ORANGE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS

SPECIAL MEETING

SPECIAL BOARD MEETING

Costa Mesa, California

Monday, November 17, 2014

Reported by:
MARIA MAHIEU
CSR No. 13260
JOB No. 13758R

ORANGE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE COMMON CORE STATE STANDARDS

SPECIAL MEETING

Special Board Meeting taken at the Orange County Board of Education, 200 Kalmus Drive, Costa Mesa, California, beginning at 6:01 p.m. and ending at 9:37 p.m. on Monday, November 17, 2014, before Maria Mahieu, Certified Shorthand Reporter No. 13260.

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE ORANGE COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION:

Al Mijares, Superintendent
Nina Boyd, Associate Superintendent
Penny Dunseth, Recording Clerk
Linda Lindholm, Member
John W. Bedell, Member
Ken L. Williams, President
Robert M. Hammond, Vice President
David L. Boyd, Member

PANELISTS:

Gerald Solomon
Bill McCallum
Doug Grove
Deborah Brown
Zev Wurman
Sandra Stotsky
James Milgram
Karen Effrem

EXHIBITS

Costa Mesa, California, Monday, November 17, 2014
6:01 p.m. to 9:37 p.m.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: For the record, the Special Meeting of the Orange County Board of Education is called to order. And we will all please stand as we give our pledge of allegiance to the flag led by my good board member, Dr. Bedell.

(Whereupon the pledge of allegiance was performed)

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Role call.

PENNY DUNSETH: Trustee Boyd?

TRUSTEE BOYD: Here.

PENNY DUNSETH: Trustee Hammond?

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Here.

PENNY DUNSETH: Trustee Williams?

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I am present.

PENNY DUNSETH: Trustee Bedell?

TRUSTEE BEDELL: Here.

PENNY DUNSETH: Trustee Lindholm?

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: Here.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: May I have a motion to adopt the agenda for this evening?

TRUSTEE BEDELL: So moved.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Second?

UNKNOWN SPEAKERS: So moved.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Comments?

Being no comments, all in favor, say "I."

TRUSTEE BEDELL: I.

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: I.

TRUSTEE BOYD: I.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: I.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Motion passes five, zero.

Any introductions?

NINA BOYD: There are no introductions.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Good evening and welcome to this second of two public meetings that was approved by this Board in response to public comments about our relatively knew set of national academic standards called Common Core. We welcome our distinguished panel that is here before us. Thank you for taking the time to be here and able to assist us in the effort to better understand Common Core.

Our panelists come from diverse academic backgrounds that are impressive, and they are loaded with experience and knowledge. We deeply appreciate, again, the fact that you're here with us this evening. Throughout this last year, our Board has witnessed comments and statements from the public that dictate further examination of Common Core in this very neutral and academic environment.

While the Board understands that members of the audience may have feelings about Common Core one way or the other, we ask for your courtesy and respect throughout the presentations this evening. This meeting is being recorded and transcribed by a court reporter for the purpose of providing information that will be documented in a paper that will be created by this Board. The October transcripts are already on our website.

This meeting is being held pursuant to the Brown Act, and the members of the public are welcome to listen as we deliberate in the civil academic environment. Please refrain from clapping, booing or any emotional outburst or conduct as this distracts the viewpoint and the dialogue between the Board and our panelists. Please be advised that any untoward activities or comments are in violation of State Education Code 32210 and this State Criminal Penal Code 403. Any violation of these laws may result in potentially being found guilty of a misdemeanor. We pray that you will find this meeting to be very informative.

For the record, a representative from the State Board of Education as well as a member of the State Validation Committee on Common Core State Standards were

invited, but were unable to attend our meeting in October as well as tonight. We welcome all of the public, including good students from my dear colleague, Dr. Bedell, who are here from Cal State Fullerton. Thank you for coming, and you are here to witness the practice of self-governance as well as the exercise of freedom we have as Americans.

Every panelist, my colleagues as elected Board members and every member of the Orange County Department of Education, the staff, we all care about the children and the education in our community. We care about the state of education in our country and what we learn from our U.S. Constitution, how we apply it. We talk and care about critical thinking skills, STEM skills and increasing academic standards. We care about teaching our children to be responsible and informed and involved citizens. We ask that you demonstrate good will and civility and an open mind as we hear from our panel of experts on Common Core. Tonight there are no blue states, red states, Republican, Democrat and Independent or Tea Party members. In this room tonight, we are all Americans.

Moving on with the time certain, at this time we do have public comments. Public comments are limited to three minutes as have been approved by our Board at

an earlier Board meeting. We have been assigning opponents and proponents that have been randomly drawn that will be speaking tonight, and Penny will announce your names. And if your name is announced, we ask that you come up to the podium. We can have a line off to the side here and then you will have three minutes to speak. Our hard working Board secretary and my good friend, Penny, will keep time. She has a device -- show that device. There will be a green light, a yellow light and a red light. You get two minutes with the green light. You get one minute with the yellow and when you get to the red, if you can kind of just around that time, stop. I'll give you a few seconds thereafter, but not a whole lot.

Okay. At this point, Penny, will you give us those chosen for public comments.

PENNY DUNSETH: Candy Plahy. Nick Johnson. Ann Wilson. Jeff Arthur. Allen Katz. Ruth Fant. Wendell Bashaw. Lydia Gutierrez. Shereen Watter and Celia Jaffe.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: By the way, everybody, silence your cell phones. That would be greatly appreciated.

CANDY PLAHY: Good evening. My name is Candy Plahy, and I am the assistant superintendent of

Placentia/Yorba Linda Unified School District, and I stand before you in support of the Common Core State Standards, but I also stand before you as a grandmother of five children that are in the school system, two of them currently in kindergarten. I would like to share with you some of the things that we have noticed differently since we have implemented Common Core. And that would be first and foremost, a very thorough staff development plan went into place. For two years, we've been training our teachers on how to implement the Common Core State Standards.

The standards tell us what to teach, not how to teach. And so the standards when you look at them very carefully, lay out what is expected of a kindergartner and first grader and so forth. Those standards are very clearly understood by our teachers, and there seems to be some misunderstanding that the standards is changing how we teach students to come to the right answers.

I want you to know that with our new change to Common Core, our teachers have strategies that help them with different ways of teaching, but the methods may have changed but the content is the same. Students still need to get to the right answer. It's not acceptable to come up with the wrong answer, but what has changed is there's multiple ways to achieve that

answer so that students who learn in a different way have the opportunity to differentiate the way they understand learning and to take that learning and then explain that to another student. And that student who may not have understood in a high level now gets to hear another student's thinking. That's new to us to take that time and allow those students to do that.

Another thing in the area of math is there seems to be a feeling that we're not preparing our students for higher levels of math. I would share with you that's not correct. If you look at the standards very carefully, the information and content has changed from one grade level to the other, but our students will leave our high schools ready for A through G requirements for a four-year university. Our kids are well-prepared. They are better involved and more engaged in learning and they do know how to look at information and determine whether or not the information is accurate because they've been taught to go back to the original source and to look and make the determination.

In my opinion, in this day of age of instant information and the Internet, it's critical that our students have very good skills in being able to understand what is it that kids -- whether it's true or

not true and how they can go back and verify their sources. There are so many different ways that students can come to an understanding and learning and this has taken them to a new depth of understanding and allowed us to reach more students, allow students to experience instructions. Accelerated learning happens in our classroom so our students working above the standard just like before continue to work above the standards and have the opportunity to.

So from my sake, I would tell you that from my grandchildren, I see a huge difference and I appreciate your time.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you.

PENNY DUNSETH: Nick Johnson.

NICK JOHNSON: Good evening. My name is Nick Johnson. I have worked for the past 15 years in public education as an elementary school teacher, an instructional coach, county office mathematics coordinator and most recently as an education researcher.

But the opinions I express this evening, however, are mine and mine alone. Simply put, the Common Core standards present a tremendous opportunity to reshape the quality of the mathematics student in our schools. In the past, mathematics has been limited to

those who seemingly have been blessed with innate mathematical abilities. For the rest of us, the outlook is bad. And remember when we came to conclusion we were not quote, "math people." This belief, however, that only a few of us can truly understand under mathematics is completely untrue. To those who would investigate this, I would invite you to examine the research of Stanford professor Joe Fuller and the international mathematical studies of UCLA professor, James Stigler and James Hiebert of the University of Delaware.

Unfortunately, some would prey upon the anxieties and the uncertainties by the public when it comes to school mathematics, and it is understandable that many parents and community members may be confused by politics and the conversations that have surrounded Common Core. I have been confused myself at times. Let me be clear on this point: The Common Core State Standards are designed based on what we know about how students learn, a claim that no other set of standards can make. And the Common Core Standards really are our best shot at changing what it means to do math in schools for the better. Thank you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Just to remind the public, no outbursts will be tolerated here, so, please, if you can just be more tempered and civil.

ANN WILSON: Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Your name, please.

ANN WILSON: My name is Angela DeCarlo, but I use my pen name because I'm a journalist and a writer and also a teacher. I'm also a parent and grandparent. I have looked at Common Core as a investigative journalist more than a teacher. I'm from Chicago so I'm highly concerned about the persons who began this program such as terrorist Bill Ayers, Arnie Duncan, who is in Chicago. And anyone who is from Chicago, born and bred as I am, has a deep understanding of how things operate there, and it doesn't produce a feeling of calm and acceptance, to put it mildly.

My investigation into Common Core indicates that the persons that created this were not persons who were concerned primarily about education, but with control, control of the population, control of students. I'm highly disturbed by the term data mining. I'm highly disturbed by the fact that this huge country, the United States, is a very, very big country and there are differences in regions as well as schools and so on. To impose one stamp on everyone according to what these names before now, nameless people, unknown persons, demanded, seems like not a good idea. Americans are

independent. Americans have initiatives. Americans are interested in innovation. Why would parents want to have their children educated at the behest of someone like Bill Ayers? I don't understand it, not at all.

As for the math that's been in the news, again, as a journalist and public relations person, I have come to see that as a smokescreen. Everyone is talking about the crazy math -- who likes it, who doesn't like it, et cetera, et cetera. It has no bearing on the foundation of what's wrong with Common Core, which is the federal control of children -- children's minds, children's learning. So on that basis, that's why I am opposed to it. Thanks very much.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you.

WENDELL BASHAW: Thank you. My name is Wendell Bashaw. I appreciate the opportunity to speak. I'm really nervous. Just real quick -- when I went to school in Orange County, California, it was the fourth highest educational system in the world. I served my country during the war and I got out. I studied chemistry. I had this Firebird with a big block Pontiac motor in it. I used to push that thing a couple blocks to go get gas.

I went on to become a chemical engineer. I came up with an alternate energy source to become a

billionaire. It didn't work because there is so much oil and coal in the mantle of the earth, that there is no alternate process to compete with it.

Now, recently, I was walking in the (inaudible) Reserve. When I was in high school, it was an oil dredge waste. I used to go surfing out there every day.

NINA BOYD: Excuse me, sir, could you move over to the mike. You keep stepping away.

WENDALL BASHAW: I'm sorry.

We used to go surfing out there and I met this young man who said he was a graduate of UC Santa Barbara in biology and I asked what he thought about global warming, and he said, "Well, with increased temperatures and melting of icecaps and increased storms," he believed it. Now, in the 1850's, there was a storm, and it rained in California, and it rained so much, there was a lake in (inaudible) Creek.

The point I asked is, how does the planet grow? And he (inaudible). If you want the greatest country in the world to crumble, if you want a progress to die, if you want to see us do nothing, continue with this silliness. We need to get back to the standards we had when I was a kid. Thank you.

SHEREEN WATTER: My name is Shereen Watter and I am a parent volunteer. I'm also a physical engineer,

and I have an MBA in finance and accounting. My last child graduated from high school last year, so I no longer have kids in the school system. I, of course, hope to have grand kids someday in the school system, but I don't yet.

I'm so excited about the Common Core State Standards. I think they are so -- and so disappointed that they weren't in place when my kids were in school, I have a daughter now who's doing her teaching credential, and she is living back at home and she spends a lot of time with me going through a lot of her training, how she's learning to do guided instruction for math. It's amazing the way that kids are going to be taught to think for themselves, and that's the hugest difference that I see in it. It's not going to teach them facts, it's not going to tell them what they need to know. It's going to tell them how to think, and it's something that our kids are really lacking. So I'm super excited about it. It's going to teach our kids the skills that they need to be successful in a 21st Century world. They need to be college and career ready and I'm just so excited about Standards.

And I attended the last hearing, and I was totally amazed at how much controversy there is over the Common Core State Standards. They're just Standards.

They're a framework. Every school district still has the ability to set their own curriculum. They don't differ that markedly from what they were before, what California standards were before. They're just working on teaching our kids to think differently, to think creatively. So I think they're better. I think they're deeper. I think they'll prepare our students better.

They're not mind control. They're not a federal takeover of the education system. They're not the dumbing down of our curriculum and our standards for our kids, and I really hope that my grand kids get the opportunity to go to school and learn under Common Core State Standards. Thank you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you very much.

CELIA JAFFE: Hi, my name is Celia Jaffe. I had the privilege to be on the panel last time, but since I have two hats, I decided to do a little public speaking on my other half which is as a school board member in Huntington Beach. So I'm speaking as an individual and a school board member. I did a school visit this morning at an elementary school, and I want to tell you what I saw of standards being taught in that school. We had kids -- I saw several different grade levels of kids working on fractions from learning what a numerator and denominator was to using manipulatives to

kind of visualize what dividing decimals means, fifth grade dividing decimals already.

I saw fourth graders reading a magazine article about whales, then having to decide whether they were for or against Japanese whaling and using facts from the article to support whichever stands they took. This is the kind of critical thinking that the Common Core standards are looking for, still covering the main skills and facts that they always have, but it's helping kids approach them with different techniques, different ways of thinking about it, so more kids catch on, so the knowledge they get kind of sinks in more deeply.

These standards were passed four years ago -- over four years ago. They received bipartisan support from the legislature, all the major education associations in the state. Administrators and teachers all over Orange County and all over the State of California are working really hard developing lessons and trying out new instructional materials and the students are getting it. They're working with it. Change is never super easy, but they get enthusiastic about these kinds of lessons. I've got to tell you. I saw it with my own eyes today. I think that politicizing the subject, talking about national politics in terms of it instead of talking about what's

happening in our California classrooms is a disservice to our kids.

California adopts its standards by the State Board of Education, examining them, having experts in the field look at them and then having a public hearing and feedback and then voting on them. That's what they did in the 1990's for previous standards. That's what they did for these standards. We have an open process that was followed four years ago, and we are now all working very hard to implement these, I think, very high quality standards. So let's not be so intimidated by change. Let's not get wrapped up in issues that don't have to do with the students in the classroom and what they're going to come out of their K-12 system knowing and being able to do. That's the focus we have to have.

Everyone's working so hard on these and doing a great job and the progress is happening already and will continue to. It takes time. In the '90s, it took time to put in those standards. These standards are going to take time, but it's worth it.

PENNY DUNSETH: Your time is up.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Celia.

Please state your name.

RUTH FANT: Good evening. My name is Ruth Fant. I have a first grader at Newport Mesa Unified

School District. Superintendent Mijares, Dr. Williams, thank you for the opportunity to express my concerns about Common Core. A document for Common Core standards frequently asked questions from the national PTA appeared on the information table at the October 20th forum. I have just a few minutes to highlight my concerns.

