



**Testimony of
Emily Durso
Interim Superintendent of Education**

**Public Oversight Roundtable on
The Results of the 2013 DC Comprehensive Assessment System
(DC CAS)**

**Council of the District of Columbia
Committee on Education
The Honorable David Catania, Chairman**

**September 26, 2013
Council Chambers, Room 123
John A. Wilson Building**



INTRODUCTION

GOOD MORNING CHAIRMAN CATANIA. MY NAME IS EMILY DURSO, AND SINCE JUNE OF THIS YEAR I HAVE BEEN THE INTERIM SUPERINTENDENT FOR THE OFFICE OF STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION.

I AM JOINED BY OSSE'S DIRECTOR OF ASSESSMENTS AND DATA MANAGEMENT, JEFF NOEL, WHO HAS BEEN THE TEAM LEADER ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMPREHENSIVE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM (DC CAS) PROGRAM ALONG WITH HIS OTHER DUTIES. ALSO, I AM JOINED BY OSSE'S CHIEF OF STAFF, JOSE ALVAREZ. AS YOU KNOW, STARTING IN LATE MARCH THROUGH JUNE, MR. ALVAREZ WAS THE SENIOR MANAGER FOR OSSE IN THE SUPERINTENDENT'S ABSENCE.

WE WISH TO ACCOMPLISH TWO OBJECTIVES TODAY. ONE IS TO PROVIDE YOU WITH A TIMELINE OF ACTIONS AND ACTIVITIES RELATING TO THE 2013 DC CAS AS FAR BACK AS 2010, BUT SPECIFICALLY FROM JUNE 13, WHEN MR. NOEL TOOK OVER AS TEAM LEADER UNTIL THE RELEASE OF THE FINAL DC CAS SCORES TO THE PUBLIC JULY 30.

SECOND, WE WILL TRY TO RESPOND TO WHAT SEEM TO BE PERSISTENT QUESTIONS YOU AND MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND PRESS HAVE RAISED SINCE WE RELEASED THE SCORES, ESPECIALLY WITH RESPECT TO OUR DECISION TO MAINTAIN COMPARABILITY INSTEAD OF CREATING NEW PERFORMANCE STANDARDS, WHICH WOULD ESTABLISH A NEW BASELINE.



BEFORE I START, WE HAVE HEARD THE CONCERNS REGARDING THE LACK OF TRANSPARENCY OF THE SCORES ASSOCIATED WITH THE ALTERNATIVE GRADING OPTION. WHILE WE STAND BY OUR DECISION, WE ARE WILLING TO RELEASE THIS DATA AT THE LEA AND SCHOOL LEVEL WITH A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING THAT THESE SCORES CANNOT BE COMPARED TO PREVIOUS YEAR PROFICIENCY LEVELS, CANNOT BE USED WITH CURRENT ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS, AND DO NOT REFLECT THE CHANGES IN PROFICIENCY LEVELS THAT WILL BE IMPLEMENTED WHEN WE FULLY TRANSITION TO THE NEXT GENERATION ASSESSMENT, THE PARTNERSHIP FOR ASSESSMENT OF READINESS OF COLLEGE AND CAREERS (PARCC) IN 2014/15. THIS INFORMATION WILL BE RELEASED BY EARLY NEXT WEEK.

BACKGROUND ON THE COMMITMENT TO COMPARABILITY

AS WE HAVE STATED ON NUMEROUS OCCASIONS, OUR PRIMARY REASON FOR DECIDING TO MAINTAIN THE SAME CUT SCORES THAT HAVE BEEN USED SINCE THE DC CAS WAS FIRST IMPLEMENTED IN 2006 WAS THE FACT THAT WE FEEL IT IS IMPERATIVE FOR THE DISTRICT TO MAINTAIN COMPARABILITY OF SCORES UNTIL THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PARCC.

