

REP. GANDHI'S PRESENTATION RE: COMMON CORE STANDARDS

3/19/13

I would like to address this issue from a little different angle

LET US LOOK AT 'TESTING' FOR COMMON CORE STANDARDS

- Testing for COMMON CORE STANDARDS plays a very significant role.
- Implimentation of Common Core cannot be effective without timely establishment of Testing
- It is expensive and has an ongoing cost which usually escalates as we go.

For example, in the year 2003, Texas Education Agency reported that they spent about \$47.4 million on testing. However from 2008 to 2012 they ended up spending on an average \$88 million per year. (NCLB)

- In the absence of a track record testing is also subject to costly errors and delays.

For example, in 2006 Hawaii ended up replacing their test publisher 'Harcourt' of American Institute of Research. They had to re-grade 98000 tests, because students had received scores for submitting BLANK booklets. However the company did absorb the cost. (NCLB)

We know that the state of Kansas had signed a memorandum of agreement (MAO) along with 44 other states in 2009 to be part of COMMON CORE INITIATIVE.

They also elected to sign up with two companies to develop a testing program.

- PARCC - which stands for 'Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College/Career Consortium', and
- SBAC - which stands for 'Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium.'

Both of these programs were introduced by the federal government and have already been retained and funded by US Department of education to provide the states with their services. The tests are expected to be ready by 2014-2015. US secretary of Education Arne Duncan, made the announcement in September of 2010. It is estimated that it will cost over Kansas about \$170 million.

- PARCC- received \$170 million and
- SBAC- Received \$160 million

It is somewhat worrisome to know that the federal government controls the purse strings of the TESTING PROGRAMS that we will be using.



Do State Tests Make the Grade?

By Pauline Yu, Staff Writer

It's hard to overestimate the importance of standardized tests in public schools today. Grade advancement, high school diplomas, teacher bonuses, principals' jobs and school reputations can all hinge on whether a student picks the right answer.

So who creates the tests that carry so much weight?

Much of the work is done by five giants: CTB/McGraw-Hill, Educational Testing Service, Harcourt Assessment, Pearson Educational Measurement and Riverside Publishing. Together, the companies own about 90 percent of the state-testing business, which has become a \$1.1 billion industry since passage of the federal No Child Left Behind Act in 2001. The law, which took effect in January 2002, requires states to give annual reading and math tests to third- through eighth-graders, and to test students in those subjects once again in high school.

Working with state educators, the big five - or big four, once Pearson's planned acquisition of Harcourt takes place - create and score the tests. But the explosion of testing and changes in the types of tests states administer have left the companies scrambling to keep up.

Also, differences in state standards that are used to create the tests and the reluctance of some states to spend money for high-quality, challenging tests have caused a great disparity in testing from state to state.

How a question makes it onto the test

The process of getting a question onto a state test is complex, usually involving multiple steps. Let's look at how a math question ends up on a test. The first step is to identify the content area that will be tested. This has been done for the words "state" in Missouri, which the state's chief president of assessment and development for Measurement Incorporated, a company that designs and administers state tests.

Step 1

The state prepares a blueprint for creating, administering, scoring and reporting results for a test. The blueprint includes which strands or sub-categories of a subject the state wants to measure, how many questions for each strand and what kind of questions the state wants, such as multiple choice or open-ended answers. The state accepts only

Step 2

The company's writers, knowledgeable in the content area and often current or former teachers, write test questions (also called "items") based on the state's content standards. "That's their bible," Burch said. "You don't write anything that doesn't match those content standards."

Step 3

The company conducts an internal review of the questions for content and style. They can be altered or dropped based on whether they appear to be national English language learners or special-edited or students or even based on how well they translate into another language, for example.

Step 4

The company meets with a state committee, usually made up of teachers. The committee then has a week or two to three days to review and either the items



U.S. Department of Education

Search

[Advanced Search](#)[Funding](#) [Policy](#) [Research](#) [News](#) [About ED](#)

U.S. Secretary of Education Duncan Announces Winners of Competition to Improve Student Assessments

Two winning applications composed of 44 States and D.C. Win Grants to Fund Assessments Based on Common Core Standards

SEPTEMBER 2, 2010

Contact: Press Office, (202) 401-1576, press@ed.gov (<mailto:press@ed.gov>)

In an effort to provide ongoing feedback to teachers during the course of the school year, measure annual student growth, and move beyond narrowly-focused bubble tests, the U.S. Department of Education has awarded two groups of states grants to develop a new generation of tests. The new tests will be aligned to the higher standards that were recently developed by governors and chief state school officers and have been adopted by 36 states. The tests will assess students' knowledge of mathematics and English language arts from third grade through high school.

