1	STATE OF FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
2	
3	AMERICAN FOR RESEARCH
4	FLORIDA'S RACE TO THE TOP
5	STUDENT GROWTH IMPLEMENTATION
6	COMMITTEE MEETING
7	
8	University of Central Florida
9	Teaching Academy Building
	Orlando, Florida
10	
11	
12	Thursday, May 20, 2011
13	Volume 2
14	
15	
16	DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION:
17	KATHY HEBDA, Deputy Chancellor for Educator Quality JUAN COPA, Director, Research & Analysis
18	AIR MEMBERS PRESENT:
19	JON COHEN, Ph.D., Executive Vice-President HAROLD DORAN, Ed.D., AIR, Principal Research Scientist CHRISTY HOVANETZ
20	MARY ANN LEMKE
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	American Court Reporting 850.421.0058

189

		1	
	190		192
1	(Whereupon, this is an uninterrupted	1	this data set. What if the rule changes? It
2	continuation from Day 2, Volume 2, to-wit:)	2	goes up. Now what's the
3	* * * * *	3	MS. KEARSCHNER: Aren't we going to be
4	MS. BROWN: Sam, can we discuss from the	4	revising this yearly? Can't we add it in at a
5	standpoint of what we have now, meaning class	5	later date?
6	size restriction defined under the current	6	MR. LeTELLIER: I would rather start with
7	legislation because as was pointed out probably	7	it and take it down if it's not necessary than
8	before we had that we would have seen more	8	trying to add it in.
9	deviation, more impact, right? So do we	9	MS. KEARSCHNER: Even if it's not
10	consider just what we are under right now or	10	significant?
11	because we know we're moving to end of-course	11	MR. LeTELLIER: But it's not significant
12	exams, we know we're going to have more	12	only for those constraints that we're talking
13	differentiation and those classes may have	13	about and we know it's going to change right
14	larger class size variation. Can we should	14	now. I mean, for next year.
15	we consider that it's a changing landscape	15	MR. FOERSTER: Jon?
16	because that would frame which way I'm I'm	16	DR. COHEN: Let me make one technical point
17	leaning the other way, that class size should be	17	and maybe you seem to be at a bit of an
18	included because I've seen all of these things	18	impasse and let me make a suggestion to help get
10	we've been told are in the process of changing	19	you past it.
20	now and are going to continue to change, and	20	If you constrain the variation of your
21	because of that I think class size is important	21	dependent variable, say you're trying to
22	and does matter even if with this particular	22	explain, then you know you're going to attenuate
23	constrained example, it's not showing it.	23	your quote. We're talking about an independent
24	MR. LeTELLIER: I agree.	24	variable that has a strain. That probably
25	MS. BOURN: So what I think you just said	25	shouldn't have technically shouldn't have
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	191		193
1	is if in fact this data looks as though there's	1	much of an impact of making it seem less
2	no effect because it was measured during a time	2	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would
2 3	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a	2 3	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what
2	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able	2	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to
2 3	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next	2 3	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing,
2 3 4 5 6	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year	2 3 4	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are
2 3 4 5	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say?	2 3 4 5	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a
2 3 4 5 6	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say	2 3 4 5 6	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now,
2 3 4 5 6 7	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around	2 3 4 5 6 7	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see classes grow because we can't afford to have all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see classes grow because we can't afford to have all classes tiny and because we're going to be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we need to be able to measure and see the effect
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see classes grow because we can't afford to have all classes tiny and because we're going to be assessing and using those assessments to grade	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we need to be able to measure and see the effect and teachers are going to want to know as those
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see classes grow because we can't afford to have all classes tiny and because we're going to be assessing and using those assessments to grade teachers that that piece should be in that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we need to be able to measure and see the effect and teachers are going to want to know as those changes are made. And that's my argument.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see classes grow because we can't afford to have all classes tiny and because we're going to be assessing and using those assessments to grade teachers that that piece should be in that formula.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we need to be able to measure and see the effect and teachers are going to want to know as those changes are made. And that's my argument. MR. FOERSTER: I think that's a great
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see classes grow because we can't afford to have all classes tiny and because we're going to be assessing and using those assessments to grade teachers that that piece should be in that formula. MS. BROWN: You convinced me when we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we need to be able to measure and see the effect and teachers are going to want to know as those changes are made. And that's my argument. MR. FOERSTER: I think that's a great argument; I really do. I want to make sure I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see classes grow because we can't afford to have all classes tiny and because we're going to be assessing and using those assessments to grade teachers that that piece should be in that formula. MS. BROWN: You convinced me when we started because now I'm concerned that this data	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we need to be able to measure and see the effect and teachers are going to want to know as those changes are made. And that's my argument. MR. FOERSTER: I think that's a great argument; I really do. I want to make sure I understood what Jon was saying just so that we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see classes grow because we can't afford to have all classes tiny and because we're going to be assessing and using those assessments to grade teachers that that piece should be in that formula. MS. BROWN: You convinced me when we started because now I'm concerned that this data is constrained by artificially by the cap	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we need to be able to measure and see the effect and teachers are going to want to know as those changes are made. And that's my argument. MR. FOERSTER: I think that's a great argument; I really do. I want to make sure I understood what Jon was saying just so that we see both sides of it. I think what Jon was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see classes grow because we can't afford to have all classes tiny and because we're going to be assessing and using those assessments to grade teachers that that piece should be in that formula. MS. BROWN: You convinced me when we started because now I'm concerned that this data is constrained by artificially by the cap that exists.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we need to be able to measure and see the effect and teachers are going to want to know as those changes are made. And that's my argument. MR. FOERSTER: I think that's a great argument; I really do. I want to make sure I understood what Jon was saying just so that we see both sides of it. I think what Jon was saying was that the way that this analysis was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see classes grow because we can't afford to have all classes tiny and because we're going to be assessing and using those assessments to grade teachers that that piece should be in that formula. MS. BROWN: You convinced me when we started because now I'm concerned that this data is constrained by artificially by the cap that exists. MR. MOREHOUSE: That is precisely my point,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we need to be able to measure and see the effect and teachers are going to want to know as those changes are made. And that's my argument. MR. FOERSTER: I think that's a great argument; I really do. I want to make sure I understood what Jon was saying just so that we see both sides of it. I think what Jon was saying was that the way that this analysis was done it has already taken into account fluctuations in class size. So the situation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	no effect because it was measured during a time when all the courses under consideration had a maximum cap, then we may not necessarily be able to apply it as even just next year, already next year Is that what you're trying to say? MS. KEARSCHNER: Yes, and I'll just say this, that I know there's a lot of debate around class size and whether we should have that restriction or not have it and so on. You could look to other studies that have been done saying whether you feel it does matter or doesn't matter, but to people who are going to see classes grow because we can't afford to have all classes tiny and because we're going to be assessing and using those assessments to grade teachers that that piece should be in that formula. MS. BROWN: You convinced me when we started because now I'm concerned that this data is constrained by artificially by the cap that exists. MR. MOREHOUSE: That is precisely my point, that here we don't know what the numbers are for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	much of an impact of making it seem less significant. If it hadn't affected, it would have you would still likely see it, but what you could choose to do is you might choose to revisit because the situation is changing, the world is changing, how class sizes are determined will change, you could make a recommendation that you maybe take it out now, re-introduce it as a check into the model each year to monitor how changing policy is changing the value-added. MS. KEARSCHNER: I'd rather have it in now because as those things change that we're talking about, those assessments, the potential for class sizes to grow, all of those things, we need to be able to measure and see the effect and teachers are going to want to know as those changes are made. And that's my argument. MR. FOERSTER: I think that's a great argument; I really do. I want to make sure I understood what Jon was saying just so that we see both sides of it. I think what Jon was saying was that the way that this analysis was done it has already taken into account

_			
	194		196
1	that you're contemplating about having more	1	detail that went into their calculation and
2	classes that are bigger in his opinion likely is	2	they're going to see I have this class of 35
3	not going to change what we see in these	3	kids and the expectation was actually higher as
4	numbers. That's a technical	4	a consequence.
5	DR. COHEN: It typically does what you see,	5	MS. KEARSCHNER: When we looked at that
6	but because of the change in policy the world	6	initially, my instinct was to decide on one and
7	can change. The decisions people make about	7	two because first of all those incidents are so
8	class size could change. Constraining your	8	rare; that's why you're seeing that, if I'm
9	independent variables doesn't usually change the	9	understanding correctly. When you get out to
10	effects on the on constrain, but the dependent	10	six, if you have 51 numbers that's blown up
	variable does. So we're constraining an	11	because that doesn't recur.
11	-		DR. HOVANETZ: Less than half of the
12	independent variable here but we're talking	12	
13	about two things happening at the same time.	13	students in middle and high school have a single
14	Removing that constraint is also going to change	14	course. Like five percent of elementary
15	how people form their classes and the kinds of	15	students have a single course. So it's not that
16	decisions they make with their resources. I	16	only it's not that there's only just one
17	mean, Linda's approach is as good as the one I	17	course at the impact negative, the distribution
18	suggested. You could leave it in and revisit it	18	of students in multiple courses, you're like,
19	next meeting.	19	how can a student have six courses? Remember
20	MS. KEARSCHNER: Sam, I'm coming from a	20	what we talked about yesterday? Students in
21	policy standpoint.	21	elementary school are enrolled in reading,
22	MR. FOERSTER: Sure.	22	spelling, writing, language arts
23	MR. MOREHOUSE: You want to motion it,	23	So if you're looking at class size four,
24	Linda?	24	it's not statistically significant; and you
25	MS. KEARSCHNER: So moved, keep it in.	25	know, it's nominal marginal impact and so we're
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	195		197
1	MS. BROWN: Second.	1	not just looking at it from the perspective that
1 2	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I	1 2	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible).
	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of		not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.)
2	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters?	2	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational
2 3	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of	2 3	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not
2 3 4	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters?	2 3 4	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in.
2 3 4 5	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No.	2 3 4 5	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we
2 3 4 5 6	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are	2 3 4 5 6	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You	2 3 4 5 6 7	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us operate under the assumption that class size as	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us operate under the assumption that class size as it increases results in lower expectations for students, thereby helping teachers. What she's pointing out is that isn't the case, at least	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course some kids it's their English course
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us operate under the assumption that class size as it increases results in lower expectations for students, thereby helping teachers. What she's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course some kids it's their English course PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us operate under the assumption that class size as it increases results in lower expectations for students, thereby helping teachers. What she's pointing out is that isn't the case, at least	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course some kids it's their English course PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) DR. HOVANETZ: it should be an all or nothing, and just looking at the impact and significance it's, you know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us operate under the assumption that class size as it increases results in lower expectations for students, thereby helping teachers. What she's pointing out is that isn't the case, at least that's not what we see here. Where there are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course some kids it's their English course PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) DR. HOVANETZ: it should be an all or nothing, and just looking at the impact and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us operate under the assumption that class size as it increases results in lower expectations for students, thereby helping teachers. What she's pointing out is that isn't the case, at least that's not what we see here. Where there are effect sizes in many cases they are positive,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course some kids it's their English course PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) DR. HOVANETZ: it should be an all or nothing, and just looking at the impact and significance it's, you know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us operate under the assumption that class size as it increases results in lower expectations for students, thereby helping teachers. What she's pointing out is that isn't the case, at least that's not what we see here. Where there are effect sizes in many cases they are positive, meaning that as the class gets bigger the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course some kids it's their English course PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) DR. HOVANETZ: it should be an all or nothing, and just looking at the impact and significance it's, you know MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we have a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us operate under the assumption that class size as it increases results in lower expectations for students, thereby helping teachers. What she's pointing out is that isn't the case, at least that's not what we see here. Where there are effect sizes in many cases they are positive, meaning that as the class gets bigger the expectation for the teacher is going to go up.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course some kids it's their English course PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) DR. HOVANETZ: it should be an all or nothing, and just looking at the impact and significance it's, you know MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we have a technical guidance that we need to be taking
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us operate under the assumption that class size as it increases results in lower expectations for students, thereby helping teachers. What she's pointing out is that isn't the case, at least that's not what we see here. Where there are effect sizes in many cases they are positive, meaning that as the class gets bigger the expectation for the teacher is going to go up. So where we have a benefit in saying, yes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course some kids it's their English course PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) DR. HOVANETZ: it should be an all or nothing, and just looking at the impact and significance it's, you know MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we have a technical guidance that we need to be taking this on as agreeable; we either leave them in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us operate under the assumption that class size as it increases results in lower expectations for students, thereby helping teachers. What she's pointing out is that isn't the case, at least that's not what we see here. Where there are effect sizes in many cases they are positive, meaning that as the class gets bigger the expectation for the teacher is going to go up. So where we have a benefit in saying, yes, teacher, it's in the model and it's accounted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course some kids it's their English course PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) DR. HOVANETZ: it should be an all or nothing, and just looking at the impact and significance it's, you know MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we have a technical guidance that we need to be taking this on as agreeable; we either leave them in we either leave class size and homogeneity. Can
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. BROWN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: Moved and seconded, and I assume you're talking about keeping in all of the class size parameters? MS. KEARSCHNER: Do we want to discuss that because PANEL MEMBERS: No. MS. BOURN: Because the majority are raising expectations as you get bigger. You guys understand that? MS. KEARSCHNER: I'm thinking one or two, at the most fine. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, everybody here, Ronda? We're operating under a I think most of us operate under the assumption that class size as it increases results in lower expectations for students, thereby helping teachers. What she's pointing out is that isn't the case, at least that's not what we see here. Where there are effect sizes in many cases they are positive, meaning that as the class gets bigger the expectation for the teacher is going to go up. So where we have a benefit in saying, yes, teacher, it's in the model and it's accounted for, we have a problem in that when they see the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	not just looking at it from the perspective that everybody (inaudible). PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we need a rational way to figure out what we're keeping in and not keeping in. MS. KEARSCHNER: First of all, should we consider whether or not to consider parse out or not? Then we do look at the number 1, 2, and 3? DR. HOVANETZ: I don't think you can parse out 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6. Looking at that, because just the way they're enrolled in the courses, there's not a systemic way that we're saying okay, well, for some kids the spelling course is the first course is going to be a reading course some kids it's their English course PANEL MEMBERS: (Over-speaking.) DR. HOVANETZ: it should be an all or nothing, and just looking at the impact and significance it's, you know MR. FOERSTER: Okay. So we have a technical guidance that we need to be taking this on as agreeable; we either leave them in we either leave class size and homogeneity. Can we take homogeneity out simultaneously or can we

	198		200
1	do class size and	1	data looked the same, I just thought that we
2	DR. COHEN: Yeah, no reason to do them	2	needed to know that.
3	separately.	3	DR. COHEN: We have more numbers.
4	MR. FOERSTER: Okay, class size and	4	MR. FOERSTER: Only if you notice something
5	homogeneity for classes 1 through 6, leave them	5	markedly different from the
6	in or leave them out is the technical guidance.	6	DR. COHEN: No, they're the same. They're
7	So I will take a motion either way.	7	small effects, there are a lot of them that
8	DR. COHEN: There's one more alternative.	8	bounce back and forth.
	You can calculate the average class size of	9	MS. TOVINE: We're coming up with a
9	-	-	
10	overall the class of overall the classes of kids	10	formula, with a model to calculate the score for
11	in it is another opportunity but it's another	11	a teacher. Under the contention, I still don't
12	reasonable approach. When you have one class	12	understand why we would include variables in
13	size it would just be the average.	13	there that aren't even making a difference, just
14	MR. LeTELLIER: I would even think now	14	for comfort level. I mean, we're talking about
15	couldn't we just do that? Just simple class	15	a statistical application here, not the other
16	size?	16	side of it.
17	MR. FOERSTER: Harder to explain, to me.	17	MS. KEARSCHNER: I think it's for
18	You lose the granularity, you would have the	18	information which is valuable, and understanding
19	same counter-arguments that you have with SWD.	19	the elements that are going into providing this
20	MS. GINN: May I ask you a question?	20	score for teachers, the pieces that are going
21	Suppose you have a student in the 8th grade but	21	into the formula are changing. We need
22	they're taking honors high school classes	22	information, information not comfort,
23	wherein the class size is different, are we	23	information; teachers are going to need
24	taking that into consideration here? For	24	information, communities are going to need
25	example, our 8th graders, 45% of them are taking	25	information to have faith in what that score is.
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	199		201
1		1	
1	honors science and they're taking for high	1	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If
2	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the	2	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we
2 3	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the	2 3	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to
2 3 4	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at	2 3 4	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are
2 3 4 5	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all?	2 3 4 5	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely
2 3 4 5 6	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade	2 3 4 5 6	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked
2 3 4 5 6 7	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school.	2 3 4 5 6 7	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it would be harder to explain that from a policy
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th grade, you base it upon the high school.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it would be harder to explain that from a policy perspective to explain why we kept in something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th grade, you base it upon the high school. MR. TOMEI: Question. Jon, everything	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it would be harder to explain that from a policy perspective to explain why we kept in something even though it has a very effect size. So I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th grade, you base it upon the high school. MR. TOMEI: Question. Jon, everything we've discussed and everything we've looked at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it would be harder to explain that from a policy perspective to explain why we kept in something even though it has a very effect size. So I'm with Linda on this; I'm more comfortable leaving
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th grade, you base it upon the high school. MR. TOMEI: Question. Jon, everything	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it would be harder to explain that from a policy perspective to explain why we kept in something even though it has a very effect size. So I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th grade, you base it upon the high school. MR. TOMEI: Question. Jon, everything we've discussed and everything we've looked at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it would be harder to explain that from a policy perspective to explain why we kept in something even though it has a very effect size. So I'm with Linda on this; I'm more comfortable leaving
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th grade, you base it upon the high school. MR. TOMEI: Question. Jon, everything we've discussed and everything we've looked at is that. Were there any noticeable differences	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it would be harder to explain that from a policy perspective to explain why we kept in something even though it has a very effect size. So I'm with Linda on this; I'm more comfortable leaving it in.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th grade, you base it upon the high school. MR. TOMEI: Question. Jon, everything we've discussed and everything we've looked at is that. Were there any noticeable differences in the data we're talking about for regional	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it would be harder to explain that from a policy perspective to explain why we kept in something even though it has a very effect size. So I'm with Linda on this; I'm more comfortable leaving it in. MS. GINN: Me, too, because that's the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th grade, you base it upon the high school. MR. TOMEI: Question. Jon, everything we've discussed and everything we've looked at is that. Were there any noticeable differences in the data we're talking about for regional DR. COHEN: You see the same kind of we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it would be harder to explain that from a policy perspective to explain why we kept in something even though it has a very effect size. So I'm with Linda on this; I'm more comfortable leaving it in. MS. GINN: Me, too, because that's the reason I said things are changing. So I'd
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th grade, you base it upon the high school. MR. TOMEI: Question. Jon, everything we've discussed and everything we've looked at is that. Were there any noticeable differences in the data we're talking about for regional DR. COHEN: You see the same kind of we can pop it open for reading.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it would be harder to explain that from a policy perspective to explain why we kept in something even though it has a very effect size. So I'm with Linda on this; I'm more comfortable leaving it in. MS. GINN: Me, too, because that's the reason I said things are changing. So I'd rather have it in and err on the safe side.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	honors science and they're taking for high school credit. So even though they're in the 8th grade they're taking high school, so the class size changed. Does that have an impact at all? MS. ACOSTA: We still use the 8th grade class cap in my school. MS. GINN: What now? MS. ACOSTA: For my school, for the 8th grade that are taking 9th grade classes, we use the 8th grade class cap size. MS. GINN: I thought it was in the pipeline for MS. ACOSTA: The new law says MS. GINN: the new law so it does count, yes. That's why I asked. The new law says if you're taking a 9th grade class or honors in 8th grade, you base it upon the high school. MR. TOMEI: Question. Jon, everything we've discussed and everything we've looked at is that. Were there any noticeable differences in the data we're talking about for regional DR. COHEN: You see the same kind of we can pop it open for reading. MR. TOMEI: As long as we know that the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. TOMEI: I tend to agree with you. If we agree that we can't parse it out, that we either keep it all or don't keep any of it, to me even though we know that only portions are significant and the effect size is likely extremely small; it's not going to have a marked effect on the statistics we're generating or teacher accountability, but it seems to me easier to explain from a policy standpoint that we kept it in the model because we know this is particularly class size is a sensitive issue and I'd rather be able to look at the data for a few years before we then make a case of where we're at the point where we really don't want it in the model because of parsimony considerations. But to do that now, I think it would be harder to explain that from a policy perspective to explain why we kept in something even though it has a very effect size. So I'm with Linda on this; I'm more comfortable leaving it in. MS. GINN: Me, too, because that's the reason I said things are changing. So I'd rather have it in and err on the safe side. MR. LETELLIER: I'd rather be able to point

