

2696

RECEIVED

OCT 13 AM 9:11

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
COMMISSION

**Position of PAESSP regarding
State Board of Education
Regulation ID#6-312
Academic Standards and Assessment
Submitted by**

The Pennsylvania Association of Elementary and Secondary School Principals

The Pennsylvania Association of Elementary and Secondary School Principals opposes Regulation ID#6-312.

First, let us be clear that we do not oppose the concept of school, district and state accountability. There is a clear difference between using test data as one measure of how a school, district or state is providing for a quality education and using such data to deny a student a high school diploma. The way the current regulation is worded, the student appears to be the only one to have severe and perhaps far-reaching consequences for a failure to pass 10 Keystone Examinations yet to be developed by the State.

We believe that the Keystone Examinations as proposed, are unsupported by research; divert large amounts of funding from proven achievement improvement measures; will be harmful to a large number of potential high school graduates; increase cost to school districts between 10 to 20 percent; open a window for potential law suits that will further divert educational funds into legal defenses; assume that passing these exams will assure a quality product; push instruction toward standardized measures while what is needed is more individualized, customized instruction; and that the unintended consequences of such a regulation will more likely diminish the quality of education in Pennsylvania schools than increase it.

We will briefly address these issues:

Unsupported by Research/Financial Considerations

The potential harmful effects of Keystone Examinations (Exams) are enumerated by various, highly respected organizations, such as the American Psychological Association. This research is readily available by conducting a Yahoo or Google search of "high stakes testing." While some (a minority) of the studies will point out that high stakes testing may be reliable compared to other tests, no proof is provided that requiring a student to pass a high school competency exam or series of exams enhances a student's ability to be a productive citizen or that such exams capture the scope of a student's learning through 13 years of schooling. To the contrary, most students that fail to achieve competency, as defined by an arbitrary pass number selected by someone, demonstrate that they are capable of attending college without remediation or successfully enter the workforce.

In testimony before the Pennsylvania Senate Education Committee, a representative of Achieve, Inc. – an organization formed by the Governors in 1996 to promote assessment and accountability and a leading advocate of high stakes testing – responded when asked for proof of the value of Graduate Competency Exams “it is too early to provide such evidence.” In fact, the representative’s number one assurance was that many other states are doing it – you won’t be alone. This is not a justification for a quarter of a billion dollar investment.

Achieve, Inc.’s studies highlight the need for certain proven methods to be in place to assure the success of high school students to reach proficiency. Without certain remediation, interventions and programs, the effectiveness of high stakes testing achieves nothing but to report what we already know.

One must ask the question, with such conflicting research, with the possibility for harmful effects on high school graduates, why the rush to implementation?

There is a substantial difference between an idea and proven practice. The implementation of Keystone Exams as proposed requires the expenditure of a quarter of a billion dollars over five years on an idea that is not proven to be good practice. If you examine much of the “research” provided in support of this idea, you will find that the research focuses upon identifying the problem, e.g., many students graduate yet have not demonstrated proficiency as defined by the PSSA. This is a statement that even those in opposition would not necessarily argue with, however, there is a huge difference between providing research that identifies a problem and presenting research that supports a solution. Little or no research is presented that demonstrates how Keystone Exams will improve student preparation for successful lives in the workforce or college.

Finally, research does clearly demonstrate that certain types of school interventions help students acquire needed competencies to be contributing members of society. We propose that our limited funds should go to those proven practices rather than the unproven value of Keystone Exams.

Potential Lawsuits

There is substantial evidence that the implementation of Keystone Exams as a requirement for a diploma results in a flurry of lawsuits that states and districts are required to defend. California, Alaska, Massachusetts and Indiana are currently involved in such suits, among others. There are also reports of students moving from Texas to complete their senior year in high school elsewhere rather than have 13 years of education negated as a result of a test score and suits are pending.

Why would the state subject itself and school districts to the unnecessary diversion of funds to legal actions based upon an unproven idea?

Assumptions About the Ability of the Tests to Capture 13 Years of Schooling

After 13 years of schooling would you stake your future on your ability to pass a minimum of six high stakes tests?

First, one must assume that the tests accurately reflect the curriculum to which you have been exposed. Where is the assurance of this? We do not even have state model curricula constructed that assure reasonable universal expectations. Shouldn't we have the support in place prior to the requirement? Also, who will be designing these tests? The regulation trust that someone, somehow will develop a test that captures 13 years of schooling and that someone just as wise will determine the cut scores for such a test. This seems like an unreasonable leap into the unknown. Worse yet, today's sixth graders are being ask to prepare for a test that has not yet been developed and so therefore may not be reflected in the child's preparation. There is an assumption that the first six years of the child's preparation has been so good that within the next six years he/she will be able to pass the exam. This assumption is in contrast to the motives for creating the test to begin with.

Secondly, one must assume that you will remember all that you have been taught – this is contrary to what we know about learning theory. While one might be able to pass a test as a freshman immediately following Algebra 1, there is no assurance that the same individual has retained that information as a graduating senior. In fact, memory research would suggest otherwise. Therefore, what was intended to prove competency as a graduating senior may not accurately reflect what you know at the time of graduation.

