- 1	•
1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	EDUCATION ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY
7	
8	REVIEW SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING
9	HELD ON DECEMBER 10, 2014
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	Nancy L. Nunnelley, RMR
24	Kentucky Certification No. 20042B131 4413 Chenwood Lane
25	Louisville, Kentucky 40299 Phone: (502) 594-1728 Fax: (502) 267-4156

CHAIRPERSON: And if you would, would you please identify yourself for the record.

MR. BROWN: Kevin Brown, Associate Commissioner and General Counsel for Kentucky Department of Education.

1.5

1.8

MS. FOSTER: Hi. Kelly Foster, Associate Commissioner, Office Next Generation Schools and Districts.

MR. WICKERSHAM: I'm David Wickersham,
Policy Advisor for the Office of Next Generation
Schools and Districts.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you all. I think we have one regulation to take into consideration. So with that, you may proceed.

MR. BROWN: Madam Chairman, there is one new regulation. There's also two regulations that we are repealing. We are combining those into the new regulations. They are involving the school and district accountability -- or involving the audit process as well as the persistently low-achieving school regulation. That's pursuant to KRS 160.346.

Associate Commissioner Foster is going to just give you a very brief overview of what those two regulations do now -- currently do now that we're repealing and then how that changes into all -- into

the new regulation. And then David, I think, if it's the pleasure of the Chair, will go over and summarize some of the comments that we have received during the comment period and our response to those.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay. But before we go forward, I'd also like to introduce Donna Little from the LRC staff. I believe there are some amendments --

MR. BROWN: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: -- suggested amendments.

MS. LITTLE: Yes. If you want to, I'll summarize the amendment now.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MS. LITTLE: It's a staff-suggested amendment that we worked with the department of education to prepare. And what it does is it adds a statutory citation and makes changes to comply with the directing and formatting requirements of KRS Chapter 13A. That way there's consistency between this regulation and the statutes and other administrative regulations. And if you'd like a more detailed summary, I can provide it, but that's the basic summary, is to comply with 13A's requirements.

CHAIRPERSON: I think we have that summary in all of our folders. Does anyone have questions or

can we proceed? Okay. I think we're all right. So you-all can continue.

Okay. We will need a motion to accept those amendments. Second. All in favor say aye.

COMMITTEE: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay. And if you-all would, be sure your microphone -- Donna, you didn't seem like you were...

MS. FOSTER: Basically by combining the two regulations, we're trying to put all the information regarding priority schools into one location. And, unfortunately, in low-performing schools, sometimes the leadership does not have the capacity to lead the turn-around efforts. And what this allows us to do is be able to work with school leadership in making a turn-around plan and school decisions based on the evidence found in the diagnostic review, which is reviewing all parts of the school system as far as their systems, their academics and their facilities, and helping guide them until they can regain that capacity of a school council or a school leadership to help improve student achievement.

MR. WICKERSHAM: The ECEA flexibility waiver submission that Kentucky has required

Kentucky, amongst other states, to develop a process to identify and then to help serve priority schools. And the processes that are presently in place are now outlined in 702 KAR 5:120, which we're seeking to repeal, and then also in 702 KAR 5:180, which outlines what the intervention systems are.

These are several years old. In fact, 5:120 was actually passed in 2004 and established the accountability process under CAT. So the statutory requirements that underpins that regulation are no longer in place. So it's appropriate for us to repeal that.

And then 5:180 was actually developed in 2010. And while it contained several elements that we're carrying forward into the present version of the regulation, we're trying to eliminate some overlap between those two and possibly some confusion for the districts that might be subject to the exercise of the regulation.

Generally, we have had -- there's one public comment that came in during the -- during the public comment period basically covering a total of about 10 different subject areas: The statutory powers of the school council, the role of replace or advisory school councils, elected or appointed school

councils, the selection of intervention plans, diagnostic reviews, termination of the authority of school councils, the repeal of existing school council policies, the authority to implement intervention options, external management organizations and intervention standards and exit criteria.

If you'd like, I can give you some detail on what those comments were and the agency's response. If you'll just let me know what the pleasure of the committee is, I'm happy to continue if you'd like.

CHAIRPERSON: Representative Marzian.

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: Thank you, Madam Chairman and -- Chairwoman, I mean. And I appreciate you-all coming forward. And I just want to rest assured that the Jefferson County Teachers

Association, that the regulation does not affect the continuing effectiveness of the agreement with Jefferson County Public Schools at priority schools.

MR. WICKERSHAM: We do not believe that it does. We had actually received a little bit outside the comment period, but consistent with the formal comment that came in addressing collective bargaining. We have received this information from

the Jefferson County Teachers Association asking -- REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: I can't hear you. Repeat.

MR. WICKERSHAM: We had received a communication from them outside of the public comment period, but consistent with a comment that we received during the comment period (Inaudible) on that particular issue, on the collective bargaining issue. Basically the situation is that 160.346(9), we believe already addresses that issue. There are four intervention options that are laid out there, but there's also a specific provision that indicates that professionally-negotiated contracts by a local board of education may not take precedent over three of the four options that are available there.

So we do not believe that this would impair any portion of what's in place right now between JCTA and between JCPS, that they would be able to continue to negotiate in good faith, as they have been, and to good effect and being able to resolve that.

We're in a bit of a spot because

13A.120(e) doesn't permit us to promulgate an

administrative regulation when the statute already

addresses that. And the present version of the

regulations are silent on dealing with the particular type of arrangement that JCTA has. So we feel like that since the statute addresses it and the present regs do not, it's not something that we're statutorily permitted to intervene in. But we don't see any impairment there.

1.6

And, in fact, JCTA had obtained from Kentucky's attorney general an opinion on that, about the use of that statute indicating that there would not be any impairment in their ability to continue to negotiate as they have been.

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: So the regulation that we're getting ready to approve -- Madam Chairman, if I may continue? I'm sorry.

-- would have no effect on the agreements that JCTA has made with -- or entered into with our public school?

MR. WICKERSHAM: We don't believe so, because the way that the attorney general has analyzed it, we think is accurate and correct and if there is a conflict between the collective bargaining agreement and either federal regulation or state statutes, effectively the parties to that collective bargaining agreement must continue to negotiate pursuant to the terms of their agreement. However,

they're supposed to negotiate under that and then agree to either waive or to modify any part of that agreement that conflicts with statute or to make a --select an intervention option that does not violate that.

MR. BROWN: Jefferson County -- JCPS and JCTA have done that several times, because there are PLA, persistently low-achieving schools in Jefferson County. And that is working now. But the new regulation does not change that interaction that's going to take place.

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: Okay. Well, thank you for your letting my mind rest on this because I do -- I support our teachers in Jefferson County and they work so hard. And, of course, my daughter is a teacher and my son-in-law in Jefferson County, so got to watch out for them. Thank you.

MR. WICKERSHAM: Yes, ma'am.

CHAIRPERSON: Any other questions?
Senator Givens.

SENATOR GIVENS: Madam Chair, thank you and please forgive my tardiness on not being here to hear the entire presentation.

The commissioner spoke on Monday at the interim joint committee on education. Chairman

Graham presided over that meeting and did a very admirable job, as he always does. And the commissioner spoke, I think, to the need for this reg. And I just want to make sure that this is the same reg that he was speaking to, basically indicating that there was some interest in being able to utilize the turn-around options within the district at an earlier point in time. Is that this reg, or is that a separate conversation?

MR. BROWN: That is a separate conversation. If that conversation were to proceed, it would -- it would look similar to this. But this is about the -- what happens when districts fall into the five -- the lowest five percent, with a school that has the lowest five percent ranking and then the intervention options that take place that the state oversees.

MS. FOSTER: This is just for our priority schools. And the conversation he was having on Monday would allow that same opportunity for focus schools, schools that haven't fallen below the five percent, but we want to try to prevent them from doing so. So districts would have the authority to do a diagnostic review to determine, you know, where schools were academically, physically, the

facilities, their leadership, and put some intervention options in at the district level rather than at the state level.

MR. BROWN: That would require a statutory change.

back to what you said just a moment ago when you started, Mr. Brown, the trigger is if a school is in the bottom five -- if a district is in the bottom five percent and they have a school within that district that's in the bottom five percent?

MS. FOSTER: It's actually the school. A priority school is a school that has been in the bottom five percent for three years in a row, has not met their AMO for three years in a row. So that is with the priority schools is what this regulation is dealing with.

SENATOR GIVENS: Okay.

MS. FOSTER: The conversation on Monday would be a district. If they had some schools that were focus schools, which would be in the bottom 10 percent, but they haven't fallen into priority status, if they wanted to do something like this, they would have the authority to do so.

SENATOR GIVENS: Okay. Very briefly and

in summary, for someone who didn't come in on time, tell me again the need for us making these changes specific to where we are today and why we need to make the changes.

MR. WICKERSHAM: The two regulations that we're repealing are rather outdated. Basically what we're doing, the ESEA flexibility waiver requires us to develop a priority school process. That's presently laid out in 702.5:120 and then in 5:180. Those are both several years old.

5:120 was actually passed in 2004 to implement the CATS accountability system. And because that's basically gone by the board and is no longer in place, it's stale and needs to be stricken in any event.

So what we're attempting to do is to confine the pieces of that that continue to be required by federal and state law into a single regulation for clarity (Inaudible). It basically reduces us from having two regulations that overlap to a single.

SENATOR GIVENS: So I can go home and tell my folks that we're eliminating some regulations?

MR. WICKERSHAM: You can.

SENATOR GIVENS: That's always a good

thing.

1.5

One last -- more of a statement than a question: Certainly, while I understand the need in Jefferson County is a little different than in other parts of the state, and not going to be derogatory at all in what I'm going to say, so please don't take it that way, but this overarching concern about protecting teachers while not talking about the interest of students is something that always concerns me. So when we have these conversations about making sure that we're not threatening any teachers, let's extend the conversation and say, are we doing the best for our students. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Representative Marzian.

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: Well, you know, we always play last word at home with my husband.

SENATOR GIVENS: You always win, too.

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: I do. But I believe in the interest of making sure our teachers are adequately protected, paid well, have autonomy at their schools, that our children will benefit from that and they certainly have in the Jefferson County Public School System. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Any more discussions? If

not, do I have a motion that we accept 5:260? 1 have a motion and second. All in favor say aye. COMMITTEE: Aye. CHAIRPERSON: And that motion was as it was amended. Now for 5:122. Do you have a motion to 5 6 repeal? COMMITTEE: So move. CHAIRPERSON: All in favor? COMMITTEE: Aye. CHAIRPERSON: Thank you all. 10 COMMITTEE: Thank you. 11 CHAIRPERSON: I will say that this 12 regulation gave me an opportunity to do a lot of 13 reading as several of the groups did come forward and 14 15 express their concern. Next, we have a report on -- from the 16 office of education accountability. And I will ask 17 that they come forward to give their research agenda. 18 MS. TIMMEL: Good morning. I'm Karen 19 Timmel. I'm acting director of the office of 20 education accountability. And today we're going to 21 be presenting our final report (Inaudible). 22 CHAIRPERSON: Could you identify the other 23 people at the table, please, before you start? 24

MS. TIMMEL: Yes, I will. I'm sorry.

2

3

4

7

8

9

25

Seated here is Deborah Nelson. She's one of our research analysts, and she will be presenting the report today. And also is Gerald Hoppmann, and he's the director of research at OEA.

1.6

1.8

And today's study is looking inside

Kentucky's college and career readiness data. And,

again, Deb -- Deborah Nelson will present, and we'll

be happy to answer any questions when she does -
when she concludes.

DR. NELSON: Good morning. This study analyzes college and career readiness data for high school graduates, focusing in particular on data that was collected beginning in 2012 with the new accountability system. These data are generally reported as a single percentage, but are made up of many different components. So the study looks individually at these components and how they've changed over time and vary among schools and students.

I'll begin with some background about the CCR measure and describe the study and major findings, look at each component in detail and conclude with a discussion that urges caution in the use of the college and career readiness data to dredge up changes in learning outcomes or make

comparisons among districts and schools. And from here on in, I'll refer to college and career readiness as CCR.

On the slide here you see how CCR is often presented beginning in 2010, and you see steep increases from 30 percent of graduates in 2010 to 62 percent of graduates in 2014. The data that are included in these percentages have changed over time. Prior to 2012, CCR data would have included only college-ready students and be based on ACT data. Beginning in 2012, CCR included additional college-ready tests as well as a variety of career-ready measures.

This change was prompted by requirements of Senate Bill 1, which required that a new accountability system be implemented in 2012. The legislation did not specifically require the CCR measure, but the measure is in line with many goals of the legislation; for example, a plan to reduce the percentage of graduates who enroll in college and need remedial course work prior to taking credit-bearing classes.

The CCR measure was developed by the Kentucky Board of Education, and as outlined in regulation, it is the percentage of high school

graduates who meet criteria for one of these components. To be considered college ready, students must pass ACT tests or one of two college placement tests. To be considered career ready, students must meet technical and academic criteria, each of which can be met a variety of ways. To be considered college and career ready, students must meet the technical criteria to be career ready and also pass college-ready tests.

б

And I will describe each of these indicators in greater detail later in the presentation. But what the slide shows is that single percentage that you saw in the previous screen is actually composed of many different elements.

So what the study does is break up total CCR percentages into the different elements. And what you see on the screen right here is just one way of doing that. And I will return, also, to these data later on.

But just to illustrate what the study does, is beginning in 2012 it breaks up the data according to the new measures that were introduced. It also looks in detail at data for 2014 to see whether the types of proportions you see at the state level hold true across student groups and among

schools. For example, you'll see here that of the students who are considered CCR, just under two-thirds of them pass ACT tests. And we'll look to see whether this is true, these proportions hold true for all students and among all schools.

What you see on this slide, also, is a steep increase beginning in 2012 with the percentage of students who would be deemed college ready. The study follows these students, this first class of students, into Kentucky colleges and universities to see whether they enroll and how they perform. To do this, we use data from the Kentucky Center For Education Work Force Statistics, or KCEWS, which links graduate data and post-secondary data. Based on the strength of this KCEWS system, the Commonwealth is given high marks nationally for the quality of its education data systems.

The study was not able to analyze outcomes for students who did not enroll in Kentucky post-secondary institutions, such as students who enroll out of state, are in the military or enter the workforce.

The study finds that the gains in CCR come primarily from the new measures that were introduced in 2012. From those new measures we've seen steep

increases in the percentage of students deemed college ready. Based on analyzing data from that first class of 2012, we know that as a result of this increase, remediation rates have dropped. However, enrollment rates have reigned flat -- remained flat and grades and enrollment for those graduates vary according to whether they were college ready by the ACT or the new measures that were introduced in 2012.

We also know that among students in the state, the percentage who are deemed college ready, the proportion of those students varies among schools and among student groups. Finally, career readiness has increased, but we are -- outcomes for these graduates, these career-ready graduates, are not yet entirely known.

Looking first at the college-ready data. To be considered ready for college with the CCR measure, students must meet CPE benchmarks in all of these three subjects: English, mathematics and reading. They can do so by passing ACT tests, which all students take in the 11th grade. Students who don't meet the benchmarks in the 11th grade can pay to retake ACT tests prior to graduation and be counted as a college and career ready. And I should mention here that the benchmarks that are set by CPE

for college readiness on the ACT are slightly different in mathematics and reading than the benchmarks set by ACT itself, and we describe this in the report.

Students who don't meet benchmarks in the 11th grade can be deemed college ready by taking one of two college placement tests: The COMPASS or the KYOTE, which they can take in the 12th grade at no cost.

Regardless of whether students become college ready by the ACT, the COMPASS or the KYOTE, they are permitted to take credit-bearing classes in any Kentucky college or university without first taking a remedial course. However, there are some important differences among these tests. ACT is a college readiness test that is commonly used for college admission. The COMPASS, which is an ACT product, and the KYOTE, which was developed by educators here in the Commonwealth, are placement tests used to put students in the appropriate courses once they reach college.

Also, as we describe in the report, the ACT is administered under more secure conditions than are possible to ensure with the COMPASS and the KYOTE.

So we'll present the college-ready data in this presentation in three groups: First, students who meet benchmarks in all three subjects in the 11th grade administration. The second group would be students who did not meet all three benchmarks in the 11th grade, but did so prior to graduation. And the third group would be those who are considered college ready who met benchmarks in English, reading and mathematics, but did not meet benchmarks in all three ACT tests. So they would have met benchmarks in at least one subject on the COMPASS and KYOTE. So we have called this a combination group.

so you'll see here, the percentage of graduates who met college readiness benchmarks on the ACT when they were in the 11th grade. And although the CCR measure that we're focusing on begins here in 2012, we do provide one year of prior data here for comparison.

Students who do not meet benchmark in the 11th grade are required by statute to be provided with accelerated learning opportunities. Also, a Senate Bill 1 in that plan to reduce college remediation, required the department to work with the Council on Post-Secondary Education and the Professional Standards Board to develop a plan to

reduce those remediation rates. Part of that plan was development of transitional classes and other strategies that they shared with districts to help students become college ready from the 11th grade to the 12th grade.

2.2

As you can see, many students who do not meet benchmarks in the 11th grade do so prior to high school graduation.

Now, beginning in 2012, you can see a steep increase in the percentage of students who are deemed college ready. And this comes from the possibility of demonstrating college readiness through this combination of ACT, COMPASS or KYOTE tests.

so what are the post-secondary outcomes from this group of students that are -- this increasing group of students that are college ready, deemed college ready? We only have data so far for one year, which is this graduating class of 2012.

So in the next series of slides I'll show you the outcomes that we know based on their enrollment in 2013. We know, for example, that as students demonstrated college readiness through these various tests, fewer were required to do remedial courses. However, not all of these students who are

becoming college ready actually enroll in college. And enrollment rates and grades vary according to which group students were in, whether they met the benchmarks in the 11th grade, met ACT benchmarks prior to graduation or met benchmarks through a combination of measures.

so this slide shows you data on college remediation. It shows you the percent of students who would have been required to take a remedial course based on their graduate data. It shows you percentages for each subject, and also here on the left it shows you the percentage of graduates who enrolled in Kentucky post-secondary institutions and would have been required to take a remedial course in at least one subject.

And what you'll see here is this steep drop between 2012 and 2013 and the percentage of students who are required to take remedial courses. This is that 2012 class as it entered Kentucky colleges and universities. There was a significant drop in the percentage of students requiring mediation from 54 percent in 2011 to 38 percent in 2013. And in the report we note that this group of students that enrolled in Kentucky colleges and universities would have been required to take about

10,000 fewer remedial courses than those who enrolled in 2011.

As the percentage of students deemed college ready have increased, we have not seen increases in the number of students who actually enroll in college. This shows you the number that have enrolled for 2011 and 2013 and which has not grown. Of course, we do see here in the blue increasing numbers of students who enroll and are deemed college ready. But overall, the percentage of graduates that enroll has remained flat at about 56 percent.

Outside the scope of this study, to explain this trend, the fact that we have increasing percentages of students who are college ready but not increasing percentage of students who enroll, we have some data that may be relevant to that question.

First, we'll look at the percentage of graduates who enroll in Kentucky colleges and universities based on student groups. In the report we show these percentages by race. And you'll see that the percentage of students who enroll does not vary substantially by race. White, black, Hispanic and Asian students enroll in Kentucky colleges and universities at about the same rate.

However, we do see differences based on gender. Looking at all graduates, the percentage of females that enroll in Kentucky post-secondary institutions is much greater than the percentage of males.

CHAIRPERSON: Can you stop just one moment? I believe Representative Simpson has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE SIMPSON: Thank you, Madam Chair. Can you go back to the previous slide when you showed 50 -- I think 55 percent of individuals are enrolling. Is that data relative to Kentucky public universities and not to the private universities or the for-profit universities?

