

Good afternoon.

My name is (indiscernible) I work with the CV office of assessment. And as David alluded to, so we just completed a procurement process for the selection of new gifted and talented assessments for early childhood students and based on a review of two proposals we -- quest star and Pearson which is the existing vendor for gifted and talent talented, we have made a recommendation to go with quest star, for a variety of reasons.

I think the product from Pearson, while it's a good product and we would be happy to continue with it, if not for a better option, I think quest star has provided a better option for us , primarily around an ability to have a custom developed assessment for New York City.

I think the proposal from Pierson is the current assessment, which is the N-net, nag gler I nonverbal assessment, and the old set, which is verbal component of it, those are two off the shelf products, that are widely used.

And comes with a risk of prior exposure, not just here in New York City, it's been the test tests that have been used for a few years, but is also used in other districts around the country , I think that there's an ongoing risk for prior exposure, and whether or not that creates a truly level playing field for all students.

So we think a custom assessment really enhances our ability to have a gifted and talented assessment that is truly built and designed for New York City.

Should I go for more?

>> Well, I guess the question came up, I have to be honest, I called the head of CPAC today and said do you know anything about the -- about the GNT changing. And the answer that came back was no.

The last time they changed a test everybody knew In advance, that the test was going to be changed , when they brought the NNAT on.

The OLSAT is tried and true and stands the test for reliability and validity, there's not even a test design yet for quest star, or there is?

And if it is designed, and this may be more for this room, this may be a briefing, but if it is designed for us, what are we actually measuring Because are we measuring GNT, are we measuring stat, what are we actually measuring is this going to be an abstract thinking and measuring test or is this going to be who got to the local tutor fast enough to teach math and science to their kids. So I think there are a lot of unanswered questions on a program level.

>> Sure.

>> That we're being asked to vote on a contract of which we don't even know what the custom customization is going to be.

And nor does the population know, the parent population , I don't know if teachers know that this is happening.

There's sort of been murmurings around.

But in the past, we would have known this information before we would have gotten to a passage of a vote.

So I don't know where that takes us, but --

>> There are several variables that haven't been answered with this.

We've come up with them, they may not be (inaudible) with anyone, so maybe it's better to come back to the table with answers to some of the questions.

>> Well, I'm happy to try to answer them now.

>> But I don't think it's for us.

It's not for us.

It's for the larger pool who this affects.

And for you to tell me that these questions are going to be reliable?

Well, how do I know.

Did you go out and do test data, have questions been out there for three or four years, that now they're going to customize those questions for you?

>> So I think a couple of things.

So the first that I would respond to is the last time we changed the test -- to clarify, it's not a change in the gifted and talented test for this year, it's a change for the following school year.

So this test would first be administered in January of 2016.

So we would engage in the public aspect of making sure that all parents, community members, are informed of how the gifted and talented assessment would be modified, provide an opportunity for parents to see sample questions, which is similar to what we did last time the gifted and talented test was modified. So we did not in advance of the last change or on prior changes go out and say this is the test that we're considering.

And have that prior to a selection of a -- (inaudible)

>> -- and I read also that they're doing the new version, the new LSAT or new generation test testing.

-DELETE- So how do you know that this one is going to be better than that one, when that's the standard And again, what are you measuring?

>> Pierson (inaudible) is not going to be rolled out in sqaen

>> Pardon me?

>> Why is the the goal being presented so early if it's not going to be rolled out until sqaen -DELETE- Which gives affirm time for something -- until 2016 which gives ample time to be tested

>> If I could jump in I think the principle is we're engaging in a new contract to develop the test, which takes some time, they need to develop, they media to start developing test questions so they can start working on et right away.

And so you have the vendor, Pierson and quest star giving proposals to the committee, so the committee looks at both vendors and their capacity to develop tests that the committee felt would have reliability.

Quest star is not new to this.

>> No, I --

>> This is their business.

Or an important aspect of their business.

So maybe --

>> Could I just -- are they any better at developing these tests?

>> Was Pierson given the opportunity to understand what the custom test was that you're (inaudible) -- made the contract?

>> So Pierson -- both vendors were provided the opportunity to customize assessments and/or provide off the shelf assessments, and Pierson, throughout their negotiation process, came back with this is their off the shelf product It doesn't provide New York City an opportunity to review items prior to them being utilized, doesn't provide an opportunity for Pierson's catalog off the shelf product.