OSSE'S POLICY REGARDING MAINTAINING COMPARABILITY WHILE ADOPTING COMMON CORE CONTENT STANDARDS, WAS FIRST OFFICIALLY DOCUMENTED IN THE DISTRICT'S RACE TO THE TOP APPLICATION, WHICH WAS AWARDED ON SEPTEMBER 24, 2010. ON PAGE 65 OF THE APPLICATION IT STATES:



“OSSE WILL WORK WITH ITS TEST CONTRACTOR IN SUMMER 2010 TO BEGIN WORK ON MODIFYING THE CURRENT DC-CAS TO PHASE IN QUESTIONS THAT BETTER ALIGN WITH NEW STANDARDS AND PHASE OUT QUESTIONS THAT DO NOT. OSSE WILL ALSO WORK WITH ITS TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL TO ENSURE THAT THIS TRANSITION MAINTAINS THE ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS AND DOES NOT DISRUPT THE TRENDLINES IN ACHIEVEMENT.”

THIS STATEMENT CLEARLY SETS FORTH A POLICY OF MAINTAINING COMPARABILITY, WHICH IS NOW ASSOCIATED WITH \$75 MILLION IN FEDERAL FUNDING.

WHILE IT HAS BEEN POINTED OUT BY THE COMMITTEE THAT WHEN UNDERGOING SUBSTANTIAL CONTENT SHIFTS IN AN ASSESSMENT, IT IS CONSIDERED PRUDENT TO CONDUCT A REVIEW OF YOUR CUT SCORES; THE COMMITMENT TO COMPARABILITY IS ALSO CONSIDERED A PERFECTLY SOUND OPTION WHICH MANY STATES ADOPT. THIS WAS CONFIRMED IN AN EMAIL TO OSSE FROM CTB MCGRAW-HILL (THE DISTRICT’S TEST VENDOR) FROM SEPTEMBER 6, 2013:

“SOME STATES OR JURISDICTIONS CHOOSE TO RESET THE TEST SCALE AND CUT SCORES WHEN TESTS ARE BUILT TO MEASURE NEW CURRICULUMS. OTHERS, BECAUSE OF THE FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR LONGITUDINAL COMPARISONS OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, CHOOSE TO MAINTAIN THEIR HISTORIC SCALES AND CUT SCORES TO SUPPORT THE FEDERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.”



IN THE CASE OF THE DISTRICT, PRESERVING COMPARABILITY IS NOT ONLY IMPORTANT FOR FEDERAL COMPLIANCE BUT IS ALSO AN INTEGRAL COMPONENT OF THE DISTRICT'S ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS. CURRENTLY, OSSE'S ACCOUNTABILITY CLASSIFICATIONS UNDER THE ESEA WAIVER ARE BASED IN PART ON GROWTH IN PROFICIENCY LEVELS. THIS MEANS THAT IF WE WERE TO SET A NEW BAR, WHICH WOULD PREVENT US TO MEASURE GROWTH IN PROFICIENCY LEVELS FROM ONE YEAR TO THE NEXT, WE WOULD HAVE TO WAIVE OR REVISE OUR ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM. EITHER OF THESE OPTIONS WOULD HAVE REQUIRED AN AMENDMENT TO OUR ESEA WAIVER.

ADDITIONALLY, THE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD SIMILARLY USES GROWTH IN PROFICIENCY LEVELS WITHIN THEIR PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK AND THEREFORE WOULD NEED TO HAVE CREATED AN ALTERNATIVE APPROACH FOR THIS YEAR.

LASTLY, SEVERAL TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEMS THAT ARE BASED, AT LEAST IN PART, ON VALUE ADDED MEASURES WOULD HAVE ALSO BEEN UNDERMINED OR, AT THE VERY LEAST, SIGNIFICANTLY COMPLICATED. FOR THESE EXACT REASONS, OSSE HAS ALREADY BEGUN WORKING WITH ALL OF THESE PARTNERS ON THESE ISSUES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PARCC IN SY14/15 WHEN WE WILL BE ADOPTING A NEW, MORE RIGOROUS, NATIONALLY RESEARCHED AND SHARED PERFORMANCE STANDARD.



IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT WHEN OTHER STATES, SUCH AS NEW YORK OR KENTUCKY, HAVE ADOPTED NEW PERFORMANCE STANDARDS, THEY HAVE SOFTENED OR WAIVED THEIR RELEVANT ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS AS ACKNOWLEDGEMENT THAT THEY WERE CREATING A NEW BASELINE.

