

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
HOUSE EDUCATION STANDING COMMITTEE**

April 26, 2024

8:04 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Jamie Allard, Co-Chair
Representative Justin Ruffridge, Co-Chair
Representative Mike Prax
Representative CJ McCormick
Representative Tom McKay
Representative Rebecca Himschoot
Representative Andi Story

MEMBERS ABSENT

All members present

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

CS FOR SENATE BILL NO. 29(FIN)

"An Act relating to civics education, civics assessments, and secondary school graduation requirements; and providing for an effective date."

- MOVED HCS CSSB 29(EDC) OUT OF COMMITTEE

PRESENTATION(S): EDUCATION ASSESSMENT RESULTS

- HEARD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

BILL: SB 29

SHORT TITLE: CIVICS EDUCATION

SPONSOR(S): SENATOR(S) STEVENS

01/18/23	(S)	PREFILE RELEASED 1/9/23
01/18/23	(S)	READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
01/18/23	(S)	EDC, FIN
02/22/23	(S)	EDC AT 3:30 PM BELTZ 105 (TSBldg)
02/22/23	(S)	Heard & Held
02/22/23	(S)	MINUTE(EDC)
03/06/23	(S)	EDC AT 3:30 PM BELTZ 105 (TSBldg)
03/06/23	(S)	Moved CSSB 29(EDC) Out of Committee
03/06/23	(S)	MINUTE(EDC)

03/08/23 (S) EDC RPT CS 5DP SAME TITLE
03/08/23 (S) DP: TOBIN, BJORKMAN, GRAY-JACKSON,
STEVENS, KIEHL
03/14/23 (S) FIN AT 9:00 AM SENATE FINANCE 532
03/14/23 (S) Heard & Held
03/14/23 (S) MINUTE(FIN)
04/18/23 (S) FIN AT 9:00 AM SENATE FINANCE 532
04/18/23 (S) Moved CSSB 29(FIN) Out of Committee
04/18/23 (S) MINUTE(FIN)
04/24/23 (S) FIN RPT CS 4DP 1NR NEW TITLE
04/24/23 (S) DP: STEDMAN, KIEHL, MERRICK, BISHOP
04/24/23 (S) NR: OLSON
05/05/23 (S) TRANSMITTED TO (H)
05/05/23 (S) VERSION: CSSB 29(FIN)
05/08/23 (H) READ THE FIRST TIME - REFERRALS
05/08/23 (H) EDC, FIN
03/27/24 (H) EDC AT 8:00 AM DAVIS 106
03/27/24 (H) Heard & Held
03/27/24 (H) MINUTE(EDC)
04/26/24 (H) EDC AT 8:00 AM DAVIS 106

WITNESS REGISTER

TIM LAMKIN, Staff
Senator Gary Stevens
Alaska State Legislature
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Presented the changes to CSSB 29(FIN), proposed under the House committee substitute, Version Y, on behalf of Senator Stevens, prime sponsor.

PAUL FUHS, representing self
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified in support of SB 29.

ALEX KOPLIN, representing self
Homer, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Testified during the hearing on SB 29.

KATHY MOFFITT, Director
Division of Innovation and Education Excellence
Department of Education and Early Development
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Co-presented a PowerPoint, titled "Education Assessment Results."

KELLY MANNING, Deputy Director

Division of Innovation and Education Excellence
Department of Education and Early Development
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Co-presented a PowerPoint, titled "Education Assessment Results."

ELIZABETH GRENINGER, Assessments Administrator
Division of Innovation and Education Excellence
Department of Education and Early Development
Juneau, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Co-presented a PowerPoint, titled "Education Assessment Results."

ACTION NARRATIVE

[8:04:12 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR JAMIE ALLARD called the House Education Standing Committee meeting to order at 8:04 a.m. Representatives Prax, McCormick, McKay, Himschoot, Story, Allard, and Ruffridge were present at the call to order.