If an individual question is not performing well or is not exactly appropriate for a New York City (inaudible) off the shelf product it is one test that is

used for every district or (inaudible) (technical difficulties) which we think could be replaced or enhanced, some of those questions have been in use for a number of years, and we think there's an opportunity to improve the assessment offering we're providing to our students in terms of the reliability and the validity of it, so all test questions are field tested whether it's by Quest Star or by Pierson or any other vendor to establish that reliability and validity.

So Quest Star undoubtedly, as part of this contract, would go out and do a national sampling to field test every question.

We would have an opportunity to see how those items performed across demographics.

Both --- and gender, to make sure they're free of bias and level expected and providing the level of information that is needed to be able to identify students who are performing at an exceptionally high level to be eligible for a gifted and talented program here in New York City.

So we do feel 100 percent confident that the reliability and validity would be answered prior to any assessment actually being utilized, but part of that is as David alluded to, the reason why we need a long runway in order to be able to ensure that that customization is in fact solidified prior to administration.

>> I guess I agree with that as far as the timing is essential, but whether it was this month or next month, I think you've missed a major communication opportunity with this new administration. A real missed opportunity, is what I would call this.

Especially since murmurings are out there in the field that something is happening.

But to the point of Pierson, and I don't care if it's Pierson or someone else, but there is a new you product, there's the LSAT generation coming up.

>> But not for two years.

So Pierson's proposal was to continue the same OLSAT that we've been using -- going off the top of my head here, 2008?

>> OLSAT since -- I don't know, I can't remember.

>> So it's --

>> No before that, I think.

Because --

>> So 2007 -- 2007 approximately when we standardized the city-wide gifted and talented process -DELETE- So maybe prior to that individual districts, there were 32 different ways in which districts may have --

>> I had a -- 12-year-old she took the OLSAT so back in 2002.

>> She was born in 2002?

>> Yes

>> Probably took it when she was 4 or 5, 2006, 2007, roughly around the time when this process -- -DELETE-

>> Right, but that's a national standard.

So now we're going to go to, quote unquote, customization, but GNT is a standard, and you want to know if your kids in New York are as gifted and talented as kids in Michigan.

So to customize it -- I'm not sure -- I'm not really sure it should be customizing it --

>> We're not customizing the definition or the ability to compare to a national sample of how students were performing, that's part of the field testing. Is to get that representative national sample how kids performed, and whether or not students who answered X number of questions correctly at this appropriate age perform at the snigegh percentile or 98th percentile or 97th percentile that we're currently doing, that is part of the field testing process building out those national norms to be able to compare across the country, across a national sample of students These students who got X number of questions correct perform at the 99 percent sen tile.

>> It says the reason for this --
>> That's okay, I'm listening.

>> Is that they've broken the test.
The New York parents have been savvy enough to break the OLSAT and the NNAT isn't that old , because they were not using that up -- it was just a few years ago that we put in that.

>> -- few years at the end there.

>> But that's only three years old so we're going to change -- is that the issue?

Is the OLSAT the issue, is the NNAT the issue or are they both the issue?

>> I think part of it is the ability truly to get custom (inaudible) (technical difficulties) as -- David indicated this is part of their core business as well we're partnering with ERB , which is also a very large (inaudible) early childhood admissions for admissions test so we don't have any concern about the fact of whether or not these are tried and true questions and are we just making this up, or is quest star just making up these types of questions as they go along.

They're backed by research and implementation I think that not just the fact that it's ccustomized , they provide a comprehensive plan that I think is more effective than what Pierson provided In terms of their proposal.

>> I'm having a hard time understanding why Pierson would not be flexible enough to be competitive towards their competitor.

>> It's timing.
It's timing, right?

>> They're operating on their own business model, Pierson is a very large company and I've seen it before, they're with very large companies they have their way of doing business, and Pierson is selling these very specific products , they sell nationally, their business model is this is the test.
And I think that's what the answer was.

>> Right.

>> When they proposed.
So we -- you know --

>> But they may also -- I don't know this, but they may also, with this -- is it called new generation?

(Technical difficulties)

>> -- from I think we'll probably -- you know, I can go through it's describing the article -- expertise, a panel of experts from the -- department will evaluate the proposals that come forward.

Not particularly surprisingly there's a limited number of proposals we get because this is a narrow area, and there aren't that many companies that are nationally known and qualified and have deep experience in doing this kind of testing.

We've got at least a couple of proposals, and so this committee with expertise in this area would be limited to two proposals.

And it isn't -- from Pierson I think besides the positive they looked at two sets of proposals and agreed there was a great degree of confidence in the quality of the tests and the quality of the output that we can get from these somewhat more customized tests that we'll be receiving from quest star.