DR. NELSON: It does include private universities. I'm not actually sure about the for-profit.

REPRESENTATIVE SIMPSON: Okay.

DR. NELSON: I can find out for you.

REPRESENTATIVE SIMPSON: Now, does that also -- is that inclusive of this training schools where you're getting similar to community colleges?

DR. NELSON: Yes, it includes community colleges and universities.

REPRESENTATIVE SIMPSON: How about

1.

б

training programs that are financed by the employer in-house?

1.4

DR. NELSON: Do not know the answer to that question, but we will look into it and get back to you.

REPRESENTATIVE SIMPSON: Okay. Fine. Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: And I believe Senator Wilson has a question.

SENATOR WILSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

And if you could just do me a favor and back up one more slide to the percentage of prior year graduates that are enrolled in Kentucky colleges and universities that are required to take remedial classes.

DR. NELSON: Yes.

SENATOR WILSON: I know a lot of what's happening now is they're moving to a co-requisite type of remediation where they're enrolled in the class that they should be taking for their degree, but then they're doing some lab or remediation that way. Is that counted in here as remediation or not?

DR. NELSON: That's a good question. What these data show is the percentage of students based on their status when they graduated who would have

been required to take a class that was considered remedial in some way. So it does not count -- it does not look at course data of students who enrolled and dividing them into different groups. It just says based on your status when you graduated, would you have been required to take either a full remedial course or the type of course that you described.

1.3

SENATOR WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

DR. NELSON: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON: And I believe Representative Graham has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Madam Chairman,

I'm just curious as to the breakdown of -- and in

looking at retention rates. As you get this

information and you provide us with this information,

we've got three major items that determine whether a

kid is college and career ready: The ACT, the KYOTE

and the COMPASS test.

Is this information broken down in terms of what percentages of those students met college and career readiness in terms of the percentage of students on the ACT, those students that may not have performed well on the ACT did well on the COMPASS or the KYOTE test and they were considered to be college and career readiness?

And in terms of breaking it down even further, the retention percentage for those who were able to not go into remediation because of the KYOTE test, what percentage of those students, you know, had a percentage of that retention rate, what percentage of those students that had the -- were able to -- to opt out of remediation, that did well under the COMPASS test and obviously the number of students that copped out in terms of not having to take retention because they met the benchmarks of the ACT.

Do you-all have that broken down in terms of the number of students who were retained in college based upon their performance on the COMPASS and so forth, and the KYOTE and the ACT?

> We do. DR. NELSON:

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: And does that make sense?

DR. NELSON: Yes, it makes -- it absolutely makes sense. What you're saying is, okay, these students here --

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Some students make it all three --

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM:

DR. NELSON: They're -- they're ---- some make it

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

just with one --1 DR. NELSON: Right, they're deemed college 2 ready. 3 REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: -- some make it 4 with two. 5 DR. NELSON: What happens to them when 6 they get to college. What we are going to present in 7 this presentation are their grades. In the full 8 report we do have one figure that has to do with 9 retention. We were not able to look at data 10 following the graduates from 2013 to see whether they 11 return in 2014. What we do show is those who 12 enrolled in the fall, were they still enrolled in the 13 14 spring. REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Uh-huh. 15 DR. NELSON: And we do see some 16 differences in those years, and I will --17 REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: So you're going to 18 touch --19 DR. NELSON: -- give you the figure after 20 the presentation. I'll show you the figure. 21 REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Okay. Okay. 22 DR. NELSON: We do see -- I'm -- just from 23 memory, I'm saying it's above -- it's a difference 24 between, say, 80 percent for one group and 85 percent 25

for another group. So we do see differences. But what we do not see is students who are, say, ready by this measure who then do not come back. We see differences, but not really great differences.

me ask -- Madam Chairman, can I ask one more?

So in terms of tracking these students over a period of time, I take it that CPE keeps that track of that information as they stay in school, whether they are retained in school. How -- I guess the fundamental question becomes outside of, how do you know they are staying on track per se and that they are doing well in school per se? How is that information disseminated so that we can continue to make sure that these kids are doing what they need to do based upon the information that I asked you previously?

DR. NELSON: So you're asking, can we continue to monitor --

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Right.

DR. NELSON: -- how these students do?

Like, is this college-ready group, for example,

can -- you know, who are --

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Exactly.

DR. NELSON: Okay. To do this you really

need the KCEWS data system because the Council on Post-Secondary Education has all of the enrollment data. They do not know, based on their own data, necessarily how students would fall into these categories. To do that you would need Kentucky Department of Education data.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Okay.

DR. NELSON: So to answer the question that you're asking, you have to combine the data, which is what we did.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Okay.

DR. NELSON: We got data from KCEWS for this study. We were only able to get one year. If you were interested in tracking this, this is the type of analysis we could easily do, you know, quickly in future years by using KCEWS data, and if that's something that you'd like to see, you --

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: I would if I could, I'd appreciate it. And one last thing, Madam Chairman. You -- you mention in your -- in your presentation, you said something to the effect that the ACT is more secure than the COMPASS and KYOTE. What do you -- tell me what you really meant by that. I didn't quite understand what you meant in terms of secure.

DR. NELSON: The ACT can only be administered at predetermined times and locations. So we have certain test --

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: That's what you were talking about.

DR. NELSON: Well, we have certain test dates where usually you'll have a group of students taking it. It will either be in the high school or sometimes at another location. And these are preset times and locations of all students taking it together.

The COMPASS and the KYOTE can be taken at any time, and it might be a single student taking it. So it might be -- can be taken online. It might be, say, a single student in the library with a monitor from the school. So rather than having a group -- group of students all taking the test at once, as you do with the ACT, you might have a single student with a single monitor. And there's many different test events. With the ACT, there's only a few every year. The COMPASS and KYOTE, there's probably thousands for each individual student. They can take it, they can retake it.

And obviously the department is not able to monitor all of these thousands of test events.

They have to rely on -- to determine whether there's any inappropriate test practices, they have to rely on reports to the department.

So there was a report -- such a report last year, and the department looked into it and found, for example, that students were taking the test in the library and the monitor or the teacher that was there was, you know, aiding them in answering the questions, that they had seen some of the questions ahead of time, and the scores for that school were invalidated.

MS. TIMMEL: Invalidated.

DR. NELSON: Yes. But the point is, KD cannot be in all of the -- you know, the benefit of the COMPASS and the KYOTE is that it does give students an opportunity to demonstrate their readiness prior to college. And for many students, that's had positive outcomes.

However, if we're going to draw conclusions about the strength of various high schools based on this data, it is important to know that the outcomes vary and that there's more security in some measures than others. Does that answer your question?

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Yeah. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

1.

1.5

DR. NELSON: Where was I, 25? Oh, I know. Okay. Okay.

So we know that as college-readiness rates have increased, based on the CCR measure, enrollment has remained flat. And -- oh, I think I was here.

Okay. When you look, you see the differences, that you have more females enrolling in college than males. When you look at just that smaller group of students who meet college-ready benchmarks, the percentages are closer. But still you see a greater percentage of female college-ready students enrolling than you do male college-ready students.

Looking at family income, and this is based on eligibility for the federal priorities like lunch programs, with lower family income students being eligible and higher family income students not being eligible. When you look at all graduates, there are great differences between the percentage of those groups that enroll. When you look at just college-ready graduates, the percentages are closer, but still you see a difference of almost ten percentage points in enrollment between college-ready students from lower income families who enroll in

college and college-ready students from higher income families.

CHAIRPERSON: And Senator Givens has a question.

SENATOR GIVENS: Just a quick question to make sure I understand what you're presenting on the slide. When we say gender differences and we add the 49 and the 62, we don't get 100.

DR. NELSON: Right. It is the -- it is not -- it's the percentage of all graduates. So the percentage of all male graduates who enroll.

SENATOR GIVENS: Okay. Great. Thanks.

DR. NELSON: So this slide shows data from that first graduating class of 2012 as they entered college and the percentage who actually enrolled in college. And here you can see those graduates who met ACT benchmarks prior to graduation, 82 percent of them enrolled in college versus 67 percent of students who met benchmarks through a variety of measures.

And here, this is a -- was a small group in 2012. There was about 400 students who were considered college ready but did not pass a single ACT test. And you can see that enrollment rates for this small group of students was not really different

from students who were not college ready at all. We don't show this little group in all of our big figures because they are so small. But this group is growing. In 2014 it wasn't 400 students; it was over 1200 students who were considered college ready but didn't pass a single ACT test.

And this slide shows you cumulative GPAs for the first year of enrollment for the 2012 graduates based on how they were college ready, with 3.0 or higher being a B average or higher and on the lower side, less than 2.0, that would be less than a C average. And you can see by far, those students with the highest grades were those who met ACT benchmarks in 11th grade. 57 percent of those students, an average of 3.0 or higher, compared to just 31 percent of students who passed through a combination of measures. And then you'll see for this very small, but growing group, almost half of them had GPAs of 2.0 or less.

So this slide does show differences in grades based on how students were deemed college ready. I would like to make another point before I leave this slide, though. This group of students right here, or both of these groups, but this is the largest group, this group of students are students

who met all the benchmarks who would not have been required to take any remedial courses. And you can see, still the majority of them are getting GPAs of greater than 2.0.

In the report we present data just on math, looking at each measure and the percentage that met benchmarks on the ACT, the COMPASS and the KYOTE and how many of them passed their first algebra class. And similarly with those students, the majority of students, by any test that became college ready, still passed their first algebra class.

So you can look at this two ways. One is there are differences among the measures. The other is these students are no longer required to take remedial classes. Most of them are doing okay.

CHAIRPERSON: Senator Wilson has a question.

SENATOR WILSON: So let me just see if I understand correctly what you're telling us here, is that the grade point average is as good an indicator of college and career readiness as the testing is?

DR. NELSON: No. Sorry. I was not clear.

This is not the --

SENATOR WILSON: Okay. All right. I'm sorry. I was confused.

DR. NELSON: Now, I have seen research that does claim that. What this shows is not their grade point average in high school, but their grade point average when they got to college. SENATOR WILSON: Okay. DR. NELSON: So this shows -- what this does show is that based on how they were college ready, you can expect different college grades. SENATOR WILSON: Okay. DR. NELSON: So one group is not the same as another. SENATOR WILSON: All right. Thank you. DR. NELSON: Okay. Thanks for asking. CHAIRPERSON: Representative Jenkins. REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. Have you looked at income level and ACT scores and COMPASS and KYOTE, because logically to me it would seem that lower income folks are not going to be taking that ACT over and over again, but -- or have access to COMPASS and KYOTE. DR. NELSON: You are exactly correct. Wе did look at that. REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: Is that coming up and I skipped ahead?

DR. NELSON: It's not. It's in the

1

2

3

4

5

б

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

report, and I can -- in the interest of time, I'll just get that to you later. But... sorry.

REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: You can wait till after you're finished instead of having you skip around in your presentation. I'm sorry.

DR. NELSON: Okay. The percentages -- the percentage of students who qualified for free or reduced-price lunch, especially if you look at those students who do not meet ACT benchmarks in the 11th grade but do in the 12th grade, versus students who don't meet ACT benchmarks in (Inaudible), but meet it on the combination of tests. Just from memory, one group that -- the group that does meet it on the ACT, it's maybe about something like 40 percent free or reduced-price lunch versus something like 60 percent for the other group.

And that brings up another issue, which we weren't going to talk about, but there is conflict in statute about whether students -- whether the department should pay for students to retake the ACT. There's one statute that was based on legislation, I think, in 2007, which says after they're remediated that the department would pay for them to take one ACT -- take it again once. Current, they're -- currently they do not. With introduction of the

COMPASS and KYOTE, students can take that for free.

The department does not pay for students to retake
the ACT. So you're exactly right. These groups of
students are not the same.

REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: And you keep talking about Kentucky benchmarks and national benchmarks on ACT. What is that score? What's the Kentucky bench to say you passed the ACT?

DR. NELSON: It's different in different subjects.

REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: Oh.

DR. NELSON: So the Kentucky benchmark in math I think is 19, and the ACT benchmark is 22. And Kentucky benchmark in reading, I think it's, like, 18 versus 20, something like that.

REPRESENTATIVE JENKINS: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRPERSON: Senator Givens.

SENATOR GIVENS: Madam Chair, thank you.

And, Ms. Nelson, I hope you realize what a compliment it is to you and your presentation that we keep interrupting you with questions. I've seen committee chairmen and chairwomen that have struggled at the end of the presentation.

(END OF SIDE ONE OF TAPE)

SENATOR GIVENS: The question was a good

```
one, and I'd like to try and take another stab at it.
1
2
               DR. NELSON:
                             Right.
                SENATOR GIVENS: Slide 27 is the one that
3
    you were last on.
4
                           Okay. You want the grades?
               DR. NELSON:
5
                   TIMMEL: Grades.
6
7
               DR. NELSON: Grades. Okay.
                                             I think
    that's right here.
8
                                 That's a GPA slide.
                SENATOR GIVENS:
9
                             Sorry. Sorry the slowness.
10
               DR. NELSON:
    No, no, no, no. Oh, sorry. You're right.
11
               MS. TIMMEL: I'm here for a reason.
12
                             Always listen to your boss.
               DR. NELSON:
13
                SENATOR GIVENS:
                                 Good.
                                        I think this is a
14
    really telling slide, and I think you've kind of
15
    indicated to us that this is a really telling slide.
16
    And I want to make sure that my thinking is right.
17
    You're kind of saying to us that we have
18
    college-ready and then we have really college-ready
19
    students. Really college-ready students in the sense
20
    of if you're an 11th grader and you do score well on
21
    the ACT, 57 percent of those make a 3.0 or higher.
22
                Now, under the new 2012 measure, we're
23
    also counting as college ready these students on the
24
    far right-hand side who do COMPASS or KYOTE only.
25
```

We're saying they're college ready for KDE measures, but we're showing that their likelihood of scoring a 3.0 or higher is only 21 percent versus the other group that we're saying is really college ready is scoring -- 57 percent of them are scoring 3.0 or higher. Have I got that right?

DR. NELSON: That's correct. Now, to be fair, you could do the same thing with the ACT. You could divide up the ACT and you could say, those who got above 27 and those who got between 21 and 26. There's always going to be different groups of students.

what the introduction of these new tests is to allow -- you know, the positive aspect is it allows them to become -- to be deemed college ready enough to not take remedial classes. So that's a positive outcome for those students if they go on to pass the class.

Those measures shouldn't be expected to change a student who didn't pass the ACT in 11th grade into the same type of student who did. I think the intent of the measures was to allow them to demonstrate college readiness sufficient enough to be able to not take a remedial class.

The problem comes, and this is what we

1.

really hit hard at the end of the report. So that's a good outcome: Allow them to demonstrate it to avoid those remedial classes. When you get down to a school and you start saying, well, 60 percent of your students are college ready, and 60 percent of your students are college ready, but the measures are different, that's where the issue lies, and that's really the point that we highlight. So this, you can look at it in two ways. Here's an opportunity for these students to be deemed college ready enough to not take remedial class.

б

And the research on students who take remedial classes in college is mixed, that, you know, just because you take a remedial class, you won't necessarily do better. These guys are not taking remedial classes, and most of them are doing okay. And we saw the same for math. Passing on these tests doesn't change you into another type of student as would be measured by the ACT in 11th grade.

SENATOR GIVENS: I'm going to hold the rest of my questions for the end. Thank you. Well done.

DR. NELSON: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON: I believe you have engaged the group, which is good, because Representative

Graham has another question.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: On a follow-up of what you said, it also helps in terms of the cost factor --

DR. NELSON: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: -- and the university factor of not having to provide professors to teach remediation. So we're saving.

DR. NELSON: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: We're also saying to those 21 percent, I look at that as a positive way in saying that kids can perform if given the opportunity. And it -- the mindset there is also is that they have to want to learn a different strategy in terms of study strategies in order to perform well, but they have the ability to do the college work. The question is, can they change their study habits, which comes down to a personal decision in terms of success.

DR. NELSON: Yeah.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: But I agree with you, and your assessment is that we're also saving these kids from having to pay for remediation when they really don't need remediation. And the university's also reducing the cost of these students

to be taught in remediation classes and pulling professors into those remediation classes rather than allowing them to teach regular classes.

DR. NELSON: Yes. And if I can reemphasize this point, and we spent a fair amount of time talking about this in the report. Data like this is not -- should not call into question the validity of the COMPASS or KYOTE tests for what they were designed to do, which is to allow students to take a credit-bearing class without taking remedial classes. They've saved students a lot of money. And most of these students are doing fine.

This is a totally different group of students. They're high -- you know, the conditions that these students have in so many ways are different from these students. So you would not expect these tests to show similar outcomes. These -- and we also know the grades for these students, if you look at their high school grades, they're higher. They're just catching a different group of students.

The point of this slide is not to call into question the use of the COMPASS and the KYOTE to allow students to take credit-bearing classes and not be remediated, and really, the department, the CPE and the EPE, they really need to be commended for

some of this data you see at the increasing percentages of students who are becoming college ready between 11th grade and 12th grade and go on, most of them, to do fine in college, saving them a lot of money and hopefully graduating earlier than they otherwise would have.

1.3

The problem with this comes when we take it back and look at outcomes in high schools among groups of students and we draw conclusions on it.

And that's what I'll hit in the next series of slides. Does that make sense?

CHAIRPERSON: Okay. I think Representative Marzian has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: I just have a real brief question or maybe two real brief. I read recently some authors got -- received an award from University of Louisville Grawemeyer awards. And their philosophy or their premise, thank you, was that a lot of this testing is kind of unnecessary, that you really should look at grade point averages in high school, activities, engagement, what the focus has been on their studies in high school, teachers' evaluations, and that to judge a college outcome on one two- or three-hour test is really not very valid. And have you done anything on high

school grade point average or high school activities rather than just looking at these tests and the outcome of the tests? And I've also heard that more and more universities are doing away with requiring an ACT or even SAT.

1.1

DR. NELSON: We did not compare in this study how high school GPA would stack up against these tests in terms of predicting college outcomes. The KCEWS data system would allow us to do that, and these are studies that as a committee you can request. As far as other things like the activities they participated and some of those other measures, in order to study that, data for students would first have to be collected systematically. And to my knowledge, we don't have that type of data. As we build the data systems, the more we build the data systems, the more we can study these types of questions.

Another factor that I've seen in research is persistence, that just that, you know, the characteristics of a student can predict some outcomes. Well, we have no measure at the K-12 level for that, so we can't study it. But -- but grade point average versus test as a predictor of college grades or persistent or enrollment is something that

we could look at.

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: Yeah. And that should be fairly easy to acquire --

DR. NELSON: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: -- I mean, your grade point average, and then stack it up against this and see, you know, what -- how well they're doing as far as grade point average.

DR. NELSON: And that's something that as a committee you could request.

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: All right. That would be great. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: All right. As we move on, Senator Givens.

SENATOR GIVENS: Madam Chair, thanks for your indulgence. I did not say I was not going to ask any more questions. We had this conversation about the last word a moment ago, and I'm trying to win the last word contest.

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: Okay. Go ahead.

SENATOR GIVENS: Thank you. Chairman

Graham and I enjoy doing a point/counterpoint sort of thing, and he's made a point, and I've got to try a counterpoint and see if it sticks or not.

I certainly am a huge fan of students

achieving above their expectations. And so if we are 1 doing good by announcing a group of students are 2 college ready and they're going and they're getting 3 college credits and they're completing and they're 4 becoming wage earners, I'm a huge fan of that. 5 for the sake of my conversation, if we were to draw 6 7 the line prior to 2012 on this chart of what we call college ready, would it be between groups 2 and 3? 8 So college readiness --9 DR. NELSON: College ready in 2011 SENATOR GIVENS: 10 meant only the left two groups. 11 That's correct. That's DR. NELSON: 12

correct.

