



**Second Annual
National Superintendents' Forum**

*Reauthorization of NCLB:
A New Era in Education?*

October 5–6, 2007
Palo Alto, California

Zaner-Bloser
The Language Arts and Reading Company

Second Annual National Superintendents' Forum
Palo Alto, California
October 5, 2007

Online Transcript

Introduction

The National Superintendents' Forum was created in 2006 and designed to provide school superintendents with a venue to explore the myriad of challenges they face in their school district. The forum created a place where superintendents could both learn from some of the most highly respected education researchers and reformers from around the country and share ideas for addressing these challenges with their colleagues. It was designed to be a forum for inquiry, reflection, and learning—a place where superintendents and education leaders could think deeply about the issues facing public education across diverse settings and explore new ideas for improving teaching and learning through inspired leadership.

The first National Superintendents' Forum was held in October 2006 in Cambridge, MA. The theme of the first forum was “Perspectives on Leadership, Learning and Literacy.” The second forum was held in Palo Alto, CA, in October 2007 and focused on “Reauthorization of NCLB: A New Era in Education?”

Participants at the second forum included superintendents and education leaders representing 18 states. Presenters included Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond (Stanford), Dr. Catherine Snow (Harvard), Dr. Robert Selman (Harvard), Dr. Maria Carlo (University of Miami), Dr. Bob Calfee (Professor Emeritus, Stanford), Dr. Arnetha Ball (Stanford), and Dr. Patrick Walker (founder, Voices Literature and Character Education Program). Ron Rapp, Director of Government Policy and Communications facilitated the forum. The following transcript is an edited version of the proceedings of this important conversation. Certain sections of the forum were not included due to space limitations.

Framing the Conversation

Ron Rapp: The purpose of the forum, as I mentioned earlier, is to bring together forward-thinking superintendents from around the country with leading education researchers to talk about the critical issues that we all face in improving the lives of children. I want to thank Bob Page, President of Zaner-Bloser for supporting this effort over time, and we hope to see you at future events.

I want to start by talking about why we chose to select the theme for the conference, other than the fact that reauthorization is the hot topic. I have to start by telling you a story—a very short story. When I first started teaching, I moved from Ohio, a graduate of Ohio State. I moved from Ohio to South Carolina just because everybody from Ohio vacations in South Carolina. I'd never been there in my life, but I loved the beach, or at least the sound of going to the beach. So my new wife and I packed up, bought a tent, took the \$500 that we had from the things we sold from college and the money from our wedding, and moved to South Carolina looking for jobs. We said that we would camp on the beach until we got jobs, and that's exactly what we did. I remember

preparing for interviews, my wife blow-drying her hair at the campsite, looking in the side mirror of the car as we were preparing for the interview, but we did eventually get jobs. We got jobs in the same district. She was an elementary teacher; I was a high school English teacher.

If any of you know anything about this area of South Carolina, it's very rural. The beaches are great, and they're very commercial—Myrtle Beach—but once you go inland, it's very rural, and it's very poor. There are tobacco fields everywhere. We ended up teaching in the tobacco fields in South Carolina. My wife taught at a school about seven miles down the road, and I taught in an old dilapidated high school. No blinds on the windows, most of the lights were burned out and not replaced. It was the year that "A Nation at Risk" came out. You all remember that; I'm not even going to tell you the year, because you remember. That was my first year of teaching, and that was my first teaching job.

The recommendations of "A Nation at Risk" were things like: these kids need more Carnegie units; they need more of the same; teachers need to be held accountable. They need to complete paperwork and checklists and document progress for all of their children on a daily basis, for every skill in reading and in writing.

I had 150 very poor students. One of my senior girls could not read, and I was using an anthology of British literature to teach them English. That struck me, back in 1983, as being wrong for children. South Carolina, as you know, was the first state in the country to pass an omnibus education reform package. Multiple states soon followed. Governor Riley, then governor of South Carolina, was heralded as a tremendous educational leader. And maybe his reform package was a good package, on the heels of "A Nation at Risk," and maybe we did need more accountability, but I can tell you that when the law was translated at the local level, it wasn't what these children needed. And I very soon realized the negative impact that education policy can have on children who really need our help.

That started my career in education policy. Every state I moved to was beginning to pass a new omnibus reform package. I moved to Colorado; they were passing a funding package. I moved to Ohio; they were passing Senate Bill 140. I became very active at the statehouse as a teacher. After teaching all day, I would put on my best clothes and go to the statehouse at night. I would speak for what teachers needed to help children in need. That's how I started.

And so, I was thinking about the theme of this conference, and reauthorization of NCLB, and following the conversations among superintendents, among associations in regards to how do we improve this law? I said, "That's it! That's what we have to address." Because this law marks the first time, really, that the federal government has been deeply involved in what happens at the local level and in the classrooms. That's not going to go away.

The first time the bill was passed, the doors were closed. They didn't listen to others about what would be good for children. But now the doors are open, and our keynote presenter, Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond, is here today to talk about the key issues. The House and Senate Education Committees have been holding hearings on NCLB. Multiple associations have spoken out about how to improve the law.

That brings me to the point where I was thinking about how we frame this conversation. The essential question for us today in Palo Alto is, “How can we ensure that the reauthorization of NCLB positively impacts my work as an education leader?” And I would add to that, “As an education leader, how can I ensure that the reauthorization of NCLB positively impacts children, especially those children in the most need?” As we have these discussions today, I encourage you to think deeply about those important questions.

We are honored today to have Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond with us, and thank you, Dr. Darling-Hammond, for joining us. I feel like I don’t even need to introduce Linda because all of us have most likely followed her career for years, when she was at Columbia and now at Stanford—but Linda is the Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education at Stanford. She launched the Stanford Educational Leadership Institute and the School Redesign Network. When she was at Columbia, she was the founding executive director of the National Commission for Teaching and America’s Future, the blue-ribbon panel that in 1996 produced the report “What Matters Most: Teaching for American’s Future.”

She has over 200 publications. One is “Powerful Teacher Education: Lessons from Exemplary Programs.” She has received many, many awards. One of them was the 2005 Horace Mann Outstanding Educator Award from the American Association of School Administrators. In addition, she has received the National Commission on African-American Education’s 2003 Founder’s Award and Stanford University School of Education’s 2002 Outstanding Teaching Award. Recently she has been a consultant to Congress and to Congressman George Miller, and she is here today to share with us the latest information about the discussions surrounding NCLB. Please welcome Dr. Linda Darling-Hammond.

Reauthorization of NCLB: Key Issues

Linda Darling-Hammond: It’s a huge topic and a complicated one, so I’m going to try to give us just a little bit of a toehold into these issues, and then let’s take a lot of time for questions if we can.

Ron’s first year of teaching in 1983 sounded a lot like my first year of teaching in 1973 as an English teacher where I was on the East Coast in the Camden and Philadelphia areas. I also had kids in my 12th grade English class who didn’t know how to read, and the curriculum and the system of supports and assessment was really not designed to enable me to teach them how to read. We’re still struggling with these same issues today.

NCLB has a lot of nicknames. You may have your own favorite, or some in your community. Howard Dean used to call it No School Board Left Standing. Some folks have called it No Child’s Behind Left. It goes on and on. There’s a little document in your folder here which talks about a poll of superintendents ranking the law, and, on a scale of 1 to 10, 43 percent of superintendents ranked it at the bottom of the scale as harmful to schools, a 1, 2, or 3 on that scale. At the top end of the scale in terms of helpful to schools, there were 8 percent of superintendents ranking it helpful, and then everyone else kind of arrayed in between.

There are some helpful aspects of the law, some important aspects of the conception of the law: its focus on equity, its focus on looking at outcomes and looking at outcomes for all kids, and understanding in a disaggregated way how kids are doing in different schools. That's probably a breakthrough conceptually in thinking about how we try to pursue equity, and the insistence that students should have highly qualified teachers, again, at the rhetorical level, an important idea, that we ought to ensure that kids who are being served by these programs do have teachers who are able to teach them.

Then you have all of the wrinkles of the law, and it is a very wrinkly law. It's a hundred-and-some pages of text in the law, the implementation issues, the design issues about the accountability system, the way things are being implemented...we could use the entire day just talking about that. So I'm going to zero in on just a few key things that are going on. I have been doing a little work with the staff on the House and Senate sides in Congress. There are hundreds of people giving advice to the Congress, and they are listening to a variety of people. They are making sausage; there is no guarantee what's going to come out on the other end.

I think the big question in Washington right now is, will there be enough tweaks to the law to respond to the kind of concerns that have been raised from the field all across the country? To make it, at least in the view of most folks, likely to do more good than harm. Or will it be insufficiently changed, such that many people are talking about mobilizing to just blow it up, to see that it's not reauthorized at all...wait for a new presidential election, and the potential for a clean start. And that's really a conversation that many, many people are having right now, both on the constituency side and on the legislative side.

Key Issue 1: Part of the issue is that we start with a paradigm for this law that is a difficult starting point. So as you try to tweak or wrench features of the law, it's not clear how far the politics will allow it to go. Just to sort of say a word about the paradigm, just truth in advertising, my own view is, and I've written about this in some articles, that we didn't start at the right place in No Child Left Behind. That the paradigm of the law is to set targets and punish schools to motivate them to reach those targets; the theory of action is that schools are withholding effort and they will put forth that effort or states will, with the set of mostly negative incentives, mostly sanctions attached to it. There's not much of a theory of action around a learning system for the educational system. One could also assume that if we're not achieving our goals, we need to enable people to obtain the capacity to do the kinds of work that are called for, and that we need to increase, certainly we need to incentive attention to equity because it's been a long-standing problem.

Key Issue 2: We also have to provide the resources and the capacity to close what is called, not the "Achievement Gap," but "Paying Off the Educational Debt." We have a lot of inequality in access to resources across the country. The top 10 percent of school districts in the United States spend ten times as much as the bottom 10 percent. If you go to any high-achieving, industrialized nation in the world, schools are funded equally, for starters, and additional money is given to schools quite often who have additional needs. So we start in the hole with respect to equity, and the law does not address that problem.

Key Issue 3: Then we need to worry about getting a system of curriculum, assessment, and instruction that is geared toward 21st century skills, that enables people to move toward that kind of teaching and learning and that gives teachers and leaders the capacity, the knowledge, the skills to address the serious problems we have. The law gives us a little bit of a toehold on some of those issues but doesn't really start from that starting point. So I'm going to talk a little about some of the issues that we currently have and just open it up to conversation.

Key Issue 4: The big questions that people have are centered around whether or not No Child Left Behind will lead to higher standards, better tests, and stronger and fairer accountability systems. Will it increase the number of highly qualified teachers, especially in high-need schools? Will it motivate and enable school districts to focus on and succeed with the neediest students? My take would be, and I'd love to hear your take, that the answers to these questions are a mixed bag. That, in some instances, standards may be higher in the sense they raise cut scores on tests, and the expectation for kids to reach cut scores is going up.

Key Issue 5: But probably, by and large, the quality of the tests has gone down since NCLB, because the desire to have every child every year tested led a lot of states to let go of performance-based assessments that they were beginning to develop in the 1990s and to move toward a form of testing much more off-the-shelf—multiple-choice tests that could be scored quickly and easily and sent back into schools...that the incentives embedded in the assessments for deep thinking, critical problem-solving, reading, writing—I'm an old English teacher—NAEP scores are going down. In fact, nationally, our writing scores are going down. Twelfth graders do less well in writing today than they did a few years ago, and eighth grade readers are also doing less well. So there are issues around that. And then the quality of the accountability systems is where a lot of the issues are, the way in which accountability is being implemented.

Key Issue 6: There has been some improvement in some places in efforts to ensure that kids get qualified teachers. California is a case in point. A few years ago there were more than 40,000 teachers who were not trained to teach in California's public schools. That number is down to about 17,000 now, and that is primarily because of No Child Left Behind, because of the pressure to say, you have to figure out some strategies to get people into classrooms who are prepared, rather than simply lowering standards as opposed to raising incentives for teaching. On the other hand, there are lots of issues around the definition of "highly qualified" teachers, and many of the widgets that go with that part of the law.

Key Issue 7: And finally, does the law motivate and enable school districts to focus on and succeed with the neediest students? And I would say my sense is that the focus has increased, but the capacity to succeed is quite variable—again, depending on the resources available, whether the kinds of strategies that are being adopted are actually likely to be successful, and are being successful both with respect to curriculum, with respect to the nature of the teaching process, and with respect to whether schools that are under-resourced and under the gun and serving high-needs students are incentivized to teach kids better or to push low-achieving kids out. And there are some startling, dramatic data about the amount of push-out from schools that is occurring, which is a way to get test scores up.

Key Issue 8: In terms of the effects of the law, there's something called the Trend NAEP, which is a form of the NAEP test which allows you to look over time. I know there was just a release last week of NAEP scores, but they're not looked at yet as part of the Trend NAEP. You have to reanalyze the data to know what it will say. Through 2005, the steepness of the incline of math scores had declined. That is to say, we're improving at a slower rate now in math than we were before No Child Left Behind. The most recent math scores that came out just last week are similar, that the rate of improvement in math is substantially lower than it was in the 1990s. In reading, and this is eighth grade, scores actually went down, and that was true again last week when the new NAEP scores came out. There was a slight bump in fourth grade reading. So we're not seeing that the law is producing huge improvements in the rate of progress in reading and math. I think that that relates to some of these issues that I've mentioned earlier.