	000		00.4
	202		204
1	to data that says it doesn't matter than not	1	DR. DORAN: Let me explain these others so
2	have it in the model and try to convince	2	you can consider them at your convenience.
3	teachers it's not there because it doesn't	3	Missing mobility, we don't know about the
4	matter.	4	transitions. Attendance is a continuous
5	I make a motion that	5	variable of the number of days present in the
6	MS. BROWN: There's a motion on the floor.	6	school. Gifted is a dichotomous variable coded
7	MR. FOERSTER: It was ambiguous which is	7	as zero or one, one meaning they are gifted,
8	why we stopped, but we have gotten technical	8	zero meaning they are not; and ELL/LY was also a
9	guidance.	9	dichotomous that was a dichotomous variable
10	Linda, your motion was that we accept or	10	that was well coded as ELL/LY 1, zero otherwise.
11	keep in the model all of the class size and	11	You can consider these.
	•		
12	homogeneity covariates as they're listed for	12	MS. FEILD: The ELL was I believe the flag
13	both math and reading.	13	was set if they were less than two years in the
14	Is that the motion that you seconded?	14	program, correct?
15	MR. MOREHOUSE: Yes.	15	DR. DORAN: Yes.
16	MR. FOERSTER: Then it's moved and	16	MS. FEILD: And the gifted is based on the
17	seconded. All those in favor of including all	17	primary exceptionality whether or not the child
18	of the class size and homogeneity covariates in	18	is enrolled in a gifted course?
19	the model for math and reading, please indicate	19	DR. DORAN: Yeah, the code is L and the
20	by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you.	20	exception model
21	Majority carries.	21	MS. FEILD: So that means a kid could be
22	I'm not sure how we're doing on scheduling	22	gifted, but he hasn't been enrolled in a gifted
23	and breaks. Do you want to take a break? Are	23	course in five years.
24	you all ready for a break? Do you want	24	And for the modal age, the adjustment is
25	MS. KEARSCHNER: We only have a few more to	25	per one
23	American Court Reporting	23	American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	203	-	205
	203		203
1	go.	1	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different
2	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it.	2	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over
2 3	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay.	2 3	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age?
2 3 4	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam?	2	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if
2 3	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've	2 3	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age
2 3 4	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through	2 3 4	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10
2 3 4 5	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this.	2 3 4 5	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would
2 3 4 5 6	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through	2 3 4 5 6	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10
2 3 4 5 6 7	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this.	2 3 4 5 6 7	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking).
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about that and I remember I think from the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about that and I remember I think from the teleconference one of the committee members
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age. Jon, how is mobility coded? DR. COHEN: Mobility is number of 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about that and I remember I think from the teleconference one of the committee members having a conversation about this, or maybe it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age. Jon, how is mobility coded? DR. COHEN: Mobility is number of transitions, a transition being you leave a 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about that and I remember I think from the teleconference one of the committee members having a conversation about this, or maybe it was in a different meeting I was in, but some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age. Jon, how is mobility coded? DR. COHEN: Mobility is number of transitions, a transition being you leave a school and enter another school is a transition, 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about that and I remember I think from the teleconference one of the committee members having a conversation about this, or maybe it was in a different meeting I was in, but some research that suggested that even a matter of a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age. Jon, how is mobility coded? DR. COHEN: Mobility is number of transitions, a transition being you leave a school and enter another school is a transition, or you leave the school and re-enter that school 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about that and I remember I think from the teleconference one of the committee members having a conversation about this, or maybe it was in a different meeting I was in, but some research that suggested that even a matter of a few months age-difference showed marked
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age. Jon, how is mobility coded? DR. COHEN: Mobility is number of transitions, a transition being you leave a school and enter another school is a transition, or you leave the school and re-enter that school more than 21 days later. We just count the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about that and I remember I think from the teleconference one of the committee members having a conversation about this, or maybe it was in a different meeting I was in, but some research that suggested that even a matter of a few months age-difference showed marked difference in student achievement; and if that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age. Jon, how is mobility coded? DR. COHEN: Mobility is number of transitions, a transition being you leave a school and enter another school is a transition, or you leave the school and re-enter that school more than 21 days later. We just count the number of times that a student makes the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about that and I remember I think from the teleconference one of the committee members having a conversation about this, or maybe it was in a different meeting I was in, but some research that suggested that even a matter of a few months age-difference showed marked difference in student achievement; and if that's true and there are people on the committee that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age. Jon, how is mobility coded? DR. COHEN: Mobility is number of transitions, a transition being you leave a school and enter another school is a transition, or you leave the school and re-enter that school more than 21 days later. We just count the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about that and I remember I think from the teleconference one of the committee members having a conversation about this, or maybe it was in a different meeting I was in, but some research that suggested that even a matter of a few months age-difference showed marked difference in student achievement; and if that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age. Jon, how is mobility coded? DR. COHEN: Mobility is number of transitions, a transition being you leave a school and enter another school is a transition, or you leave the school and re-enter that school more than 21 days later. We just count the number of times that a student makes the 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about that and I remember I think from the teleconference one of the committee members having a conversation about this, or maybe it was in a different meeting I was in, but some research that suggested that even a matter of a few months age-difference showed marked difference in student achievement; and if that's true and there are people on the committee that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 go. MR. FOERSTER: Okay, I'm good with it. Okay. DR. DORAN: Do you want to keep going, Sam? MR. FOERSTER: Yeah, it sounds like we've got a lot of people who want to get through this. DR. DORAN: within each grade you repeat the modal age within that grade; and then for any particular student who differs from that, it's a continuous variable. So age, for example, in grade four was ten and the student was 11 years old. So it's essentially a way to get out retained students because they would be older than the typical age. So a student would have a decrease in their expected score for any difference of one from the modal age. Jon, how is mobility coded? DR. COHEN: Mobility is number of transitions, a transition being you leave a school and enter another school is a transition, or you leave the school and re-enter that school more than 21 days later. We just count the number of times that a student makes the transition. 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	DR. DORAN: For every unit, different MS. FEILD: So if a child is two years over age? DR. DORAN: Then it would be two times, if they are two years older than the modal age within their grade, so if the modal age were 10 and the kid were 12, their expectation would decrease by 26 points, 28 points. MR. TOMEI: Is that looked at by year? Do you look down what increments do you go to? Do you go down by year and month and do that in twelfths? PANEL MEMBERS: (Inaudible over talking). DR. COHEN: I would say that all kids have some difference for modal age. MR. TOMEI: Well, I have a question about that and I remember I think from the teleconference one of the committee members having a conversation about this, or maybe it was in a different meeting I was in, but some research that suggested that even a matter of a few months age-difference showed marked difference in student achievement; and if that's true and there are people on the committee that think that's an important effect and maybe

	200	1	200
	206		208
1	differently in the early grades than the later	1	So I guess I'm looking at from a policy
2	grades because my recollection was a	2	perspective, what kind of statement are we
3	conversation about kindergarten or first grade	3	making when we say older kids don't have as big
4	students and some local action research that was	4	as of an expectation as kids that are on track?
5	done that showed significant differences between	5	MS. KEARSCHNER: Isn't the point of this to
6	students who were born in January and February	6	be able to make the student move, to grow, to
7	versus those who were	7	get out a gain of them, and should we expect
8	MS. FEILD: Yes, that was Miami-Dade. That	8	that gain to be different just because we
9	was placement into gifted, placement into gifted	9	want to move from point A to point B. Does it
10	in higher level was for kids that were that	10	matter if point A is in the same grade that it
11	turned older in the grade level. Those kids	11	was last year, which it's the growth piece.
12	were higher in terms of being placed into gifted	12	It's the gain that we're interested in.
13	than those that were younger.	13	MR. BROWN: I want to go back to this
14	MR. TOMEI: Okay. That talks to the	14	comment. Earlier we tried to make everybody
	question that I want to ask that should that I		
15	•	15	feel better by saying this isn't an arbitrary
16	want to ask, that should that particular	16	expectation; this is the reality of the group
17	variable be looked at in high resolution than	17	that was observed. So we're not saying we
18	just increments of a year?	18	expect less of students who are retained. We're
19	DR. COHEN: I don't think increments of a	19	saying the reality is that kids that are sitting
20	year; I think a unit is a year, but it would be	20	in these classes that are a year older tend to
21	like 1.1 year and 1.2 years, but let me point	21	have this performance. Therefore, the fair
22	out that what this is saying is basically the	22	thing for evaluating teachers which is the
23	kid's been retained so they're a year older than	23	purpose of what we're doing here is to say we
24	everybody else. You're expecting the teacher to	24	realize that exists. Therefore, back to what
25	produce 13 points less growth, which if you want	25	you say, the real incentive is you know you can
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	007		200
	207		209
1	to think about the potential unintended	1	make a lot of growth gain with that student
1	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would	1 2	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra
	to think about the potential unintended		make a lot of growth gain with that student
2	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would	2	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra
2 3	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that	2 3	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them.
2 3 4	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids.	2 3 4	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as
2 3 4 5	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had	2 3 4 5	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are
2 3 4 5 6	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a	2 3 4 5 6	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that.
2 3 4 5 6 7	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a	2 3 4 5 6 7	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also. DR. LETELLIER: That's a good point.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting MS. BROWN: And it may take extra effort to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also. DR. LETELLIER: That's a good point. MR. FOERSTER: Would you guys like to take	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting MS. BROWN: And it may take extra effort to get where they need to be and if they do it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also. DR. LETELLIER: That's a good point. MR. FOERSTER: Would you guys like to take these individually or as a group?	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting MS. BROWN: And it may take extra effort to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also. DR. LeTELLIER: That's a good point. MR. FOERSTER: Would you guys like to take these individually or as a group? MR. TOMEI: Group.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting MS. BROWN: And it may take extra effort to get where they need to be and if they do it they're going to get a lot of extra credit for it.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also. DR. LETELLIER: That's a good point. MR. FOERSTER: Would you guys like to take these individually or as a group? MR. TOMEI: Group. MR. FOERSTER: I'm getting a wince from the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	 make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting MS. BROWN: And it may take extra effort to get where they need to be and if they do it they're going to get a lot of extra credit for it. MR. FOERSTER: Ronda's been pretty patient
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also. DR. LeTELLIER: That's a good point. MR. FOERSTER: Would you guys like to take these individually or as a group? MR. TOMEI: Group. MR. FOERSTER: I'm getting a wince from the sidelines.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting MS. BROWN: And it may take extra effort to get where they need to be and if they do it they're going to get a lot of extra credit for it. MR. FOERSTER: Ronda's been pretty patient over here, so
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also. DR. LeTELLIER: That's a good point. MR. FOERSTER: Would you guys like to take these individually or as a group? MR. TOMEI: Group. MR. FOERSTER: I'm getting a wince from the sidelines. DR. HOVANETZ: It's not a wince, but	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting MS. BROWN: And it may take extra effort to get where they need to be and if they do it they're going to get a lot of extra credit for it. MR. FOERSTER: Ronda's been pretty patient over here, so MS. BROWN: Sorry.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also. DR. LeTELLIER: That's a good point. MR. FOERSTER: Would you guys like to take these individually or as a group? MR. TOMEI: Group. MR. FOERSTER: I'm getting a wince from the sidelines. DR. HOVANETZ: It's not a wince, but thinking about what we just said here is we want	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting MS. BROWN: And it may take extra effort to get where they need to be and if they do it they're going to get a lot of extra credit for it. MR. FOERSTER: Ronda's been pretty patient over here, so MS. BROWN: Sorry. MS. BOURN: It's a technical question. Is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also. DR. LETELLIER: That's a good point. MR. FOERSTER: Would you guys like to take these individually or as a group? MR. TOMEI: Group. MR. FOERSTER: I'm getting a wince from the sidelines. DR. HOVANETZ: It's not a wince, but thinking about what we just said here is we want to expect less from students that we know are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting MS. BROWN: And it may take extra effort to get where they need to be and if they do it they're going to get a lot of extra credit for it. MR. FOERSTER: Ronda's been pretty patient over here, so MS. BROWN: It's a technical question. Is the prior year's score on the same grade
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also. DR. LeTELLIER: That's a good point. MR. FOERSTER: Would you guys like to take these individually or as a group? MR. TOMEI: Group. MR. FOERSTER: I'm getting a wince from the sidelines. DR. HOVANETZ: It's not a wince, but thinking about what we just said here is we want to expect less from students that we know are definitely struggling and most need our help.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting MS. BROWN: And it may take extra effort to get where they need to be and if they do it they're going to get a lot of extra credit for it. MR. FOERSTER: Ronda's been pretty patient over here, so MS. BROWN: Sorry. MS. BOURN: It's a technical question. Is the prior year's score on the same grade instrument.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	to think about the potential unintended consequences, it could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. It could be that a teacher would tend to write off those kids. The kids who were already struggling, they had been retained. I'm going to get a pass as a teacher because I only expected to teach them a little bit less. MR. FORESTER: The counter-argument would be that that kid could be extra credit, right, because the standard has been lowered for that child. If I demonstrate just even an average amount of growth in that kid, I'm going to get extra credit if you will for them. I think it could be a positive incentive, also. DR. LETELLIER: That's a good point. MR. FOERSTER: Would you guys like to take these individually or as a group? MR. TOMEI: Group. MR. FOERSTER: I'm getting a wince from the sidelines. DR. HOVANETZ: It's not a wince, but thinking about what we just said here is we want to expect less from students that we know are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 make a lot of growth gain with that student that's retained, so you can get a lot of extra credit points if you really move them. So I'm not so sure that it's as clear as we're saying, we expect less for kids who are retained. I'm not going to agree with that. MS. FEILD: I agree with you, Anna, I think the issue is also that these kids are starting so much lower than the kids that were not. You know, these deficits accumulate so as the kid continues to be retained whether it happens once or twice the deficits are accumulating, and all we're saying is we know that the teacher is going to struggle to make growth. So we're expecting MS. BROWN: And it may take extra effort to get where they need to be and if they do it they're going to get a lot of extra credit for it. MR. FOERSTER: Ronda's been pretty patient over here, so MS. BROWN: It's a technical question. Is the prior year's score on the same grade

		-	
	210		212
1	MS. BROWN: It depends if the student was	1	factors that have brought that child here
2	retained	2	retained once or twice, what is something to
3	DR. DORAN: That's right, they would reach	3	level when the teacher falls short of bringing
4	if they overcame	4	that child right to grade level? What levels
5	MS. BROWN: They had been retained in the	5	that out? What says that we know you taught
6	prior grade, so they could be a year older and	6	your heart out and did everything you could and
7	have been retained five years ago.	7	he's still a little bit behind, but we're a
8	MS. FEILD: The fifth graders there	8	little bit closer. And I think trend data is
9	probably weren't retained in 4th grade; they	9	going to show what teachers are doing.
10	were probably retained in 3rd and they're	10	All teachers, yes, but I don't think that
11	already one year behind, and they're going to	11	data shows teachers that are saying, Johnny, go
12	carry that throughout 10th grade.	12	sit in the corner, you're worth 40 points, you
13	DR. DORAN: Just a thought for your	13	don't have to score as high as everybody else.
14	consideration, based on what you just said, it	14	I mean, are there teachers like that? Yes,
15	was observed under this system. So if you	15	there are, but there's other data that's going
16	continue then you're continuing with the	16	to start weeding those teachers out and it's not
17	expectation that those students would be allowed	17	going to be your retained students.
18	to under-perform or have a lower expected growth	18	MS. BROWN: I think it's important, too,
19	than other students. In other words, it's	19	because it's true that there's an opportunity to
20	another way of saying you're not going to change	20	say we're going to make change and this, that,
21	what was necessarily change what was observed in	21	and the other; but we're also supposed to be
22	the past. It reminds of that saying, if you do	22	charged with making sure that we are looking out
23	what you've always done, you'll get what you've	23	for maintaining equity for teachers in
24	always got. So this is an opportunity where you	24	evaluation. And when we also look at the
25	could say that was observed but I'm unhappy with	25	instances, I mean, another thing we've looked at
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	211		213
1	it. So that's a thought that you can consider	1	here is what is the end that teachers are
1 2	it. So that's a thought that you can consider when you make a change in this particular part	1 2	here is what is the end that teachers are dealing with? So how many teachers have an
		-	
2	when you make a change in this particular part	2	dealing with? So how many teachers have an
2 3	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy.	2 3	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's
2 3 4	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the	2 3 4	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools
2 3 4 5	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned	2 3 4 5	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do.
2 3 4 5 6	 when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the 	2 3 4 5 6	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard
2 3 4 5 6 7	 when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older 	2 3 4 5 6 7	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to 	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter where you go, and in education, also; but the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon? DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter where you go, and in education, also; but the majority of the teachers that I have worked with	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon? DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside maybe I shouldn't even play it up, but the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter where you go, and in education, also; but the majority of the teachers that I have worked with in Florida that I've been on committees with go	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon? DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside maybe I shouldn't even play it up, but the numbers do imply that the kid who's been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter where you go, and in education, also; but the majority of the teachers that I have worked with in Florida that I've been on committees with go into that classroom and say this child has been	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon? DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside maybe I shouldn't even play it up, but the numbers do imply that the kid who's been retained can continue can always have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter where you go, and in education, also; but the majority of the teachers that I have worked with in Florida that I've been on committees with go into that classroom and say this child has been retained twice, and I'm going to do everything	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 9 20 21	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon? DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside maybe I shouldn't even play it up, but the numbers do imply that the kid who's been retained can continue can always have teachers who are identified as at least being
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter where you go, and in education, also; but the majority of the teachers that I have worked with in Florida that I've been on committees with go into that classroom and say this child has been retained twice, and I'm going to do everything in my power when this child leaves my classroom	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon? DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside maybe I shouldn't even play it up, but the numbers do imply that the kid who's been retained can continue can always have teachers who are identified as at least being the standard and continue to fall farther and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter where you go, and in education, also; but the majority of the teachers that I have worked with in Florida that I've been on committees with go into that classroom and say this child has been retained twice, and I'm going to do everything in my power when this child leaves my classroom that they are going to be caught up or as close	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon? DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside maybe I shouldn't even play it up, but the numbers do imply that the kid who's been retained can continue can always have teachers who are identified as at least being the standard and continue to fall farther and farther behind the peers. That's what it does
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter where you go, and in education, also; but the majority of the teachers that I have worked with in Florida that I've been on committees with go into that classroom and say this child has been retained twice, and I'm going to do everything in my power when this child leaves my classroom that they are going to be caught up or as close to caught up as they can be.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon? DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside maybe I shouldn't even play it up, but the numbers do imply that the kid who's been retained can continue can always have teachers who are identified as at least being the standard and continue to fall farther and farther behind the peers. That's what it does to that expectation, and so in urban districts
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter where you go, and in education, also; but the majority of the teachers that I have worked with in Florida that I've been on committees with go into that classroom and say this child has been retained twice, and I'm going to do everything in my power when this child leaves my classroom that they are going to be caught up or as close to caught up as they can be. Given that constraint, given all the other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon? DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside maybe I shouldn't even play it up, but the numbers do imply that the kid who's been retained can continue can always have teachers who are identified as at least being the standard and continue to fall farther and farther behind the peers. That's what it does to that expectation, and so in urban districts where you have high retention rates, you are de
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter where you go, and in education, also; but the majority of the teachers that I have worked with in Florida that I've been on committees with go into that classroom and say this child has been retained twice, and I'm going to do everything in my power when this child leaves my classroom that they are going to be caught up or as close to caught up as they can be. Given that constraint, given all the other American Court Reporting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon? DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside maybe I shouldn't even play it up, but the numbers do imply that the kid who's been retained can continue can always have teachers who are identified as at least being the standard and continue to fall farther and farther behind the peers. That's what it does to that expectation, and so in urban districts where you have high retention rates, you are de American Court Reporting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	when you make a change in this particular part of the policy. MS. FRAKES: But I think that most of the teachers that we have in Florida are concerned for the students who sit in their classroom, and I do not think that teachers are going into the classroom saying that baby is two years older than his age, so you know what? I'm going to sit him in the corner because he can score 40 points lower and it's not going to make a difference. Teachers teach because they love kids. Are there exceptions to the rules? Yes, they are. I just watched on the news last night about a bad cop right here in Orlando. I mean, there are exceptions to the rules no matter where you go, and in education, also; but the majority of the teachers that I have worked with in Florida that I've been on committees with go into that classroom and say this child has been retained twice, and I'm going to do everything in my power when this child leaves my classroom that they are going to be caught up or as close to caught up as they can be. Given that constraint, given all the other	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	dealing with? So how many teachers have an entire class of retained kids? Now it's possible, there are a few because some schools can make that decision but not all schools do. Speaking with teachers that are dealing with struggling students that are working hard like Stacy's talking about, they want to know that their effort will be rewarded, which in this case it can be double, triple rewarded, but they also want to know that if their effort doesn't get them to an 'X' level or get that kid magically back to the norm in one year that they have the student that they're not going to be penalized for that. MR. FOERSTER: Jon? DR. COHEN: This may be a bit outside maybe I shouldn't even play it up, but the numbers do imply that the kid who's been retained can continue can always have teachers who are identified as at least being the standard and continue to fall farther and farther behind the peers. That's what it does to that expectation, and so in urban districts where you have high retention rates, you are de American Court Reporting 850.421.0058