SENATOR GIVENS: College ready in 2011 --DR. NELSON: Oh, no. That's almost correct, yeah.

SENATOR GIVENS: -- almost meant just the So if we're telling the two groups left two groups. on the right that we now deem you to be college ready and you're going out and you're borrowing money that but for you may not have, are we doing them a great service?

DR. NELSON: So let me answer the question in separate pieces.

First of all, the college readiness, the

25

13

14

15

1.6

17

18

1.9

20

21

22

23

percentage of graduates considered college ready, was not reported at the state level prior to 2012 at all. Sometimes you see the data reported kind of retroactively, but it was not reported by the department. So the data that I showed you really started in 2012.

Prior to 2012, students were taking the COMPASS and KYOTE. Some of them were taking those tests in high school. Many of them take those tests prior to entering college, take them over the summer, or take them once they get to college. So there were students taking these tests prior to 2012. They just weren't included in the accountability system, and we don't have data for those students. We weren't able to analyze it.

So these tests didn't begin in 2012. And I think what you're getting at is maybe the need for different words. One is college readiness and the other is permitted to take a credit-bearing class without remediation. And that's actually kind of what we're getting at in this presentation, too, that by lumping everybody into the same group and drawing conclusions based on trends and comparing schools based on it, we lose something. So it's not an argument against using these other tests, but an

argument really for being able to separate the students out and saying some of you are college ready by this measure; others are permitted to take a credit-bearing class, and not lumping everybody together.

CHAIRPERSON: All right. I think we're ready to proceed. And I would caution the members that we are halfway through her report. So we will continue.

DR. NELSON: Okay. So the previous slides have shown -- I think we've discussed this enough, but let me emphasize this again, this is not -- the fact that ACT is a stronger predictor is not an argument against using the COMPASS or KYOTE tests. But what it means is that when we look at students deemed college ready under CCR, we can expect different outcomes from them. That's what it does mean.

And this is something to keep in mind as we look at the next series of slides, which shows that the proportion of students who are deemed college ready under the CCR measure, the proportion of them who actually meet benchmarks on the ACT vary by student characteristics and vary quite a bit among schools.

This slide shows the percentage of students by race who are considered college ready. And if you look at the top of each column, this is the total percentage of students who would be considered college ready by the CCR measure. Then in yellow you see the percentage of those graduates who met benchmarks on all three ACT tests versus the percentage that met through a combination of tests.

And you see for white students about two-thirds of the students deemed college ready met benchmarks marks on the ACT. And this is because most of the students in the state are white. This is similar to percentages you would see for the state. The majority of Asian students deemed college ready have met benchmarks on ACT tests. And fewer than half of black students deemed college ready meet benchmarks on all three ACT tests.

Now, looking at similar data based on program eligibility, and again, this is based on family income. So you can see a far greater percentage of students from higher income families are deemed college ready versus students from lower income families, but also the proportions are different.

Here, over three-fourths of the students

1.6

from higher income families who are deemed college ready under the CCR measure meet the ACT benchmarks versus less than half of the students from lower income families. And this could, again, speak to the cost of the ACT.

And then, of course, you see very low percentages overall by either measure of special education students, those are students who are identified with a disability that affects their learning, or limited English proficiency students, a relatively small percentage being deemed college ready by any measure.

so those are differences you see broadly at the state level. These differences between the percentage of college-ready students who meet benchmarks on different tests can look even more dramatic when you get down to the school level.

Here you see examples of three actual schools in 2014, all of which if you looked at their CCR and the percentage of the students college ready, it would all be about 60 percent in all three of these schools. And by the way, we present data for all -- over 200 schools in one of the appendices of the report.

So this school is typical for the state.

1.8

About two-thirds of the college-ready students meet benchmarks on all ACT tests. And this school, the majority of the students do. And here in this school, just over a third of the students do -- of the college-ready students, meet benchmarks on all three ACT tests. This proportion of school A is not typical for the state. There's only about 20 schools that fall in this category. But there's many schools where less than 50 percent of the college-ready students meet ACT benchmarks.

So two points I'd like to make with this slide. First of all, if you just looked at the percentage of students who were college ready in these schools and said, well, they're all real likely to expect similar outcomes from them, we know that's probably not true. The college-ready students in school C are more likely to go on and enroll and more likely to get higher grades than the students in school A.

The other point I'd like to make with this slide is this difference you see between the percentage of students college ready on the ACT versus all the measures, this is a -- like I said, this is not common for schools in the state. Most of the schools you see with this low percentage of

students meeting ACT benchmarks would have, you know, maybe about here.

1.9

What happened in this school? Why are so -- why is it so unusual? Why are so many more students meeting those benchmarks? Well, we don't know. It's possible that they did a really good job of providing interventions to these students in the 11th grade. They all demonstrated college readiness. And perhaps it was lower income students who couldn't afford to take the ACT. So that would be the best case scenario. But looking at what causes those big jumps in schools, that would be -- that would be one possibility, is that they were very effective with intensive interventions.

However, there are some other factors that could affect those differences, and those factors would undermine the validity of the college ready data in that school. One could be a test-focused instruction. And this is something we've presented on in the past. If there was a real effort in that school to really focus the kids on learning exactly the types of questions and exactly the content likely to appear on the COMPASS and KYOTE, rather than giving them a full course identifying all of their deficiencies, you might see a big jump. Whereas the

students might not truly have mastered the material enough to go on and perform well in college.

1.

1.6

Something else that falls in that category. There is a calculator application called Zoom Math that allows students to solve complex algebraic equations using the calculators that they had been permitted to use on these tests. Oh, I should say it was permitted by ACT for the ACT test and also for the ACT COMPASS test.

This calculator application was never permitted on the KYOTE test, which was developed by post-secondary educators here in Kentucky who believed that use of that application would undermine the validity of the data from the KYOTE test. So it was used on two tests; not used on the KYOTE test.

These educators raised concern that, hey, students can be -- pass these college-ready math tests just by plugging into the calculator. They brought this concern to the department. The department investigated it. They actually took tests where they answered all of the algebraic equations by just using the calculator, and they guessed on the rest and they passed. So they agreed with the concerns of these Kentucky professors. Next year, this application will no longer be allowed on any of

the tests.

After the Kentucky Department of Education made this decision, ACT followed suit and has -- will not be allowing this application for any of the tests nationally. So this is truly an example of the Kentucky Department of Education taking the lead in really trying to protect the validity of the data.

However, some of the jumps you might see, especially in math, and math, if you look in the full report, that's where we've seen really great jumps in college readiness. Some of those jumps from previous years could possibly be explained by this application.

And, finally, as I mentioned before, it's possible when you see large differences between students college ready on the ACT and other tests, that there could be inappropriate test administration practices, such as coaching.

So we have two recommendations related to this previous set of slides. One is that as part of its research agenda, the department requests studies looking at the instructional practices in schools with very large differences between students who are college ready on the 11th grade administration of the ACT and students who are college ready prior to

graduation.

1.3

And the other is that KDE should work with its vendors to ensure that unusual patterns in CCR test data are monitored and reported formally to the department. And an unusual pattern might be a school where you have many students going -- scoring very low on the ACT in the 11th grade and suddenly popping up to the top of the COMPASS range by 12th grade.

Moving on to career-ready data, and it will go a lot quicker from here.

CHAIRPERSON: I think Representative Graham had one question before you move on.

DR. NELSON: Yes.

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE} \textbf{REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM:} \quad \textbf{Go back to the} \\ \textbf{(Inaudible)}.$

DR. NELSON: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: (Inaudible).

DR. NELSON: Well, there's conflict in the statute. One statute says yes and one statute says no. So it's something we mention in the report. I think when the legislation passed in, I think it was 2007, that required those accelerated learning opportunities, said the department should pay for a retake. Since the introduction of the COMPASS and KYOTE, the department does not pay for the retake.

And are there data available? We could get data.

It's not lying around for us to look at right now, to my knowledge.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: (Inaudible).

DR. NELSON: Yes. If there's a really big difference in a school, they have a validity research agenda where they can request studies from the organization that they contract with. And they have researchers. And they have in the past, it was about eight years ago, gone into schools and looked to see whether their instructional practices corresponded with their test scores. So you could go into a school with very big differences and find, well, they're doing after school, before school, all of this stuff. There's reason to, you know -- that -- REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: Right.

DR. NELSON: Yes. And you might go into a school where you found that that was not true. And we know that there -- as we mentioned in the report, most students who don't pass the ACT are not taking the full courses that have been developed by CPE to assist them in learning all the materials. For some students, the intervention might be more focused on a limited amount of material.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: My question

1.5

(Inaudible).

1.6

DR. NELSON: They would only -- to my knowledge, they would only do that now. They would have to request a study. If they do it, I'm not aware. I think what tends to happen more in education is we say, oh, your test scores went up; you must be doing something right. Let's go and see what you're doing. And there's sort of another piece. Well, if what you were doing was the Zoom Math -- and, you know, a lot of districts were purchasing for students the Zoom Math application and putting it on their calculator for them, because this district's scores went up; we're going to get it for ours, too. Well, that's one way of benchmarking, but then you're sort of missing the educational piece.

So to be considered ready for a career, students must meet technical and academic criteria. And Kentucky is unusual among states. Most states only require students to meet technical criteria. But the Kentucky Board of Education felt students should do both.

Students can meet technical criteria through one of these two measures, which we describe in the report. They will only be considered technically ready if they've also taken a sequence of

three classes that are aligned with this technical area. So a student cannot be considered career ready unless they take a sequence of three classes that's aligned with that area.

To be considered academically ready, they can pass either the WorkKeys or the ASVAB. So they have to meet both components to be considered ready for a career.

This slide shows the percentage of graduates from 2012 to 2014 who met the career academic, career technical and who were ultimately considered career ready. In each year you have a greater percentage of students meeting the technical than the academic. And you can see an increase from eight percent of students career ready in 2012 to 18 percent in 2014.

This slide shows the most common areas in which students met technical criteria in 2014. We did not look in great detail at this issue. However, we do cite in our report a report that was done recently by the Southern Regional Educational Board that did look in detail at the area students were becoming career ready in. And they did raise concerns that students are not always becoming career ready in areas that align with workforce demand. And

they cited in particular the need for more courses and more capacity in some of the technical centers to train students in areas such as manufacturing, and said currently there's not necessarily the staff and the resources to provide those sequence of classes in the high-skill, high-wage, high-demand jobs.

1.3

This shows the percentage of graduates by race who are considered career ready -- oh, by race and gender. And you can see that a higher percentage of white students are considered career ready than Asian or black students, and a slightly higher percentage of male than female students.

Looking at career readiness by program eligibility, there's not a great difference based on family income on students who are considered career ready. And we have a smaller percentage of special education students meeting the criteria, and a very small percentage of limited English proficiency students considered career ready.

Moving now to look at students considered college and career ready. To be considered ready for college and a career, students must meet the technical requirements of career readiness and pass the A -- the college-readiness test. They -- to be ready for college and career, students do not have to

pass the ASVAB or WorkKeys because these tests are considered to be more rigorous.

So this college and career-readiness category was developed by the Kentucky Board of Education and included in the accountability system as a way of incentivizing schools to take these students who met technical criteria and move beyond the ASVAB and WorkKeys and actually become college ready on these tests.

That incentive includes a bonus point where students who are considered college and career ready are counted as 1.5 points in the accountability system. So this is a hypothetical school, but this mirrors averages for the state, where if you had 20 percent of your students considered college and career ready here in the green, they would actually be worth 30 points in the accountability system.

As you can see, this incentive appears to be working. This shows the percentage of -- at the state level of students considered college and career ready in the different components, and the component that has increased most over time is this college and career category, increasing from nine percent in 2012 to 19 percent in 2014.

We know that some educators have raised

concerns about the bonus points, and the concern is this: The intention of the bonus point was to take these career-ready students and get them to pass the college-ready test, and so they'll enter into the green category. The concern is that now, schools are incentivized. If a student meets the college-ready criteria, they say, hey, why don't you go enroll in this sequence of classes so you can become technically proficient and we'll get a bonus point The concern is that students may not always for you. be encouraged to enroll in the classes that are the most appropriate for them or to their abilities or to This is not an issue that we their career intention. looked into in the report. We just wanted you to be aware of that discussion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And, finally, this is a relatively small point. It just has to do with the way career readiness is reported. And we note that there's a discrepancy in the way that career readiness is described in these categories and the total percentages of career-ready students that are reported by the department.

So you would think if you were reporting students who were career ready, you would report this group of students who were career ready only and this

group of students who were college and career, because they should all be ready, they've all met the criteria. And so in total, you should see 26 percent of students being career ready.

1.5

However, in this college and career-ready category not all of these students are reported as career ready. And, again, this is -- this is just a sort of reporting issue. The students who are not reported are those who met the technical requirements, passed college-readiness tests, but didn't take the ASVAB or WorkKeys, or of a very small number of students that actually didn't pass the ASVAB or WorkKeys. Most of them are students who met the technical criteria, took the college-readiness tests and didn't take these tests that are required for career readiness. So they were not counted as career ready, even though they should be if they're in this category.

so while 18 percent was reported in 2014, really if you combine these categories, there should be 26 percent of students in total considered ready for a career. And in the report, I believe we break this out by race, and you'll see, like, a much higher percentage of students in all races considered career ready if you include all of the criteria in the

reporting.

1.2

so we want to emphasize again this is an issue that affects reporting only. There's really no negative consequence for schools and students.

Still, we recommended this be cleaned up and that KDE reevaluate its criteria to ensure some consistency between the criteria and the way the numbers are reported.

so in conclusion, and this I think will really bring together a lot of the discussion that we've been having, we would like to urge some caution in the way that the CCR indicator has sometimes been used. The way it's been used is to say, look, CCR rates have grown. This shows this or this shows that, or CCR rates have grown in this school, so this shows this school is more effective than that school.

Well, an indicator that is used that way for evaluation or for comparing should measure the same outcome over time. It should measure the same outcome at different locations. And it should be very clear about what it is measuring.

However, we know that's not true with the CCR data. It would look to be true. It looks like it's the same measure. It looks like it's increasing over time. But with the conclusions that you would

draw, based on looking at this slide, are different from the conclusions you would draw looking at this slide. Here -- and, again, it's just one way of breaking it out. There's only one measure on here that meets the criteria we established in the previous slide, only one measure that's been the same over time and that we can really ensure is the same in different locations, and that's the ACT.

So we have seen a moderate increase in the ACT of seven percentage points, but that's compared to 32 percentage points in the increase of total CCR. So we have to be careful about the conclusions that we draw based on that broader indicator and really look within it.

And I should say that if you look at individual schools, this would look different. There are schools that may have gone from here to here, and we know there are schools because we've looked at them, where the ACT has stayed exactly the same. So it looks like their college and career readiness has doubled, but by the one measure that has been consistent over time hasn't changed.

So we really just urge caution in the use of the measure to draw conclusions about learning outcomes, effectiveness of programs and that type of

thing.

1.

We also use caution in using the measure to make comparisons among schools. Here again are the three schools I showed you before, where if you looked at them and said, well, they're all 60 percent college ready, so whatever they're doing is working the same in all schools. Well, we know you cannot expect similar outcomes from the students in these schools, at least based on that 2012 data, that the students in school C will have different outcomes from the students in school A.

So, again, this is not calling into question the use of the COMPASS and the KYOTE tests. It is calling into question the lumping of everybody together into a single indicator to draw conclusions based on that single indicator.

And so our final recommendation is that the Kentucky Department of Education should not use the CCR measure as the sole or primary indicator when reporting progress of student outcomes over time or evaluating the impact of particular programs or policies. College and career-readiness rates should not be used in isolation to compare student outcomes among districts and schools.

So that concludes the presentation. I do

want to emphasize that many of the questions that you've asked, we can -- we can get data for your districts, for your schools. If we put all of the data in the report, it would be a telephone book. But if there's any particular interest -- issues that you're interested in, we can get you data for -- that you would be interested in.

CHAIRPERSON: Dr. Nelson, we thank you.

That's been very enlightening, and I would say very engaging by the questions that were raised. And as I watched the audience, no one fell asleep. So that was excellent, too.

So we still have some more questions. And I believe Representative Marzian, we'll start with her.

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: Thank you for a very informative study results. But I would like to send, I guess, a committee request at some point, we could ask for looking at high school grade point average and compare that with the ACT and the KYOTE, you know, see what the comparison would be. I think it would be very interesting to see if their outcomes are just as good or better or whatever. So...

DR. NELSON: That would be interesting. That would be interesting for us to do. I want to

emphasize, again, that all of these questions that we have about what we think our K-12 data means in terms of what students do, we cannot look at these questions without the KCEWS data, without the Kentucky Center For Education and Workforce Statistics, because that links the data we have for the K-12 with what happens after graduation.

1.6

REPRESENTATIVE MARZIAN: And I'd also like to find out if you-all could look at how many colleges and universities are deleting the requirement for the standardized college-readiness testing, because, you know, I'm hearing more and more that they are -- some of the -- some of the Ivy Leagues are even dropping them, so...

CHAIRPERSON: Okay. I thank you. And, Senator Wilson.

SENATOR WILSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I wanted to -- I know that we have representatives here from KDE. And if you would like to come to the table to respond to any of this or if you need some time to respond to the study to get back to us.

INDIVIDUAL: What we normally do is we prepare a written statement back, based on the recommendations from the OEA study, and we're happy to do that and follow up on any additional questions

the committee poses today.

SENATOR WILSON: Okay.

INDIVIDUAL: If that's okay. If there's something we can answer while we're here, we're happy to do that. We have a few folks in the audience.

Ken Draut is not here this morning. He had been scheduled someplace else. So our assessment folks aren't in the room. I'm sorry for that. But scheduling conflicts. But we can answer any questions that you have or get back to you.

SENATOR WILSON: Okay. If you could report it back to the education staff and then disseminate it, she'll disseminate it to the members. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: And Representative Graham has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: (Inaudible).

CHAIRPERSON: Microphone.

REPRESENTATIVE GRAHAM: I want to commend you and the office for your presentation and the information in terms of breaking it down and really tolerating all the questions that I asked particularly. But I think this information is very important and I think it's a key for us to address several issues that we talked about, Senator Givens;

in our education committee meeting on Monday. And this only just adds more information for us to try to work towards a solution in terms of achievement gaps across socioeconomic as well as those of color as well. So we appreciate this information. It's very important that we -- we study and get as much information as possible before we try to legislate new outcomes for our education system across the Commonwealth of Kentucky. So I commend you and I thank you for your presentation.

DR. NELSON: Thank you. And I would like to say that I sort of come up with the questions in terms of this report, but it really would not be possible without this shady character sitting right here. Raise your hand. Who is actually the person who brings together tens of thousands of education records and is able to pull them together for us.

CHAIRPERSON: And we thank you for that.

Any other questions? Okay. If not, do I hear a -oh, yeah, we do have the study agenda. You wanted to
bring that.

MS. LITTLE: Yes. Did you want to approve the report first?

CHAIRPERSON: Okay. We will approve this one first. Do I have a motion?

1.

1.6

INDIVIDUAL: So move.

CHAIRPERSON: Second. All in favor?

COMMITTEE: Aye.

1.3

CHAIRPERSON: All right. Now we'll move on to our study agenda.

MS. LITTLE: Yes. Every year the committee approves a study agenda for the Office of Education and Accountability. And this year, and I think it's in your packet, is the proposal that Mr. Hoppmann and I, in conjunction with Senator Wilson and Representative Smart, have developed and are seeking your approval on.