SB 29-CIVICS EDUCATION

[8:05:27 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR ALLARD announced that the first order of business would be CS FOR SENATE BILL NO. 29(FIN), "An Act relating to civics education, civics assessments, and secondary school graduation requirements; and providing for an effective date."

[8:06:24 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE moved to adopt the proposed House committee substitute (HCS) for CSSB 29(FIN), Version 33-LS0246\Y, A. Radford/Bergerud, 4/23/24, as the working document.

[8:06:38 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 8:06 a.m. to 8:07 a.m.

[8:07:16 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE objected for the purpose of discussion.

[8:07:57 AM](#)

TIM LAMKIN, Staff, Senator Gary Stevens, Alaska State Legislature, presented the changes to CSSB 29(FIN), proposed under the House committee substitute, Version Y, on behalf of Senator Stevens, prime sponsor. He noted that the four changes in the House committee substitute (CS) incorporated amendments previously discussed with each committee member and their staff.

[8:10:09 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR ALLARD asked whether committee members had comments before public testimony.

[8:10:18 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT observed that the fiscal note was from 2023 and questioned whether it was still current.

MR. LAMKIN affirmed that the fiscal note should be consistent due to the bill not having much activity since last year; however, Version Y could possibly result in an adjusted fiscal note.

[8:11:02 AM](#)

The committee took a brief at-ease at 8:11 a.m.

[8:11:26 AM](#)

MR. LAMKIN, in response to further request for clarification from Representative Himschoot, said the most current fiscal note was dated January 10, 2024, and reflected a \$276,000 fiscal note, which was consistent with what was reported out of the Senate Finance Committee last year.

[8:12:10 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STORY sought clarity regarding a requirement under Version Y regarding "either has achieved a passing score" or "completed a project-based assessment" when she observed from reading the bill language that it seemed like "you must do all" rather than "either/or."

MR. LAMKIN pointed out that page 61, subsection (c), of the Manual of Legislative Drafting, published by Legislative Legal Services, referenced the use of words and phrases such as "and/or" as being too ambiguous.

REPRESENTATIVE STORY stated that she would like the "memo on that" when Mr. Lamkin can provide it.

[8:13:53 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 8:13 a.m. to 8:14 a.m.

[8:14:59 AM](#)

MR. LAMKIN confirmed that the document is available on the Alaska State Legislature website under publications.

[8:15:50 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE removed his objection to the motion to adopt the proposed House committee substitute (HCS) for CSSB 29(FIN), Version 33-LS0246\Y, A. Radford/Bergerud, 4/23/24, as the working document. There being no further objection, Version Y was before the committee.

[8:16:23 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 8:16 a.m. to 8:22 a.m.

[8:22:17 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR ALLARD opened public testimony on SB 29.

[8:22:44 AM](#)

PAUL FUHS, representing self, testified in support of SB 29. He stressed his belief that it was important for kids to understand the civic structure of the state and what it means to them. He noted the importance of all resources in the state and how they affect the future should also be understood. He said the information children are getting currently is not correct; recent polls showed that children are misinformed.

[8:26:13 AM](#)

ALEX KOPLIN, representing self, stated that he was still trying to figure out the final bill and that he supported civics education but had concern with the amendments. He said he supported the alternatives proposed, but in some areas, he questioned why the proposals would be in a civics bill and not some other area. He shared his concern that he did not think he could get behind the bill until he saw a final version.

[8:28:26 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR ALLARD, after ascertaining no one else wished to testify, closed public testimony on SB 29.

[8:28:41 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX moved to adopt Conceptual Amendment 1 to Version Y.

REPRESENTATIVE MCKAY objected for purpose of discussion.

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX explained that Conceptual Amendment 1 proposes a title change related to environmental and sustainable resource development education and inserts a new section on page 2, line 11. He further explained that it adds the words "environmental and sustainable development" so that sustainable development is added into the education curriculum as Mr. Fuhs had alluded to in his testimony.

