

DRAFT MINUTES

JOINT LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

September 11, 2012

The Joint Legislative Education Oversight Committee met on Tuesday, September 11 2012, at 10:00 a.m. in room 544 of the Legislative Office Building. Senator Jerry Tillman, Senate Co-Chairman, presided. The following Senators were in attendance: Senators Brock, Pate, Preston, Robinson, Rucho, Soucek, and Tucker. The following House members were also present: Representative Bryan Holloway, House Co-Chairman and Representative Linda Johnson, House Co-Chairwoman; Representatives Brandon, Goodman, Hilton, Lucas, and Pridgen. The following members of the Legislative Research Staff were in attendance: Drupti Chauhan, Patsy Pierce, Kara McCraw, Dee Atkinson, Denise Adams, and Sara Kamprath. Yvonne Hall, Legislative Assistant for Senator Tillman, served as the Committee Clerk. Members of the sergeant-at-arms were present.

Chairman Tillman convened the meeting and welcomed the members, staff, and guests. He recognized the members of the Sergeant at Arms and thanked them for their assistance with the meeting.

Sen. Tillman asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the April 19, 2012 meeting. Sen. Rucho so moved and was seconded by Rep. Lucas. The motion carried and the minutes were approved.

Sen. Tillman introduced Dr. Sharon Morrissey, Senior Vice President for Academic & Student Services and Chief Academic Officer – NC Community College System Office, and Dr. Suzanne Ortega, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs – UNC General Administration. Their presentation was entitled, “Transfer Articulation: The Road Ahead.” (See Handout marked 1)

Dr. Morrissey began by saying that their presentation would be an update on revising the Comprehensive Articulation Agreement between the NC Community College System and The University of North Carolina. She noted that this presentation is timely in that she had just read some data from the National Student Clearinghouse which tracks college transfer students across the nation. They reported that of all students who finished a four-year degree in 2010-11, 45% had attended a 2-year community college before they transferred to the senior institution. In North Carolina for the year 2010-11, 39% of the baccalaureate degree completers had attended a community college. This information points to NC Community Colleges playing a key role in putting students on a pathway to obtaining a baccalaureate degree.

Dr. Morrissey referenced 2 reports presented to this committee last year, one of which spoke of engaging academic officers working to move the transfer (articulation) process

forward. Today's presentation would include an update of that work as well as responses to questions suggested by the Legislative Research Staff.

Dr. Morrissey then began to share a brief history of the articulation process. In the 1990's, there was not a system-wide articulation agreement between the community colleges and the university system. There were as many as 300 bi-lateral agreements between individual community colleges and universities. Students complained about transfer barriers, namely the inability to transfer course credits from one community college to another community college, and also the inability to transfer credits from their community college to a university that their community college did not have a bi-lateral transfer agreement with. The solution was to develop a statewide comprehensive articulation agreement. The 1995 Session of the General Assembly in House Bill 739 directed the UNC Board of Governors and the Community College System to develop such an agreement. The legislature also instructed the Community College System to implement common course descriptions for all community college programs by June of 1997. This in effect was a two-step process; with step one being a reengineering of the NC Community College System. This involved the development of a common course catalogue, with common course descriptions that are used by all 58 community colleges. It also involved revising all of the curriculum standards in the NC Community College System and converting from a quarter-based calendar to a semester-based calendar. This reengineering took two years (1995-1997) and involved over a thousand faculty members in the NC Community College System.

Step two was the actual development of the comprehensive articulation agreement that is still in place today. Faculty members from both systems were involved in its development.

Two very specific premises are central to the comprehensive articulation agreement:

1. Institutions will recognize the professional integrity of other public, post-secondary institutions that are regionally accredited for college transfer. All of North Carolina's community colleges are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to provide college transfer programs.
2. There is sufficient commonality in the lower division general education requirements to develop a common general education component at the community colleges that would transfer as a block of credit to the university.

Dr. Morrissey then laid out how the basic articulation agreement process works:

In order for a student to meet the requirements of the comprehensive articulation agreement, the student would need to complete the 44 hour general education core, or complete an AA (Associate in Arts degree) or AS (Associate in Science degree). They

must have a 2.0 GPA (Grade Point Average), and must have made a “C” or better in all of their transfer courses.