What it -- what we are planning to do this year is essentially a total of five studies, which would include our annual district data profiles, a study on school safety, which would be a pretty comprehensive study that may actually take more than a year to complete. We're going to look at recess and physical education in the K-5 schools and as well as a -- our biannual compendium on state rankings for 2015. We do this annually. Every two years we do -- update the rankings. And then we are also going to work on a primer for Kentucky independent school districts that will include a pretty broad basic review of statutory, regulatory, constitutional

requirements, and then demographic data, financial data, revenue, where they get that, and as well as performance and things like that. So...

CHAIRPERSON: I would like to make the committee members aware that we have talked with various groups, and as we looked at these topics for studies and possible other topics for studies, you can request, and we will probably be bringing up further topics throughout the year. It seems like we got to the point where we were only coming up with our ideas in December and then were trying at the last minute to get these reviewed and finished.

But we hope that this coming year that these top -- these studies will come in at different times, so -- and then we can be adding topics at different times so they're not all due at the same time. And it will not only help the staff, but it will give us more time to digest and so forth. So if you have something else that comes up in February, March and you want to suggest that to us, you can do that. You don't have to wait till the end.

MS. LITTLE: Yes, ma'am. If anyone has a recommendation or they want us to start doing some preliminary work on something, they can just contact me via e-mail or they can contact Mr. Hoppmann as we

are -- as our statute requires us to work with you to develop this agenda. So...

1.3

CHAIRPERSON: And the -- you may be giving us bits and pieces as you go along --

MS. LITTLE: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON: -- rather than just waiting to give us --

MS. LITTLE: Particularly with the safe schools --

CHAIRPERSON: Right.

MS. LITTLE: -- since it's going to be a longer study, we will probably present little pieces of that as we go. It is our intention to try to have at least our annual report ready for you by June or July, and hopefully the independent school district study as well, and then the recess one by August or September. That would maybe free up the end of the year for us to be more focused on finishing up the school -- safe schools and then any other data that you would be interested in.

We also plan to review some of our old studies to see if there's any new data out there that we need to update that this -- the committee on as well.

CHAIRPERSON: So do we have any questions

regarding the study agenda? Do I hear a motion we approve it? Second? All in favor.

COMMITTEE: Aye.

CHAIRPERSON: You may get to work.

MS. LITTLE: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: All right. Do we have any other -- oh, Senator Givens wants the last word.

Okay.

SENATOR GIVENS: She left. Here's my chance. Thank you for that reminder.

Madam Chair, compliments to you and Co-Chair Wilson on a really productive meeting. And I'd like to ask KDE for one other thing to add to what Chairman Wilson has requested.

Because our attention spans are so short and time drifts our minds away pretty quickly from a really good discussion like we had here, if KDE would provide the report or the response to Mrs. Nelson -- Dr. Nelson, before the meeting and then at the -- at the request of the chairs, if Dr. Nelson could come back and do kind of like the season ends, the TV series season ends and the new season starts and she does a segue to get us back in the mode of this discussion before KDE comes to the table, I think that might be helpful for us to fully engage in

response to KDE's response.

CHAIRPERSON: I believe that's a very good suggestion. Kind of like Downton Abbey. And I will have the last word. And I will say that we have requested staff to work to see if they could get us a regular meeting date -- day. And then members, you can put that on your calendar. But for now we'll just have to notify you when the next meeting is scheduled.

No other news, we'll say, Happy Holidays, Merry Christmas and good-bye. Thank you.

1.

1.0

_	61:18, 63:24, 65:19		42:9, 42:20, 43:19,	align [1] - 61:25
1	2015 [1] - 73:21	8	47:5, 51:13, 51:23,	aligned [2] - 61:1,
1 [2] - 16:15, 21:22	21 [3] - 42:3, 42:10,	80 [1] - 29:25	52:7, 52:11, 52:15,	61:4
1.5 _[1] - 63:12	44:11	82 (1) - 35:17	52:17, 53:2, 53:5,	allow [7] - 10:20,
1.5(1) = 03.12 10 [3] - 1:8, 5:23,	22 [1] - 40:13	85 [1] - 29:25	54:2, 54:6, 54:10,	42:14, 42:22, 43:2,
10 [5] - 1.0, 5.25, 11:21	25 [1] - 34:2	00 [i] - 20.20	54:22, 55:1, 55:10,	45:9, 45:23, 47:9
10,000 [1] - 24:1	26 [3] - 42:10, 65:3,	Α	56:8, 56:9, 57:3,	allowed [1] - 56:25
100 (1) - 35:8	65:21		57:16, 57:25, 58:7,	allowing [2] - 45:3,
11th [19] - 19:21,	267-4156 [1] - 1:25	Abbey [1] - 77:3	59:20, 67:8, 67:10,	57:4
19:22, 20:6, 21:3,	27 [2] - 41:3, 42:10	abilities [1] - 64:12	67:19, 69:20	allows [3] - 4:15,
21:6, 21:15, 21:20,	20 [2]	ability [2] - 8:10.	acting [1] - 14:20	42:15, 56:5
22:4, 22:7, 23:4,	3	44:16	activities [3] - 46:21,	almost [4] - 34:23,
36:14, 39:9, 41:21,		able [14] - 4:15, 7:19,	47:1, 47:11	36:18, 49:15, 49:17
42:20, 43:19, 46:3,	3 [1] - 49:8	7:20, 10:6, 18:18,	actual [1] - 53:18	amended (1) - 14:5
55:8, 57:24, 58:7	3.0 (5) - 36:10, 36:15,	28:3, 28:7, 29:10,	add [2] - 35:7, 76:13	amendment [2] -
1200 [1] - 36:5	41:22, 42:3, 42:5	31:13, 32:24, 42:24,	adding [1] - 74:15	3:12, 3:15
12th [5] - 20:8, 22:5,	30 [2] - 16:6, 63:17	50:14, 51:1, 72:17	additional [2] -	amendments [3] -
39:10, 46:3, 58:8	31 (1) - 36:16	absolutely (1) -	16:11, 70:25	3:8, 3:10, 4:4
13A (1) - 3:19	32 [1] - 67:11	28:20	address [1] - 71:24	AMO [1] - 11:15
13A's [1] - 3:23	38[1] - 23:22	academic [4] - 17:5,	addresses [3] - 7:10,	amount [2] - 45:5,
13A.120(e [1] - 7:23		60:17, 61:11, 61:14	7:25, 8:3	59:24
160.346 [1] - 2:21	4	academically [2] -	addressing (1) - 6:24	analysis [1] - 31:15
160.346(9[1] - 7:9		10:25, 61:5	adds [2] - 3:16, 72:2	analysts [1] - 15:2
18 [3] - 40:14, 61:16,	40 [1] - 39: 1 4	academics [1] - 4:20	adequately [1] -	analyze [2] - 18:18,
65:19	400 [2] - 35:22, 36:4	accelerated [2] -	13:21	50:15
19 [2] - 40:13, 63:24	40299 [1] - 1:24	21:21, 58:22	administered [2] -	analyzed [1] - 8:20
	4413 [1] - 1:24	accept [2] - 4:3, 14:1	20:23, 32:2	analyzes [1] - 15:11
2	49 [1] - 35:8	access [1] - 38:20	administration [3] -	analyzing [1] - 19:2
		according [ଞ] -	21:4, 57:17, 57:24	AND [1] - 1:6
2 [1] - 49:8	5	17:22, 19:7, 23:2	administrative [2] -	announcing (1) -
2.0 [3] - 36:11, 36:19,	50 05:44 54:0	accountability [11] -	3:21, 7:24	49:2
37:4	50 (2) - 25:11, 54:9	2:19, 5:9, 12:12,	admirable (1) - 10:2	annual [2] - 73:15,
20 [3] - 40:15, 54:7,	502 [2] - 1:25	14:17, 14:21, 15:14,	admission [1] -	75:14
63:15	54 [1] - 23:22	16:16, 50:13, 63:5,	20:17	annually [1] - 73:21
200 [1] - 53:23	55 _[1] - 25:11 56 _[1] - 24:12	63:12, 63:17	Advisor[1] - 2:10	answer [7] - 15:8,
2004 [2] - 5:8, 12:11	57 [3] - 36:14, 41:22,	Accountability [1] - 73:8	advisory [1] - 5:25	26:3, 31:8, 33:23,
20042B131 (1) - 1:23	42:5	ACCOUNTABILITY	affect [2] - 6:18, 55:16	49:23, 71:4, 71:9
2007 [2] - 39:22,	594-1728 [1] - 1:25	[1] - 1:6	affects [2] - 53:9,	answered [1] - 56:21
58:22	5:120 [3] - 5:4, 5:8,	accurate (1) - 8:20	66:3	answering (1) - 33:9
2010 [3] - 5:14, 16:5,	12:11	achievement [2] -	afford [1] - 55:10	appear [1] - 55:23 appendices [1] -
16:6	5:122 [1] - 14:5	4:23, 72:3	agency's [1] - 6:9	53:23
2011 [5] - 23:22,	5:180 [3] - 5:5, 5:13,	achieving [3] - 2:20,	agenda [8] - 14:18,	application [7] -
24:2, 24:7, 49:10, 49:14	12:9	9:8, 49:1	57:21, 59:7, 72:20,	56:4, 56:10, 56:13,
2012 (28] - 15:13,	5:260 [1] - 14:1	acquire [1] - 48:3	73:5, 73:7, 75:2, 76:1	56:25, 57:4, 57:13,
16:9, 16:11, 16:16,		ACT [73] - 16:10,	ago [3] - 11:7, 48:18,	60:11
17:21, 18:7, 18:25,	6	17:3, 18:3, 19:8,	59:10	appointed [1] - 5:25
19:3, 19:8, 21:17,	<u> </u>	19:20, 19:23, 20:1,	agree [2] - 9:2, 44:21	appreciate [3] - 6:15,
22:9, 22:19, 23:17,	60 [5] - 39:15, 43:4,	20:3, 20:11, 20:15,	agreed (1) - 56:23	31:19, 72:5
23:19, 35:14, 35:22,	43:5, 53:21, 68:5	20:17, 20:23, 21:10,	agreement [5] - 6:19,	appropriate [3] -
36:8, 41:23, 49:7,	62 [2] - 16:7, 35:8	21:15, 22:13, 23:4,	8:22, 8:24, 8:25, 9:3	5:11, 20:20, 64:12
50:2, 50:6, 50:7,	67 [1] - 35:18	27:17, 27:22, 27:23,	agreements [1] -	approval [1] - 73:12
50:12, 50:16, 61:10,		28:11, 28:15, 31:22,	8:15	approve [4] - 8:13,
61:15, 63:23, 68:9	7	32:1, 32:18, 32:20,	ahead (3) - 33:10,	72:22, 72:24, 76:2
2013 [5] - 22:22,		35:17, 35:24, 36:6,	38:24, 48:20	approves [1] - 73:7
23:17, 23:23, 24:7,	702 [2] - 5:4, 5:5	36:13, 37:7, 38:17,	aiding [1] - 33:8	area [3] - 61:2, 61:4,
29:11	702.5:120 [1] - 12:9	38:19, 39:9, 39:11,	algebra [2] - 37:8,	61:22
2014 [11] - 1:8, 16:7,		39:13, 39:20, 39:24,	37:11	areas [4] - 5:23,
17:23, 29:12, 36:4,		40:3, 40:7, 40:8,	algebraic [2] - 56:6,	61:17, 61:25, 62:3
53:19, 61:10, 61:16,		40:13, 41:22, 42:8,	56:21	argument (ঃ] -
=				

50:25, 51:1, 51:14 arrangement [1] -Asian [3] - 24:24, 52:14, 62:11 asleep [1] - 69:11 aspect (1) - 42:14 assessment [2] -44:22, 71:7 ASSESSMENT[1] assist [1] - 59:22 associate [1] - 2:22 Associate [2] - 2:3, Association [2] -6:18, 7:1 assured [1] - 6:17 ASVAB [5] - 61:6, 63:1, 63:8, 65:11, 65:13 attempting [1] -12:16 attention [1] - 76:15 attorney [2] - 8:8, audience [2] - 69:11, 71:5 audit (1) - 2:19 August [1] - 75:16 authority [4] - 6:2, 6:4, 10:23, 11:24 authors [1] - 46:16 autonomy [1] - 13:21 available [2] - 7:15, 59:1 average [11] - 36:10, 36:12, 36:15, 37:20, 38:3, 38:4, 47:1, 47:24, 48:6, 48:8, 69:20 averages [2] - 46:20, 63:14 avoid [1] - 43:3 award [1] - 46:16 awards [1] - 46:17 aware [3] - 60:5, 64:15, 74:5 aye [7] - 4:4, 4:5, 14:2, 14:3, 14:9, 73:3, 76:3

В

background [1] -15:20 bargaining [4] -6:25, 7:8, 8:21, 8:24 based [30] - 4:17, 16:10, 18:14, 19:2,

22:21, 23:10, 24:20, 25:1, 26:24, 27:5, 28:14, 30:16, 31:3, 33:21, 34:5, 34:16, 36:9, 36:21, 38:7, 39:21, 50:23, 50:24, 52:18, 52:19, 62:14, 67:1, 67:13, 68:9, 68:16, 70:23 basic (2) - 3:23, 73:24 bearing [6] - 16:22, 20:12, 45:10, 45:23, 50:19, 51:4 became [1] - 37:10 become [5] - 20:10, 22:4, 42:15, 63:8, 64:8 becomes [1] - 30:11 becoming 151 - 23:1. 46:2, 49:5, 61:23, 61:24 begin [2] - 15:20, 50:16 beginning (6) -15:13, 16:5, 16:11, 17:21, 18:7, 22:9 begins [1] - 21:16 below [1] - 10:21 bench [1] - 40:8 benchmark [4] -21:19, 40:12, 40:13, 40:14 benchmarking [1] benchmarks [38] -19:18, 19:22, 19:25, 20:3, 20:5, 21:3, 21:5, 21:8, 21:9, 21:10, 21:14, 22:7, 23:4, 23:5, 28:10, 34:11, 35:17, 35:19, 36:14, 37:1, 37:7, 39:9, 39:11, 40:6, 40:7, 51:23, 52:7, 52:11, 52:15, 52:17, 53:2, 53:16, 54:2, 54:5, 54:10, 55:1, 55:5 benefit [2] - 13:22, 33:14 best [2] - 13:13, 55:10 better [2] - 43:15, 69:23 between [17] - 3:19,

5:17, 7:18, 8:21,

23:17, 29:25, 34:20,

34:24, 42:10, 46:3,

49:8, 53:14, 54:21,

57:15, 57:23, 66:7

beyond [1] - 63:7 biannual [1] - 73:20 big [5] - 36:2, 55:11, 55:25, 59:5, 59:13 Bill [2] - 16:15, 21:22 bit [3] - 6:22, 7:22, 51:24 bits (1) - 75:4 black [3] - 24:23, 52:16, 62:11 blue [1] - 24:8 Board [5] - 16:24, 21:25, 60:20, 61:21, 63:4 board [2] - 7:14, 12:13 bonus [4] - 63:10, 64:1, 64:2, 64:9 book [1] - 69:4 borrowing [1] -49:20 boss [1] - 41:13 bottom [5] - 11:9, 11:11, 11:14, 11:21 break (2) - 17:15, breakdown (1) -27:13 breaking [3] - 28:1, 67:4, 71:21 breaks [1] - 17:21 brief [3] - 2:23, 46:15 briefly [1] - 11:25 bring [2] - 66:10, 72:21 bringing [1] - 74:8 brings [2] - 39:17, broad [1] - 73:24 broader[1] - 67:13 broadly [1] - 53:13 broken [2] - 27:19, 28:12 brought [1] - 56:19 brown [1] - 11:8 BROWN [6] - 2:3, 2:15, 3:9, 9:6, 10:10, 11:4 Brown [1] - 2:3 build [2] - 47:16 but.. [1] - 39:2 bye [1] - 77:11

C

calculator [5] - 56:4, 56:10, 56:18, 56:22, 60:12 calculators [1] - 56:6 calendar [1] - 77:7

cannot [4] - 33:14, 61:2, 68:7, 70:3 capacity [3] - 4:14, 4:21, 62:2 career [56] - 15:6, 15:11, 15:24, 16:2, 16:13, 17:4, 17:7, 17:8, 19:12, 19:14, 19:24, 27:17, 27:21, 27:25, 37:21, 58:9, 60:16, 61:2, 61:8, 61:10, 61:11, 61:12, 61:15, 61:23, 61:24, 62:8, 62:10, 62:13, 62:15, 62:19, 62:21, 62:22, 62:23, 62:25, 63:3, 63:11, 63:16, 63:20, 63:23, 64:3, 64:13, 64:17, 64:19, 64:21, 64:24, 64:25, 65:1, 65:4, 65:5, 65:7, 65:16, 65:17, 65:22, 65:24, 67:20, 68:22 career-readiness [2] - 63:3, 68:22 career-ready [6] -16:13, 19:14, 58:9, 64:3, 64:21, 65:5 careful (1) - 67:12 carrying [1] - 5:15 case [1] - 55:11 CAT [1] - 5:9 catching (1) - 45:20 categories [3] - 31:5, 64:20, 65:20 category [7] - 54:8, 56:4, 63:4, 63:23, 64:5, 65:6, 65:18 CATS [1] - 12:12 causes [1] - 55:11 caution [5] - 15:23, 51:7, 66:11, 67:23, 68:2 CCR [25] - 15:21, 16:3, 16:4, 16:9, 16:11, 16:17, 16:23, 17:16, 18:2, 18:23, 19:17, 21:16, 34:5, 51:16, 51:22, 52:5, 53:2, 53:20, 58:3, 66:12, 66:13, 66:15, 66:23, 67:11, 68:19 Center [2] - 18:12, centers [1] - 62:2 certain [2] - 32:3, certainly [3] - 13:3, 13:23, 48:25

Certification [1] -

Chair [12] - 3:2, 9:21, 13:14, 25:10, 26:7, 26:10, 38:16, 40:18, 48:15, 70:17, 76:11, 76:12 chairman (2) - 9:25, 48:21 Chairman [8] - 2:15, 6:15, 8:14, 27:12, 30:6, 31:20, 34:1, 76:14 chairmen [1] - 40:22 CHAIRPERSON [44] - 2:1, 2:12, 3:5, 3:10, 3:13, 3:24, 4:6, 6:13, 9:19, 13:15, 13:25, 14:4, 14:8, 14:10, 14:12, 14:23, 25:6, 26:8, 27:10, 35:3, 37:16, 38:14, 40:17, 43:24, 46:12, 48.13, 51:6, 58:11, 69:8, 70:15, 71:15, 71:18, 72:18, 72:24, 73:2, 73:4, 74:4, 75:3, 75:6, 75:10, 75:25, 76:4, 76:6, 77:2 chairs [1] - 76:20 Chairwoman [1] -6:15 chairwomen [1] -40:22 chance [1] - 76:10 change [6] - 9:10, 11:5, 16:14, 42:20, 43:18, 44:17 changed [3] - 15:18, 16:8, 67:22 changes [5] - 2:25, 3:17, 12:2, 12:4, 15:25 Chapter (1) - 3:19 character [1] - 72:14 characteristics [2] -47:21, 51:24 chart [1] - 49:7 Chenwood [1] - 1:24 children [1] - 13:22 Christmas [1] -77:11 citation [1] - 3:17 cite [1] - 61:20 cited (1) - 62:1 claim [1] - 38:2 clarity [1] - 12:19 class [16] - 18:9, 19:3, 22:19, 23:19, 26:20, 27:1, 35:14, 37:9, 37:11, 42:18,