You know, quest star brought to the table, in these tables they have national experts, NRB they have evaluations included in the tests, and -- (inaudible) maybe we should -- (inaudible) describe in terms of what would be better.

But I think at the end of the day ultimately the committee had a choice of going with the known vendor, who was not without problems in this area, and this other vendor that is different and new to us, is not new to the field. They felt that the new offering is a better offer than the one that we had.

So if we haven't done a great job of explaining that to you, in detail, I think we need to do a better job, maybe the panel meeting can specifically tell why (inaudible) I know with a procurement of this nature we had a committee of people who sort of (inaudible) responsibilities here, know the stakes involved, and went through and in a certainly very comprehensive diligent process to evaluate the materials

>> I think we need to know what we're measuring.

Gifted and talentedness?

Is not what we're measuring.

So I think (inaudible) (Technical difficulties)

>> -- quote unquote problems with breaking the test that the tutoring was off the charts, and I don't know how you determine that, but it was widely known before it hit the streets that there's a new G& t-test.

Right?

-DELETE- For a long time?

You must have experienced that as well.

>> -- how far in advance do you feel it was known that there was a new G& t-test, do you think the public knew that before the -- before the --

>> If I recall, because I sat as a member of CTAC at the time --

>> But before the panel vote, the folks knew at the end we were going to --

>> I can't tell you -- I can't tell you that, because honestly, I didn't even know what the panel -- I wasn't even aware, that the quote unquote panel -- And if it wasn't done, why couldn't it be done

>> Maybe, I think it's unlikely -- I'll say this, I think it's unlikely, maybe the department made a decision last time (inaudible) specific tests before we conduct procurement, but the Pierson -- I shouldn't say that is Pierson proprietary. It's a proprietary product.

Seeing it is a proprietary product it would be surprising to me if we had announced before we conducted a procurement that we'll be using that product, and if we didn't -- allow me -- if we didn't announce that we were using that proprietary product up front, that we had made that 12KEUGSZ already -- well I should phrase it differently.

If we were to have made known in advance of the procurement that we were going to use that proprietary product up front, then by definition we could not have

conducted a competitive procurement and I believe we did conduct a competitive procurement last time.

>> I'm saying DLE has determined that time to relook at G& t-testing, how that was communicate communicated, I'm sure they didn't say this company or that company that would -- wouldn't have done it but they did know that the test was , quote unquote changing.

>> I don't know how they would have known that before we conducted the procurement, the reality is before we conducted this procurement I don't think anybody would have known that the outcome was going to be quest star, and I will say that if anybody had asked me to bet before we conducted this procurement what the outcome would be, with my many years of experience, knowing this is that we're not going to get a lot of competition , I would have bet on Pierson. I would have lost that bet but I would have bet on Pierson.

-- has something of an advantage in procurement -- (inaudible) make sure they're legitimate this is one of the cases where the outcome is not what the the oddsmakers might have placed on a procurement that had two benefits other than something in the wings.

I think that -- I don't think the ability to vet and discuss this outcome is gone.

I think that it starts around the committee having viewed the two alternatives and select selected quest star as the best -- as what the committee felt was the outcome that's

>> -- data exists, and there is another one in the works.

So it doesn't matter to me if Pierson or -- it really doesn't matter to me. Which company.

But the standard is the OLSAT.

Now, it's not as good as a one-on-one, it suffers from being a brute test as well, but it somehow met the standards.

So it's not clear to me why this one is better

>> Sure so I think --

>> And that doesn't mean it won't be clear to somebody else

>> Sure let me take that feedback I think it's valid and we can certainly do a better job of making sure that that is understood and ccommunicated effectively on the evening and even beyond but I also want to highlight that the standard is OLSAT, but that's simply because New York City has used the OLSAT.

It's not the standard nationally as being the only assessment for gifted and talented.

Different states and different districts use different assessments other than the OLSAT, so --

>> And you would answer what is the most widely used, and why this one is better.

>> Right.

>> Why quest star's product -- you know I went to look up quest star's product today, so -- you know, I looked up everybody.

So -DELETE- -DELETE-

>> Sure

>> Is it quiteageable staff, well educated in sike 0 metrics, that's not the issue.

, it's why we're changing and why we should change to this alternative.

>> -- investment itself, but also I think maybe we'll do a better job of just talking about the overall proposal, about why other aspects of it were also more -- more exciting than --

>> Right, and it's not that there were some -- some delivery problems with Pierson last year, there were lots of problems.