I WOULD LIKE TO TAKE A MOMENT TO CLEAR UP SOME CONFUSION REGARDING THE ABILITY TO COMPARE RESULTS ACROSS YEARS. IF OSSE WERE TO HAVE ADOPTED THE ALTERNATIVE CUT SCORES, PROFICIENCY LEVELS WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN COMPARABLE OVER THE YEARS. THIS WAS CONFIRMED IN AN EMAIL FROM CTB ON JUNE 18, 2013:

“IF NEW CUTS WERE APPLIED TO THIS YEAR, WE COULD NOT COMPARE THIS YEAR PERCENTAGE OF EACH PERFORMANCE LEVEL TO LAST YEAR DIRECTLY BECAUSE OF CUT SCORE CHANGES OR TEST STANDARD CHANGES.”

IN THE SAME EMAIL THEY GO ON TO EXPLAIN THAT BECAUSE THE SCALE SCORES REMAIN THE SAME, ONE COULD COMPARE THE AVERAGE SCALE SCORES FROM YEAR TO YEAR OR USE THE NEW CUT SCORES TO RETROACTIVELY REVIEW THE PREVIOUS YEAR’S RESULTS. HOWEVER, THESE APPROACHES AT COMPARISON WOULD NOT BE SUFFICIENT TO BE USED WITH OUR ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS OR TO COMPLY WITH OUR FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS.

ON THE OTHER HAND, KEEPING THE CUT SCORES CONSTANT, DESPITE THE SHIFTS IN CONTENT, DOES ALLOW FOR DIRECT COMPARABILITY THROUGH THE LINKING PROCESS. THIS TOO HAS BEEN CORROBORATED BY CTB IN AN EMAIL SENT ON SEPTEMBER 6, 2012:



“DURING THE TRANSITION TO THE COMMON CORE, THE TEST FRAMEWORKS, TEST SPECIFICATION, AND IN SOME CASES TEST DIFFICULTY CHANGED. WHEN SUCH CHANGES OCCUR, THE TERM “LINKING” IS USED IN PLACE OF “EQUATING” TO SIGNIFY POTENTIAL DIFFERENCES IN THE MEANING OF THE TEST SCORES. ALTHOUGH THE TECHNICAL PROCESS TO PERFORM THE LINKING OR EQUATING IS THE SAME, THE MEANING OF THE TEST SCORES MAY BE DIFFERENT. FOLLOWING STRICT PSYCHOMETRIC TERMINOLOGY, FOR DC CAS THE PRE- AND POST-COMMON CORE SCALE SCORES ARE NOT “EQUIVALENT AND INTERCHANGEABLE;” RATHER, THE TECHNICAL TERM IS THAT SCORES ARE “COMPARABLE.” POLICYMAKERS ARE ABLE TO SEE RELATIVE COMPARISONS REGARDING HOW STUDENTS PERFORM FROM YEAR TO YEAR; HOWEVER, THE CONTENT UNDERLYING THOSE COMPARISONS HAS CHANGED AS ITEMS ARE CREATED TO ALIGN TO THE COMMON CORE STANDARDS.”

WHEN CONDUCTING THE LINKING PROCESS, INDUSTRY STANDARDS DICTATE THAT TO HAVE A LOW STANDARD OF ERROR, THE TEST SHOULD BE MADE UP OF AT LEAST 20% ANCHOR ITEMS, WHICH ARE ITEMS THAT HAVE BEEN USED ON PREVIOUS YEARS TESTS. FOR THE SY 12/13 DC CAS, THE GRADE LEVEL WITH THE LOWEST PERCENT OF ANCHOR ITEMS WAS 10TH GRADE MATH, WITH 34.5% OF ANCHOR ITEMS. THE GRADE LEVELS WITH THE HIGHEST AMOUNT OF ANCHOR ITEMS WAS 3RD AND 4TH GRADE MATH, WHICH BOTH HAD 41.7% OF ANCHOR ITEMS. THIS SHOWS THAT THE LINKING PROCESS AT EVERY GRADE LEVEL FAR EXCEEDED THE MINIMUM THRESHOLD, AND THEREFORE THE RESULTING COMPARABILITY HAS A VERY LOW STANDARD OF ERROR.



