 it was valuable to you, and particularly thank
2 you to the speakers who shared their thoughts
3 with us this afternoon, and to the states who,
4 in many cases, traveled long distances to be
5 here for the last couple of days. I hope it
6 was a good use of your time and thanks for
7 coming.

8 (Whereupon, at 4:43 p.m., the
9 meeting was adjourned.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23