42:24, 43:11, 43:14, 45:10, 50:19, 51:4 classes [19] - 16:22, 20:12, 22:2, 26:15, 37:15, 42:16, 43:3, 43:13, 43:16, 45:1, 45:2, 45:3, 45:11, 45:23, 61:1, 61:3, 62:5, 64:8, 64:11 cleaned [1] - 66:5 clear [2] - 37:22, 66:21 closer [2] - 34:11, 34:22 Co [1] - 76:12 co [1] - 26:18 Co-Chair [1] - 76:12 co-requisite [1] coaching [1] - 57:18 collected (2) - 15:13, 47:14 collective (4) - 6:24, 7:8, 8:21, 8:23 college [150] - 15:6, 15:11, 15:24, 16:2, 16:10, 16:12, 16:20, 17:2, 17:3, 17:7, 17:9, 18:8, 19:2, 19:7, 19:10, 19:16, 19:17, 19:24, 20:1, 20:6, 20:7, 20:11, 20:13, 20:16, 20:17, 20:21, 21:1, 21:7, 21:14, 21:22, 22:4, 22:11, 22:12, 22:17, 22:18, 22:23, 23:1, 23:7, 24:4, 24:6, 24:10, 24:15, 27:17, 27:20, 27:24, 28:14, 29:2, 29:7, 30:22, 33:17, 34:4, 34:9, 34:10, 34:12, 34:13, 34:22, 34:24, 35:1, 35:15, 35:16, 35:18, 35:23, 36:1, 36:5, 36:9, 36:21, 37:10, 37:21, 38:4, 38:7, 38:8, 41:19, 41:20, 41:24, 42:1, 42:4, 42:15, 42:23, 43:5, 43:6, 43:10, 43:13, 44:16, 46:2, 46:4, 46:23, 47:8, 47:24, 49:3, 49:4, 49:8, 49:9, 49:10, 49:14, 49:19, 49:25, 50:1, 50:10, 50:11, 50:18, 51:2, 51:16, 51:22, 52:2, 52:5, 52:10, 52:14,

52:16, 52:22, 53:1, 53:11, 53:15, 53:20, 54:1, 54:5, 54:9, 54:13, 54:16, 54:22, 55:8, 55:17, 56:2, 56:17, 57:11, 57:16, 57:24, 57:25, 62:21, 62:22, 62:24, 62:25, 63:3, 63:8, 63:11, 63:15, 63:20, 63:22, 64:4, 64:6, 65:1, 65:5, 65:10, 65:14, 67:20, 68:6, 68:22, 70:11 college-readiness [5] - 34:4, 62:24, 65:10, 65:14, 70:11 college-ready (23) -16:10, 16:12, 17:9, 19:16, 21:1, 30:22, 34:10, 34:12, 34:13, 34:22, 34:24, 35:1, 41:19, 41:20, 53:15, 54:1, 54:5, 54:9, 54:16, 56:17, 64:4, colleges (9) - 18:10, 23:20, 23:24, 24:19, 24:24, 25:22, 25:24, 26:13, 70:10 color (1) - 72:4 column [1] - 52:3 combination [6] -21:12, 22:13, 23:6, 36:17, 39:12, 52:8 combine [2] - 31:9, 65:20 combining [2] - 2:17, coming [4] - 6:16, 38:23, 74:10, 74:13 commend [2] -71:19, 72:9 commended [1] comment [8] - 3:4, 5:21, 5:22, 6:23, 6:24, 7:5, 7:6, 7:7 comments [2] - 3:3, commissioner [2] -9:24, 10:3 Commissioner [3] -2:4, 2:7, 2:22 COMMITTEE [7] -4:5, 14:3, 14:7, 14:9, 14:11, 73:3, 76:3 committee [11] -6:11, 9:25, 40:21,

47:10, 48:10, 69:18,

71:1, 72:1, 73:7, 74:5,

75:23 common [2] - 54:24, 61:17 commonly [1] -20:16 Commonwealth [3] -18:16, 20:19, 72:9 communication [1] -7:5 community [2] -25:22, 25:23 compare [3] - 47:6, 68:23, 69:20 compared [2] -36:15, 67:10 comparing [2] -50:23, 66:18 comparison [2] -21:18, 69:21 comparisons [2] -16:1, 68:3 COMPASS [28] -20:7, 20:11, 20:17, 20:24, 21:11, 22:13, 27:18, 27:23, 28:8, 28:14, 31:22, 32:12, 32:21, 33:15, 37:7, 38:17, 38:20, 40:1, 41:25, 45:8, 45:22, 50:8, 51:14, 55:23, 56:9, 58:8, 58:24, 68:13 compendium [1] -73:20 complete [1] - 73:18 completing [1] - 49:4 complex [1] - 56:5 compliment [1] -40:19 compliments [1] -76:11 comply [2] - 3:17, 3:23 component [2] -15:22, 63:21 components [5] -15:16, 15:17, 17:2, 61:7, 63:21 composed [1] -17:14 comprehensive (1) -73:17 concern [7] - 13:7, 14:15, 56:16, 56:19, 64:1, 64:5, 64:10 concerns [4] - 13:10, 56:24, 61:24, 64:1 conclude [1] - 15:23 concludes [2] - 15:9, 68:25

conclusion [1] - 66:9 conclusions [8] -33:20, 46:9, 50:23, 66:25, 67:2, 67:12, 67:24, 68:15 conditions [2] -20:23, 45:14 confine [1] - 12:17 conflict [3] - 8:21, 39:18, 58:18 conflicts [2] - 9:3, 71:9 confused [1] - 37:25 confusion [1] - 5:17 conjunction [1] -73:10 consequence [1] -66:4 consideration [1] -2:13 considered [31] -17:2, 17:4, 17:6, 18:2, 19:17, 21:7, 27:1, 27:24, 35:23, 36:5, 50:1, 52:2, 52:5, 60:16, 60:24, 61:2, 61:5, 61:7, 61:12, 62:8, 62:10, 62:15, 62:19, 62:20, 62:21, 63:2, 63:11, 63:15, 63:20, 65:21, 65:24 consistency [2] -3:19, 66:6 consistent [3] - 6:23, 7:6, 67:22 constitutional [1] -73:25 contact [2] - 74:24, contained [1] - 5:14 content [1] - 55:22 contest [1] - 48:19 continue [10] - 4:2, 6:11, 7:19, 8:10, 8:14, 8:24, 12:17, 30:14, 30:19, 51:9 continuing [1] - 6:19 contract [1] - 59:8 contracts [1] - 7:13 conversation [8] -10:9, 10:11, 10:19, 11:19, 13:12, 48:17, 49:6 conversations [1] -13:10 copped [1] - 28:9 correct [7] - 8:20, 38:21, 42:7, 49:12, 49:13, 49:16, 75:5

correctly [1] - 37:19

corresponded [1] -59:11 cost [4] - 20:9, 44:3, 44:25, 53:5 Council [2] - 21:24, 31:1 council [3] - 4:22, 5:24, 6:4 councils [3] - 5:25, 6:1, 6:3 Counsel [1] - 2:4 count [1] - 27:2 counted [4] - 19:24, 26:22, 63:12, 65:16 counterpoint [1] -48:24 counting [1] - 41:24 County [9] - 6:17, 6:20, 7:1, 9:6, 9:9, 9:15, 9:17, 13:4, 13:23 course [11] - 9:15, 16:21, 20:14, 23:10, 23:14, 24:8, 27:3, 27:7, 53:6, 55:24 courses [7] - 20:20, 22:25, 23:18, 24:1, 37:2, 59:21, 62:1 covering (1) - 5:22 CPE [5] - 19:18, 19:25, 30:8, 45:24, 59:21 credit [6] - 16:22, 20:12, 45:10, 45:23, 50:19, 51:4 credit-bearing [6] -16:22, 20:12, 45:10, 45:23, 50:19, 51:4 credits [1] - 49:4 criteria [17] - 6:7, 17:1, 17:5, 17:8, 60:17, 60:19, 60:22, 61:18, 62:17, 63:7, 64:7, 65:3, 65:14, 65:25, 66:6, 66:7, cumulative [1] - 36:7 curious [1] - 27:13 current [1] - 39:24

D

data (69) - 15:6, 15:11, 15:12, 15:14, 15:24, 16:7, 16:9, 16:10, 17:19, 17:21, 17:23, 18:12, 18:14, 18:17, 19:2, 19:16, 21:1, 21:17, 22:18, 23:7, 23:10, 24:17,

25:12, 26:24, 27:3, 29:10, 31:1, 31:3, 31:6, 31:9, 31:12, 31:16, 33:21, 35:13, 37:5, 45:6, 46:1, 47:9, 47:13, 47:15, 47:16, 50:3, 50:5, 50:14, 52:18, 53:22, 55:18, 56:14, 57:7, 58:4, 58:9, 59:1, 66:23, 68:9, 69:2, 69:4, 69:6, 70:2, 70:4, 70:6, 73:15, 74:1, 74:2, 75:19, 75:22 date [1] - 77:6 dates (1) - 32:7 daughter[1] - 9:16 David [2] - 2:9, 3:1 dealing [2] - 8:1, 11:17 Deb [1] - 15:7 Deborah [2] - 15:1, December[1] -**DECEMBER** [1] - 1:8 decision [2] - 44:18, decisions (1) - 4:17 deem [1] - 49:19 deemed [20] - 18:8, 19:1, 19:10, 20:6, 22:11, 22:18, 24:3, 24:10, 29:2, 36:21, 42:15, 43:10, 51:16, 51:21, 52:10, 52:14, 52:16, 52:22, 53:1, 53:11 deficiencies [1] -55:25 degree [1] - 26:20 deleting [1] - 70:10 demand [2] - 61:25, 62:6 demographic [1] demonstrate [3] -33:16, 42:23, 43:2 demonstrated [2] -22:23, 55:8 demonstrating[1] -22:12 Department [5] - 2:5, 31:6, 57:2, 57:6, 68:18 department [17] -3:15, 21:23, 32:24, 33:3, 33:5, 39:20, 39:23, 40:2, 45:24, 50:5, 56:19, 56:20,

57:21, 58:5, 58:23, 58:25, 64:22 derogatory [1] - 13:5 describe [5] - 15:21, 17:10, 20:3, 20:22, 60:23 described [2] - 27:7, 64:20 designed [1] - 45:9 detail [6] - 6:8, 15:22, 17:11, 17:23, 61:19, 61:22 detailed [1] - 3:22 determine [3] -10:24, 27:16, 33:1 develop [4] - 5:1, 12:8, 21:25, 75:2 developed [7] - 5:13, 16:23, 20:18, 56:11, 59:21, 63:4, 73:11 development [1] diagnostic [3] - 4:18, 6:2, 10:24 difference [5] -29:24, 34:23, 54:21, 59:6, 62:14 differences [17] -20:15, 25:1, 29:17, 30:1, 30:4, 34:8, 34:20, 35:7, 36:20, 37:13, 53:13, 53:14, 55:16, 57:15, 57:23, 59:13 different [30] - 5:23, 13:4, 15:16, 17:14, 17:16, 20:2, 27:4, 32:19, 35:25, 38:8, 40:9, 42:11, 43:7, 44:14, 45:13, 45:16, 45:20, 50:18, 51:17, 52:24, 53:16, 63:21, 66:20, 67:1, 67:8, 67:16, 68:10, 74:14, 74:16 digest[1] - 74:18 directing [1] - 3:18 director[2] - 14:20, 15:4 disability [1] - 53:9 discrepancy [1] -64:19 discussed [1] discussion [5] -15:23, 64:15, 66:10, 76:17, 76:24

discussions [1] -

disseminate [2] -

13:25

71:13 disseminated [1] -30:14 district [8] - 2:19, 10:8, 11:2, 11:9, 11:11, 11:20, 73:15, 75:15 district's [1] - 60:13 Districts [2] - 2:8, 2:11 districts [9] - 5:18, 10:13, 10:23, 16:1, 22:3, 60:10, 68:24, 69:3, 73:24 divide [1] - 42:9 dividing [1] - 27:4 done [4] - 9:7, 43:22, 46:25, 61:20 Donna [2] - 3:6, 4:7 doubled [1] - 67:21 down [7] - 27:19, 28:1, 28:12, 43:3, 44:18, 53:17, 71:21 Downton [1] - 77:3 DR [64] - 15:10, 25:15, 25:19, 25:23, 26:3, 26:16, 26:23, 27:9, 28:16, 28:19, 28:24, 29:2, 29:6, 29:16, 29:20, 29:23, 30:18, 30:21, 30:25, 31:8, 31:12, 32:1, 32:6, 33:13, 34:2, 35:9, 35:13, 37:22, 38:1, 38:6, 38:10, 38:13, 38:21, 38:25, 39:6, 40:9, 40:12, 41:2, 41:5, 41:7, 41:10, 41:13, 42:7, 43:23, 44:5, 44:9, 44:20, 45:4, 47:6, 48:4, 48:9, 49:9, 49:12, 49:15, 49:23, 51:10, 58:13, 58:16, 58:18, 59:5, 59:17, 60:2, 69:24, 72:11 Dr [3] - 69:8, 76:19, 76:20 dramatic [1] - 53:17 Draut [1] - 71:6 draw [8] - 33:19, 46:9, 49:6, 67:1, 67:2, 67:13, 67:24, 68:15 drawing [1] - 50:22 dredge [1] - 15:25 drifts [1] - 76:16 drop [2] - 23:17, 23:21 dropped (1) - 19:4 dropping [1] - 70:14

due [1] - 74:16 during [4] - 3:3, 5:21, 7:7

E e-mail [2] - 1:25, 74:25 earners [1] - 49:5 easily [1] - 31:15 easy [1] - 48:3 ECEA [1] - 4:24 EDUCATION [1] - 1:6 education [14] -3:16, 7:14, 9:25, 14:17, 14:21, 18:17, 53:8, 60:6, 62:17, 71:12, 72:1, 72:8, 72:16, 73:19 Education [13] - 2:5, 16:24, 18:13, 21:24, 31:2, 31:6, 57:2, 57:6, 60:20, 63:5, 68:18, 70:5, 73:8 educational [1] -60:15 Educational [1] -61:21 educators [4] -20:19, 56:12, 56:16, 63:25 effect [3] - 7:20, 8:15, 31:21 effective [2] - 55:13, 66:16 effectively [1] - 8:23 effectiveness [2] -6:19, 67:25 effort [1] - 55:20 efforts [1] - 4:14 eight [2] - 59:10, 61:15 either [6] - 8:22, 9:2, 27:6, 32:8, 53:7, 61:6 elected [1] - 5:25 elements (3) - 5:14, 17:14, 17:16 eligibility [3] - 34:16, 52:19, 62:14 eligible [2] - 34:18, 34:19 eliminate [1] - 5:16 eliminating [1] -12:23 emphasize [4] -51:12, 66:2, 69:1, 70:1 employer [1] - 26:1 encouraged [1] -

64:11

end [5] - 40:23, 43:1, 43:21, 74:21, 75:17 END [1] - 40:24 ends [2] - 76:21, 76:22 engage [1] - 76:25 engaged [1] - 43:24 engagement (1) -46:21 engaging [1] - 69:10 English [4] - 19:19, 21:8, 53:10, 62:18 enjoy [1] - 48:22 enlightening [1] -69:9 enroll [19] - 16:20, 18:11, 18:19, 18:21, 23:1, 24:6, 24:9, 24:11, 24:16, 24:19, 24:22, 24:24, 25:3, 34:21, 34:25, 35:11, 54:17, 64:7, 64:11 enrolled [11] - 23:13, 23:24, 24:1, 24:7, 26:13, 26:19, 27:3, 29:13, 35:15, 35:18 enrolling [3] - 25:12, 34:8, 34:13 enrollment [10] -19:5, 19:6, 22:22, 23:2, 31:2, 34:5, 34:24, 35:24, 36:8, 47:25 ensure [4] - 20:24, 58:3, 66:6, 67:7 enter [2] - 18:21, 64:4 entered [3] - 8:16, 23:19, 35:14 entering (1) - 50:10 entire (1) - 9:23 entirely (1) - 19:15 EPE[1] - 45:25 equations [2] - 56:6, 56:21 ESEA [1] - 12:7 especially [2] - 39:8, 57:9 essentially [1] -73:14 established [2] - 5:8, 67:5 evaluating [1] -68:21 evaluation [1] -66:18 evaluations [1] -

46:23

event [1] - 12:15

events [2] - 32:20,

32:25 evidence [1] - 4:17 exactly [6] - 30:24, 38:21, 40:3, 55:21, 55:22, 67:19 example [6] - 16:19, 18:1, 22:22, 30:22, 33:6, 57:5 examples [1] - 53:18 excellent [1] - 69:12 exercise [1] - 5:19 existing [1] - 6:3 exit[1] - 6:6 expect [5] - 38:8, 45:17, 51:16, 54:15, expectations (1) expected [1] - 42:19 explain [1] - 24:14 explained [1] - 57:12 express [1] - 14:15 extend [1] - 13:12 external [1] - 6:5

F

facilities [2] - 4:20, fact [4] - 5:7, 8:7, 24:14, 51:13 factor [3] - 44:4, 44:7, 47:19 factors [2] - 55:15, 55:16 fair [2] - 42:8, 45:5 fairly [1] - 48:3 faith [1] - 7:19 fall [4] - 10:13, 29:13, 31:4, 54:8 fallen [2] - 10:21, 11:22 falls (1) - 56:3 families [6] - 34:25, 35:2, 52:21, 52:23, 53:1, 53:4 family [5] - 34:15, 34:17, 34:18, 52:20, 62:15 fan [2] - 48:25, 49:5 far [7] - 4:19, 22:18, 36:12, 41:25, 47:11, 48:8, 52:20 favor [6] - 4:4, 14:2, 14:8, 26:11, 73:2, Fax [1] - 1:25 February [1] - 74:19 federal [3] - 8:22, 12:18, 34:16

fell [1] - 69:11 felt [1] - 60:20 female [2] - 34:12, 62:12 females [2] - 25:3, 34:8 few [2] - 32:20, 71:5 fewer [3] - 22:24, 24:1, 52:15 figure [3] - 29:9, 29:20, 29:21 figures [1] - 36:3 final [2] - 14:22, 68:17 finally [3] - 19:12, 57:14, 64:16 financed [1] - 26:1 financial [1] - 74:1 findings (1) - 15:22 fine [3] - 26:6, 45:12, 46:4 finished [2] - 39:4, 74:12 finishing [1] - 75:18 first [15] - 18:9, 19:3, 19:16, 20:13, 21:2, 24:18, 35:14, 36:8, 37:8, 37:11, 47:13, 49:25, 54:12, 72:23, 72:25 five [9] - 10:14, 10:15, 10:21, 11:9, 11:10, 11:11, 11:14, 73:14 flat [4] - 19:5, 24:11, flexibility [2] - 4:24, focus [4] - 10:20, 11:21, 46:22, 55:21 focused [3] - 55:18, 59:23, 75:18 focusing [2] - 15:12, 21:16 folders [1] - 3:25 folks [4] - 12:23, 38:18, 71:5, 71:7 follow [2] - 44:2, 70:25 follow-up [1] - 44:2 followed [1] - 57:3 following [1] - 29:11 follows [1] - 18:9 for-profit [2] - 25:14, 25:17 Force [1] - 18:13 forgive [1] - 9:22 formal [1] - 6:23

formally [1] - 58:4

formatting [1] - 3:18

forth [2] - 28:15, 74:18 forward [5] - 3:6, 5:15, 6:16, 14:14, 14:18 FOSTER [5] - 2:6, 4:9, 10:18, 11:12, 11:19 Foster [2] - 2:6, 2:22 four [2] - 7:11, 7:15 fourths [1] - 52:25 free [4] - 39:7, 39:14, 40:1, 75:17 full [5] - 27:6, 29:8, 55:24, 57:9, 59:21 fully [1] - 76:25 fundamental [1] -30:11 future [1] - 31:16