[8:30:36 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCCORMICK provided his perspective on the amendment and reflected on a comment made by Mr. Fuhs about a lack of resource development leading to boarding schools. He added that the children who were forcibly removed from their homes to be put in boarding schools were used for unpaid labor in resource development, which he said he wanted to correct for the record. He related that he appreciated the sentiment in the amendment, but in the scope of civics, he opined it "flies way out of the lane" of what a civics education should be trying to accomplish. He concluded that he appreciated the dialogue but would not support the amendment.

[8:32:13 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STORY referred to the fiscal note to help develop civics education, but there was another topic presented with Version Y which she said may add to the existing fiscal note. She suggested to consider another bill in another session due to a bigger fiscal note and not much more room in the budget. She confirmed she did not support the amendment.

[8:33:07 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT referenced her time as a teacher and that she was involved in an environmental literacy program which involved natural resources. She said she saw a connection to civics due to the word "history" being used, and although she saw value, she said she would welcome a different bill on a different day and that it strays from the original intent of the civics education bill. She said she supported the amendment but opined it does not fit with "what we are doing today."

[8:34:37 AM](#)

MR. LAMKIN said he appreciated the dialogue and shared with the committee that Senator Stevens had worked on the subject matter [in the bill] extensively. Mr. Lamkin gave a definition of civics from a "Google" search and said it ducktails with public policy which included things such as natural resource development. It is, however, a departure from the bill and he spoke on behalf of Senator Stevens that he would not support the amendment.

[8:36:06 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX said he appreciated recent comments and that the CS could be included in another bill; therefore, he [moved] to withdraw the Conceptual Amendment 1. [There being no objection, it was so ordered.]

[8:37:17 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX moved to adopt Conceptual Amendment 2, to delete lines 1 through 11 on page 2 of Version Y.

REPRESENTATIVE MCKAY objected for the purpose of discussion.

[8:38:24 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX acknowledged previous comments made that the bill is a civics bill and not a history bill. The removal of lines 1 through 11 would take out the study of other systems of government that are listed. He noted the importance of the systems, but he opined that they belong in a history curriculum as opposed to a civics curriculum.

[8:40:08 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR ALLARD offered her support to include all areas of the curriculum; therefore, she opposed Conceptual Amendment 2.

[8:41:05 AM](#)

MR. LAMKIN reiterated that civics by definition is a study of the rights, privileges, and duties of citizenship within a system of government. He said Senator Stevens supported maintaining the language in the bill.

[8:41:51 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCCORMICK asked why other systems of government are not included.

MR. LAMKIN added that [subsection (b), in Section 1 of Version Y] is a short list that could be a long list, and in [subsection (a)] the language was crafted to include comparative systems of government.

REPRESENTATIVE MCKAY removed his objection to the motion to adopt Conceptual Amendment 2.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT objected.

REPRESENTATIVE MCKAY expounded that he is a no-vote because the bill sponsor prefers to leave the section in.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT commented that the more the bill is expanded, the greater the burden on schools to make sure that they are staying within the exact letter of the law. She offered her support for the removal of the language.

REPRESENTATIVE STORY mirrored what Mr. Lamkin said, that on page 1, line 7, there are comparative systems of government included, therefore, it does not need to be "spelled out" in an amendment.

[8:45:15 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 8:45 a.m. to 8:46 a.m.

[8:46:27 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT withdrew her objection.

[8:47:06 AM](#)

A roll call vote was taken. Representatives Prax and McCormick voted in favor of Conceptual Amendment 2 to Version Y of SB 29.

Representatives Story, McKay, Himschoot, and Allard voted against it. Therefore, Conceptual Amendment 2 failed by a vote of 2-4.

[8:47:55 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 8:47 a.m. to 8:50 a.m.

[8:50:04 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE MCKAY moved to report HCS CSSB 29(FIN), Version 33-LS0246\Y, A. Radford/Bergerud, 4/23/24, out of committee with individual recommendations and the accompanying fiscal notes. There being no objection, HCS CSSB 29(EDC) was reported out of the House Education Standing Committee.

[8:50:43 AM](#)

The committee took an at-ease from 8:50 a.m. to 8:56 a.m.

