

BRITISH COLUMBIA
PUBLIC SCHOOL EMPLOYERS'
ASSOCIATION

Backgrounder:
Philosophy, Politics, or a Combination of Both:
The Foundation Skills Assessment and the Battle Over Testing

January 14, 2009

The purpose of this backgrounder is to provide an overview of the events surrounding the current (2008-2009) dispute between the BC Teachers' Federation (BCTF) and the Ministry of Education regarding Foundation Skills Assessment (FSA).

Although BCPSEA is concerned specifically with the employment implications of the BCTF campaign in opposition to the FSA, we are providing background information on the FSA — its origin and its purpose — in order to place the issues in context. A discussion of the efficacy, effectiveness and value of the FSA or like assessment instruments is more appropriately left to another paper and forum.

This backgrounder addresses the questions concerning individual employees' discretion to choose what work they will perform, and the advice provided by the BCTF to its members to take certain courses of action.

The BCTF remains opposed to FSA; however, the 2008-2009 dispute has been cast as opposition to the testing and reporting approach — census versus sample.

WHAT ARE THE MATTERS AT ISSUE?

There are two general matters at issue:

- The philosophical and political issue of testing, the government's approach and motivations, and the BCTF's approach and motivations.
- The employment issue: Can an individual employee participate without sanction in a concerted refusal to perform work? Does an employee have the discretion to choose what work they will perform and what work they will not perform?

The BCTF and the current provincial government have been at odds on a variety of education issues since the government came to power in 2002. The accountability construct adopted by the government is one of the areas of disagreement. When examining the written record, in general the BCTF objects to a system that emphasizes external mechanisms and, in their view, understates internal accountability that teachers assume as members of the teaching profession:

“An external accountability system implies that internal accountability does not exist or is not sufficient. External accountability models demonstrate a lack of trust in teachers and the teaching profession. Teachers in BC find this lack of trust unjustified and hard to accept.”¹

Teachers, the argument goes, self-identify as professionals and view themselves to be already accountable to the profession, to their school districts, and to parents, for teaching practices and for learning outcomes. Accountability measures of the nature of the FSA are seen as affronts to the teaching profession and to public education generally.

The BCTF further argues that external accountability measures, such as large-scale assessments and the Fraser Institute rankings, are blunt instruments that can have a deleterious effect on teaching and learning by narrowing curriculum and instruction, decreasing student motivation, and further disadvantaging already disadvantaged communities.²

Accountability measures, they assert, should be developed for all levels of the education system, including the Ministry of Education and government, to match the responsibilities specific to each level.³

The BCTF has also stated that accountability measures take time away from teaching and learning because of "the proliferation of testing and ranking, relentless data collection and increased paperwork."⁴

Finally, the BCTF opposes the FSA tests on grounds that the FSA, like other large-scale assessments, narrow instruction and promote teaching to the test, cause students to focus on short-term performance, cause test anxiety, and convince some students they cannot succeed.

Central to the BCTF opposition is their assertion that test results are inappropriately used as measures of school quality — parents inappropriately use them to select schools for their children, contributing to the movement of students, and therefore funding, away from schools in poorer neighborhoods. Organizations like the Fraser Institute use the data to rank schools. The BCTF characterizes this as an American-style approach and an inappropriate use of the data.

The BCTF *encourages* teachers not to administer the tests and *encourages* parents to withdraw their children from the FSA assessments.

The Ministry takes the view that there is a place for tests like the FSA in the variety of testing and evaluative approaches adopted by the province, school districts, schools, and teachers. With respect to the FSA and the implications for students, the Ministry has said that FSA tests should not cause stress for students. They contend that they are not high stake — in fact they involve no stakes for students. The FSA tests do not involve a pass/fail and do not count toward report card marks. Students should be covering the foundation skills of reading, writing and numeracy in their regular classroom activities. Teachers and students do not need to “skill and drill” for FSA. However, students will be able to do their best if they are comfortable with the FSA format (the type of questions, how to answer on the computer sections, and how long their answers should be on the written questions). Sample FSA questions are available on the government website at: www.bced.gov.bc.ca/assessment/fsa/

¹ BC Teachers' Federation. *Accountability in Public Education*, 2006.

² Ibid.

³ Ibid.

⁴ BC Teachers' Federation. *Accountability*, 2007.

Further, students take FSA only in Grades 4 and 7 — less than 10 hours of provincial testing in 10 years of school from Kindergarten through Grade 9.