Bob Linn, who was the president of AERA around the time of maybe a year or two after the No Child Left Behind was enacted, and who is a measurement expert, looked at what we would have to do if we used the NAEP proficiency level as our target for No Child Left Behind, how quickly schools would have to improve to make 100 percent proficiency by 2014. So here's where we were kind of in the years up to NCLB, and that's what we would have to do to reach the NAEP proficiency level by 2014. So the expectations of the law are extraordinary. You saw on the slide where we actually are. We're actually slowing our rate of progress. We're not getting close to achieving that kind of improvement. If we were trying to project from the rate of improvement from the 1990s, it would take 57 years to get to the target in grade 4 math, 61 years for grade 8, 166 years to get to the target for 12th grade math, and you can see that it would require this dramatic acceleration.

This is recent data for California, which shows what's happening in states and what's likely to happen in states over the coming years. Most states saw this law come down and said, OK, in many cases, they lowered their standards for what proficiency would mean so that the notion of 100 percent proficient would become potentially achievable. But even beyond that, they created a plan that had a relatively slow rate of progress until 2007 on the assumption that the law would change and somebody would create a different framework for the future. Then they said, after 2007, we're going to have this rate of kids reaching the proficiency benchmark. So this is for California, this is 2007, this is where we are today, and this is what's in our plan for the coming years, and this looks like many, many state plans. So if the current NCLB rules hold, all of California schools will be designated failures in the coming years.

So here's 2007, but very rapidly we see more and more schools being designated failures. The schools will not fail at the same rate. Those schools who serve 90 to 100 percent African American and Latino students will start to hit the bar sooner, like right away. This is partly because of the English-language learner provision of the law, which is a catch-22, which says that you have to get 100 percent of the kids proficient. But if they become proficient, they get kicked out of the sub-group, and then you always have new immigrants coming in. So there are features of the law that are just plain nonsensical, and that is one. And I will tell you that right now in the House draft, this is not fixed, this problem is not fixed. But it's also because of the fact that all schools will have this problem.

So this is for 50-89 percent minority schools, the rate of failure, and this is for the schools that have a majority of white students, 0-49 percent. And you can see that they hit the wall slower, but they all hit the wall. And that's what's likely to happen in most states, we get closer and closer to this notion of 100 percent of kids proficient. There was a task force that the National Conference of State Legislatures convened, and they looked at the projected failure rates for different states. You can see, Connecticut, Minnesota, Massachusetts, Louisiana, everyone is sort of at 75 percent and above the failure rate.

So if we don't have major changes in the framework of the law, what we're talking about doing is blowing up our public education system...which is a startling thought. And this will happen even if schools are improving or doing well. That's the big elephant in the room that, in the most recent hearings, no one really talked about. People talked about should we tweak this thing, should we allow multiple measures, a little credit for science tests there, or a little local performance assessment project somewhere else, etc. But nobody talked about this fundamental issue in the nature of the law.

Different states start at different places. So, you can just see that, for example, if you use the proficiency levels, Colorado looks like they have 75 percent of their kids proficient, Massachusetts 39 percent in elementary reading...that's just a function of the different standards that states have set, because they score very similarly to each other on the NAEP. So you do have this variability across the country.

Key Issue 9: Now another problem is that some kinds of accountability strategies may lead to fewer students ultimately being educated. So we now have dropout rates increasing in a number of states that have put in place exit exams. Scores are going up in a number of places, but graduation rates are going down. Our graduation rate nationally is somewhere around 70 percent to 75 percent right now. Most high-achieving nations are graduating well over 90 percent of their kids, and we have had a decline in overall national graduation rate. This is a huge problem in a knowledge-based economy. More and more kids are dropping out, and the pipeline from failure to graduate to prison is very, very strong at this point. It really is. If you don't have a high school degree, the odds that you're going to get employed are less than 1 in 2, less than 1 in 5 for an African American young person, and the odds that you'll go to prison are much greater than that. So what happens to kids? This is when Massachusetts implemented its high school exit exam, and in 10th grade scores on that exam were the basis for the accountability ranking of the school. We saw for that class, when it first was put in place, that you had more and more kids getting lost between 9th and 10th grades, differentially by race and ethnicity, just not making it as a function of retention and then leaving at that point.

So one of the driving forces behind this law is the notion that we need to see test scores climb every year. Here's a school that had an average score of 70 one year and a score of 72 the next year. One of the questions we'd ask is, should this school get rewards for raising its average, or sanctions? How many of you would put this school under most accountability schemes into a rewards category for having raised their average? Quite a few people. Anybody who would argue for sanctions instead? You see what's going on here? What's going on? We've lost this kid—the kid who scored the 20 is gone—but every other kid's score actually went down. So you could

actually see kids less well-educated but pushed out the bottom and get your average to go up. In fact, we've seen that happen, there's been a number of studies that have documented that this is happening in a number of places across the country—that scores are going up but graduation and staying in school's going down.

Key Issue 10: Another issue that's coming up is that the focus on the achievement gap may be turning the public's gaze away from the opportunity gap. Back to California, again from the study that's coming out this week from UCLA, is that there are these huge disparities in access to what we call A through G classes, which are college prep classes, taught by certified teachers in the schools that are not making AYP. But we're worried about the outcomes and not about the inputs. Same kind of thing with respect to access to those courses for students.

Key Issue 11: So if we're trying to think about accountability in a more thoughtful way, we need to be thinking about how to create a shared accountability system in which we not only ask kids to be accountable for their test scores and schools to be accountable for that, but we also say that states need the federal government and districts to be accountable for the resources and the investments that are going to be needed to make a difference. We, by the way, last year hit a 32-year high in the percentage of our population in severe poverty in the United States, and most of those are children. So we've got kids who are poor, with less access to health care, in schools that have not had great increases in the amounts of funding. In fact, in some states, the investment in public education in real dollar terms has gone down...and we've got these expectations. We've really got to be thinking about the shared accountability for that. We need to be thinking about designing systems of curriculum and assessment and investment in teaching that are informed by research.

Key Issue 12: Another aspect of the law has been the selection of a few programs to be federally encouraged, rather than a process of allowing districts and schools to find what will work most effectively for them in promoting achievement. And then we need performance expectations that are ambitious but realistic and attainable, so that what we're doing is encouraging schools to make steady progress.

Key Issue 13: So here are some of the discussions around fixing the accountability and AYP provision. There is a provision now in most versions of the new bill to use value-added approaches that assess the progress of individual students, rather than just changes in average student scores that penalize the schools that are serving the neediest students. There's also, as you know, a sort of a diversity penalty for schools that serve a lot of sub-groups of students. So, the way it's structured, you have to meet every sub-group. The number of targets has been 30-some, and there's pressure to include graduation rates, so that would actually raise the number of individually-achievable targets to 40-some targets. You know that old song, "Fifty Ways to Leave Your Lover"? [laughter] This is "Fifty Ways to Fail AYP." And so one of the questions is going to be how those measures are looked at and whether it's possible to put them together in an index that allows you to have a single target which is a composite of multiple indicators, rather than having 50 or 40 separate indicators that you have to make. You probably know there are lots of schools that make 17 out of 18 targets or 32 out of 33 targets, and you can see progress for kids in the school in sub-groups, but one little benchmark is missed and they go into program improvement,

and that often causes, depending on how the state manages that, the school to have a lot of the productive reforms that it's been implementing put aside. In California, they're likely to be just given a specific scripted reading program and that's the strategy.

So value-added approaches could be productive and helpful, but the modeling that's been done around the particular version of this that the Department of Education has accepted shows that it will not make a difference in the number of schools declared failing. So it's not going to stop that progress that we saw. We need to use appropriate growth measures to evaluate English-language learners and special needs students. The kinds of assessments that are used need to be appropriate, and the way in which we calculate growth needs to be appropriate to the proficiency process of learning English and so on. There's a little bit of tweaking on this so far, but not nearly enough to solve the problems that we've experienced in getting appropriate assessments and accountability for those sub-groups.

People are talking about including graduation rates and other measures of student progress in a proficiency index, and that's something I'm working on right now with a number of folks, which would, as I said, put a number of measures, including multiple measures of learning of various kinds, that could be weighted and put into an index so you get a single target that your school is trying to achieve, and it reshapes the accountability paradigm to "Fifty Ways to Make AYP" rather than "Fifty Ways to Fail AYP." You have a number of ways that you can encourage growth in each content area—keeping kids in school—and perhaps other indicators as well: attendance rates, learning conditions, and so on.

So that's under discussion. Not clear whether it will be adopted yet, but it is something people are working on. It would also look at student progress at all points of the scale, not just at the proficiency bubble, so that you get credit for moving a kid from the bottom of the scale up. And it would give more incentive to focus on kids there, but also the ones who are beyond proficient. And finally it would, rather than looking for a hundred percent of kids to reach a benchmark, it would be a hundred percent of schools to reach a score level that represents progress on all of those indicators. That's one of the things that's going on.

Key Issue 14: There are efforts to try to support higher quality assessments, to encourage states and schools to use assessments that are more performance-based and motivate high quality intellectual work...when we get into the next section on teaching, I'm going to show you what other countries are doing and their assessments, and you'll be stunned to see how different they are from what we typically use in this country. We've got to move beyond a multiple-choice teaching and testing culture, or we are going to be at the fall of Rome. It's just not going to get us where 21st century nations need to go for a knowledge-based economy.

So there are a few little things in the law that encourage some local performance assessments and some development of broader assessments. Not much, a little bit, a toehold in the right direction, but not likely to change the whole landscape, at the moment, in the way it's being talked about right now.

Key Issue 15: And finally, improving access to qualified teachers. There are issues around how highly qualified teachers are defined. For one thing, for small schools, the notion that you'd have a major in every field that you teach, if you're teaching more than one field or if you're teaching in an interdisciplinary class, is kind of unachievable. So there will be some adjustment to that. But once we get the definition of qualified teachers in a better place, we have to worry about both enforcing those provisions and then developing federal supports. I will say that there is some progress on the issue of developing much more muscular federal supports for investing in teacher quality.

Just last week, \$345 million in service scholarships for preparing teachers who will go into high-need schools was enacted. Congressman George Miller gets the credit for that. It's something he and I have been talking about for many years, and it's been enacted as mandatory spending, so it will have to be spent every year. Instead of "to create high-quality preparation programs in high-need areas," there's a little provision in the bill for teacher residency programs that would allow, rather than bringing people into high-need schools and giving them a few weeks of training and throwing them in and saying, "Sink or swim," bring people in who are willing to be in those communities, pay for them to be in a residency under the wing of an expert mentor teacher who knows how to teach high-need kids well, in a school that's designed for that purpose, sort of a "teaching hospital" type of model, while they get their credential/coursework finished, and then they pledge at least four years to stay in that district. And that teacher residency model is in the bill and could move us away from the lower-the-standards approach to handling teacher shortages.

Mentoring supports for beginners are in the bill. I calculated that for \$500 million we could provide a mentor with release time for every beginning teacher in America. It's a very tiny amount of money. There's a little progress towards that. Actually, substantial progress in the version of the bill being discussed.

And then incentives to attract accomplished teachers to high-need schools. California provides a \$20,000 bonus to National Board Certified teachers who teach in high-need schools. It's paid out over four years, so they get a certain amount each year. There are other things being discussed as ways to both keep and attract teachers to high-need schools and improve working conditions. Because ultimately, we're not going to make a difference for kids who are not currently making progress unless we get and keep the highest quality teachers in those schools, and we can't do that without investments.

A little while back, I proposed a sort of Marshall Plan for teaching. It had many of these elements in it, and I calculated for the cost of less than one week in Iraq, we could basically solve the teacher shortage problem in this country. And it has the elements that will get people to where they need to be and keep them there, because retention is one of our greatest problems. And those ideas are percolating about, and some of them are making some headway.

But all in all, I would say my bottom-line analysis is that there's a long way to go for the reauthorization to get to where it would need to be to ensure that we have the capacity-building in all of the communities of the country that's needed, and the form of accountability that is supportive

and productive for moving schools forward, rather than punitive and disruptive.

And it's important for Congress to hear from you. I was with a Senate staffer last week who said, "Nobody's writing. Nobody's calling. Nobody's saying, we need these changes in the law." And this is one of the staffers really trying to work on some pretty important changes. Unless the Congress is hearing that there's an appetite for that kind of change, the amount of movement toward a more supportive system may be less than we need it to be for this to do more good than harm in the years ahead.

Superintendent Question and Answer Session

Linda Darling-Hammond: Let's open it up to questions or comments.

Superintendent: Among the legislative leadership, around the 2014 issue, they must understand the data you put up there [on slides].

Linda Darling-Hammond: They're just beginning to understand because those data are just beginning to circulate recently.

Superintendent: But they, like Kennedy, are committed to the 2014 piece. Are they just thinking five or six years down the road, they're going to revamp and that we'll just hold it in place for now, or what's the real thinking on that?

Linda Darling-Hammond: I've asked that question many times, and it's a mystery. One congressman who saw these data—and was shocked, most people are shocked by the data—the next day said, well maybe we should loosen the timeline to 2020. And that's been discussed in other conversations. Well, for states that raise their standards even higher we'll move the timeline to 2020. So I don't know what folks think, and the view that we should hold to the 2014 timeline and the notion of 100 percent proficient with the specific way of calculating proficiency that we have, has been the requirement of the Bush White House to get a bipartisan bill. I think both Senator Kennedy and George Miller have been trying very hard to see if they can get a bipartisan bill. It's an interesting political question because until this time, Democrats could call the bill a Republican bill. But once it's reauthorized, it becomes a Democratic bill, so I don't know how they're thinking through that political calculus.

Superintendent: As you pointed out, even the highest achieving districts under the current system are doomed to fail, and the high-achieving district of Palo Alto in terms of English-language learners, and the very lowest-achieving students, is actually slated for failure within the next two years...I'm not clear on exactly what that looks like. What happens to a place like the Palo Alto School District that's already doing stellar in other methods? What happens to them if they fall behind on English-language learners?