PRESENTATION(S): Education Assessment Results

[8:56:08 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR ALLARD announced that the final order of business would be the Education Assessment Results presentation.

[8:56:56 AM](#)

KATHY MOFFITT, Director, Division of Innovation and Education Excellence, Department of Education and Early Development (DEED), informed the committee that she would turn the presentation over to Ms. Manning but that she would be available for questions any time.

[8:57:19 AM](#)

KELLY MANNING, Deputy Director, Division of Innovation and Education Excellence, Department of Education and Early Development, as co-presenter, began a PowerPoint [hardcopy included in the committee packet] to share the 2022 to 2023 assessment results. On slide 2, titled "Mission, Vision, and Purpose," she highlighted that the assessment team focused on the purpose of DEED, which is to provide information, resources, and leadership to support an excellent education for every student every day. The team serves as support and technical assistance to districts in administering statewide assessments,

she explained. She moved to slide 3, titled "Strategic Priorities: Alaska's Education Challenge," and illustrated that the assessment information the department gleans is helpful in providing guidance and support to districts in how to address the five shared priorities, in particular, areas that are informed by the academic results from the assessments. She showed slides 4 through 7, titled "Statewide Assessments," which featured various assessments.

[9:01:23 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE STORY drew attention to slide 5, which referred to a "sample of students" under the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and asked for an elaboration about the students who were included. She further asked whether the Alaska Developmental Profile (ADP) had been received this year.

MS. MANNING confirmed that the department had administered the ADP and provided a broader report to the legislature and that she would follow up. She directed Representative Story's first inquiry to Ms. Greninger.

[9:02:37 AM](#)

ELIZABETH GRENINGER, Assessments Administrator, Division of Innovation and Education Excellence, Department of Education and Early Development, addressed Representative Story and explained that NAEP is not administered to a broad range of students in the state; it is a sample that selects specific districts that are chosen by each administration of NAEP, and students within those districts are sampled from that selection. She said the parameters could be provided at a later date.

[9:03:36 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT observed that NAEP also tested in science, and she asked why.

MS. MANNING replied that DEED had looked at the science NAEP assessment and began looking at how to assess students differently and evaluate their ability to apply their skills. She further explained the department chose not to continue to assess in science, but to evaluate from time to time.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT commented that the state should be participating in opportunities to know how much kids know in science to strengthen the state.

CO-CHAIR ALLARD agreed.

[9:05:11 AM](#)

MS. MANNING continued to expound on assessments, and she explained that DEED implemented the newest assessment for the state which is the screener of literacy skills called Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS), as shown on slide 7. She said in almost all districts there is an option to use a different screener, but most have used the statewide provided screener, which is DIBELS.

CO-CHAIR ALLARD circled back to Representative Himschoot's comment on the science assessment and asked her to elaborate.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT clarified that NAEP offered a science assessment, and then there is the Alaska state science assessment. She said NAEP is a national test.

MS. MANNING restated an earlier discussion provided by Ms. Greninger.

[9:07:37 AM](#)

MS. GRENINGER said that the only additional piece she would add is that some of the decisions were predated to her time at the department and she noted going over feedback considering the statewide perspective and what is required of districts and students.

CO-CHAIR ALLARD offered her understanding that if there is too much time spent testing, then students are actually not learning, and this is something that must be worked through.

[9:09:17 AM](#)

MS. MANNING advanced to slide 8, which featured AK STAR, summative assessment and MAP Growth, interim assessment. She highlighted the image of the umbrella on the slide addressing the new system incorporating the two. The new system reduces testing time while providing DEED with additional data, she said.

REPRESENTATIVE STORY acknowledged that that evolved through much hard work from DEED and was quite an accomplishment, and now Alaska is being "looked at."

[9:12:47 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX asked whether the goal of the tests was to compare school performance and district performance to national standards.

MS. MANNING replied that each assessment has a different purpose, and they are being looked at to how Alaska compares to national students. She expounded on AK STAR and the numbers of different ways to look at data and compare student performance.