The comprehensive articulation agreement guarantees the student admission to one of the sixteen universities in the UNC System, but not to a specific UNC campus. The student will have fulfilled the lower level general education requirement at the receiving university. If the student has completed one of the associate degrees, they will transfer with junior year status.

Dr. Morrissey then noted that there is a transfer advisory committee, comprised of members of both community colleges and universities. They oversee the articulation agreement, hear student appeals, manage the various policy changes that have occurred over the years, and oversee the courses that are in the articulation agreement and pre-major agreement.

She said that there are currently 644 courses on a list that is called “College Transfer Courses.” Community college students may take these courses in order to transfer to a university. Of the 644 courses, 198 are general education, and 446 are either pre-major or elective. There are 30 pre-major agreements that students can follow like pathways into a major.

Dr. Morrissey next moved on to address a question the Legislative Research Staff had submitted, namely, “Which credentials NC Community College System offers are transferable and which are not?” There are three credentials that are designed for transfer. They are the Associate in Arts (AA), the Associate in Science (AS), and the Associate in Fine Arts. The AA and the AS include the 44 hours of general education and at least 20 hours of pre-major. A student finishing either of these 2 degree programs is guaranteed admission into one of the universities – albeit perhaps not the one of his choice – and enters as a junior with 64 hours of credit and completion of the general education core. The Associate in Fine Arts is often performance or portfolio based, and does not transfer as seamlessly as the AA or the AS. More often the transfer is on a course by course basis, a performance basis, or by a demonstration of a student of his or her art or craft.

Dr. Morrissey then talked about degrees not designed for transfer. One of these is the Associate in Applied Science degree, which is designed as a terminal degree which prepares skilled employees for the workforce. This degree has far more hours in technical hands-on training than in general education. This degree trains technicians and mid-level professionals for jobs that are essential to North Carolina’s economy and workforce, such as welders, machinists, and nurses.

Dr. Morrissey then described the Associate in General Education degree, which has a broad emphasis on general education. It is not designed for transfer students or students desiring to enter the workforce, as much as it is designed to meet the needs of students looking for a broad liberal arts education. It is also a degree program where students on a

waiting list in an applied science program such as nursing, can take courses, and receive financial aid, etc., while they are waiting for a slot to open in an applied science program.

Dr. Morrissey then shared some numbers she thought the Committee might find interesting. In the fall of 2011, 250,000 students enrolled who had declared a major. Of those, 150,000 were enrolled in the Associate in Applied Science program. Approximately 61,000 were enrolled in the Associate in Arts and Associate in Science programs, 1600 in the Associate in Fine Arts program, and 37,000 in the Associate in General Education program.

Dr. Morrissey next referenced a slide in the handout "2009 Transfer Numbers." She pointed out that of the total transfers, over 80% were enrolled in programs designed to facilitate a transfer. There is a large number who transfer without finishing the general education core or without an Associate degree – (see middle column). Sixty-six percent are transferring without the helpful 44 hours of general education or without an Associate degree. This is an area which can be highlighted when discussing transfer barriers to students.

Dr. Morrissey addressed another question submitted by the Legislative Research Staff which dealt with bi-lateral agreements still in existence between community colleges and universities. For example, while the Associate Applied Science degree is a terminal degree (not intended for transfer), many community colleges and universities have bi-lateral agreements which recognize specific courses as eligible for transfer. She provided a slide which shows a sample of schools with bi-lateral agreements. (See Handout 1) One such example is Cleveland Community College and UNC-Greensboro.

Dr. Morrissey turned the presentation over to Dr. Suzanne Ortega. Before she began, Chairman Tillman recognized that the previous vote to approve the April 19, 2012 minutes was taken without a quorum being present. A quorum being present, he asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the April 19, 2012 meeting. Sen. Rucho so moved and was seconded by Sen. Robinson. The motion carried and the minutes were approved. Sen. Tillman also mentioned that the 1995 legislation surrounding articulation agreements was penned by Sen. Preston and Robert Grady. The members gave Sen. Preston a round of applause.