CUT SCORE REVIEW

ON AUGUST 22, 2011, CTB SENT OSSE'S DIRECTOR OF ASSESSMENTS A MEMO REGARDING THEIR RECOMMENDATION TO CONDUCT A CUT SCORE REVIEW. THIS RECOMMENDATION IS IN RESPONSE TO THE CONTENT SHIFTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE TRANSITION TO THE COMMON CORE CONTENT STANDARDS. AT THAT TIME, THE DIRECTOR OF ASSESSMENTS AND THE ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION FOLLOWED THIS RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVED CTB'S FACILITATION OF A STANDARD SETTING REVIEW. THIS DECISION WAS MADE WITHOUT REVIEW BY OSSE'S LEADERSHIP AND WITHOUT REGARD OR AWARENESS OF THE FEDERAL COMMITMENTS OSSE HAD MADE, OR THE IMPLICATIONS OF THE LACK OF COMPARABILITY ON THE DISTRICT'S ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS. IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT BOTH OF THESE EMPLOYEES HAVE SINCE BEEN SEPARATED FROM THE AGENCY.

BETWEEN AUGUST 13 – 17, 2012, CTB CONDUCTS THE STANDARD SETTING REVIEW BY PULLING TOGETHER SEVERAL DOZEN TEACHERS TO REVIEW THE CONTENT AND RECOMMEND NEW CUT SCORES.

THIS IS ANOTHER AREA WHERE CONFUSION HAS ARISEN REGARDING THE SPECIFICS OF THIS PROCESS. IT HAS BEEN SAID THAT OSSE REJECTED THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF 120 TEACHERS THAT WERE INVOLVED IN THE STANDARD SETTING PROCESS. HOWEVER, OF THE 120 TEACHERS CITED, 25 WERE INVOLVED WITH THE CUT SCORES FOR THE 2ND GRADE READING AND MATH TEST, 21 TEACHERS WERE INVOLVED WITH THE COMPOSITION STANDARDS, AND AT LEAST FOUR WERE INVOLVED WITH THE 9TH GRADE READING CUT SCORE REVIEW.





SINCE, AT THAT POINT, THESE WERE ALL NEW TESTS, THERE WERE NO CONCERNS RELATED TO MAINTAINING COMPARABILITY WITH PREVIOUS TESTS SO THESE RECOMMENDATIONS WERE ALL ADOPTED AND HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED. REGARDING THE 2013 CUT SCORE REVIEW FOR MATH, THERE WERE A TOTAL OF 32 TEACHERS AND OSSE'S DIRECTOR OF ASSESSMENTS INVOLVED; HOWEVER, ONLY SIX OF THE TEACHERS WERE INVOLVED WITH THE RECOMMENDATIONS, THE OTHERS WERE INVOLVED ONLY IN THE CONTENT SORTING PROCESS. THEREFORE, WHILE IT IS ACCURATE TO SAY THAT THERE WERE OVER 100 TEACHERS INVOLVED IN THIS PROCESS, THE FACT IS THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS THAT OSSE ULTIMATELY OPTED AGAINST WERE PRODUCED BY 41 TEACHERS OVER TWO YEARS (35 FOR READING IN 2012 AND 6 FOR MATH IN 2013).

AFTER THE 2012 READING CUT SCORE REVIEW, OSSE ADOPTED THE RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO THE READING CUT SCORES (WHICH CREATED A LOWER BAR FOR PROFICIENCY) AND INCLUDED THE NEW CUT SCORES IN THE SY11/12 DC CAS TECHNICAL REPORT. THIS DECISION, AGAIN, WAS NOT COMMUNICATED TO OSSE LEADERSHIP AND DID NOT COMPORT WITH OSSE'S STATED POLICY OF PRIORITIZING COMPARABILITY OF SCORES UNTIL THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PARCC.

2013 DETERMINATION TO REAFFIRM COMPARABILITY

ON THURSDAY, JUNE 13, 2013 THERE WAS A LEADERSHIP CHANGE IN OSSE'S DIVISION OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AND THE ASSESSMENT



DIVISION WAS MERGED WITH OSSE'S OFFICE OF DATA MANAGEMENT, WHICH IS LED BY JEFFREY NOEL. MR. NOEL IS NOTIFIED THAT ON THE FOLLOWING MONDAY, JUNE 17, A STANDARD SETTING REVIEW FOR MATH IS BEING FACILITATED BY CTB.

