

Session Transcript: 28-05-2020 University of Penn - C-SAIL 20/20 Closing Session

>> Welcome to our closing remarks. Thank you for being here. We do have close captioning available. We have our speaker today named James. We would like to hear a few words from you.

>> Thank you Andy. It has been a nice introduction and also good working with you over the last five years. I look forward to the next year as well. I want to thank the team for presenting your findings this morning and to conducting a nice says of breakout sessions. Over the last two years I have reviewed findings from each of the teams as findings have emerged from your studies. Two important ways the findings confirm expectations that IES had for the standards and school center when we wrote the request for application six years ago. First college and career ready standards which embody complex interlacing's of content standards, cognitive demand levels and standards of practice would be and have been difficult for districts, schools and teachers to implement. Secondly implementation has posed specific challenges for educators of students with disabilities and English learners. As I have reviewed findings from the longitudinal outcomes study team and as I have received reports and presentations from the National Center for education statistics on their analysis of recent data from the national assessment of educational progress I have found myself profoundly discouraged by the lack of progress on a national level to where improving achievement for lower achieving students over the last 10 years. When the common core State standards were adopted in 2010 I along with many others hoped that the standards would lead to more substantial narrowing of the gaps between our highest and lowest achieving students that had occurred during the and CLB period. It seemed reasonable to believe in progress toward this goal given that the new standard more rigorous than standard state standards at the time. Unfortunately key gaps have widened in the last 10 years and in retrospect the NLC be years look like a time of progress especially in mathematics. Thus I find myself asking a new and different set of questions for researchers and policymakers today. First are college and career ready standards and effective way of organizing instruction in states, districts and schools that take them seriously over an extended period of time and by that I mean over years with consistent endorsement and support by states and districts. I'm thinking about recent research that is been conducted in the Chicago public school as well as the state of Tennessee. Number two have we asked to match of teachers. Especially those serving and under resourced districts during this transition to college and career ready standards. Have we asked them to be education researchers, curriculum developers, pedagogical wizards, and classroom managers all at the same time. Question number three is fiscal austerity constraining the ability of districts and schools to implement advanced curriculum and to recruit and train teachers to implement them. Our educator efforts to addressed educational inequality being hampered by the limitations of federal and state efforts to address the everyday needs of the K to 12 student population and their families. These pressing needs often prioritize access to quality housing, healthcare, and social services over the purchase of laptop computers and internet service and the completion of homework assignments. With that said I will turn the mic over to Andy Porter and I look forward to hearing from Linda Darling Hammond.

>> Thank you very much James. I feel the same with you. You have been a great officer and I really appreciate it. Now I am introducing our main speaker of the session. Linda Darling Hammond. She's the Charles E Professor of education and merit to said Stanford. She recently became the president of the California State Board of Education. One of our partners states. She and I have... I'm a little bit older than she is but we've had a long time together. As far as I can tell and without really checking it she is one just about every major award and honor and is gotten any accolade a person in education can get. That is .1. Point number two is she is, in my view one of the most influential educational thinkers of all time. So it is great Linda to have you with us today. Linda you need to turn on your video there she is. Just as good-looking as ever.

>> Thank you. She is going to make some remarks and then maybe if we have some time we can do a Q&A.

>> It is great to see you and wonderful to be in this conversation with you. We've been in conversations about standards-based reform for many years. I want to make a couple of remarks about the question of can standards-based reform work and I'm putting that in the context of what it take to learn the system because I will argue that if we look historically standards-based reform has been meaningful when they have been a part of a systemic reform. As you have been talking about with us today we have two achievement gaps. We have the gap between students of Color and those living in poverty as a growing share of our student population who are continuing to achieve that whole lower levels in general. And then the gap between US and other high achieving nations that have made substantial gains over the last 30 or 40 years which is an important part of the question as well. What we see happening in those systems that are making those gains. Despite years of standardized reform and high-stakes testing US courts have declined on the international Pisa test. Between 2020 15 2000 was just before in CLB came online. 2015 was when it ended stop we have seen... Ongoing gap. We've need to ask your colleagues to look at more recent requirements. You can see... I think I'm having audio challenges and maybe I should try to dial in to be heard. Can you hear me OK?