It's -- -- why we were able to do it the six years previous, and why did they fall short on the year seven.

So I don't think that's the way to deliver the message.

That they screwed up last year on some things What happened.

>> Listen, I hope it didn't come off that way, I was not delivering the message that (inaudible)

>> -- national Norm.

So -- that's a huge question to be answered by you.

>> So I hear a couple of things, in what's being said.

Again, the initiative to changing the test, why are we changing the test, I'm not sure that's exactly what it is you were supposed to be focusing on.

That might be another area that we should be talking about, to get that answer.

How was this communicated to parents, how was it determined that we would be changing the test.

However I'm going to play devil's advocate.

But where my mind is thinking, Pierson realized that change needs to be made.

Pierson intends to make change.

However, that is two years out from probably what would be a test period.

So we're talking three years possibly before Pierson launches their new product,

possibly When I'm thinking customization I'm imagining that what Pierson is

looking forward to doing is what we can implement now with this type of opportunity to make changes or have some flexibility with how we do the

assessment for our -- you know, the students, our gifted students.

I am aware of some prior concerns of parents about prior tests and it hasn't been a perfect -- you know --

>> Never been perfect.

>> And so we always are at risk.

You did say, I'm not questioning you quality of what quest star could possibly.

So --

>> Only -- only looking at the -- you know, I looked at the website, I looked at the products, I looked at their financials online

>> Looked at their experience.

>> I'm playing devil's advocate

>> That's okay.

>> They're a competitor of Pierson, they're a player, they're a big player in this field.

So.

>> Ands it is always comforting to stay with what we know.

But I think we should also have flexibility in what could be available to us, what we could do with with it, and how we make it challenging and opportunity for us, for the students that we're talking about.

Again, how we promote this, how did we come to this idea that the test needs to be changed We've been using it for quite awhile now.

Pierson -- Pierson doesn't have to make changes , but Pierson has fully identified that it needs to make changes.

And Pierson is saying we're not in a rush, and I apologize if Pierson thinks I'm attacking them; I'm not.

But they're not -- they're not in the rush to make sure that we -- our children are where we need them to be.

And we are.

So we wanted to make sure that, you know -- I mean, I'm sure the work that was done to select quest star over Pierson, it took a lot, like you said if I put the gambling cards on the table

>> I wouldn't say -- (inaudible) Pierson on the table.

>> Like I say --

>> -- (inaudible) you would have chosen that guy.

>> The research technique and everything that we know that Pierson would put -- have put into a product, and is not willing to move right now with a new proposal for an opportunity to do what we need them to do, allow some customization , allow some changes, Pierson doesn't appear to be as flexible.

>> I think they're one year difference, right?

One could put it in in 2016

>> It's one year of a three year contract, so.

>> Maybe that's a testing issue.

Again, that would be nice to know.

Field testing.

Is that a --

>> They probably have their own product development timeline, and --

>> Maybe there's more -- this guy can rush it out, but he's not going to do as much field test testing.

-DELETE-

>> Well, that field testing will depend on if we give them the opportunity to use adequate time to do field testing.

Because they're also not expecting to do any launch until 2016.

That's a window of time to do testing.

Just, again playing devil's advocate.

I'm listening to both sides, both sides make absolute sense, but I don't -- I definitely hear discomfort with hearing that the G&T test will be changed and how you that message was brought out to the public.

(inaudible)

>> Enough to know --

>> Why.

>> Why

>> And look thation that's one of the reasons why we have these meetings, is we don't want to have the panel uncomfortable voting on -- we don't like (indiscernible) I think this is something that merits having a thoughtful discussion , with teachers, and explaining why we think it's worth it to -- change at this stage And we'll have that discussion on Wednesday, come back and explain -- like any other -- (inaudible) panel, briefing in experts, we'll certainly do that --

>> (inaudible)

>> Yeah, because any question we're asking you here, any doubt or any -- you can be sure there are 10 people behind us.

>> Absolutely.

>> And especially G&T, I have to say G&T is --

>> Controversial?

No.

Tell me, please no.

(Laughter) (inaudible) --

>> We have four initiatives that we generate revenue from, most of which goes to chance and PSAL a lot of activities and the rest we are always looking for ways to expand on those opportunities as well.

So this we went down and requested proposals from firms to help us market ourselves, and take the best of generating revenue opportunities they have with the department, they will manage on an ongoing basis the contracts that we have already in place and the -- and work with my office on a procurement for snack and beverage vending in the schools.