Dr. Ortega began her part of the presentation with a look at how college transfer students are being advised. She indicated that there are 3 ways that a transfer student is advised, namely talking with an advisor at a community college, talking with an advisor at a UNC Campus, or using the online Transfer Navigator tool. The Transfer Navigator tool is located on the CFNC.org website which has a course by course articulation. The tool is useful at many levels, but especially for a student considering transfer without an Associate degree – giving them a course/campus roadmap showing which campus will give the best acceptance of prior courses in a transfer.

Dr. Ortega then pointed out that advising is a shared responsibility. There is a need for good advisors and enough of them to meet the demand. But the students also need to seek out advice and take that advice when making transfer decisions.

Dr. Morrissey came back and talked about challenges to seamless transfers. Advising pre-major students was one of the challenges she discussed, highlighting that different majors, different times of transfers and different target universities make each student's case unique, and therefore making uniform advice for all students unpractical. A disparity in resources from one community college to another also makes transfer advising different from school to school. The articulation agreement is a great help for those students who complete the 44 hour general education process or one of the Associate degree programs. The complexity to advising arises for those students who do not.

Dr. Ortega added that another challenge to transfer advising is with those students who do not declare a major or who have not decided on a major. Students who declare a major make more timely progress in their degree, and are more likely to complete their degree. A study of the fall 2007-2009 cohorts of transfer students that came with Associate degrees showed that 30% did not know what they wanted to major in. Of those who did know, at least 14% would change their major. Dr. Ortega opined that this is evidence that quality advising of transfer students is essential.

Dr. Ortega went on to talk about the concept of student swirl saying of 2011's graduates 45% had taken some coursework at a community college. The fall 2011 class was comprised of 30% transfer students. Swirl is when a student starts at a UNC college and then takes a course or courses at a community college. The taking of classes in both systems adds to the challenge of advising and maintaining a system that is robust and maintains the integrity of the degree.

Dr. Morrissey next shared some real-life student stories that illustrate the challenges surrounding advising students in the area of transferring. One student planned on going to one university but ended up not getting accepted and had to go to another. She had to take additional courses at the 2nd university to obtain her baccalaureate degree. Another student had a lot of courses that would not transfer because he overloaded his coursework of taking too many courses in a subject he enjoyed, but not enough in courses that would transfer. He had not consulted an advisor and as a result had not mapped out his class schedule in a way that would optimize his transfer capabilities. Dr. Morrissey suggested that tools, such as academic mapping software that would put students into a pathway of study that could not be deviated from without an advisor's approval, might be beneficial. She indicated that such a tool is not in place but is being looked at for possible use.

Dr. Morrissey's third real-life story was an amalgam of students who transfer early without completing the 44 hour general education core. The receiving university evaluates the courses taken and assigns either course credit or elective credit to them. Too many elective credits could put the student at risk of exceeding the tuition surcharge limit.

Dr. Ortega then spoke about ways to improve the transfer process. A transcript warehouse of sorts is in place with the transfer navigator tool, but keeping it up to date is a challenge due to course changes, etc. She indicated that there really is not a repository for student records that follow a student from community college to a four year university. She pointed out that there are important policy questions that can only be asked with an understanding of the full range of courses. For example, identifying clusters of courses that seem to lead to a better chance of success would aid advisors in advising students on the benefits of taking such courses.

Also, keeping track of whether community college courses are mapped well to courses in the university system is a large undertaking that needs to be done and kept up to date so that the transfer of courses remains viable. She gave chemistry and changes it has undergone as an example. With 644 courses, this is not a small undertaking.

Dr. Ortega next spoke of the need for technical challenges in the area of hardware and software to be met head on, with tools such as the transfer navigator being kept up to date. She also referenced an April appearance before this committee wherein it was promised that a group would be launched to lay out a research and policy agenda with a timeline for implementation. She said this has been done. A staff person is to be hired to begin the curricular realignment.

Dr. Ortega reported that keeping the “crosswalks” up to date is vital to the transfer process. She indicated that there are approximately 1700 transfer requests each year to the university system, mostly from within North Carolina. There is research being done to determine the best predictors of transfer student success, what community colleges have the best relationships with their university system counterparts, and how can the success exhibited by some community colleges in the transfer arena be duplicated at other community colleges.

Dr. Morrissey next directed the committee to the presentation handout which highlighted the expected outcomes of the research that is being done. Some of these include better transfer pathways, improved technology for advising and transfer course-mapping, and reduced cost to students and the State through increased efficiencies.