	014		010
	214		216
1	facto setting lower expectations for groups of	1	are they meeting their benchmarks, are they
2	students in that area. If you guys know you're	2	moving forward, are they on track to graduate?
3	doing that and you're comfortable with doing	3	Will they graduate? Those pieces.
4	that, that's your choice. You should recognize	4	So we have parallel systems running and our
5	that as something that leaving this in the model	5	educational system is designed and each of our
6	does, in the same way that it increases the	6	districts is working to insure that our lowest
7	expectation for ELL students.	7	performing students are exceeding their
8	MS. FEILD: See, that's the problem. Maybe	8	expectations. So I think to only look at it
9	mentally it doesn't sound right, but if we're	9	here implies that we're not doing anything
10	using data to drive our decision, we can't go	10	anywhere else.
11	hand we can't go picking and say we're going	11	MR. TOMEI: The data are what the data are,
12	to keep this because politically this will look	12	okay? It captures a phenomenon that's actually
13	well but we're going to take this one out	13	taking place. We can keep it in the model which
14	because it appears that we're having to reduce	14	is how you fairly treat the teachers that are
15	the expectations. I mean, the data is showing	15	teaching those students. We can take it out of
16	this and this is going to be what a teacher is	16	the model; that doesn't change the phenomenon.
17	going to be evaluated on. So it's hard for me	17	It doesn't change our expectations. In my way
18	to say, you know, we didn't want to set the	18	of thinking, I disagree with Jon because I don't
19	wrong message out there and say we expect kids	19	think that changes our expectations for those
20	that are retained to score less, but by the way,	20	students. We still want to set the bar high,
21	you're an autistic teacher and because your	21	but if we take it out of the model we're
22	autism in the data shows you need to make 20	22	ignoring something that we know has an impact on
23	more points and we're going to put that in your	23	the teacher. So it's a no-brainer to me. We're
24	model.	24	not changing the phenomenon with our decision.
25	DR. DORAN: Let me just say one thing real	25	The data are what the data are. We're just
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	215		217
1	quickly as you as what hale saying. In this	1	
-	quickly so you see what he's saying. In this		deciding are we going to keep it in the model
2	particular model, if the student were the	2	and react to it in terms of teacher
2	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next	2	and react to it in terms of teacher
2 3	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next	2 3	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this
2 3 4	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next	2 3 4	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just
2 3 4 5	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next	2 3 4 5	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students.
2 3 4 5 6	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be	2 3 4 5 6	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just
2 3 4 5 6 7	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next	2 3 4 5 6 7	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also I think interweaving is an assumption that by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the model gives that teacher an opportunity to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also I think interweaving is an assumption that by allowing that continue we no longer have high	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the model gives that teacher an opportunity to benefit from over-achieving with that student
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also I think interweaving is an assumption that by allowing that continue we no longer have high expectations for students. This is only one	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the model gives that teacher an opportunity to benefit from over-achieving with that student and setting the mark higher. So if there is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also I think interweaving is an assumption that by allowing that continue we no longer have high expectations for students. This is only one piece of the pie and it's only one way that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the model gives that teacher an opportunity to benefit from over-achieving with that student and setting the mark higher. So if there is some policy consequence on expectations, I think
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also I think interweaving is an assumption that by allowing that continue we no longer have high expectations for students. This is only one piece of the pie and it's only one way that we're calculating the teacher effect. That's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the model gives that teacher an opportunity to benefit from over-achieving with that student and setting the mark higher. So if there is some policy consequence on expectations, I think leaving it in the model has a positive effect on
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also I think interweaving is an assumption that by allowing that continue we no longer have high expectations for students. This is only one piece of the pie and it's only one way that we're calculating the teacher effect. That's what this is all about. We still have policies	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the model gives that teacher an opportunity to benefit from over-achieving with that student and setting the mark higher. So if there is some policy consequence on expectations, I think leaving it in the model has a positive effect on expectations, not a negative.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also I think interweaving is an assumption that by allowing that continue we no longer have high expectations for students. This is only one piece of the pie and it's only one way that we're calculating the teacher effect. That's what this is all about. We still have policies and procedures and things in place to make sure	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the model gives that teacher an opportunity to benefit from over-achieving with that student and setting the mark higher. So if there is some policy consequence on expectations, I think leaving it in the model has a positive effect on expectations, not a negative. MS. BROWN: And I just thought of something
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also I think interweaving is an assumption that by allowing that continue we no longer have high expectations for students. This is only one piece of the pie and it's only one way that we're calculating the teacher effect. That's what this is all about. We still have policies and procedures and things in place to make sure that students are making gain on a different	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the model gives that teacher an opportunity to benefit from over-achieving with that student and setting the mark higher. So if there is some policy consequence on expectations, I think leaving it in the model has a positive effect on expectations, not a negative. MS. BROWN: And I just thought of something that maybe could be potentially true just in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also I think interweaving is an assumption that by allowing that continue we no longer have high expectations for students. This is only one piece of the pie and it's only one way that we're calculating the teacher effect. That's what this is all about. We still have policies and procedures and things in place to make sure that students are making gain on a different scale by which we will measure a student's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the model gives that teacher an opportunity to benefit from over-achieving with that student and setting the mark higher. So if there is some policy consequence on expectations, I think leaving it in the model has a positive effect on expectations, not a negative. MS. BROWN: And I just thought of something that maybe could be potentially true just in this data set. If the grade 5 teacher
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also I think interweaving is an assumption that by allowing that continue we no longer have high expectations for students. This is only one piece of the pie and it's only one way that we're calculating the teacher effect. That's what this is all about. We still have policies and procedures and things in place to make sure that students are making gain on a different scale by which we will measure a student's growth. We have policies and procedures for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the model gives that teacher an opportunity to benefit from over-achieving with that student and setting the mark higher. So if there is some policy consequence on expectations, I think leaving it in the model has a positive effect on expectations, not a negative. MS. BROWN: And I just thought of something that maybe could be potentially true just in this data set. If the grade 5 teacher incredibly exceeds the expectation then that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	particular model, if the student were the difference would be 14 points. Then the next year they met their prediction, but the next year they could still be 10 points and be behind but that's compounded, so now a student can be 24 points behind their per years. Then the next year another 8 points, so 32 points becomes compounded each year and those students are still meeting their expectations, but the gap between those students and their non-retained peers becomes larger and larger over time and those students would still be meeting their expectations despite that gap becoming larger. MS. BROWN: True. However, what we're also I think interweaving is an assumption that by allowing that continue we no longer have high expectations for students. This is only one piece of the pie and it's only one way that we're calculating the teacher effect. That's what this is all about. We still have policies and procedures and things in place to make sure that students are making gain on a different scale by which we will measure a student's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	and react to it in terms of teacher accountability or not? And I don't think this has anything to do with expectations for students. MR. LeTELLIER: No, I think what you just said was going through my head, too. We're not saying now we're giving a pass for students to not achieve. That's not what it's about. It's using the data to realistically say what a teacher is accountable for at a certain level, and then as you mentioned, Anna, we've got the other pieces of the puzzle to account for student growth. MR. TOMEI: If anything, keeping it in the model gives that teacher an opportunity to benefit from over-achieving with that student and setting the mark higher. So if there is some policy consequence on expectations, I think leaving it in the model has a positive effect on expectations, not a negative. MS. BROWN: And I just thought of something that maybe could be potentially true just in this data set. If the grade 5 teacher

	040	1	000
	218		220
1	student's next year's expectation is naturally	1	have other accountability systems where we can
2	elevated by the model because we're using prior	2	perpetually meet the standards but not actually
3	performance to help drive that expectation. So	3	improve the student's status, and just from the
4	even though that student is still in that	4	pure policy side of that, the implications to
5	category of difference from modal age, they are	5	understand that the over-arching goal is to
6	moving as teachers make that increased	6	improve student achievement, and one of the
7	performance. So there is still an incredible	7	catalysts the legislature thinks that you can do
8	incentive to move students along.	8	that is to change the metric by which we
9	But this allows us, as you said, it's an	9	evaluate teachers. So just keeping that in
10	anomaly that occurs. These are not always	10	mind, yes, we're trying to put together the best
11	retained children, either. There are many	11	teacher evaluation system we can.
12	children that come to us from out of country	12	MR. LeTELLIER: Christy, I have a question
13	over-aged and as they matriculate through they	13	about that because that's very important
14	continue to be over-aged. So we may still be	14	obviously; but is there really any incentive for
15	getting that same gain.	15	a teacher not to want to succeed with that
16	MS. FEILD: I think the thing is on these	16	student, to not work hard with them? In other
17	student variables there's almost two categories.	17	words, if we leave that in the model I don't see
18	There's one category that once the child meets	18	any incentive for the teacher to put the kid in
19	it, it stays with him forever. Over-aged once	19	the corner like somebody was saying and not work
20	he retains that once he carries that, right?	20	harder. I think if anything maybe we would be
21	Gifted is the same way. If the child is staffed	21	changing to the positive knowing that, hey, you
22	into gifted in first grade, never even attended	22	know, you can actually work hard with the
23	a gifted class, he's going to carry a higher	23	student and there is a good incentive.
24	expectation throughout his entire career, same	24	I'm asking you, am I looking at that wrong.
25	thing with ESE, but there are a few others like	24	DR. HOVANETZ: I agree, John, but I think
23	American Court Reporting	23	American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	219		221
	219		221
4	mobility and attendance that are going to alter	4	but it's the expectation that the state is
1	mobility and attendance that are going to alter	1	but it's the expectation that the state is
2	every single year based on that. So it's hard	2	setting. By saying we don't expect this student
2 3	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was	2 3	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have
2 3 4	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great	2 3 4	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is
2 3 4 5	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school	2 3 4 5	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our
2 3 4 5 6	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to	2 3 4 5 6	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower
2 3 4 5 6 7	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of	2 3 4 5 6 7	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LETELLIER: Right, but our expectation
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a teacher evaluation system, but the reason the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any negatives to leaving it in?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher evaluation system was changed was to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any negatives to leaving it in? MS. FRAKES: Is that based on scale score
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher evaluation system was changed was to improve student achievement, so we just don't	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any negatives to leaving it in? MS. FRAKES: Is that based on scale score point? I mean, we're talking 13 and.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher evaluation system was changed was to improve student achievement, so we just don't want to lose sight of the fact that the ultimate	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any negatives to leaving it in? MS. FRAKES: Is that based on scale score point? I mean, we're talking 13 and. PANEL MEMBERS: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher evaluation system was changed was to improve student achievement, so we just don't want to lose sight of the fact that the ultimate goal here isn't just an effective teacher	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any negatives to leaving it in? MS. FRAKES: Is that based on scale score point? I mean, we're talking 13 and. PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MS. FRAKES: And that's very I mean,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher evaluation system was changed was to improve student achievement, so we just don't want to lose sight of the fact that the ultimate goal here isn't just an effective teacher evaluation system, it's revising the teacher	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any negatives to leaving it in? MS. FRAKES: Is that based on scale score point? I mean, we're talking 13 and. PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MS. FRAKES: And that's very I mean, we're talking 13 points. I don't think that's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher evaluation system was changed was to improve student achievement, so we just don't want to lose sight of the fact that the ultimate goal here isn't just an effective teacher evaluation system, it's revising the teacher evaluation system with the end goals of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any negatives to leaving it in? MS. FRAKES: Is that based on scale score point? I mean, we're talking 13 and. PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MS. FRAKES: And that's very I mean, we're talking 13 points. I don't think that's huge. I don't think it's going to make me say
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher eisn't just an effective teacher evaluation system, it's revising the teacher evaluation system with the end goals of improving student achievement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any negatives to leaving it in? MS. FRAKES: Is that based on scale score point? I mean, we're talking 13 and. PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MS. FRAKES: And that's very I mean, we're talking 13 points. I don't think that's huge. I don't think it's going to make me say I'm not going to work with you as much over 13
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher evaluation system was changed was to improve student achievement, so we just don't want to lose sight of the fact that the ultimate goal here isn't just an effective teacher evaluation system, it's revising the teacher evaluation system with the end goals of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any negatives to leaving it in? MS. FRAKES: Is that based on scale score point? I mean, we're talking 13 and. PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MS. FRAKES: And that's very I mean, we're talking 13 points. I don't think that's huge. I don't think it's going to make me say I'm not going to work with you as much over 13 points. Now if it said, I don't know, 500
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher eisn't just an effective teacher evaluation system, it's revising the teacher evaluation system with the end goals of improving student achievement.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any negatives to leaving it in? MS. FRAKES: Is that based on scale score point? I mean, we're talking 13 and. PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MS. FRAKES: And that's very I mean, we're talking 13 points. I don't think that's huge. I don't think it's going to make me say I'm not going to work with you as much over 13
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	every single year based on that. So it's hard because, you know, you may have a child that was staffed at gifted because he had a great pre-school and they staffed him in first school but turned out to be average, but he's going to be bound by a higher expectation, well, most of the time, throughout his entire educational career unless we go in and take off the gifted flag. MR. FOERSTER: I'll take a motion any time. MR. HOVANETZ: This is just bringing it up one step further. It is completely understood you guys get the data, you understand the implications of something very bold, and yes this is about determining how to set up a teacher evaluation system, but the reason the teacher evaluation system was changed was to improve student achievement, so we just don't want to lose sight of the fact that the ultimate goal here isn't just an effective teacher evaluation system with the end goals of improving student achievement. So just keeping that in mind, I know we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	setting. By saying we don't expect this student as much as another student because they have over-aged them. I don't think the teacher is going to do that but it's worsening our expectation for that particular student is lower because they're older and that compounds year after year. MR. LeTELLIER: Right, but our expectation is not lower. The data that you provided shows that it is lower. So all that we're saying is if we take that into account, will we actually move that data year after year after that teacher is working hard so that that number actually becomes smaller and smaller. So could that have a positive impact versus is there any negatives to leaving it in? MS. FRAKES: Is that based on scale score point? I mean, we're talking 13 and. PANEL MEMBERS: Yes. MS. FRAKES: And that's very I mean, we're talking 13 points. I don't think that's huge. I don't think it's going to make me say I'm not going to work with you as much over 13 points. Now if it said, I don't know, 500

	222		224
1	possibly, but we're talking 13 points maybe in	1	on student achievement.
2	5th grade, 26 at the most. I mean, that's not	2	There's a counter-argument that by
3	going to make me do any less of my job because	3	including this difference for modal age what
4	if I do I'm a fool. I mean, that's not a huge	4	you're actually doing is honoring the job of the
5	amount of number for me to say my expectations	5	teacher and saying our experience tells us that
6	are lower for you, and that's why I wanted to	6	this is the real world, this is what happens;
7	ask that question.	7	and we're going to acknowledge that and hope
8	MS. BROWN: I just want to not be	8	that you actually take this as an incentive or
9	completely argumentative, just a little bit, but	9	an opportunity, let's say, to be rewarded for
10	I think there's two ways to look at the same	10	the extraordinarily hard work that would be
11	coin. It has two sides. I don't I firmly do	11	required to reach a normal growth or what would
12	not believe that and statisticians will not	12	be a standard growth for a child with this
13	agree with me that policy-wise we are saying,	13	attribute. That seems to be what it is about,
14	the State is saying, we expect less. What I	14	which way you think this would go and what you
15	believe we could be saying policy-wise is the	15	feel more comfortable advocating for when we walk out of here.
16	State recognizes the difficult job of the	16	
17	teacher in the classroom, therefore we have a	17	So the matter is do we include difference
18	variable included for the time when you do have	18	for modal age in the model? And I will take a
19	to deal with this situation; we're helping you,	19	motion to that effect and we can put it to a
20	we know you're going to keep moving forward.	20	vote.
21	How about for once the State say I'm behind	21	MR. LeTELLIER: I move that we include it
22	you as a teacher? That could possibly be the	22	in the model.
23	policy statement we're making. It doesn't have	23	MS. GINN: Second.
24	to be that those are the words because not one	24	MR. FOERSTER: All those in favor of
25	person in this room used those words.	25	including difference for modal age in the model,
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	223		225
	-		
1	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and	1	indicate by raising your right hand. Okay.
1 2	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider,	1 2	indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this
	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers		indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going?
2	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider,	2	indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this
2 3	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers	2 3	indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and
2 3 4	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid	2 3 4	indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we
2 3 4 5	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how	2 3 4 5	indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and
2 3 4 5 6	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every	2 3 4 5 6	indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded.
2 3 4 5 6 7	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a	2 3 4 5 6 7	indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do and that is to teach.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do and that is to teach. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. I'm going to try to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag. Somebody tells me what that means, please. DR. DORAN: In some cases for most kids we
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do and that is to teach. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. I'm going to try to put a bow on this one. It really seems like a philosophical decision here again. It's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag. Somebody tells me what that means, please. DR. DORAN: In some cases for most kids we observe the number of times they move between schools and the criteria was less than 21 days,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do and that is to teach. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. I'm going to try to put a bow on this one. It really seems like a philosophical decision here again. It's perspective and what you believe you're	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag. Somebody tells me what that means, please. DR. DORAN: In some cases for most kids we observe the number of times they move between schools and the criteria was less than 21 days, Christy; it that right? If they re-enter school
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do and that is to teach. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. I'm going to try to put a bow on this one. It really seems like a philosophical decision here again. It's perspective and what you believe you're conveying by accommodating this in the model.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag. Somebody tells me what that means, please. DR. DORAN: In some cases for most kids we observe the number of times they move between schools and the criteria was less than 21 days, Christy; it that right? If they re-enter school less than 21 days, it's not considered mobile.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do and that is to teach. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. I'm going to try to put a bow on this one. It really seems like a philosophical decision here again. It's perspective and what you believe you're conveying by accommodating this in the model. There's one argument to be made that by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag. Somebody tells me what that means, please. DR. DORAN: In some cases for most kids we observe the number of times they move between schools and the criteria was less than 21 days, Christy; it that right? If they re-enter school less than 21 days, they are mobile; is
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do and that is to teach. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. I'm going to try to put a bow on this one. It really seems like a philosophical decision here again. It's perspective and what you believe you're conveying by accommodating this in the model. There's one argument to be made that by incorporating this difference for modal age,	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag. Somebody tells me what that means, please. DR. DORAN: In some cases for most kids we observe the number of times they move between schools and the criteria was less than 21 days, Christy; it that right? If they re-enter school less than 21 days, it's not considered mobile. If it's more than 21 days, they are mobile; is that right? All right.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do and that is to teach. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. I'm going to try to put a bow on this one. It really seems like a philosophical decision here again. It's perspective and what you believe you're conveying by accommodating this in the model. There's one argument to be made that by incorporating this difference for modal age, you're conveying a lower expectation for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag. Somebody tells me what that means, please. DR. DORAN: In some cases for most kids we observe the number of times they move between schools and the criteria was less than 21 days, Christy; it that right? If they re-enter school less than 21 days, it's not considered mobile. If it's more than 21 days, they are mobile; is that right? All right. In other cases, we don't have that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do and that is to teach. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. I'm going to try to put a bow on this one. It really seems like a philosophical decision here again. It's perspective and what you believe you're conveying by accommodating this in the model. There's one argument to be made that by incorporating this difference for modal age, you're conveying a lower expectation for students and that could have an adverse effect	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag. Somebody tells me what that means, please. DR. DORAN: In some cases for most kids we observe the number of times they move between schools and the criteria was less than 21 days, Christy; it that right? If they re-enter school less than 21 days, it's not considered mobile. If it's more than 21 days, they are mobile; is that right? All right. In other cases, we don't have that information about a particular kid; we just
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MS. GINN: Anna, I agree with you, and something else I think we all need to consider, we're looking at these numbers only how teachers are going to be rated. I don't look at a kid that comes in my room and say let me see how many points I can get from him; I look at every kid that comes in my room, I look at them as a student that I'm going to teach. All of the other stuff is just stuff. I am first and foremost a teacher, and when they come in my room I don't care if you've got a score here or here, it is my job to teach him. What the State has with their policy thank you for that little extra, but that extra doesn't mean that much to me when I'm doing what I'm paid to do and that is to teach. MR. FOERSTER: Okay. I'm going to try to put a bow on this one. It really seems like a philosophical decision here again. It's perspective and what you believe you're conveying by accommodating this in the model. There's one argument to be made that by incorporating this difference for modal age, you're conveying a lower expectation for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	 indicate by raising your right hand. Okay. Thank you. Do we want to take a break at this point or do we want to keep going? MR. TOMEI: Let me make a motion that we retain all remaining variables in the model and see if it gets seconded. MS. GINN: Second. MR. FOERSTER: It is seconded. Any discussion on including the balance of these variables in the model? Ready for a question. All those in favor of including the balance of these covariates in the model, indicate by raising your MS. BOURN: Wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait, wait. Missing mobility flag. Somebody tells me what that means, please. DR. DORAN: In some cases for most kids we observe the number of times they move between schools and the criteria was less than 21 days, Christy; it that right? If they re-enter school less than 21 days, it's not considered mobile. If it's more than 21 days, they are mobile; is that right? All right. In other cases, we don't have that