The Ministry has said that the primary purpose of FSA is to help schools, school planning councils, school districts, and the province evaluate how foundation skills are being addressed and formulate plans to improve student achievement. The secondary purpose is to give parents, teachers, and principals information about individual students, again, to address specific issues of student achievement.

BACKGROUND

Standardized tests in reading, writing and numeracy have been in place in British Columbia since the mid-1970s. However, prior to 1999, these tests were administered to a random sample of students in grades 4, 7 and 10 and were designed specifically to assess the effectiveness of the curriculum.

Origin of the FSA

Partly in response to parental pressure for greater accountability, in 2000 the then-NDP provincial government introduced the Foundation Skills Assessment, a test of all grade 4 and 7 students in the province that reports results on a student, classroom, and school and district level. The FSA evaluates how well students have achieved basic foundation skills in reading comprehension, writing, and numeracy and is intended to provide baseline data that can be used to make plans to improve student achievement.

Stakeholder groups contributed ideas for how FSA results should be communicated. For example, in the spring of 1999, an “Assessment Working Group,” comprised of representatives from key stakeholder groups including the BCTF, was tasked with making recommendations to the Deputy Minister as to the “contextualization, interpretation and communication of results of the annual assessment.”

The Assessment Working Group made recommendations, including templates for communications home to parents on a student’s results and how those results were to be interpreted. At that time, there were no disagreements on the nature, structure, and use of FSA results for policy purposes. The BCTF was opposed, however, to reporting assessment results at the school and individual student levels, and the use or potential use of the data by organizations outside the public education sector.

Although results of earlier standardized tests had been collected in the past, the FSA would become particularly controversial because new freedom of information (FOI) legislation allowed third parties (such as the Fraser Institute) to access the data. As Jerry Mussio, a senior official with the Ministry of Education until 2001, wrote:

“The introduction of FOI legislation enabled outside agencies — i.e., the Fraser Institute — to extract student testing data and produce new sets of statistics for the public, and influence public discussion. This pushed the Ministry to begin displaying school-by-school data on its website.”⁵

⁵ Steffenhagen, Janet. “Short history of standardized testing in BC.” *The Vancouver Sun*, December 18, 2008. <http://communities.canada.com/vancouver/blogs/reportcard/archive/2008/12/18/short-history-of-standardized-testing-in-b-c.aspx>

Census vs. Sample

Census and sample approaches to testing are adopted for different purposes. The FSA has been conducted on a census basis since its introduction by the then-NDP government. Over the years, the census and sample approaches to testing have been the subject of policy discussion and initiatives, with the approach ultimately adopted based on the stated objectives of the initiative.

Assessments based on a sample only give results at the provincial level. Sample-based tests do not provide any information specific to school districts, schools, specific groups of students, or individual students. The census approach, on the other hand, provides information on:

- specific groups of students such as aboriginal students, English as a second language (ESL) students, students with special needs by category, children in care and other vulnerable students
- school districts and schools
- individual student achievement levels for all parents and teachers.

The census approach allows strategic and focused planning for improvement in achievement for individual students, specific groups of students, schools and school districts. This information would not be available in a sample-based approach.

For example, the Provincial Learning Assessment Program (PLAP), which was initiated in 1976, sometimes used a census approach and sometimes a sample, but the assessments had a very specific set of research questions and served more of a curriculum evaluation purpose.

The PLAP was conducted annually between 1976 and 1997, with the following subjects assessed on a cyclical basis: Reading and Writing, Mathematics, and Science. Assessments of Social Studies were conducted twice during that period. During that time, schools and districts wanted their own results so there was a push toward census assessments. When the multiple-choice booklets were administered on a census basis, schools and districts received reports of their results.⁶

The last PLAP assessment was administered in 1998. It was a reading and writing assessment and was conducted on a census basis. "The 1998 assessment was the first planned annual assessment of reading comprehension and first-draft writing (mathematics and problem solving are to be added in 1999)... The 1998 population was similar to that of many prior assessments, consisting of all students in Grade 4, 7 and 10 in public and funded independent schools."⁷

FSA AND THE REFUSAL TO ADMINISTER: 2002

Issues concerning the refusal to administer the FSA arose following the provincial strike of 2002 and the legislated collective agreement. In response to the legislation, the BCTF instituted a work to rule campaign. In Surrey, the school district challenged the FSA component of the work to rule campaign.

⁶ Ministry of Education. *British Columbia 1998 Assessment of Reading Comprehension and First-Draft Writing Technical Report.*

⁷ Ibid.