Third, the test has not been put to the test. There is a large assumption in this regulation that someone or institution will be able to ascertain what an individual needs to know to be successful in life based upon his/her ability to pass six high stakes tests. This is a huge and dangerous assumption. We would suggest that before implementing the regulation the tests should be tested to determine their usefulness in predicting success. If the Board of Education, PDE and the advocates of such testing are so certain that these tests capture what is needed to be awarded a high school diploma, and accurately measure a graduates ability to function successfully in life, we suggest that they take this magnificent predictor before implementing the program, and if they fail to pass all high stakes tests, they relinquish their high school diplomas and thus their right to decision making on the issue. Certainly we would not want individuals incapable of demonstrating the ability to master a high school diploma making such a monumental decision that will impact all potential graduates to come.

Curricula Alterations

High stakes testing has been proven to have widespread impact upon curricular focus and attention. The PSSA has already ushered in an era in which more and more time is devoted to the remediation of math and reading and less and less time devoted to social studies, the sciences and the arts. High stakes testing actually creates a standardized

environment where emphasis is placed upon the regurgitation of facts. It also assumes that if all individuals are educated to acquire a minimum set of competencies in math and science we will have created a better educated citizenry. It is ironic to observe how high stakes testing drives us back to the old, outdated factory models of education long ago rejected as nonproductive to the needs of modern citizens. Ask any principal if PSSA and other high stakes testing have changed how we educate our youth. Ask them if the curricular opportunities for students are broader or more narrowed. Ask them if we are focusing on students' strengths or weaknesses. Good educational practices support the findings that a student develops faster and more fully when his/her strengths are emphasized. Ask art and music educators if their curricular areas have increased or diminished. Ask employers whether they needed graduates that are well rounded or display minimum competencies on high stakes tests.

Greek and Roman societies set the standards for modern Western Civilizations and the importance of an educated citizenry. Both emphasized the need for art, music and physical education in combination with academics. The current state obsession with high stakes testing is having an unintended and destructive impact on the depth and breadth of offerings in schools and actually drives us from the individualized, personal, customized development of each child so needed for today's citizens.

Unintended Consequences

It should be noted that the intention of the advocates for high stakes testing is honorable. We are not disputing the motives or intention of these individuals and groups, but we believe the facts merit a rejection of the implementation of these regulations at this time. The process has been too hurried and is extremely unsupported by credible research to support this unknown leap to action. There are many unintended consequences that could make this \$250,000,000 investment a detriment rather than an asset. Other groups opposing this regulation will no doubt reiterate these possible consequences beyond what we have in this paper. Please consider carefully their contributions and concerns. *What we do know is millions of dollars will be spent and this Administration will be gone in 18 months. Will the new Administration even have an interest in this initiative?*

Facts on Required Graduation Exams and Graduation Rates

According to data gathered from the Center on Educational Policy and the Educational Research Center of the top 10 states (Pennsylvania is number 4) with the highest graduation rate only two require examinations tied to graduation; and of the bottom 10 states in graduation rate nine require graduation testing. It appears we are modeling our education system on states such as Louisiana, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee.

We should not decrease our graduation rate by spending large sums of money on unproven testing.

There are adequate test comparisons between states to show that Pennsylvania is leading the way in improving student achievement. A comprehensive study by the Center on Educational Policy looked at the academic achievement of students by state from 2002-2008. One state stood out as making significant progress in all academic areas and across all grade levels – Pennsylvania. What will Keystone Exams add to our productivity? What might they detract?

Summary

Thank you for your consideration of our position on this issue. We reiterate that we do not object to accountability, or even the use of tests to determine the progress of institutions such as schools, districts and the state to provide what is needed to assure a quality education. We do, however, believe that imposing high stakes test as a requirement for graduation is an unsupported, dangerous idea. It holds only the students accountable and not the institutions. It inhibits students from pursuing viable career opportunities because of a score that may or may not be reflective of their ability, which may or may not be the failure of the student but rather the failure of one or more institutions charged with their education. It is an idea that is to be implemented without any of the basic support structures in place that even the advocates of such testing know must be in place for success. It will require current sixth-graders to pass a test that does not yet exist based upon a curricular model that the state has not yet provided to pass high stakes test that have not yet been validated or tested themselves. Make no mistake, these tests are not a “basket of options” provided for students to choose from -- they are separate high stakes test that students must pass in numerous areas.

If this concept has merit, it will withstand the scrutiny of examination. That comprehensive examination has not yet taken place. The concept has not adequately been vetted.

We urge the IRRRC to not vote in the affirmative on October 22, 2009 for the Keystone Exams.

2696



RECEIVED

PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION OF
ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY
SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

122 VALLEY ROAD, P O BOX 39
SUMMERDALE, PA 17093
PHONE: (717) 732-4899

OCT 13 AM 9:11
INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
COMMISSION

FACSIMILE TRANSMITTAL SHEET

TO IRRC

FROM PAESSP (Sheri Thompson) *labeled by*

COMPANY

DATE 10-12-09

FAX NUMBER

717-783-2664

TOTAL NO OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER

6

PHONE NUMBER

SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER

RE

YOUR REFERENCE NUMBER

PAESSP's Written Comments on Keystone Exams

- URGENT
- FOR REVIEW
- PLEASE COMMENT
- PLEASE REPLY
- PLEASE RECYCLE

notes/Comments:

We also sent via email.

Thank you.

FAX: (717) 732-4890