	226		228
1	don't know now, Christy, does "don't know"	1	Anna was saying that her county actually
2	mean they were in the same school or does "don't	2	takes two data points within a semester, and I
3	know" mean that we don't know if it was 21 days?	3	thought, wow, what a neat idea; what a great
4	DR. COHEN: There are a lot of technical	4	idea if they have an October and a December
5	variables that I've actually hidden in this	5	count to see kind of like a mini-survey, too, to
6	spreadsheet. That's one of them that should	6	look at the semester to say that the student has
	have been hidden. We didn't always have the	7	been stable in that semester course, and then
7			
8	check-in/check-out dates and in order to keep	8	the same thing for the February and maybe April
9	all the kids in, you have to do something. If	9	or March look at.
10	you have mobility in, you've got to have the	10	MR. FOERSTER: So is your request that the
11	missing mobility flag in and they go together;	11	State would have additional surveying dates
12	there's nothing substantive there.	12	available for use?
13	DR. DORAN: It's so we don't lose kids.	13	MS. HALL: I think that I am concerned with
14	DR. COHEN: So we don't lose kids, yes.	14	mobility rate of a student who comes in October
15	MR. FOERSTER: So what we're contemplating	15	15th, then leaves, and has not had a lot of
16	is whether or not we keep in mobility,	16	stability in that. I know we've captured some
17	attendance, gifted, and ELL as covariates in the	17	mobility here, but is that a true marker when
18	model. Been moved and seconded. Thank you for	18	we're looking at the entire school and the whole
19	the question, Ronda. Any further discussion?	19	population of that?
20	All those in favor, indicate by raising your	20	MS. TOVINE: Either they would have to
21	right hand? Thank you for the suggestion.	20	somehow adjust the data collection time period
		21	
22	Lance? Now we can take a break. Thank you.		or add another one, or go to a similar business
23	(Whereupon, a short break was had.)	23	rule like they use for school grading purposes,
24	MR. FOERSTER: I have some really, really	24	some way to capture that; but you're right, I
25	good news. We're just about done. I mean,	25	mean, a student could enroll just right before
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	227		
			229
1	really, really just about done.	1	that time period when the data is collected and
1 2	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business	1 2	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher
	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do		that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation.
2	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call	2	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and
2 3	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do	2 3	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation.
2 3 4	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call	2 3 4	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and
2 3 4 5	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day?	2 3 4 5	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level
2 3 4 5 6	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've	2 3 4 5 6	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree
2 3 4 5 6 7	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was	2 3 4 5 6 7	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's saying that because they're looking at semester	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course. MR. FOERSTER: Kathy?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's saying that because they're looking at semester issues that you can be present in survey two at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course. MR. FOERSTER: Kathy? MS. HEBDA: I was just going to address
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's saying that because they're looking at semester issues that you can be present in survey two at this school and count and then you can be	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course. MR. FOERSTER: Kathy? MS. HEBDA: I was just going to address that very same thing. I think Juan mentioned
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's saying that because they're looking at semester issues that you can be present in survey two at this school and count and then you can be present in survey three and count in this	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course. MR. FOERSTER: Kathy? MS. HEBDA: I was just going to address that very same thing. I think Juan mentioned this yesterday that we are working the student
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's saying that because they're looking at semester issues that you can be present in survey two at this school and count and then you can be present in survey three and count in this school. So I don't know whether that's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course. MR. FOERSTER: Kathy? MS. HEBDA: I was just going to address that very same thing. I think Juan mentioned this yesterday that we are working the student teacher data link projects with the Gates
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's saying that because they're looking at semester issues that you can be present in survey two at this school and count and then you can be present in survey three and count in this school. So I don't know whether that's a recommendation or a note to say that our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course. MR. FOERSTER: Kathy? MS. HEBDA: I was just going to address that very same thing. I think Juan mentioned this yesterday that we are working the student teacher data link projects with the Gates Foundation grant, and there will be a pilot in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's saying that because they're looking at semester issues that you can be present in survey two at this school and count and then you can be present in survey three and count in this school. So I don't know whether that's a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course. MR. FOERSTER: Kathy? MS. HEBDA: I was just going to address that very same thing. I think Juan mentioned this yesterday that we are working the student teacher data link projects with the Gates
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's saying that because they're looking at semester issues that you can be present in survey two at this school and count and then you can be present in survey three and count in this school. So I don't know whether that's a recommendation or a note to say that our	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course. MR. FOERSTER: Kathy? MS. HEBDA: I was just going to address that very same thing. I think Juan mentioned this yesterday that we are working the student teacher data link projects with the Gates Foundation grant, and there will be a pilot in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's saying that because they're looking at semester issues that you can be present in survey two at this school and count and then you can be present in survey three and count in this school. So I don't know whether that's a recommendation or a note to say that our committee is concerned about that. I don't know	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course. MR. FOERSTER: Kathy? MS. HEBDA: I was just going to address that very same thing. I think Juan mentioned this yesterday that we are working the student teacher data link projects with the Gates Foundation grant, and there will be a pilot in the fall; and certainly this committee will be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's saying that because they're looking at semester issues that you can be present in survey two at this school and count and then you can be present in survey three and count in this school. So I don't know whether that's a recommendation or a note to say that our committee is concerned about that. I don't know if any of you are concerned that they're only	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course. MR. FOERSTER: Kathy? MS. HEBDA: I was just going to address that very same thing. I think Juan mentioned this yesterday that we are working the student teacher data link projects with the Gates Foundation grant, and there will be a pilot in the fall; and certainly this committee will be fully informed of all the results of that and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	really, really just about done. Does any member have any other business that they would like to bring up before we do the wrap-up, hand it over to Ms. Hebda, and call it a day? MS. HALL: I just have one thing that I've talked to a couple of people about that was brought up yesterday about a student counting for survey two and then a student counting for survey three. I had some questions about that because in the model that we have now a student must be present in both survey two and survey three. What was presented yesterday in our accountability to say that they've been there for the October and February FTE. In this correct me if I'm wrong in this model it's saying that because they're looking at semester issues that you can be present in survey two at this school and count and then you can be present in survey three and count in this school. So I don't know whether that's a recommendation or a note to say that our committee is concerned about that. I don't know if any of you are concerned that they're only looking at one data point for per semester.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	that time period when the data is collected and that student score would be used for teacher evaluation. MS. BOURN: I think the October and February is sufficient for school level accountability because you have a certain degree of confidence that that student counts for that school. But when we move to a teacher level accountability, I don't think that's sufficient and I'm wondering I think you bring up a really good point I'm wondering how that interacts with the student teacher data link and the idea of dosing in terms of how many days of instruction that particular student has had with that particular teacher in that particular course. MR. FOERSTER: Kathy? MS. HEBDA: I was just going to address that very same thing. I think Juan mentioned this yesterday that we are working the student teacher data link projects with the Gates Foundation grant, and there will be a pilot in the fall; and certainly this committee will be fully informed of all the results of that and how that's going. That includes a roster

		1	
	230		232
1	verification tool that allows data capture more	1	need two things. We need the teacher effect and
2	frequently than just at the survey points we	2	its standard error. In order to get its
3	traditionally do, ultimately wanting that to	3	standard error, you have to have at least three
4	feed into the State database down the road, but	4	kids in the class. Now if you wanted to come up
5	even before that can happen using it for	5	with some number that says you have to have at
6	assistance when making this kind of data more	6	least 10 kids or 11 kids, there would be no
7	useful at the teacher level.	7	empirical criteria which we could come up with
8	MR. FOERSTER: So, Kathy, would it be fair	8	that number, so it would just be a number that
9	to say that as that project moves along, if it	9	we would choose out of thin air, okay? We could
10	in fact is able to provide a higher resolution	10	have that conversation.
11	of where the kid is at when a highly verified	11	But one of the things that would happen is
12	higher resolution, that that could be	12	if you have teachers included in the model that
13	incorporated into the model before the results	13	have only a very small number of kids, say four
14	are tabulated for next year?	14	or say nine, the standard error of that teacher
15	MS. HEBDA: Absolutely, yes, that's a great	15	effect will be really, really big. What that
16	way to put it; and that is the purpose of the	16	means is, is it will be hard for any teacher
17	project so that we can do that at a much more	17	that has a very, very small number of kids to
18	refined level than we do now.	18	have a reliable teacher effect so that they
19	MR. FOERSTER: Great. So that means survey	19	would be either identified as high value-added
20	two or survey three while not optimal is really	20	or very, very low value-added. They would have
21	limited to historical data and going forward	21	to do something exceptional with those students
22	likely we'll have an answer. Thank you.	22	to be identified as such. So there's something
23	MS. FRAKES: I have a question. When we're	23	of a safeguard in place by use of the standard
24	talking about the information and I forget your	24	error in making the determination of where a
25	name that's working on the facts how quickly	25	teacher effect is, whether they're high or low.
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	231		233
1	are we looking at having that information	1	Now with that said, if you wanted to have a
2	available? I ask because this committee is	2	conversation about what is the minimum number of
3	getting a lot of press. One of the Florida	3	students a teacher would need to have in class
4	teachers said that we're webcasting it and so	4	before you produce or use a teacher effect
5	it's getting a lot of attention and people do	5	estimate? You could have that conversation, but
6	ask questions, so not to put any pressure on you	6	there's no statistical guidance that we could offer. It would be just an opinionated
7	but what are we looking at? MS. LEMKE: We'll work with the Department.	7	conversation that you could have, a well
8 9	We now have a lot to talk about, so I hear you	8 9	regarded opinion; you could come up with
10	and we'll work as quickly as possible to get	10	something that's very thoughtful. We would just
11	material in your hands that you can use to	11	have to not be able to advise you on what that
12	MS. FRAKES: Will those be made to just	12	number would be other than it has to be bigger
13	committee members or to everybody at large?	13	than three.
14	MS. LEMKE: Ultimately, it will be to	14	MS. WESTPHAL: So what you're saying is
15	everybody at large.	15	that teachers that have less than 10
16	MR. FOERSTER: Lori?	16	statistically are going to fall in that range of
17	MS. WESTPHAL: My question is to Harold.	17	we're not real sure if they're high; we're not
18	The first slide you put up today said something	18	real sure if they're low.
19	about minimum class size to include but I	19	DR. DORAN: Most likely they would and it
20	don't know that we ever answered that.	20	would be true because the standard error of
21	DR. DORAN: Let's address it real quickly.	21	their teacher effect would be very vague, which
22	The question was, what should be the minimum	22	means they're not measured very reliably because
23	class size before you estimate a teacher effect?	23	there's not a lot of information, information in
24	There are a couple of things. One, for a	24	the sense you have a lot of kids, that would
25	teacher in order to get a teacher effect we	25	help us make a good estimate of their teacher
		1	
	American Court Reporting 850.421.0058		American Court Reporting 850.421.0058

	00.4	1	000
	234		236
1	effect. So most likely they would be in that	1	What happens if for some reason there's any
2	range	2	aspect of this that he does not accept? What
3	MS. WESTPHAL: So when we get that kind of	3	happens then to our responsibility to respond to
4	rating, that's when we would say, okay, these	4	any area that is unacceptable?
5	evaluation peaks are going to pick up the	5	MS. HEBDA: Your responsibility as a
6	business rule, like, okay now you're down to 40	6	committee is to make a recommendation to the
7	or 60 or something?	7	commissioner, and the information that Mary Ann
8	DR. DORAN: Kathy?	8	will put together and that we'll put together
9	MS. HEBDA: The 40 or 50% applies in the	9	working for you will also have to ultimately
10	law to the number of years in teacher data that	10	reflect what the commissioner says. But there's
11	you have, not to the number of students that you	11	a video from this meeting, there will be notes
12	have. The student conversation seems to be	12	from this meeting, there will be other things
13	something you have on the local level because	13	that capture what you all did to come to your
14	only the district is going to know ultimately	14	recommendation and so that if the final decision
15	how many students were assigned to that teacher.	15	by the commissioner on June 1st is different
16	We'll know in the database to a certain point,	16	from yours then there will be documentation of
	• •		that.
17	but until we get the student teacher data link	17	
18	in place, it's going to be the survey periods.	18	MS. EDGECOMB: Okay. What happens to the
19	So there are going to be some things in the	19	body of all this work? I mean, if he says no
20	evaluation system that they're going to have to	20	is it all no, partially no, some no?
21	have local decisions on when there are things	21	MS. HEBDA: What the commissioner has to do
22	about data that are only known locally and not	22	is recommend a model or select a model. Now he
23	known at the state level.	23	can select the model that you recommend or he
24	MS. KEARSCHNER: That kind of goes to my	24	can select a different model. He doesn't really
25	question here, an example that we need for the	25	have a choice right now to not select a model.
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	235		237
			M. FOFDCTED, Annally and the second
1	business rule, that in this case you have a big	1	Mr. FOERSTER: Any other questions? Okay.
2	standard error and that might kick in the	2	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show
2 3	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a	2 3	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%.
2 3 4	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied	2 3 4	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the
2 3 4 5	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're	2 3 4 5	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late.
2 3 4 5 6	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making	2 3 4 5 6	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in
2 3 4 5 6 7	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on?	2 3 4 5 6 7	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means. MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those along the way.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means. MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With technology, is there any way to get the hand
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those along the way. MS. KEARSCHNER: So it could be something	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means. MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With technology, is there any way to get the hand raise in the webinar to actually work because it
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those along the way. MS. KEARSCHNER: So it could be something in the future	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means. MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With technology, is there any way to get the hand raise in the webinar to actually work because it was a little frustrating at some times. With
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those along the way. MS. KEARSCHNER: So it could be something in the future MS. HEBDA: Yes.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means. MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With technology, is there any way to get the hand raise in the webinar to actually work because it was a little frustrating at some times. With everybody talking at the same time, there's no
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those along the way. MS. KEARSCHNER: So it could be something in the future MS. HEBDA: Yes. MS. EDGECOMB: As we move forward, I think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means. MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With technology, is there any way to get the hand raise in the webinar to actually work because it was a little frustrating at some times. With everybody talking at the same time, there's no way to indicate you know, Stacey wants to
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those along the way. MS. KEARSCHNER: So it could be something in the future MS. HEBDA: Yes. MS. EDGECOMB: As we move forward, I think we're going to have piggyback or preparation for	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means. MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With technology, is there any way to get the hand raise in the webinar to actually work because it was a little frustrating at some times. With everybody talking at the same time, there's no way to indicate you know, Stacey wants to talk, she's next; John's next, and then Ronda.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those along the way. MS. KEARSCHNER: So it could be something in the future MS. HEBDA: Yes. MS. EDGECOMB: As we move forward, I think we're going to have piggyback or preparation for materials. This is going to the commissioner by	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means. MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With technology, is there any way to get the hand raise in the webinar to actually work because it was a little frustrating at some times. With everybody talking at the same time, there's no way to indicate you know, Stacey wants to talk, she's next; John's next, and then Ronda. I tried to click that just because I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those along the way. MS. KEARSCHNER: So it could be something in the future MS. HEBDA: Yes. MS. EDGECOMB: As we move forward, I think we're going to have piggyback or preparation for materials. This is going to the commissioner by June 1st.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means. MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With technology, is there any way to get the hand raise in the webinar to actually work because it was a little frustrating at some times. With everybody talking at the same time, there's no way to indicate you know, Stacey wants to talk, she's next; John's next, and then Ronda. I tried to click that just because I thought, well, I can't speak, I'll just try
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those along the way. MS. KEARSCHNER: So it could be something in the future MS. HEBDA: Yes. MS. EDGECOMB: As we move forward, I think we're going to have piggyback or preparation for materials. This is going to the commissioner by June 1st. American Court Reporting	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means. MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With technology, is there any way to get the hand raise in the webinar to actually work because it was a little frustrating at some times. With everybody talking at the same time, there's no way to indicate you know, Stacey wants to talk, she's next; John's next, and then Ronda. I tried to click that just because I thought, well, I can't speak, I'll just try American Court Reporting
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	standard error and that might kick in the business rule. Will this body we've talked a lot about when a business rule might be applied or not applied. Is that something that we're going to be thinking of we should be making recommendations on? MS. HEBDA: That's a great question. I don't always know the answer to that question because I don't know what things might come up. This was one example that I know was sort of a local data point but we may not have it in the department in a reliable way that a district will have to accommodate and do something about. But there can be other things that come up but I won't know how to answer your question unless we take those one at a time as we discover those along the way. MS. KEARSCHNER: So it could be something in the future MS. HEBDA: Yes. MS. EDGECOMB: As we move forward, I think we're going to have piggyback or preparation for materials. This is going to the commissioner by June 1st.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	We have asked AIR to run a model that will show us the impact of school effects distributed 50%. I know I didn't say that accurately given the discussion of the previous morning, it's late. You guys want to see what that decision means in terms of attributing some of the school effect t the teachers' value-added score as compared to attributing no school effect to the teacher value-added score. I think we all have some questions about what that does exactly. So they have offered to run that model and share it with us via a webinar on the 25th. So I'm sure e-mails will be sent out to schedule that to get you guys all staring at a screen at the same time, and we'll see what it means. MS. STEWART: Question about webinar. With technology, is there any way to get the hand raise in the webinar to actually work because it was a little frustrating at some times. With everybody talking at the same time, there's no way to indicate you know, Stacey wants to talk, she's next; John's next, and then Ronda. I tried to click that just because I thought, well, I can't speak, I'll just try American Court Reporting 850.421.0058

	220		240
	238		240
1	really quick, you know, and it doesn't work. So	1	think I can say it any better than Sam said, but
2	I didn't know if that was a possibility. It	2	I would like to say again thank you. We are on
3	might help moderate things.	3	behalf of the commissioner, chancellor, State
4	MS. HEBDA: We'll do our best.	4	Board of Education, DOE, everybody, the entire
5	MR. MOREHOUSE: What time is it, the	5	state of Florida, literally the entire state of
6	webinar?	6	Florida, thank you. You do amazing work, you're
7	MS. HEBDA: I think it's 4:30.	7	a remarkable group of people, and what you're
8	MR. MOREHOUSE: If you can't participate,	8	doing for our state, for our kids, for education
		-	-
9	can we get access to a video?	9	system, and for our teachers, everybody in the
10	MS. HEBDA: Yeah, we'll record everything.	10	system, it's historic. It just is. Not to
11	We record all of it and as soon as possible the	11	sound too hokey or anything, but I really
12	materials will be sent to you soon.	12	believe that and I hope you all understand just
13	MR. FOERSTER: Okay, last order of business	13	how important it really is and just how grateful
14	for me at least. I'm hoping you guys can	14	we are that each of you is here and dedicating
15	provide some feedback as to whether or not	15	this time to it.
16	you're satisfied with how business is transacted	16	I also want to thank everybody who watched
17	to this point, and if there are any constructive	17	today on the web and was present in the room. I
18	criticisms that you might have or suggestions	18	know not everybody can make the commitment that
19	you'd like to make, I would welcome them.	19	you're making to the time, but it's very, very
20	Yes, sir?	20	important that everybody see just how
20	MR. LeTELLIER: I wouldn't mind when we're	20	deliberative and thoughtful and careful and
			-
22	meeting to have a glossary of sorts to work	22	outspoken in everything that you are. I wish
23	from, sort of a card that we can look at and	23	there was a great way to capture that whole 3
24	refer to that may have pertinent data as we're	24	minute segment that we could mail to everybody
25	discussing this. This way it might be easier	25	and they could see it because you deserve a lot
	American Court Reporting		American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058		850.421.0058
	239		241
1	for us to grasp some of these concepts quicker.	1	of credit for that, and that is an incredibly
2	MR. FOERSTER: Would it be helpful to have	2	important part of this whole process that we're
3	that even before the meeting so that it could be	3	going through as a state that everybody see just
4	studied before we meet?	4	what this process is like. So I commend you
5	MR. LeTELLIER: I would like that.	5	from the bottom of my heart and from my brain,
6	MR. FOERSTER: Okay. Thank you. Any other	6	both parts of me really appreciate what you've
7	suggestions? Okay. Then I'm going to say again	7	
8			done. Other than saying that it's actually
			done. Other than saying that it's actually Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my
-	it is a privilege. This is really fun and	8	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my
9	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was	8 9	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE
9 10	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful,	8 9 10	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all
9 10 11	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members	8 9 10 11	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home.
9 10 11 12	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a	8 9 10 11 12	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey
9 10 11 12 13	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being	8 9 10 11 12 13	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms.
9 10 11 12 13 14	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms.
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity. Thank you, AIR. I know you guys have	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity. Thank you, AIR. I know you guys have worked really, really hard. We thank you for	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity. Thank you, AIR. I know you guys have	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity. Thank you, AIR. I know you guys have worked really, really hard. We thank you for	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity. Thank you, AIR. I know you guys have worked really, really hard. We thank you for all the information that you presented and	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity. Thank you, AIR. I know you guys have worked really, really hard. We thank you for all the information that you presented and getting us to this point. It was an ambitious	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity. Thank you, AIR. I know you guys have worked really, really hard. We thank you for all the information that you presented and getting us to this point. It was an ambitious agenda and I for one am really thankful for your contributions and that we got here.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity. Thank you, AIR. I know you guys have worked really, really hard. We thank you for all the information that you presented and getting us to this point. It was an ambitious agenda and I for one am really thankful for your contributions and that we got here. With that, I'm going to hand it over to	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity. Thank you, AIR. I know you guys have worked really, really hard. We thank you for all the information that you presented and getting us to this point. It was an ambitious agenda and I for one am really thankful for your contributions and that we got here. With that, I'm going to hand it over to Kathy to close us out.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity. Thank you, AIR. I know you guys have worked really, really hard. We thank you for all the information that you presented and getting us to this point. It was an ambitious agenda and I for one am really thankful for your contributions and that we got here. With that, I'm going to hand it over to Kathy to close us out. MS. HEBDA: Thanks very much. I don't	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * * (Whereupon, this concludes the meeting.)
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it is a privilege. This is really fun and listening to you guys go at it, I think, was good stuff. Spirited discussions, thoughtful, intelligent, one of our committee members earlier indicated it's really something to see a group this big be able to disagree without being disagreeable. It's really something and so I want to say thank you sincerely for this opportunity. Thank you, AIR. I know you guys have worked really, really hard. We thank you for all the information that you presented and getting us to this point. It was an ambitious agenda and I for one am really thankful for your contributions and that we got here. With that, I'm going to hand it over to Kathy to close us out.	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	Derrick's birthday, our web guy in the back, my thanks to AIR as well, and everybody back at DOE that's making this possible. I hope you all have safe travel home. MR. FOERSTER: Thank you. I have survey forms. * * * * *

	242
1	<u>CERTIFICATE</u>
2	
3	THE STATE OF FLORIDA)
4	COUNTY OF WAKULLA
5	
6	I, Suzette A. Bragg, Court Reporter and
7	Notary Public, State of Florida at Large,
8	DO HEREBY CERTIFY that the above-entitled
9	and numbered cause was heard as herein above set
10	out; that I was authorized to and did transcribe the
11	proceedings of said matter, and that the foregoing
12	and annexed pages, numbered 1 through 241,
13	inclusive, comprise a true and correct transcription
14	of the proceedings in said cause.
15	I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to
16	or employed by any of the parties or their counsel,
17	nor have I any financial interest in the outcome of
18	this action.
19	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
20	subscribed my name and affixed my seal, this 13th
21	day of June, 2011.
22	, ,
23	SUZETTE A. BRAGG, Notary Public
	State of Florida at Large
24	My Commission Expires: 2/21/2013
25	
	American Court Reporting
	850.421.0058