[9:15:09 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX said he brought it up because it is difficult for parents who are not day to day immersed in what DEED is trying to accomplish, and whether parents should be reaching out to other entities to help figure out what they are supposed to learn or do in response to the "information out there."

MS. MOFFIT commented that Representative Prax had good points and there is a lot of work being done to address his concerns. She said that Ms. Greninger and her team have elaborated on information that is available on DEED's website, and in addition, there are district test coordinators who are the conduit from the work her team is doing down to the districts.

[9:17:41 AM](#)

MS. GRENINGER added that her favorite part of the work that DEED is doing is assessment literacy, which is a term intended to help all states, families, students, and policy makers understand what assessments are intended to do and the results they produce. She provided examples of communications to families and that a "tool kit" has been developed, and she assured that DEED is trying to be as transparent as possible with families. She spoke briefly to the reporting to stakeholders.

[9:20:53 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT offered her belief that the fundamental function of NAEP is to explore - at a federal level - where funding needs to be directed to support students who might be underachieving as compared to other students.

MS. MANNING said she agreed that was accurate, and she added that NAEP also provides information about subgroups and their performance across national standards.

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT expressed that it would be beneficial to talk about summative, formative, and interim [assessments]. Families need to understand what assessments are about, she opined.

[9:23:33 AM](#)

MS. GRENINGER explained that formative assessments are those that happen in real-time in the classroom and include what teachers are doing day to day. Interim assessments include MAP Growth across the state done in key points during the instructional period. The summative assessment is used at the end of a period of instruction, such as at the end of the school year, she said. She shared that she could follow up with additional webinar resources and documents on DEED's website and could work with vendors to develop future presentations.

[9:27:55 AM](#)

MS. MANNING advanced to slide 9, titled "AK STAR Development Process," which read as follows [original punctuation provided]:

Spring 2022: Administered AK STAR and MAP Growth as two separate assessments. Data supported alignment and setting of initial cut scores.

Spring 2023: Administered AK STAR and MAP Growth as one aligned assessment. Data used for validation study of initial cut scores.

Summer 2023: Policy Review Committee evaluated validation study findings and refined the cut scores.

Winter 2024: State Board of Education approved final cut scores.

[9:31:06 AM](#)

MS. MOFFITT acknowledged that Ms. Manning described the processes very well, and she further defined that the cut scores are the scale scores that sit between the level of proficiency, and not an exact science, but take a lot of work. She said after the validation study, it was determined that the cut

scores warranted further review. She proceeded to slide 10 which showed an AK STAR Linking Study from Sept 2022 with a MAP Growth Reading chart. She moved through slides 11 through 17, which featured the case of "Andy," a third grader. She explained averages and ranges of growth for students and how it related to cut scores. She said therein lies the need for the policy review and she recognized that the charts are "busy," and one piece of data at a time could not be done.

[9:35:46 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR ALLARD asked whether standards had been lowered.

MS. MOFFITT affirmed that standards were not lowered but measured to where "we need to be."

[Co-Chair Allard welcomed Co-Chair Ruffridge back to the meeting.]

[9:36:54 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PRAX asked for more clarity for understanding the materials and stated that he was unclear on the explanations provided.

MS. MOFFITT replied that DEED had to share the information with all superintendents and stakeholders across the state. She pointed out an "excellent video" that explained the adjustment to the cut scores in relation to the perception that standards were being lowered.

CO-CHAIR ALLARD requested that the video be shown to the committee in the future with a presentation to follow.

[9:39:03 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT opined that the graph report for parents out of MAP Growth was helpful in the way it was designed. She stated that it was helpful for people to have an understanding of the change in the cut scores.

MS. MOFFITT confirmed that parents love MAP Growth. She added that she would be willing to do a presentation specifically on MAP Growth.

[9:41:09 AM](#)

MS. MOFFITT quickly moved through slides 18, titled "Achievement Levels," and 19, which showed a circle graph of AK STAR English Language Arts achievement for grades three through nine.