The opening statement declares the CCSS are set up internationally benchmarked K-12 standards. Seriously? Why then four years later have none of us seen these international benchmarks? The next two paragraphs praise the standards for their rigor, clarity and consistency. This, in my opinion, is pure myth. I ask you simply to compare California's prior standards in math, in English Language Arts, and science -- which science is the next standard to be imposed on -- with these new standards. In every academic area, prior California standards exceed new Common Core standards.

The fourth paragraph claims the process was thoughtful and transparent. Then why were members of the Validation Committee required to sign a confidential agreement demanding that they discuss nothing about what happens behind closed doors? Tonight you have the opportunity to hear and question Dr. Sandra Stotsky, Dr. James Milgram, Dr. William McCallum, all of whom

played a crucial role in the development of Common Core. I trust they will address the claims made by the national PTA.

I have one last concern: The national PTA received a grant of two million dollars in 2012 from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. Did this in any way affect their endorsement of Common Core? I submit these comments and other relevant documents. I call your attention to one particular document, a May 28, 2009 letter signed by Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger, California Board of Education president, Ted Mitchell and the California Superintendent of Public Instruction, Jack O'Connell, clearly states that conditions that California would require to accept Common Core. However, none of these conditions were met.

Lastly, I'm not a doctor, but I am a cancer survivor. Common Core to me is like a cancer. And you have cut the cancer out, so you have to cut Common Core out. Thank you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you.

JEFF ARTHUR: Hello, my name is Jeff Arthur. Thank God I went to school in Los Alamitos before Common Core. I took AP Calculus and got four units of credit. And as the chief operation officer, a lot of people talk about how change is tough. I've implemented dozens of

systems, change is tough. But in the business, garbage in, garbage out. Common Core is garbage in. You're going to get garbage out.

So the question that I want to talk about mainly today is, is the Common Core cognitive child abuse? Psychologist Dr. Gary Thompson, who spoke at the first forum, made a bold claim that Common Core is cognitive child abuse. Those of us who heard Dr. Thompson speak the next day, "August" 21st, heard evidence he was not able to present in the time limit he faced on August 20th. What Dr. Thompson did on August 20th was to enter into evidence a body of peer reviewed articles from many sources. I think it was about this thick. You have that research in the record. Dr. Thompson is not the only voice in this challenge of Common Core.

Dr. Mary Calamia's video testimony in New York has been widely reviewed, Dr. Joe Stapp from Georgia. Noteworthy that all three describe the same scenario -- a sudden spike in clients, children in particular, symptoms of difficult behaviors, anxiety, refusal to go to school, cutting, eating disorders, suicidal threats, all testify to one cause -- the institution of Common Core, in particular, the testing component.

More than 500 early child professionals have

signed a document entitled, "A Joint Statement of Early Childhood Health and Education Professionals on Common Core Standards." They state, "We have grave concerns about the Core standards for young children. The proposed standards conflict with compelling new research and cognitive science, neuroscience, child development, and early childhood education about how young children learn, what they need to learn and how best to teach them in kindergarten and the early grades. This document was signed by educators, pediatricians, developmental psychologists, researchers, including many of the prominent members in these fields. A Stanford study describes the importance of memorization in young children and the damage that will be done by Common Core. Is Common Core cognitive child abuse? Consider the evidence. Thank you.

ALLEN KATZ: My name is Allen Katz. I'm a retired engineer. I still keep my license alive. It's a quality engineering license in the state by issuing -- kind of said I'm an expert in things I know about. I grew up in a housing project called Carmelitos in Long Beach. One of my friends once told me, "You're a victim of your environment. You're not going to get anywhere." Well, I earned three degrees in my life. I became a manager of quality assurance at Northrop Grumman. I

traveled the world for a blue ribbon team out of Century City. I've taught for four years at the extension division of Cal State Fullerton. And I think I've gotten into the education of children in a pretty good way that made me feel good and I think it benefits the children. When I was a member of the motivational task force out of Hawthorne, Lawndale, Torrance area for the corporation I worked for, we'd go to the schools, talk to the kids about staying in school, trying to find out what was motivating them to not stay in school and overcome that.

But I found from talking to the students and when I go into a classroom and spend an hour, those of us on the team were told we could ask the teachers to stay or if they chose, to leave the room and I just left it up to them. And I asked the kids to be very honest, "What's your reasoning of thinking about leaving school?" And most of them unequivocally said, "This is so hard. I don't understand it. I'm wasting my time. I'd rather be out making some money. My family is poor."

Well, I think we have to do things in a way that makes kids want to stay in school and learn, and I don't see that learning under Common Core is easy. From what I've heard, it's rather difficult, and I'd just

like to supplement what I'm talking about here that we got permission from the Orange County Register to hand out the leaflets of the reprint of their article and yesterday's paper by columnist James Poulos, and he states that New York Times article recently had a remarkable headline that states to listen to children -- excuse me -- as parents give rampant testing an F. The New York Times revealed an eye-popping detail implementing Common Core isn't just a challenge for government bureaucrats or teachers, it's a daunting, dehumanizing ordeal for parents and children alike.

And the article went on to talk about the parents and how their kids are dealing with it and relating to them, that some wept as they described their teenagers taking Xanax to cope with test stress, children refusing to go to school and teachers who retired rather than promote a culture that seems to value testing over learning.

One other quote out of this, one mother testified about her child in high school who went from loving school to refusing to leave the car in the morning, too tired to sleep --

NINA BOYD: Your time is up.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Thank you, Mr. Katz.

LYDIA GUTIERREZ: Thank you for this

opportunity to speak. My name is Lydia Gutierrez. I am a public schoolteacher, and I've taught nearly 30 years public education. And just to give you a little more of my background, before teaching, I was in aerospace. I was a supervisor in my early 20's. I oversaw contract scheduling and budgets. Presently, I have a Master's degree, two teaching credentials. I'm a bilingual teacher. I have a credential and international baccalaureate. I have a certificate with Cal Poly State University, a reading and literature project certificate from UCLA. I have access to science standards and educational technologist experience. I am also a master teacher for UCLA mathematics teacher and teacher for student teachers.

One of the things that has been hurtful to hear from the administrators in the educational field and teachers themselves, saying we have to wait until the future, we have to see if this is going to work. That right there is validating that it's never been piloted, never been scientifically vetted, proven that it's academically appropriate. If those findings were secure, accurate, then those people would be making comments saying the proof is already present. And there is no proof or there is none present.

One thing that has been -- I find my colleagues

saying that from the last forum that we had there was a young man who stated he was so excited that they were doing (inaudible) grouping, sharing and discussing. That is a method, a method that I've been doing for 30 years. Nothing has changed. What has changed is the continuing mandate of standardized testing.

Since 1979 when Carter opened the door to the US Department of Education has then been the force of our educational experience in the classroom where we have pushed out our -- where we have pushed out PE. Less teachers do PE time where they are drilling their children for the test, the pretest, the posttest, monitoring every child. That has changed public education. Also, we've had -- recall the pendulum swing. We had the whole language approach, if you remember that. We could not teach them phonics. We had to make them feels words so they had comprehension and understanding. Then there was the bilingual approach where we mandated that everyone had to teach a second language. What happened with that was that we had to use people that were inexperienced as educators. We had to use aides to be the teachers.

Then the third one was the 20 to 1. When we went 20 to 1, did you know we actually went down from 43rd to 42nd academically, and the reason why is they

made us do more testing on the children. They did not give us the academic freedom that we needed. Common Core, as I talk today, even though you're going to give me all this training, which I'm going through right now, is still forcing more on the children. And as you heard my experience and my mathematics background, let me tell you, it is more pressure on our children. Thank you.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Any more?

PENNY DUNSETH: That's it.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Wonderful. Moving on with our meeting here, at this point, I would like to introduce our moderator for this evening, Maggie Chidester. She is from the Law Office of Chidester & Associates, and she will introduce our panelists, and she will moderate them from this point. So I will be handing over the gavel. She is much meaner than I am.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Good evening, everyone, and on behalf of the Board of Education and the County Superintendent, welcome and thank you for your very intense interest this evening. We appreciate your interest in hearing diverse viewpoints including some that you may not agree with tonight. We remind you that the opportunity for public comment has now concluded and the Board requests your respectful listening, requests

that you defer any clapping or comments until the conclusion of the meeting.

The format for this evening will be as follows: First, the expert panelists will be introduced, both in support and in opposition to Common Core. The panel in support of Common Core will begin presentations. Each expert will have five minutes to speak. This will be followed by the panel in opposition to the Common Core. Those experts will also have five minutes each. We will then begin our round robin questions and remarks from our trustees this evening. And we will take a break after the first round robin of Board questions and remarks followed by the second.

Last, there will be closing remarks by each panelist, approximately eight minutes per panelist. I would like at this time to introduce to you the distinguished experts that have come to the Board this evening, and I will just reiterate they have all been asked if they have any materials that they would like to present, that they are welcome to do so. Hopefully, it's available on a flash drive for our Board secretary, but if not, obviously we will be glad to accept them so long as they're labeled. We know you have a very short period of time to present and we appreciate you have lots of good things to say and it is not enough time to

say them.

So, the first panel consists of Mr. Gerald Solomon, Mr. Bill McCallum, Dr. Doug Groves and Deborah Brown. And all these speakers, ladies and gentlemen, have long and very distinguished resumes, and I hope the speakers will forgive me for reciting only a few of their accomplishments and qualifications.

Mr. Solomon of the Samueli Foundation is the executive director. He's served in that post since April 2008. Prior to that, he served as CEO of the Public Health Foundation for approximately seven years, transforming that organization at the time of his departure to one that operated in 31 states with 1,500 hundred employees and annual revenues that exceeded 120 million dollars. In his tenure at Samueli, he has achieved many significant goals including refining the strategic plan and establishing the secondary operating foundation titled the Anaheim Ducks Foundation to develop a sports philanthropic approach to address community health disparity issues for use of hockey.

He has developed long-range collaborative community initiatives and local, state and regional networks addressing science technology, engineering and mathematics to education deficiencies within the K-16

curriculum. He serves on many boards and committees, including UCLA School of Engineering and Deans Advisory Counsel, UCI School of Engineering Advisory Counsel, UCI Department of Education Chair and Advisory Committee, Chair of the National STEM Founders Network, Chair of the OC STEM Initiative and many others.

His previous work includes service on numerous boards of directors. He served as president and CEO of several highly successful non-profit organizations and had a distinguished 18-year career as a civil trial attorney and judge pro tem. Mr. Solomon's non-profit experience includes service as president of a child abuse foundation, a director and CEO of a multistate residential and outpatient drug and alcohol treatment program and executive director of the Encinitas Chamber of Commerce. Welcome, Mr. Solomon.

Our second speaker on the pro panel is Dr. William G. McCallum. He's a distinguished university professor of mathematics at the University of Arizona. He was born in Sydney, Australia. He received his Ph.D. in mathematics from Harvard University, spent two years at the University of California Berkeley and one at the Mathematical Science Research Institute in Berkeley prior to joining the faculty at the University of Arizona in 1987. He also joined the Harvard Calculus

Consortium, was the lead author of the Consortium to Multivariable Calculus and College Algebra texts. He has spent time as a scholar at several elite foreign universities. He's received the Directors Awards for distinguished teaching scholars from the National Science Foundation. In 2006, he founded the Institute for Mathematics and Education at the University of Arizona and presently serves as its director. In 2009, '10, he was one of the lead writers for the Common Core State Standards in mathematics. Welcome, Dr. McCallum.

Our next distinguished expert on the pro panel is Dr. Doug Grove. Dr. Grove is the assistant provost for adult graduate and online education at Concordia University in Irvine. As assistant provost, he plays a significant administrative role in developing online and blending programs and courses, faculty development in online teaching and coordinating efforts between the business office marketing, adult and graduate admissions and provost's office. He was appointed as assistant provost of adult graduates in online learning in July of 2013, also holding a faculty position in the school of education.

Dr. Grove holds a Bachelor's degree in English from Concordia University, a Master's degree in technology from Pepperdine University and a Master's in

Science in leadership from California State University at Fullerton and Ph.D. in education from Claremont Graduate University. He is experienced in his educational evaluation, including management of numerous state and federal grants, totaling more than 12 million dollars in research. He has four peer-reviewed journal publications, published book chapters, three published books, and 46 presentations that he has done domestically. He has also served as a high school assistant principal, coordinator of the county office assessment unit and school board member. Welcome, Dr. Grove.

Now I'm pleased to read to you the qualifications of Ms. Deborah Brown, Associate Director of Education Policy for Children Now. Ms. Brown has engaged in a wide-range capacity relative to education budgeting, legislation and policy issues over 15 years. For Children Now, she helps implement an education policy agenda, including the organization's work on school finance reform, learning opportunities and early childhood readiness. She was previously a senior legislative advocate at California State School Boards Association and was their lead advocate on funding and finance.

Ms. Brown helped to draft CSBA legislative

priorities, advocated at the state capitol, wrote numerous budget and legislative updates and policy briefs and presented in numerous forums. She served as a project manager for an advocacy consulting firm, working on a variety of policy-related issues including accountability, curriculum and instruction. She holds a Bachelor's degree in history from the San Francisco State University. Welcome, Ms. Brown.

I have so many qualifications from this expert panel, I stop to make sure I'm attributing the right expertise to each one.

Now, the panel in opposition to the Common Core, I would like to introduce Zev Wurman. Mr. Wurman of the Hoover Institution from 2012 to date, also a visiting scholar at Stanford University. He served at the United States Department of Education from 2007 until 2009 as a senior policy advisor at the Office of Planning Evaluation and Policy Development. He has written numerous policy briefs, data analysis reports and presentations and summarized educational research. He's advised the Assistant Secretary of Education on issues in K-12 education with a focus on the assessment, accountability, English Language Learners, educational technology, student data systems, math and science instruction and APE in human resource development

activities focused on math and sciences. He's published numerous articles and opinioned editorials as well as professional press pieces. He's a frequently invited speaker on the topic of Common Core since at least 2011. He served as commissioner of California Academic Content Standard Commission in 2010, a member of teaching mathematics advisory panel for the California Commission on Teacher Credentials in the 2009, '10 school years.

He served as US delegate to a 2008 symposium in China, organized the first US, China bilateral mathematics education expert meeting. He is a member of the California Mathematic Framework Committee, member of the LAUSD Mathematic textbook adoption committee in the year 2000.

He has held numerous positions demonstrating his engineering experience. He holds a Bachelor of Science from the Israel Institute of Technology and has a Master's degree from the same Institution. He also has to his credit 16 United States patents. Welcome, very much, Mr. Wurman.

I'd like to welcome Dr. Sandra Stotsky of the International Dyslexia Association and a pioneer institute senator for school reform. Dr. Stotsky is credited with developing one of the country's strongest sets of academic standards for K-12 students as well as

strongest academic standards in licensure testing for prospective teachers while she served as senior associate commissioner in the Massachusetts Department of Education from 1999 until 2003. She's nationally known for her in-depth analysis of issues with Common Core, English Language Arts standards. Her current research ranges from deficiencies in teacher preparation programs and teacher licensure tests to deficiencies in the K-12 reading curriculum and the question of gender bias in the curriculum. She's regularly invited to testify or submit testimony to state boards of education and state legislatures on bills that address licensure tests, licensure standards and Common Core standards.

She serves on several committees for the International Dyslexia Association and on the Advisory Board for the pioneer centers, institute centers for school reform. Her major publications include The Death and Resurrection of a Coherent Literature Curriculum, the literary study in grades 9, 10 and 11, a national survey, What's at Stake in the K-12 Standard Wars: A Primer for Educational Policy. Welcome, Dr. Stotsky.