Dr. Morrissey told the committee that they welcome being held accountable for reaching these goals and would welcome opportunities to return and report to the committee in the future.

Chairman Tillman opened the floor to the Committee Members for questions of Dr. Morrissey and Dr. Ortega. Dr. Morrissey and Dr. Ortega received and answered questions from the Committee members.

Sen. Tillman next introduced Andrea Poole of the North Carolina General Assembly Fiscal Research Division for her presentation on “Resident Tuition for Nonresident Veterans.” (See Handout Marked 2)

Ms. Poole began by explaining that her presentation would deal with the costs of providing nonresident veterans with resident tuition, as this has been a topic of discussion of late in the NC General Assembly. She would also talk about 3 different policy options to address this topic.

Ms. Poole referenced her first slide as background showing that the federal government had changed the amount it would pay in the post 9/11 GI Bill from capping at the highest in-state tuition in a state to the actual in-state tuition at the institution. This lowered the amount of tuition covered for most nonresident students. This change took effect beginning in FY 2011-12.

Ms. Poole then spoke on the fact the central issue has to do with residency, and that while this is a complex legal issue, it can be boiled down to two points:

- A permanent resident of NC for the previous 12 months
- Not a resident solely to attend a NC college or university

She did comment that NC statutes do give special consideration to members of the military, their dependents, and members of the NC National Guard.

Ms. Poole next pointed out that both the NC Community College System and The UNC System charge substantially higher tuition for nonresidents than they do for residents. Allowing a nonresident to pay the resident tuition would result in lost tuition revenue, which might need to be made up by state appropriation. She went on to say that the amount of tuition revenue lost is different for the two systems, and varies by UNC Campus. Based on FY 2011-12 tuition cost, the amounts lost would be \$192/credit hour or slightly over \$6,000 per annual FTE. For The UNC System, the average loss would be \$11,779 per student per year with a range of \$9,114 at Winston-Salem State to \$19,825 per year at UNC-Chapel Hill. The figures for 2012-13 are the same for the community colleges as their rates went up the same percent for both resident and nonresident tuition, but the increase for UNC-Chapel Hill is not over \$12,000.

Ms. Poole spoke next about policy options. The first would be to assist the current students only. This would entail looking at those students who were in The UNC System last year who were nonresident veteran students using the post 9/11 GI Bill. The second option would be resident tuition for all veterans. Option three would be to provide assistance to nonresident veterans through scholarships, capped waivers, etc.

Ms. Poole next broke down the costs for each option. Option 1 would cost approximately \$7 million to \$10.5 million nonrecurring, based on last year's tuition figures. This would break down to an estimated cost of \$6.26 million for The UNC System and between \$823,280 and \$4.39 million in the community colleges. The cost for Option 2 – treating nonresident veterans and possibly their dependents as residents is not available due to the unknown amount of growth in the veteran population this could cause. However, it

would be at least the \$7 million to \$10 million described in Option 1, since this is a known group of nonresident veteran students already in the system. Option 3 would provide a source of funds such as scholarship or capped tuition waivers to assist nonresident veterans with their tuition.

Ms. Poole also listed the federal Yellow Ribbon program to help cover the gap between what the GI Bills pays and matches what the state pays to cover the difference. The contract would be between the Federal government and the university, not the State. This means that the schools would be required to continue funding regardless of State appropriations. Ms. Poole said that there are already several private universities participating in this program, a few public universities – including UNC-Chapel Hill, and 3 NC community colleges.

Ms. Poole concluded her presentation with a look at ways to limit cost. First she said that the exact population of veteran students and or their families the State would want to assist would need to be determined. She reiterated that capped options and participation in the Yellow Ribbon program could limit cost. Also, she indicated that parameters could be established to specify or limit which group of veterans would be eligible. For example, some states limit participation to combat veterans or purple-heart recipients. Other options might be a residency requirement or a requirement to have paid taxes in NC. Time limits and waiting periods might also be used.

Chairman Tillman opened the floor to the Committee Members for questions of Andrea Poole. Andrea Poole received and answered questions from the Committee members.

Chairman Tillman adjourned the committee for lunch at 11:45AM.