Work to rule is a strike — a concerted refusal to perform some or all of employees' work for the purpose of inducing an employer to agree to terms and conditions of employment advanced by the union, and is not permitted when a collective agreement is in force as it was following the legislation of 2002.

In response to the Surrey application to the LRB, in April 2002 the LRB issued a decision (BCLRB No. 123/2002) concluding that supervising FSA tests is work that teachers were obligated to perform and ordered the BCTF to suspend its direction to members not to supervise the test.

On pages 5 and 6 of this award, the LRB stated:

“...it is clearly within the authority of the Ministry of Education to set this test as a provincial student learning assessment under the Ministry order. The Ministerial Order also allows school boards to designate teachers as the individuals responsible for supervising the FSA test.”

After the 2002 LRB decision, the Student Learning Assessment Order (Ministerial Order M60/94) was amended to state:

Administration and completion of assessments

3...a teacher, administrative officer or other person designated by the minister or board...must

(b)ensure that assessments are administered and completed, and that the data collected from assessments are transmitted to the minister, in accordance with the assessment protocols, instructions and invigilation procedures sent to the board...by the minister with each assessment.

FSA OPPOSITION CONTINUES: 2007-2008

The BCTF continued to oppose the FSA and launched a public relations campaign claiming that FSA testing was harmful to students.

In April 2007, the BCTF provided local teachers' unions and members with a brochure about the FSA for teachers to distribute to parents. This brochure recommended that parents withdraw their children from the FSA tests. However, the BCTF assertion that parents could withdraw their children from the FSA tests by writing a letter to the school principal was seen as not accurate and contrary to Ministry-established FSA requirements. The Ministry of Education has clearly stated that, with the exception of specific defined exemptions, students' participation in the FSA is not optional.

The then-Deputy Minister of Education addressed this issue in his April, 2007 *Report on Education*:

“To be clear, the FSA is not an optional activity that students or parents can opt into or out of. It is a required educational activity in the same manner as instruction in the Language Arts curriculum is required...Parents should not expect that their child will be excused from participation because they write a letter of request motivated by the BCTF miscommunications about FSA.” (Doddall, 2007)

During the 2007-2008 school year, aside from press comments and BCTF advertising, the issue of whether BCTF information could be sent home with students became an issue resolved through arbitration.

Arbitrator John Kinzie released an arbitration award on May 2, 2008, concerning what became known as the *Students as Couriers* case. The grievance that was submitted to arbitration concerned the decision of a school district not to permit teachers to send home with students a BCTF pamphlet opposing the use of the FSA tests in schools. The teachers proposed to send that pamphlet home in a sealed envelope addressed to parents.

In his reasons, the arbitrator concluded that schools have the right to control what information is sent home to parents from the school. He agreed that the BCTF pamphlet, titled "FSA testing can be harmful to students!" was "confusing and does not provide parents the whole story."

However, the arbitrator determined that rather than instituting "an absolute ban" on teachers from sending home information with students, the Board of Education should have instead addressed concerns with the union about the accuracy and confusing nature of the pamphlet. If the union refused to correct the inaccuracies, then the Board would have been justified in restricting its teachers from sending the pamphlet home with students. As this process did not occur, the arbitrator ruled that the absolute ban on sending the pamphlet out to parents through students was not a reasonable limit demonstrably justified in a free and democratic society under section 1 of the *Charter of Rights and Freedoms*.

Arbitrator Kinzie followed the decision of the BC Court of Appeal⁸ on that point:

"The first issue that must be considered is whether the Employer has established that there was a 'pressing and substantial objective' that needed to be addressed through the restriction it imposed in this case. The Employer first of all says that Grade 4 and Grade 7 students should not be involved in carrying home political messages to their parents. While I agree that there is a political element to the pamphlet at issue in this case, its primary message, in my view, raises concerns about the impact of FSA tests on their children's education. Thus, the pamphlet deals with the type of subject matter that materials traditionally sent home with students commonly deal with; i.e., matters pertaining to their children's education. Further, and in any event, the B.C. Court of Appeal in *BCPSEA v. BCTF, supra*, concluded that 'school grounds are public property where political expression must be valued and given its place (at para.65). This conclusion included political expression by teachers.'"

Shortly after the release of the award, one local teachers' union characterized it as an acceptance of the BCTF position in its entirety; i.e., granting teachers an unlimited right to send BCTF and related material home with students. The reality was the contrary. The award did not provide a teacher the right to send any information home through students to parents. The award placed a restriction on the subject matter of the material that can be sent, required it to be accurate, and retained a process for employer control of what information is sent home.