I'd like to welcome R. James Milgram. Mr. Milgram holds a Bachelor's degree from the University of Chicago, a Master's in Science degree from the same institution and a Ph.D. from the University of

Minnesota. He has held distinguished visiting professor -- distinguished visiting professor provisions positioned in many institutions including in France, China, Barcelona, Montreal, Switzerland, also domestically. From 1970 until present, he has served as a professor of mathematics at Stanford University. Welcome Dr. Milgram.

Last, but certainly not least, may I introduce Dr. Karen Effrem of the Education Liberty Watch. Dr. Effrem is a pediatrician, a researcher and a conference speaker. She holds a medical degree from John Hopkin's University and has her pediatric training from the University of Minnesota. She's provided testimony for congress as well as in-depth analysis of numerous pieces of major federal education health and early childhood legislation for congressional staff and for legislatures and many organizations. She serves on boards of national organizations such as Education Liberty Watch and Alliance for Human Research Protection. She's been interviewed by Fox News and interviewed and quoted in the Washington and British Medical Journal, the National Journal, World Net Daily, Newsmax and other forums. Welcome, Dr. Effrem.

Without further ado, so you don't have to listen to me, I would like to now commence with our

panel of experts in support of the Common Core and ask Mr. Solomon, would you like to begin.

GERALD SOLOMON: Thank you very much. Members of the Board and Superintendent Mijares, thank you very much for the opportunity to be here. I appreciate what this great country is all about which gives us the opportunity to share and to be able to dialogue matters that are important to our communities. So who am I, why am I here? I'm here, first and foremost, besides being head of the foundation of an organization called the Orange County STEM Initiative, comprised of philanthropic and business and community leaders ranging from United Way to the Children and Family Commission to Boeing, Kaiser Hospital, (inaudible), Broadcom, and numerous others.

Our objective is simply to provide students the ability to have the 21st Century skills they need in order to be competitive, to provide for teachers the set of competencies to teach children and to have the Orange County community work for us to be leaders in both California and in the country. I also served as chair of the national STEM Network made up of organizations such as Motorola, Pactel, Packard, and a number of other organizations deeply committed to the education of our community with the similar objective as what we do on a

local level.

From a funder's perspective, we're deeply involved in funding educational initiatives, especially partnering with the national academies such as the K-12 science framework, the integrated STEM report. STEM is a report (inaudible) cross collaboration on learning and partnering with change the equation. At a state level, we have funded, and I personally served on NGSS adopting a communications strategy committee, co-chaired the tenure STEM education blueprints. I'm deeply involved in our after school learning about STEM education and served on the California Department of Ed Foundation Board of Directors.

I am not a researcher, and I am not an academician like my learned colleagues who are here before me. I am a parent, and I am a citizen who's deeply concerned and motivated by what is best for our children. My presentation will focus on the challenges of problems through the lens of business and STEM, why Common Core, especially math, is critically important to support STEM and then in my closing remarks around opportunities of what STEM provides and what Common Core provides with that.

So how did we get here? A little interesting story I like to tell when I talk to people is when you

go back many, many years ago when we were in an agrarian society, we had to really forge for ourselves. We had to learn, we had to experiment, we had to innovate, we had to create. We had to be entrepreneurs and then with the rise of the industrial revolution, we became an assembly line society with rote memorization and repetitive activity as the norm. That's what our society as an industry did. Then recently, not too long ago, we moved -- we moved backwards in the sense that we have gone back to the need for entrepreneurship and innovation, what we call now the innovative societies of the future.

Unfortunately, our educational system has not kept up with that speed of what's necessary to meet workforce needs. The evidence, we believe, demonstrates that. I'll highlight for a minute a little bit from a report called "Rise Above the Gathering Storm," commissioned in 2005, later revised in 2010, whose purpose was to go ahead and study America's competitiveness in a new global workforce in a marketplace. Unfortunately, when it was revised and looked at five years post, the committee unanimously viewed that the national outlook was unfortunately worse off than it was five years preceding the outstanding activities that have been performed.

Let me share some facts, and this is how we view things. 30 years ago, 10 percent of California's general fund went to higher education, 3 percent to prisons. Today, 11 percent goes to prisons and 8 percent goes to education. In 2009, 51 percent of the US patents were awarded to non-US companies. In 2005, the number of foreign students studying physical sciences and engineering in the United States for the first time surpassed US students, and it has risen ever since.

China has now replaced the United States for number one high technology exporters. China's Tsinghua and Peking University are the two of the largest suppliers of students who receive Ph.D.'s in the United States. Since 1995, the United States' world shipment of (inaudible) of just 40 percent to well under 10 percent, but the overall market has grown by 100X. Almost one third of the US's manufacturing companies have said in a recent survey that the employees lack the requisite skills necessary to be competitive. According to the (inaudible), 78 percent of high school graduates do not meet the readiness benchmarks for one or more of the college-entry level courses in math, science and English.

40 percent of the current job vacancies in

Orange County require STEM skills. Broadcom is one company, for example, who has over 10,000 employees, of which 7,000 are engineers, and the same is true for many other companies that exist in this community. From our perspective, what we are looking at and what we need is a change in the way we teach our children. And I will use my concluding remarks to share the opportunities. Thank you.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much, Mr. Solomon. Dr. McCallum, would you like to present.

BILL McCALLUM: Thank you very much for the opportunity. You've already given my credentials, so I won't repeat those.

But I do want to say in addition to the mathematics research of the university teaching that I have done, I have been involved in K-12 education for 20 years. During that time, I've come to be known in the mathematics and in the mathematics education communities as someone that can be trusted to care about both the rigor of the mathematics curriculum and about how children learn. And when I was asked to lead the work team to write the Common Core State Standards in mathematics, I decided to use that trust, knowledge and experience to the utmost. I saw a once in a lifetime opportunity to improve our children's education for

college and career and to give them the mathematics education they deserve and need in order to prosper. I wanted to help build a world where people know, use and enjoy mathematics. Our children are no less capable than the children of other countries. They can meet high standards and they deserve the opportunity to do so.

I want to talk a little bit about the principal on which Common Core was designed, and there were three shifts to the standards over previous state standards -- focus, coherence and rigor. First, what do I mean by focus? Focus means not trying to do everything at once. US standards around 2009 were criticized as being a mile wide and an inch deep, the result of too many pet topics crammed into too many grades. The Common Core restores focus and gives teachers the time to concentrate on what is important so their students are ready for the next grade. For example, the strong focus in the standards in the early grades is on arithmetic. Arithmetic is an important life skill as well as a thinking subject and a rehearsal for Algebra in the middle grades.

What do I mean by coherence? Coherence is about making mathematics make sense. Mathematics should not seem like a sequence of disconnected tricks. It should be like a story in which ideas grow naturally on

a trellis of sound basic principals such as place, value and the properties of operations.

Focus and coherence together also imply teaching students to draw on what they know and make connections instead of turning every single thing into its own separate topic. Some important topics in arithmetic in the Common Core were removed earlier, and that was previously the case in many state standards. For example, fluency was -- two digit addition was moved from grade 3 to grade 2, while others were moved later. Division and fractions were moved from grade 5 to grade 6. Taken as a whole, the reorganization of topics replaces this plate piled high smorgasbord approach of previous standards for the carefully thought out sequence of courses. This represents a smartening up of the curriculum.

As for rigor, the Common Core receives full marks for content and rigor in a 2010 review by the Fordham Institute. It calls for rigorous balance in what we seek to instill in students -- mathematics students during the K-12 years. Conceptual understanding, procedural skills, fluency and application are all required by the standards.

I'd like to talk a little bit of what is meant by college and career readiness and how the standards

prepare students for college. The definition of college readiness in the standards is readiness for entry level, credit bearing courses in mathematics at four-year colleges as well as courses in two-year colleges that transfer for credit of four-year colleges.

From the beginning, we knew that this meant the high school standards would have to have three years of mathematics at the level of Algebra II -- up to the level of Algebra II. But college readiness and STEM readiness are two different things. Standards have confused this difference. The mathematical demands that students facing college have will vary on whether they're pursuing a STEM major or not. Students who intend to pursue a STEM major in college should know what is required. That was true before the Common Core, and it remains true today. States still can and still should provide a pathway to calculus for all students who are prepared to succeed on that pathway. Not only because it's the heart of many STEM fields, but being a mathematician, I have to say, calculus is one of the greatest intellectual developments in human history.

The Common Core has every promise of increasing the number of students in our country who actually attain the levels of performance. Just because the Common Core standards end with Algebra II, it doesn't

mean the high school curriculum is supposed to end there. California, for example, had calculus standards before it adopted Common Core, and it still has them now as it should. The difference in California today is that better standards can help more of California's students gain the strong foundation they need in calculus. Thank you.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much, Dr. McCallum.

Dr. Grove.

DOUG GROVE: Thank you. Good evening, Honorable Trustees, Superintendent, my fellow panelists and the public attendees. Thank you for the nice introduction that you gave this evening. I had the opportunity to spend half of my career in K-12 public education and the other half in Christian higher education. My career has also allowed me to serve as an evaluator on over 20 educational programs nationwide, including the programs funded by the National Science Foundation, the United States Department of Education and the California Department of Education.

The focus of my evaluation work has largely been around looking at programs and seeing how they impact student achievement. I'm also a parent of a sophomore in community college here in California --

Long Beach City College, and I am also the parent of a child at Newport Harbor High School. Go Sailors.

My comments this evening will focus mainly on higher education, teacher training and assessments related to Common Core. There's no doubt that a gap continues to exist between high school graduation and college readiness. Even at Concordia University where the incoming average grade point average is 3.3, a third of our freshman are getting remediation in English and mathematics.

Common Core Standards were adopted to address this issue not only in California, but also for students nationwide. College readiness is not only a freshman college student problem, but it eventually becomes a problem for a six-year graduation rates from colleges. It is a high debt with no degree problem. It is a loan default problem, and it is a career opportunity problem. Students entering college requiring remediation are more likely to not finish college, drop out early and default on college loans.

What we are doing now to remedy these problems is not working. Higher education leaders from the UC system, the CSU system, California community colleges and the Association of Independent California Colleges and Universities endorse the Common Core as a step

toward better preparing students for high education in the workforce. These higher education systems are aligning teacher preparation programs, administrator preparation programs, support and reenforce the implementation of the Common Core. Yes, the Common Core is about a concerted effort to minimize the gap between high school and higher education, but also to prepare a large number of non-college bound students for the work force. Let's not forget those non-college bound students.

I hear too often that students come to our university and they lack the ability to think critically, and I also hear how often my business associates have issues with hiring high school graduates and college students that do not have a prerequisite set of skills. We have to provide an education system that produces students to think critically, analyze information, apply skills to real life scenarios and most importantly, find the joy in applying what they have learned now in the future. The promise in the Common Core related to the alignment of the early assessment program and Smarter Balance consortium, having conducted these studies on student achievement continues to baffle me that we place so much emphasis on one test at the end of the school year taken by a number

of students who will have little motivation to perform.

I am reminded of a conversation with my son when he was in high school and he was taking the California standards test. I told him that I thought his test scores are looking pretty low and asked him what was the problem. He responded to me that he did not take the test seriously but wanted to finish reading "A Brave New World." He also made a comment to me that he doesn't understand how those test scores really affect his grades in school. Having assessments that actually mean something to students and provide a purview to college and career readiness could go a long way toward increasing motivation to perform. Smarter balance assessments, refocusing assessments discussion away from what the newspaper prints and back to the kinds of formative assessments in classes that teachers use on a daily basis to help us understand learning standards.

When I want to understand what my child is doing in school, I don't look at their standardized test score, I talk to their teachers and ask the teacher to provide evidence that demonstrates my child is learning. My hope -- and maybe it won't happen this evening -- is that we can move off this rhetoric and unite to move collaboratively with the Common Core. Too many students

continue to fall through the cracks not being ready for college or the workforce. There's no perfect solution to fixing our education system and standards remain only one aspect of a very complex system. I want to thank you again for allowing me to speak this evening.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much Mr. Grove.

Ms. Brown.

DEBORAH BROWN: Good evening, President Williams, Board Members and Superintendent Mijares and members of the audience. I appreciate this opportunity to have this important conversation about Common Core and thank you for including us in this debate. My name is Deborah Brown, and I'm here on behalf of Children Now. We are the leading non-partisan research policy development advocacy organization dedicated to promoting children's health and education in California, including national media policies that support child development.

And while I haven't had as much experience in academia as my colleagues, I have had over 15 years in state policy work, and I've had the fortune to work for two wonderful organizations that have really been dedicated and focused on doing what is best for kids, and so that's the perspective I come with today. I also happen to be the mother of two elementary schoolchildren

who in -- and therefore I experience Common Core on a daily basis, and work with them as they do their work and talk with them about their experiences in school.

So I'm going to talk about a little about how California is different than other states, and how really as a state, I think we're a model in how we should be implementing this. The adoption of the standards in California, I think, has brought with it many exciting opportunities to refocus what was happening in classrooms and to begin a new dialogue about the skills our students have so they will be successful in their life after high school which is what we want for them.

The standards are a set of learning goals that work grade by grade and step by step toward what colleges and employers expect, putting our students on a path toward success. The Common Core standards were approved back in 2010 by California policymakers on a bipartisan basis with widespread support from educators and a wide range of stakeholders. Our government is part of the National Governors Association and our Superintendent of Public Instruction is part of the counsel of Chief State School Officers and had requested development of what became the Common Core standards and were naturally supportive of them when they were

developed. By 2010, the standards that were developed in the mid 90's were going to need some revision and Common Core was an efficient approach to that. The state then made some amendments to the Common Core Standards and adopting to the standards when we adopted them. And since that time as a state we have not only embrace this standards but have become a leader in implementing in the fact we dove head first right from the beginning.

We have as a state and our policymakers have set up the adoption timeline to ensure the districts and schools they need successful incomplete standards. This includes adopting new frameworks that clearly articulated their expectations for students learning and these are guides for teachers. It helps them also help us speed up the timeline for textbook instructional materials development. And these guides have in fact become the model as to what students should be learning, what we should be taught and how to teach that for each subject. We also as a state in 2013 provided 1.25 billion dollars for local districts to help implement the Common Core standards. The districts were left with a fair amount of flexibility to determine their own needs. And just last month, the governor signed legislation that strengthened data protections

for our students.

Additionally, the legislature and the state board recognized that making fundamentals decisions to incorporate English Language development standards and the English Language Arts framework and we have done that, ensuring our over 1.4 million dollars -- 4 million English learners will have the opportunity to become fluid in English at the same time they are mastering standards. While the standards don't require all students to go through all math courses, California has ensured our version of the standards allows for student to go through calculus.

The state has two routes through high school math -- Algebra I, Geometry, Algebra II or Integrated Math I, II, and III. This is followed by AP probability and statistics for AP calculus. While those standards don't require all these advanced math courses, they still facilitate taking them to high school students interested in attending college in the STEM field.

Because we have it in the state, we do see there is quite a bit of support for the Common Core standards. We see that from the education leaders, all of the major statewide organizations representing teachers, school board members and the folks that are in the field all support the standards 100 percent.

We also see parents who -- higher education also supports the standards which we've seen recently with the letters from the leaders of the four major statewide systems demonstrating their strong support. I did provide copies of that letter. Businesses also support the Common Core standards because they do see it as a way to ensure that students of all backgrounds will have the skills to succeed in an increasingly competitive marketplace and businesses will have a competent workforce to draw upon. Equity groups also support the standards because they do see they're designed to reduce disparities in the classroom. Too much valuable classroom time has been spent on drills and test prep. I will finish up at closing arguments. Thank you.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you, Ms. Brown.