AT THE MATH STANDARD SETTING, A GROUP OF SIX TEACHERS REVIEWED MULTIPLE CUT SCORE SCENARIOS AND THE RELATED IMPACT DATA AND DEVELOPED A RECOMMENDATION FOR ALTERNATIVE CUT SCORES FOR MATH IN SY12-13. AS A RESULT OF THE STANDARD SETTING RECOMMENDATIONS, CTB PRESENTED MR. NOEL WITH A MEMO OUTLINING THE TWO OPTIONS – MAINTAINING COMPARABILITY OR ADOPTING THE NEWLY GENERATED CUT SCORES - INCLUDING IMPACT DATA OF THE OPTIONS. MR. NOEL THEN CONFIRMS WITH CTB THAT CHANGING THE CUT SCORES WOULD ELIMINATE DIRECT COMPARABILITY WITH PREVIOUS YEARS.

HAVING A BROADER UNDERSTANDING OF THE IMPLICATIONS OF NOT MAINTAINING COMPARABILITY AND KNOWING THAT NONE OF THE WORK NECESSARY TO PREPARE OSSE'S ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM, PCSB'S PMF, OR ANY LEAS' TEACHER EVALUATION SYSTEMS, FOR SUCH A SHIFT HAS TAKEN PLACE, MR. NOEL RECOMMENDS TO OSSE'S CHIEF OF STAFF, JOSE ALVAREZ, THAT OSSE MAINTAIN COMPARABILITY. HAVING AGREED WITH THE RECOMMENDATION, MR. ALVAREZ THEN INSTRUCTED MR. NOEL TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE DECISION AT WHICH POINT MR. NOEL VERBALLY CONFIRMS THE DECISION TO CTB ON THEIR WEEKLY DC CAS CONFERENCE CALL WHICH IS ATTENDED ONLY BY OSSE STAFF AND CTB STAFF.



BOTH THE MEDIA AND THE COUNCIL HAVE FOCUSED ON THE FACT THAT THIS DECISION WAS MADE BY OSSE SHORTLY AFTER RECEIVING THE IMPACT DATA REGARDING THE OPTIONS, HOWEVER IT NEEDS TO BE MADE CLEAR THAT THIS INCLUSION OF IMPACT DATA IS ALWAYS PART OF THE STANDARD SETTING REVIEW PROCESS NATIONWIDE. MORE IMPORTANTLY, NOT ONCE HAS ANYONE ACKNOWLEDGED THE OTHER PRECIPITATING FACTOR THAT ACTUALLY DETERMINED OSSE'S DECISION AND THAT ALSO HAPPENED WITHIN DAYS OF THE DECISION. THIS IS THE FACT THAT MR. NOEL TOOK OVER THE ASSESSMENT DEPARTMENT AND RECOGNIZED THE SIGNIFICANT CONCERNS RELATED TO THE LOSS OF COMPARABILITY, THE RELATED FEDERAL COMPLIANCE ISSUES, AND THE LACK OF ANY PREPARATION THAT WOULD BE NEEDED TO ENSURE THAT THIS TRANSITION WOULD BE DONE IN A TRANSPARENT WAY, AND THAT ALL STAKEHOLDERS UNDERSTOOD THE IMPLICATIONS. FOR THIS REASON, WE NOT ONLY CONTINUE TO SUPPORT MR. NOEL'S RECOMMENDATION BUT WE FEEL THAT HIS LEADERSHIP AND SWIFT ACTION DURING A TRANSITION TIME WITHIN OSSE SHOULD BE COMMENDED.