G

gains [1] - 18:23 gaps [1] - 72:3 gender [3] - 25:2, 35:7, 62:9 General [1] - 2:4 general [2] - 8:8, generally [2] - 5:20, 15:14 Generation [2] - 2:7, Gerald (1) - 15:3 given [2] - 18:16, 44:12 GIVENS [21] - 9:21, 11:6, 11:18, 11:25, 12:22, 12:25, 13:18, 35:5, 35:12, 40:18, 40:25, 41:3, 41:9, 41:14, 43:20, 48:15, 48:21, 49:10, 49:14, 49:17, 76:9 Givens [6] - 9:20, 35:3, 40:17, 48:14, 71:25, 76:7 goals [1] - 16:18 good-bye [1] - 77:11 GPA [2] - 41:9, 47:7 GPAs [3] - 36:7, 36:19, 37:3 grade [32] - 19:21, 19:22, 20:6, 20:8, 21:4, 21:6, 21:15, 21:20, 22:4, 22:5, 22:7, 23:4, 36:14, 37:20, 38:3, 39:10, 42:21, 43:19, 46:3, 46:20, 47:1, 47:23,

grader [1] - 41:21 grades [13] - 19:6, 23:2, 29:8, 36:13, 36:21, 38:8, 41:5, 41:6, 41:7, 45:18, 45:19, 47:25, 54:18 graduate [2] - 18:14, 23:10 graduated [2] -26:25, 27:5 graduates [25] -15:12, 16:6, 16:7, 16:20, 17:1, 19:6, 19:14, 21:14, 23:12, 24:11, 24:19, 25:2, 26:12, 29:11, 34:19, 34:22, 35:10, 35:11, 35:16, 36:9, 50:1, 52:6, 61:10, 62:7 graduating [3] -22:19, 35:14, 46:5 graduation [7] -19:23, 21:6, 22:8, 23:5, 35:17, 58:1, 70:7 GRAHAM [27] -27:12, 28:17, 28:22, 28:25, 29:4, 29:15, 29:18, 29:22, 30:5, 30:20, 30:24, 31:7, 31:11, 31:18, 32:4, 33:25, 44:2, 44:6, 44:10, 44:21, 58:14, 58:17, 59:4, 59:16, 59:25, 71:17, 71:19 Graham [6] - 10:1, 27:11, 44:1, 48:22, 58:12, 71:15 Grawemeyer [1] -46:17 great [8] - 30:4, 34:20, 35:12, 48:12, 49:21, 57:10, 61:19, 62:14 greater [6] - 17:11,

48:6, 48:8, 55:8,

69:19

57:24, 58:7, 58:8,

greater [6] - 17:11, 25:4, 34:12, 37:4, 52:20, 61:13 green [2] - 63:16, 64:5 group [34] - 21:4, 21:7, 21:12, 22:16, 22:17, 23:3, 23:23, 29:25, 30:1, 30:22, 32:7, 32:16, 32:17, 34:10, 35:21, 35:25,

36:2, 36:3, 36:18,

36:23, 36:25, 38:10,

39:13, 39:16, 42:4, 43:25, 45:13, 45:20, 49:2, 50:22, 64:25, 65:1 groups [16] - 14:14, 17:25, 19:12, 21:2, 24:20, 27:4, 34:21, 36:24, 40:3, 42:11, 46:9, 49:8, 49:11, 49:18, 74:6 growing [2] - 36:4, 36:18 grown [3] - 24:8, 66:14, 66:15 guess [2] - 30:10, 69:18 guessed [1] - 56:22 guide [1] - 4:20 guys [1] - 43:15

Н

habits [1] - 44:18 half [3] - 36:18, 52:16, 53:3 halfway [1] - 51:8 hand [2] - 41:25, 72:15 Happy [1] - 77:10 happy (4) - 6:11, 15:8, 70:24, 71:4 hard [2] - 9:15, 43:1 hear [4] - 7:2, 9:23, 72:19, 76:1 heard [1] - 47:3 hearing [1] - 70:12 **HELD** (1) - 1:8 help [4] - 4:22, 5:2, 22:3, 74:17 helpful [1] - 76:25 helping [1] - 4:20 helps [1] - 44:3 hi [1] - 2:6 high [20] - 15:11, 16:25, 18:16, 22:7, 32:8, 33:20, 38:3, 45:14, 45:19, 46:8, 46:21, 46:22, 46:25, 47:1, 47:7, 50:9, 62:6, 69:19 high-demand [1] -62:6 high-skill [1] - 62:6 high-wage [1] - 62:6 higher [15] - 34:18, 35:1, 36:10, 36:15,

41:22, 42:3, 42:6,

45:19, 52:21, 53:1,

54:18, 62:9, 62:11,

65:23

highest [1] - 36:13 highlight [1] - 43:8 Hispanic [1] - 24:23 hit [2] - 43:1, 46:10 hold [3] - 17:25, 18:4, 43:20 Holidays [1] - 77:10 home [2] - 12:22, 13:17 hope [2] - 40:19, 74:13 hopefully (2) - 46:5, 75:15 Hoppmann [3] -15:3, 73:10, 74:25 hour[1] - 46:24 house [1] - 26:2 huge [2] - 48:25, 49:5 husband [1] - 13:17 hypothetical [1] -63:13

[

ideas (1) - 74:11 identified [1] - 53:9 identify [3] - 2:2, 5:2, 14:23 identifying [1] -55:24 illustrate [1] - 17:20 impact [1] - 68:21 impair[1] - 7:17 impairment [2] - 8:6, implement [2] - 6:4, 12:12 implemented [1] -16:16 important [4] -20:15, 33:21, 71:24, 72:6 improve [1] - 4:22 in-house [1] - 26:2 inappropriate [2] -33:2, 57:17 Inaudible [2] - 7:7, 39:11 Inaudible) [7] -12:19, 14:22, 58:15, 58:17, 59:4, 60:1, 71:17 incentive (2) - 63:10, 63:18 incentivized [1] -64:6 incentivizing [1] -63:6 include [4] - 25:15,

65:25, 73:15, 73:24 included [5] - 16:8, 16:9, 16:11, 50:13, 63:5 includes [2] - 25:23, 63:10

inclusive [1] - 25:21 income [14] - 34:15, 34:17, 34:18, 34:25, 35:1, 38:16, 38:18, 52:20, 52:21, 52:23, 53:1, 53:4, 55:9, 62:15

increase (6) - 18:7, 19:4, 22:10, 61:14, 67:9, 67:11 increased (4) -19:13, 24:4, 34:5,

63.22increases [3] - 16:6, 19:1, 24:5

increasing [7] -22:17, 24:9, 24:14, 24:16, 46:1, 63:23, 66:24

independent [2] -73:23, 75:15 indicated [1] - 41:16 indicates [1] - 7:12 indicating (2) - 8:9,

indicator[7] - 37:20, 66:12, 66:17, 67:13, 68:15, 68:16, 68:19 indicators [1] - 17:11 individual (2) -

32:22, 67:16 INDIVIDUAL [3] -70:22, 71:3, 73:1

individually [1] -15:17

individuals [1] -25:11 indulgence [1] -

48:16

information [13] -4:11, 6:25, 27:15, 27:19, 30:9, 30:14, 30:16, 71:21, 71:23,

72:2, 72:5, 72:7 informative [1] -

inside [1] - 15:5 instead [1] - 39:4 institutions (3) -18:20, 23:13, 25:4

instruction [1] -

instructional [2] -57:22, 59:11

intensive [1] - 55:14 intent [1] - 42:22 intention [3] - 64:2, 64:13, 75:13 interaction [1] - 9:10 interest [5] - 10:6, 13:9, 13:20, 39:1. 69:5

interested [4] -31:14, 69:6, 69:7, 75:20

interesting [3] -69:22, 69:24, 69:25 interim [1] - 9:25 interrupting [1] -40:21

intervene [1] - 8:5 intervention [9] -5:6, 6:1, 6:5, 6:6, 7:11, 9:4, 10:16, 11:2,

55:7, 55:14 introduce [1] - 3:6 introduced [3] -17:22, 18:24, 19:8 introduction [3] -39:25, 42:13, 58:24

interventions [2] -

59:23

invalidated [2] -33:11, 33:12 investigated [1] -

56:20 involving [2] - 2:18, 2:19

isolation [1] - 68:23 issue [9] - 7:8, 7:9, 7:10, 39:17, 43:7, 61:19, 64:13, 65:8,

66:3 issues [2] - 69:5,

71:25 items [1] - 27:16

itself [1] - 20:3 Ivy [1] - 70:13

J

JCPS [2] - 7:18, 9:6 JCTA [5] - 7:18, 8:2, 8:7, 8:16, 9:7 Jefferson [9] - 6:17, 6:20, 7:1, 9:6, 9:8, 9:14, 9:16, 13:4, 13:23 Jenkins [1] - 38:14 JENKINS [6] - 38:15, 38:23, 39:3, 40:5, 40:11, 40:16 job [2] - 10:2, 55:6 31:22, 32:12, 32:21, 33:15, 37:7, 38:17, jobs [1] - 62:6

joint [1] - 9:25 judge [1] - 46:23 July [1] - 75:15 jump [1] - 55:25 jumps [4] - 55:12,

57:8, 57:10, 57:11 June [1] - 75:14

K

K-12[3] - 47:22, 70:2, 70:7 K-5(1) - 73:19 KAR[2] - 5:4, 5:5 Karen [1] - 14:19 KCEWS [7] - 18:13, 18:15, 31:1, 31:12, 31:16, 47:9, 70:4 KD (1) - 33:13 KDE [7] - 42:1, 58:2, 66:5, 70:19, 76:13, 76:17, 76:24 KDE's [1] - 77:1 keep [3] - 40:5, 40:20, 51:19 keeps [1] - 30:8 Kelly [1] - 2:6 Ken [1] - 71:6 Kentucky [34] - 1:23, 1:24, 2:4, 4:25, 5:1, 16:24, 18:10, 18:12, 18:19, 20:13, 23:13, 23:19, 23:24, 24:19, 24:24, 25:3, 25:12, 26:13, 31:5, 40:6, 40:8, 40:12, 40:14, 56:12, 56:24, 57:2, 57:6, 60:18, 60:20, 63:4, 68:18, 70:5, 72:9, 73:23 Kentucky's [2] - 8:8, Kevin [1] - 2:3 key [1] - 71:24 kid [1] - 27:17 kids [4] - 30:15, 44:12, 44:23, 55:21 kind [7] - 41:15, 41:18, 46:19, 50:3, 50:20, 76:21, 77:3 knowledge [3] -47:15, 59:3, 60:3 known [1] - 19:15 KRS [2] - 2:21, 3:18 KYOTE [30] - 20:8, 20:11, 20:18, 20:25, 21:11, 22:13, 27:17, 27:24, 28:3, 28:15,

38:20, 40:1, 41:25, 45:8, 45:22, 50:8, 51:14, 55:23, 56:11, 56:14, 56:15, 58:25, 68:13, 69:20

L lab [1] - 26:21 laid [2] - 7:11, 12:9 Lane [1] - 1:24 large [2] - 57:15, 57:23 largest [1] - 36:25 last[10] - 13:2, 13:17, 31:19, 33:5, 41:4, 48:18, 48:19, 74:12, 76:7, 77:4 law (2) - 9:16, 12:18 lead [2] - 4:14, 57:6 leadership [4] - 4:13, 4:16, 4:22, 11:1 Leagues [1] - 70:14 learn (1) - 44:14 learning [7] - 15:25, 21:21, 53:10, 55:21, 58:22, 59:22, 67:24 least [4] - 21:11. 23:15, 68:9, 75:14 leave (1) - 36:23 left [4] - 23:12, 49:11, 49:18, 76:9 legislate [1] - 72:7 legislation [4] -16:17, 16:19, 39:21, 58:21 less [5] - 36:11, 36:19, 53:3, 54:9 letting [1] - 9:13 level [9] - 11:2, 11:3, 17:25, 38:16, 47:22, 50:2, 53:14, 53:17, 63:20 library [2] - 32:15, 33:7 lies [1] - 43:7 likelihood [1] - 42:2 likely [4] - 54:14, 54:17, 54:18, 55:22 limited [3] - 53:10, 59:24, 62:18 line [2] - 16:18, 49:7 links [2] - 18:14, 70:6 listen [1] - 41:13 LITTLE [9] - 3:11, 3:14, 72:22, 73:6, 74:22, 75:5, 75:8, 75:11, 76:5 local [1] - 7:13

location [2] - 4:12,

32:9 locations [4] - 32:2, 32:10, 66:20, 67:8 logically [1] - 38:18 look [37] - 10:12, 15;22, 18:3, 24:18, 26:4, 27:3, 29:10, 34:7, 34:9, 34:19, 34:21, 37:12, 38:22, 39:8, 43:9, 44:11, 45:19, 46:8, 46:20, 48:1, 51:15, 51:20, 52:3, 53:16, 57:9, 59:2, 61:19, 61:22, 62:20, 66:13, 66:23, 67:14, 67:15, 67:16, 70:3, 70:9, 73:18 looked [9] - 33:5, 38:16, 53:19, 54:12, 59:10, 64:14, 67:18, 68:5, 74:6 looking [14] - 15:5, 19:16, 25:2, 27:14, 34:15, 37:6, 47:2, 52:18, 55:11, 57:22, 62:13, 67:1, 67:2, 69:19 looks [5] - 15:16, 17:23, 66:23, 66:24, 67:20 lose [1] - 50:24 L'ouisville [2] - 1:24, 46:17 low [6] - 2:20, 4:12, 9:8, 53:6, 54:25, 58:7 low-achieving [2] -2:20, 9:8 low-performing (1) lower [7] - 34:17, 34:25, 36:11, 38:18, 52:22, 53:3, 55:9 lowest [2] - 10:14, 10:15 LRC[1] - 3:7 lumping [3] - 50:22, 51:4, 68:14 lunch [3] - 34:17, 39:8, 39:15 lying [1] - 59:2

M

ma'am [2] - 9:18, 74:22 Madam [14] - 6:14, 8:13, 13:13, 25:9, 26:7, 26:10, 30:6, 31:19, 34:1, 38:16, 40:18, 48:15, 70:17,

76:11 madam [3] - 2:15, 9:21, 27:12 mail [2] - 1:25, 74:25 major [2] - 15:21, 27:16 majority [4] - 37:3, 37:10, 52:14, 54:3 male [3] - 34:13, 35:11, 62:12 males [2] - 25:5, 34:9 management [1] manufacturing [1] -62:3 March [1] - 74:20 marks [2] - 18:16, 52:11 Marzian [4] - 6:13, 13:15, 46:13, 69:14 MARZIAN [13] - 6:14, 7:2, 8:12, 9:12, 13:16, 13:19, 46:14, 48:2, 48:5, 48:11, 48:20, 69:16, 70:8 mastered [1] - 56:1 material [2] - 56:1, 59:24 materials [1] - 59:22 Math [3] - 56:5, 60:10, 60:11 math [6] - 37:6, 40:13, 43:17, 56:17, 57:9 mathematics [3] -19:19, 20:2, 21:9 mean [3] - 6:15, 48:5, 51:18 means [2] - 51:15, 70:2 meant (4) - 31:23, 31:24, 49:11, 49:17 measure [26] - 15:21, 16:18, 16:23, 19:18, 21:16, 30:3, 34:5, 37:6, 41:23, 47:22, 51:3, 51:22, 52:5, 53:2, 53:7, 53:12, 66:18, 66:19, 66:24, 67:4, 67:6, 67:21, 67:24, 68:2, 68:19 measured [1] - 43:19 measures (17) -16:13, 17:22, 18:24, 18:25, 19:8, 23:6, 33:23, 35:20, 36:17, 37:13, 42:1, 42:19, 42:22, 43:6, 47:12, 54:23, 60:23

measuring [1] -

66:21 mediation [1] - 23:22 meet [28] - 17:1, 17:5, 17:7, 19:18, 19:22, 20:5, 21:3, 21:5, 21:9, 21:19, 22:7, 34:10, 39:9, 39:11, 39:13, 51:23, 52:16, 53:2, 53:15, 54:1, 54:5, 54:10, 60:17, 60:19, 60:22, 61:7, 62:22 MEETING [1] - 1:7 meeting [10] - 10:1, 55:1, 55:5, 61:13, 62:17, 72:1, 76:12, 76:19, 77:6, 77:8 meets [2] - 64:6, members [4] - 51:7. 71:13, 74:5, 77:6 memory [2] - 29:24, 39:12 mention [3] - 19:25, 31:20, 58:20 mentioned [2] -57:14, 59:19 Merry [1] - 77:11 met [25] - 11:15, 17:6, 21:8, 21:10, 21:14, 23:3, 23:4, 23:5, 27:20, 28:10, 35:17, 35:19, 36:13, 37:1, 37:7, 52:7, 52:8, 52:10, 52:15, 61:10, 61:18, 63:7, 65:2, 65:9, 65:13 microphone [2] -4:7, 71:18 might [12] - 5:18, 32:13, 32:14, 32:18, 55:25, 56:1, 57:8, 58:5, 59:17, 59:23, 76:25 military [1] - 18:21 mind [2] - 9:13, 51:19 minds [1] - 76:16 mindset [1] - 44:13 minute [1] - 74:12 mirrors [1] - 63:14 missing [1] - 60:15 mixed [1] - 43:13 mode [1] - 76:23 moderate [1] - 67:9 modify [1] - 9:2 moment [3] - 11:7, 25:7, 48:18

Monday [4] - 9:24,

10:20, 11:19, 72:1

money [3] - 45:11, 46:5, 49:20 monitor [5] - 30:19, 32:15, 32:19, 32:25, 33:7 monitored [1] - 58:4 morning [3] - 14:19, 15:10, 71:6 most [12] - 37:15, 43:16, 45:12, 46:4, 52:12, 54:24, 59:20, 60:18, 61:17, 63:22, 64:12, 65:13 motion [7] - 4:3, 14:1, 14:2, 14:4, 14:5, 72:25, 76:1 move [6] - 14:7, 48:13, 58:12, 63:7, 73:1, 73:4 moving [3] - 26:18, 58:9, 62:20 MR [14] - 2:3, 2:9, 2:15, 3:9, 4:24, 6:21, 7:4, 8:18, 9:6, 9:18, 10:10, 11:4, 12:5, 12:24 MS [19] - 2:6, 3:11, 3:14, 4:9, 10:18, 11:12, 11:19, 14:19, 14:25, 33:12, 41:6, 41:12, 72:22, 73:6, 74:22, 75:5, 75:8, 75:11, 76:5 must [8] - 8:24, 17:3, 17:4, 17:7, 19:18, 60:7, 60:17, 62:22

N

Nancy [1] - 1:23 national [1] - 40:6 nationally [2] -18:16, 57:5 necessarily [3] -31:4, 43:15, 62:4 need [15] - 4:3, 10:3, 12:2, 12:3, 13:3, 16:21, 30:15, 31:1, 31:5, 44:24, 45:25, 50:17, 62:1, 70:20, 75:23 needs [1] - 12:14 negative [1] - 66:4 negotiate [4] - 7:19, 8:11, 8:24, 9:1 negotiated [1] - 7:13 NELSON [64] -15:10, 25:15, 25:19, 25:23, 26:3, 26:16, 26:23, 27:9, 28:16,

29:6, 29:16, 29:20, 29:23, 30:18, 30:21, 30:25, 31:8, 31:12, 32:1, 32:6, 33:13, 34:2, 35:9, 35:13, 37:22, 38:1, 38:6, 38:10, 38:13, 38:21, 38:25, 39:6, 40:9, 40:12, 41:2, 41:5, 41:7, 41:10, 41:13, 42:7, 43:23, 44:5, 44:9, 44:20, 45:4, 47:6, 48:4, 48:9, 49:9, 49:12, 49:15, 49:23, 51:10, 58:13, 58:16, 58:18, 59:5, 59:17, 60:2, 69:24, 72:11 Nelson [7] - 15:1, 15:7, 40:19, 69:8, 76:18, 76:19, 76:20 never [1] - 56:10 new [15] - 2:16, 2:17, 3:1, 9:9, 15:13, 16:15, 17:22, 18:24, 18:25, 19:8, 41:23, 42:13, 72:8, 75:22, 76:22 news [1] - 77:10 next [6] - 14:16, 22:20, 46:10, 51:20, 56:24, 77:8 Next [2] - 2:7, 2:10 nine (1) - 63:23 normally [1] - 70:22 note [2] - 23:23, 64:18 notify [1] - 77:8 number [5] - 24:5, 24:6, 28:8, 28:13, 65:12 numbers [2] - 24:9, 66.7 Nunnelley [1] - 1:23 nunnelleys@twc.