That concludes opening remarks from the panel in support of the Common Core. We will now turn to the experts in opposition beginning with Mr. Wurman.

ZEV WURMAN: Good evening, Mr. President, Members of the Board, Superintendent, I want to address three key points. First is that the quality of expectations of the Common Core mathematics is incomparable with and lagging behind, that of high achieving nations. This comes across from every

academic study that has been done of them since their publication in 2010 except one. The only study that did find Common Core mathematics comparable to that of high achieving nations done by Professor William Schmidt is based on flawed coding of Common Core and on misrepresentation of their organization and coherence that borders on scientific malpractice. This has been documented in a report that I authored for the Pioneer Institute, and that is attached to my testimony.

My second point is that Common Core delays early Algebra taken by grade 8 that has been supported by the Presidential Nation Mathematic Advisory Panel, by civil rights leaders, and by our previous California standards. Indeed, early Algebra taking has been supported by the progenitors of the Common Core itself just a year prior to the release and has been used to justify its creation. Yet, inexplicably, Common Core eventually pushed Algebra I to the high school.

The evidence I submitted to this Board clearly shows that minority students and students from challenging backgrounds were the prime beneficiaries of early Algebra taking over the last 15 years in California. And their progress and success over those years far exceed the success of white students, closing the gap the way it should be closed -- by raising the

bottom rather than squashing the top.

My final point is that the California Academic Content Standards Commission, which I was a member of, recognized this deficiency in the rigor of Common Core in 2010 and added Algebra I as an alternative set of standards for grade 8 in California and their recommendation was adopted by the State Board of Education then. Two and a half years later, the State Board of Education removed this alternate set of Algebra 1 set of standards for grade 8 in California under the guise of technical changes that were supposed to maintain, quote, "the rigor of the state of Common Core academic content standards in mathematics." Unfortunately, the resulting California Common Core Standards thus became delayed by at least one full year from the previous 1997 California Standards, thus retarding the progress of California students.

California Board of Education had expressed the sentiment that acceleration should continue to be provided to interested and prepared students, to enable them to take early Algebra. Yet the State Board did not detail such or fund such acceleration in middle schools across the state, thus effectively leaving acceleration to students' families. Clearly, this mode of acceleration paid by students' families will result in

drastic reduction in acceleration of minority and disadvantaged students. To aggravate this situation, the new 2013 California Mathematics Framework as approved by the State Board directly and explicitly exhorts educators that acceleration should not be rushed, that acceleration in the middle grades requires solid evidence of mastery of prerequisite Common Core. Standards. Why only middle school? Don't high school students need mastery too before they move forward? All Common Core standards no matter how minor, need to be included in the accelerated programs as if the standards were given from Mount Sinai. The Framework that exhorts not to sacrifice attention to the quite meaningless and content-empty standards for mathematical practice. In other words, the Framework seems to intentionally discourage schools and districts from acceleration. And indeed, all across the state we start to hear about middle school Algebra enrollment dropping from 60 percent 70 and 80 to as low as less than 10 percent in some districts. This is not an aberration. This is a direct and correct result of grading the new California mathematics framework and standards. Thank you.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much.

Dr. Stotsky.

SANDRA STOTSKY: Thank you for the opportunity

to speak at this hearing. I am going to use my three major points for not signing off on Common Core standards while I was a member of the Validation Committee as the frame for my comments. First of all, Common Core is English Language Arts standards which I focused on during the year that I was on Common Core's Validation Committee are not internationally benchmarked. During the year that I was on the Validation Committee, I kept asking for evidence of international comparability to high-achieving countries that used English. I never got crosswalks or comparisons or even the names of the country. And frankly, in six years, I have still not seen any crosswalks or names of countries with which the English Language Arts standards that Common Core produced might be compared.

I did my own research that year and found the Standards from Ireland, from British Columbia, from Alberta, Canada, areas that do use English and Common Core standards, in no way compared.

The second point that I did not sign off on for was that the standards are not rigorous and I'm going to give you an example from your own old English Language Arts Standards in California, a document that I consulted with when it was being done. It was

considered one of the best sets of English Language Arts standards in the country.

Here is a typical standard in the literature section: Students are to analyze, recognize works of world literature from a variety of authors, first sub-objective, contrast the major literary forms, techniques and characteristics of the major literary periods. For example, Homeric Greece, medieval romantic, neoclassic and modern. Second sub-objective relates literary work, (inaudible) authors to the major themes and issues of their eras. Why is that a good standard? It is a standard because it aims for the literary historical knowledge that one would want all high school students before they graduate from high school to attain. It doesn't pin down the teachers, and English teachers above all, like autonomy. It doesn't pin down English teachers to any specific work, but it guides them and the assessment developers to specific areas of the curriculum so that students can become educated and knowledgeable about the evolution of the English language.

Now to show you what a Common Core literature standards is like in contrast, let me read a literature standard for grades 9 and 10 which asks students to determine a theme or central idea of a text and analyze

in detail its development over the course of the text including how it emerges and is shaped and refined by the specific details; semicolon, provide an objective summary of the text. It is a very poor sentence. No good English teacher would have ever allowed that sentence to remain as a standard. I presented it to over 24 literary scholars, college level, and they immediately spotted that it was a self-contradictory sentence. You can't provide an objective summary of a text and at the same time, do all the other activities which require interpretation of the text, and it requires too many different things in one statement.

So we have a non-rigorous set of ELA standards that in no way compare to what you had before. Finally, I am an academic researcher, and my background is reading research. These standards were in no way research-based no matter how much the writers of these standards have claimed they were. There are basically no developmental progressions from 6 to 12 which means increasing level of difficulty, conceptual as well as reading difficulty of the works themselves that might be required.

But first of all, the major problem has been the division of the standards into informational reading, something English teachers have never been

responsible for and nine literary studies in every grade level from K to 12. This is not supported by any research whatsoever. It was made up and it's been imposed on every school system in this country. I will finish the rest of the problems with the research in my closing remarks. Thank you.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you, Dr. Stotsky.

Dr. James Milgram.

JAMES MILGRAM: Thank you, gentlemen and members of this distinguished Board for the opportunity to speak here. And let me start by saying that in the last two weeks throughout California, we have talked with thousands of educated parents and they were all scared to death by the math their kids were bringing home. Here's the thing you need to do know: Sometimes an ill-informed school official, such as a principal, curriculum developer or superintendent may tell a parent, "Of course you don't get it. We're teaching new 21st Century math as well as higher order reasoning skills." The problem with that is that math is math. It's the same as it was a thousand years ago and the same as it was two thousand years ago and the same as it will be a thousand years in the future. In math, higher order reasoning skills only come from deep subject matter knowledge and very hard work. So don't believe

these people. It's nonsense.

So Zev Wurman mentioned the bilateral conference with China, and I was one of the US representatives there at this conference. China gave us the copies of their -- advanced copies of their new mathematics standards. Wow. These are the real deal, what 21st Century standards need to be. And ours on the other hand, they're Common Core. So as regards to that, in 1992, we had a set of standards that created a disaster in California. And today we're hearing the same exact words we heard then and the same programs we had then are coming back. So welcome to California in 1992.

As to the Common Core itself, I was the only math content expert on the National Validation Committee in charge of verifying research underlying every standards, adding those research-based standards necessary if they are missing and removing those that are not adequately research based. By default, I interacted most closely with the mathematics lead writer's of the mathematic standards. They were Professor William McCallum over there, Professor Jason Zimba and Mr. Philip Daro. None except Daro have any experience writing standards, and they made somewhat of a hash of it. Daro had a string of catastrophic

standards to his credit starting with the 1992 California standards. And so we're not doing so well there, are we?

At a certain point, the Validation Committee suddenly had all of its authority removed, the authority I described earlier. And as a result, the Common Core standards were never validated by us. But California, by law, requires strong research-based standards for California. So in reality, our standards are not research-based and the problems that we are seeing with them are real and we would better reconsider what we're doing.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you, Dr. Milligram.

Dr. Effrem?

KAREN EFFREM: Thank you, distinguished Members of the Board. It is an honor to be here and having worked with education policy in a number of states, I really want to commend you for your willingness to take such a deliberate-balanced approach to this very important question.

I also want to thank my fellow panelists on both sides of the issue, and I would like to thank the audience and the people that were willing to ask me to come.

I see five major problems with the Common Core

and three main ones. One of the main ones is that they are academically inferior. Since we have three other people on my side that are national experts on the quality of the standards, I am going to leave that alone except to say that if David Coleman, one of the chief architects of the English standards, said that he was unqualified to write them, if Jason Zimba, one of the chief architects of the math standards said that they are inadequate for STEM majors in selective four-year universities, and if Bill Gates, one of the national funders, chief funders and proponents, says that we probably won't know if this is experiment is going to work for another 10 years, we probably have a problem.

The second major issue I want to discuss is the developmentally inappropriateness of the standards. As was mentioned earlier in the public comments, psychologists and pediatricians and doctors of all kinds are seeing a huge spike in stress, anxiety, depression, school refusal, stomach and headaches, self mutilation, et cetera, of both students and actually significant concerns by teachers. And we need to ask why. Children are being expected in English to have a strong literary background in first or second grade in order to derive conclusions from texts. They are being asked to behave as adult members of corporate boards in their

discussions, which is completely not appropriate for little children.

One of the anchor math standards is for them to reason abstractly from K through 12. That is not adequate. It is not appropriate. Children do not develop that skill, that ability to reason abstractly much before the third grade and many until later. They're using non-standard algorithms for teaching math. This is a huge problem for teachers. It is a problem for students, and it is a problem for parents because math is starting to take so much time. There is such a process orientation to the math that it is destroying family time because they are being told to do it 15 different ways from Sunday instead of just the simplest.

One of the chief math analysts for the American Institute for Research, Steve Leinwand -- and AIR is writing the computer adaptive questions for SBAC, your test provider, basically admitted that Common Core is a national curriculum, and he also said parents have to get over their obsession with the right answer and have to spend too much time on process. That is another real problem. And young children are being asked to manipulate computers, computer mouse drag and drop and things that they are just not ready to do. So that's

another problem.

Both psychologist and content experts say that these are developmentally inappropriate. That is another problem. The Gisele Child Development Institute and 500 early childhood experts across the country are having problems. So I will talk about the other problems in my concluding remarks. Thank you.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you Dr. Effrem.

At this time, we will begin our round robin of questions and remarks by our trustees. I asked the trustees if you will kindly name the speaker that your question is addressed to, if it's addressed to a panel. And members, would you please kindly identify yourself so the audience is aware of who is speaking.

Trustee Lindholm, would you like to begin?

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: Yes, thank you.

First, thank you all for coming and taking time out from your busy schedules. I'd like to thank our superintendent for being here as well as our Board members. And what an esteemed group of panelists. It is a pleasure to have you with your very in-depth background. I'm here because I wanted to have an open forum where we can have a very good discussion for people with all kinds of opinions on the issue. And that was my purpose to have this forum. I also want to

make sure that our teachers know and our principals know that we think they are doing an excellent job. This is coming to them and they're the ones firsthand in our schools, and I can't thank them enough for all they do.

My question has -- I get a lot of comments from parents regarding mathematics so that's where I'm going to go with this one. I'd like to ask, if you'd be so kind, Dr. Bill McCallum -- and my question has to do -- many parents say it's very convoluted. You get 2 times 4 and it goes on and on and on with models and drawings and visualizations. Is that absolutely necessary? Why is that occurring? It is one of the biggest complaints I get, so I'm asking on behalf of the parents.

BILL McCALLUM: I think too much of it is occurring. I think parents have a right to help their kids with their homework, and I think kids should be doing at home --that the work they're taking home should be that part of what they're learning that their parents can help them with, and there's plenty of that in Common Core. Common Core requires fluency with standards algorithms for addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. It's one of the very first set of standards to require explicitly fluency. So why can't people be practicing that at home? That's the sort of thing that

their parents can help with.

A lot of these things that people are sending home I think are overeager attempts to embrace some of the reasoning requirements in the standards. A lot of those activities -- well, some of them are just bad. But a lot of them, even the ones that are good, I think are activities that require a professional classroom facilitator like the teacher. Also, I think there's often a confusion that these activities are viewed as different ways of getting the answer, whereas more often what they are is ways of understanding the number system, understanding that they will lead you to fluency with procedures. So I am fully -- I completely understand this frustration, and I think it could be a better balance between what goes on in the classroom and what is sent home with the kids.

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: For the parents who are involved in this, how can they make a change?

BILL McCALLUM: Well, of course, parents -- there's always the local school district, the local school board, the principal. I would encourage parents to look at the materials that their schools are using. There are many, many people out there claiming -- everyone put the Common Core stamp on their materials and to see whether they really are aligned. I think

that we need more support for parents. We need more support for teachers in implementing the standards. I think children can do mathematics at the level required by Common Core, and think we can help parents help children do the mathematics.

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: Thank you. Thank you very much.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you, Trustee Lindholm.

Trustee Bedell?

TRUSTEE BEDELL: Thank you. Trustee Lindholm took the words out of my mouth with her question.

Sue and I have -- my question is for you, Dr. McCallum. Sue and I have a delightful, delightful, nine-year old boy grandson who is a superb athlete, unlike his grandfather, but is a strong B student in general. And when he multiplies eight numbers, nine numbers, whatever, he gets the right answer 100 percent of the time. He gets sheets and sheets of 100. He comes home with Common Core math, 40 percent. I go to his soccer game, my son says, "Dad, we've got to do something with this Common Core." I'm getting it at home.

I really respect your body of work. It seems to me what you're talking about, maybe we really need to up the staff development, teacher development and

parental workshops. Is that what I'm hearing you say?

BILL McCALLUM: I certainly think that would help. I also think it would help to know what's in the Common Core. The Common Core requires that children should know their math facts, their multiplication facts from memory by the end of grade 3. Your son should be honored -- your grandson should be honored for knowing that. I hate when I see these situations where the teacher is saying, "Well, you know, good that you know that. Good to know that you -- we want you to do it this way."

I think there's actually a fundamental misconception there about Common Core. Common Core wants students to understand what they're doing, and a good way to do that is to have multiple methods available to them. That's not the same thing as requiring every single method be used. It's a bit like when you go to work, you could take a bus, a train. You could bike, you could walk, you could drive. Everybody understands that those are choices. Nobody believes that every single morning you have to bus, train, ride, drive or walk. And I think sometimes there's a misconception of this multiple method approach.

TRUSTEE BEDELL: I have a question for anybody. We have frequently heard that this is top down

Obama-Core or something like that. This is federal control of local control. Can somebody address -- fact or fiction? Karen.

KAREN EFFREM: The tests, SBAC and PARCC, are federally funded. They have a review panel within the test that are actually through the Federal Department of Education overseeing the development of test questions. That is a huge concern as far as states sovereignty and constitutionality as well as violating three federal laws that says that the federal government should not be involved. So, yes.

In addition, there are multiple university professors who have admitted that Common Core tests and the content drive curriculum -- if you have tests that are federally funded and federally supervised, yes, you are going to have federal interference with curriculum. It is just the way it is.

ZEV WURMAN: If I may continue on this point. Linda Darling-Hammond of Lompoc, California, one of the leaders of the smarter balance consortium. Sh frequently refers to the fact that she expects the tests to drive instruction in the classroom. This is different from the past when the test was supposed to evaluate knowledge of students. She repeatedly stated on the record that this is intending to drive

instruction in the classroom. The test is coming from Washington. Make whatever you want of it.