>> Linda this is your host. The first thing we want to try is to have you turn off your Webcam. I hate we will not be able to see you but we can hear you and let's try that first.

>> How is that?

>> That sounds good. Linda keep going if we need you to dial and I will let you know.

>> So there's this huge decline in the gap in the 70s and 80s and then because of a change of policies in the 1980 that eliminated many of the reforms of the war on poverty and the society that were changing the context. For students loss but also desegregating schools and engaging in school finance reforms that reduced inequalities of many kinds. But there was no standards-based reform at the time there was a beginning of standard base reform in the 1990s and we can see that some kids have yet to do better but the gap did grow again and it's been continuing in a like manner since then.

Those with a mass course easily reading scores when you can see the decline in the gap was even bigger in reading than it was a math. The gap has reopened and the site does not showed all the way to 2019 but the gap is now 30% larger today than it was 30 years ago. So what is this have to say about standards-based reform? Is standards-based reform quote unquote not working? I want to go back to the theory before. We had written one induration and one era and the 1990s that took hold in states across the country. We did see some gains in some states from that era. But the theory of standard base reform was put up by Smith and Jennifer... Was that it was to set clear goals with students and develop their curriculum and assessments and align standards for educators and then to ensure professional learning around standards. To ensure quality materials in additional investments were needed and use evidence of practice to guide this. This is the piece I think that is important in understanding what is happened since. Many states however in this era have had testing focused on lower level tests which have driven a different kind of curriculum than the one intended by the standards. It is been very uneven training for teachers and in many states a large number of teachers coming in with no preparation before they enter the classroom usually these teachers are in the schools that teach the highest needs students. We've had a lot of popcorn reforms innovations that come and go. And in many states deeply inequitable spendings and schools. 38 states do not spend more on education of students with greater needs than the education of those with fewer needs and about half of those half of the states where there rich get richer and the poor get poorer. Of course US poverty rates are the highest in the industrialized world. Homelessness increase during the great recession. For children food insecurity and were seeing another heads in that regard right now in this moment of COVID it is deepening inequality. Notice in that era where show tremendous gains in achievement and reduction of the that the percent of children in poverty in the 1960s was cut by half in one decade. And that was the decade that really signaled the big changes in achievement. It has now crept back up to not quite the level that it was in the 1950s. So one of the highest achieving nations doing differently? All of them do have standards-based reform. Standards designed to emulate some of the standards of other countries that were fewer, higher, and deeper. But we see in the highest performing nations and I have studied those in the flat world and in and empowered educators.. That you get an integrated system of teaching and learning. A much more systemic approach were school funding is equitable with more funding and places that have greater need. 21st century curriculum and assessments are tied together so assessments and curriculum go together and not separately. Investments in quality teaching are very profound. People get into teaching and high quality programs that are completely free to them in places like Singapore and Genoa. They have it deeply tied to the curriculum and the assessment strategy. The schools are designed for teacher learning. They have anywhere from 8 to 15 hours a week of additional time beyond what our teachers have for collaboration and learning and then there are many supports for child welfare and early learning. Where people do not live them children do not live in poverty but even if they do they have more basic supports. Some states achieve at those at high international levels. Are used to hearing about Massachusetts which is been ranked number one since been reported in the early 1990s. Connecticut was falling on his heels and New Jersey is a surprise and I want to speak about that in particular in a moment. Those states actually have followed a trajectory of systemic reform that is much more like what we see in other countries and much less like what we see in other states that have on the service done standards-based reform but have not vetted it in a systemic way. The Massachusetts and Connecticut reforms that were tied