Chairman Tillman called the committee back to order at 12:45 PM. He recognized Dr. Rebecca Garland, Chief Academic Officer with the NC Department of Public Instruction; and Ms. Angela Quick, Deputy Chief Academic Officer with the NC Department of Public Instruction, for their presentation on “Testing Requirements.” (See Handout Marked 3).

Dr. Garland greeted the committee and said that they would be sharing on common core state standards in NC, as well as giving an update on the assessments system that will be implemented this year. She turned the presentation over to Ms. Angela Quick to first go through some remarks about the common core.

Ms. Quick began by saying that before we can talk about assessments, it is necessary to talk about what children are learning and being taught as well as the standards that are being used. North Carolina has had a standard course of study for over a hundred years. This sets the baseline for expectations from students. Other states across the nation do not have a standard course of study which helps teachers know what to teach.

Ms. Quick said that the standard course of study is in all content areas – math, science, PE, foreign languages, career technical education, social studies, English, etc. All

content areas have specific instructions for the content. This is the foundation of schooling for the work being presented today to the committee.

Ms. Quick then gave the committee some historical background. In 2004, there was a blue ribbon commission established to look at North Carolina's standards, assessment, and accountability model. This report led to a "remodeling" of public education starting with new standards, new assessments, and a new accountability model. The report was then framed with the State Board of Education in 2008 and out of this came a plan called, "The Framework for Change." She mentioned that there was collaboration between the State Board, members of the General Assembly, professors from universities in NC, and work being done on the national level, also. She stressed that the assessment area of the framework for change was extremely important.

Ms. Quick reported that this year, all students and teachers are working with a new course of study and the common core, which is English, language arts, and mathematics. In all other subject areas there are essential standards. She said this is a very important change that is going on in classrooms today.

Ms. Quick then posed the question, "Why the common core state standards?" First of all, equity – no matter where a student lives in our state they should have a common level of expectations of what they are to learn and be able to do in each content area. Secondly, college and career readiness is important in preparing a student for whatever they choose to do after high school. Entering a college remediation free is a key goal. The community college system and the university system have both signed off to work together on this.

Thirdly, comparability – being able to compare how North Carolina students are doing with other states is another reason for the common core state standards. Next, Ms. Quick noted that using the common core state standards is helpful in the sharing of resources and economies of scale that come from working together with other states to create new instructional resources, instructional materials, and assessments. This should save money as opposed to creating these things apart from other states.

Lastly, Ms. Quick indicated that student mobility is another benefit of using the common core state standards. This provides a uniform set of expectations for students from other states, particularly in our large military population. The Department of Defense Education Agency has endorsed the common core work.

Looking ahead to 2014-15, Ms. Quick said that North Carolina will continue to collaborate with other states on common core standards, and it is expected that there will be a national assessment available for English, language arts and mathematics.

Ms. Quick noted that a big question that the Department gets daily is, "How are we supporting schools?" She said that the Department has been preparing for two years for the launch of the common core standards that are in play now. The Department held summer institutes the past two summers for professional development for representatives

of the LEAs who in turn went back and offered training on their local levels. There is also ongoing online learning, implementation support, and resources.

Sen. Tillman interjected at this point that it would be important to know how many states are participating in the common core. Ms. Quick answered that there are 42 states currently using it. He then asked if all of the states are at the same point, given that North Carolina is implementing this year. Ms. Quick said that North Carolina is two –four years ahead of most other states that are doing this work.

Sen. Tillman then turned the floor over to Dr. Garland. She said the goal of her presentation was to clear up some misunderstandings about assessments and to clarify how they are used, where they go, etc. Dr. Garland said that they are looking through the assessments that they are using this year, and that they do line up with the requirements of the Excellent Public Schools Act, along with Senate Bill 479. She indicated that a lot of the work was supported by funding from Race to the Top. She said that the General Assembly's agenda is in sync with Race to the Top.

Dr. Garland gave an example of Senate Bill 479's implementation in that the Department is now assessing career and college readiness. They are introducing this year tests that are related to the common core, and introducing diagnostic tools for teachers to use in their instruction. State and federal funds are being used to pay for these. She went on to say that the Department feels ready to implement the Excellent Public Schools Act. The particular portion around school performance grades will be done with the accountability assessments that are required by the federal government and by state statute. The assessments for college and career readiness will be done as a part of this.