As Arbitrator Kinzie stated:

"I will add though that if the Employer had requested that the Union amend the provisions of the pamphlet concerning parents requesting their children be excused from writing the tests so that they accurately reflected the Ministry's guidelines and the Union had refused, I am of the view that the Employer would have been justified in restricting teachers from distributing the pamphlet through its internal mail delivery system to

⁸ *B.C. Public School Employers' Association v. B.C. Teachers' Federation* (2005), 141 L.A.C. (4th) 385.

parents. That refusal would have meant that an absolute ban would have been the only way that the Employer could have addressed this 'pressing and substantial concern.'"

Subsequently, Arbitrator John Hall released an expedited arbitration award on January 9, 2009 regarding the distribution of FSA materials to parents through students in School District No. 39 (Vancouver). Arbitrator Hall remained seized of the issue after he issued a Consent Award regarding FSA on October 15, 2008. This expedited arbitration arose after a dispute between a district and a local "over a pamphlet which the union had produced regarding FSA testing. The pamphlet had been provided to teachers to send home to parents through students."

Although this expedited arbitration award is limited to the specific issue of the distribution and does not address the content of the BCTF FSA material, Arbitrator Hall's award makes two important findings.

First, with regard to teachers sending home material about FSA through students, Arbitrator Hall relied on Arbitrator Kinzie's statement in his May 2, 2008 award that placing the FSA pamphlet in a sealed envelope addressed to the parents or guardians of students "constitutes a reasonable attempt" to address the concern that inserting students into the policy discussion causes them to feel "uncertain about two very important sets of people in their lives."

Arbitrator Hall goes on to say:

"...if the Union wishes to distribute FSA material to parents via students, it must do so in a sealed envelope or in some other manner designed to prevent students from reading the contents of the material. This precautionary measure avoids the potential for harm to the students, and does not infringe the right of teachers to express their views about FSA testing to the students' parents."

Second, with regard to the authority of the employer to control what is sent home from school, Arbitrator Hall stated that, in light of his October 15, 2008 Consent Award:

"...the Union must give the employer and/or principals advance notice of the method selected for distribution..."

and "...any issue over the manner of distribution" of FSA material should be resolved before the material is sent home.

Arbitrator Hall referred to Arbitrator Kinzie in saying that:

"the Employer has the right to control what is sent home to parents through the medium of their children/students at its schools."

FSA OPPOSITION: 2008-2009

On December 9 and 10, 2008, the BC Teachers' Federation (BCTF) held a province-wide vote of its membership on the FSA. Public school teachers were asked by their union to vote on the following question:

Do you agree with the 2008 AGM decision that unless the Ministry of Education changes to a random sampling with neither schools nor student identified, teachers exercise their professional autonomy and not prepare for, administer, or mark the provincial FSAs?

On December 11, 2008, the BCTF announced that 85 per cent of the 22,397 ballots cast were in favour of taking the above-referenced action against the FSA.

BCTF President Irene Lanzinger stated:

"With this vote, teachers across the province spoke very clearly...The FSAs drain much-needed time and resources away from teaching and learning. This particular standardized test is unfair, does not help students learn, and is not an accurate measure of student progress."⁹

She further stated:

"It's time for us to stand up and say we're not going to do it rather than relying on parents. It's time for us to take that struggle on."¹⁰

However, while still opposed to the FSA, the union now advocates that it be administered on a random sample basis.

Following the December 2008 vote of its members, BCTF president Irene Lanzinger wrote a letter to the Minister of Education stating that random sampling would "put an end to the unfair and inappropriate ranking of schools by the Fraser Institute," and that the FSA:

"...does not help teachers teach, students learn, or parents understand the true nature of their child's progress. The test takes valuable time and resources away from the classroom, narrows the curriculum, and reduces opportunities for other meaningful learning experiences."

BCPSEA has remained of the position that whatever personal opinions school trustees, district staff, the BCTF, and teachers may hold with respect to the FSA, the FSA is an initiative of the Ministry of Education and is grounded in the *School Act* and Regulations. BCPSEA has stated that:

"...as public school employers, we are obliged to ensure that the FSA proceeds as intended without disruption to the workplace."

As part of their public relations campaign in opposition to the FSA, the BCTF has publicly framed the issue under the banner, "When will they learn?" This slogan became synonymous

⁹ "BC Teachers vote to oppose Foundation Skills Assessment." BCTF News Release, December 11, 2008.