TRUSTEE BEDELL: I don't know how many seconds I have, but -- Deborah?

DEBORAH BROWN: I just wanted to add that as far as the federal intrusion, I think the activities which are just some of the things that state has done goes to speak that this is something that the state has taken ownership over, certainly the standards in all the work and investment that we've made in it speaks to it being an investment that the state is making and not federal.

KAREN EFFREM: However, the Memorandum of Understanding, you have to understand and Race to the Top to get the money absolutely requires the signature saying that they would not alter more than 15 percent of the standards. That is the agreement that each state signed with the federal government.

DOUG GROVE: California didn't sign.

TRUSTEE BEDELL: California did not sign Race to the Top.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We didn't get the money.

TRUSTEE BEDELL: Because we didn't comply with what they want.

ZEV WURMAN: No, no. We didn't get enough

points. We didn't score enough points.

SANDRA STOTSKY: I would also like to mention very quickly that there's no mechanism for changing these standards. Whatever complaints there are, the basic standards must be the same, and so there is no state control of these standards or local control of these standards. No mechanism for privately copyrighted standards is available.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you, Dr. Stotsky.

Trustee Williams.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I had a lot of questions, but this conversation is very lively. Continue, Dr. Stotsky on that point, these standards cannot change, cannot be amended. Is that of a national level? And is that at the state level? And I don't understand --

SANDRA STOTSKY: This was the idea behind a Common Core, and these standards in memos of understanding often had to be explicitly adopted verbatim. They have been -- they've undergone name changes in many states. They're called the Florida Sunshine Standards, the Pennsylvania Academic Standards, the Alaska Academic Standards. They all have a new name, but when you look at the standards, they are mainly cut and paste from Common Core. They may take

out examples in parentheses. There are little ways to try to do something so that they don't look quite exactly like the STEM that is available. But the whole point behind it was to have the same standards, and the test items may even be to some extent the same on the variety of the tests that will be Common Core based for determining the grade 11 college readiness level.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: What was the comment you were making about the copyright issue?

SANDRA STOTSKY: The standards were developed by two private organizations in Washington D.C., and they copyrighted it -- the National Governors Association and the chief state school officers. There's a big copyright.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Is that good or bad though?

SANDRA STOTSKY: Well, it's bad in the sense that if they are privately copyrighted, you cannot use a copyrighted set of standards to change them without permission of those who own them. That's the nature of private copyrights. They may say you can add 15 percent, so you can do something at the top, something at the end of the document, but the standards are basically the same. Even if teachers want to revise them and want to have a timely or routine regular revision of them in a state, you really end up with

basically the same standards as happened at least in Indiana and has happened in a few other states.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: So what you're saying is that what happens at the top of the national standards, the Common Core standards, which you're a part of but you didn't like, you did not sign off on; is that correct?

SANDRA STOTSKY: Uh-huh. They're national standards --

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: So they're copyrighted, and the State of California took those copyrighted standards and created their own standards?

You're nodding, Mr. Wurman.

ZEV WURMAN: They ended a few sentences throughout K-12. We sat on this document for many days and there were minor -- handful of additions basically, but any time you wanted to do something, you apply yes, but you don't get tested on the test, so should we push it? Does it make sense? Who cares, in a sense. We added very few standards in ELA. We added more content in high school for Common Core from California that was deficient, plus the Algebra in grade 8, but as I said number one, Algebra (inaudible) as the state board and supplemented K-7 to support Algebra in grade 8 students.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: And that's because your

commission's capacity to make decisions is power --

ZEV WURMAN: We had the authority. However, there was a lot of resistance to do anything in K-7 because the annual testing. The grade 8 Algebra was essentially dictated from the governor's office who said if it's not as rigorous as previous standards which is typically symbolized by the Algebra in grade 8, I will not sign it. So forced to take to grade 8, but they refuse to go anything below that.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: You did not sign it, you voted against it?

ZEV WURMAN: Right.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: We invited the State Board of Education here to answer that because I'd like to know why but they won't.

Dr. Effrem, earlier we talked about two articles I wrote in 2013, and I appreciate your kind comments. Did you disagree with any of the contents within those two articles? And let me go specifically to what the Sutherland Institute wrote: "Standards drive and influence curriculum, pedagogy, assessments, instructional materials, accountability systems and more."

Do you agree with that statement?

KAREN EFFREM: I agree with that statement, and

that has been affirmed both by the federal panel that is reviewing the test questions for PARCC and SBAC, and it has been affirmed by multiple professors, particularly at the University of Tennessee, and it has been affirmed by Bill Gates, who is thrilled that this is going to be driving contents.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I only have a few seconds left. It just turned red. Okay.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Trustee Hammond?

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Thank you very much. First two questions from -- Dr. Milgram, it appears that the presidents of all the major mathematical societies within the CBMS Conference, Board of Mathematical Sciences, have endorsed Common Core. How can you just apply your criticisms based on all the support, sir?

JAMES MILGRAM: Thank you. Well, let me answer that as follows: I happen to have here a document that was leaked to us by a certain president of one of the conference board societies that did not sign that letter, and it's a very, very interesting document. The appendices here make it clear that the support statement was to be signed by the president of the CMBS. A member of the society says, "A personal expression of support, not on behalf of their organizations, but it was also clear that the presidents were to be identified by means

of their organizations, not academic affiliation. Nor were they asked to review the Common Core standards, but rather to provide a promotional statement for the Common Core."

And I have here the two documents, and can I give them to you later for distribution to the Board.

PENNY DUNSETH: Yes.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Can you name them for clarification purposes?

JAMES MILGRAM: The exhibit is entitled "Those Mathematical Societies that Supposedly Endorse Common Core Standards Didn't."

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: All right.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Just for the record, that would be what Exhibit?

NINA BOYD: Et al.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Dr. McCallum, in early 2010, it appears you said the math Common Core standards are not what we aspired for our children. Tonight you're promoting those standards. There seems to be a bit of a contradiction here. Can you explain, please.

BILL McCALLUM: Yeah, I never said that about the Common Core State Standards. I've seen that quote misused, out of context many times in many places. That was at a talk I gave in the January of 2010 joint

meeting of the American Mathematical Society and Mathematical Association of America, and I had a question from the audience from one Zev Wurman who was talking about a different document and expressing his fear that document was going to mean that the Common Core State Standards would not go about Algebra I, and if you actually go and listen to the audiotape that someone took of me saying that, you'll see what I'm saying is no, we do want the Common Core State Standards to go above the level of Algebra. That is our intention. That has always been our intention. And you don't need to go back to January of 2010 to analyze these words to see what ended up being in the Common Core State Standards in June of 2008, because you can just read the standards.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Thank you very much.

Mr. Solomon, will math Common Core standards better serve our students in general and minority disadvantaged students in particular? And why or why not?

GERALD SOLOMON: From the business perspective, part of the challenge is how do we allow for everyone to have the same opportunity to be gainfully employed. What we look at, and again, look at it through the business of the STEM lens, this will provide equal

opportunity where people can gain the skills that we talk about which are critical thinking, collaboration, the ability to analyze and understand and that's a collaborative effort. That's a team effort -- the way you have to learn in order to be competitive with 21st Century skills.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Mr. Wurman, same question.

ZEV WURMAN: Our track record over the last 15 years shows that we increased in the successful completion of high-level courses in our high schools by minorities and by disadvantaged students much faster than by white populated students. However, all of them increased significantly their success. In fact, even the entry-level (inaudible) dropped from over 50 percent remediation to less than 30 percent. Why? The number of (inaudible) clearly it was (inaudible) early Algebra going their way.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Thank you.

Ms. Brown, it appears it will take -- I've heard people say -- about 10 years before we know if this implementation of Common Core standards will be successful. Do you believe this is some type of experimentation on our kids?

DEBORAH BROWN: I don't think it's an experimentation in a negative way. I think it's trying

to explore -- it's trying to explore the best way -- we had the standards from 15 years ago, and there were ways that those fell short, and so we are learning from those. And certainly in California, it's taking on new ways of learning and helping kids learn which is important.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Can I have about 15 more seconds since you ate mine up?

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Sure.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Dr. Stotsky, I'm going to ask the same question. About 10 years before we really know about the Common Core Standards if they're successful, do you feel it's an experimentation on the kids? Why or why not?

SANDRA STOTSKY: There is no reason to have any experimentation at all. California standards in all four major subjects were among the best in the country and most of them were similar to the Massachusetts standards for which we have a lot of empirical evidence. You have had population changes and other issues, particularly schools of education which I'll get to in my closing remarks, to deal with in California. But the Massachusetts standards which were the model for the ELA standards in California has helped boost Massachusetts students to the top on almost every test we know -- on

NAEP and then internationally in math and science. And there is no reason not to expect those previous California standards to be just as good, particularly when you look at the quality of the individual standards as well as the organizations. There's a lot more to be said, but I don't want to go into a whole lecture here.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you, Dr. Stotsky.

Trustee Boyd?

TRUSTEE BOYD: Thank you. I wish we had more time to listen to you and for people who are interested in particularly for these three individuals, there are numerous videos on the web where you had 30, 40 minutes, an hour to more clearly define standards.

SANDRA STOTSKY: The details are very important.

TRUSTEE BOYD: And if Mr. Katz is still here, our public speaker, I would like to meet him afterwards. I also grew up in Carmelitos in North Long Beach.

Question to the three professors, the anti-Common Core professors. I hate to throw a label on it, because I'm assuming you don't hate everything about Common Core, and you don't agree with everything about Common Core, but that's the label. Has there ever been a time in the United States where everybody agreed on what the standards should be or what learning outcomes

should be? Isn't this an ongoing debate?

SANDRA STOTSKY: Actually, we did have much closer agreement in 1890. And yes they did have pretty good agreement on what was required for getting into what they were concerned about, and that was the Ivy Leagues at that time and that's the beginning.

TRUSTEE BOYD: Where I'm going with this -- I only have five minutes myself -- it is a situation now, and all three of you certainly have great academic credentials and great careers, but reasonable people with equal credentials can disagree. And they're not bad people, are they? They just have a different view of things, and that's what we get at the Board all the time. You can't just simply be against or for Common Core, you have to be a bad person. And we hear that time after time after time.

Last month we had one of our presenters make a comment about Bill Gates and it has come up again tonight. And his quote was, "We should shut down Common Core and stop making Bill Gates wealthy." Well, it's clear that the Gates Foundation did provide a significant amount of funds for Common Core, if not all. That's not in dispute. But do you think the Gates Foundation is an evil organization?

SANDRA STOTSKY: No.

TRUSTEE BOYD: That's my point.

SANDRA STOTSKY: The question is whether it's a qualified organization.

TRUSTEE BOYD: Okay. It was not too long ago that no private organization in the world has done more in the last decade to help children around the world than the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, as spoken by the Pope. And George Bush and Bill Clinton have expressed similar views. So I'm hoping no one here thinks that the Gates Foundation is in it for the money. I don't think Bill really needs the money.

So the debate we have between the opposing forces here is really healthy. It's healthy that you were selected to be on the committees that assist us. They could have excluded you altogether.

SANDRA STOTSKY: They tried.

TRUSTEE BOYD: So the debate is a healthy debate as long as the facts are not misrepresented.

ZEV WURMAN: But that's exactly the point. I look at the Common Core that they are all great people with good intentions. However, the policies and the standards imposed reflect the intention, not empirical evidence, and that's a problem. We have California records for 15 years. We had the '92 standards that brought us to the bottom of the states and we had a long

way to climb from there, not like Massachusetts that started (inaudible) to go to the top. We're now about in the middle. It took us 15 years to get there. We are throwing it overboard.

TRUSTEE BOYD: Thank you all. How much time do I have?

This is to Dr. Effrem. I'm reading a quote here. You tell me if it's an accurate representation of your views.

Effrem says "Common Core creates a womb-to-tomb dossier and includes between 300 and 400 different data points such as parents voting rights, religious affiliation, medical data, newborn screening and genetic data." Does that sound familiar?

KAREN EFFREM: It does sound familiar.

TRUSTEE BOYD: And that's your view?

KAREN EFFREM: That is my view.

TRUSTEE BOYD: Now, we're talking about Common Core. I've spent a lot of time on the Common Core website, and I don't see anything about data mining. Am I not clicking to the right page?

KAREN EFFREM: The standards themselves have nothing to do with data mining, but the tests do.

TRUSTEE BOYD: That's my point. Your quote was that Common Core creates this and that's a

misrepresentation and a lot of people who are in this room are --

KAREN EFFREM: The Common Core system does.

TRUSTEE BOYD: -- here because they're concerned about data mining. Aren't we talking about two different issues? We're talking about the Common Core State Standards and what the federal government may or may not be doing with respect to obtaining data.

KAREN EFFREM: You cannot have the Common Core standards without the accompanying assessments. You don't know where the assessments are going unless you do data. Part of what I'm going to talk about in my concluding remarks is the fact that both PARCC and SBAC have signed agreements in their memoranda of understanding with the federal government that they will give individual student-level data on the tests -- not anonymous, not aggregated data, but individual data on these tests, and the standards are psychologically oriented which I will further elucidate in my comments.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you, Dr. Effrem.

Trustee Lindholm?

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: I was looking at the clock. This is time for them to have the break.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: We're going to be taking a break at this time for about 10 minutes, and we'll start

immediately at 8:14.

(Recess.)

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Ladies and gentlemen, we will now resume our trustees round robin questions and comments.

Trustee Lindholm.

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: The question I want to ask at this point has to do with the assessments that are coming up and the money that's being spent on the firms that will be doing the assessments. I think that's kind of something as an elective that concerns me that there's a track of considerable amount of money depending on which article I'm reading whether it's -- this one has about two -- no, about a billion dollars. It's a contract with the testing agency. This one says 2.46 billion dollars a years testing market. Aside and apart from the Common Core, are the funds that are being spent for the testing agencies, those are different than the teachers used in the classroom, those are -- that's different from the standards that have been developed and there's quite a bit of funding in competition.

Would any of you like to address that? Yes, Doctor.

KAREN EFFREM: In Florida, we switched from PARCC to AIR, so we had to spend another 220 million

dollars to get new tests and then still have to spend another 5 million dollars to rent and field test questions from Utah, which is a completely democratically different population. Really a problem. In my concluding remarks -- unless you want to hear some of it now, AIR is very problematic because they are much more oriented toward psychobehavioral testing and research than they are academics and that is something that every school board member, every legislator and every state should be particularly concerned about.

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: And, Dr. Wurman?

ZEV WURMAN: I would like to point out, I have been on the oversight committee, so I'm pretty familiar with the testing issues in public education. We spent in California $20.00 per child for the STAR test. Then the new test from the consortium would be around 35 depending if you use paper or computer. However, the $35 does not include about $50 per testing student annually for the technology. That is the cost of the computer, then is the organization and the support, you name it. So we are going to pay about three times, maybe a bit more for testing. So that's just information. I'm not saying anything. Now, quality of the test, I already mentioned that Linda Darling-Hammond expressed her interest in having a test that would

affect how teachers are teaching in the classroom, not how students are doing. There's a completely different goal. There will be issues of liability, but test is not so much about getting the right answer, but it's not point. The point is to show the process, because the process will indicate whether teachers teach the right process in the classroom. That's what it's about. It's a completely new way of testing. If you are waiting for that, good. If not, that's not a problem.

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: Question for -- go ahead, please.

DEBORAH BROWN: I want to add that the technology aside, the issue with the $35, that's actually for the full set of tests. It's not for the end of the year. It's for the formative assessments.