The grant requests, totaling approximately \$330 million, are part of the Race to the Top competition and will be awarded to the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) and the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) in the amounts of approximately \$170 and \$160 million respectively.

"As I travel around the country the number one complaint I hear from teachers is that state bubble tests pressure teachers to teach to a test that doesn't measure what really matters," said Duncan.

"Both of these winning applicants are planning to develop assessments that will move us far beyond this and measure real student knowledge and skills."

The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers is a coalition of 26 states including AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DC, DE, FL, GA, IL, IN, KY, LA, MA, MD, MS, ND, NH, NJ, NY, OH, OK, PA, RI, SC and TN. The SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium is a coalition of 31 states including AL, CO, CT, DE, GA, HI, IA, ID, KS, KY, ME, MI, MO, MT, NC, ND, NH, NJ, NM, NV, OH, OK, OR, PA, SC, SD, UT, VT, WA, WI, and WV. The assessments will be ready for use by the 2014-15 school year.

"Given that these assessment proposals, designed and developed by the states, were voluntary, it was impressive to see a vast majority of states choose to participate," said Duncan.

The PARCC coalition will test students' ability to read complex text, complete research projects, excel at classroom speaking and listening assignments, and work with digital media. PARCC will also replace the one end-of-year high stakes accountability test with a series of assessments throughout the year that will be averaged into one score for accountability purposes, reducing the weight given to a single test administered on a single day, and providing valuable information to students and teachers throughout the year.






The SMARTER coalition will test students using computer adaptive technology that will ask students tailored questions based on their previous answers. SMARTER will continue to use one test at the end of the year for accountability purposes, but will create a series of interim tests used to inform students, parents, and teachers about whether students are on track.

For both consortia, these periodic assessments could replace already existing tests, such as interim assessments that are in common use in many classrooms today. Moreover, both consortia are designing their assessment systems with the substantial involvement of experts and teachers of English learners and students with disabilities to ensure that these students are appropriately assessed.

The parameters of the competition were informed by 10 public and expert input meetings that the Department hosted across the country last winter. Forty-two invited assessment experts joined nearly 1,000 members of the public and officials from 37 states plus Washington D.C. for over 50 hours of public and expert input on critical questions about assessment and assessment design.

The winning applicants were selected by a panel of peer reviewers. Due to the highly technical nature of the Race to the Top Assessment Competition, the Department sent invitations to two groups of individuals to serve as peer reviewers: 1) experts who served as panelists for the Race to the Top Assessment public meetings (these were nominated by the director of the National Academies of Sciences' Board on Testing and Assessment, by the U. S. Department of Education's National Technical Advisory Council chair, and/or by Department experts); and 2) persons experienced as peer reviewers in the Title I review of State assessment systems (all recruited on the basis of assessment expertise). The Department specifically solicited individuals with experience and expertise in K-12

Related Resources

-  [Letter to governors](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-assessment/governors-letter.html)
(<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-assessment/governors-letter.html>)
-  [Applications and Scores](http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-assessment/applicant.html)
(<http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop-assessment/applicant.html>)
-  [Secretary's remarks on assesement at Achieve meeting](http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/beyond-bubble-tests-next-generation-assessments-secretary-arnie-duncans-remarks-state-1) (<http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/beyond-bubble-tests-next-generation-assessments-secretary-arnie-duncans-remarks-state-1>)
-  [Press call](http://www.ed.gov/news/av/audio/2010/09/09022010.mp3)
(<http://www.ed.gov/news/av/audio/2010/09/09022010.mp3>)
-  [Press call transcript](http://www.ed.gov/news/av/audio/2010/09/09022010.doc)
(<http://www.ed.gov/news/av/audio/2010/09/09022010.doc>)



Partnership for Assessment of
Readiness for College and Careers

Stay informed!

Keep up with what's happening at PARCC.

PARCC Becomes a Non-Profit

[Printer-friendly version \(http://www.parcconline.org/print/parcc-becomes-non-profit\)](http://www.parcconline.org/print/parcc-becomes-non-profit) [PDF version \(http://www.parcconline.org/printpdf/526\)](http://www.parcconline.org/printpdf/526)

WASHINGTON - March 12, 2013 - The Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) today announced the formation of a new non-profit organization to oversee the development of its next generation assessments. To date, PARCC has been a consortium of states with no legal status; under its new non-profit status, PARCC will become its own legal entity as a 501(c)(3). Launching the non-profit is the first step in the process to ensuring the PARCC assessment system can be sustained in the long term and beyond the U.S. Department of Education's Race to the Top Assessment grant period which ends in September 2014.