Linda Darling-Hammond: So when you fail to make AYP, maybe there's somebody here who's got experience with this who'd like to explain the process.

Superintendent: I'd be glad to. We have a wonderful elementary school in my district of about 700 kids. This wonderful elementary school didn't make AYP for two years running because in Virginia you have to meet all 29 benchmarks. They missed one by two points, each of two years. This is a school that's fully accredited by the Virginia accreditation process, the Standards of Learning, SOLs, go ahead and laugh, that's what it's called in Virginia, is the SOLs. You take the SOL test... This elementary is fully accredited by the Virginia Department of Education, made really great progress. Also, it is fully accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. But because it failed to meet one of the 29 benchmarks, we had to go into improvement and offer a choice to parents. Now, the good part of that story is that there were only five parents in that whole school of 700 who chose to actually go to another school that wasn't in improvement, and those were mostly people who had been turned down for out-of-zone exemption anyway. So, the choice thing is not popular. I read that it's not popular across the country, either. The travesty here is what we've had to deal with in the community. I have personally spent hours talking with members of the local media, trying to explain to them that this is not a failing school, and that's what they talk about. We had the opportunity last month, Ray Simon came down with our congressman, Eric Cantor in the seventh district of Virginia, and overwhelmingly, all the superintendents talked about that part, of how the political perception when schools don't make AYP, that they're failing schools. They're talking about something now called differentiated consequences, and we said to them, it's still a negative. But why can't you talk about it in terms of being helpful to schools? And that's really one of the biggest problems that we personally experience. It's a wonderful school, I'd love for my children to go to that school, but yet, two years it didn't make AYP. This year it did make AYP, but we still have to offer choice.

Linda Darling-Hammond: For a school that doesn't make AYP for five years, first you have a choice. Then there are more consequences....

Superintendent: I have a high school of more than 4,300 students, an award-winning high school, 65 percent minority; we outperformed Massachusetts in every one of our sub-groups and so on, with the exception of Special Ed and English-language learners. We're a gateway community, so we constantly get an influx of primarily people from West Africa and the islands. So one year we failed, we didn't make it in Special Ed. The following year we made it in Special Ed, but we failed in ELL, and so we go through the whole thing. We're in corrective action now, and, possibly because of sub-group issues, into restructuring next. And here's a high school that three years in a row has won awards from Portland University as a model school. With our populations, the governor gave us John and Abigail Adams scholarships because more than 25 percent of our students scored advanced in Massachusetts, which is the most rigorous test in the country by all examples, and particularly with our minority groups. And yet, when it comes out in the newspaper, just as the gentleman was saying over there, didn't make AYP, considered for corrective actions, so therefore must be.... I mean, I don't understand it myself sometimes. I have to look at it real carefully, between Massachusetts, when they had a pretty good accountability system before 2002 No Child Left Behind, and then the state has to create annual testing, so it got us all confused.

Linda Darling-Hammond: I think a lot of states feel that way, and the march that that school is on is the march that virtually all schools will be on.

Superintendent: A small tweak would be if the same sub-groups fail for a certain number of years and you haven't made any progress, it would make sense to me, but if we're going through a yo-yo, Special Ed one year, next year makes it, ELL doesn't make it, or one or the other ethnic sub-groups don't make it—see, you just play this little game.

Linda Darling-Hammond: That is actually one of the tweaks in the law, is to say that it has to be the same sub-group two years in a row, and so on. But the fundamental problem, let me back up to the process. So that school will need to be reconstituted or restructured or turned into a charter or something after five years of, if it doesn't make AYP. The problem with the projections is that because the slope is going to go up very quickly in every state, even if they're already a state that has more kids meeting their proficiency benchmark, and because of the way Special Education and English-language learners are treated, which means that there's not a way to give credit for the proficiency gains that occur for that population. Eventually, it will be impossible to get out of the box.

Superintendent: So my question to the legislator was, why don't you give me the same flexibility that you give to Commonwealth charter schools, so I can restructure some of those schools without having all of these various impediments in my way?

Linda Darling-Hammond: The administration's initial bill for the reauthorization was going to require that every school that failed to make AYP would offer vouchers to all of its kids.

Superintendent: And if you only have one or two—for example, choice has failed because that's the only high school in the system—where are you going to go?

Superintendent: Do you have any insights into where some of these politicians stand, or what's going to happen in terms of education, in the election?

Linda Darling-Hammond: It's an interesting thing. I think this particular issue is one that the candidates, I know from talking to staffers, candidates were surprised when they got outside of Washington—the Senate candidates, Dodd, Obama, Clinton, and Biden—at the negative response they heard about No Child Left Behind when they got in the field. They were quite shocked, because the conversation inside the beltway is really utterly different than the conversation in the field. It's especially different for senators versus Congresspeople, because Congresspeople come home to their local districts and they're a little more tied to the folks in their local districts, whereas the senators are kind of a little bit more removed from that. So it was a shock, and their rhetoric on NCLB has changed to say there have to be changes and so on. But the reality is, I know, that they are worrying through the question of how to respond to the bills that are likely to come out, which may propose minor changes but not a major rethinking of the paradigm. All of them have said, though, that NCLB has to have big changes. They've talked about the testing problems, they've talked about teacher problems. Conversations about investing in teachers are going to be on almost every candidate's docket, but people are approaching it very differently. Obama has a bill which is for teacher residency programs, to create these programs that will prepare people for urban districts and keep them there over the long haul, and so on. Hillary Clinton introduced the Teach for America Act, which is to fully fund Teach for America

and have a continual revolving door of two-year recruits into urban districts. So those are very different approaches to the question of teacher investments. Biden will do something that's a career-ladder kind of approach. It should be very interesting to see how it plays out. But the war and health care are dominating.

Superintendent: There's something I just don't understand...if the Congress and Senate look at it as the way it really is...which is to destroy public schools, you can't win at this, the way it's set up. Then if you constantly look at whatever they present or want to change, but if the outcome is the same, the schools can't win. I don't know why they would enact the law, because I think that's what happened when it was passed the last time. I think there was probably a deal between the Republicans and the Democrats to say, yeah, let's do this jointly, and right now, you're going to win—the Republicans—but down the road we're going to win because some changes will occur...but that did not happen. And so right now, most districts have two accountability systems: one is the feds and one is the state. So what happens is when you get your NCLB data, you've got schools who are failing. But when you get your state data, they're not failing. But you know you've already sent the letters out to the school community, and who does choose to transfer? In our school district we have 135 schools. We have 39 that are failing. When you send those letters out, the failing students are not the ones that transfer; it's the students who are doing okay. The students who apply for the supplemental services, no matter what we try to do to get our Family Resource Centers and counselors and teachers involved in targeting the failing kids to get these services, those aren't the kids. The kids that usually take the service, they're usually on reduced lunch, not free, because that's your greatest poverty level, and they're already performing at apprentice or proficient level. So even with the things that they have in place and that they're talking about continuing, it's not helpful. And if you look at the supplemental services the way it is, in our district we have, the charge, we have 33 providers, and in New York they have over a hundred providers, you know, because of the size of the district. But number one, just communicating to parents, and getting those systems set up to support it, not to mention the fact that 20 percent is coming out of our Title I funds to pay for this, which drains more money from the public system, you've got providers who charge anywhere from \$25 an hour to \$75 an hour... now that is a "state" kind of approved thing, but still the law allows that the way it's set up.

Linda Darling-Hammond: One of the things I would say to you, and to everyone who has similar stories and thoughts, write your congressman now. In the next two or three weeks, a lot of decisions are going to be made. The Senate is talking marking up the bill in the next couple of weeks. The House is revising its draft bill. What I'm hearing is that they're not hearing from people because people are kind of waiting to see what's going to come out. But if what comes out is not sufficiently responsive to the needs, then you're going to be in a very difficult political situation. I would really encourage you, do it and get a friend to do it, and have that friend get a friend to do it. Because, in fact, a senator told me last week when I was in Washington, "I'm not hearing from my constituents on this. And it would help me to be able to be more assertive in my proposals if I could say I've had 150 e-mails on this topic."

Superintendent: I don't think that's the message that's out there, though, because most of us belong to associations, and so we have different groups that are representing us that are supposed to be communicating what the field is saying.

Linda Darling-Hammond: Yes, but they're not being listened to, and the field has to speak.

Superintendent: Well, that's what I'm saying, that that needs to occur. And then just one more thing about teacher quality, what you've talked about is great, but it's not going to address the real issue, and that's...take China...they recruit 15 percent of their graduating seniors, their top candidates, into the teaching profession. We don't do that here. The young people who are going into teaching nowadays are not of the same quality that were in the past.

Linda Darling-Hammond: We'll talk about that in the next section more. Let me just say one thing. Please take these ideas and send an e-mail—it doesn't take much—to the representatives and senators who represent you, and get others to, because they really are in need of hearing from the field. I don't think there's a sense in Washington of the depth of the problems with NCLB in the field. But the politics around what actually makes its way into legislation is very, very difficult. The only thing that would solve the fundamental problem is something like this Continuous Progress Index, which is a way, and this is being talked about, sort of like what California does, which is that you set a benchmark for the combined set of indicators that you're trying to use in an accountability system and then ask each school to make a certain percentage of improvement each year. And so it's looking toward moving the whole group of students forward at a steady pace that's realistic, towards a benchmark that is not looking for every single student to be score-proficient, but for the group of students to get, as a whole, a higher benchmark. So that you can get around some of these fundamental problems. But if something like that doesn't happen, I think we've got the fundamental problem that, ultimately, everything blows up.

Superintendent: If I could shift from the politics for a moment and go back to what you were saying about assessments, in Wisconsin they just had an article in the *Milwaukee Journal-Sentinel* earlier this week that, of a study of 26 states, in comparing the state scores with NAEP, of the 26, we were the worst in terms of not correlating very strongly with NAEP, and we've been criticized a lot for that.

Linda Darling-Hammond: The proportion of kids scoring proficient on the Wisconsin assessment in relation to the percent scoring proficient on NAEP?

Superintendent: Right. There also was a report earlier this week, or actually last week, about we have the highest achievement gap—the largest, I should say—between blacks and whites. So there's been a lot of criticism lately, at least in the Milwaukee, Wisconsin, area, about the state assessments. So I'm curious to know what you were saying about how they are looking at changing those assessments.

Linda Darling-Hammond: The problem you're describing is that every state has set its own proficiency level on its own tests. Actually, the states that really understood what this law meant did what Wisconsin did—which is set a bar that says proficiency on our test, whatever we call proficient, because it doesn't have any real meaning, it's an abstraction, is set at a point where we actually might be able to get 100 percent of our kids to achieve it. You have other states like California, I think Massachusetts may be one, that set the proficiency bar closer to where it is on

NAEP, which is way above grade level. By the way, congressmen think this is a grade-level standard, and it is not. It's way above grade level. So they set it at a level where only 25 percent of kids are scoring proficient. It's just a higher level. It actually doesn't mean that Wisconsin is doing worse than California. The people who use those charts would have you believe that Wisconsin is doing worse than California, but if you actually look at how Wisconsin does on NAEP, you do very well compared to California. So the law has caused a huge amount of confusion about what we're talking about here: what is proficiency? What are we talking about? A more rational thing to do might have been to say, here is a benchmark. It's a reasonable benchmark. Let's try to move states toward it. There's some talk in the law about maybe asking states to calibrate their proficiency standards to something that would be a nationally normed grade-level standard, so everybody would be sort of closer to the same zone, but that's just an artifact you know, you can't say to people, set a high standard and then get a hundred percent of kids to meet it within a short number of years, and expect that there will be an incentive for people to do that. Now Wisconsin does have the equity issue of Milwaukee, and I could say a lot about what state and local policy has been like in Milwaukee over the last twenty-some years, yeah... [laughter]

Superintendent: Isn't there a movement to define proficiency? I've looked at NAEP data where Massachusetts correlates almost perfectly with NAEP as far as that goes, we're one or two in the country, and yet in my district, for example, here I am looking at, my scores came out yesterday so I'm writing a little response to whatever the media's going to hit me with next Tuesday morning when I walk into my office, and so what I've been saying is, what is the definition for proficiency? It's an abstraction. And then when you make those comparisons... so isn't there a body that's saying, a grade-level standard is this, proficient or needs improvement or advanced, whatever words you want to say, they mean THIS across the national level, or so on, and then when you start comparing, it becomes apples to apples, rather than apples to oranges.

Linda Darling-Hammond: Yes, there is talk about that. The irony of this law is that it has been so badly managed that there's huge push-back now against any federal anything, so there's a conversation about national standards, and some calibration of standards. But the push-back is even greater now than it was five or six years ago because the view is that this federal intrusion has been so problematic that states are pushing back even more firmly against even calibrating standards. But there is a conversation about seeing whether there could be a common standard. I don't think it's going to happen. What I'm told from people on Capitol Hill is that that idea, though it has been talked about, is dead on arrival, and it's because of the push-back from the results of this process. So I actually think that this law, ironically, with much more federal intervention and control over how people thought about their accountability systems, has set back the movement towards national standards that some people—I'm of two minds on the subject myself—but some people think is an important move, and even calibrations, so I don't know if it'll happen or not.

But the other issue is, here's an item on our NAEP eighth and twelfth grade science test, and we can calibrate to NAEP, and that might be a good thing in terms of comparability of a standard, but I'm going to talk about how far this approach to learning is from what other countries are doing. And so NAEP is a better assessment in some ways, but it's not all that good compared to what other countries are doing.

Superintendent: Another radical solution, let the feds make the national standards and let us figure out how to get there, and then create our own assessments, and then create our own sanctions for it, rather than have federal sanctions requiring choice of schools, supplemental programs, etc.