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: Dr. McCallum.

BILL McCALLUM: I just had a quick correction to make about AIR. They're not writing the questions for Smarter Balance. They designed the platform, but the questions are coming from many different companies, also from the state (inaudible) in the Smarter Balance to writing questions.

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: So you're saying AIR is the technology end of this?

BILL McCALLUM: The actual questions themselves

from coming from CTB/McGraw-Hill. Smarter Balance has a process of engaging teachers member states to write questions so some of questions come from there.

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: Question for -- I have a question for all of you. The State of California was ranked 43rd nationally in education, 47th in science. When we look at Common Core, I think it was an attempt to improve that ranking. How do you see us going around when we are ranked 43rd?

ZEV WURMAN: Excuse me for saying this, but I don't think the data is not what you are showing. We moved from 49 currently to around 70-something in mathematics over the last 15 years. If you account for the demographic change which is a huge increase in the Latino population that tends to have lower achievement initially and a decrease in white population, we actually climbed somewhere around 30-something or so. We are the lower end of the middle of pack.

TRUSTEE LINDHOLM: Thank you. I think my time is up. Thank you.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Trustee Bedell.

TRUSTEE BEDELL: Thank you very much, Maggie.

At a recent board meeting on a 3 to 2 vote, this Board voted to approve 1.4 million dollars for Common Core funding of technology for our unique

students. This Board is responsible for about 9,500 juvenile hall children, all sorts of unique children outside the traditional mainframe of what people would be in the regular classroom.

What would have happened it the vote had flipped the other way and we voted no, we're not going to take this money for technology for our unique kids. We're not going to take this money for technology for our unique kids, keeping in mind that thousands of them go back to districts who are implementing Common Core. To me, it was a moral argument, but that's a different story. What would have happened if we said, "No, hell no, we're not taking this money"?

Because I know of no Board in the United States that has spent the time on hearings. Since April of 2013, we've been dealing with Common Core. I know of no Board in the United States that has done that at all, even come close in many cases. So I'd like from the panel, what would have happened to our unique children if we said no?

ZEV WURMAN: In my experience, we're not (inaudible) to the common California law. School districts now get essentially all of their money -- not categorical money, but block grants for local control association, and nothing would have happened. I'm sure

some would scream, but nothing would have happened because the money is part of the block grant, and spend it the way you feel it should be spent and as long as your results will not drop drastically, you are okay.

TRUSTEE BEDELL: Interesting. Do the rest of you agree with that?

DEBORAH BROWN: I think we're talking about two different things here. When we talk about the local control funding formula and then we talk about the block grant funding that the state provided for districts to spend however they wanted for Common Core implementation, I think that's the block that you're talking about. That's separate from the local control funding formula. And you have to have a plan that you needed to send. Right now there's no provision if you didn't spend the money that you had to spend the money according to the plan that you adopted.

ZEV WURMAN: And as long as the money is spent on some kind of standard, nobody -- it's part of your local authority.

TRUSTEE BEDELL: How am I doing? I'll pass.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Okay. Continuing on in my previous first round, I mentioned two articles that were in the Orange County Register. I've got it them and will enter them as exhibits, so it will be whatever

number it is. I'll go ahead and give those to you.

Also, I have the -- well, the question is, how does Common Core affect people? It is the people who elected us. We serve people in the constituents. I have 14 affidavits signed by public school teachers, private school teachers, parents, who for one reason or another, have given an example of why they are being negatively impacted by Common Core. And many of these are from parents within our own program as well as other individuals here in Orange County. So there's 14 of them. So I will again enter into the record that they are being negatively impacted.

Going to another issue if I can just real quickly ask Mrs. Brown -- has the Gates Foundation -- please, if this is not true, let me know. Did they receive some money -- or has your Children Now ever received money from the Gates Foundation to promote Common Core?

DEBORAH BROWN: Yeah, we've received money from lots of different foundations to support the work that we do.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: But answer specifically -- did Gates give money to promote Common Core?

DEBORAH BROWN: Yes, we do get Gates money for Common Core.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: How much is that?

DEBORAH BROWN: I don't know that that's appropriate to be talking about here.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Continuing on.

Zev, you gave the example of our standards in 1992 when California was near the bottom. And then you said that we got up to midway?

ZEV WURMAN: About midway. The '92 framework was (inaudible) out of the Common Core and therefore, a couple years later California ended up next to the last on the nape of the standards. Always joke, thank God for Mississippi. We had nowhere to go, nowhere to go. The backlash called 1997 Standards which were indeed demanding, rigorous, and they realized that it will take time, then we started to climb up.

I have data in my report I submitted to show this. We started to climb out of the hole and ended up somewhere like lower center, not lower. Which is about 15, 20 percent up. Not great, but we are on the way.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: We had the standards, and we were on the way. We're not quite where Massachusetts is. And so now we're abandoning those standards to take on Common Core standards. Is that --

ZEV WURMAN: That is correct. The evidence that I have that I presented to the Board shows that all

of this essentially was triggered by this early Algebra taking, not that that itself is important, except it enabled more challenging courses in high school, repeated if necessary of high schools, and there are clear data showing that the drop in remediation while allowing to enroll in CSU.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Dr. Stotsky, you were in Massachusetts and you were part of their education standards; is that correct?

SANDRA STOTSKY: Uh-huh.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: How can California get to where Massachusetts is?

SANDRA STOTSKY: Well, the first thing is by restoring sets of Standards that it had that were among the best in the country in English, math and science, which the Board of Ed just dumped and not let your history standards be corrupted by whatever the Board is planning to do, the Board of Ed, with history. But that's only the first step. The second step has to be the school of education. You've got to change those. There is no way you can do a lot more as were able to do in Massachusetts without changing teacher licensing regulations and teacher licensing tests. That's a good piece of it. Something has to happen with the preparation of your teachers.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: I have about 30 seconds left. For Dr. Effrem, the individual data mining was really quite disturbing especially as we see what's going on with the government. What you were testifying to was private organizations wanting individual, not aggregate or some areas -- but individual data?

KAREN EFFREM: Well, first of all, the PARCC and SBAC signed a memorandum of understanding to say they would give individual data to the federal government. That's one thing.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Is there a document that you could get?

KAREN EFFREM: Yes, and it's in my 22 pages of footnoted references. The other issue is that FERPA, Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act has been gutted to the point that any organization that does any kind of checking or validation or anything associated with education can also get data.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: The reason I ask this is because our department intimately got involved in this. I keep on asking my good friend Dr. Hittenberger if he knows anything about this data mining. He says, "No, we're not date mining."

ZEV WURMAN: You're not. The feds are.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: How are they doing it? Tell

me so we can stop it here at this department.

ZEV WURMAN: Can I answer?

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: Yes.

ZEV WURMAN: You cannot unless you dump any of the consortia tests because the consortia has integrated -- they will transfer the data. So we now have a new in California to protect our privacy, but useless though because as long as you use Smarter Balance or PARCC, they have a prior obligation to transfer all individual students data to the federal government. Now, the federal government has its own plans, and that's (inaudible). They get the data now -- Health and Human Services, you name it, everybody can get it as long as you use the right word.

Consequently, the (inaudible) is wonderful, except that it's useless. As long as we use wonderful socialism. You go directly to another vendor, no problem. As long as you use one of the consortia, (inaudible) excellent or you use them, your data will get to Washington, what they do is not up to you.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you, Mr. Wurman.

Trustee Hammond.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Here we go. Ms. Brown, about the testing -- this is simply a yes or no. The SBAC testing appears to be all online. Do you have any

concerns about this testing?

DEBORAH BROWN: Generally, no. I think it's going to be a challenge as we do take on these new challenges with the new tests, particularly the technology-based SBAC. But I think the information that we yield will be better than what we got from the fill-in-the-blank bubble tests and will be a more reliable and accurate assessment of how kids are doing.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Thank you very much.

Mr. Grove, do you know when was the date that the Common Core State Standards were actually finalized?

DOUG GROVE: It was 2010, but I don't know the exact date.

June 6th, my colleague just said. That's illegal on a test, by the way.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: June 6th, is that what you're saying?

DOUG GROVE: Yes.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Thank you very much.

Dr. Stotsky, does that sound right?

SANDRA STOTSKY: They were released on June 2.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Released on June 2nd?

SANDRA STOTSKY: 2010.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Dr. Solomon, the national PTA states the Common Core State Standards are

internationally benchmarked. When were these internationally benchmarked, if you know, sir?

GERALD SOLOMON: I don't. As I indicated, I'm not a mathematician. I would have to defer to my colleagues to respond to that.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: You're sitting next to him, so I'll direct it to you.

BILL McCALLUM: The process for the math standards is that we look at international standards all the way through the process of writing them very carefully, in particular the standards of high achieving countries -- Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore. We also looked at the best state standards and every time we had to make a decision about grade placement or we were given advice, we would always check back against those standards.

Now, those countries and states don't always agree with each other, so this process cannot simply be a process of say, "Well, let's do it that (inaudible)." We took advantage of a document that was produced by Steve Leinwand and Al Ginsburg that did a synthesis not on Korea and Singapore. That was a very good way of trying to synthesize the recommendations.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: When was that done?

BILL McCALLUM: It was a publication -- it was

called Standards of Hong Kong. What America Can Learn from these Standards.

We also kept a very close eye on the California Standards and the Massachusetts Standards. We knew and agreed those were among the best in the country, and we tried very hard to make sure --

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Just more about internationally though.

Dr. Milgram, same question: Are these internationally benchmarked?

JAMES MILGRAM: Yes, if you understand the word benchmarked in the formal sense. They looked at the international standards certainly, but they very, very seldom put these standards in the corresponding positions. Typically -- in fact almost without exception -- our standards on the Common Core are two or more years behind those of the countries to which we are supposed to be comparing.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Dr. Stotsky, do you believe the ELA standards have been internationally benchmarked?

SANDRA STOTSKY: No, they're not internationally benchmarked. They're really not standards. They're skills, which presents a different problem. The example was one that I read. A skill can be applied, as I read off one, to "Moby Dick" or to

"Three Little Pigs." The content is what matters, and Common Core's ELA standards provide really no guide to the level of content or the reading difficulty of the skill. So you can't internationally benchmark except to say you can find skills all over the world in some form at some rate.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Mr. Grove, if what Dr. Stotsky says is correct, that the ELA standards have not been internationally benchmarked, California Code Section 60605.8, we have to use -- our standards shall be internationally benchmarked. If the ELA standards have not been internationally benchmarked, how do we justify using them?

DOUG GROVE: I think it goes back to how we define benchmarked. So I think Dr. Stotsky is giving you one definition of benchmarked and Dr. McCallum gave you another definition of benchmarked.

TRUSTEE HAMMOND: Please, Doctor.

BILL McCALLUM: Can I just add something to that. This claim is two years behind I've heard repeatedly from Jim Milgram. I have not seen any evidence for it. There is evidence for alignment. William Schmidt, who's an expert in international mathematics performance, previous director of the (inaudible) Study compared the Common Core State

Standards in high performing countries up through grade 8. There's peer-reviewed research by the pioneers. The agreement was found to be high and more of no -- those states previous standards were close to matching high performing countries that the Common Core State Standards and that includes California.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you, Dr. McCallum.

Trustee Boyd.

TRUSTEE BOYD: Thank you.

How many on the panel are past school board members? Didn't we have a couple? Weren't you, Sandra?

SANDRA STOTSKY: State board.

TRUSTEE BOYD: Okay. At last month's meeting, one of our anti-Common Core folks -- and I hate to use that label, but that's how he was labeled. Hugh Hewitt said, and I quote, "I know for the record that I'm not an opponent of Common Core." But what he encouraged the Board to do is to file a lawsuit against the federal government on some constitutional grounds to void Common Core here in California. Do you think that's a proper function of this county Board? To give you a little bit more background this issue came up six or nine months ago. At that point in time, we did get estimates from law firms on what that might cost, and it was somewhere 800,000 and a million dollars. We don't have that in

our budget. Do you think that's something we should talk about in the future, suing the federal government?

SANDRA STOTSKY: It would be a question of what your goal is. If you want to provide first-rate standards for your students, that you can do at a local level, as I understand the California code. And you can direct teachers to develop the curriculum that addresses those first rate standards or to return to the kind of curriculum that addressed first rate standards. Now, if Sacramento is going to say they are going to withhold money, then the question is call their bluff. Can they really do it? Is that in the code? Or do you need a lawsuit against Sacramento? I'm not sure what a lawsuit by a county Board against the federal government would be, but I'm not a lawyer.

TRUSTEE BOYD: That makes two of us.

Anybody else care to comment on that?

ZEV WURMAN: For the state to sue the federal government, there would have been a report done by the three -- two top lawyers, former lawyers of the US Department of Education. They basically found the case that the department overreached, and the (inaudible) federal laws of the constitution.

TRUSTEE BOYD: I guess that gets back to my original question. Is that something we as a Board

should pursue given our limited resources?

ZEV WURMAN: You're not state, you are local.

TRUSTEE BOYD: Okay. With that, I'm done, Mr. President.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you, members of the Board of Trustees. At this time, I want to thank the audience for your attention. I will direct your attention for the closing remarks of both panels. Each speaker will have a maximum of eight minutes. We will begin with the panel in support of the Common Core and Mr. Solomon.

GERALD SOLOMON: Thank you, Mr. President and Members of the Board, Superintendent. For a lay person like me, I have to say it's an interesting experience. Thank you for the opportunity. We are in a juncture with the economic history of this country and within this community. I'll remind you why we're here. Our tests for the 34 top economies in the world, we're 17th in reading, 20th in science, 27th in math. We have similar poor performance on (inaudible), and it's been that way for more than a decade.

The report by Tony (inaudible) about the future workforce that by 20, 20 employment requires STEM knowledge and skills whereby professional services within the STEM field project an increase for 29 percent

in opportunity. In computer sciences, over 47 percent. In technology skills, over 58 percent. We currently have more than 50 percent of STEM jobs that do not require Bachelor's degrees. There's really an opportunity for many, many people of all backgrounds to be able to participate. STEM jobs earn on average more than 11 percent of non-STEM jobs. STEM jobs earn more than $250,000 over a lifetime of STEM employment. 15 of the top 20 growing occupations require significant math and science. The National Association of Manufacturers, 67 percent of the respondents said they don't have enough skilled employees within the STEM fields with mathematical (inaudible).

In Orange County, we have created recently the first ever Orange County business counsel. I'd like to share some of the findings around why STEM is so critical, and mathematics is a core component of that. In Orange County, our workforce in STEM comprises of 21 percent of the total economy within Orange County. The annual average salary of a STEM degree is $55,500 versus non-STEM of $36,000. Over 40 percent of all job vacancies require STEM in math skills. If we were to look at what we project out for 10 years within STEM disciplines and learning and people who have degrees and science and mathematics, a doubling of our STEM

graduation rate in the next 10 years, would increase our labor pool economy by over 900 million dollars in Orange County with a multiplier effect impact -- with an economic impact of over 1.7 billion dollars and generates over 2 billion dollars in economic capacity within Orange County. Our tax rate alone would be $465 million dollars over those 10 years.

I would suggest that what we are doing is no longer relevant, that we have a change as we've alluded to in how our citizenry needs to learn, grow, innovate and be part of the 21st Century economic development in this country and this community. As is science is the art of observation and assessment, technology provides tools for needs, and as engineering teaches us how to solve problems in a fashion, it is mathematics that is the universal language that codifies and describes relationships, data and function. It is no longer sufficient to simply memorize sequences and formulas, but the jobs of our future in an innovative economy require the ability to analyze, infer, extrapolate reason, understand, work collaboratively and it really is a grounding in real world life experiences.