The RA talks about some revenues that we've brought in in the past, and the obviously the revenues that they're going to bring in which is tied to the revenue that the department receives from these activities.

So you know, and you can see as part of the RA we show what their piece of the action is for this, and how much we brought in, I'll tell you that over the past five years we've brought in just shy of \$23 million in revenues through these various activities.

>> hoych?

>> Just shy of \$23 million in revenues, in the DOE, from the vending contracts, and we also have a broadcast sponsorship arranged with PAL which just shy of \$40 million in revenues we brought in, some of the key individuals in this I'll tell you are actually income bents that have been involved in prior contracts, and this is where the income bents who have experience in this area are being brought back.

I will tell you that I personally (inaudible) some of these procurements with beverages and snacks.

(inaudible) snack and beverage contract.

(Inaudible) has to be certified, healthy snacks and center, very low calorie beverages.

Sort of tastes like water.

>> --

>> Enough said on that.

No cupcakes.

>> Oh please.

>> Okay, I shouldn't -- --- don't go there.

Next one is (June Flanders) this is also a revenue generator for the schools, an option for the schools to opt in and get these planners.

Or not.

-- (inaudible) in case you want to see this is from the company that was actually selected from the ven news -- (inaudible) I don't know if the school will be choosing the (inaudible) what things look like.

>> Why are they so little?

I expected that to be more?

50,000?

>> That's a revenue guaranteed to us for the first year.
There are revenues, but they're giving these out for free.

>> Right.

>> To the students.
They're not selling them.

>> Not selling them.

>> That's just sort of the kick back for allowing them to sell these things to the schools -DELETE- There's some cost to the department that we don't charge just because all the advertising actually gets (inaudible) there is some very specific criteria for what they sell --

>> High school --

>> And middle school

>> --

>> In middle school they were like five bucks, and high school they were 10, amazing product, my daughter lived by it.
But we're not charging for it right.

>> What happens is we put out this procurement and the requirement was we're not charging for them.

-DELETE- So the committee is looking at the quality of the offering.

It's a free offering.

That's the best part, a free offering, and how much (inaudible) a piece of the advertising action is going back to the department.

The two different revenue from do you twircht vendors, that's what they pick.

I think this is a triple win.

It's a lovely thing for the schools because they get free planners, the schools also get a little money out of the deal.

The local businesses get to advertise these things, because it is -- the kids have their things it's good for the city as well, so this is a win all around, it's a lovely thing, every once in awhile we make people happy with procurement

>> (inaudible)

>> I'm trying to figure that out.

>> -- of high school --

>> I did see it has the good --

>> Cool stuff, right?

>> And this could be expanded?

>> (inaudible)

>> I presume they're -- I really don't know.

>> -- elementary school we sold student planners, and by the time it left the elementary school, from first grade on.

So they're making them, the elementary schools are using them.

So down the road --

>> What I will say is if they're successful for the high schools, and they came to us in an appropriate chain they want it in the earlier grades as a revenue thing, that's the kind of contract change that I could 1KWRUSZ --

>> --

>> I think it was -- (inaudible)

>> Quality planners was the other vendor and they were just giving us \$25,000. Versus day books is giving us 10 percent in the first year, 10 percent of ad sales with a minimum of \$150,000 in each of the second through fifth year of the contracts.

So they've given us a guaranteed revenue that's six times what quality planners was giving us.

And with a 10 percent of their ad revenues is more than 150,000, we get --

>> -- I know the principal my kids at the high school, she likes to put her own stuff in?

Can the principals put in pages if they want into these?

>> I don't -- I don't know.

>> Do you think they're more the standard?

>> I imagine --

>> (inaudible) schools contract privately -- zlf okay.

So next time.

Now we're thankfully getting -- (inaudible) two hours every week, that's not the case.

The next item is getting into these multiple contracts The first one is the third RA for the chancellor 's (inaudible) you've seen these before, it's just vendors, the next one is for nonpublic schools graduate courses, for school (inaudible) again just getting vendors here.

The next one is a preK program provider.

This vendor had been previously approached for a full day program, and (inaudible) -- a lot of the Jewish orthodox have a problem with full day, if they have religious content they can't get through in three hours they've got to give 6 hours full day, they have 6 hour 20 minutes of nonreligious instruction. Starts early on Friday and the religious requirements of their day they can't meet our requirements of the full 6 hours 20 minutes.

So there are a lot of them that have elected to take a half day, a shortened day.