Linda Darling-Hammond: That's certainly an idea that's being talked about, but I don't think it's got traction politically.

Superintendent: I'm going to go back to the teacher quality piece and the politics of that, because I work in a very urban, very poor area, I'm concerned about teacher quality all the time. What has been the participation of teacher preparation institutions and unions on this national debate? What are they adding, or not adding, to this?

Linda Darling-Hammond: I would say on this question, there has not been a lot of discussion from the unions. From the teacher preparation institutions, there has actually been a lot of movement. There's new leadership at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, which organizes the schools of education. Sharon Robinson, who used to be in the Clinton administration, is now the head of that organization. They're being very aggressive in lobbying for investments in teacher quality and lobbying for raising the bar on teacher quality, etc. I mean, a lot of things. They're pushing their own members to be engaged in raising their own internal standards, changing the way in which they do business internally, creating partnerships with districts, and so on and so forth. So they've been much more active in this recent reauthorization than in the past and in the work that they're doing. So they're asking for highly qualified teacher definitions to include passing a teacher performance assessment that shows you can actually teach. There is a performance assessment that's been developed in some states they're trying to get to be made available. Nationally, they were very much involved in getting the \$345 million dollars for service scholarships, because one of the ways you get higher-ability candidates to go into teaching is to not make them go into debt to go into a field that doesn't pay them very much, and push them toward the districts that most need them. So, I think there's a lot of activity. They're lobbying for these partnership models, professional development school models with local districts for training teachers with more clinical experience so that they're really ready to go in the classroom. So there's a lot going on on that level. I'd like to see the teacher associations stepping into this fray because it is ultimately in their interest for members to be well prepared and well supported, and to get the kind of salaries in lower income districts that will allow them to compete in the labor market for their teachers. That's the other piece that has to happen.

Superintendent: I would like to say something in reference to teacher quality, and that is that, as a superintendent in a district that is urban, in my highest-needs school, which is about 95 percent low income, I have a stable workforce, and a good workforce, dedicated teachers. My concern is that I don't have the funding for ongoing professional development unless I get a hit-or-miss grant, and that equity in funding is a greater problem, at least in Pennsylvania, because we're not distributing funds equitably. I think if we don't fix that, I can recruit great teachers, I can get them in there for four years, give them bonuses, but we're not going to change anything unless I have the resources to do what we know that will work.

Linda Darling-Hammond: I will say in the proposed law, because of the drum beat, there will be more resources for professional development. Whether they will be delivered in a way that's sufficiently flexible for everyone to use them in the ways that they would like to use them, I don't know the answer to that yet.

Education Leader: How will that money get channeled? Is it going to come through the states?

Linda Darling-Hammond: Everything comes through the states.

Education Leader: And then it's going to be competitive to the districts, the low-AYP districts are going to have to apply to the states, or...?

Linda Darling-Hammond: Well, some of it comes to Title I schools directly, and there will be more available to schools that are designated in need of improvement. There may be some competitive grant money as well that's available. Some of it's going to come through the Competes Act, the math/science stuff that was just enacted. It still won't be all that we want.

Superintendent: I want to share with you a conversation that took place on Tuesday in Pennsylvania. Members of the executive session of school administrators, where we were receiving the same reports—there's not going to be any change, they're not going to bend on 2014—and an exact comment came out: "It's almost as though they want the public schools to fail." And I made a comment back to our executive director, "What makes you think that they don't?" Secondly, I made a recommendation to them, for those of us who were around at "A Nation at Risk," where it was perceived that America is going to fall behind unless we increase rigor in math and science, that until we show that there's something in this for everyone, Democrats and Republicans alike, in terms of world competition, I don't think we're going to have any change. In my view, the way to change this law is to show that the intent, while there has been some progress in different areas, it is not working and is going to lead to more failure in the future. That's my take.

Superintendent: I'm really concerned about getting a 21st century curriculum to all students. And what's happening now is that the more capable students are receiving 21st century skills, education, they are involved in "thinking" curriculum. The students who may be more challenged to pass some of the tests and to get credit for the courses and to take longer to do that are not being exposed at all to a 21st century curriculum, and, as you say, they're dropping out in many cases. They are not having the experiences in school, and so the whole purpose is defeated in many ways. And when we talk about the reauthorization, whether it's an indexed type of scoring to measure progress or whether it's some type of value-added assessment, what has happened with NCLB is that the means have become the end, and that's all that you focus on—with teachers and principals in many cases where it is more challenging to make the scores. And so with some schools, it's really difficult to talk about education and how to provide the quality of education we need for the students, so how can we get the 21st century skills curriculum in focus in any kind of reauthorization?

Linda Darling-Hammond: You know, we have to be thinking about rethinking our assessments

and our curriculum systems, and that's not really on the table. and our curriculum systems, and that's not really on the table. You're talking like an educator, but that's not the conversation that's going on in Washington. The simplistic mindset is, get the tests—the tests are a black box; nobody worries about what's on them—and then just drive people toward the test scores. You're thinking about what kind of curriculum is actually going on for kids, and one of the things that's happening instructionally, I believe, is that we really are shooting ourselves in the foot in many ways. For one thing, if you focus a lot of instruction on the kind of decontextualized skills that are on many state tests in the early grades, you actually undermine the likelihood that the kids will be able to do well when they get to the middle grades and high school, because what they're doing is reading kids drill-and-kill, not reading real books. In fact, in California, one of the widely-used approaches for schools, which is reinforced if you go into program improvement, is a scripted curriculum. In reading, which has no books attached to it, and the teachers have to hide the books when the reading police come through to kind of look at what's going on. So kids aren't reading books, so they're not developing vocabulary, they're not developing context knowledge, they're not developing critical thinking skills. There's very little writing that goes on because our tests don't require them to write, so they're not writing from an early age, and then you learn to think by writing, so they're not developing those kind of skills and so on. I think one of the reasons our 8th grade reading scores in the country—not just in California; California has been 50th out of 50 states in 8th grade reading—I think it's a function of how it's dealt with in 3rd and 4th grade reading—but that's happening nationally. Our 8th grade reading scores are going down. So the kids who are getting a steady diet of that curriculum, which is not a thinking curriculum, which may actually help them to do a little bit better, a tiny bit better, on the 3rd and 4th grade tests, is undermining what can be accomplished later.

We really have to step back. In other countries that are high achieving, what you have is a very different system for teaching and learning. You have a curriculum framework or standards that are much leaner than ours; they're not a mile wide and an eighth-inch deep. We, in many states, have the wrong kind of standards: they're both pointed at the wrong century and there's too many of them and so we're doing this superficial coverage. Other countries that are high achieving teach half as many topics in math as we teach in a year, sometimes fewer. The same thing in science—they go deep. There's much more performance-oriented work going on on a regular basis. Their way again of investing, they use the assessments in the highest-achieving countries for driving curriculum development, professional development, not for rewards and sanctions. Margaret Thatcher's reform in England, which was sort of the precursor of NCLB, has been taken off the books of England and their achievement is improving, so they're no longer doing the school rankings and so on. They're investing in a different kind of assessment, then they're investing in training teachers around the uses of those assessments, with a lot of school-based assessment, which actually counts in the accountability system. So they're having kids do important tasks, etc. We've got to just step back entirely from the way we conceptualize curriculum, teaching, and assessment in this country and begin to build these integrative systems that are improvement-oriented and aiming at the right skills. We really are just going like this (down) in the international rankings, on a par with Latvia in math, 28th out of 40 countries, on a par with Iceland in science, and there's nothing that is incentivized in these policies to transform the nature of teaching and learning in classrooms, so I appreciate you bringing it up. It really does require a paradigm shift.

Superintendent: I think that's the difficulty with getting into deficit thinking. It kind of spins us out of thinking in a positive way and is really very difficult to release any positive endorphins at all in a room. But continuing on what you've just said, one of the questions that I have is that there's a lot of focus on response to intervention. There is some understanding of value-added, and a number of states are taking that on in different ways. Isn't there hope in all of that, especially if we continue to think about it and continue to improve our models? Hopefully we don't go in a direction that starts aggregating data so that we're okay. We really need to make sure that we disaggregate data, so we pay attention to all the children. But continuing some of the things that you were just exploring before my question, is there hope in continuous improvement, is there learning in value-added that will help us, is there response to intervention—which the federal government is investing in pretty heavily to get us all working to intervene as early as possible to help our children learn more, and be prepared at an earlier age?

Linda Darling-Hammond: I think there's some really useful aspects of the concept of value-added, the notion that we've got to take kids from where they are and move them toward a goal. As we continue to look at assessment data as a means of driving change, we do have to get the assessments right. Because we'll be focusing on improving scores, and they have to represent the kind of skills that we really need to develop. So I think that's one piece of it. But the concept of thinking about things in value-added terms is useful. We also have to get the interventions right. In the early grades, where we're causing districts to focus more on kids, the federal government has been fairly heavy-handed about which interventions can be adopted and which assessments. There's quite a lively debate in the field about the value of those interventions and the value of others that are not being encouraged. So I think that we really need a truly open conversation about the nature of the interventions, an open process of evaluating the research and the knowledgebase about different interventions that may work, so that, in fact, as we're trying to get people to worry about that sooner, there's more opportunity to use a range of useful approaches. So I think that conceptually, there's some value. As we worry about the use of value-added, I think that there are a lot of issues in understanding what value-added data mean. I'm doing studies right now where I'm looking at "the value added" by individual teachers. I can tell you that we've modeled it six different ways, and every way we model it, different teachers look effective and different teachers look ineffective, depending on whether you are controlling for school effects or not, whether you're controlling for student demographic variables or not. So, it's a very new science. It can be helpful on a global level of looking at, generally speaking, do certain programs seem to be productive in adding student gains. If we start to move, as some are arguing, for evaluating individual teachers on those measures, it will again set back that process a long way because the science isn't ready; we're not ready to do that. We don't know what it means at the individual teacher level. But at the level of evaluating programs, at the level of evaluating professional development, it has some value to get us to focus on whether we see some changes in student learning.

Superintendent: Has anyone brought to the attention of our lawmakers that we have two federal laws, IDEA and No Child Left Behind, that cannot coexist?

Linda Darling-Hammond: Yeah, that point has been made. [laughter]

Superintendent: I'm just wondering if there is a debate and if someone should be kicking and screaming that this is occurring. My second point is, in Pennsylvania we examined the fact that our top students are not making progress. We believe that's because of the focus on the most needy students, which obviously is a good thing to have. But are we leaving our best students behind?

Linda Darling-Hammond: I think that's a really good point. I think the other thing that we have to continue to worry about, back to the kind of issue of teaching and learning, is that raising scores on one kind of assessment may or may not produce transferrable learning that shows improvements on other kinds of assessments measuring other things. There's a whole barrage of studies out there showing that states that have raised their achievement scores on their local and state assessments are not necessarily getting the same gains on NAEP or may not be getting the same gains on the SAT, etc., because not all learning produces transferable knowledge and transferable skills. So the other thing that may be going on with kids at the upper end is that the level of challenge that they're getting in the curriculum is just not enough to allow them to be making the gains that they also need to be making. One of the things we most desperately need a serious national conversation on teaching and learning, and not just on testing. And then to look at the question of testing through a much more sophisticated teaching and learning lens than we currently are because the tests are the tail wagging the dog. In the policy conversation, we accept test scores as the coin of the realm without asking the question, are we both evaluating and teaching in the ways that are actually going to produce the skills and the knowledge and the abilities that we want at the other end?

Ron Rapp: I have a comment here. This is Dr. Bob Calfee. He is Professor Emeritus from Stanford, and currently at UC Riverside, correct?

Linda Darling-Hammond: Bob knows a lot more about all this than I do, so he should be answering some of these questions.

Bob Calfee: That's not true, though. It's a delight to be here. I want to raise a question that connects your comment, Linda, about testing with the notion that we need to test kids and we sort them, you know, kind of like artichokes. I don't know if you been down to Watsonville, but they've got a wonderful artichoke sorter down there. They run down a ramp with different slots, and they fall through depending on the size.

So we sort out our kids on these tests. And the ones at the bottom, we know they can't learn anything very complicated, high-level, blah, blah, blah, so we give them very low stuff. The kids in the bubble, we do our best to get that test focused just right so they'll get up, and the kids at the top, we just don't have time for. Well, turn that around and say, we ought to have curriculum and instruction that prepares all of our kids, no matter where they sort out, for the kind of life that they're going to need to support us when we retire in a few years. I think the basic idea is that kids who test at the low end can't learn anything, is maybe a fundamental problem in its own right. They can learn. We've got good demonstrations of that across the board. We don't want to look at it, because sometimes, it takes a very skillful, qualified teacher. But suppose we said, every kid can learn really difficult things? It's Jerry Bruner's point.... If we did that, then we

would take the test and set it aside, because that's not the primary thing that we use in order to decide. We instead say, what's this kid interested in, what CAN they do, not what CAN'T they do, and how do we set the stage so that they work together in communities with teachers to learn these things? But I don't hear that coming out of Miller and Kennedy and No Child Left Behind. It's a very, very different look at how education works. But I wanted to pick up just that notion that we're ignoring the high kids. Yes, we clearly are, but we're ignoring almost everybody in terms of a demanding, challenging, effective curriculum.

Superintendent: Linda, why do you think it is that some of the very policy issues which we continue to find there's community support for, and I'll take one: calendar, probably every superintendent who has ever put in a year-round or extended calendar has gotten to read about himself or herself, and not in a positive way, I should say; yet if we look at what we know about teaching and learning and extended opportunities to help students focus, you try and change the calendar in a community, and it's still built around the summer schedules and who we can hire. There are so many real things that we know could make this difference, instead of the direction that things have gone. Why is no one really seeing, when there's so much research out there, around any one of those and a dozen other things we know. Why are we ignoring those? Why aren't those the things our legislators are helping with?