¹⁰ Steffenhagen, Janet. "Teachers support boycott of FSA." *The Report Card*, December 11, 2008. <http://communities.canada.com/vancouver/sun/blogs/reportcard/archive/2008/12/11.aspx>.

with the most recent trustee elections in November 2008. The BCTF advertisements,¹¹ which have appeared in *The Vancouver Sun*, characterize the issue as:

“Foundation Skills Assessment testing doesn’t help students learn or teachers teach. Instead, FSA results are used by the Fraser Institute for American-style ranking of schools that only erodes confidence in public education.

Teachers teach their students every day. We care passionately about their success. We believe in regular assessment and testing, and working with parents to improve learning.

With so much to learn and so many challenges facing our children, why is the provincial government wasting valuable classroom time on a discredited approach to testing?”

The advertisement concludes with the statement:

“If the government really wants to improve student achievement, they should keep their promise to reduce class size and improve support for students with special needs. When will they learn?”

The title of this backgrounder is *Philosophy, Politics, or a Combination of Both: The Foundation Skills Assessment and the Battle Over Testing*. The BCTF advertisement is illustrative of the very political nature of this dispute. This decidedly political approach is further illustrated by an increasing number of letters from local teachers’ union presidents to Chairs of boards of education in the province.

For example, one such letter states:

“...teachers intend to exercise their professional autonomy and will not be administering the Foundation Skills Assessment tests this year.

We believe that appropriate student assessment is an important part of our professional responsibilities, and we will continue to exercise our best professional judgment in selecting assessment tools that provide comprehensive assessment as, of, and for student learning. In our opinion, the FSA tests do not meet these criteria. Further, the misuse of the test results by the Fraser Institute to rank B. C. schools is egregious, and we can no longer be a party to it.

We also request that the school district view this issue as a provincial-level dispute between the BCTF and the Ministry of Education, and therefore refrain from “directing” grade 4 and 7 teachers, or any teachers, to administer the FSA tests. If the district wishes the tests to be given, we request that school administrators be asked to take on the task.

Further, we request that school administrators communicate about the FSA with Chief Staff Representatives and Staff Committee Chairs, not directly with grade 4 and 7 teachers.”

In addition, recent media reports punctuate the political flavour of the BCTF opposition to FSA:

“The BC Teachers’ Federation has started its election advertising early, for fear its spending will be dramatically curtailed during the three months leading up to the May 12 election.

¹¹ *The Vancouver Sun*. Saturday, January 10, 2009, page A13.

A provincial law restricts third-party advertising as of Feb. 13. The union has gone to court to challenge the law, but the judge has said he's not confident he will reach a decision before the campaign begins.

As a result, the BCTF is going heavy with TV advertisements now. President Irene Lanzinger said her union expects to spend about \$1 million on election advertising before the Feb. 13 deadline in an effort to defeat the Liberals. After that, it will use other, non-costly tactics to deliver its message — rallies, public demonstrations, community forums and all-candidates meetings. (As of Feb. 13, third-party advertising is limited to \$150,000.)

The union's TV advertising focuses on school closures, class size and supports for special-needs students. The union is also advertising its opposition to the Foundation Skills Assessment (FSA) in daily and community newspapers but that's a separate campaign.

"Our message is that people should consider education as an issue when they go to the polls," Lanzinger told me today. "We feel very strongly that that's one of the most significant issues in an election.

"It's no secret that we do not believe the Liberals have supported education with the resources we need."¹²

FSA AND EMPLOYMENT

In a December 11, 2008 news release, the BCTF stated that as a result of the December 2008 vote of BCTF members:

"BCTF members will not prepare for, administer, or mark the FSA exams next February unless the government moves towards random sampling."

In our view, this work is properly the work of teachers. We are supported in this view by the 2002 decision of the LRB (BCLRB No. B123/2002), wherein Vice-Chair Kearney held that:

"...supervising the FSA test is *prima facie* work which teachers are obligated to perform" (at paragraph 18).

No workplace allows an employee the unfettered right to decide what work they will do and will not do. Consequently, a refusal to perform this work may be an illegal work stoppage and therefore contrary to the *Labour Relations Code*.

Further, in our view, refusing to perform duly assigned work is not an appropriate exercise of the professional autonomy provisions in the collective agreement. If teachers are directed to perform work in regard to the FSA, it is expected that they will do so, and will follow the "work now grieve later" principle and file a grievance in regard to any alleged breach of the professional autonomy provisions if the union believes that such a breach has occurred.