	6	age [16] - 203:9, 203:11,	assessing [1] - 191:17
	0	203:15, 203:17, 204:24,	assessments [2] - 191:17,
'X' [1] - 213:12	6 [2] - 197:11, 198:5	205:3, 205:5, 205:6,	193:14
	60 [1] - 234:7	205:15, 205:22, 211:9,	assigned [1] - 234:15
1 1		218:5, 223:23, 224:3,	assistance [1] - 230:6
	8	224:18, 224:25	assume [1] - 195:3
1 [5] - 197:9, 197:11, 198:5,	_	age-difference [1] - 205:22	assumption [2] - 195:15,
204:10, 242:12	8 [1] - 215:8	aged [4] - 218:13, 218:14,	215:16
1.1 [1] - 206:21	8th [7] - 198:21, 198:25,	218:19, 221:4	attendance [2] - 219:1,
1.2 [1] - 206:21	199:3, 199:6, 199:9,	agenda [1] - 239:21	226:17
10 [4] - 205:6, 215:5, 232:6,	199:11, 199:17	ago [1] - 210:7	
233:15		agree [8] - 190:24, 201:1,	Attendance [1] - 204:4
10th [1] - 210:12	9	• • • •	attended [1] - 218:22
11 [2] - 203:13, 232:6	e (1) 400 40 400 47	201:2, 209:6, 209:7, 220:25, 222:13, 223:1	attention [1] - 231:5
12 [1] - 205:7	9th [2] - 199:10, 199:17		attenuate [1] - 192:22
13 [5] - 206:25, 221:19,		agreeable [1] - 197:23	attribute [1] - 224:13
221:22, 221:24, 222:1	A	air [1] - 232:9	attributing [2] - 237:7, 237:9
13th [1] - 242:20	able [8] - 191:4, 193:16,	AIR [5] - 189:18, 189:19,	authorized [1] - 242:10
14 [1] - 215:3	201:12, 201:25, 208:6,	237:2, 239:17, 241:9	autism [1] - 214:22
15th [1] - 228:15	230:10, 233:11, 239:13	allowed [1] - 210:17	autistic [1] - 214:21
1st [2] - 235:25, 236:15	above-entitled [1] - 242:8	allowing [1] - 215:17	available [2] - 228:12, 231:2
	Absolutely [1] - 230:15	allows [2] - 218:9, 230:1	average [4] - 198:9, 198:13,
2	Academy [1] - 189:8	almost [1] - 218:17	207:12, 219:6
	accept [2] - 202:10, 236:2	alter [1] - 219:1	
2 [5] - 189:13, 190:2, 197:9,	access [1] - 238:9	alternative [1] - 198:8	В
197:11	accommodate [1] - 235:14	amazing [1] - 240:6	beb 444 211-9
2/21/2013 [1] - 242:24		ambiguous [1] - 202:7	baby [1] - 211:8
20 [2] - 189:12, 214:22	accommodating [1] - 223:21	ambitious [1] - 239:20	bad [1] - 211:15
2011 [2] - 189:12, 242:21	account [3] - 193:24, 217:13,	AMERICAN [1] - 189:2	balance [2] - 225:9, 225:11
21 [5] - 203:23, 225:19,	221:12	amount [2] - 207:13, 222:5	bar [1] - 216:20
225:21, 225:22, 226:3	accountability [6] - 201:8,	analysis [1] - 193:23	base [1] - 199:18
24 [1] - 215:7	217:3, 220:1, 227:14,	Analysis [1] - 189:17	based [4] - 204:16, 210:14,
241 [1] - 242:12	229:6, 229:9	Ann [1] - 236:7	219:2, 221:18
25th [1] - 237:13	accountable [1] - 217:11	ANN [1] - 189:20	becomes [3] - 215:8, 215:12,
26 [2] - 205:8, 222:2	accounted [1] - 195:24	Anna [4] - 209:7, 217:12,	221:15
28 [1] - 205:8	accumulate [1] - 209:10	223:1, 228:1	becoming [1] - 215:14
	accumulating [1] - 209:12	annexed [1] - 242:12	behalf [1] - 240:3
3	accurately [1] - 237:4	anomaly [1] - 218:10	behind [6] - 210:11, 212:7,
_	achieve [1] - 217:9	answer [3] - 230:22, 235:9,	213:23, 215:5, 215:7,
3 [3] - 197:9, 197:11, 240:23	achievement [5] - 205:23,	235:16	222:21
32 [1] - 215:8	219:19, 219:24, 220:6,	answered [1] - 231:20	benchmarks [1] - 216:1
35 [1] - 196:2	224:1	application [1] - 200:15	benefit [2] - 195:23, 217:17
3rd [1] - 210:10	achieving [1] - 217:17	applied [2] - 235:4, 235:5	best [2] - 220:10, 238:4
	acknowledge [1] - 224:7	applies [1] - 234:9	better [2] - 208:15, 240:1
4	ACOSTA [3] - 199:6, 199:9,	apply [1] - 191:5	between [3] - 206:5, 215:11,
4 [1] - 197:11	199:14	appreciate [1] - 241:6	225:18
	action [2] - 206:4, 242:18	approach [2] - 194:17,	big [4] - 208:3, 232:15,
40 [4] - 211:10, 212:12,	add [3] - 192:4, 192:8,	198:12	235:1, 239:13
234:6, 234:9	228:22	April [1] - 228:8	bigger [4] - 194:2, 195:9,
45% [1] - 198:25	added [5] - 193:11, 232:19,	arbitrary [1] - 208:15	195:21, 233:12
4:30 [1] - 238:7	232:20, 237:8, 237:10	arching [1] - 220:5	birthday [1] - 241:8
4th [1] - 210:9	additional [1] - 228:11	area [2] - 214:2, 236:4	bit [6] - 192:17, 207:8, 212:7,
	address [2] - 229:18, 231:21	argument [5] - 193:18,	212:8, 213:17, 222:9
5	adjust [1] - 228:21	193:20, 207:9, 223:22,	blown [1] - 196:10
5 [2] - 197:11, 217:24	adjustment [1] - 204:24	224:2	Board [1] - 240:4
50% [2] - 234:9, 237:3	adverse [1] - 223:25	argumentative [1] - 222:9	body [2] - 235:3, 236:19
500 [1] - 221:25	advise [1] - 233:11	arguments [1] - 198:19	bold [1] - 219:15
51 [1] - 196:10	advocating [1] - 224:15	artificially [1] - 191:22	born [1] - 206:6
5th [1] - 222:2	affected [1] - 193:2	arts [1] - 196:22	bottom [1] - 241:5
	affixed [1] - 242:20	aspect [1] - 236:2	bounce [1] - 200:8
	afford [1] - 191:15	ασρούι [1] - 200.2	bound [1] - 219:7
		 	

BOURN [5] - 190:25, 195:8, 209:23, 225:14, 229:4 bow [1] - 223:18 BRAGG [1] - 242:23 Bragg [1] - 242:6 brain [1] - 241:5 brainer [1] - 216:23 break [5] - 202:23, 202:24, 225:2, 226:22, 226:23 breaks [1] - 202:23 bring [2] - 227:3, 229:10 bringing [2] - 212:3, 219:12 brought [2] - 212:1, 227:8 BROWN [13] - 190:4, 191:20, 195:1, 202:6, 208:13, 209:16, 209:22, 210:1, 210:5, 212:18, 215:15, 217:22. 222:8 Building [1] - 189:8 business [8] - 227:2, 228:22, 234:6, 235:1, 235:3, 235:4, 238:13, 238:16 С calculate [2] - 198:9, 200:10 calculating [1] - 215:20 calculation [1] - 196:1 cap [4] - 191:4, 191:22, 199:7, 199:11 capture [4] - 228:24, 230:1, 236:13, 240:23 captured [1] - 228:16 captures [1] - 216:12 card [1] - 238:23 care [1] - 223:11 career [2] - 218:24, 219:9 careful [1] - 240:21 carries [2] - 202:21, 218:20 carry [2] - 210:12, 218:23 case [4] - 195:18, 201:13, 213:10, 235:1 cases [3] - 195:20, 225:17, 225:24 catalysts [1] - 220:7 categories [1] - 218:17 category [2] - 218:5, 218:18 caught [2] - 211:23, 211:24 Central [1] - 189:7 certain [3] - 217:11, 229:6, 234:16 certainly [1] - 229:23 **CERTIFY** [2] - 242:8, 242:15 **Chancellor** [1] - 189:16 chancellor [1] - 240:3 change [17] - 190:20, 192:13, 193:7, 193:13, 194:3, 194:6, 194:7, 194:8, 194:9, 194:14, 210:20, 210:21, 211:2, 212:20, 216:16,

216:17, 220:8 changed [2] - 199:4, 219:18 changes [3] - 192:1, 193:18, 216:19 changing [10] - 190:15, 190:19, 193:5, 193:6, 193:10, 200:21, 201:23, 216:24, 220:21 charged [1] - 212:22 check [2] - 193:9, 226:8 check-in/check-out [1] -226:8 child [11] - 204:17, 205:2, 207:12, 211:20, 211:22, 212:1, 212:4, 218:18, 218:21, 219:3, 224:12 children [2] - 218:11, 218:12 choice [2] - 214:4, 236:25 choose [3] - 193:4, 232:9 CHRISTY [1] - 189:19 **Christy** [3] - 220:12, 225:20, 226:1 class [35] - 190:5, 190:14, 190:17, 190:21, 191:10, 193:6. 193:15. 193:25. 194:8, 195:4, 195:15, 195:21, 196:2, 196:23, 197:24, 198:1, 198:4, 198:9, 198:10, 198:12, 198:15, 198:23, 199:4, 199:7, 199:11, 199:17, 201:11, 202:11, 202:18, 213:3, 218:23, 231:19, 231:23, 232:4, 233:3 classes [10] - 190:13, 191:15, 191:16, 194:2, 194:15, 198:5, 198:10, 198:22, 199:10, 208:20 classroom [5] - 211:6, 211:8, 211:20, 211:22, 222:17 clear [1] - 209:4 click [1] - 237:24 close [2] - 211:23, 239:24 closer [1] - 212:8 code [1] - 204:19 coded [3] - 203:18, 204:6, 204:10 COHEN [14] - 189:18, 192:16, 194:5, 198:2, 198:8, 199:23, 200:3, 200:6, 203:19, 205:14, 206:19, 213:17, 226:4, 226:14 coin [1] - 222:11 collected [1] - 229:1 collection [1] - 228:21 comfort [2] - 200:14, 200:22 comfortable [3] - 201:20, 214:3, 224:15 coming [2] - 194:20, 200:9

commend [1] - 241:4 comment [1] - 208:14 Commission [1] - 242:24 commissioner [6] - 235:24, 236:7, 236:10, 236:15, 236:21, 240:3 commitment [1] - 240:18 **COMMITTEE** [1] - 189:6 committee [8] - 205:18, 205:24, 227:23, 229:23, 231:2, 231:13, 236:6, 239:11 committees [1] - 211:19 communities [1] - 200:24 compared [1] - 237:8 completely [2] - 219:13, 222:9 compounded [2] - 215:6, 215:9 compounds [1] - 221:7 comprise [1] - 242:13 concepts [1] - 239:1 concerned [5] - 191:21, 211:5, 227:23, 227:24, 228.13 concludes [1] - 241:15 confidence [1] - 229:7 consequence [2] - 196:4, 217:19 consequences [1] - 207:2 consider [8] - 190:10, 190:15, 197:8, 204:2, 204:11, 211:1, 223:2 consideration [3] - 191:3, 198:24, 210:14 considerations [1] - 201:16 considered [1] - 225:21 constrain [2] - 192:20, 194:10 constrained [2] - 190:23, 191:22 Constraining [1] - 194:8 constraining [1] - 194:11 constraint [2] - 194:14, 211:25 constraints [1] - 192:12 constructive [1] - 238:17 contemplating [2] - 194:1, 226.15 contention [1] - 200:11 continuation [1] - 190:2 continue [6] - 190:20, 210:16, 213:20, 213:22, 215:17, 218:14 continues [1] - 209:11 continuing [1] - 210:16 continuous [2] - 203:11, 204:4 contributions [1] - 239:22 convenience [1] - 204:2

conversation [7] - 205:19, 206:3, 232:10, 233:2, 233:5, 233:8, 234:12 conveying [2] - 223:21, 223:24 convince [1] - 202:2 convinced [1] - 191:20 cop [1] - 211:15 COPA [1] - 189:17 corner [3] - 211:10, 212:12, 220:19 correct [3] - 204:14, 227:16, 242:13 correctly [1] - 196:9 counsel [1] - 242:16 count [5] - 199:15, 203:23, 227:19, 227:20, 228:5 counter [3] - 198:19, 207:9, 224:2 counter-argument [2] -207:9, 224:2 counter-arguments [1] -198:19 counting [2] - 227:8, 227:9 country [1] - 218:12 counts [1] - 229:7 COUNTY [1] - 242:4 county [1] - 228:1 couple [2] - 227:7, 231:24 course [12] - 190:11, 196:14, 196:15, 196:17, 197:14, 197:15, 197:16, 204:18, 204:23, 228:7, 229:16 courses [4] - 191:3, 196:18, 196:19, 197:12 Court [1] - 242:6 covariates [4] - 202:12, 202:18, 225:12, 226:17 credit [6] - 199:2, 207:10, 207:14, 209:3, 209:18, 241:1 criteria [2] - 225:19, 232:7 criticisms [1] - 238:18 current [1] - 190:6

D

Dade [1] - 206:8 data [36] - 191:1, 191:21, 192:1, 199:22, 200:1, 201:12, 202:1, 212:8, 212:11, 212:15, 214:10, 214:15, 214:22, 216:11, 216:25, 217:10, 217:24, 219:14, 221:10, 221:13, 227:25, 228:2, 228:21, 229:1, 229:12, 229:21, 230:1, 230:6, 230:21, 234:10, 234:17, 234:22, 235:12, 238:24

database [2] - 230:4, 234:16 date [1] - 192:5 dates [2] - 226:8, 228:11 days [7] - 203:23, 204:5, 225:19, 225:21, 225:22, 226:3, 229:13 de [1] - 213:25 deal [1] - 222:19 dealing [2] - 213:2, 213:6 debate [1] - 191:9 December [1] - 228:4 decide [1] - 196:6 deciding [1] - 217:1 decision [6] - 213:5, 214:10, 216:24, 223:19, 236:14, 237:6 decisions [3] - 194:7, 194:16, 234:21 decrease [2] - 203:16, 205:8 dedicating [1] - 240:14 deficits [2] - 209:10, 209:12 defined [1] - 190:6 definitely [1] - 207:25 degree [1] - 229:6 deliberative [1] - 240:21 demonstrate [1] - 207:12 department [1] - 235:13 **DEPARTMENT** [2] - 189:1, 189:16 Department [1] - 231:8 dependent [2] - 192:21, 194:10 Deputy [1] - 189:16 Derrick's [1] - 241:8 deserve [1] - 240:25 designed [1] - 216:5 despite [1] - 215:14 detail [1] - 196:1 determination [1] - 232:24 determined [1] - 193:7 determining [1] - 219:16 deviation [1] - 190:9 dichotomous [3] - 204:6, 204:9 difference [12] - 200:13, 203:17, 205:15, 205:22, 205:23, 211:12, 215:3, 218:5, 223:23, 224:3, 224:17, 224:25 differences [2] - 199:21, 206:5 different [8] - 198:23, 200:5, 205:1, 205:20, 208:8, 215:23, 236:15, 236:24 differentiation [1] - 190:13 differently [1] - 206:1 differs [1] - 203:10 difficult [1] - 222:16 Director [1] - 189:17

disagree [2] - 216:18, 239:13 disagreeable [1] - 239:14 discover [1] - 235:17 discuss [2] - 190:4, 195:5 discussed [1] - 199:20 discussing [1] - 238:25 discussion [3] - 225:9. 226:19, 237:5 discussions [1] - 239:10 distributed [1] - 237:3 distribution [1] - 196:17 district [2] - 234:14, 235:13 districts [2] - 213:24, 216:6 **DO** [1] - 242:8 documentation [1] - 236:16 **DOE** [2] - 240:4, 241:9 done [7] - 191:12, 193:24, 206:5, 210:23, 226:25, 227:1, 241:7 DORAN [16] - 189:19, 203:4, 203:8, 204:1, 204:15, 204:19, 205:1, 205:4, 210:3, 210:13, 214:25, 225:17, 226:13, 231:21, 233:19, 234:8 dosing [1] - 229:13 double [1] - 213:10 down [5] - 192:7, 205:10, 205:11, 230:4, 234:6 DR [34] - 192:16, 194:5, 196:12, 197:10, 197:18, 198:2, 198:8, 199:23, 200:3, 200:6, 203:4, 203:8, 203:19, 204:1, 204:15, 204:19, 205:1, 205:4, 205:14, 206:19, 207:16, 207:22, 210:3, 210:13, 213:17, 214:25, 220:25, 225:17, 226:4, 226:13, 226:14, 231:21, 233:19, 234.8 drive [2] - 214:10, 218:3 during [1] - 191:2 Ε

e-mails [1] - 237:14 early [1] - 206:1 easier [2] - 201:9, 238:25 Ed.D [1] - 189:19 EDGECOMB [2] - 235:22, 236:18 education [2] - 211:17, 240:8 EDUCATION [2] - 189:1, 189:16 Education [1] - 240:4 educational [2] - 216:5, 219:8 Educator [1] - 189:16 effect [22] - 191:2, 193:16,

195:20, 201:5, 201:7, 201:19, 205:25, 215:20, 217:20, 223:25, 224:19, 231:23, 231:25, 232:1, 232:15, 232:18, 232:25, 233:4, 233:21, 234:1, 237:7, 237:9 effective [1] - 219:21 effects [3] - 194:10, 200:7, 237:3 effort [3] - 209:16, 213:9, 213:11 either [6] - 197:23, 197:24, 198:7, 201:3, 218:11, 232:19 Either [1] - 228:20 elementary [2] - 196:14, 196:21 elements [1] - 200:19 elevated [1] - 218:2 ELL [3] - 204:12, 214:7, 226:17 ELL/LY [2] - 204:8, 204:10 empirical [1] - 232:7 employed [1] - 242:16 end [3] - 190:11, 213:1, 219:23 English [1] - 197:16 enroll [1] - 228:25 enrolled [4] - 196:21, 197:12, 204:18. 204:22 enter [3] - 203:21, 203:22, 225:20 entire [6] - 213:3, 218:24, 219:8, 228:18, 240:4, 240:5 entitled [1] - 242:8 equity [1] - 212:23 err [1] - 201:24 error [6] - 232:2, 232:3, 232:14, 232:24, 233:20, 235:2 ESE [1] - 218:25 essentially [1] - 203:13 estimate [3] - 231:23, 233:5, 233:25 evaluate [1] - 220:9 evaluated [1] - 214:17 evaluating [1] - 208:22 evaluation [9] - 212:24, 219:17, 219:18, 219:22, 219:23, 220:11, 229:3, 234:5, 234:20 exactly [1] - 237:11 example [5] - 190:23, 198:25, 203:12, 234:25, 235:11 exams [1] - 190:12 exceeding [1] - 216:7 exceeds [1] - 217:25

exception [1] - 204:20 exceptional [1] - 232:21 exceptionality [1] - 204:17 exceptions [2] - 211:13, 211:16 **Executive** [1] - 189:18 exists [2] - 191:23, 208:24 expect [7] - 207:24, 208:7, 208:18, 209:5, 214:19, 221:2, 222:14 expectation [17] - 195:22, 196:3, 205:7, 208:4, 208:16, 210:17, 213:24, 214:7, 217:25, 218:1, 218:3, 218:24, 219:7, 221:1, 221:6, 221:9, 223:24 expectations [14] - 195:9, 195:16, 214:1, 214:15, 215:10, 215:14, 215:18, 216:8, 216:17, 216:19, 217:4, 217:19, 217:21, 222.2 expected [3] - 203:16, 207:7, 210:18 expecting [2] - 206:24, 209:15 experience [1] - 224:5 Expires [1] - 242:24 explain [6] - 192:22, 198:17, 201:9, 201:17, 201:18, 204:1 extra [7] - 207:10, 207:14, 209:2, 209:16, 209:18, 223:14 extraordinarily [1] - 224:10 extremely [1] - 201:6 F

fact [3] - 191:1, 219:20, 230.10 facto [1] - 214:1 factors [1] - 212:1 facts [1] - 230:25 fair [2] - 208:21, 230:8 fairly [1] - 216:14 faith [1] - 200:25 fall [3] - 213:22, 229:23, 233:16 falls [1] - 212:3 favor [4] - 202:17, 224:24, 225:11, 226:20 February [4] - 206:6, 227:15, 228:8, 229:5 feed [1] - 230:4 feedback [1] - 238:15 FEILD [9] - 204:12, 204:16, 204:21, 205:2, 206:8, 209:7, 210:8, 214:8,