Linda Darling-Hammond: One question is, why is the conversation and the set of tools adopted by policymakers so out of sync with the tools that educators would like to use to improve education? One reason is that there's not a lot of conversation about teaching and learning in Washington. There just isn't. It's a conversation about policy levers. So if you adopt the policy levers that aren't likely to get you there, then you've got a real problem. One of the reasons I keep saying that people have to hear from educators is that it can make a difference. It certainly is beginning to make a dent in the consciousness of legislators that we need to do something different. What's hard is figuring out what we need to do. I think we actually had a more productive framework for improvement in the Goals 2000 Act of the 1990s, where people were beginning to explore a variety of ways of investing in curriculum, and new assessments, and looking at extended time and a variety of other things. I think that kind of came to something of a halt when the framework was changed to a punitive, test-rather-than-invest framework. But, it may be possible to return to a framework where we're really thinking about what we know about teaching and learning, and how we build an infrastructure that would allow those kinds of things to be explored and implemented. I teach policy courses and teacher education courses. So I teach the prospective teachers at Stanford, and I also teach prospective policymakers. When I was at Columbia, I used to have a course that was directed for educators about policy, because they're two different groups of people, often two different frames of reference. So thinking about how to enable educators to become more engaged in setting the policy agenda, so that it's more responsive to what we know about teaching and learning, and how we get policymakers to listen enough to educators that they will accept advice about what might be productive for teaching and learning, is a long-run issue for us. We've really got to work on that because they really are often very different conversations.

Superintendent: I think it gets back to what Bob Page started us out with, when he said there needs to be a balance between service and business, because what No Child Left Behind has

done is they've tried to develop an accountability system and it's compared to a business, which gets back to the artichokes. Business does sort those artichokes, and that's how they make money. But that does not translate to education, because we are responsible for all those artichokes.

Bob Calfee: Actually, artichoke makers worry as much about growing as they do grading [laughter], and that's where the success of American education needs to be.

Recommendations for Ensuring High Quality Teaching and Learning

Ron Rapp: I was talking with Linda before the break, and she was asking me where we should go during this next session. I told her that what I was thinking is we would talk about the issues in the first session, and the conversations in Washington, and hear your perspectives and how those issues are playing out in your districts. Then after the break, we would talk about positive things in regards to what will ensure high quality teaching and learning, and what you can do as education leaders to ensure that you provide the supports to your teachers and to your children for high quality teaching and learning. That's where we're going in this late-morning session.

Linda Darling-Hammond: We'll just dive right back in. I really feel bad starting on such a depressing note this morning, but you know, this is an ingenious country, and we will figure our way out of that, and we will figure out how to move forward. Some of it's going to happen this round of legislation.

But let's talk about teaching, because that's really where it all begins and hopefully does not end. One of the points I want to start with is the point that 21st century teaching is different than 20th century teaching has been. You may remember this little piece from *Ferris Bueller's Day Off*...this is his high school social studies teacher, just so we can remember what 20th century teaching was looked like in many places.

[Video clip of actor Ben Stein as teacher] "In 1930, the Republican-controlled House of Representatives, in an effort to alleviate the effects of the... Anyone? Anyone?... the Great Depression, passed the... Anyone? Anyone? The tariff bill? The Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act? Which, anyone? Raised or lowered?... raised tariffs, in an effort to collect more revenue for the federal government. Did it work? Anyone? Anyone know the effects? It did not work, and the United States sank deeper into the Great Depression."

Linda Darling-Hammond: ...and so did the students. So that certainly doesn't characterize all classrooms, but the image we had of teaching for much of the factory-model era was the teacher has some knowledge and they tell it to the kids. The kids listen, they learn it, they put it down on the test, and some kind of learning has occurred. A lot of the way we thought about training teachers, a lot of the way we thought about organizing classrooms was informed by this transmission model of teaching. There are still many people who hold that notion as to what teaching is about. It leads to repeated calls for "let's get people who have a lot of content knowledge into schools—they don't really need anything else—and then let them teach." The notion is, really all you need is that content knowledge. This guy on the video is a smart guy. He knows about the

Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act, but he can't teach kids so that they can learn. So that's our challenge, you know. You're working on it. How do we get the kind of teaching where, in fact, all kids are enabled to learn—not just that we've covered the material; we haven't just gotten through the book. And that's still a struggle for us: changing that notion of teaching, changing that apparatus that supports teaching so that it's much more than getting through the book.

We have a lot of evidence, and this is just one example from one study, that teacher quality makes the most difference for student learning. In some analyses, like this one by Ron Ferguson, about half the variability in student achievement gains is home and family factors, but the other half is schools. Powerful schools makes [pointing to a pie chart] the green part of the pie smaller because the schools do more to make up for that. But the lion's share is teacher quality, represented here by licensing, examination scores, teacher education and experience. Class size and school size make a difference. Ferguson says when the ratio between the two is very similar as well that it makes a difference to know the kids you're teaching, to have that personalization. But by itself, lowering class size is not enough to make a huge difference in student learning.

This summary from a group of studies that was done by Larry Hedges suggests that the improvement in test score units for an increment of spending; if you had an extra \$500, or any increment, this is how he measured it, that increase in teacher education buys you more achievement than lowering the pupil-teacher ratio, increasing teacher experience, and other things.

This is a lesson that a lot of other countries have really learned, in terms of investing in teachers. I want to talk a little bit about what they do. And also, everything I'll talk about is being done in the United States in some districts, in some schools. We are very good at developing innovative practices. We're not as good at systematizing them so that they're available in all schools to all children and all teachers. That's really our challenge. It's your challenge, I'm sure, as superintendents, how do you systematize the good stuff that's going on so that it's not just here and there, but that it is everywhere? That's what, I think, high scoring nations are doing.

This is where we are on the international assessments right now. The U.S. is 19th out of 40 in reading, 28th out of 40 in math, 28th out of 40 in science. Some of these countries—Finland, South Korea, Australia, Hong Kong—which appear in more than one place as being in the top ten ranked nations have also had substantial increases in their performance over recent years. They've made very deliberate systemic investments to change where they were. Finland, after it came out of the Soviet Union's shadow after Communism, was way down in the rankings. It had a worse-than-mediocre education system. It's now one of the top systems in the world. South Korea was at the very bottom and is now one of the top nations in the world. In 20 years, they went from having 10 percent of their population getting a high school education, to a 90-plus percent graduation rate for the population. So the scope of investment, the intensity of investment, in other countries is extraordinary. The United States has just not been making the same level of investments for a long time.

This slide is hard to read, but it's growth in baseline qualifications in a world of change, and here's the United States. It shows that in the 1960s, 1970s, and so on, we were way ahead of everyone else, but we're now 13th in the proportion of people with, essentially, a high school

education. South Korea was 27th in the world in the 1960s. It's now first. What's happening is some of these nations are just pulling ahead. We were first in the world in higher education participation for a long time. We're now 15th because other countries are making investments in higher education, at much greater rates.

So what are some of these high achieving and steeply improving nations doing? The number one thing is huge investments in initial teacher education and ongoing support. Finland, if you talk to the Minister of Education, says that's what did it. They sent every teacher to two or three years of post-graduate teacher education, completely at state expense with a stipend. Same thing in most other high-achieving countries. It's completely free, and everybody gets the same amount and the same quality of teacher education initially. For us, it's whatever you can afford. You can come into teaching with three weeks of training, one year of training, three years of training; you might have had student teaching, you might not have had student teaching; you might have had 10 weeks, you might have had a year; you might have been in a school with an expert mentor teacher, or you might have been in a classroom where the practice was horrible; you might have learned a lot about the teaching of reading, or maybe not; it's all over the map.

What they've done is really invest in that, standardize it, and then there's a lot of ongoing support in most of the countries that I just talked about. Every beginning teacher gets intensive mentoring. Schools are funded, when they have beginning teachers, to have someone with release time, usually in the same subject area, who will mentor that teacher and coach them in the classroom, and that's governmentally funded. And then, teachers have 15 to 20 hours a week of time to learn and plan and work with each other. Our teachers in the United States teach more hours per year, by a very large margin, than teachers in any other industrialized country, by a 30 percent greater margin. They may have longer school years in some countries, but teachers are teaching roughly 15, 20 hours a week in terms of contact with children, and an equal amount of time is working with other teachers so that what they do with the children is much stronger, much more thoughtful, much more well-designed, much more coherent across the school. That's how they get coherence across the grade levels, across the departments, and so on.

They have a leaner curriculum, and as I said, they teach fewer things more deeply, and it's clear that you're going to teach certain things in certain grade levels, you're going to spend a lot of time on them. For example, in the first year of middle grades mathematics in Japan, there are only four topics. One is ratio and proportion, deepening the understanding of integer estimation, big ideas like that. We have 30 chapters in the book, and people are trying to get through those 30 chapters. We teach fractions poorly in 3rd grade for a week or two. Half the kids don't learn it. We teach it again in 4th grade, we teach it again in 5th grade, and we are still teaching fractions in 9th grade because we didn't take the time in 3rd or 4th grade to spend a half a year on ratio and proportion and fractions, and how do you think about those things, so that kids could actually learn it deeply, and then they could build on it.

So when I talk about teaching, we have to talk about the curriculum system within which teachers work, because the quality of teaching is not only a function of the quality of the teacher, but it's also a function of the quality of the curriculum system within which they work, the quality of the assessments that are organizing their learning, increasingly, and the quality of the

collaborative work that they can do with their colleagues in the schools to make sure that what goes on is consistent and coherent from classroom to classroom. It's very hard on kids to change teachers frequently. Our kids experience many more teachers between kindergarten and the time they graduate than kids in most other high achieving countries, because quite often they'll stay with the same teacher for two years. A teacher in high school will be trained to teach two subject areas...so they don't bounce around to as many people. We adopted age-grading from the Prussians, so we send them on to another teacher almost every year and almost every period, and that reduces achievement. The achievement gain of having the same teacher, assuming it's a competent teacher, over more than one year is almost the same effect-size as reducing class size by about three kids per class. So just that continuity makes a difference. And so creating continuity in the learning process is part of it. Then of course where they invest in higher education access has been part of this.

Superintendent: I spent 12 years in the United Nations as most of my career. It goes back to what I said earlier about national standards. Every one of those places that you point to has a National Ministry of Education and national curriculum. We have 15,000 school districts around this country, each one making their own decisions.

Superintendent: A few of us went to China this summer, and I was astounded as I was sitting there listening, the Chinese government made an investment to become the largest English-speaking nation in the world in 20 years, and so they're sending their teachers over, spending millions. I had a superintendent sitting with me who said, "Well, I hope I can go back and convince my school board for at least one salary." If you do this piecemeal approach, each district doing it, we're never going to get it. So it's the political will issue, and how do we get the political will to do this, and then not having the school board's association, the unions saying that we don't want to have this, so I don't expect this in my lifetime.

Linda Darling-Hammond: I think you're raising an important point. There's much more of a national commitment. It is, in the high scoring countries, it's probably about half-and-half in terms of the number that have state standards or provincial standards versus national standards. I think what's equally important is the quality of the standards is higher. We may or may not get national standards, but we've got to worry about what's the quality of the standards.

One of my questions about the national standards' conversation in the United States is, if we got national standards right now in the United States—we've got a national accountability system now...we didn't take Massachusetts' accountability system or Connecticut's or some of the other high achieving states, we took Texas' as the model—if we did national standards right now, would we raise our standards to the level of the higher performing states in the nation and the kinds of standards they have, or would we end up getting a least common denominator set of standards, which takes the mile-wide, inch-deep standards that we have in some places and foists them on everyone? I don't know the answer to how that would play out.

Superintendent: But that conversation hasn't even started. That's the point I was trying to make earlier about what the federal government's role should be for setting standards. They should try to create a system where states will still have control over education that they were intended to

have, and I don't even want to talk about local school boards.

Linda Darling-Hammond: So the conversation has started. Where it's going to end up is the question.

Superintendent: Just a question. When you talked about the teachers staying with the students. We've all read the research and data on looping and things that happen there. But the newest research is now saying that, while looping does a good job because the teacher knows that child that was deficient and they can start off ahead with that child moving forward, but the second year the child that's advanced loses, and in fact if you have a third year, they'll lose even more. And so isn't there some of the fact that they have one or two standards instead of six or seven, if we're all getting to that one point, that staying with the child would be beneficial, but if we're trying to get to the highest level for all children, again where we were talking about before for the advanced, that probably is counterproductive. Your comment?

Linda Darling-Hammond: I don't know that we can generalize. I've seen studies that have shown continuous gains for kids in the second year of the same teacher, so I'd have to look at the studies and see what they're looking at, but I do think that there is a feature of making that practice work, which is, a teacher's going to make it work—and this may be a factor that the study you're citing ran into—has to be very, very highly knowledgeable, both about instructional strategies, about the nature of the curriculum, about how to individualize the curriculum, how to work with kids who are heterogeneous, and so there may be context within which that level of teaching expertise is not adequate to keeping all of the kids moving forward. Clearly, a lot of things that we might want to do, in the end, work only if we have high levels of teaching expertise.

De-tracking is another one. We have a lot of research which shows that the amount of learning gain that a kid will have is going to depend more on the richness of the curriculum they get than on their initial starting place. Kids who are tracked up learn more. But, de-tracking only works if you have really skilled teachers who can then think about how to teach that wide range. Well, and you shouldn't do it if your teachers aren't able to do it well, because you may end up with less learning than you would have had. So that investment in the teacher's expertise kind of constrains every reform.