28:19, 28:24, 29:2,

0

com [1] - 1:25

obtained [1] - 8:7 obviously [2] - 28:8, 32:24 OEA [2] - 15:4, 70:24 OF [2] - 40:24 Office [3] - 2:7, 2:10, 73:7 office [3] - 14:17, 14:20, 71:20 often [1] - 16:4 old [3] - 5:7, 12:10, 75:21

ON [1] - 1:8 once [4] - 20:21, 32:17, 39:24, 50:11 ONE [1] - 40:24 one (48) - 2:13, 2:15, 4:11, 5:20, 13:2, 15:1, 17:1, 17:3, 17:17, 20:6, 21:11, 21:17, 22:19, 23:15, 25:6, 26:11, 29:1, 29:9, 29:25, 30:6, 31:13, 31:19, 37:12, 38:10, 39:12, 39:21, 39:23, 41:1, 41:3, 46:24, 50:18, 53:23, 55:12, 55:18, 57:20, 58:12, 58:19, 60:14, 60:23, 67:3, 67:4, 67:6, 67:21, 69:11, 72:25, 75:16, 76:13 online [1] - 32:14 opinion [1] - 8:8 opportunities [2] -21:21, 58:23 opportunity [5] -10:20, 14:13, 33:16, 43:9, 44:13 opt[1] - 28:7 option [1] - 9:4 options [6] - 6:5, 7:11, 7:15, 10:7, 10:16, 11:2 order [2] - 44:15, 47:13 organization [1] organizations (1) otherwise [1] - 46:6 outcome [6] - 42:17, 43:2, 46:24, 47:3, 66:19, 66:20 outcomes [20] -15:25, 18:18, 19:13, 22:15, 22:21, 33:18, 33:22, 45:17, 46:8, 47:8, 47:22, 51:17, 54:15, 67:25, 68:8, 68:10, 68:20, 68:23, 69:22, 72:8 outdated [1] - 12:6 outlined [2] - 5:4, 16:24 outlines [1] - 5:6 outside [4] - 6:22, 7:5, 24:13, 30:11 overall [2] - 24:10, overarching [1] -13.7

overlap [2] - 5:17, 12:20 oversees [1] - 10:17 overview [1] - 2:23 own [1] - 31:3

P packet [1] - 73:9 paid (1) - 13:21 part [3] - 9:2, 22:1, 57:20 participated [1] -47:12 particular [6] - 7.8. 8:1, 15:12, 62:1, 68:21, 69:5 particularly [2] -71:23, 75:8 parties [1] - 8:23 parts [2] - 4:18, 13:5 pass [14] - 17:3, 17:8, 18:3, 35:23, 36:6, 42:18, 42:20, 56:17, 59:20, 61:6, 62:23, 63:1, 64:3, 65:12 passed [9] - 5:8, 12:11, 36:16, 37:8, 37:11, 40:8, 56:23, 58:21, 65:10 passing [2] - 19:20, 43:17 past [2] - 55:20, 59:9 pattern [1] - 58:5 patterns [1] - 58:3 pay [7] - 19:22, 39:20, 39:23, 40:2, 44:23, 58:23, 58:25 people (1) - 14:24 per [2] - 30:12, 30:13 percent [39] - 10:14, 10:15, 10:22, 11:10, 11:11, 11:14, 11:22, 16:6, 16:7, 23:8, 23:22, 24:12, 25:11, 29:25, 35:17, 35:18, 36:14, 36:16, 39:14, 39:15, 41:22, 42:3, 42:5, 43:4, 43:5, 44:11, 53:21, 54:9, 61:15, 61:16, 63:15, 63:23, 63:24, 65:3, 65:19, 65:21, 68:5 percentage [57] -15:15, 16:20, 16:25, 17:13, 18:7, 19:1, 19:10, 21:13, 22:10,

23:12, 23:17, 23:21,

24:3, 24:10, 24:16,

22:1, 75:21

planning [1] - 73:13

24:18, 24:22, 25:2, 25:4, 26:12, 26:24, 27:21, 28:2, 28:4, 28:5, 28:6, 34:12, 34:20, 34:24, 35:10, 35:11, 35:15, 37:6, 39:7, 50:1, 52:1, 52:4, 52:6, 52:8, 52:21, 53:11, 53:15, 53:20, 54:13, 54:22, 54:25, 61:9, 61:13, 62:7, 62:9, 62:12, 62:16, 62:18, 63:19, 65:24, 67:10, 67:11 percentages [13] -16:8, 17:16, 23:11, 24:15, 24:21, 27:20, 34:11, 34:22, 39:6, 46:2, 52:13, 53:7, 64:21 perform [4] - 18:11, 44:12, 44:15, 56:2 performance [2] -28:14, 74:3 performed [1] -27:23 performing (1) - 4:12 perhaps [1] - 55:9 period [6] - 3:4, 5:22, 6:23, 7:6, 7:7, 30:8 permit [1] - 7:23 permitted [7] - 8:5, 20:12, 50:19, 51:3, 56:7, 56:8, 56:11 persistence [1] -47:20 persistent [1] - 47:25 persistently [2] -2:20, 9:8 person [1] - 72:15 personal [1] - 44:18 philosophy [1] -46:18 Phone [1] - 1:25 physical [1] - 73:19 physically [1] - 10:25 piece [2] - 60:9, 60:15 pieces [4] - 12:17, 49:24, 75:4, 75:12 PLA [1] - 9:8 place (6) - 5:3, 5:11, 7:17, 9:11, 10:16, 12:14 placement [3] - 17:3, 20:7, 20:19 plan [6] - 4:16, 16:19, 21:22, 21:25,

plans [1] - 6:1 play [1] - 13:17 pleasure [2] - 3:2, 6:11 plugging [1] - 56:18 point [23] - 10:8, 33:13, 36:22, 37:20, 38:3, 38:4, 43:8, 45:5, 45:21, 46:20, 47:1, 47:24, 48:6, 48:8, 48:23, 54:20, 63:10, 64:2, 64:9, 64:17, 69:18, 69:19, 74:10 point/counterpoint [1] - 48:22 points [7] - 34:24, 54:11, 63:12, 63:17, 64:1, 67:10, 67:11 policies [2] - 6:4, 68:22 Policy [1] - 2:10 popping [1] - 58:7 portion [1] - 7:17 poses [1] - 71:1 positive [4] - 33:18, 42:14, 42:17, 44:11 possibility [2] -22:12, 55:13 possible [6] - 20:24, 55:6, 57:15, 72:7, 72:14, 74:7 possibly (2) - 5:17, 57:12 post [6] - 18:14, 18:20, 22:15, 23:13, 25:3, 56:12 Post [2] - 21:24, 31:2 post-secondary [6] -18:14, 18:20, 22:15, 23:13, 25:3, 56:12 Post-Secondary [2] -21:24, 31:2 powers [1] - 5:24 practices [4] - 33:2, 57:18, 57:22, 59:11 precedent (1) - 7:14 predetermined [1] -32:2 predict[1] - 47:21 predicting [1] - 47:8 predictor [2] - 47:24, 51:13 preliminary [1] -74:24 premise [1] - 46:18 prepare [2] - 3:16, 70.23 present [9] - 5:15, 7:25, 8:3, 15:7, 21:1, 29:7, 37:5, 53:22,

75:12 presentation [13] -9:23, 17:12, 21:2, 29:8, 29:21, 31:21, 39:5, 40:20, 40:23, 50:21, 68:25, 71:20, 72:10 presented [2] - 16:5, 55:19 presenting [3] -14:22, 15:2, 35:6 presently (2) - 5:3, 12:9 preset [1] - 32:9 presided [1] - 10:1 pretty [3] - 73:16, 73:24, 76:16 prevent(1) - 10:22 previous [6] - 17:13, 25:10, 51:10, 57:11, 57:20, 67:6 previously (1) -30:17 price [2] - 39:8, 39:15 primarily [1] - 18:24 primary [1] - 68:19 primer [1] - 73:23 priorities [1] - 34:16 priority [8] - 4:11, 5:2, 6:20, 10:18, 11:13, 11:16, 11:22, 12:8 private [2] - 25:13, 25:15 problem [2] - 42:25, proceed [4] - 2:14, 4:1, 10:11, 51:7 process [4] - 2:20, 5:1, 5:9, 12:8 processes [1] - 5:3 product [1] - 20:18 productive [1] -76:12 Professional [1] -21:25 professionally [1] -7:13 professionallynegotiated [1] - 7:13 professors [3] -44:7, 45:2, 56:24 proficiency [2] -53:10, 62:18 proficient [1] - 64:9 profiles [1] - 73:15 profit [2] - 25:14, 25:17 program [2] - 52:19,

62:13 programs [4] - 26:1, 34:17, 67:25, 68:21 progress [1] - 68:20 prompted [1] - 16:14 promulgate [1] -7:23 proportion [4] -19:11, 51:21, 51:22, 54:6 proportions [3] -17:24, 18:4, 52:23 proposal [1] - 73:9 protect [1] - 57:7 protected [1] - 13:21 protecting [1] - 13:8 provide [6] - 3:22, 21:17, 27:15, 44:7, 62:5, 76:18 provided [1] - 21:20 providing [1] - 55:7 provision [1] - 7:12 public [5] - 5:21, 5:22, 7:5, 8:16, 25:13 Public [2] - 6:20, 13:24 pull [1] - 72:17 pulling [1] - 45:1 purchasing [1] -60:11 pursuant [2] - 2:21, 8:25 put [5] - 4:10, 11:1, 20:20, 69:3, 77:7 putting [1] - 60:12

Q

qualified [1] - 39:7 quality [1] - 18:17 questions [21] -3:25, 9:19, 15:8, 33:9, 33:10, 40:21, 43:21, 47:18, 48:17, 55:22, 69:1, 69:10, 69:13, 70:1, 70:4, 70:25, 71:10, 71:22, 72:12, 72:19, 75:25 quick [1] - 35:5 quicker[1] - 58:10 quickly (2) - 31:16, 76:16 quite (2) - 31:24, 51:24

R

race [6] - 24:21, 24:23, 52:2, 62:8, 65:23

range [1] - 58:8 ranking [1] - 10:15 rankings [2] - 73:20, 73:22 rate [2] - 24:25, 28:5 rates [10] - 19:4, 19:5, 22:1, 23:2, 27:14, 34:4, 35:24, 66:14, 66:15, 68:22 rather [7] - 11:2, 12:6, 32:16, 45:2, 47:2, 55:23, 75:6 reach [1] - 20:21 read [1] - 46:15 readiness [33] - 15:6, 15:11, 15:24, 16:3, 19:12, 20:1, 20:16, 21:14, 22:12, 22:23, 27:21, 27:25, 33:17, 34:4, 37:21, 42:23, 49:9, 49:25, 50:18, 55:8, 57:11, 62:13, 62:23, 62:24, 63:3, 64:18, 64:19, 65:10, 65:14, 65:16, 67:20, 68:22, 70:11 reading [5] - 14:14, 19:20, 20:2, 21:8, 40:14 ready [124] - 8:13, 16:10, 16:12, 16:13, 17:2, 17:4, 17:7, 17:8, 17:9, 18:8, 19:2, 19:7, 19:10, 19:14, 19:16, 19:17, 19:24, 20:6, 20:11, 21:1, 21:8, 22:4, 22:11, 22:17, 22:18, 23:1, 24:4, 24:10, 24:15, 27:17, 29:3, 30:2, 30:22, 34:10, 34:12, 34:13, 34:22, 34:24, 35:1, 35:23, 36:1, 36:5, 36:9, 36:22, 37:11, 38:8, 41:19, 41:20, 41:24, 42:1, 42:4, 42:15, 43:5, 43:6, 43:10, 46:3, 49:3, 49:8, 49:10, 49:14, 49:19, 50:1, 51:2, 51:7, 51:16, 51:22, 52:2, 52:5, 52:10, 52:14, 52:16, 52:22, 53:2, 53:12, 53:15, 53:20, 54:1, 54:5,

races [1] - 65:24

raise [2] - 61:23,

raised [3] - 56:16,

63:25, 69:10

72:15

54:9, 54:13, 54:16, 54:22, 55:17, 56:17, 57:16, 57:24, 57:25, 58:9, 60:16, 60:25, 61:2, 61:5, 61:7, 61:12, 61:15, 61:23, 61:25, 62:8, 62:10, 62:16, 62:19, 62:21, 62:25, 63:9, 63:12, 63:16, 63:21, 64:3, 64:4, 64:6, 64:21, 64:24, 64:25, 65:2, 65:4, 65:5, 65:7, 65:17, 65:21, 65:25, 68:6, 75:14 real [4] - 46:15, 54:14, 55:20 realize [1] - 40:19 really [33] - 30:4, 30:25, 31:23, 35:25, 41:15, 41:16, 41:19, 41:20, 42:4, 43:1, 43:8, 44:24, 45:24, 45:25, 46:20, 46:24, 50:5, 51:1, 55:6, 55:21, 57:7, 57:10, 59:5, 65:20, 66:3, 66:10, 67:7, 67:13, 67:23, 71:21, 72:13, 76:12, 76:17 reason [2] - 41:12, 59:15 received [6] - 3:3, 6:22, 6:25, 7:4, 7:7, 46:16 recently [2] - 46:16, 61:21 recess [2] - 73:18, 75:16 recommendation (2) - 68:17, 74:23 recommendations [2] - 57:19, 70:24 recommended [1] -66:5 record [1] - 2:2 records [1] - 72:17 reduce [3] - 16:19, 21:22, 22:1 reduced [2] - 39:8, 39:15 reduced-price [2] -39:8, 39:15 reduces (1) - 12:20 reducing [1] - 44:25 reemphasize [1] -45:5

reevaluate [1] - 66:6

reg [3] - 10:4, 10:5,

refer [1] - 16:2

10:9 regain [1] - 4:21 regarding [2] - 4:11, 76:1 regardless [1] -20:10 Regional [1] - 61:21 regs [1] - 8:4 regular [2] - 45:3, 77:6 regulation [17] -2:13, 2:16, 2:21, 3:1, 3:20, 5:10, 5:16, 5:19, 6:18, 7:24, 8:12, 8:22, 9:10, 11:16, 12:19, 14:13, 16:25 regulations (9) -2:16, 2:18, 2:24, 3:21, 4:10, 8:1, 12:5, 12:20, 12:23 regulatory [1] -73:25 reigned [1] - 19:5 related [1] - 57:19 relative [1] - 25:12 relatively [2] - 53:11, 64:16 relevant [1] - 24:17 rely [2] - 33:1, 33:2 remained [3] - 19:5, 24:11, 34:6 remedial [20] - 16:21, 20:14, 22:24, 23:9, 23:14, 23:18, 24:1, 26:14, 27:2, 27:6, 37:2, 37:15, 42:16, 42:24, 43:3, 43:11, 43:13, 43:14, 43:16, 45:10 remediated [2] -39:22, 45:24 remediation [15] -19:4, 21:23, 22:1, 23:8, 26:19, 26:21, 26:22, 28:3, 28:7, 44:8, 44:23, 44:24, 45:1, 45:2, 50:20 reminder [1] - 76:10 repeal [4] - 5:5, 5:12, 6:3, 14:6 repealing (3) - 2:17, 2:25, 12:6 repeat [1] - 7:3 replace [1] - 5:24 report [31] - 14:16, 14:22, 15:3, 20:4, 20:22, 23:23, 24:20, 29:9, 33:4, 37:5, 39:1, 43:1, 45:6, 51:8, 53:24, 57:10, 58:20,

59:19, 60:24, 61:20, 64:14, 64:24, 65:22, 69:4, 71:12, 72:13, 72:23, 75:14, 76:18 reported [11] - 15:15, 50:2, 50:3, 50:4, 58:4, 64:18, 64:22, 65:6, 65:9, 65:19, 66:8 reporting [5] - 64:23, 65:8, 66:1, 66:3, 68:20 reports [1] - 33:3 representative (3) -6:13, 13:15, 38:14 Representative [8] -25:7, 27:10, 43:25, 46:13, 58:11, 69:14, 71:15, 73:11 REPRESENTATIVE [51] - 6:14, 7:2, 8:12, 9:12, 13:16, 13:19, 25:9, 25:18, 25:20, 25:25, 26:6, 27:12, 28:17, 28:22, 28:25, 29:4, 29:15, 29:18, 29:22, 30:5, 30:20, 30:24, 31:7, 31:11, 31:18, 32:4, 33:25, 38:15, 38:23, 39:3, 40:5, 40:11, 40:16, 44:2, 44:6, 44:10, 44:21, 46:14, 48:2, 48:5, 48:11, 48:20, 58:14, 58:17, 59:4, 59:16, 59:25, 69:16, 70:8, 71:17, 71:19 representatives [1] -70:18 request [7] - 47:11, 48:10, 59:7, 60:4, 69:18, 74:8, 76:20 requested [2] -76:14, 77:5 requests [1] - 57:21 require [3] - 11:4. 16:17, 60:19 required [17] - 4:25, 12:18, 16:15, 21:20, 21:23, 22:24, 23:9, 23:14, 23:18, 23:25, 26:14, 27:1, 27:6, 37:2, 37:14, 58:22, 65:15 requirement [1] -70:11 requirements (7) -3:18, 3:23, 5:10, 16:14, 62:23, 65:10, 74:1

requires [2] - 12:7,

requiring [2] - 23:21, requisite [1] - 26:18 research (8) - 14:18. 15:2, 15:4, 38:1, 43:12, 47:19, 57:21, 59:6 researchers [1] -59:9 resolve [1] - 7:21 resources (1) - 62:5 respond [2] - 70:20, 70:21 response [5] - 3:4, 6:10, 76:18, 77:1 rest [4] - 6:16, 9:13, 43:21, 56:23 result [1] - 19:3 results [1] - 69:17 retained [2] - 28:13, 30:10 retake [6] - 19:23, 32:23, 39:20, 40:2, 58:24, 58:25 retention [5] - 27:14, 28:2, 28:5, 28:10, 29:10 retroactively [1] -50:4 return [2] - 17:18, 29:12 revenue [1] - 74:2 **REVIEW**[1] - 1:7 review (4) - 4:18, 10:24, 73:25, 75:21 reviewed [1] - 74:12 reviewing [1] - 4:18 reviews [1] - 6:2 right-hand [1] -41:25 rigorous [1] - 63:2 RMR [1] - 1:23 role [1] - 5:24 room [1] - 71:8 row [2] - 11:14, 11:15