Dr. Garland said these assessments are laying a foundation that will give a school the option to implement pay for performance if they wish to do so. More importantly, principals will have information as to which teachers are having a positive impact in regards to what students are learning.

Dr. Garland moved on to discuss national comparability and college readiness. She said that this year they implemented the use of the ACT. This year for the first time, all eleventh graders were given the ACT to determine their status for college and career readiness. This will be helpful in attaining the goal of making sure that students are remediation free when they go to college.

Dr. Garland said that this year they also implemented PLAN, which is a diagnostic test. It is a test given to tenth graders. The data does not come to the Department. The information from the PLAN test goes to the student and to the school. This helps principals know how to plan for the following year.

Dr. Garland next mentioned EXPLORE which is a test given to eighth graders that lets them know if they are ready for high school and on track for college and career readiness. PLAN and EXPLORE both have aptitude sections which let the student know where their aptitude is strong and explore some interest for a career pathway. These assessments

give the students, parents, and teachers information that will help make the student's education more beneficial.

Dr. Garland mentioned that the national consortium has assessments related to the common core and that the Department is looking at them to determine which ones if any they want to use.

Dr. Garland next talked about formative and diagnostic assessments. The Department is on track with the Excellent Public Schools Act in implementing the reading diagnostic program. Every school system in the state has been contacted and an indication gotten from them as to when they will be ready to move forward with training their teachers. Devices have been ordered, money has been appropriated for the devices, and training kits have been ordered. Work has been done with Wireless Generation on a training calendar. Many school systems will be coming on board in the fall and others in the spring. The goal is to have the system fully in place and ready to be used by every school system in the state by the beginning of next school year so that a benchmark diagnostic can be done at that time.

Dr. Garland mentioned next the Instructional Improvement System which is technology based resources for all the teachers in North Carolina. This is being paid for with Race to the Top dollars.

Dr. Garland then mentioned some common core exams that will be used in pay for excellence and for teacher evaluations at the school building level.

Dr. Garland then reminded the committee that some assessments have been eliminated from North Carolina's high schools in the past few years. Civics, chemistry, physics, algebra 2, geometry, US history, and physical science have been eliminated. Some schools express concern over not doing assessments for social studies. She mentioned that financial literacy was being assessed under civics so we are no longer assessing financial literacy, as well.

Dr. Garland moved on to talk about the three reasons for assessments. One is school accountability. This is how a community is informed about the viability of a school or schools in their community. Next are assessments that are used at the classroom level. The data from these assessments never come to Raleigh, but rather are used by teachers and principals in changing instruction, and by students and parents to know where the student needs to work harder. Finally there are new assessments that are being used for teacher effectiveness. The primary purpose of these is to show if students are growing, and if teachers are having a positive impact on student learning. This data also does not come to Raleigh, but stays at the school with the principal.

Dr. Garland then went into a more detailed look at the reasons for assessments. First she mentioned school accountability. This is what people are most familiar with. This is what will be reported in the A, B, C, D, F performance grade required in the new statute. It consists of End of Grade (EOG) and End of Course (EOC) tests. Students in grades 3-

8 are tested in English and mathematics. Students in grades 5 and 8 are tested in science. This is required by the federal government. There is a requirement to one test of English, math, and science at the high school level. This is accomplished by testing biology, English 2, and algebra 1. North Carolina, through Senate Bill 479 has also added assessing for career and college readiness. This is being done through the ACT for college readiness and WorkKeys for career readiness. WorkKeys is administered to any student who has completed four courses in a CTE pathway. All of this calculates into school performance grades. The ACT is given in March and WorkKeys is given in February. This data is collected in Raleigh and is reported to the federal government, to the General Assembly, and to the general public on the school report card.

Dr. Garland described the next type of assessments, which are the formative and diagnostic assessments. They are designed to help students on a daily basis. They include the previously mentioned EXPLORE and PLAN, as well as the K-3 reading diagnostic, and a kindergarten screening which is mentioned in the Excellent Public Schools Act and paid for by the Race to the Top Early Childhood Grant. These assessments give teachers and students information they need to do better in order to have higher student performances.