218:16	fully [1] - 229:24	guy [1] - 241:8	241:10
few [5] - 201:13, 202:25,	fun [1] - 239:8	guys [9] - 195:10, 207:17,	hoping [1] - 238:14
205:22, 213:4, 218:25	FURTHER [1] - 242:15	214:2, 219:14, 237:6,	HOVANETZ [7] - 189:19,
fifth [1] - 210:8	future [1] - 235:20	237:15, 238:14, 239:9,	196:12, 197:10, 197:18,
figure [1] - 197:5		239:17	207:22, 219:12, 220:25
final [1] - 236:14	G		huge [2] - 221:23, 222:4
financial [1] - 242:17		Н	
fine [1] - 195:12	gain [6] - 208:7, 208:8,		
firmly [1] - 222:11	208:12, 209:1, 215:23,	half [1] - 196:12	
first [7] - 196:7, 197:15,	218:15	HALL [2] - 227:6, 228:13	idea [3] - 228:3, 228:4,
206:3, 218:22, 219:5,	gap [2] - 215:10, 215:14	hand [7] - 202:20, 214:11,	229:13
223:9, 231:18	Gates [1] - 229:21	225:1, 226:21, 227:4,	identified [3] - 213:21,
First [1] - 197:7	generating [1] - 201:7	237:18, 239:23	232:19, 232:22
five [3] - 196:14, 204:23,	Gifted [2] - 204:6, 218:21	hands [1] - 231:11	ignoring [1] - 216:22
210:7	gifted [13] - 204:7, 204:16,	hard [9] - 213:7, 214:17,	impact [9] - 190:9, 193:1,
flag [4] - 204:12, 219:10,	204:18, 204:22, 206:9,	219:2, 220:16, 220:22,	196:17, 196:25, 197:19,
225:15, 226:11	206:12, 218:22, 218:23,	221:14, 224:10, 232:16,	199:4, 216:22, 221:16,
floor [1] - 202:6	219:4, 219:9, 226:17	239:18	237:3
FLORIDA [2] - 189:1, 242:3	GINN [8] - 198:20, 199:8,	Harder [1] - 198:17	impasse [1] - 192:18
Florida [9] - 189:7, 189:9,	199:12, 199:15, 201:22,	harder [2] - 201:17, 220:20	IMPLEMENTATION [1] -
211:5, 211:19, 231:3,	223:1, 224:23, 225:7	Harold [1] - 231:17	189:5
240:5, 240:6, 242:7,	Given [1] - 211:25	HAROLD [1] - 189:19	implications [2] - 219:15,
242:23	given [2] - 211:25, 237:4	head [1] - 217:7	220:4
FLORIDA'S [1] - 189:4	glossary [1] - 238:22	hear [1] - 231:9	implies [1] - 216:9 imply [1] - 213:19
fluctuations [1] - 193:25	goal [2] - 219:21, 220:5	heard [1] - 242:9	
FOERSTER [34] - 192:15,	goals [1] - 219:23	heart [2] - 212:6, 241:5	important [7] - 190:21,
193:19, 194:22, 195:2,	grade [24] - 191:17, 198:21,	Hebda [1] - 227:4	205:25, 212:18, 220:13,
195:13, 197:4, 197:21,	199:3, 199:6, 199:10,	HEBDA [12] - 189:16,	240:13, 240:20, 241:2
198:4, 198:17, 200:4,	199:11, 199:17, 199:18,	229:18, 230:15, 234:9,	improve [3] - 219:19, 220:3,
202:7, 202:16, 203:2,	203:8, 203:9, 203:12,	235:8, 235:21, 236:5,	220:6
203:5, 207:17, 207:20,	205:6, 206:3, 206:11,	236:21, 238:4, 238:7,	improving [1] - 219:24
209:20, 213:16, 219:11,	208:10, 209:24, 210:6, 210:0, 210:12, 212:4	238:10, 239:25	IN [1] - 242:19
223:17, 224:24, 225:8,	210:9, 210:12, 212:4,	help [5] - 192:18, 207:25,	in/check [1] - 226:8 Inaudible [1] - 205:13
226:15, 226:24, 228:10,	217:24, 218:22, 222:2	218:3, 233:25, 238:3	
229:17, 230:8, 230:19,	graders [2] - 198:25, 210:8 grades [2] - 206:1, 206:2	helpful [1] - 239:2 helping [2] - 195:17, 222:19	inaudible) [1] - 197:2 incentive [7] - 207:15,
231:16, 237:1, 238:13,	grading [1] - 228:23	HEREBY [1] - 242:8	208:25, 218:8, 220:14,
239:2, 239:6, 241:12			200.25, 210.0, 220.14, 220:18, 220:23, 224:8
fool [1] - 222:4	graduate [2] - 216:2, 216:3 grant [1] - 229:22	herein [1] - 242:9	, ,
FOR [1] - 189:2	• • • •	hereunto [1] - 242:19	incidents [1] - 196:7
foregoing [1] - 242:11	granularity [1] - 198:18	hidden [2] - 226:5, 226:7	include [4] - 200:12, 224:17, 224:21, 231:19
foremost [1] - 223:10	grasp [1] - 239:1	high [13] - 196:13, 198:22,	
FORESTER [1] - 207:9	grateful [1] - 240:13	199:1, 199:3, 199:18, 206:17, 212:13, 213:25	included [3] - 190:18, 222:18, 232:12
forever [1] - 218:19	great [6] - 193:19, 219:4,	206:17, 212:13, 213:25, 215:17, 216:20, 232:19,	includes [1] - 229:25
forget [1] - 230:24	228:3, 230:15, 235:8, 240:23	232:25, 233:17	including [5] - 202:17, 224:3,
form [1] - 194:15	240:23 Great (1) - 230:19	higher [8] - 196:3, 206:10,	224:25, 225:9, 225:11
forms [1] - 241:13	Great [1] - 230:19	206:12, 217:18, 218:23,	inclusive [1] - 242:13
formula [3] - 191:19, 200:10,	group [4] - 207:18, 208:16, 239:13, 240:7	219:7, 230:10, 230:12	incorporated [1] - 230:13
200:21	Group [1] - 207:19	highly [1] - 230:11	incorporating [1] - 223:23
forth [1] - 200:8	groups [1] - 214:1	historic [1] - 240:10	increased [1] - 218:6
forward [4] - 216:2, 222:20,	groups [1] - 214.1 grow [3] - 191:15, 193:15,	historical [1] - 230:21	increases [2] - 195:16, 214:6
230:21, 235:22	208:6	hokey [1] - 240:11	incredible [1] - 218:7
Foundation [1] - 229:22	GROWTH [1] - 189:5	home [1] - 241:11	incredibly [2] - 217:25, 241:1
four [3] - 196:23, 203:12,	growth [10] - 206:25, 207:13,	homogeneity [5] - 197:24,	increments [3] - 205:10,
232:13	208:11, 209:1, 209:14,	197:25, 198:5, 202:12,	206:18, 206:19
FRAKES [5] - 211:4, 221:18,	208.11, 209.1, 209.14, 210:18, 215:25, 217:14,	202:18	independent [3] - 192:23,
221:21, 230:23, 231:12	224:11, 224:12	honoring [1] - 224:4	194:9, 194:12
frame [1] - 190:16	guess [1] - 208:1	honors [3] - 198:22, 199:1,	indicate [5] - 202:19, 225:1,
frequently [1] - 230:2	guidance [4] - 197:22, 198:6,	199:17	225:12, 226:20, 237:22
frustrating [1] - 237:20	202:9, 233:6	hope [3] - 224:7, 240:12,	indicated [1] - 239:12
FTE [1] - 227:15	202.0, 200.0		malouteu [1] - 200.12
		rt Reporting	

213:12, 213:19, 220:18, individually [1] - 207:18 223:4, 223:7, 225:25, information [13] - 200:18, 200:22, 200:23, 200:24, 230:11 200:25, 225:25, 230:24, kid's [1] - 206:23 kids [30] - 196:3, 197:14, 231:1, 233:23, 236:7, 197:16, 198:10, 205:14, 239:19 206:10, 206:11, 207:3, informed [1] - 229:24 instances [1] - 212:25 207:4, 207:5, 208:3, 208:4, 208:19, 209:5, 209:8, instinct [1] - 196:6 209:9, 211:13, 213:3, instruction [1] - 229:14 214:19, 225:17, 226:9, instrument [1] - 209:25 226:13, 226:14, 232:4, insure [1] - 216:6 232:6, 232:13, 232:17, intelligent [1] - 239:11 233:24, 240:8 interacts [1] - 229:12 kind [6] - 199:23, 208:2, interest [1] - 242:17 228:5, 230:6, 234:3, interested [1] - 208:12 234:24 interweaving [1] - 215:16 kindergarten [1] - 206:3 introduce [1] - 193:9 kinds [1] - 194:15 issue [2] - 201:11, 209:8 knowing [1] - 220:21 issues [1] - 227:18 known [2] - 234:22, 234:23 J L January [1] - 206:6 Lance [1] - 226:22 **job** [4] - 222:3, 222:16, landscape [1] - 190:15 223:12, 224:4 language [1] - 196:22 John [1] - 220:25 Large [2] - 242:7, 242:23 John's [1] - 237:23 large [2] - 231:13, 231:15 Johnny [1] - 212:11 larger [4] - 190:14, 215:12, **Jon** [7] - 192:15, 193:21, 215:14 193:22, 199:19, 203:18, last [3] - 208:11, 211:14, 213:16, 216:18 238:13 **JON** [1] - 189:18 late [1] - 237:5 Juan [1] - 229:19 law [4] - 199:14, 199:15, JUAN [1] - 189:17 199:16, 234:10 June [3] - 235:25, 236:15, leaning [1] - 190:17 242:21 least [5] - 195:18, 213:21, 232:3, 232:6, 238:14 Κ leave [8] - 194:18, 197:23, Kathy [4] - 229:17, 230:8, 197:24, 198:5, 198:6, 234:8, 239:24 203:20, 203:22, 220:17 **KATHY** [1] - 189:16 leaves [2] - 211:22, 228:15 **KEARSCHNER** [15] - 191:8, leaving [4] - 201:20, 214:5, 192:3, 192:9, 193:12, 217:20, 221:17 194:20, 194:25, 195:5, legislation [1] - 190:7 195:11, 196:5, 197:7, legislature [1] - 220:7 200:17, 202:25, 208:5, LEMKE [3] - 189:20, 231:8, 234:24, 235:19 231:14 keep [12] - 194:25, 201:3, Less [1] - 196:12 202:11, 203:4, 214:12, less [13] - 193:1, 204:13, 216:13, 217:1, 222:20, 206:25, 207:8, 207:24, 225:3, 226:8, 226:16 208:18, 209:5, 214:20, keeping [6] - 195:3, 197:5, 222:3, 222:14, 225:19, 197:6, 217:15, 219:25, 225:21, 233:15 220.9 LeTELLIER [12] - 190:24, kept [2] - 201:10, 201:18 192:6, 192:11, 198:14, kick [1] - 235:2 201:25, 207:16, 217:6, kid [12] - 204:21, 205:7, 220:12, 221:9, 224:21, 207:10, 207:13, 209:10, 238:21, 239:5

level [13] - 200:14, 206:10, 206:11, 212:3, 212:4, 213:12, 217:11, 229:5, 229:8, 230:7, 230:18, 234:13, 234:23 levels [1] - 212:4 likely [6] - 193:3, 194:2, 201:5, 230:22, 233:19, 234:1 limited [1] - 230:21 Linda [3] - 194:24, 201:20, 202:10 Linda's [1] - 194:17 link [3] - 229:12, 229:21, 234:17 listed [1] - 202:12 listening [1] - 239:9 literally [1] - 240:5 local [4] - 206:4. 234:13. 234:21, 235:12 locally [1] - 234:22 look [14] - 191:12, 197:9, 201:12, 205:10, 212:24, 214:12, 216:8, 222:10, 223:4, 223:6, 223:7, 228:6, 228:9, 238:23 looked [6] - 196:5, 199:20, 200:1, 205:9, 206:17, 212:25 Looking [1] - 197:11 looking [12] - 196:23, 197:1, 197:19, 208:1, 212:22, 220:24, 223:3, 227:17, 227:25, 228:18, 231:1, 231:7 looks [1] - 191:1 Lori [1] - 231:16 lose [4] - 198:18, 219:20, 226:13, 226:14 love [1] - 211:12 low [3] - 232:20, 232:25, 233:18 lower [10] - 195:16, 209:9, 210:18, 211:11, 214:1, 221:6, 221:10, 221:11, 222:6, 223:24 lowered [1] - 207:11 lowest [1] - 216:6 Μ magically [1] - 213:13 mail [1] - 240:24 mails [1] - 237:14 maintaining [1] - 212:23 Majority [1] - 202:21

majority [2] - 195:8, 211:18

March [1] - 228:9

mark [1] - 217:18

marginal [1] - 196:25

marked [2] - 201:6, 205:22 markedly [1] - 200:5 marker [1] - 228:17 MARY [1] - 189:20 Mary [1] - 236:7 material [1] - 231:11 materials [2] - 235:24, 238:12 math [2] - 202:13, 202:19 matriculate [1] - 218:13 matter [10] - 190:22, 191:13, 191:14. 202:1. 202:4. 205:21, 208:10, 211:16, 224:17, 242:11 maximum [1] - 191:4 mean [17] - 192:14, 194:17, 200:14, 211:15, 212:14, 212:25. 214:15. 221:19. 221:21, 222:2, 222:4, 223:14, 226:2, 226:3, 226:25, 228:25, 236:19 meaning [4] - 190:5, 195:21, 204:7, 204:8 means [7] - 204:21, 225:16, 230:19, 232:16, 233:22, 237:6, 237:16 measure [2] - 193:16, 215:24 measured [2] - 191:2, 233:22 meet [2] - 220:2, 239:4 meeting [10] - 194:19, 205:20, 215:10, 215:13, 216:1, 236:11, 236:12, 238:22, 239:3, 241:15 **MEETING** [1] - 189:6 meets [1] - 218:18 member [1] - 227:2 members [3] - 205:18, 231:13, 239:11 **MEMBERS** [6] - 189:18, 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 mentally [1] - 214:9 mentioned [2] - 217:12, 229:19 message [1] - 214:19 met [1] - 215:4 metric [1] - 220:8 Miami [1] - 206:8 Miami-Dade [1] - 206:8 middle [1] - 196:13 might [7] - 193:4, 235:2, 235:4, 235:10, 238:3, 238:18, 238:25 mind [3] - 219:25, 220:10, 238:21 mini [1] - 228:5 mini-survey [1] - 228:5 minimum [3] - 231:19, 231:22, 233:2 minute [1] - 240:24