Next one is -- was done by (inaudible) the vendor (inaudible) matrix we were doing pro curment this was the last one of them you can see that they were -- of the responsible and responsive vendors they were actually the fifth in line,, but the other vendors ahead of them were lrp at capacity.

That very often happens when you -- you know -- the low bidders on other items, and they will max out on the other items.

So they're down the list of geometrics, still you see a lot of them sitting on this contract , and (inaudible) Next one is just another vendor, and for this multiple test award contract special ed development national language institute next item up to --

>> And that's been happening with both (inaudible)

>> twhofr is using it.

Remember it's multiple tests for contracts are choosing from -- to make sure we set reasonable standards, the vendors are setting standards, prices that are fair and reasonable, schools then choose the vendors they're going to use, we have enforced a competitive process that (inaudible) \$25,000.

Some schools may not have been happy but the schools that are happy are going to use this So the next one is more graduate courses.

So college graduate courses in SPL certification also nonpublic school --

>> You're just going to put a notation are or something for Laura?

>> So all headings are all clear, I think the only place where in some cases we've been less than clear is on the advertisements. I saw that some did but -- so this one -- actually , this one did take in public schools there might have been one that didn't.

>> Now, Laura's suggestion was that when we're funding, like Mary got an email from an --

>> You want the funding on the advertisement?

>> No, no, no.

When we're offering like the contract for the nonpublic school, principals could be trained We already had a question on that.

Why are we giving money -- why spend money for a nonpublic school training for a teacher?

In the explanation online it says the holder, the custodian, or where the -- whatever they are, then we wouldn't get -- we wouldn't get any of those (inaudible) credit.

>> (inaudible)

>> Now I've got (inaudible) good, okay.

The next one is government to government purchase with New York programs for special ed teaching and (inaudible) with castle oil.

So in this case the city dwait -- debated and we're going on their -- The next one is for defibrillators this is another government run agency contract this is another castle contract we're using in this case for defibrillators.

This is to replace (inaudible)

>> The question I have is who is trained to use them. That will be our next -- but not here.

>> One of the reasons why they're required --

>> I said the next question to that is who is trained in the schools to use them, but that's not a contracts conversation.

>> That's a -- (inaudible) conversation.

>> One of the reasons nubl inaudible standardized on the city contract for this one is because people who are trained in the use of defib llailters (inaudible) they don't want to learn an entirely new defibrillator because we're going to have to start training everybody over So there are the apparently -- you asked -

-
>> I'm ready.

>> 42033 schools city wide distributed by OSH in response to recommendations from the vendor , public schools (inaudible) requesting schools -- at least six staff members receive the ADDCR severed training and the actual number at schools varies.

All DLE school employees are eligible for training And in order to comply we have stated at least one AD must be present at practices and games That's why I actually have people giving -- (inaudible) in balance.

>> Someone I know just started -- PSA 4 and they couldn't start it without the - there was a big issue.

Who has the defibrillator and who was trained and did they get the certificate.

>> So next one was -- actually next three, quickly we're in the grand fortion of our agenda , they're all grant with the vendors name in the grants, just services when we want them and we use the vendor or we don't, so we'll quickly pass those three.

And next is the application with a few vendors that are named (inaudible) or different things , but these are just the -- in every case they're sold (inaudible) they can't be (inaudible) through resellers.

(inaudible) Next one is also a listing advocation with in rev scheffer these are also textbooks and materials -DELETE- Last one with tora education software these materials are purchased by nonpublic schools and I will tell you that we took a very careful look at this one, because as a Jewish person I recognize torah has something to do with Jewish -- being Jewish materials.

And actually a lot of the materials would not pass our instructional material review, which makes sure that materials are not actually religious in nature. These materials are -- I looked at a couple of them I was curious myself. They're historical in nature.

So one of the things talks about the Jewish immigration from eastern Europe, and so those are the things that would (inaudible) organization would pass the scrutiny.

So there are various materials that could be sold and, you know, predominantly in the nonpublic schools, that might come from publishers that are certainly cater to a religious organization In this particular case, the Jewish organization But that are not necessarily of a religious nature And that applies to what the materials -- the nonpublic (inaudible) they have to be materials that pass that screening.

Perhaps some time I could share with you the instructional material that we screen, we actually have people that review the materials that get into the schools to make sure they pass certain rubrics to make sure that they're appropriate educational content.

You know, would qualify, and appropriate for instruction in our schools, and non-pubs if they come through the reimbursement.

Next item is just another (inaudible)

>> (inaudible)

>> So that's it.

>> Thank you.