Common Core, especially Common Core math does that. Let me try to share a little bit by way of some analogies that may make a little more sense. It did for

me when I first heard it. And that is from a systems perspective, the changes that we're talking about is like remodeling. It's keeping a valuable asset, taking that which is outdated and changing that, but keeping that which is most valuable. Remodeling involves change. It's not just painting.

When you look at remodeling, it's not complete rebuilds. It's about targeting changes to ways that can make a difference based upon evidence. And, yes, it does require some temporary inconvenience. There is always dust. There is always noise, but the benefit is significant.

From a student's perspective, think of it in terms of you were cooking and cooking with information. Children need to know how to use information like cooks. Use the ingredients -- select, evaluate and combine ingredients. They need to be able to actively participate, use tools and solve problems, and yet they need to be able to get their hands dirty.

Information is like an ingredient. It involves analysis, application of concepts and blending ideas. Why does it matter? Because I think we have the same common goal, we want to be able to raise children who can get good jobs, support a family and make a good living and be good contributors to society. That's what

we're all trying to able to do. Our modern workforce needs people who can solve complex problems, can communicate and work in teams. It needs to be agile and adaptive and need to have updated skills to meet the demands of where this country and this local community is going. We can't afford to do it in an updated system which is no longer relevant.

Common Core, simply put, provides for our students to be critical thinkers and to be college and career ready. It provides life skills in a way that allows them to communicate and collaborate and really plain and simply allows them to stand on their own two feet. Businesses need skilled workers, and they need them now. There's a shortage and Common Core math provides the opportunity to acquire the skills that are necessary for today's economy and for the 21st Century workplace.

On behalf of the employees and the employers, rather, of this community, we encourage you to be supportive of Common Core. Thank you.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much, Mr. Solomon.

Dr. McCallum, your concluding remarks, please.

BILL McCALLUM: Thanks very much. I want to just say a little at the beginning about what standards

are, and what they are not. Standards are expectations for what children should know at the end of each grade level, what they should be able to do, what they should understand. Standards are not assessments and standards are not curriculum. Assessment and curriculum, of course, are built on standards. You start with your expectations and then you build out from there.

A lot of what we've heard tonight has been about assessment, and I think it's a very healthy development with this country starting to question the conjoining of standards and assessments that have been in place since the No Child Left Behind Law enacted by the Bush administration. I think a lot of the debate is about that. I think it's a very healthy debate.

But let's suppose for a moment that all of that testing goes away, and I think that's something a lot of people in this room would like to happen. Let's suppose the struggle between states and federal government turns the other way with the power of the Federal Department of Education to determine testing goes away, we are still going to have to know what we want our kids to know and understand and be able to do at the end of each grade level. Parents are going to want to know that for their kids. We are still going to have to have standards. The Common Core State Standards say that

kids should learn to add fractions with like denominators in grade 4 and add fractions with unlike denominators in grade 5. I apologize for mentioning addition and fractions which I know incites terror in the hearts of many people.

If you decide to dump the Common Core, if the states decides to write its own standards, what's it going to do? Move it half a grade level, down a grade level? Is it going to do it in the other order? None of this make sense. There's just lots of structure in mathematics. As Jim said, it's a 2,000 year old subject. That's structure largely determines a progression if we want kids to get to a point where they're able to do Algebra.

So whatever happens with the testing and curriculum, it's healthy to talk about that. We're still going to need standards. The Common Core is a set of standards a bunch of states have agreed on is a pretty good bet. I'd like to address now some of the issues how standards were written because there are many false accounts of this in circulation today, and I myself have often been quoted out of context to support these accounts, and I always try and set the record straight when I learn of such instances.

Some of these I'll summarize. The Common Core

originated in November 2007 with a meeting of the Council of Chief State School Officers. And for many years, the states have been hearing that the mathematics curriculum in this country covered too many topics too superficially, and they recognized the power of an agreement to share standards.

(Inaudible) the Governors Association in 2009, 48 states agreed to help develop the standards, and then in 2009, 2010, the NGO and CCSA put together a team of about 80 mathematicians, teachers, educators policymakers and State Department of Education staff divided into a working group and feedback group.

A UC Berkeley math professor Lucy Wu and Pomona College school teacher Diana Ceja were on the work group. Cal Poly statistics professor, Roxy Peck was on the feedback group. And I chaired the work group. They also constituted the 29 member Validation Committee because one person resigned from this committee. This committee was not directly involved in the work. Their role was to validate the final product. Three of us, myself, Phil Daro and Jason Zimba were lead writers. I want to say for the record, I never during that year spoke to a single representative of the federal government. I never during that year spoke to a single representative of the Gates Foundation.

We saw raw material produced by the working group, and then we developed periodic drafts for them to review. Many states put together teams of teachers at each grade level to provide detailed feedback. We also received reviews from the feedback group, national organizations such as the National Counsel of Teachers of Mathematics, the American Federation of Teachers and from prominent individuals and researchers.

I remember one particular grueling weekend in Washington with teachers from the AFT that had been pulled together from all over the country who really sort of gave us what they thought about the standards. One teacher from Florida, Becky Pitter, insisted that we insert a standards about the meaning of the equal sign and we did in grade one.

The Standards were released in 2010. In March of 2010, they were put out for public comment. There were 10,000 public comments. We made many changes large and small in response to these comments. I have a folder on my computer with about 1,000 documents in it with all these different pieces of feedback and then three months after that, the standards were released on the 2nd of June 2010.

I want to emphasize that throughout this process, we focused a lot not on our opinions, but on

the evidence. Our job is to listen carefully, make decisions in response to the evidence and to the amazing quality of feedback we received from many sources. California's feedback was particularly useful, and we made changes in response to it. For example, one of California's pieces of feedback was to move the multiplication table from grade 4 to grade 3. That's why they're now in grade 3. We also got feedback from Jim Milgram, very useful. We made many changes in response to that, and by the way, some praise at that time.

These standards are built for American students, and they're based on the evidence of the best standards of this country and around the world. Research on high performing countries shows their teachers tend to focus on fewer topics in each grade level, teach them to greater mastery and build on them the next year in a coherent sequence of topics. So focus and coherence were called principals in the design of the standards. The year's major national reports that called for us to abandon our mile wide, inch deep approach and embrace focus and coherence in school mathematics, and the standards finally act on those reports.

I want to just -- I mentioned earlier evidence

from the research from William Smith, so I won't go over that again. I do want to mention something about the developmental appropriateness because we did rely heavily on a publication on the National Research Counsel Mathematics Learning in Early Childhood which does support the grade level placements in the Common Core. This is a synthesis by the National Academies, the most prestigious scientific organization in the country.

I want to read from a teacher in Missouri, rural Missouri, who says, "My dear colleagues teaching my high school are no longer asking, 'We never understood this stuff, so why should the students be expected to?' We're recognizing the difference between students trained as robots versus students who can think."

Elementary school students are welcoming professional development so the fractions make sense. I'd like to conclude by saying these standards are a historic agreement between the states, and they are also a long overdue promise to our children. Without action, the agreement is just empty words and the promise is broken. We should stand forward today to deliver on that promise. The road to faithful implementation of the standards is not easy. Tough standards don't

implement themselves. That's up to states and local districts. There are many challenges ahead in improving curriculum, preparing teachers, thoughtfully approving assessments. It helps us meet those challenges. I think we should take advantage of standards to give our nation's children a chance to learn the skills they need in order to prosper.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much, Dr. McCallum.

Dr. Grove, your concluding remarks, please.

DOUG GROVE: Thank you very much again for having me. I do want to point out that I have submitted three grants to the Gates Foundation and never got one of them funded, so I have an issue with them for a completely different reason.

But I do want to also pick up on what my panelist next to me, Bill said, that is we talked a lot about assessment tonight, but we talked mostly about data mining and concerns of data integrity. We didn't really talk about assessment. We talked about the concerns or the conspiracy or the potential use of data. I want to address that because quite honestly in 2010, I might have been sitting on the other size of this panel. I was fortunate enough to write a book, "Multi-dimensional Indications Common Sense Approach to

Data Driven Thinking" -- shameless book plug. You can get it on Amazon. The book really talks more about ways to use data to look at school improvements. When I wrote that book and we were getting ready to push it to publication, the editor came back to me and asked me to add a chapter at the end of the book about the Common Core, and that was in 2010.

I won't read what I wrote but I took that opportunity to go back to do my own research. It was very new. It was 2010. Here we are four years later still talking about what happened in 2010. But I went back and looked at what was happening in the Common Core and I was skeptical for two main reasons. And my two main reasons for being skeptical is that it was not clear to me how this standards initiative would be different than the standards initiative that I got caught under in the public school system in the '90s and the 2000's.

The second thing is it was not clear to me the kinds of assessments being proposed. And I do say assessments. I'm not talking about data mining. I'm talking about assessments being proposed to be realized and delivered. I've done a fair bit of research in the State of California and California standards test data, and I will tell you it is rarely used to improve student

achievement. I mean, the data that teachers use the most are formative assessments, the data that they use and the data they collect in the classrooms.

They may look at the test scores at the end of the year, but those kids are already gone by the time they get the test scores. So it was not clear to me that -- it was not clear to me from looking at Common Core in 2010 that we would have any changes to the data and specifically to the assessment data. What I've learned four years later after writing that chapter is that the Common Core State Standards initiative is much better supported now than it was back in 2010. It's much better resourced. It's much better planned, and it's aimed at meeting student needs probably better than the reformed predecessors that came before it.

So my second concern in 2010, we now have a clear understanding of how SBAC assessments worked. Deborah didn't get a chance to explain it, but there is a formative assessment component to SBAC that is very powerful in the classroom, in the classroom used by the teacher to guide performance and to improve achievement.

We have some hope that students -- I don't know if this will ever happen. I don't think we're ever going to like tests, right? I mean, I don't think students are ever going to enjoy assessments. We

continue to have a motivational issue with students taking tests. How many of our grandchildren or children go to school on the day of STAR testing excited about a test. That is a rare individual. I don't have any of those in my house. But there is some potential that these assessments can be seen as a way to help students understand whether or not they are ready for college and whether or not they are ready for the workforce. I think that could be an incentive for them.

The Common Core State Standards initiative represents an opportunity for improvement in our schools and success for the college bound and non-college bound students. We talked a lot tonight about K-12 because that's your purview as a Board is your concern for K-12, but there really remains a very big concern on the higher ed and specifically the kind of students that we're getting in and the kind of students we're having to remediate. Something has to be done. And something has to be done not only for the student that is going to come into our school, but something has to be done for the student that is going to go right into the workforce and hopefully have a job at one of our local businesses.

So I reiterate once more in my opening statement that higher education -- and that's who I'm speaking on behalf of in California -- has embraced

Common Core. The universities have worked to align the curriculum and new standards, both the new teacher preparation programs and the first-year college work. Throughout the states, higher education is partnered up with K-12 to support the professional development and readiness for implementation. The connection between higher education and K-12 has long been coming.

Some points to highlight this relationship now and in the future is now there are a growing number of K-12 higher education cooperative efforts, higher education faculty helped write the standards. More faculty agreed with the standards than opposed them in the State of California. Faculty are assisting with the implementation of standards. And the higher education leaders and their boards have voiced their support. For higher education, the bus is moving, and it is moving with the Common Core. The Common Core standards initiative represents an important component of a larger reform that needs to take place in our education system.

I posit here this evening that beyond embracing the Common Core, we should exhibit just as much time and resources and energy getting a better handle on ensuring our teachers are trained well, our schools are safe environments for learning and that we have given -- or are giving attention to non-college bound students who

desperately need an education that gets them career ready. We have a lot of work to do on all these fronts. The future of the Common Core will not be determined this evening. I thought maybe we'd get there, but we're not. But I am concerned with how we will spend our time, our energy, our resources and to what extent meetings like this one and other meetings are really more about politics and less about students.

I wanted to applaud the Orange County Department of Education for the way it has supported the Common Core. I want to thank the Orange County Department of Education for providing resources and professional development and partnering with higher education towards a common goal of assuring that the Orange County students graduate college and career ready. Thank you.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much, Dr. Grove.

Ms. Brown, your concluding remarks, please.

DEBORAH BROWN: Thank you. Much of what I wanted to say has already been said. Mr. Solomon eloquently stated why so many people support Common Core. Hundreds of groups throughout the state support Common Core with bipartisan support from policymakers at state and local levels. We have a lot support for

Common Core for a reason we gave which is the right path and approach to ensure our kids graduate from high school ready for college as the way he laid out.

I do want to thank the Board for the opportunity to have a conversation, have a civil dialogue with people of different mindsets. As Trustee Boyd said, reasonable people can disagree, and so I appreciate the opportunity to have the conversation. We think we obviously they the colon the right path more needs to be done we need to spend -- provide more resources to give teachers the training and support they need. We need to able to do better inventive ways to communicate with parents so they understand what is happening in their classrooms and they understand what changes are occurring.

This conversation was mostly about Common Core although obviously the assessments came in. That's a whole other conversation about how those assessments can help inform parents, teachers and kids on how they're doing. California is undergoing a significant transformation in education, and Common Core is a huge part of that. As we look at what's happening, where the state is making significant decisions that are putting more authority at the local levels so we have talked a little bit about the local control funding. That is a

significant shift. Now we're making another shift in the conversation that's really looking at how do we demonstrate how schools are doing. Are they meeting the needs of their students? The local control accountability plans are one way to do that, but the state level is revisiting how it's holding schools and districts accountable and providing transparency so parents can see what's happening.

Common Core is an important part of that conversation, and without it, we won't be able to have a true gauge of what's happening. So we think we need to continue to support the teachers and educators who are doing the hard work. They're in the classrooms, they're talking with the kids trying to get the kids up to speed on the new standards and the new way of learning. And they're working really hard to be supporting them in every way that we can think. Thank you.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much, Ms. Brown and the panel in support.

We now turn to the panel in opposition. Mr. Wurman, your concluding remarks, please.

ZEV WURMAN: Again, I am grateful for your work here and for the opportunity. After hearing the exchange that took place here today, I can look to a few simple truths that cannot be (inaudible). I'm sorry.

It's true (inaudible) it has the support of historical records, empirical data and of achievement data of California of 15 years and analysis by multiple experts.

First, Common Core is one to two years behind international higher achievers in K-8 and the high school, officially Algebra II, their definition of college readiness. California (inaudible), but that was Common Core. Well, as I said in the beginning, four or five studies, different researchers found this fact with one exception, Bill Schmidt, who was a member of the Validation Committee signed off on the standards that they are internationally benchmarked and then two of his later published papers showing that they were not internationally benchmarked. His work is, let's put it, questionable. It's smoke and mirrors. It's tricks and it's documented, submitted to you.

The fact that Common Core is (inaudible) is not even questionable. We used to have Algebra. We don't. So you can say whatever you want. We don't. Some superintendents actually argue, well, Common Core grade 8 is as good as old Algebra, maybe more. Well, I have a page -- I don't think I submitted it to you, but maybe I should -- that compares grade 7 California standards to pre-Algebra with grade 8. The Common Core grade 8 perhaps is equivalent to prior pre-Algebra,

perhaps, kind of almost. Hence, this is not really something we are challenging our students with. In contrast to our old standards, the Common Core does include an enormous amount of pedagogy. Dr. McCallum said, "Well, you know everybody should (inaudible) after some many numbers after 20 (inaudible) within grade level. Indeed, all standards in California and Common Core start the same way. Children are numbers within 20 - or something. It's not essential to this anyway. That's old standards. That's what we expected of our students.