PARCC will continue to be state led. PARCC state chiefs are deeply engaged in leading this unprecedented collaboration among 22 states to develop and implement a common set of K-12 assessments in English language arts/literacy and mathematics anchored in what it takes to be ready for college, careers and life. The new non-profit will be governed by a Board of Directors comprised of PARCC state chiefs. The current PARCC Governing Board will retain all decision-making authority for the development of the PARCC assessment system through the end of the grant.

"I am pleased with the progress the consortium continues to make in developing PARCC, the next generation assessment system that is aligned to the Common Core State Standards," said Massachusetts Commissioner of Elementary and Secondary Education Mitchell Chester, who chairs the PARCC Governing Board. "The creation of a non-profit entity establishes a state-led governance structure to oversee the administration and sustainability of these new assessments."

"This is an important step to ensure a seamless transition from the development stage of the PARCC next generation assessments to their implementation," said New Jersey Education Commissioner and PARCC Governing Board member Chris Cerf. "This non-profit will ensure that states continue to be at the forefront of new, more meaningful Common Core-aligned assessments."

PARCC's top priority is successful and on-time development of assessments in grades 3-8 and high school. A subset of the PARCC Governing Board - Janet Barresi (OK), Chris Cerf (NJ), Mitchell Chester (MA), Deborah A. Gist (RI), and Hanna Skandera (NM) - serve on the PARCC Executive Committee, which is responsible for providing day to day leadership of the project. A search will commence for a CEO to head the organization within the next two months.

For more information, visit <http://www.parcconline.org/>.

###

PARCC is an alliance of states working together to develop common assessments serving nearly 24 million students. PARCC's work is funded through a four-year, \$185 million dollar grant from the U.S. Department of Education. Partners include over 700 higher education institutions and systems representing hundreds of campuses across the country that will help develop the high school component of the new assessment - and then put it to good use as an indicator of student readiness. PARCC is led by its member states and managed by Achieve, a non-profit group with a 17-year track record of working with states to improve student achievement by aligning K-12 education policies with the expectations of employers and the postsecondary community. PARCC's ultimate goal is to make sure all students graduate from high school college- and career-ready. For more information, visit www.parcconline.org/.

Media Contact: Chad Colby (202) 419-1570, ccolby@achieve.org (<mailto:ccolby@achieve.org>)

[SHARE](http://www.addthis.com/bookmark.php) (<http://www.addthis.com/bookmark.php>)

Table 2 — CCS Cost Per Student

(Total Cost in \$ Millions) (Cost per Student in dollars as shown)

State	State	Total Cost	Students	Cost per Student
Abr.				
AL	Alabama	281.693	748,889	\$376
AZ	Arizona	374.704	1,077,660	348
AR	Arkansas	193.529	480,088	403
CA	California	2,188.494	6,257,082	350
CO	Colorado	304.494	832,368	366
CT	Connecticut	226.215	563,985	401
DE	Delaware	48.892	126,801	386
DC	District of Columbia	29.331	68,984	425
FL	Florida	1,024.163	2,634,522	389
GA	Georgia	646.622	1,667,685	388
HI	Hawaii	67.556	180,008	375
ID	Idaho	99.246	276,299	359
IL	Illinois	799.021	2,104,175	380
IN	Indiana	386.623	1,046,661	369
IA	Iowa	192.565	491,842	392
KS	Kansas	185.515	470,057	395
KY	Kentucky	256.754	679,717	378
LA	Louisiana	270.086	690,915	391
ME	Maine	79.189	189,225	418
MD	Maryland	327.234	848,412	386
MA	Massachusetts	377.294	956,231	395
MI	Michigan	591.593	1,634,151	362
MS	Mississippi	187.300	484,467	387
MO	Missouri	362.058	917,982	394
MT	Montana	56.208	141,807	396
NV	Nevada	151.051	428,469	353
NH	New Hampshire	79.715	197,140	404
NJ	New Jersey	563.657	1,344,785	419
NM	New Mexico	126.751	334,419	385
NY	New York	1,088.436	2,650,201	411
NC	North Carolina	576.903	1,482,859	389
ND	North Dakota	40.281	95,073	424
OH	Ohio	662.048	1,764,297	375
OK	Oklahoma	246.387	653,118	377
OR	Oregon	201.964	582,839	347
PA	Pennsylvania	705.985	1,783,502	396
RI	Rhode Island	58.883	145,118	406
SC	South Carolina	273.045	723,143	378
SD	South Dakota	49.301	123,713	399
TN	Tennessee	373.326	972,549	384
UT	Utah	196.306	582,793	337
VT	Vermont	39.995	92,431	433
WA	Washington	365.092	1,035,347	353
WV	West Virginia	109.957	282,662	389
WI	Wisconsin	331.092	872,436	380
WY	Wyoming	36.163	88,155	410
	Totals	15,834.717		

Table 3 — Total CCS Cost

(\$ Millions)

The column that is particularly significant is the far-right column — Total Cost. This is the Total Cost (in millions of dollars) that each state will have to bear to implement the CCS.