Superintendent: Just to follow up with that. The recent Bracey report says that if you take the school districts that have more than 25 percent of their kids coming from below the poverty line out of the equation, that the United States scores number one in the world in math and reading. And Bracey's not saying that there's statistical data behind this, that if you look back to "A Nation at Risk," and I had the pleasure of hearing some of the writers and authors of that, that made the statement that when they looked at education back in "A Nation at Risk," we were doing the best job we'd ever done in the history of the world, but we were one generation away from being at risk if we didn't invest in our children. That was the purpose behind the title of "A Nation at Risk." I don't think it's ever been said that it was used to beat up on education. We haven't invested in education. We haven't invested in children. In fact, we've almost devalued children with lack of health care and the like. Now that we see all these additional problems that are taking

place because we haven't, we want to come back and say, oh, once again, it's education's fault, instead of the investment in the children.

Linda Darling-Hammond: You're right about the statistic that if you look at the international results, our high performing kids and our high-performing states do as well as any nation in the world. Our low performing kids, predominantly underserved students of color, African American/Latino students, and our lower performing states do as poorly as the lowest-achieving countries in the world. So it's that huge gap that drives where the United States is in the rankings. Most of these are countries that have narrowed the gap substantially. Some didn't have as big a gap to begin with, but some of these countries that have increased a lot have narrowed their gap, and let's talk a little about how they did that.

Superintendent: And yet, and I don't know if you've followed any of Dana Pink's recent writings, he's talking about the only niche that the United States of America has, the only one, is our creativity and imagination and ingenuity. That if it's replicable, you can duplicate it, the rest of the world can do it better, cheaper. But that's gone. The marketplace has ended. And high-stakes testing is forcing us to try to homogenize everything to one point, instead of going to the diversity of all, and creating everyone. So we're probably going in the exact opposite direction we want if we want to maintain our number one place in the world.

Linda Darling-Hammond: I would agree with that. I'm going to talk a little bit more about the assessment piece of that. Just to give you a sense of some of the things we might be aiming for if we could systematize the good work that we do in some places. Preparation, as I said, is fully subsidized. Everybody gets the same amount, it's the same quality, they did a lot of work to upgrade the quality of preparation...that's clinical training linked to study. In Singapore, they're student-teaching every year for four years. In Finland, there's a full year. In Sweden, there's a full year. Clinical training in a school attached to the university, with highly able teachers. We tend to devalue that.

By the way, we run a charter school at Stanford, which I helped to found in East Palo Alto, which is a low-income, high-need community where two-thirds of the kids were not graduating from high school; we're now graduating most of those kids and sending most of them to college, and we've created this little school. When I hire teachers, one of the things I ask, I care where people are trained, because I know enough about the training programs to know what they likely got. I want to know how much student teaching they got, and who they got it from. I want to know how much literacy training they got, even for high school teaching. I want to know what kind of content pedagogical training they got. I want to know if they've had an opportunity to use performance assessments and portfolios. I need to know those things, even if I'm hiring a beginning teacher. I certainly want to know if I'm hiring a veteran teacher. And then I want to see them teach in the classroom, and we will go to their classrooms to see them teaching if they're already employed, but we will also have them teach demonstration lessons to our kids in our community.

So investing in the caliber of personnel selection that really values those things is one piece of the system that we need to build. And some districts have had the capacity to do that, and others have not. It's not often a place where we make big investments. But once you bring somebody in,

the trauma you're going to have if they don't do well would be worth the investments in the front end. [You] need to also leverage the schools of education that feed you, to do the kind of work they should be doing, and they need to hear from the consumers.

The other thing about Finland, for example, is that they really focused on teaching their teachers to teach all learners. They spend a lot of time training them to teach Special Education students, special needs learners. Their theory is, if you can diversify and individualize and diagnose and so on, it will push everything up, and in fact that's what's happened. Everything has moved up across the board. They also focus on teaching teachers to teach for higher-order thinking and performance skills, how you teach transferable skills. The strong mentoring systems we've talked about are also important. Let me talk about what happens for teachers in the field when they're in schools, because that's really relevant to the work that you need to do. In addition to having this time for shared planning, and people are in planning teams, usually there's a big teacher room, everyone is in the teacher room, and so that's where they do their planning. We have such a room in the high school that I'm working in, and it's invaluable because they're always seeing each other and talking. There's time built into the schedule, and there are ways to do that even within standard budgets, so that they plan with their disciplinary team. There's also time for the high school teachers, where they plan with the team that shares the same kids. So they have two kinds of shared planning time.

Then the teachers are involved in "lesson study." You probably know about lesson study, this is taking Asia by storm. Japan, Singapore, Hong Kong, Australia, everybody. I mean, every time I go over there, there are conferences on lesson study. And what is it? Teachers get together: we're the 3rd grade teachers, we're planning our lesson on fractions, and so Sharon does a first draft of this lesson and says here's what I'm going to do with my kids. We give her advice, and critique, and why don't you try this, why did you decide to do that—together we develop this polished lesson. Sharon teaches it. We go stand in her classroom and watch her teach it. We also talk to the kids, look at their work, we see what the learning was like that came out of that teaching. We get back together, we debrief that lesson, we say what happened? Who learned? Who didn't learn? How much did they learn, and what might we do the next time to improve on that?

Then I get the chance to borrow—R and D, "Rip off and Disseminate"—Sharon's lesson and I adapt it to my kids because they're a little different than her kids. Then if I want to have lesson study, we can do that all over again. The quality of the lessons becomes so polished, as some of the researchers, Stigler and others who've been over there put it, that you're not going in there and just around, saying, well I think I'll do something on fractions today. You've got a whole set of lessons embedded in this lean curriculum that we were talking about, because they map to that curriculum, and you're ready to then teach. And you do this over and over again throughout the school year. It builds a professional culture.

Superintendent: That's right, and you could start that by just changing the architecture of the building. Right now we have this isolation. I always joke that American schools are 20 independent classrooms held together by a common parking lot.

Linda Darling-Hammond: And that was designed, actually. There were people who worked on

this, in the efficiency movement back in the early 1990s, and that architecture was designed with the factory model kind of idea in mind.

So there are these opportunities for this kind of lesson study. Action research—in Singapore right now, let me just say a little bit about that. I was just there. A beginning teacher in Singapore goes on the Ministry's payroll as soon as they go into teacher training. They select from the top third of the class. They are paid while they get prepared, and then they get stipends on top of that. They get mentoring when they come in. Beginning teachers earn more than beginning doctors in Singapore. In Japan, the salary is pegged to an engineer's salary, so there are lots of ways to make sure that it's competitive enough. But then when they get in a school, they have three career ladders available to teachers. So over time they can go on a career ladder to become a mentor teacher, a curriculum specialist, or a principal. And then they can earn more. There's more preparation that goes along with that, and salary and so on.

But while they're in the classroom, they've got this huge project going on now of "action research." They've got every teacher engaged in action research projects. The universities are providing the seminars to train them in this. There are teams of teachers at the schools, there are trainers of trainers who've been helped, and they pick a topic of interest in their teaching and learning curriculum. They're trying to improve the quality of essays or whatever. I was talking to a team of teachers who were trying to improve persuasive essays, and their question was, if kids are involved in certain kind of debate formats where they learn to argue certain points and go back and forth, will that increase the quality of their persuasive essays? They were doing pre-tests and scoring the essays, and then administering post-tests and scoring the essays, and so on. And little projects like that are going on in all the schools.

What happens is that teachers are becoming highly professional about how they improve their practice. Let's take a piece of our curriculum. Let's figure out how we're going to improve it. Let's try something. Let's measure it at the beginning and the end. It not only has an effect on those little pieces of the curriculum, but it has an effect on how the teachers think about their practice and how they work together. They do it in teams. So again, it's another part of this professionalization. Coaching is very common. Classroom observation. Teachers in Singapore get 100 hours a year, that's 2 ½ weeks a year, of professional development time that's paid for. They do classroom observations in a variety of classrooms within the school. They may go to other schools and look at what teachers are doing. Some teachers are famous for doing certain things, and they look at that, and of course they do a lot of analysis of learning because in many of these countries, teachers are responsible for a big chunk of the assessment system. They do school-based assessments. They either implement a state's tasks or they design and implement tasks, and they score them together. And that is part of the professional learning around what are kids are doing and how well are they doing.

And that becomes part of the accountability system, and it's counted in the examination score. About half of the examination score in most of the English-speaking countries in Asia, and in Europe and Canada as well, have test scores that are half classroom-based. The classroom-based assessments are structured and specified, and I'm going to show you something in a minute, how that works and is scored, so that drives the curriculum to be supportive. And what are kids doing?

They're doing research projects, they're doing scientific investigations, they're doing tasks that are preparing them for 21st century skills, and that, in fact, informs the teaching process. So it's a whole system of teaching and learning development that operates in these ways.

Superintendent: Aren't you seeing, though, that there are good things going on in some classrooms in the United States? I'm seeing it more and more in schools. I see a lot of neat things going on in the classrooms. I think we're heading in the right direction. A lot of schools are implementing some of these ideas.

Linda Darling-Hammond: A lot of school districts are, yes, absolutely.

Superintendent: ...and I think it's working, I really do.

Linda Darling-Hammond: Yeah. And each of you are in different states and contexts, so that the extent to which there is support for that may vary. But clearly, the forward-looking districts in this country are doing very similar things. It would be good if we could get governmental support for the funding that's needed to provide the time and all the rest of it, but it is possible to do this.

So in our country, the problem is not that we don't do some of these things, but that it's not systematized, right? Preparation is uneven, salaries are unequal and noncompetitive, so some districts can't compete in the labor market for good teachers. Mentoring is still not routine, and we have less collaboration time. So we have lots of places doing good things and lots of places not yet able to get organized to do those good things.

I don't want to take too much time except to say that when we think about raising achievement, it's not just the qualifications that teachers have, although I believe that they make a big difference, but also the practices. So on the national assessment, they found, for example, that kids do better when their teachers use literature-based approaches to teaching reading, when they use trade books rather than reading kits, when they assess reading through writing and not multiple choice tests. So again, in the context we have now, we have to help teachers not teach directly to the test if they're going to improve students' performance. And that's counterintuitive in a lot of places. That's part of the challenge of building the quality of teaching that we need.

In math and science achievement on the 8th grade NAEP, there was a study that showed that teachers do better not only when they have the content background and the teacher education, but when they were really focused on using manipulatives, hands-on science, manipulatives in math, and teaching to higher-order thinking skills...and when they had more training for special populations. Kids did better when their teachers had training in multicultural education, in special education, and in the teaching of English-language learners. We don't often think about do we improve math and science teaching by giving professional development around the teaching of diverse learners. But a lot of the problem we have in math and science teaching in this country, especially math teaching, is that not only are teachers often not fully comfortable in the content area, they tend to teach in a way that's not particularly student-responsive, and so those are areas that we often need to work on.

[Referring to a slide] So here's an example of a typical item from a test in the U.S. on our 12th grade NAEP. Here's an example of an item from the biology exam in Victoria, Australia. This is very similar to what you would see in Hong Kong and Singapore. They're both working to create similar kinds of systems that are both school-based and state assessments. You don't have to read all of this, it's impossible to read. But the kids are shown a virus and told how the virus operates, and then they have to design a drug that will be effective against the virus, and outline the aspects, and use diagrams, and so on. I reduced the amount of space that they had for their answer; they have pages of space. Then they have to design an experiment to test the drug. So look at the difference in what we're training kids to do. In one case, we're memorizing facts and trying to reproduce them in a multiple choice question. In the other case, we're asking kids to apply knowledge in ways that are creative and inventive, and represent the kind of work they're going to have to do in the world in the future. And this is what most other countries' assessments look like. And that's why I say our testing system is a real problem for us in moving toward the kind of learning that we want.

Equally important, the syllabus in Australia—back to your point about the standards, they have the standards, they have a syllabus for this, and then teachers are expected to do a set of classroom tasks, curriculum-embedded tasks, that are going to be scored and graded and count in the examination score. And they're doing tasks that are going to prepare them to be able to do well on that test but, more importantly, to do well in science, in life. So they have to do what they call “practicals” on particular topics, microscope, enzyme movement, etc. They have to do presentations, research reports, a practical on DNA and patterns, so they specify—these are lab experiments, and this has to go on in the classroom and get scored, and it's embedded in the curriculum.

So in this unit, they do six pieces of work specified in the study design. They have to do three practical tasks on cells, enzymes, and membranes. These are lab experiments. They do some other tasks on animals and plants and then a research report on pathogenic organisms and mechanisms by which organisms defend against disease. That research report is one of the things that prepares them to answer that question on the test. So it's tightly linked to a conception of what has to be learned.

So let me just say, this practice of designing school-based performance assessment that includes research and inquiry is being undertaken in a very purposeful and intensive way in all of the high achieving countries. Part of what we have to think about is how we're going to build assessment practices into our classrooms. That guided kind of curriculum that gets teachers working with kids on the things they have to work on. Otherwise, there's a disconnect between what we're hoping they'll learn and what's going on in the classroom. And then that gives teachers something to work together around—these assessments. Many of you have schools that are doing performance assessments, portfolios, and so on. They give the school something to work around. But this is being built in, systemwide, in a lot of places.

As we already said, our states that are high performing do as well as the highest performing nations. Just as one example, this is 2003. I haven't updated it, but it hasn't changed too much, the percent of students proficient in reading and math. Connecticut was at the top. There are only

two states here that have a large number of students of color and English-language learners, and those are New Jersey and Connecticut, of the top states. Connecticut is also number one in science and number one in writing, and it was a state that had steep improvement during the 90s.