A third kind of assessment is new, and part of Race to the Top and required by any state that gets a waiver from No Child Left Behind. There is a requirement to include student performance in teacher evaluation. North Carolina chose to do this by creating for its school systems a library of common exams. This approach was inspired by a visit to other states, in particular in Florida's Hillsborough County. They are using assessments that teachers have created in conjunction with their local accountability program, to see if students are actually growing in each one of their courses. North Carolina has a hybrid of what they are doing.

Dr. Garland explained that the purpose of these tests is to create an EVAAS score. EVAAS is a statistical coefficient that shows if teachers are producing low, medium, or high growth among their students. The EVAAS score that becomes part of the teacher evaluation will be used in employment decisions for teachers. While this is new, principals and administrators have been looking at this information when making placement decisions for low-performing schools. For example, should a teacher who has been doing well go into a high need school that has been chronically behind? This is now, however a requirement under No Child Left Behind and the grant funding of Race to the Top. There are now about 33 states across the country that are doing this process.

Dr. Garland continued by describing what the library of common exams is and is not. When it was decided that North Carolina would apply for a Race to the Top grant, the local school superintendents wanted the state to put together the methods of measuring teacher effectiveness library of common exams on their behalf. This is in contrast to a state like Ohio wherein 300 school systems are doing this work on their own. North Carolina has a commonly used teacher evaluation system that is used by all the principals across the state. The superintendents in North Carolina want to have a uniform tool to measure student growth statewide. The State is creating this library of common exams

for them to use. These exams have been developed by teachers, with over 800 coming to Raleigh on several occasions to work together on creating these exams. Once these exams are in place, there will be an EVAAS score for every English, math, science, and social studies teacher in grades 4-12. This should show if North Carolina's teachers in these grades are producing positive impact in student learning.

Dr. Garland shared that it is also hoped that these assessments will balance the curriculum. Also, she noted that the State is basing all of their work on research coming out of Harvard on teacher effectiveness.

Dr. Garland underscored that the local exams program is a local initiative. It is a principal's responsibility by statute. The common exams will be implemented according to local policy. She cited test schedules, proctored versus non-proctored, electronic tests versus paper & pencil tests as examples of local discretion over these tests. In fact, the extent to which the local exams are implemented is also a local decision, not one made by the state. She gave as an example an elementary school wherein the teachers are teaching reading and mathematics. This situation would likely not have a common exam implemented as the teachers already have an EVAAS score which is generated through the students' reading and math. The state says that the EVAAS score is needed, but how it is obtained is a local decision.

Dr. Garland announced a meeting in Greensboro, NC on September 20, 2012, wherein each school system from across North Carolina will bring a team of four. Also, over 60 charter schools will be sending a team. This meeting will be for the purpose of sharing with the local teams what needs to be done and "checked-off" in regard to the local exams. She reiterated that how these are implemented will be local decisions.

Dr. Garland anticipated a question as to why charter schools would be represented at this meeting by saying that if a teacher is to get a continuing license in North Carolina, they have to use the teacher evaluation system. Also, if a charter school has taken any Race to the Top money, they would fall under the requirement to do the evaluations.

Dr. Garland next spoke about the cost of the various assessments, referring to the related sheet attached to Handout 3. As regards to school accountability, in terms of meeting federal and state requirements for the school performance report card, the cost is around 30 million dollars. This includes the ACT. The formative assessments cost close to \$37 million dollars. PLAN and EXPLORE are currently not funded by the General Assembly. They are funded this year through reversions. Dr. Garland made a plea to the Committee that the General Assembly needs to fund these going forward. The total cost of the common exams for teacher evaluation is around 3.5 million dollars. A good part of this was initial costs incurred for the 800 teachers who were brought in for the development of the tests – food, lodging, etc. This was paid for through Race to the Top. The cost for 2012-13 is a little over 1 million dollars.

This concluded Dr. Garland's presentation. Chairman Tillman commended her for the work that she and her department are doing. He said that he is on board with the

common core and believes North Carolina is in a position to make some meaningful comparisons going forward.

Chairman Tillman opened the floor to the Committee Members for questions of Dr. Garland and Ms. Quick. Dr. Garland and Ms. Quick received and answered questions from the Committee members.

Chairman Tillman adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark Shiver, Committee Clerk

Sen. Jerry Tillman