ONCE THIS DECISION WAS MADE, CTB USED THE CUT SCORES TO FINISH GRADING THE DC CAS AND PROVIDED OSSE FINAL PRE-APPEALS DC CAS SCORES ON JULY 2. OSSE THEN ANALYZED THE RESULTS AND PROVIDED LEAS A TEN DAY WINDOW, FROM JULY 9 TO 19, TO REVIEW AND APPEAL THEIR INDIVIDUAL RESULTS. THEN BETWEEN JULY 22 AND 26, OSSE REVIEWED APPEALS AND FINALIZED THE POST APPEALS RESULTS. DURING THIS SAME TIME, ON JULY 23, OSSE, FOR THE FIRST



TIME, MET WITH THE MAYOR, THE DEPUTY MAYOR FOR EDUCATION, CHANCELLOR HENDERSON, AND MR. PEARSON FROM THE PUBLIC CHARTER SCHOOL BOARD TO REVIEW THE PRE-APPEALS RESULTS. THEN, ON JULY 26, THE FINAL POST-APPEALS RESULTS WERE RELEASED TO LEAS UNDER AN EMBARGO UNTIL THE OFFICIAL RELEASE ON JULY 30, 2013.

CONCLUSION

IN CONCLUSION, AGAIN WE APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO CLARIFY THE DETAILS REGARDING THIS VERY COMPLEX PROCESS AND WE HAVE BROUGHT CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN OSSE AND THE CTB, AS WELL AS INTER-AGENCY EMAILS AND CORRESPONDENCE, MEETING AGENDAS, AND REPORTS SO THAT WE MAY RESPOND TO ANY QUESTIONS YOU MAY HAVE. THANK YOU MR. CHAIRMAN.



DC CAS Timeline

July 22, 2010	Common Core Standard Adoption
August 24, 2010	Race to the Top Application Approval – including a commitment to realign assessments to the common core and maintain comparability of performance standards
May 10, 2010	OSSE Joins PARCC Consortium for next generation assessment
June 2, 2011	Charter school meeting regarding common core standards and PARCC. Commitment to avoid excessive changes to the difficulty prior to adoption of PARCC.
August 22 2011	CTB produces a memo on blueprints and comparability with the move to common core. CTB recommends a cut score review as a part of the change to common core.
April 2012	OSSE administers common core aligned reading assessment.
August 13-17 2012	CTB facilitates Cut Score Review.
July 26, 2012	D.C. reports assessment results from the 2011-12 assessment cycle.
September 2012	OSSE adopts new cut scores for reading.
September 12, 2012	Director of Assessments is separated from the agency.
December 2012	OSSE receives DC CAS 2012 Technical Report which includes new reading cut scores.
June 6, 2013	OSSE receives a file from CTB that had the names of all students who took the test and their raw scores; however, it did not include scaled scores and proficiency levels because linking had not yet been completed. Without scaled scores and cut scores, raw scores mean nothing.
June 12, 2013	Director of Assessments receives a file from CTB with preliminary aggregate DC CAS results.
June 13, 2013	Assistant Superintendent for Elementary and Secondary Education removed from role.
June 13, 2013	Assessment Division merged with Division of Data Management (Jeff Noel).
June 14, 2013	DC CAS demographic verification by LEAs.
June 17, 2013	A group of six teachers reviews impact data and develops a recommendation for alternative cut scores for SY12-13 Math. CTB produces a memo with two options – maintaining comparability and adopting the newly generated cut scores including impact data of options.
June 19, 2013	Director of Data Management recommends maintaining comparability to OSSE Chief of Staff. COS agrees with recommendation. OSSE receives agenda for weekly DC CAS conference call including requirement to confirm final decision no later than 6/20/13.
June 20, 2013 1PM	OSSE verbally confirms to CTB on weekly DC CAS conference call a decision to implement comparable cut scores rather than the recommendations of the teacher group.





June 20, 2013 2:15PM	OSSE commits in writing that it will maintain comparable cut scores for Reading and Math.
July 2, 2013	OSSE Receives DC CAS results including scale score and proficiency levels.
July 3, 2013	Director of Assessments separated from the agency.
July 9, 2013	OSSE provides raw data and pre-appeals data summary to LEAs.
July 10-19, 2013	LEA review of pre-appeal results.
July 22-26, 2013	OSSE reviews LEA appeals and produces final post-appeals data set.
July 23, 2013	OSSE briefs key education partners, Mayor Gray, Deputy Mayor Smith, Chancellor Henderson, and Mr. Pearson from PCSB.
July 26, 2013	Final post-appeals DC CAS data released to LEAs under embargo.
July 29, 2013	OSSE briefs State Board of Education.
July 30, 2013	D.C. Releases DC CAS results.