However, the Common Core continues with four, five, six -- and I don't remember exactly right now -- different clauses, not examples, how they -- clauses are part of the standards, hence every child is expected to be taught and be able to appreciate every one of them, not one that he likes, every one of them. It's not what to expect, it's how to teach it. The separation is fictitious in Common Core. The old California standards were indeed content standards. You had many ways to react it. It didn't dictate.

The Common Core does dictate incessantly. It has, for example, a particular way to teach triangular congruency in high school. Is there empirical support in a good way? No, actually there is empirical support

that it's a failing way. They said how to do it. California said students will prove to be congruent. Didn't say how to do it, the good way or the bad way. This is what to do. They said, "No, you do it this way. Our way or the highway."

Common Core (inaudible) claims it's standards only is just plain incorrect. More involvement perhaps -- even though some people were not happy with the discussion about assessments, the assessments will indeed test those ways, so they cannot test if you can prove if two triangles are congruent. (Inaudible) you can assess if you prove it their way. That goes to many other things. That's what make the examples of Common Core assessment so frustrating and difficult. Because students often have to guess what a test maker had in mind. It's not that they have to (inaudible).

Which way did they want me to show it? The first way? The second way? The third way? The seventh way? Whatever. That's what confuses students. And they are docked points for not guessing right. That's not a test performance achievement. That's a test -- do they mindlessly dream it to themselves? It's supposedly a wise way they (inaudible) classroom trying to wrap up.

The first and foremost victim of Standards will be disadvantaged students. That's the sad truth because

early Algebra is highly discouraged. And we indeed (inaudible). The data is hard to get because now there is no state managing the data. (Inaudible) had 62 percent taking early Algebra in 2013 because there is data. (Inaudible). Today, 9 percent. 9 percent from 62. Palo Alto, my own district, went from 92 percent who were taking Algebra in middle grades to 67 percent. It's a 25 percent drop in two years. Another district -- I don't want to name it yet -- it went from 60 percent to 28 percent in this area. This is large, those are quite terrifying numbers because early Algebra taking enables taking (inaudible) in high school. We have them. We had Algebra and calculus and trigonometry that was missing and Algebra II. Who (inaudible) the kids who did acceleration, but to get to Algebra II, those who could not get there are disadvantaged kids, so this is a problem.

And finally, let me just mention something about the mild wide, inch deep legend. It's true of many state standards where like my one inch deep -- in the 1990's -- since the California standards our standards were not a mile wide inch deep. They actually have fewer of the (inaudible) in grades K-8 than Common Core. So they are not a mile wide inch deep.

Linda Darling-Hammond showed at (inaudible) at

Stanford discussing with Diane Ravitch, a panelist and she said in public, "Had I been in a place to make a decision, I would have not adopted Common Core for California." Linda Darling-Hammond. She's on the record. I was trying to get the video for school education for months, and they refused to give it. She said it, not I.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much, Dr. Wurman. Ms. Stotsky, your closing remarks, please.

SANDRA STOTSKY: Let me begin first of all by saying when I was in the Department of Education in Massachusetts, we had several goals, basic goals. We wanted to raise all students' academic achievements. We weren't trying to close gaps. We were trying to raise everybody because everybody needed to do better. We were also concerned about making sure that we were developing content knowledge, the knowledge base of our students because you cannot do critical thinking in an intellectual vacuum.

You have to know something in order to do critical thinking. So we were trying to develop content knowledge, and we were trying to develop the teachers' knowledge of the subjects they teach because it is the only finding about effective teachers that we could find when I was on the National Advisory Mathematics Panel.

Teachers who do not know the subjects they teach are not effective teachers. Common sense.

In any event, we were interested in producing first class standards because we were not libertarians. We wanted to see what we could do in the State of Massachusetts to improve all students. I am not against national standards if they are first class. Common Core is so far from being first class that they are damaging because it's better not to have standards than to have poor standards that lock textbooks and teachers into bad practice.

First of all, Common Core's ELA standards, and I can find my remarks to ELA in deference to the math expert next to me. Common Core ELA standards are not rigorous or internationally benchmarked and will not make our student competitive. There is no research to support Common Core's stress on writing instead of reading. There is no research to support Common Core's stress on informational reading instead of literary study in the English class.

If we know anything at all by introspection, we know that it is through reading complex literary text that we develop analytical reading, thinking and writing. It is not from the informational text that appear in history, science or mathematics classes. They

are there to convey information. They help students to develop critical thinking, but English teachers have always been responsible by helping kids learn how to read between the lines, and that is what they are being deprived of by the deduction in literary studies that Common Core ELA standards introduce.

Worse yet, there is no research to support the value of cold reading of historical documents, a very bizarre pedagogy that's been promoted by the chief architect of ELA standards. We have in Common Core's ELA standards, a mixture of statements that are skills, curriculum and pedagogy. If you insist on reducing literary studies, raising informational text reading, you are directly affecting the curriculum and that is what Common Core is doing deliberately.

I will just mention briefly the flaws in Common Core's ELA Standards because that is what I noticed at first when I was on the Validation Committee, and these flaws are not present in either California's old standards or in the current Massachusetts standards before Common Core. Most of Common Core's reading standards are simply content-free skills.

The one that I read earlier is an example. It can apply to the "Three Little Pigs." It can apply to "Moby Dick." You can analyze the development of a plot

with a short little story for first grade. You can do it at the high school level. That's not a standard. That is something other than a standard, and that is a good part of the problem we have. It's stresses writing more than reading at every grade level and every teacher knows that our kids need to do more reading than writing. I come from the background of research and instruction, and there's a hundred years' of research behind that statement.

Common Core's writing standards are developmentally inappropriate in early grade levels. It expects English teachers to spend at least half of their time on informational texts, something they cannot teach, and that is where we're now getting snippets of reading comprehension exercises in which students are being deprived of whole literary works to read because they are now being given excerpts from the "Iliad," the "Odyssey," plays by Shakespeare, whatever. It is a destruction of the literature program which is far more important than most people realize. It does not develop critical thinking. It does the opposite, and its standards are not fewer, clearer and deeper, one of the mantras that we keep hearing all the time.

So what could Orange County do? I have two major suggestions. I'm going to say them very briefly.

First, the County could readopt its old standards in English, math, science and history, among the best in the country. You couldn't do better. And these would be immediately teachable by your teachers without a huge amount of professional development. The cost savings would be enormous. It is very costly to train teachers to teach the wrong strategies. And that is what is now happening. They may not ever learn how to teach them, but it's going to take a long time and a lot of money.

Secondly, you need to think about how you put pressure on your schools of education if you want to get better teachers. One of the interesting remarks I always hear and heard it here today is that there's a great deal of stress on rote memorization in our schools. I've been hearing this for 50 years. Now since both teachers come from schools of ed, my question is, where have they been learning to do rote memorization, if that's al they do in the schools? Maybe we need to change the schools of ed so we can we can stop all the rote memorization in the classrooms because if that is where most teachers come from, and we still can't get rid of rote memorization -- which I don't think has been there actually in the last 20 to 30 years -- then it's going to have come with restructuring and reforming education schools.

Maybe Orange County needs to try to hire educators who have been taught to teach or supervise a curriculum that goes beyond Common Core. Then I'll be locked in, and you may need to think about how you as a county can expend where you get your better teachers from so they're not locked into a Common Core curriculum and narrow what kids should be taught.

That is about all I can say at this point. I do appreciate the opportunity to have spoken to you here, and I applaud the fact that you have had pros and cons here. I only wish you could figure out a way to get your teachers to start speaking up.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much, Dr. Stotsky.

Dr. Milgram, your concluding remarks, please.

JAMES MILGRAM: Thank you for the opportunity to speak in front of you. So I'm going to address a few of the points that were brought up. I'm not going to make much of a statement. So, it was pointed out by Professor McCallum that during the course of the writing of the Common Core, as a member of the Validation Committee, I was apprised of and constantly aware of what was going on and what changes were being made. It is certainly true that at certain points there, I readily give him praise for what was going on and what

had happened because I thought at that point that they were going to get standards we could be proud of. But well, the time -- by the end -- so this was in January of 2010, so maybe March of 2010, those standards were looking very promising. There was a path to calculus in them. There were a lot things that made sense, but in the final version, there was no path to calculus, and it stopped with a weak Algebra II course.

Now, you might want to know a little bit about what the consequences of stopping with a weak Algebra II course are. So let me tell you. First of all, if you have a student who graduates high school with only the Algebra II background, then there is at most, a 33 percent chance that student will ever get a college degree. One third of the students with that background that enter college will never get a college degree. Of course, that says nothing about STEM. That's all degrees. Okay. The US government also analyzed the students that are interested in STEM or want to go into STEM and enter college with Algebra II type of background. And for them it's a 2 percent chance that they will ever get into STEM. That is a 1 in 50 shot. That's not my data. That's data from the National Board for Educational Statistics.

Now as to the issue of whether or not they're

two years behind as I've been asserting, let me just tell you a little bit about what the original document, the '98 document that was, I guess -- that sort of asked for Common Core standards, that document coming from unimpeachable sources -- here's how they described what goes on in the high-achieving countries, something we would aspire to, but something we are not. And what did they say? Well, first of all, in all these countries, Algebra I starts in 7th grade. By the end of 9th grade, they have finished Algebra I, Geometry and much of Algebra II. But by the end of -- sorry 9th grade. 7, 8, 9th. I can count if I try. Okay.

So when does Common Core start Algebra I? It starts Algebra I in 9th grade. Let's see -- 7th, 9th, that's two years. I don't see how one can possibly argue that Common Core is not two years behind what is done in the high-achieving countries. I don't go into the graduation rates because those are really depressing. The difference between what we do and what they do is night and day or day and night, depending. Okay.

Now, it was brought up by some people that there's been a recent endorsement of Common Core by the presidents and chief officers of the various organization groups that head the State Universities,

Universities of California and a couple of state college systems, and all these presidents are said to have endorsed Common Core. Now I talked about this a little earlier when I described what was going on with the previous documents from the various presidents of math societies that endorse Common Core, it wasn't. What has happened here is much the same thing.

If you look very carefully at that letter, the way it's phrased is if Common Core does what it says it will do, then we will be very glad with the results. That's what it says. You can check it. Okay.

So these are the situations, and as best I can tell, we have a problem. Now Bill, himself, McCallum, he didn't fully quote what he had actually said, so let me read that. "It's not what we aspire to for our children. It's not what we as a nation want to set as a final deliverable. I completely agree with that and we should go beyond that." That's January 2010. Now, at that point, all of the materials that ultimately was in Common Core was present in the January version of Common Core. And not only that, but Wurman who asked the question of Bill originally said, Zev Wurman is very much aware of this and he had analyzed what the admission requirements were for all the public state universities and colleges in this country and was in a

position -- and that analysis assumes the Algebra II situation. So what we were talking about there was not Algebra I as Professor McCallum claims, but Algebra II.

What the statement I just read was about the students who took Algebra II alone. And we are in the same situation today with respect to the other lead author, Jason Zimba, who made even more damming statements about the quality of these standards.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much, Dr. Milgram.

Dr. Effrem, would you like to make some concluding remarks?

KAREN EFFREM: Thank you. Just for a moment back on development and appropriateness, I would add that one of the many groups expressing concern is the Gisele Child Development Institute who called the standards inappropriate and unrealistic. And as Dr. Stotsky mentioned, there are plenty of content experts as well as psychologists that think they are inappropriate.

Onto the next major point which is psychologically manipulative, I am going to quote some apparently considered political documents, but are actually government documents, including the US Department of Education which says that in national

policy, there is increasing attention on 21st Century competencies, which encompasses a range of non-cognitive factors. That isn't academics.

If I turned around and asked these people how many of them send their children or their grandchildren to school to talk about non-cognitive social, emotional learning when they're supposed to be learning math or English, how many hands do you think would be raised? The National Association for States Boards of Education said in their paper there is elements of social and emotional learning can be found in nearly every state's K through 12 standards frameworks and in the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts. The American School Counselors Association said that their mindsets and behaviors align with specific standards from the Common Core State Standards through connections at the competency level. That is skills. That is not knowledge.

Now, is that what we want? That is what we have to decide. As far as curriculum goes, which supposedly has no connection to the standards, springboard the pre-AP curriculum for English Language Arts published by a college board, now headed by David Coleman, one of the major architects of Common Core ELA Standards has numerous very disturbing pieces

such as a requirement for children to assess themselves on Kholberg's Hierarchy of Moral Reasoning which is a clear psychological test in the ELA curriculum. They also have another unit on the Marxist perspective. Now, fine, you want to study the Marxist perspective, that's okay, but they don't have compensatory viewpoints from other philosophies or other political viewpoints, again, in the ELA standards -- or the ELA curriculum.

Let's talk about the tests again. AIR is involved as we have been told in the technological platform. They are doing computer adaptive testing which actually changes the question based on the answer to the previous question. Now, if the purpose of Common Core testing and national standards is to give you uniform standards and then uniform test results so that you can compare kids in Florida to kids in Alaska, how is computer adaptive testing going to accomplish that because you are not going to have comparable results across a classroom, much less across the nation.

So why do we want computer adaptive testing with SBAC? AIR is also involved in many experimental education programs response to intervention. They are involved in a longitudinal data collection called Social Genome Project, which again doesn't have a whole lot to do with academics, and they have their center for

assessment of longitudinal data in educational research where they admit on their website they are data mining the individual results of students and teachers from multiple states.

Now, you can call that political, but those are facts. Those are what are on web sites. Those are on reports by major national organizations. Let's talk about privacy for a moment. These computer adaptive tests can be changed and manipulated by the people giving them to make them better or worse depending on the needs, and they can also be used to gather certain mindsets by not letting the child go on until they have answered a question a certain way, whether it's about a historical thing, about communism, about global warming, whatever, if they don't answer the question the way that the testers want it, they can't go on and complete the test. That is problematic.

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act in their supposedly political documents, their regulations actually say that the -- let me make sure I have this correct so I'm not accused -- that "An authorized representative is any entity or individual designated by a state or local educational authority to have data."

And there is an entire section in there about

how to collect data without parental consent. So please don't say I'm being political when it is right in their documents. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

MAGGIE CHIDESTER: Thank you very much, Dr. Effrem.

On behalf of the governing Board, I would like to thank all the experts for sharing their expertise with enthusiasm and rigor. And before we conclude the meeting, I'm going to hand the gavel back to Board President Dr. Williams.

TRUSTEE WILLIAMS: It has been requested by my dear colleague, Dr. Bedell, that if you're in his class, to receive extra credit or an A in his class, you better get up here afterwards.

I want to thank everybody here -- the panelists, the guests and staff, thank you very much. Unlike what was said, I don't think it was about politics. I think was about serious things and events that have been impacting our children. Thank you again for being here.

(Whereupon the meeting concluded at 9:37 p.m.)

I, the undersigned, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me at the time and place herein set forth; that any witnesses in the foregoing proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn; that a record of the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand which was thereafter transcribed under my direction; that the foregoing transcript is a true record of the testimony given.

Further, that if the foregoing pertains to the original transcript of a deposition in a Federal Case, before completion of the proceedings, review of the transcript [ ] was [ ] was not requested.

I further certify I am neither financially interested in the action, nor a relative or employee of any attorney or party to this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my name.

Dated: November 24, 2014

MARIA MAHIEU
CSR No. 13260