Here's Connecticut's state science assessment. The kids are given a situation, a task, a bunch of materials. In a group they have to actually design and conduct an experiment. When they finish that, they have to write a hypothesis, design the experiment. They have to do it. They have to conduct the experiment, and then they have to give their conclusions and discuss them. So this is the kind of task that we need to be engaging kids in if we want to really move our capacity. Now, Connecticut is the state that sued the Department of Education under No Child Left Behind because they said they couldn't maintain these kinds of performance assessments on an every child, every year basis, and the federal government should support that. Otherwise, it's an unfunded mandate. And they were told, go back to multiple choice tests. That was the answer. Yeah, it's much cheaper.

So as we talk about teaching, we have to think about both building the teaching force and building the curriculum system within which teachers work. The other piece about Connecticut's work is that they had a 15-year process of raising the standards, investing in teacher development, ensuring mentoring, giving extra money to the high-needs schools and districts, and so on. They still have issues and problems, Hartford being the most obvious one, but they've made a lot of headway. So I'm going to leave it there, just to say that beyond investing in teachers' preparation, we also need to invest in the standards and assessments that allow teachers to do their work. And then we need to invest in instructional leaders, which is my last little bullet, which is another conversation. But teachers can't do this work unless they have principals who really understand how to support what they're doing. So let's just open it up and talk about whatever aspects of that interest you.

Ron Rapp: You know, there's a huge conflict here. You talk about the quality of assessments, the fact that we need high quality assessments, and that assessments will drive instruction. And then you have NCLB that really forces states and districts and schools to use standardized assessments. And with the accountability mechanisms tied to that, all of the teaching and learning is around these low level skills. So what needs to take place? There's a lot of work that's been done in this country, and there are a lot of very innovative schools and districts that have performance-based assessments, but they're dropping them because of the accountability of NCLB. So it creates a huge dilemma. Can you address that? What needs to be done? What can we do about that?

Linda Darling-Hammond: I think there are several things. One is that, I'm seeing a lot of consortia of districts and states come back together and try to share what they've been doing in performance-based assessment, and rebuild and reenergize that work after having been kind of been hit in the face for a few years, and they're trying to deal with this law, just really trying to regroup. So we need to come together and build those kind of consortiums that can move us forward. We also need to bring state representatives into these schools, where you're doing this kind of work, and show them what it looks like. We've got to get people in the political system to understand the value of the work that's going on in schools so that they can have a clear, vivid

image of the kind of practice that, in fact, is going to allow kids to get where we need them to go. We have to both reinforce each other in doing this work, and the same thing is true for our state leaders. Where there are districts that are engaged in this kind of work, the state leaders, including state superintendents and legislators, need to become more knowledgeable about that.

I remember when the folks in Vermont developed a portfolio system of assessment, and it was threatened at many points in time, and it became a practice every year to invite all the state representatives, all of the school board members, the state superintendents, and so on, to the local schools. There was a portfolio walk-through day, and you could see all of the work that the kids had done. That actually saved that system, year after year after year, because people then said, “Oh, that’s what you’re doing. That’s really good work. We need to preserve that.” So I think part of it is building the work, and the other part is being aggressive about sharing it.

Superintendent: It seems to me that there’s an overarching problem that, if we could somehow solve, it would help us all, and that is there are political truths, and then there’s reality. And what I mean is, there are some ideas that are very politically popular are based in fact, and we have several examples.

The other thing that we’ve talked about in terms of assessing kids whose native language is something other than English, is that we know that it takes about seven years to get the academic language, but we’re forced to test kids after a one-year reprieve. Can you imagine any of us going to the University of Moscow and studying calculus and being expected to do that in Russian? Even though we might be highly proficient in math, it would be virtually impossible. So I guess what I’m saying is, I don’t know how you ever crack that nut. How do you get politicians to listen to facts?

Linda Darling-Hammond: Facts as opposed to political facts, right. You know, my own strategy? I think of everything as teaching. So you think of, you’re trying to teach somebody something. You’ve got to understand where they are, where they’re starting with their thinking, and what kind of example, what kind of illustration, what kind of evidence would be useful in that context, to do that teaching. And teaching is a long-term activity, so you have to really get to know your students.

Superintendent: But it’s not politically expedient. It takes time to learn.

Linda Darling-Hammond: Yeah, right. The other thing, that is a more structural solution down the road, says these other countries that we were talking about have a Ministry of Education, and usually it’s a professionally staffed Ministry of Education, with people who come out of a knowledgebase about teaching and learning and the research on it. When they’re making decisions, they’re making decisions based on that knowledge base. Our system of education is much more politically governed in the way in which, and even State Departments of Education which were intended to be professional bureaucracies, that were intended to have the characteristics of ministries, have, over the years, lost capacity. In many cases, lost the kind of people that could make decisions that are based on a professional knowledge base. We have the same thing in the federal Department of Education. You’ve got to both worry about making the case with the people who

are in the government structure that you respond to, and they are like a classroom. You have to think about a curriculum that will be effective in teaching that group of school board members or others who are making decisions. And then we, in the long run, have to continue to think about how to professionalize the management of the educational process so that you could have the reforms that are built on knowledge that actually continued for a period of years, rather than being whip-sawed by whatever the latest election was.

Bob Selman: You partially answered my question, but maybe I'll push it a little. So, you've made an international comparison, and you made historical comparisons, and you just spoke about potential causes of international comparisons and structure. But I'm wondering to what degree you thought of how cultural factors actually factor in to international comparisons. These data didn't come from nowhere, and I doubt if they came from structural ministry organizational issues. But I'd be interested in your opinion in terms of whether there are broad cultural or specific cultural issues across nations that are really driving these differences. I'll just add that at my university, you would have 50 percent of the undergraduates going into education if they knew they were going to be paid at the same level as doctors, even if the doctors pay levels came down to make it equitable. We already have 10 percent who are passionate about going into education, so the mission is there and the vision is there.

Linda Darling-Hammond: Right, right. Well, there's a lot there, and you may want to say something about what you mean in terms of cultural differences. But in some of these countries there is this differential of a more competitive salary. That's not true everywhere. In some of the high achieving countries, teachers aren't paid all that well. In Finland, teachers are not paid all that well. But the mission is there, and I think in most nations there are people who care deeply about learning and teaching and so on. And they're respected. And the job is structured in a way that they can be effective. We have not done enough to structure the job so that people who have that desire to come in, and are willing to work for the salaries that we offer, have a job that allows them to be efficacious over a long period of time. We haven't worked nearly hard enough on retention, keeping people in the profession, so we have about a third of teachers who leave within the first five years. Those who are less well prepared leave at higher rates. Those who are less well mentored leave at higher rates. Those who are in working conditions that are dysfunctional leave at higher rates. And so, we keep pouring new teachers into this leaky bucket where they're falling out the bottom, and not plugging the bucket.

So I think that there may be some cultural differences. It's always risky to generalize too much about that because the countries we're talking about here are culturally distinct from each other in many ways as well. But clearly there are differences in the way schools are organized and the way the work of teaching is supported and organized. So I think that's a good piece of it. And you know, it's interesting. There have been several studies lately that show that teachers who have had more extensive student teaching, teachers who have had more opportunities in their preparation to apply what they're learning to real classrooms, to learn about reading and then go try it and then bring it back, whatever, are more effective and stay in longer. A lot of people who have the zeal, if they don't get the tools, and they want to be successful, but they're not successful, will leave because it's too painful to be ineffective. So there are lots of pieces of this.

We've had a framework that says don't give teachers too much education. In fact, in the turn of the century, there were a lot of the efficiency oriented superintendents who would argue for less teacher preparation rather than more because teachers would be easier to control, and they would use the scripted curriculum more effectively if they didn't have ideas of their own. Pay them very little, and pay a lot of other people to tell them what to do and watch over what they're doing.

Most of the countries, I don't think there's an exception to this, that are doing much better than us have a different starting point. They say, pay teachers a living wage, invest in their knowledge and skill. They spend much more of their money on teachers and teaching, and much less on all the other apparatus of the system. About 80 percent of a dollar goes into teachers in most of those countries. I'm trying to think if there's an exception, but there's not one I can think of. It's about 43 percent in the United States, of our dollar that goes into teachers, and then we do a lot of other things with our resources.

Superintendent: To me, I know that I think that one of the problems with politicians is that they all know education, right? Everyone thinks they know it because they went to school.

Linda Darling-Hammond: And they all expect it to look the way it did when they went to school.

Superintendent: Exactly, that's right. It was good for me, so it's good for everybody else. That's sort of the way they seem to think. But I am concerned sometimes about our low level of proactivity as educators, because rather than thinking why aren't they listening to us, why aren't we making more of a push to say we know this business, this is what we do? But I think sometimes the higher we get in it, where we have a voice, the less committed we are, the more we cave in to what we know does not work for kids. And I'm just concerned that we all really feel strongly about where we're going or where we're not going, and just really aren't making the kind of efforts that say, no we're going to be heard here. You know, we serve the people; we know about these people, especially the little people, and we want to have a voice in it. So I'm just wondering how we, as educators, can have more of a voice to say we're here, this is not working for us. We need performance-based assessments because that's what teaching and learning is. At some level of reality, can we push an agenda or think about how we make our voices known. Not as, "Please listen to us," but rather, "Yeah, we're concerned about our future."

Linda Darling-Hammond: I think that's a really good point, and there are so many dimensions of it. One is, when you have a profession and a profession knows certain things, then the profession has to speak in a unified voice about those things. We saw that recently in California around the medical profession when there was this stuff about lethal injection for death penalty cases, and they couldn't find an anesthesiologist in the entire state. They went out of state, and they couldn't find anyone in the country who would engage in a practice that was considered to be malpractice by the doctors. So they actually had to go back to the drawing board and put death penalty cases on hold for the last couple of years. The thing that was interesting to me about it is, here's a profession, same thing in much of medicine, you have certain ways of treating patients, certain things that are known, everyone agrees, and you just can't force a different solution. So, we do have to get more confident and clear about the kind of things that we were talking about

earlier. We know that grade retention doesn't work. There are hundreds of studies over 40 years. Why would we not be organizing around the knowledge that we have is important. The organizations that represent you aren't making this case very loudly on your behalf, so one avenue is working through those organizations to insist on it. And then there's also what you can organize within your states and within your communities and so on. But I do think that educators in general tend to accept what is sent down and not speak truth to power about what's really needed. I think that's a really important thing.

Brown vs. Board of Education, by the way, was brought by a hardy group of lawyers who worked on this issue for 20 or 30 years and 64 educators. Particularly in the African American community, but not exclusively, who worked with those lawyers over that long period of time to change the law. It was a complete and total partnership. And many of the major changes that have been made in education have been made in that kind of a partnership. So it's very important that we dig in on this stuff, because it's our public education system. It's our children's public education system, and if we don't save it, who will?

Expert Panel Discussion

Ron Rapp: What we have done is asked some of the finest education researchers in the country to join us to talk about their recommendations for improving NCLB based upon their areas of research and expertise. You have their bios in your folders, so you can check out all of their accolades. It would take me an hour to read them, so I'm just going to give you the brief version of that.

This is Dr. Bob Selman. He is a professor at Harvard University. He'll be talking about child psychology and the way children learn. We have, next to Bob, Dr. Catherine Snow, a professor at Harvard University, and she'll be talking about reading instruction and literacy, primarily. We have, next to Catherine, Dr. Maria Carlo. She's an assistant professor at the University of Miami and an expert on English-language learners, and she'll address that aspect of NCLB. We have next to Maria, Dr. Bob Calfee, and as you know he is Professor Emeritus from Stanford and several other universities. Finally, we have Dr. Patrick Walker, who is the founder of the *Voices Literature and Character Education* program and senior author on the *Voices Reading* program. Our expert panel—please welcome them. [applause]

Bob Selman: First of all, I see myself as a trailer. Think of me as a “coming attraction.” And think of me as a short. [laughter]

I really don't feel like telling you more things you should do, or more things you should put on your plate. But my bad behavior while Ron was talking was meant to demonstrate that the area that I want you to look at is social behavior. We really haven't talked too much about it today; it really gets marginalized in the discussion about academics. You all know that, and I know that. But we also know that it's really the other one of the two Twin Peaks because, really, the challenges teachers have are both academic on the one side and behavioral on the other. And the behavior is driving them out almost as fast, if not faster, than all the kinds of things that we heard this morning that are extremely useful.

I don't really have a lot to say about what my area of expertise has to say for No Child Left Behind, because my area of expertise has never been listened to in No Child Left Behind, and I don't think it's going to start being listened to now. [laughter] But I'm going to tell you something that you guys all know: it's just very important. It's very important to think about the social backgrounds of the kids and the social skills of the kids. And in a certain sense, what we're really talking about here is a part of the spectrum that starts way on the side of really tough behavior that's really driving people crazy, whether it's tough behavior that's in the kid, or in the classroom, or in the society, or in the home. We don't know what the cause of it is, but it's there, and a little bit too often it's located in the kid, and it's really not necessarily only in the kid. We need to adjust that.

I guess the title of my movie, if you choose to come and see it, would be that "Prevention is Really Important." Prevention means not only starting early with kids, which you know, but it means continually thinking as a preventionist about what you do. The truth is that we don't really. We really haven't digested the evidence that prevention not only helps people not suffer needless pain, but it also is cost-effective. The evidence of most of the research recently on prevention, whether it be in the psycho-social range or dropping out realm is that it really is a "penny saved is a pound earned." Prevention is very useful. So, I will turn this over to my esteemed colleague, Dr. Snow.

Catherine Snow: Thank you. Well, let me start with the prevention theme, because 10 years ago or so, I chaired a national committee called "Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children." That committee produced a report called "Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children." [laughter] We made the argument very strongly in that report, that reading, that literacy is a natural product of schooling and participation in a highly literate society with universal schooling, and that the way of thinking about what schools should do is to prevent the emergence of reading difficulties. It isn't just schools, of course, but early childhood programs and communities and families that have to worry about that, too.