S

safe [2] - 75:8, 75:19 safety [1] - 73:16 sake [1] - 49:6 SAT [1] - 47:5 saved [1] - 45:11 saving [3] - 44:8, 44:22, 46:4 saw [2] - 17:13, 43:17 scenario [1] - 55:11

scheduling [1] - 71:9 school [65] - 2:18, 2:21, 4:15, 4:16, 4:19, 4:21, 4:22, 5:24, 5:25, 6:3, 8:17, 10:14, 11:8, 11:10, 11:12, 11:13, 12:8, 15:12, 16:25, 22:8, 30:9, 30:10, 30:13, 32:8, 32:16, 33:11, 38:3, 43:4, 45:19, 46:21, 46:22, 47:1, 47:7, 50:9, 53:17, 53:25, 54:2, 54:4, 54:6, 54:17, 54:19, 55:3, 55:18, 55:21, 58:5, 59:6, 59:13, 59:14, 59:18, 63:13, 66:15, 66:16, 68:10, 68:11, 69:19, 73:16, 73:23, 75:15, 75:19 School (1) - 13:24 Schools [3] - 2:7, 2.11, 6.20 schools [49] - 4:11, 4:13, 5:2, 6:20, 9:8, 10:19, 10:21, 10:25, 11:16, 11:20, 11:21, 13:22, 15:18, 16:1, 18:1, 18:5, 19:11, 25:21, 33:21, 46:8, 50:23, 51:25, 53:19, 53:22, 53:23, 54:7, 54:8, 54:14, 54:24, 54:25, 55:12, 57:22, 59:10, 63:6, 64:5, 66:4, 67:16, 67:17, 67:18, 68:3, 68:4, 68:7, 68:9, 68:24, 69:3, 73:19, 75:9, 75.19 scope [1] - 24:13 score [2] - 40:7, 41:21 scores [5] - 33:10, 38:17, 59:12, 60:6, 60:13 scoring [4] - 42:2, 42:5, 58:6 screen [2] - 17:13, 17:17 se [2] - 30:12, 30:13 season [3] - 76:21, seated [1] - 15:1 second [5] - 4:4, 14:2, 21:4, 73:2, 76:2 secondary [6] -

scheduled [2] - 71:7,

77:9

18:14, 18:20, 22:15, 23:13, 25:3, 56:12 Secondary [2] -21:24, 31:2 secure [3] - 20:23, 31:22, 31:25 security [1] - 33:22 see [60] - 8:6, 16:4, 16:5, 17:17, 17:23, 17:24, 18:1, 18:4, 18:6, 18:11, 21:13, 22:6, 22:9, 23:16, 24:8, 24:21, 25:1, 29:11, 29:16, 29:23, 30:1, 30:2, 30:3, 31:17, 34:7, 34:12, 34:23, 35:16, 35:24, 36:12, 36:17, 37:3, 37:18, 46:1, 48:7, 48:24, 50:3, 52:6, 52:9, 52:13, 52:20, 53:6, 53:13, 53:18, 54:21, 54:25, 55:25, 57:8, 57:15, 59:10, 60:7, 61:14, 62:9, 63:18, 65:3, 65:23, 69:21, 69:22, 75:22, 77:5 seeking [2] - 5:4, 73:12 seem [2] - 4:7, 38:18 segue [1] - 76:23 select (1) - 9:4 selection [1] - 6:1 Senate [2] - 16:15, 21:22 SENATOR [32] -9:21, 11:6, 11:18, 11:25, 12:22, 12:25, 13:18, 26:10, 26:17, 27:8, 35:5, 35:12, 37:18, 37:24, 38:5, 38:9, 38:12, 40:18, 40:25, 41:3, 41:9, 41:14, 43:20, 48:15, 48:21, 49:10, 49:14, 49:17, 70:17, 71:2, 71:11, 76:9 senator [3] - 9:20, 37:16, 40:17 Senator (7) - 26:8, 35:3, 48:14, 70:16, 71:25, 73:10, 76:7 send [1] - 69:18 sense [4] - 28:18, 28:20, 41:20, 46:11 separate [4] - 10:9, 10:10, 49:24, 51:1 September [1] -75:17

sequence (4) -60:25, 61:3, 62:5, 64:8 series [4] - 22:20, 46:10, 51:20, 76:22 serve [1] - 5:2 service [1] - 49:22 set [3] - 19:25, 20:3, 57:20 seven [1] - 67:10 several [6] - 5:7, 5:14, 9:7, 12:10, 14:14, 71:25 shady [1] - 72:14 shared [1] - 22:3 short (1) - 76:15 show [9] - 22:20, 24:21, 26:24, 29:12, 29:21, 36:2, 36:20, 38:7, 45:17 showed [3] - 25:11, 50:5, 68:4 showing [1] - 42:2 shown [1] - 51:11 shows [19] - 17:12, 23:7, 23:8, 23:10, 23:12, 24:6, 35:13, 36:7, 38:2, 38:6, 51:20, 52:1, 61:9, 61:17, 62:7, 63:19, 66:14, 66:16 SIDE [1] - 40:24 side [2] - 36:11, 41:25 significant [1] -23:20 silent [1] - 8:1 similar (7) - 10:12, 25:22, 45:17, 52:13, 52:18, 54:15, 68:8 similarly [1] - 37:9 Simpson [1] - 25:7 SIMPSON [5] - 25:9, 25:18, 25:20, 25:25, 26:6 single [12] - 12:18, 12:21, 15:15, 17:13, 32:13, 32:15, 32:18, 32:19, 35:23, 36:6, 68:15, 68:16 sitting [1] - 72:14 situation [1] - 7:9 skill [1] - 62:6 skip [1] - 39:4 skipped [1] - 38:24 slide [24] - 16:4, 17:12, 18:6, 23:7, 25:10, 26:12, 35:7, 35:13, 36:7, 36:20, 36:23, 41:3, 41:9,

41:15, 41:16, 45:21, 52:1, 54:12, 54:21, 61:9, 61:17, 67:1, 67:3, 67:6 slides [5] - 22:20, 46:11, 51:10, 51:20, 57:20 slightly [2] - 20:1, 62:11 slowness [1] - 41:10 smail [8] - 35:21, 35:25, 36:3, 36:18, 53:11, 62:18, 64:16, 65:11 smaller [2] - 34:10, 62:16 Smart [1] - 73:11 so.. [4] - 69:23, 70:14, 74:3, 75:2 socioeconomic [1] -72:4 sole[1] - 68:19 solution [1] - 72:3 solve [1] - 56:5 someone [1] - 12:1 someplace [1] - 71:7 sometimes [4] -4:13, 32:9, 50:3, 66:12 son [1] - 9:16 son-in-law[1] - 9:16 sorry [10] - 8:14, 14:25, 37:22, 37:25, 39:2, 39:5, 41:10, 41:11, 71:8 sort [5] - 48:22, 60:8, 60:15, 65:8, 72:12 Southern [1] - 61:21 spans [1] - 76:15 speaking (1) - 10:5 special [2] - 53:7, 62:16 specific [2] - 7:12, 12:3 specifically [1] -16:17 spent [1] - 45:5 spot [1] - 7:22 spring [1] - 29:14 stab [1] - 41:1 stack [2] - 47:7, 48:6 staff [6] - 3:7, 3:14, 62:4, 71:12, 74:17, 77:5 staff-suggested [1] -3:14 stale [1] - 12:14 standardized [1] -70:11 standards [1] - 6:6

Standards [1] -21:25 start [4] - 14:24, 43:4, 69:14, 74:23 started [2] - 11:8, 50:6 starts [1] - 76:22 state [18] - 8:22, 10:16, 11:3, 12:18, 13:5, 17:24, 18:21, 19:10, 50:2, 52:12, 52:13, 53:14, 53:25, 54:7, 54:24, 63:14, 63:20, 73:20 statement (2) - 13:2, 70:23 states [3] - 5:1, 60:18 Statistics [2] - 18:13, status [3] - 11:23, 26:25, 27:5 statute [11] - 7:24, 8:3, 8:9, 9:3, 21:20, 39:19, 39:21, 58:19, 75:1 statutes [2] - 3:20, statutorily [1] - 8:5 statutory [5] - 3:17, 5:9, 5:23, 11:4, 73:25 stay [1] - 30:9 stayed [1] - 67:19 staying [1] - 30:12 steep [5] - 16:5, 18:7, 18:25, 22:10, 23:16 sticks (1) - 48:24 still [7] - 29:13, 34:11, 34:23, 37:3, 37:11, 66:5, 69:13 stop [1] - 25:6 strategies (2) - 22:3, 44:15 strategy [1] - 44:14 strength [2] - 18:15, 33:20 stricken [1] - 12:14 stronger [1] - 51:13 struggled [1] - 40:22 student [17] - 4:23, 17:25, 19:12, 24:20, 32:13, 32:15, 32:18, 32:22, 42:20, 42:21, 43:18, 47:21, 51:24, 61:2, 64:6, 68:20, 68:23 students [207] - 13:9, 13:13, 15:19, 16:10, 17:2, 17:4, 17:7, 18:2,

18:5, 18:8, 18:9, 18:10, 18:19, 18:20, 19:1, 19:9, 19:11, 19:18, 19:21, 20:5, 20:10, 20:20, 21:2, 21:5, 21:19, 22:4, 22:6, 22:10, 22:16, 22:17, 22:23, 22:25, 23:3, 23:8, 23:18, 23:21, 23:24, 24:3, 24:5, 24:9, 24:15, 24:16, 24:22, 24:24, 26:24, 27:3, 27:20, 27:22, 28:4, 28:6, 28:9, 28:13, 28:21, 28:22, 30:2, 30:7, 30:21, 31:4, 32:7, 32:10, 32:17, 33:6, 33:16, 33:17, 34:10, 34:13, 34:14, 34:17, 34:18, 34:25, 35:1, 35:19, 35:22, 35:25, 36:1, 36:4, 36:5, 36:12, 36:15, 36:16, 36:21, 36:23, 36:25, 37:9, 37:10, 37:14, 39:7, 39:9, 39:10, 39:19, 39:20, 40:1, 40:2, 40:4, 41:20, 41:24, 42:12, 42:17, 43:5, 43:6, 43:10, 43:12, 44:25, 45:9, 45:11, 45:12, 45:14, 45:15, 45:16, 45:18, 45:20, 45:23, 46:2, 46:9, 47:13, 48:25, 49:2, 50:7, 50:12, 50:14, 51:2, 51:15, 51:21, 52:2, 52:4, 52:9, 52:10, 52:12, 52:14, 52:16, 52:21, 52:22, 52:25, 53:3, 53:8, 53:10, 53:15, 53:20, 54:1, 54:3, 54:4, 54:5, 54:10, 54:13, 54:16, 54:18, 54:22, 55:1, 55:5, 55:7, 55:9, 56:1, 56:5, 56:17, 57:16, 57:23, 57:25, 58:6, 59:20, 59:23, 60:11, 60:17, 60:19, 60:20, 60:22, 61:13, 61:15, 61:18, 61:22, 61:24, 62:3, 62:10, 62:11, 62:12, 62:15, 62:17, 62:19, 62:20, 62:22, 62:25, 63:7, 63:11, 63:15, 63:20, 64:3, 64:10, 64:21, 64:24, 64:25, 65:1, 65:4, 65:6, 65:8,

65:12, 65:13, 65:21, 65:24, 66:4, 68:8, 68:10, 68:11, 70:3 studies [9] - 46:22, 47:10, 57:21, 59:7, 73:14, 74:7, 74:14, 75:22 study [30] - 15:5, 15:10, 15:16, 15:21, 17:15, 17:20, 18:9, 18:18, 18:23, 24:13, 31:13, 44:15, 44:17, 47:7, 47:13, 47:17, 47:23, 60:4, 69:17, 70:21, 70:24, 72:6, 72:20, 73:5, 73:7, 73:16, 73:17, 75:12, 75:16, 76:1 stuff [1] - 59:15 SUBCOMMITTEE [1] subject [5] - 5:18, 5:23, 21:11, 23:11, 23:15 subjects [3] - 19:19, 21:3, 40:10 submission [1] -4:25 substantially [1] -24:23 success [1] - 44:19 suddenly [1] - 58:7 sufficient [1] - 42:23 suggest [1] - 74:20 suggested [2] - 3:10, suggestion [1] - 77:3 suit[1] - 57:3 summarize [2] - 3:2, summary [4] - 3:22, 3:23, 3:24, 12:1 summer [1] - 50:10 support [1] - 9:14 supposed [1] - 9:1 System [1] - 13:24 system [12] - 4:19, 12:12, 15:14, 16:16, 18:15, 31:1, 47:9, 50:13, 63:5, 63:13, 63:17, 72:8 systematically [1] -47:14 systems [5] - 4:19, 5:6, 18:17, 47:16, 47:17

T

table (3) - 14:24,

70:20, 76:24 TAPE [1] - 40:24 tardiness [1] - 9:22 taught [1] - 45:1 teach [2] - 44:8, 45:3 teacher [2] - 9:16, Teachers [2] - 6:17, 7:1 teachers [4] - 9:14, 13:8, 13:12, 13:20 teachers' [1] - 46:23 technical [14] - 17:5, 17:8, 60:17, 60:19, 60:22, 61:1, 61:11, 61:13, 61:18, 62:2, 62:23, 63:7, 65:9, 65:14 technically [2] -60:25, 64:9 telephone [1] - 69:4 ten [1] - 34:23 tends [1] - 60:5 tens [1] - 72:16 termination [1] - 6:2 terms [16] - 8:25. 27:19, 27:21, 28:1, 28:9, 28:12, 30:7, 31:24, 44:3, 44:15, 44:19, 47:8, 70:2, 71:21, 72:3, 72:13 test [29] - 20:16, 27:18, 27:24, 28:4, 28:8, 32:3, 32:6, 32:17, 32:19, 32:25, 33:2, 33:7, 35:24, 36:6, 37:10, 46:24, 47:24, 55:18, 56:8, 56:9, 56:11, 56:14, 56:15, 57:17, 58:4, 59:12, 60:6, 62:24, 64:4 test-focused [1] -55:18 testing [3] - 37:21, 46:19, 70:12 tests [47] - 16:12, 17:3, 17:4, 17:9, 18:3, 19:20, 19:23, 20:7, 20:15, 20:20, 21:10, 22:14, 22:24, 39:12, 42:13, 43:17, 45:8, 45:17, 47:2, 47:3, 47:8, 50:9, 50:12, 50:16, 50:25, 51:14, 52:7, 52:8, 52:15, 52:17, 53:16, 54:2, 54:6, 56:7, 56:15, 56:18, 56:20, 57:1, 57:4, 57:16, 63:1,

63:9, 65:10, 65:15, 68:13 they've [4] - 15:17. 45:11, 60:25, 65:2 thinking [1] - 41:17 third [2] - 21:7, 54:4 thirds [3] - 18:3, 52:10, 54:1 thousands [3] -32:21, 32:25, 72:16 threatening [1] -13:11 three [20] - 7:14, 11:14, 11:15, 19:19, 21:2, 21:3, 21:5, 21:9, 27:16, 28:23, 46:24, 52:7, 52:17, 52:25, 53:18, 53:21, 54:6, 61:1, 61:3, 68:4 three-fourths [1] -52:25 three-hour [1] -46:24 throughout [1] - 74:9 TIMMEL [5] - 14:19, 14:25, 33:12, 41:6, 41:12 Timmel [1] - 14:20 today [4] - 12:3, 14:21, 15:3, 71:1 today's [1] - 15:5 together [6] - 32:11, 51:5, 66:10, 68:15, 72:16, 72:17 tolerating [1] - 71:22 took [2] - 56:20, 65:14 top [3] - 52:3, 58:8, 74:14 topics [4] - 74:6, 74:7, 74:9, 74:15 total [8] - 5:22, 17:15, 52:4, 64:20, 65:3, 65:21, 67:11, 73:14 totally [1] - 45:13 touch [1] - 29:19 towards [1] - 72:3 track [2] - 30:9, 30:12 tracking (2) - 30:7, 31:14 train [1] - 62:3 training [2] - 25:21, 26:1 transitional [1] -22:2 trend [1] - 24:14

trends [1] - 50:23

trigger [2] - 11:6,

11:8 true [7] - 17:25, 18:4, 54:16, 59:18, 66:22, 66:23 truly [2] - 56:1, 57:5 try [6] - 10:22, 41:1, 48:23, 72:2, 72:7, 75:13 trying [5] - 4:10, 5:16, 48:18, 57:7, 74:11 turn [3] - 4:14, 4:16, 10:7 turn-around [3] -4:14, 4:16, 10:7 TV [1] - 76:21 two [24] - 2:16, 2:23, 4:10, 5:17, 12:5, 12:20, 17:3, 18:3, 20:7, 29:5, 37:12, 43:9, 46:15, 46:24, 49:11, 49:18, 52:10, 54:1, 54:11, 56:15, 57:19, 60:23, 73:21 two-thirds [3] - 18:3, 52:10, 54:1 type [8] - 8:2, 26:19, 27:7, 31:15, 42:21, 43:18, 47:15, 67:25 types [3] - 17:24, 47:17, 55:22 typical [2] - 53:25, 54:7

U

ultimately [1] - 61:11 under [9] - 5:9, 9:1, 18:2, 20:23, 28:8, 41:23, 51:16, 51:22, 53:2 undermine [2] -55:17, 56:13 underpins [1] - 5:10 unfortunately [1] -4:12 universities [13] -18:10, 23:20, 23:25, 24:20, 24:25, 25:13, 25:14, 25:16, 25:24, 26:14, 47:4, 70:10 University [1] - 46:17 university [2] -20:13, 44:7 university's [1] -44:25 unless [1] - 61:3 unnecessary [1] -46:19 unusual [4] - 55:4,

58:3, 58:5, 60:18
up [22] - 15:15,
15:25, 17:15, 17:21,
26:11, 38:23, 39:17,
42:9, 44:2, 47:7, 48:6,
58:8, 60:6, 60:13,
66:5, 70:25, 72:12,
74:8, 74:10, 74:19,
75:17, 75:18
update [2] - 73:22,
75:23
urge [2] - 66:11,
67:23
urges [1] - 15:23

٧

utilize [1] - 10:7

valid [1] - 46:25

validity [5] - 45:8, 55:17, 56:14, 57:7, 59:6 varies [1] - 19:11 variety [3] - 16:12, 17:6, 35:19 various [3] - 22:24, 33:20, 74:6 vary [7] - 15:18, 19:6, 23:2, 24:23, 33:22, 51:23, 51:24 vendors [1] - 58:3 version [2] - 5:15, 7:25 versus [10] - 35:18, 39:10, 39:15, 40:15, 42:3, 47:24, 52:7, 52:22, 53:3, 54:23 via [1] - 74:25 violate [1] - 9:4

W

wage [2] - 49:5, 62:6 wait [2] - 39:3, 74:21 waiting [1] - 75:6 waive [1] - 9:2 waiver [2] - 4:25, wants [1] - 76:7 watch [1] - 9:17 watched [1] - 69:11 ways [4] - 17:6, 37:12, 43:9, 45:15 welcome [1] - 27:9 were.. [1] - 4:8 whereas [1] - 55:25 white [4] - 24:23, 52:9, 52:12, 62:10 WICKERSHAM [8] -2:9, 4:24, 6:21, 7:4,

12:24 Wickersham [1] - 2:9 Wilson [6] - 26:8, 37:16, 70:16, 73:11, 76:12, 76:14 WILSON [11] - 26:10, 26:17, 27:8, 37:18, 37:24, 38:5, 38:9, 38:12, 70:17, 71:2, 71:11 win [2] - 13:18, 48:19 word [5] - 13:17, 48:18, 48:19, 76:7, 77:4 words [1] - 50:18 workforce (2) -18:22, 61:25 Workforce [1] - 70:5 WorkKeys [5] - 61:6, 63:1, 63:8, 65:11, 65:13 worth [1] - 63:17 written [1] - 70:23

8:18, 9:18, 12:5,

Υ

year [16] - 21:17,
22:19, 26:12, 31:13,
32:20, 33:5, 36:8,
56:24, 61:12, 73:6,
73:8, 73:14, 73:18,
74:9, 74:13, 75:18
years [9] - 5:7, 11:14,
11:15, 12:10, 29:17,
31:16, 57:12, 59:10,
73:21
yellow [1] - 52:6
you-all [5] - 4:2, 4:6,
6:16, 28:12, 70:9
yourself [1] - 2:2

Z

Zoom [3] - 56:5, 60:9, 60:11