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE sought to understand whether the pie charts are with the new cut of the scores.

MS. MOFFITT confirmed that was correct.

[9:42:11 AM](#)

MS MOFFITT proceeded to slide 20, which showed a line graph of what was featured on the previous slide, but by grade level. She expounded upon the percentages on the graph.

REPRESENTATIVE STORY referred to the requirements in the Alaska Reads Act, that parents need to decide if they want to promote their child or not, and she sought clarity on what the 72 percent on the chart represented as for supports.

MS. MOFFITT responded that as the year progresses, what guides the work throughout the year is the interim assessment, DIBEL. She explained that it is used as a screening tool, and based on that, the individual reading improvement plans are written. She said the chart represents a baseline looking for trends and what is working well or not.

[9:45:01 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE inquired whether the connection between the yearly assessments correlate with AK STAR to determine if they meet the requirements of testing criteria.

MS. MOFFITT said she appreciated the inquiry and explained that the nature of the assessments are different. DIBELs is one-minute building and measuring discreet skills, and she said there is research that the one-minute probe correlates to comprehension. She gave an example of an individual and what tools teachers use to ensure students are ready. She noted that it is DEED's baseline year.

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE asked, throughout the formative year, how many students by percentage needed individualized reading plans.

MS. MOFFITT responded that she could get back to the committee with exact numbers.

[9:48:04 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT asked what a normal expectation was for the percentage of students in the advanced range, and she further inquired whether other states have roughly 10 percent of students testing as advanced.

MS. MOFFITT replied that that is something that must be researched.

[9:49:27 AM](#)

MS. MOFFITT moved through slides 21 and 22, which continued featuring achievement level percentages for grades three through nine.

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE asked whether there is a correlation between students who are successful in reading by third grade equated with skills in, for example, mathematics.

MS. GRENINGER responded that she did not know exact numbers on the correlation in student performance; however, information gleaned through test development activity over time around the way math and science are being assessed is that there is an element in the standards that is very "reading heavy."

[9:53:46 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE referred back to previous conversation and asked Ms. Greninger what she meant by "giving students below grade-level information."

MS. GRENINGER clarified that it was specifically about the expectation for reading level. She spoke of metrics that help define the information students read and what grade level that fits at, and there is analysis that defines at each grade level what "on-grade level" reading is.

[9:56:32 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE offered his understanding that when taking a math or science proficiency exam, the reading content of that exam is written at a third-grade level when the student is in the fifth grade.

MS. GRENINGER responded that DEED is working toward ensuring that the assessment reflects the expectation that students are

not only seeing grade level reading material. She said this is an area the department is working on.

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE gave an example of when one is taking a math or science proficiency exam that the reading component of that exam is at a lower grade level, and he asked whether that was a fair statement.

MS. GRENINGER said currently it is at grade level or lower. She reiterated the efforts are to ensure it is at a grade level accessible for all students.

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE explained his question was if assessments are heavily reading focused, in general, whether success in reading results in better performance in math or science.

MS. MOFFITT replied yes, on a general level, and she offered to provide a follow-up at a later date. She further noted that presenting words to a child that they are unfamiliar with may show how a child solves problems in other subjects.

[10:01:55 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR RUFFRIDGE commented that in math and science, the words that are used matter. A child in third grade should know some of the words Ms. Moffitt used as an example. He requested the follow-up that was offered earlier.

CO-CHAIR ALLARD requested that the presenters return to continue the conversation.

[10:03:26 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE HIMSCHOOT observed that what is missing in the presentation is the history of testing in Alaska for the last decade. She spoke to prior assessments and the changes that have occurred, and she stressed that the changes cannot be overlooked.

[10:05:14 AM](#)

MS. MOFFITT quickly moved through slides 23 and 24 which represented proficiency in science in grades 5 through 8. She thanked committee members for their time and insisted that she would follow up as was noted in the discussion.

[10:06:46 AM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the House Education Standing Committee meeting was adjourned at 10:07 a.m.