¹² Steffenhagen, Janet. "BCTF begins TV ads against Liberals." *The Report Card*, January 13, 2009. <http://communities.canada.com/vancouver/blogs/reportcard/default.aspx>

In this respect, we note that the LRB stated in the above-noted decision that it was:

“...satisfied on a *prima facie* basis, that teachers are required to supervise students completing the FSA test when this work is assigned to them” (at paragraph 16).

We therefore disagree with the BCTF position, contained in their *School Staff Alert #11*, in which they advise their members that:

“...[t]his is not a vote to withdraw services or walk off the job. Members will be in school and performing their regular teaching duties. In our view, a refusal to prepare for, administer, and mark the FSAs is a right of teachers in exercising their professional autonomy.”

In BCPSEA’s view, the BCTF advice to their members in this regard may be contrary to the *Labour Relations Code*, arbitral and LRB decisions, and/or the collective agreement.

The BCTF direction to its members to refuse to prepare for, administer, or mark the FSA may leave school districts with no option other than to use individuals other than BCTF members to perform this work, since school districts are obliged to ensure that, to the extent possible, the FSA proceeds without interruption. However, if any school district does use individuals other than BCTF members to prepare for, administer, or mark the FSA, such action is specifically without prejudice to the ability of that school district, any other school district, or BCPSEA to advance the position that that work is properly the work of teachers and ought to have been performed by BCTF members.

If BCTF members engage in the contemplated refusal to perform this work, they may be in jeopardy of disciplinary action, and BCPSEA and/or its member employers may seek to recover damages or the costs associated with any work refusals or using others to perform the work that ought to have been performed by BCTF members. A refusal to perform assigned work may also form the basis for a grievance and application to the LRB/courts.

On January 12, 2009, BCPSEA provided a letter to the BCTF to outline our position and the possible courses of action that BCPSEA and school districts may determine to take.

As we have stated previously, the reality is that whatever personal opinions school trustees, district staff, the BCTF, and teachers may hold with respect to the FSA (or any other educational initiative for that matter), the FSA is an initiative of the Ministry of Education and is required by the *School Act* and Regulations. Boards are obliged to ensure that the FSA proceeds as intended without disruption to the workplace.

BCPSEA has distributed a series of *@issue* bulletins on this matter; the most recent is No. 2009-03 dated January 14, 2009. All the *@issue* bulletins can be found on the BCPSEA public website at www.bcpsea.bc.ca under “Publications.”

References

@issue bulletins:

Jan. 14, 2009	No. 2009-03	Foundation Skills Assessment: Labour Relations Implications
Jan. 9, 2009	No. 2009-02	Foundation Skills Assessment: Hall Expedited Arbitration Award
Dec. 18, 2008	No. 2008-16	New BCTF FSA Pamphlet
Dec. 12, 2008	No. 2008-15	Foundation Skills Assessment: The Battle Over Testing
Nov. 24, 2008	No. 2008-15	Foundation Skills Assessment
Sept. 30, 2008	No. 2008-13	Freedom of Expression
May 5, 2008	No. 2008-10	Foundation Skills Assessment (FSA): Kinzie Arbitration Award – Students as Couriers
March 7, 2008	No. 2008-07	Distribution of Foundation Skills Assessment Results
March 3, 2008	No. 2008-06	Distribution of Foundation Skills Assessment Results
Jan. 30, 2008	No. 2008-04	From Pamphlets to Buttons: The BCTF FSA Opposition Campaign Continues
Jan. 24, 2008	No. 2008-03	Foundation Skills Assessment: BCTF Opposition Campaign
Jan. 21, 2008	No. 2008-02	BCTF Opposition Campaign to Foundation Skills Assessment (FSA) Escalates
Jan. 15, 2008	No. 2008-01	Foundation Skills Assessment
Nov. 27, 2007	No. 2007-09	Foundation Skills Assessment: BCTF Position
Oct. 16, 2007	No. 2007-07	Foundation Skills Assessment: BCTF approaches, strategies, and tactics
Sept. 25, 2007	No. 2007-06	Foundation Skills Assessment
May 4, 2007	No. 2007-04	Foundation Skills Assessment: Approaches and Responses
April 24, 2007	No. 2007-03	Foundation Skills Assessment: BCTF Action; FSA Requirements
April 4, 2007	No. 2007-02	Foundation Skills Assessment: BCTF Communication