State	Testing	Prof. Dev.	Textbook	Technology	Total
Abr.	Cost	Cost	Cost	Cost	Cost
AL	22.225	91.707	44.643	123.118	281.693
AZ	31.982	100.310	64.482	177.930	374.704
AR	14.247	71.910	28.151	79.221	193.529
CA	185.690	605.938	374.295	1,022.571	2,188.494
CO	24.702	94.735	48.476	136.581	304.494
CT	16.737	84.178	33.132	92.168	226.215
DE	3.763	16.684	7.608	20.837	48.892
DC	2.047	12.300	3.647	11.337	29.331
FL	78.184	354.970	155.810	435.199	1,024.163
GA	49.492	223.838	97.932	275.360	646.622
HI	5.342	22.021	10.784	29.409	67.556
ID	8.200	29.353	16.515	45.178	99.246
IL	62.445	267.411	121.910	347.255	799.021
IN	31.062	120.220	62.427	172.914	386.623
IA	14.596	69.211	28.483	80.275	192.565
KS	13.950	67.006	27.758	76.801	185.515
KY	20.172	85.680	39.328	111.574	256.754
LA	20.504	95.866	39.771	113.945	270.086
ME	5.616	31.427	11.221	30.925	79.189
MD	25.178	112.452	49.594	140.010	327.234
MA	28.378	134.994	56.056	157.866	377.294
MI	48.496	178.986	97.181	266.930	591.593
MS	14.377	63.922	28.961	80.040	187.300
MO	27.243	130.914	53.930	149.971	362.058
MT	4.208	20.316	8.502	23.182	56.208
NV	12.716	42.683	25.557	70.095	151.051
NH	5.850	29.913	11.717	32.235	79.715
NJ	39.909	222.544	79.168	222.036	563.657
NM	9.924	43.880	19.729	55.218	128.751
NY	78.650	414.787	157.198	437.801	1,088.436
NC	44.007	202.844	87.607	242.445	576.903
ND	2.821	16.155	5.689	15.616	40.281
OH	52.359	215.071	104.702	289.916	662.048
OK	19.382	82.411	37.024	107.570	246.387
OR	17.297	55.518	33.932	95.217	201.964
PA	52.929	252.930	106.979	293.147	705.985
RI	4.307	21.946	8.655	23.975	58.883
SC	21.461	90.718	42.110	118.756	273.045
SD	3.671	18.009	7.409	20.212	49.301
TN	28.862	126.212	57.696	160.556	373.326
UT	17.295	49.190	34.563	95.258	196.306
VT	2.743	16.865	5.302	15.085	39.995
WA	30.726	103.208	61.909	169.249	365.092
WV	8.389	39.197	16.233	46.138	109.957
WI	25.891	112.821	50.023	142.357	331.092
WY	2.616	13.838	5.299	14.410	36.163
Totals	1,240.641	5,257.089	2,469.098		

LaVerne Engelhardt

From: Sharon Wenger
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2013 12:16 PM
To: Shanti Gandhi
Cc: LaVerne Engelhardt
Subject: FW: Texas Assessment Costs

Rep. Gandhi:

I received the e-mail below from the Texas Department of Education which is the official verification of the costs of student assessments in Texas.

Sharon

From: Culbertson, DeEtta [<mailto:DeEtta.Culbertson@tea.state.tx.us>]
Sent: Thursday, March 14, 2013 11:24 AM
To: Sharon Wenger
Subject: Texas Assessment Costs

Hi Sharon:

Here is what I have from my files. This includes probably more info that you wanted, but it shows the cost over several years.

Overall the 5-year testing contract for STAAR is just under \$500 million.

Below is the full cost of the Pearson contract for the listed years; the amounts include EOC, Remediation Study Guides (RSG), and Individualized Focus Study Guides (IFSG) etc. The first 3 years below (2000-2003) amounts did not change because they are solely based on the base contract.

2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005
\$39,122,054.00	\$50,208,435.00	\$47,451,455.00	\$58,692,430.00	\$62,641,857.00
2005-2006	2006-2007	2007-2008	2008-2009	2009-2010
\$87,427,757.00	\$100,214,658.00	\$87,260,970.00	\$92,103,116.00	\$85,208,340.00
2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015
\$90,665,041.00	\$89,058,910.00	93,369,544.00	\$96,532,517.00	\$98,766,605.00

Please let me know if you have further questions.

DeEtta