		-	-
Mississur 004:0.005:45	205.10 200.11 207.0		210-10 210-12 220-0
Missing [2] - 204:3, 225:15	205:16, 206:14, 207:9,	news [2] - 211:14, 226:25	218:18, 219:13, 220:6,
missing [1] - 226:11	207:17, 207:19, 207:20,	next [11] - 191:5, 192:14,	222:24, 223:18, 223:22,
mobile [2] - 225:21, 225:22	208:13, 209:20, 213:16,	194:19, 215:3, 215:4,	226:6, 227:6, 227:25,
mobility [9] - 203:18, 204:3,	216:11, 217:6, 217:15,	215:7, 218:1, 230:14,	228:22, 232:11, 235:11,
219:1, 225:15, 226:10,	219:11, 219:12, 220:12,	237:23	235:17, 239:11, 239:21
226:11, 226:16, 228:14,	221:9, 223:17, 224:21,	night [1] - 211:14	open [1] - 199:24
228:17	224:24, 225:4, 225:8,	nine [1] - 232:14	operate [1] - 195:15
Mobility [1] - 203:19	226:15, 226:24, 228:10,	no-brainer [1] - 216:23	operating [1] - 195:14
modal [11] - 203:9, 203:17,	229:17, 230:8, 230:19,	nominal [1] - 196:25	opinion [2] - 194:2, 233:9
204:24, 205:5, 205:6,	231:16, 238:5, 238:8,	non [1] - 215:11	opinionated [1] - 233:7
205:15, 218:5, 223:23,	238:13, 238:21, 239:2,	non-retained [1] - 215:11	opportunity [6] - 198:11,
224:3, 224:18, 224:25	239:5, 239:6, 241:12	norm [1] - 213:13	210:24, 212:19, 217:16,
model [39] - 193:9, 195:24,	MS [80] - 190:4, 190:25,	normal [1] - 224:11	224:9, 239:16
200:10, 201:10, 201:15,	191:8, 191:20, 192:3,	Notary [2] - 242:7, 242:23	optimal [1] - 230:20
202:2, 202:11, 202:19,	192:9, 193:12, 194:20,	note [1] - 227:22	order [4] - 226:8, 231:25,
204:20, 214:5, 214:24,	194:25, 195:1, 195:5,	notes [1] - 236:11	232:2, 238:13
215:2, 216:13, 216:16,	195:8, 195:11, 196:5,	nothing [2] - 197:19, 226:12	Orlando [2] - 189:9, 211:15
216:21, 217:1, 217:16,	197:7, 198:20, 199:6,	notice [1] - 200:4	otherwise [1] - 204:10
217:20, 218:2, 220:17,	199:8, 199:9, 199:12, 199:14, 199:15, 200:9	noticeable [1] - 199:21	outcome [1] - 242:17
223:21, 224:18, 224:22,	199:14, 199:15, 200:9, 200:17, 201:22, 202:6,	number [16] - 197:9, 203:19,	outside [1] - 213:17
224:25, 225:5, 225:10,		203:24, 204:5, 221:14,	outspoken [1] - 240:22
225:12, 226:18, 227:11,	202:25, 204:12, 204:16, 204:21, 205:2, 206:8,	222:5, 225:18, 232:5,	over-achieving [1] - 217:17
227:16, 230:13, 232:12,	208:5, 209:7, 209:16,	232:8, 232:13, 232:17,	over-aged [3] - 218:13,
236:22, 236:23, 236:24,	209:22, 209:23, 210:1,	233:2, 233:12, 234:10,	218:14, 221:4
236:25, 237:2, 237:12	210:5, 210:8, 211:4,	234:11	Over-aged [1] - 218:19
moderate [1] - 238:3	212:18, 214:8, 215:15,	numbered [2] - 242:9,	over-arching [1] - 220:5
monitor [1] - 193:10	217:22, 218:16, 221:18,	242:12	Over-speaking [2] - 197:3,
month [1] - 205:11	217.22, 218.10, 221.10, 221:21, 222:8, 223:1,	numbers [6] - 191:25, 194:4,	197:17
months [1] - 205:22	224:23, 225:7, 225:14,	196:10, 200:3, 213:19,	overall [2] - 198:10
MOREHOUSE [5] - 191:24,	227:6, 228:13, 228:20,	223:3	overcame [1] - 210:4
194:23, 202:15, 238:5,	227.0, 220.13, 220.20,		
	220.4 220.18 220.15		
238:8	229:4, 229:18, 230:15, 230:23, 231:8, 231:12	0	Р
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5	230:23, 231:8, 231:12,		_
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14,	observe [1] - 225:18	pages [1] - 242:12
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14,	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24,	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17,	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7,	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21,	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3,
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21, 235:22, 236:5, 236:18,	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7,	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21, 235:22, 236:5, 236:18, 236:21, 237:17, 238:4,	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10,	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21, 235:22, 236:5, 236:18, 236:21, 237:17, 238:4, 238:7, 238:10, 239:25	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4,	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19,	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21, 235:22, 236:5, 236:18, 236:21, 237:17, 238:4, 238:7, 238:10, 239:25 multiple [1] - 196:18	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10,
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21, 235:22, 236:5, 236:18, 236:21, 237:17, 238:4, 238:7, 238:10, 239:25	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16,	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9,	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21, 235:22, 236:5, 236:18, 236:21, 237:17, 238:4, 238:7, 238:10, 239:25 multiple [1] - 196:18 must [1] - 227:12	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13,	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21, 235:22, 236:5, 236:18, 236:21, 237:17, 238:4, 238:7, 238:10, 239:25 multiple [1] - 196:18	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8,	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21, 235:22, 236:5, 236:18, 236:21, 237:17, 238:4, 238:7, 238:10, 239:25 multiple [1] - 196:18 must [1] - 227:12	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21, 235:22, 236:5, 236:18, 236:21, 237:17, 238:4, 238:7, 238:10, 239:25 multiple [1] - 196:18 must [1] - 227:12 N	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16,	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21, 235:22, 236:5, 236:18, 236:21, 237:17, 238:4, 238:7, 238:10, 239:25 multiple [1] - 196:18 must [1] - 227:12 N name [2] - 230:25, 242:20	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22,
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18	230:23, 231:8, 231:12, 231:14, 231:17, 233:14, 234:3, 234:9, 234:24, 235:8, 235:19, 235:21, 235:22, 236:5, 236:18, 236:21, 237:17, 238:4, 238:7, 238:10, 239:25 multiple [1] - 196:18 must [1] - 227:12 N name [2] - 230:25, 242:20 naturally [1] - 218:1	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5,	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22, 203:10, 206:16, 211:2,
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2	$\begin{array}{c} 230:23,\ 231:8,\ 231:12,\\ 231:14,\ 231:17,\ 233:14,\\ 234:3,\ 234:9,\ 234:24,\\ 235:8,\ 235:19,\ 235:21,\\ 235:22,\ 236:5,\ 236:18,\\ 236:21,\ 237:17,\ 238:4,\\ 238:7,\ 238:10,\ 239:25\\ \hline \textbf{multiple}\left[1\right]-196:18\\ \hline \textbf{must}\left[1\right]-227:12\\ \hline \textbf{N}\\ \hline \textbf{name}\left[2\right]-230:25,\ 242:20\\ \hline \textbf{naturally}\left[1\right]-218:1\\ \hline \textbf{neat}\left[1\right]-228:3\\ \end{array}$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3,	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22, 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, 215:2, 221:6, 225:25,
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9	$230:23, 231:8, 231:12, \\231:14, 231:17, 233:14, \\234:3, 234:9, 234:24, \\235:8, 235:19, 235:21, \\235:22, 236:5, 236:18, \\236:21, 237:17, 238:4, \\238:7, 238:10, 239:25 \\\textbf{multiple [1] - 196:18} \\\textbf{must [1] - 227:12} \\ \hline \begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8,	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22, 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, 229:14, 229:15
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9 moving [4] - 190:11, 216:2,	$230:23, 231:8, 231:12, \\231:14, 231:17, 233:14, \\234:3, 234:9, 234:24, \\235:8, 235:19, 235:21, \\235:22, 236:5, 236:18, \\236:21, 237:17, 238:4, \\238:7, 238:10, 239:25 \\\textbf{multiple [1] - 196:18} \\\textbf{must [1] - 227:12} \\ \hline \begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8, 221:7	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22, 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, 229:14, 229:15 particularly [1] - 201:11
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9 moving [4] - 190:11, 216:2, 218:6, 222:20	$230:23, 231:8, 231:12, \\231:14, 231:17, 233:14, \\234:3, 234:9, 234:24, \\235:8, 235:19, 235:21, \\235:22, 236:5, 236:18, \\236:21, 237:17, 238:4, \\238:7, 238:10, 239:25 \\\textbf{multiple [1] - 196:18} \\\textbf{must [1] - 227:12} \\ \hline \begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8, 221:7 once [6] - 209:11, 212:2,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pages [1] - 242:12} \\ \textbf{paid [1] - 223:15} \\ \textbf{PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, \\ 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 \\ \textbf{parallel [1] - 216:4} \\ \textbf{parameters [1] - 195:4} \\ \textbf{parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, \\ 201:2 \\ \textbf{parsimony [1] - 201:15} \\ \textbf{part [2] - 211:2, 241:2} \\ \textbf{partially [1] - 236:20} \\ \textbf{participate [1] - 238:8} \\ \textbf{particular [10] - 190:22, \\ 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, \\ 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, \\ 229:14, 229:15 \\ \textbf{particularly [1] - 201:11} \\ \textbf{parties [1] - 242:16} \\ \end{array}$
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9 moving [4] - 190:11, 216:2, 218:6, 222:20 MR [62] - 190:24, 191:24,	$\begin{array}{r} 230:23,\ 231:8,\ 231:12,\\ 231:14,\ 231:17,\ 233:14,\\ 234:3,\ 234:9,\ 234:24,\\ 235:8,\ 235:19,\ 235:21,\\ 235:22,\ 236:5,\ 236:18,\\ 236:21,\ 237:17,\ 238:4,\\ 238:7,\ 238:10,\ 239:25\\ \hline \end{tabular} \label{eq:starter} \label{eq:starter}$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8, 221:7 once [6] - 209:11, 212:2, 218:18, 218:19, 218:20,	$\begin{array}{c} \textbf{pages [1] - 242:12} \\ \textbf{paid [1] - 223:15} \\ \textbf{PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, \\ 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 \\ \textbf{parallel [1] - 216:4} \\ \textbf{parameters [1] - 195:4} \\ \textbf{parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, \\ 201:2 \\ \textbf{parsimony [1] - 201:15} \\ \textbf{part [2] - 211:2, 241:2} \\ \textbf{partially [1] - 236:20} \\ \textbf{participate [1] - 238:8} \\ \textbf{particular [10] - 190:22, \\ 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, \\ 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, \\ 229:14, 229:15 \\ \textbf{particularly [1] - 201:11} \\ \textbf{parties [1] - 242:16} \\ \textbf{parts [1] - 241:6} \\ \end{array}$
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9 moving [4] - 190:11, 216:2, 218:6, 222:20 MR [62] - 190:24, 191:24, 192:6, 192:11, 192:15,	$\begin{array}{c} 230:23,\ 231:8,\ 231:12,\\ 231:14,\ 231:17,\ 233:14,\\ 234:3,\ 234:9,\ 234:24,\\ 235:8,\ 235:19,\ 235:21,\\ 235:22,\ 236:5,\ 236:18,\\ 236:21,\ 237:17,\ 238:4,\\ 238:7,\ 238:10,\ 239:25\\ \hline \textbf{multiple}\ [1]\ -\ 196:18\\ \hline \textbf{must}\ [1]\ -\ 227:12\\ \hline \hline \textbf{N}\\ \hline \textbf{name}\ [2]\ -\ 230:25,\ 242:20\\ \hline \textbf{naturally}\ [1]\ -\ 218:1\\ \hline \textbf{neat}\ [1]\ -\ 228:3\\ \hline \textbf{necessarily}\ [2]\ -\ 191:4,\\ 210:21\\ \hline \textbf{necessary}\ [1]\ -\ 192:7\\ \hline \textbf{need}\ [14]\ -\ 193:16,\ 197:4,\\ 197:22,\ 200:21,\ 200:23,\\ \hline \end{array}$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8, 221:7 once [6] - 209:11, 212:2, 218:18, 218:19, 218:20, 222:21	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22, 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, 229:14, 229:15 particularly [1] - 201:11 parties [1] - 242:16 parts [1] - 241:6 pass [2] - 207:6, 217:8
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9 moving [4] - 190:11, 216:2, 218:6, 222:20 MR [62] - 190:24, 191:24, 192:6, 192:11, 192:15, 193:19, 194:22, 194:23,	$\begin{array}{c} 230:23,\ 231:8,\ 231:12,\\ 231:14,\ 231:17,\ 233:14,\\ 234:3,\ 234:9,\ 234:24,\\ 235:8,\ 235:19,\ 235:21,\\ 235:22,\ 236:5,\ 236:18,\\ 236:21,\ 237:17,\ 238:4,\\ 238:7,\ 238:10,\ 239:25\\ \hline \end{tabular}$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8, 221:7 once [6] - 209:11, 212:2, 218:18, 218:19, 218:20, 222:21 One [2] - 231:3, 231:24	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22, 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, 229:14, 229:15 particularly [1] - 201:11 parties [1] - 242:16 parts [1] - 242:16 pass [2] - 207:6, 217:8 past [2] - 192:19, 210:22
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9 moving [4] - 190:11, 216:2, 218:6, 222:20 MR [62] - 190:24, 191:24, 192:6, 192:11, 192:15, 193:19, 194:22, 194:23, 195:2, 195:13, 197:4,	$\begin{array}{c} 230:23,\ 231:8,\ 231:12,\\ 231:14,\ 231:17,\ 233:14,\\ 234:3,\ 234:9,\ 234:24,\\ 235:8,\ 235:19,\ 235:21,\\ 235:22,\ 236:5,\ 236:18,\\ 236:21,\ 237:17,\ 238:4,\\ 238:7,\ 238:10,\ 239:25\\ \hline \end{tabular}$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8, 221:7 once [6] - 209:11, 212:2, 218:18, 218:19, 218:20, 222:21 One [2] - 231:3, 231:24 one [33] - 192:16, 194:17,	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22, 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, 229:14, 229:15 particularly [1] - 201:11 parties [1] - 242:16 parts [1] - 242:16 pass [2] - 207:6, 217:8 past [2] - 192:19, 210:22 patient [1] - 209:20
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9 moving [4] - 190:11, 216:2, 218:6, 222:20 MR [62] - 190:24, 191:24, 192:6, 192:11, 192:15, 193:19, 194:22, 194:23, 195:2, 195:13, 197:4, 197:21, 198:4, 198:14,	$\begin{array}{c} 230:23,\ 231:8,\ 231:12,\\ 231:14,\ 231:17,\ 233:14,\\ 234:3,\ 234:9,\ 234:24,\\ 235:8,\ 235:19,\ 235:21,\\ 235:22,\ 236:5,\ 236:18,\\ 236:21,\ 237:17,\ 238:4,\\ 238:7,\ 238:10,\ 239:25\\ \hline \end{tabular}$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8, 221:7 once [6] - 209:11, 212:2, 218:18, 218:19, 218:20, 222:21 One [2] - 231:3, 231:24 one [33] - 192:16, 194:17, 195:11, 196:6, 196:16,	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22, 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, 229:14, 229:15 particularly [1] - 201:11 parties [1] - 242:16 parts [1] - 242:16 pass [2] - 207:6, 217:8 past [2] - 192:19, 210:22 patient [1] - 209:20 peaks [1] - 234:5
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9 moving [4] - 190:11, 216:2, 218:6, 222:20 MR [62] - 190:24, 191:24, 192:6, 192:11, 192:15, 193:19, 194:22, 194:23, 195:2, 195:13, 197:4, 197:21, 198:4, 198:14, 198:17, 199:19, 199:25,	$\begin{array}{r} 230:23,\ 231:8,\ 231:12,\\ 231:14,\ 231:17,\ 233:14,\\ 234:3,\ 234:9,\ 234:24,\\ 235:8,\ 235:19,\ 235:21,\\ 235:22,\ 236:5,\ 236:18,\\ 236:21,\ 237:17,\ 238:4,\\ 238:7,\ 238:10,\ 239:25\\ \hline \end{tabular}$ multiple [1] - 196:18 must [1] - 227:12 $\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8, 221:7 once [6] - 209:11, 212:2, 218:18, 218:19, 218:20, 222:21 One [2] - 231:3, 231:24 one [33] - 192:16, 194:17, 195:11, 196:6, 196:16, 198:8, 198:12, 203:17,	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22, 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, 229:14, 229:15 particularly [1] - 201:11 parties [1] - 242:16 parts [1] - 242:16 parts [2] - 192:19, 210:22 patient [1] - 209:20 peaks [1] - 234:5 peers [2] - 213:23, 215:12
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9 moving [4] - 190:11, 216:2, 218:6, 222:20 MR [62] - 190:24, 191:24, 192:6, 192:11, 192:15, 193:19, 194:22, 194:23, 195:2, 195:13, 197:4, 197:21, 198:4, 198:14, 198:17, 199:19, 199:25, 200:4, 201:1, 201:25,	$\begin{array}{r} 230:23,\ 231:8,\ 231:12,\\ 231:14,\ 231:17,\ 233:14,\\ 234:3,\ 234:9,\ 234:24,\\ 235:8,\ 235:19,\ 235:21,\\ 235:22,\ 236:5,\ 236:18,\\ 236:21,\ 237:17,\ 238:4,\\ 238:7,\ 238:10,\ 239:25\\ \hline {\multiple}[1]-196:18\\ \hline {\must}[1]-227:12\\ \hline {\must}[1]-227:12\\ \hline {\must}[1]-228:3\\ \hline {\must}[1]-193:16,\ 197:4,\\ 210:21\\ \hline {\must}[1]-193:16,\ 197:4,\\ 197:22,\ 200:21,\ 200:23,\\ 200:24,\ 207:25,\ 209:17,\\ 214:22,\ 223:2,\ 232:1,\\ 233:3,\ 234:25\\ \hline {\must}[2]-196:17,\ 217:21\\ \hline {\must}[2]-196:17.215:17:21\\ \hline {\must}[2]-196:17.215:17:21\\ \hline {\must}[2]-196:17.215:17:21\\ \hline {\must}[2]-19$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8, 221:7 once [6] - 209:11, 212:2, 218:18, 218:19, 218:20, 222:21 One [2] - 231:3, 231:24 one [3] - 192:16, 194:17, 195:11, 196:6, 196:16, 198:8, 198:12, 203:17, 204:7, 204:25, 205:18,	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22, 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, 229:14, 229:15 particularly [1] - 201:11 parties [1] - 242:16 parts [1] - 242:16 parts [2] - 207:6, 217:8 past [2] - 192:19, 210:22 patient [1] - 209:20 peaks [1] - 234:5 peers [2] - 213:23, 215:12 penalized [1] - 213:15
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9 moving [4] - 190:11, 216:2, 218:6, 222:20 MR [62] - 190:24, 191:24, 192:6, 192:11, 192:15, 193:19, 194:22, 194:23, 195:2, 195:13, 197:4, 197:21, 198:4, 198:14, 198:17, 199:19, 199:25, 200:4, 201:1, 201:25, 202:7, 202:15, 202:16,	$\begin{array}{r} 230:23,\ 231:8,\ 231:12,\\ 231:14,\ 231:17,\ 233:14,\\ 234:3,\ 234:9,\ 234:24,\\ 235:8,\ 235:19,\ 235:21,\\ 235:22,\ 236:5,\ 236:18,\\ 236:21,\ 237:17,\ 238:4,\\ 238:7,\ 238:10,\ 239:25\\ \hline \end{tabular}$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8, 221:7 once [6] - 209:11, 212:2, 218:18, 218:19, 218:20, 222:21 One [2] - 231:3, 231:24 one [33] - 192:16, 194:17, 195:11, 196:6, 196:16, 198:8, 198:12, 203:17, 204:7, 204:25, 205:18, 210:11, 213:13, 214:13,	$\label{eq:pages} \begin{array}{c} 1 \\ pages [1] - 242:12 \\ paid [1] - 223:15 \\ \hline PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, \\ 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 \\ parallel [1] - 216:4 \\ parameters [1] - 195:4 \\ parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, \\ 201:2 \\ parsimony [1] - 201:15 \\ part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 \\ partially [1] - 236:20 \\ participate [1] - 238:8 \\ particular [10] - 190:22, \\ 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, \\ 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, \\ 229:14, 229:15 \\ particularly [1] - 201:11 \\ parties [1] - 242:16 \\ parts [1] - 242:16 \\ parts [2] - 207:6, 217:8 \\ past [2] - 192:19, 210:22 \\ patient [1] - 203:20 \\ peaks [1] - 234:5 \\ peers [2] - 213:23, 215:12 \\ penalized [1] - 213:15 \\ people [8] - 191:14, 194:7, \\ \end{array}$
238:8 morning [1] - 237:5 Most [1] - 233:19 most [8] - 195:12, 195:14, 207:25, 211:4, 219:7, 222:2, 225:17, 234:1 motion [9] - 194:23, 198:7, 202:5, 202:6, 202:10, 202:14, 219:11, 224:19, 225:4 move [9] - 208:6, 208:9, 209:3, 218:8, 221:13, 224:21, 225:18, 229:8, 235:22 moved [3] - 194:25, 202:16, 226:18 Moved [1] - 195:2 moves [1] - 230:9 moving [4] - 190:11, 216:2, 218:6, 222:20 MR [62] - 190:24, 191:24, 192:6, 192:11, 192:15, 193:19, 194:22, 194:23, 195:2, 195:13, 197:4, 197:21, 198:4, 198:14, 198:17, 199:19, 199:25, 200:4, 201:1, 201:25,	$\begin{array}{r} 230:23,\ 231:8,\ 231:12,\\ 231:14,\ 231:17,\ 233:14,\\ 234:3,\ 234:9,\ 234:24,\\ 235:8,\ 235:19,\ 235:21,\\ 235:22,\ 236:5,\ 236:18,\\ 236:21,\ 237:17,\ 238:4,\\ 238:7,\ 238:10,\ 239:25\\ \hline \end{tabular}$	observe [1] - 225:18 observed [4] - 208:17, 210:15, 210:21, 210:25 obviously [1] - 220:14 occurs [1] - 218:10 October [4] - 227:15, 228:4, 228:14, 229:4 OF [5] - 189:1, 189:1, 189:16, 242:3, 242:4 of-course [1] - 190:11 offer [1] - 233:7 offered [1] - 237:12 old [1] - 203:13 older [9] - 203:15, 205:5, 206:11, 206:23, 208:3, 208:20, 210:6, 211:8, 221:7 once [6] - 209:11, 212:2, 218:18, 218:19, 218:20, 222:21 One [2] - 231:3, 231:24 one [3] - 192:16, 194:17, 195:11, 196:6, 196:16, 198:8, 198:12, 203:17, 204:7, 204:25, 205:18,	pages [1] - 242:12 paid [1] - 223:15 PANEL [5] - 195:7, 197:3, 197:17, 205:13, 221:20 parallel [1] - 216:4 parameters [1] - 195:4 parse [3] - 197:8, 197:10, 201:2 parsimony [1] - 201:15 part [2] - 211:2, 241:2 partially [1] - 236:20 participate [1] - 238:8 particular [10] - 190:22, 203:10, 206:16, 211:2, 215:2, 221:6, 225:25, 229:14, 229:15 particularly [1] - 201:11 parties [1] - 242:16 parts [1] - 242:16 parts [2] - 207:6, 217:8 past [2] - 192:19, 210:22 patient [1] - 209:20 peaks [1] - 243:5 peers [2] - 213:23, 215:12 penalized [1] - 213:15

227:7, 231:5, 240:7 per [3] - 204:25, 215:7, 227:25 percent [1] - 196:14 perform [1] - 210:18 performance [3] - 208:21, 218:3, 218:7 performing [1] - 216:7 period [2] - 228:21, 229:1 periods [1] - 234:18 perpetually [1] - 220:2 person [1] - 222:25 perspective [4] - 197:1, 201:18, 208:2, 223:20 pertinent [1] - 238:24 **Ph.D** [1] - 189:18 phenomenon [3] - 216:12, 216:16, 216:24 philosophical [1] - 223:19 pick [1] - 234:5 picking [1] - 214:11 pie [1] - 215:19 piece [3] - 191:18, 208:11, 215:19 pieces [3] - 200:20, 216:3, 217:13 piggyback [1] - 235:23 pilot [1] - 229:22 pipeline [1] - 199:12 place [4] - 215:22, 216:13, 232:23, 234:18 placed [1] - 206:12 placement [2] - 206:9 play [1] - 213:18 point [18] - 191:24, 192:16, 201:14, 201:25, 206:21, 207:16, 208:5, 208:9, 208:10, 221:19, 225:3, 227:25, 229:11, 234:16, 235:12, 238:17, 239:20 pointed [1] - 190:7 pointing [1] - 195:18 points [18] - 205:8, 206:25, 209:3, 211:11, 212:12, 214:23, 215:3, 215:5, 215:7, 215:8, 221:22, 221:25, 222:1, 223:6, 228:2, 230:2 policies [2] - 215:21, 215:25 policy [13] - 193:10, 194:6, 194:21, 201:9, 201:17, 208:1, 211:3, 217:19, 220:4, 222:13, 222:15, 222:23, 223:13 policy-wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15 politically [1] - 214:12 **pop** [1] - 199:24 population [1] - 228:19 portions [1] - 201:4

positive [5] - 195:20, 207:15, 217:20, 220:21, 221:16 possibility [1] - 238:2 possible [4] - 213:4, 231:10, 238:11, 241:10 possibly [2] - 222:1, 222:22 potential [2] - 193:14, 207:1 potentially [1] - 217:23 power [1] - 211:22 pre [1] - 219:5 pre-school [1] - 219:5 precisely [1] - 191:24 prediction [1] - 215:4 preparation [1] - 235:23 present [5] - 204:5, 227:12, 227:18, 227:20, 240:17 **PRESENT** [1] - 189:18 presented [2] - 227:13, 239:19 President [1] - 189:18 press [1] - 231:3 pressure [1] - 231:6 pretty [1] - 209:20 previous [1] - 237:5 primary [1] - 204:17 Principal [1] - 189:19 privilege [1] - 239:8 problem [2] - 195:25, 214:8 procedures [2] - 215:22, 215:25 proceedings [2] - 242:11, 242:14 process [3] - 190:19, 241:2, 241:4 produce [2] - 206:25, 233:4 program [1] - 204:14 project [2] - 230:9, 230:17 projects [1] - 229:21 provide [2] - 230:10, 238:15 provided [1] - 221:10 providing [1] - 200:19 Public [2] - 242:7, 242:23 pure [1] - 220:4 purpose [2] - 208:23, 230:16 purposes [1] - 228:23 put [10] - 214:23, 220:10, 220:18, 223:18, 224:19, 230:16, 231:6, 231:18, 236:8 puzzle [1] - 217:13

Q

Quality [1] - 189:16 questions [4] - 227:10, 231:6, 237:1, 237:11 quick [1] - 238:1 quicker [1] - 239:1 quickly [4] - 215:1, 230:25, 231:10, 231:21

quote [1] - 192:23 R **RACE** [1] - 189:4 raise [1] - 237:19 raising [5] - 195:9, 202:20, 225:1, 225:13, 226:20 range [2] - 233:16, 234:2 rare [1] - 196:8 rate [1] - 228:14 rated [1] - 223:4 rates [1] - 213:25 rather [5] - 192:6, 193:12, 201:12, 201:24, 201:25 rating [1] - 234:4 rational [1] - 197:4 re [3] - 193:9, 203:22, 225:20 re-enter [2] - 203:22, 225:20 re-introduce [1] - 193:9 reach [2] - 210:3, 224:11 react [1] - 217:2 reading [5] - 196:21, 197:15, 199:24, 202:13, 202:19 Ready [1] - 225:10 ready [1] - 202:24 real [6] - 208:25, 214:25, 224:6, 231:21, 233:17, 233.18 realistically [1] - 217:10 reality [2] - 208:16, 208:19 realize [1] - 208:24 really [24] - 193:20, 201:14, 209:3, 220:14, 223:18, 226:24, 227:1, 229:11, 230:20, 232:15, 236:24, 238:1, 239:8, 239:12, 239:14, 239:18, 239:21, 240:11, 240:13, 241:6 reason [4] - 198:2, 201:23, 219:17, 236:1 reasonable [1] - 198:12 recognize [1] - 214:4 recognizes [1] - 222:16 recollection [1] - 206:2 recommend [2] - 236:22, 236:23 recommendation [4] - 193:8, 227:22, 236:6, 236:14 recommendations [1] -235:7 record [2] - 238:10, 238:11 recur [1] - 196:11 reduce [1] - 214:14 refer [1] - 238:24 refined [1] - 230:18 reflect [1] - 236:10 regarded [1] - 233:9 regional [1] - 199:22 related [1] - 242:15

reliable [2] - 232:18, 235:13 reliably [1] - 233:22 remaining [1] - 225:5 remarkable [1] - 240:7 **Remember** [1] - 196:19 remember [1] - 205:17 reminds [1] - 210:22 **Removing** [1] - 194:14 repeat [1] - 203:8 Reporter [1] - 242:6 request [1] - 228:10 required [1] - 224:11 **RESEARCH** [1] - 189:2 research [2] - 205:21, 206:4 **Research** [2] - 189:17, 189:19 resolution [3] - 206:17, 230:10, 230:12 resources [1] - 194:16 respond [1] - 236:3 responsibility [2] - 236:3, 236:5 restriction [2] - 190:6, 191:11 results [3] - 195:16, 229:24, 230:13 retain [1] - 225:5 retained [20] - 203:14, 206:23, 207:6, 208:18, 209:2, 209:6, 209:11, 210:2, 210:5, 210:7, 210:9, 210:10, 211:21, 212:2, 212:17, 213:3, 213:20, 214:20, 215:11, 218:11 retains [1] - 218:20 retention [1] - 213:25 revising [2] - 192:4, 219:22 revisit [2] - 193:5, 194:18 rewarded [3] - 213:9, 213:10, 224:9 road [1] - 230:4 Ronda [3] - 195:13, 226:19, 237:23 Ronda's [1] - 209:20 room [5] - 222:25, 223:5, 223:7, 223:11, 240:17 roster [1] - 229:25 rule [6] - 192:1, 228:23, 234:6, 235:1, 235:3, 235:4 rules [2] - 211:13, 211:16 run [2] - 237:2, 237:12 running [1] - 216:4