That's a lesson which I'm afraid got taken a little too seriously in No Child Left Behind. So let me talk very specifically about one piece of No Child Left Behind: Reading First. Reading First, as you know, was built on the consensus about the effectiveness of certain pedagogical procedures in preventing reading difficulties. I would have to give Reading First an A for effort and a C for consequences, or maybe a C minus or a D for consequences, actually.

I don't want to be totally negative about it, because I think it was a bold effort. It provided, as many of you no doubt know from personal experience, federal resources to support professional development. This is a very, very good thing. Of course, it didn't provide enough resources to support professional development for all the schools and teachers that really needed it. But I think some districts have been quite effective at using Reading First funding to get beyond the targeted schools. I know, for example, that the state of Vermont has done that—has introduced the Reading First PD to all of its primary teachers. So good, good stuff. Reading First has sort of introduced, I think, into American schools, a very important principle, and has insisted on the importance of this principle: that you should test before you teach. You shouldn't just teach kids the curriculum that you've got. You shouldn't just teach them "the program," You shouldn't just

teach them all the same way. You should figure out what they need to know, particularly in the domain of reading. That's a crucial message. As I go into first grade classrooms nowadays, I never see whole-class instruction, and I never see...undifferentiated whole-class instruction as the only basis for instruction. I think this is an important message, and it's gotten through. And it's partly because of Reading First. Now, you can argue with the tests that Reading First promotes to do that, but nonetheless the principle is an important one.

I think it is very important that Reading First was built on a research-based consensus, that it was one of the acknowledgments of the importance and the potential of research to inform practice in schools. I just wish that the rest of NCLB had been as attentive to the notion that you have a research base for how you try to do reform. It is ludicrous to think that you can make schools better by imposing sanctions and fines. There's no evidence that that's an effective way to do it. So what else is good about Reading First? I don't know, I think that's it. [laughter] Well, I mean, resources, the culture shifts for assessment and differentiated instruction, PD wisely distributed, and acknowledging the importance of research in improving practice—four pretty good things. What's wrong with Reading First is overselling of the prevention message. Reading First basically substantiates a very, very simple, incorrect theory of reading development, and it's the inoculation model. It's the model that "if you prevent, you've done everything you need to do."

In fact, literacy development is not like the measles. It's like nutrition; you've got to keep doing it. You can't stop. You can't just worry about the skills that kids will be tested on in Grade 3. You've got to worry in kindergarten, and pre-K, and first grade, and second grade, about the skills that kids will be tested on in 6th grade and in 9th grade and in 12th grade, and those are skills that involve vocabulary, that involve extended language, that involve knowing how to write, that involve having a lot of background knowledge, that involve being interested in topics that you might then want to read about. To the extent that Reading First has really focused the nation's attention on the very basic prevention skills, reading words accurately, reading words fluently, and has diverted attention from vocabulary and extending the stories and discussing literature and learning about the world. It has done great things for scores of third graders and has depressed scores of eighth graders. That's what we're seeing in the most recent NAEP. That the third graders look pretty good, and the eighth graders look worse.

So, the story is that we've really got to rethink Reading First and add a Reading Next piece to it that focuses on ongoing reading instruction in Grades 4 and 5 and 6 and 7, and content-based literacy instruction in grades through secondary school. Because it's not the case that if you can read a third grade book, that you've got all the skills you need to go on through school. That's the most important thing that I would argue needs to be fixed if NCLB is reauthorized.

Maria Carlo: I think I'll try to follow up on Catherine's mention of the nutrition metaphor, and also on the earlier call to mobilize artichoke growers of America to march on Washington [laughter] because the two reminded me of a conversation I had recently with a colleague of mine who perhaps heard this somewhere else, but it stuck to me. She was frustrated and said, "I feel like we're behaving like farmers going to a state fair, hoping to win the prize for the heaviest pig. We're all focused on weighing the pig, and nobody's paying attention to feeding the pig." The way I think about No Child Left Behind and English-language learners is, what are the inputs

that we need to be giving to children so that we can achieve whatever outcomes we're interested in? I think that we've been thinking about the outcomes without really thinking about what kind of instruction we need to be offering these children.

I'll share with you a very humbling experience I had two weeks ago when I visited a district where I've been doing research now for about five years, not in Florida. It's a predominantly Latino school district. We were very encouraged when we started looking at some of the data we had, because these predominantly Spanish-speaking children were scoring right with the national average, in some cases, all the way up to one standard deviation above the national average on some assessments of word reading, letter knowledge, pseudo word reading. They were looking really strong. But we kept looking further into some other assessments that we administered that are not part of the assessment focus of the district, and we started to see a very different picture emerge when we looked at the children's breadth of vocabulary knowledge, their listening comprehension abilities, and their ability to produce narratives. Suddenly, we started seeing—we're talking about a sample of over 700 second graders in this case—we're looking at kids with scaled scores in the 40s, so about three standard deviations below the national average on those measures.

Here we've been, going through the last three years, thinking that because we were coming into these classrooms with curricula that directly targeted vocabulary, directly targeted children's oral language for 90 minutes a week, or we maybe taught them 10 new words in depth a week, that we would make a difference. And you really need to think about what is it that is called for to move children up who are performing on the skill that is the foundation to all literacy: the ability to communicate, understand language orally, communicate orally. When they're three standard deviations below the national average, how do you move those children? We are not thinking about this in the right way when we think that we can continue through whole-class instruction or through business-as-usual, thinking about a standard curriculum for all kids, thinking that we're going to make a difference. Going back to the nutrition metaphor, thinking about a child who's been severely malnourished and who probably needs growth hormones at this point to catch up to his age-peers. We're giving them a diet of saccharine.

And so, it was very humbling for us because we had been for a number of years trying to implement what we thought was careful instruction. We see the results in some places, but we don't see them in all. What's hardest to grapple with is that from this district's perspective, they are doing an excellent job because the assessments that are in place are not measuring those skills I'm referring to. There are no measures for breadth of vocabulary. There are no measures for narrative abilities. These children look great on these low-level reading skills, which are very important, and which, I would argue, fifteen years ago, English-language learners were getting no instruction on either and were struggling at that level as well.

So it's not that I'm saying our attention to that is misguided. It's that there needs to be more. We need to be as deliberate in our thinking about how we develop language as we are in our thinking about how we teach early reading. I think we've made a lot of progress in thinking about what that looks like over time. How does instruction need to change from kindergarten through third or fourth grade? We haven't done that for the teaching of English for children who are

second-language speakers of English. We are letting them walk into classrooms and decide for themselves, what of this input is important? No one is helping them make sense of the language, and structuring it and making it systematic and deliberate, the instruction of the language. I'll stop there.

Bob Calfee: Thank you, Maria. My topic is accountability, which is impossible to cover but necessary given the tenor and the tone of the presentations today. There was a time that we recently celebrated when Sputnik started “sputting.” Remember that? What was the national response? It wasn't to say our schools were rotten, blah, blah, blah. It was to say we need to strengthen our schools, we need to give them resources, we need to focus on science and math and engineering. When “A Nation at Risk” came out, the punitive tone began, and it has increased since then. I don't think that's a good idea for our nation. I will tell you I think No Child Left Behind is an unmitigated disaster. I don't think it's going to go away in the short term, but I think we've got to get rid of it. That's my personal view. I think that the data that had been shown earlier suggests...so I won't say more than that. It's just my opinion. I started looking at data from California, and you know what I found? By looking at data in a very particular way, we found in 1998 something going on in California that is exactly parallel with what Linda showed you about reading and math this morning.

Do you remember that graph? It was the NAEP data graph that Linda shared. It wasn't California data, and it was just a couple of grade levels over a few years. A couple of years ago, my colleagues and I collected NAEP cohort data in reading and math for students in California from 1998 through 2003. What we discovered was very informative. As we went from 1998 to 2003, the grade 2 data in reading went up. It went from about the 30th percentile to about the 50th percentile. Isn't that great? If you then look at the cohorts after that, the only gains were in second and, to some degree, third grade. And from that point on, every cohort began to flatten and decline. It was a disaster by the time they got into middle school.

I thought, you're responsible. Here are the data. You're working your tails off to try and improve student achievement. Catherine made the point: the foundation is not being laid for what kids need. That point says, we need to look at data over time. Don't worry if a school goes up or down from one year to the next. We really need to look at long-term trends to make sense of what's happening.

Final comment: *Educare* is the Latin word for education, and it means “to lead somebody to something.” Punishment is not the only, nor the best, way to lead people to something. We need to get back to the notion of education as leading our kids to an appreciation of a culture that teaches the skills and techniques needed to participate, and a sense of deep responsibility.

Patrick Walker: I was trying to figure out how to keep the artichoke and pig-raising metaphor going here, and I think the issue that I'm to talk about is the nutrition of the guy who's raising the pig, and it's the nutrition of the folks raising the artichokes. My question is, how do we support effective professional development?

When I started doing this work in Boston years ago, my colleagues and I asked ourselves this

important question: “What are the most powerful ways to help a child change his or her behavior?” I’d probably rephrase that question now to say, “What are the most powerful ways to help a teacher change the way he or she teaches?” Bob Selman and I worked together over the years with the holistic concept of a child and how we can support the social development, the moral development, as well as the cognitive development of children. When you begin to address this question, you quickly begin to look at the social, moral, and cognitive development of the teacher. So how do you get teachers who can model perspective thinking? Teachers who can model problem solving? Teachers who can support a child’s identity? So we tried to think through the most powerful ways to change a child’s behavior, but it really became what were the most powerful ways to change an adult’s behavior, and their ability to teach, their ability to model core social skills.

Looking at the recently revised draft of NCLB that came out of the House Education Committee, I believe that there’s pretty solid rhetoric about professional development there that wasn’t there before. There appears to be a very strong commitment, at least relatively, to professional development. You’re going to have priority schools and high-priority schools.

You’re going to have different degrees of professional development, depending on whether you’ve got one or two sub-groups not making AYP or ten or twelve sub-groups not making AYP. Given the rhetoric in the new version of NCLB, my questions are, what is the funding mechanism? How much funding is there going to be? Is it going to support the kind of professional development that would give you genuine adult development?

So what I tried to put down here are eleven components of professional development that I believe make a difference and that can powerfully help improve a teacher’s pedagogical approaches and their ability to model core social skills. Obviously, it begins with the concept of the child. How much do social development and oral language development promote literacy, and how much does it push it the other way? You’ve got to provide the motivation, the purpose, the meaning to get kids meaningfully engaged, and you have to do the same for adults. You’ve got to engage your faculty in a way that they see their own lives critically engaged in this process.

One of the things that we have learned through experience is that the only way to really change a teacher’s behavior, and their teaching ability, is to model it in the classroom. It is critical to have specific instructional strategies that you’re modeling. You’re co-teaching. You’re observing. You have frameworks for looking at what the teacher does and frameworks for looking at what the students do. You set up structures for teachers to meet in small groups to plan those lessons, and they have a partner that they plan and co-teach lessons with. You must also build in-school and in-district capacity so that the PD gets sustained and built upon over time. Those are some of those eleven criteria there that we have found that are essential to high quality, effective professional development.

If we think back to the morning and some of the discussions that we’ve been having here about the importance of attachment, that for many kids, the initial hook, the initial way to address the needs in their lives is how do you attach them to the teacher, to the other kids and to their

parents. In many ways it's the same for the adult. There was this discussion about looping earlier today. How do you provide a continuity of relationships for the adults in your building with their principal, with the other teachers, with the professional development providers, so they learn to trust that there's long-term stability. There's the outside capacity to inspire them, but the inside capacity to sustain it and for it to be shared among all the faculty.

In terms of suggestions, I tried to be specific about the language that's in the legislation. I would say that the key piece really is that professional development has to be sustained over three years. You cannot make a meaningful change in a building without three years of ongoing, sustained support. There's got to be enough money and enough frequency to have a teacher go in there and provide that level of support. Then you've got to have the PD embedded in the curriculum, not just an add-on. You have to have the instructional strategies embedded in the curriculum so that when the PD people aren't there, it's there. The strategies get used and supported constantly. Those core activities have got to be ones that powerfully change the life of the child. What are the things you can do in that classroom that can help a child today—not twenty years from now, but today—to change the way he or she lives? And how do you get adults who have that level of commitment and awareness to do that? Thank you.

Ron Rapp: Thank you very much to our expert panel. They have provided us with some interesting ideas, more ideas to think about.

Conclusion

The Second Annual National Superintendents' Forum held in Palo Alto, CA, provided an opportunity for participants to explore deeply many of the key issues surrounding the reauthorization of NCLB and to reflect on how these issues impact their work as education leaders and the children and communities they serve. What became clear to most, if not all, in attendance was the realization that minor adjustments to the law will not ensure that there will be a positive impact on increasing student achievement and improving our nation's schools. Participants agreed that there must be major changes to the law before it can be reauthorized. These changes must be based upon what we as education leaders, researchers, and reformers know about how children learn. Clearly, this forum illuminated the fact that there currently is a gap between what policymakers believe is good for children and what works in the classroom. Several of the superintendents who attended the forum realized that it is time to speak out to policymakers to make them aware of the drastic changes that need to take place in this pending legislation. Participants came away from the discussion with a better understanding that we must all step back and take a broader view of what a high quality education means, what our education system in the United States needs in order to improve, and what our children need to learn and be able to do in order to lead productive and successful lives in the 21st century. We are merely at the beginning of a long and winding journey.

To find out more about the National Superintendents' Forum contact Ron Rapp, Director of Government Policy and Communications for Zaner-Bloser Educational Publishers, Inc. at rrapp@zaner-bloser.com. Also, visit our website at www.zaner-bloser.com.