7

S

safe [2] - 201:24, 241:11 safeguard [1] - 232:23 Sam [4] - 190:4, 194:20, 203:4, 240:1 satisfied [1] - 238:16

scale [2] - 215:24, 221:18 schedule [1] - 237:14 scheduling [1] - 202:22 school [26] - 196:13, 196:21, 198:22, 199:2, 199:3, 199:7, 199:9, 199:18, 203:21, 203:22, 204:6, 219:5, 225:20, 226:2, 227:19, 227:21, 228:18, 228:23, 229:5, 229:8, 237:3, 237:7, 237:9 schools [3] - 213:4, 213:5, 225:19 science [1] - 199:1 Scientist [1] - 189:19 score [13] - 200:10, 200:20, 200:25, 203:16, 209:24, 211:10, 212:13, 214:20, 221:18, 223:11, 229:2, 237:8, 237:10 screen [1] - 237:15 seal [1] - 242:20 Second [3] - 195:1, 224:23, 225:7 seconded [6] - 195:2, 202:14. 202:17. 225:6. 225:8, 226:18 see [21] - 191:14, 193:3, 193:16, 193:22, 194:3, 194:5, 195:19, 195:25, 196:2, 199:23, 215:1, 220:17, 223:5, 225:6, 228:5, 237:6, 237:16, 239:12, 240:20, 240:25, 241:3 See [1] - 214:8 seeing [1] - 196:8 seem [2] - 192:17, 193:1 segment [1] - 240:24 select [4] - 236:22, 236:23, 236:24, 236:25 semester [5] - 227:17, 227:25, 228:2, 228:6, 228.7 sense [1] - 233:24 sensitive [1] - 201:11 sent [2] - 237:14, 238:12 separately [1] - 198:3 set [7] - 192:1, 204:13, 214:18, 216:20, 217:24, 219:16, 242:9 setting [3] - 214:1, 217:18, 221.2 share [1] - 237:12 short [2] - 212:3, 226:23 show [2] - 212:9, 237:2 showed [2] - 205:22, 206:5 showing [2] - 190:23, 214:15 shows [3] - 212:11, 214:22, 221:10

side [3] - 200:16, 201:24, 220:4 sidelines [1] - 207:21 sides [2] - 193:22, 222:11 sight [1] - 219:20 significance [1] - 197:20 significant [6] - 192:10, 192:11, 193:2, 196:24. 201:5, 206:5 similar [1] - 228:22 simple [1] - 198:15 simultaneously [1] - 197:25 sincerely [1] - 239:15 single [3] - 196:13, 196:15, 219.2sit [3] - 211:6, 211:10, 212:12 sitting [1] - 208:19 situation [3] - 193:5, 193:25, 222:19 six [2] - 196:10, 196:19 size [26] - 190:6, 190:14, 190:17, 190:21, 191:10, 193:25, 194:8, 195:4, 195:15, 196:23, 197:24, 198:1, 198:4, 198:9, 198:13, 198:16, 198:23, 199:4, 199:11, 201:5, 201:11, 201:19, 202:11, 202:18, 231:19, 231:23 sizes [3] - 193:6, 193:15, 195:20 slide [1] - 231:18 small [4] - 200:7, 201:6, 232:13, 232:17 smaller [2] - 221:15 soon [2] - 238:11, 238:12 Sorry [1] - 209:22 sort [2] - 235:11, 238:23 sorts [1] - 238:22 sound [2] - 214:9, 240:11 sounds [1] - 203:5 Speaking [1] - 213:6 speaking [2] - 197:3, 197:17 spelling [2] - 196:22, 197:14 Spirited [1] - 239:10 spreadsheet [1] - 226:6 stability [1] - 228:16 stable [1] - 228:7 Stacey [1] - 237:22 Stacy's [1] - 213:8 staffed [3] - 218:21, 219:4, 219:5 standard [9] - 207:11, 213:22, 224:12, 232:2, 232:3, 232:14, 232:23, 233:20, 235:2 standards [1] - 220:2 standpoint [3] - 190:5, 194:21, 201:9

staring [1] - 237:15 start [2] - 192:6, 212:16 started [1] - 191:21 starting [1] - 209:8 **STATE** [2] - 189:1, 242:3 state [6] - 221:1, 234:23, 240:5. 240:8. 241:3 State [9] - 222:14, 222:16, 222:21, 223:12, 228:11, 230:4, 240:3, 242:7, 242:23 statement [2] - 208:2, 222:23 statistical [2] - 200:15, 233:6 statistically [2] - 196:24, 233:16 statisticians [1] - 222:12 statistics [1] - 201:7 status [1] - 220:3 stays [1] - 218:19 step [1] - 219:13 **STEWART** [1] - 237:17 still [12] - 193:3, 199:6, 200:11, 212:7, 215:5, 215:10, 215:13, 215:21, 216:20, 218:4, 218:7, 218:14 stopped [1] - 202:8 strain [1] - 192:24 struggle [1] - 209:14 struggling [3] - 207:5, 207:25, 213:7 student [40] - 196:19, 198:21, 203:10, 203:12, 203:15, 203:24, 205:23, 208:6, 209:1, 210:1, 213:14, 215:2, 215:6, 217:14, 217:17, 218:4, 218:17, 219:19, 219:24, 220:6, 220:16, 220:23, 221:2, 221:3, 221:6, 223:8, 224:1, 227:8, 227:9, 227:11, 228:6, 228:14, 228:25, 229:2, 229:7, 229:12, 229:14, 229:20, 234:12, 234:17 **STUDENT** [1] - 189:5 student's [3] - 215:24, 218:1, 220:3 students [32] - 195:17, 196:13, 196:15, 196:18, 203:14, 206:4, 206:6, 207:24, 208:18, 210:17, 210:19, 211:6, 212:17, 213:7, 214:2, 214:7, 215:9, 215:11, 215:13, 215:18, 215:23, 216:7, 216:15, 216:20, 217:5, 217:8, 218:8, 223:25, 232:21, 233:3, 234:11, 234:15 Students [1] - 196:20

studied [1] - 239:4 studies [1] - 191:12 stuff [3] - 223:9, 239:10 subscribed [1] - 242:20 substantive [1] - 226:12 succeed [1] - 220:15 sufficient [2] - 229:5, 229:9 suggested [2] - 194:18, 205:21 suggestion [2] - 192:18, 226:21 suggestions [2] - 238:18, 239:7 Suppose [1] - 198:21 supposed [1] - 212:21 survey [12] - 227:9, 227:10, 227:12, 227:18, 227:20, 228:5, 230:2, 230:19, 230:20, 234:18, 241:12 surveying [1] - 228:11 SUZETTE [1] - 242:23 Suzette [1] - 242:6 SWD [1] - 198:19 system [10] - 210:15, 216:5, 219:17, 219:18, 219:22, 219:23, 220:11, 234:20, 240:9, 240:10 systemic [1] - 197:13 systems [2] - 216:4, 220:1

Т

tabulated [1] - 230:14 talking) [1] - 205:13 talks [1] - 206:14 taught [1] - 212:5 teach [5] - 207:7, 211:12, 223:8, 223:12, 223:16 teacher [53] - 195:22, 195:24, 200:11, 201:8, 206:24, 207:2, 207:4, 207:7, 209:13, 212:3, 214:16, 214:21, 215:20, 216:23, 217:2, 217:11, 217:16, 217:24, 219:17, 219:18, 219:21, 219:22, 220:11, 220:15, 220:18, 221:4, 221:14, 222:17, 222:22, 223:10, 224:5, 229:2, 229:8, 229:12, 229:15, 229:21, 230:7, 231:23, 231:25, 232:1, 232:14, 232:16, 232:18, 232:25, 233:3, 233:4, 233:21, 233:25, 234:10, 234:15, 234:17, 237:9 teachers [28] - 191:18, 193:17, 195:17, 200:20, 200:23, 202:3, 208:22, 211:5, 211:7, 211:18,

212:9, 212:10, 212:11,	transitions [2] - 203:20,	v	worth [1] - 212:12
212:14, 212:16, 212:23,	204:4	• •	wow [1] - 228:3
213:1, 213:2, 213:6,	travel [1] - 241:11	vague [1] - 233:21	wrap [1] - 227:4
213:21, 216:14, 218:6,	treat [1] - 216:14	valuable [1] - 200:18	wrap-up [1] - 227:4
220:9, 223:3, 231:4,	trend [1] - 212:8	value [5] - 193:11, 232:19,	write [2] - 207:3, 207:4
232:12, 233:15, 240:9	tried [2] - 208:14, 237:24	232:20, 237:8, 237:10	writing [1] - 196:22
Teachers [1] - 211:12	triple [1] - 213:10	value-added [5] - 193:11,	witting [1] - 190.22
teachers' [1] - 237:8		232:19, 232:20, 237:8,	V
Teaching [1] - 189:8	True [1] - 215:15	237:10	Y
_	true [6] - 205:24, 212:19,	variable [10] - 192:21,	year [26] - 191:5, 191:6,
teaching [1] - 216:15	217:23, 228:17, 233:20,	192:24, 194:11, 194:12,	192:14, 193:10, 205:9,
technical [7] - 192:16, 194:4,	242:13	203:11, 204:5, 204:6,	205:11, 206:18, 206:20,
197:22, 198:6, 202:8,	try [3] - 202:2, 223:17,	204:9, 206:17, 222:18	206:21, 206:23, 208:11,
209:23, 226:4	237:25	variables [6] - 194:9, 200:12,	208:20, 210:6, 210:11,
technically [1] - 192:25	trying [4] - 191:7, 192:8,		213:13, 215:4, 215:5,
technology [1] - 237:18	192:21, 220:10	218:17, 225:5, 225:10,	215:8, 215:9, 219:2, 221:7,
teleconference [1] - 205:18	turned [2] - 206:11, 219:6	226:5	221:8, 221:13, 230:14
ten [1] - 203:12	twelfths [1] - 205:12	variation [2] - 190:14, 192:20	
tend [4] - 201:1, 207:3,	twice [3] - 209:12, 211:21,	verification [1] - 230:1	year's [2] - 209:24, 218:1
207:4, 208:20	212:2	verified [1] - 230:11	yearly [1] - 192:4
terms [4] - 206:12, 217:2,	two [17] - 194:13, 195:11,	versus [2] - 206:7, 221:16	years [11] - 201:13, 203:13,
229:13, 237:7	196:7, 204:13, 205:2,	via [1] - 237:13	204:13, 204:23, 205:2,
thankful [1] - 239:21	205:4, 205:5, 211:8,	Vice [1] - 189:18	205:5, 206:21, 210:7,
THE [2] - 189:4, 242:3	218:17, 222:10, 222:11,	Vice-President [1] - 189:18	211:8, 215:7, 234:10
thereby [1] - 195:17	227:9, 227:12, 227:18,	video [2] - 236:11, 238:9	yesterday [4] - 196:20,
therefore [1] - 222:17	228:2, 230:20, 232:1	Volume [2] - 189:13, 190:2	227:8, 227:13, 229:20
Therefore [2] - 208:21,	typical [1] - 203:15	vote [1] - 224:20	younger [1] - 206:13
208:24	typically [1] - 194:5		
they've [1] - 227:14		W	Z
thin [1] - 232:9	U		
thinking [4] - 195:11, 207:23,	0	Wait [1] - 225:14	zero [3] - 204:7, 204:8,
216:18, 235:6	ultimate [1] - 219:20	wait [7] - 225:14, 225:15	204:10
thinks [1] - 220:7	ultimately [3] - 230:3,	WAKULLA [1] - 242:4	
thoughtful [3] - 233:10,	234:14, 236:9	walk [1] - 224:16	
- · · ·	Ultimately [1] - 231:14	wants [1] - 237:22	
	Ultimatery [1] - 231.14	wants [1] - 201.22	
239:10, 240:21	• • •	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13,	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10,		
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3,	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10,	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15,	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12,	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21,	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17,	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10,	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25,	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23,	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25, 201:1, 205:9, 205:16,	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25,	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22,	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25, 201:1, 205:9, 205:16, 206:14, 207:19, 216:11, 217:15, 225:4	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22, 196:10, 200:9, 211:23,	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22 wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25, 201:1, 205:9, 205:16, 206:14, 207:19, 216:11,	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22, 196:10, 200:9, 211:23, 211:24, 213:18, 219:12,	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22 wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15 wish [1] - 240:22	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25, 201:1, 205:9, 205:16, 206:14, 207:19, 216:11, 217:15, 225:4	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22, 196:10, 200:9, 211:23, 211:24, 213:18, 219:12, 219:16, 227:3, 227:4,	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22 wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15 wish [1] - 240:22 witt [1] - 190:2	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25, 201:1, 205:9, 205:16, 206:14, 207:19, 216:11, 217:15, 225:4 tool [1] - 230:1	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22, 196:10, 200:9, 211:23, 211:24, 213:18, 219:12, 219:16, 227:3, 227:4, 227:8, 229:10, 231:18,	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22 wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15 wish [1] - 240:22 witt [1] - 190:2 WITNESS [1] - 242:19	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25, 201:1, 205:9, 205:16, 206:14, 207:19, 216:11, 217:15, 225:4 tool [1] - 230:1 TOP [1] - 189:4	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22, 196:10, 200:9, 211:23, 211:24, 213:18, 219:12, 219:16, 227:3, 227:4, 227:8, 229:10, 231:18, 232:4, 232:7, 233:9, 234:5,	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22 wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15 wish [1] - 240:22 wit [1] - 190:2 WITNESS [1] - 242:19 wondering [2] - 229:10,	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25, 201:1, 205:9, 205:16, 206:14, 207:19, 216:11, 217:15, 225:4 tool [1] - 230:1 TOP [1] - 189:4 TOVINE [2] - 200:9, 228:20	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22, 196:10, 200:9, 211:23, 211:24, 213:18, 219:12, 219:16, 227:3, 227:4, 227:8, 229:10, 231:18, 232:4, 232:7, 233:9, 234:5, 235:10, 235:15	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22 wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15 wish [1] - 240:22 wit [1] - 190:2 WITNESS [1] - 242:19 wondering [2] - 229:10, 229:11	
$\label{eq:constraints} \begin{array}{l} \mbox{three} \ [6] - 227:10, 227:13, \\ 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, \\ 233:13 \\ \mbox{throughout} \ [3] - 210:12, \\ 218:24, 219:8 \\ \mbox{Thursday} \ [1] - 189:12 \\ \mbox{tiny} \ [1] - 191:16 \\ \mbox{TO} \ [1] - 191:16 \\ \mbox{TO} \ [1] - 189:4 \\ \mbox{to-wit} \ [1] - 190:2 \\ \mbox{today} \ [2] - 231:18, 240:17 \\ \mbox{together} \ [4] - 220:10, \\ 226:11, 236:8 \\ \mbox{TOMEI} \ [10] - 199:19, 199:25, \\ 201:1, 205:9, 205:16, \\ 206:14, 207:19, 216:11, \\ 217:15, 225:4 \\ \mbox{tool} \ [1] - 230:1 \\ \mbox{TOP} \ [1] - 189:4 \\ \mbox{TOVINE} \ [2] - 200:9, 228:20 \\ \mbox{track} \ [2] - 208:4, 216:2 \\ \end{array} $	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22, 196:10, 200:9, 211:23, 211:24, 213:18, 219:12, 219:16, 227:3, 227:4, 227:8, 229:10, 231:18, 232:4, 232:7, 233:9, 234:5, 235:10, 235:15 urban [1] - 213:24	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22 wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15 wish [1] - 240:22 wit [1] - 190:2 WITNESS [1] - 242:19 wondering [2] - 229:10, 229:11 words [4] - 210:19, 220:17,	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25, 201:1, 205:9, 205:16, 206:14, 207:19, 216:11, 217:15, 225:4 tool [1] - 230:1 TOP [1] - 189:4 TOVINE [2] - 200:9, 228:20 track [2] - 208:4, 216:2 traditionally [1] - 230:3 transacted [1] - 238:16	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22, 196:10, 200:9, 211:23, 211:24, 213:18, 219:12, 219:16, 227:3, 227:4, 227:8, 229:10, 231:18, 232:4, 232:7, 233:9, 234:5, 235:10, 235:15	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22 wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15 wish [1] - 240:22 wit [1] - 190:2 WITNESS [1] - 242:19 wondering [2] - 229:10, 229:11 words [4] - 210:19, 220:17, 222:24, 222:25	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25, 201:1, 205:9, 205:16, 206:14, 207:19, 216:11, 217:15, 225:4 tool [1] - 230:1 TOP [1] - 189:4 TOVINE [2] - 200:9, 228:20 track [2] - 208:4, 216:2 traditionally [1] - 230:3 transacted [1] - 238:16 transcribe [1] - 242:10	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22, 196:10, 200:9, 211:23, 211:24, 213:18, 219:12, 219:16, 227:3, 227:4, 227:8, 229:10, 231:18, 232:4, 232:7, 233:9, 234:5, 235:10, 235:15 urban [1] - 213:24	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22 wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15 wish [1] - 240:22 wit [1] - 190:2 WITNESS [1] - 242:19 wondering [2] - 229:10, 229:11 words [4] - 210:19, 220:17, 222:24, 222:25 world [3] - 193:6, 194:6,	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25, 201:1, 205:9, 205:16, 206:14, 207:19, 216:11, 217:15, 225:4 tool [1] - 230:1 TOP [1] - 189:4 TOVINE [2] - 200:9, 228:20 track [2] - 208:4, 216:2 traditionally [1] - 230:3 transacted [1] - 242:10 transcription [1] - 242:13	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22, 196:10, 200:9, 211:23, 211:24, 213:18, 219:12, 219:16, 227:3, 227:4, 227:8, 229:10, 231:18, 232:4, 232:7, 233:9, 234:5, 235:10, 235:15 urban [1] - 213:24	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22 wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15 wish [1] - 240:22 wit [1] - 190:2 WITNESS [1] - 242:19 wondering [2] - 229:10, 229:11 words [4] - 210:19, 220:17, 222:24, 222:25 world [3] - 193:6, 194:6, 224:6	
three [6] - 227:10, 227:13, 227:20, 230:20, 232:3, 233:13 throughout [3] - 210:12, 218:24, 219:8 Thursday [1] - 189:12 tiny [1] - 191:16 TO [1] - 189:4 to-wit [1] - 190:2 today [2] - 231:18, 240:17 together [4] - 220:10, 226:11, 236:8 TOMEI [10] - 199:19, 199:25, 201:1, 205:9, 205:16, 206:14, 207:19, 216:11, 217:15, 225:4 tool [1] - 230:1 TOP [1] - 189:4 TOVINE [2] - 200:9, 228:20 track [2] - 208:4, 216:2 traditionally [1] - 230:3 transacted [1] - 238:16 transcribe [1] - 242:10	unacceptable [1] - 236:4 under [7] - 190:6, 190:10, 191:3, 195:14, 195:15, 210:15, 210:18 Under [1] - 200:11 under-perform [1] - 210:18 understood [2] - 193:21, 219:13 unhappy [1] - 210:25 unintended [1] - 207:1 uninterrupted [1] - 190:1 unit [2] - 205:1, 206:20 University [1] - 189:7 unless [2] - 219:9, 235:16 up [20] - 192:2, 195:22, 196:10, 200:9, 211:23, 211:24, 213:18, 219:12, 219:16, 227:3, 227:4, 227:8, 229:10, 231:18, 232:4, 232:7, 233:9, 234:5, 235:10, 235:15 urban [1] - 213:24	watched [2] - 211:14, 240:16 ways [1] - 222:10 web [2] - 240:17, 241:8 webcasting [1] - 231:4 webinar [4] - 237:13, 237:17, 237:19, 238:6 weeding [1] - 212:16 welcome [1] - 238:19 WESTPHAL [3] - 231:17, 233:14, 234:3 wherein [1] - 198:23 WHEREOF [1] - 242:19 whole [3] - 228:18, 240:23, 241:2 wince [2] - 207:20, 207:22 wise [2] - 222:13, 222:15 wish [1] - 240:22 wit [1] - 190:2 WITNESS [1] - 242:19 wondering [2] - 229:10, 229:11 words [4] - 210:19, 220:17, 222:24, 222:25 world [3] - 193:6, 194:6,	