to their student standards, their new student standards in the 1990s, both of them use high quality open-ended assessments that really got at the deeper elements of the standards. They both had major equalization and increase in funding, increase child health investments, standards for educator preparation went way up. A big investments in teacher salaries so they can recruit people that can meet the standards and professional learnings into that for more than 15 years. North Carolina was another one in the 1990s that was 48 the nation in math. You can see the green line on this slide in 1990 a tremendous investment over the course of the 1990s with their standards-based reform. By 2000 they were above the national average in math which was the largest gains in achievement on the largest decrease of achievement gap than any state in the nation in the 1990s. They stayed above national average until they started to seriously cut their budgets in 2011 in 2012 in 2013. I will note that a part of the tracking of these questions is that in 2008 of course we had a huge recession and in 2010 that hit the schools because the AR are a had run out. And we had tremendous declines in funding that hit the highest needed districts the most. In North Carolina that had these huge gains we solve comparable set of reforms to the ones I just described which also included emphasizing things like national board certification 12% increase in salaries for those people and a huge influx of very well-prepared teachers. Again we had coaches around the standards. The assessment from chosen to emulate like testing. So those decisions were thoughtful about the standards and then they invested in all of this around that allow the standards to rollout. I did a study around that time and achievement and found the best presented in Dichter were teachers that were qualified in their field. The teacher quality dimensions and the biggest negative impact with the newly hired and certified teachers and that is an issue with many states. But as many other studies found out was the equalization of funding so that students in high need communities got more money that made the biggest difference. New Jersey I wanted to mention is surprising thing to CEM having climbed so much in the achievement rankings. It is a majority minority state with a high proportion of low-income students and special education students. During the latter part of the 1990s when reforms went into place they began to climb and close the achievement gap in their first decade of reform they found that they got to the point where black and Latino kids in New Jersey outscored the average kid in California which was meanwhile just investing its schools. Those achievements continued and you can see the gains and systems in mathematics you can also see that Chris Christie enacted this in 2013 as funding was reduced in the schools and some of the reforms were undone. But those have been put back in place. Now New Jersey is first in the country in writing in second and eighth grade reading and math, second graduation rate. The way in which they implemented their standards which were in a context again a very thoughtful rich assessments and investments in teachers quality and learning allowed them to overcome what a lot of states would argue is a huge impediment to their forward momentum on achievement. Again the same kind of agenda that we saw in other states occurred there along with homeschool reform model. I want to note New York spends the same amount of money. It ranks at the average of all states rather than near the top. But the policy mix is very different. They'd never equalized funding. Curriculum and assessments have been a hot mess. They started us off the whole number of tests that were difficult unfolding of the common core State standards. They did not make the investments initially in teacher led learning and they put high stakes were they put learning opportunity. They had a very difficult time in getting a child's safety net put into place. So the policies that accompanied the standards-based reforms made a big difference. When standards-based

reform become systemic you can see these sets of strategies around not only the way in which the curriculum is brought online. That the standards are brought online. But the assessment system isn't able to match which is not true into many states. The investments and teacher equality and learning are made and the seeking of funding you see very different outcomes. System and systematic has actually all of the system components working and reinforcing ways and you can see this and a lot of other countries. The policies affect all of the schools and teachers and not just a little bit of a pilot here and a little bit of a thing over there. Some schools that are able to enable it to do well let with the language. They left with a complete systemic approach with the training and the funding that are needed to be engaged. When California implemented the state standards I would say that they are very much involved in that and our students are committed to the standards. This was my predecessor on the state board slide on what we had to do to align policy looking for policy gaps. It conflicts around the curriculum. Principal and teacher investments and policy. College readiness. We have standards that were written for English learners along with non-native English speakers. Specialty education and accountability systems were redefined and school funding was also put into place which was much more equitable and we have seen California go from 48 and 49th in the country respectively and eighth grade reading and math to almost all the way to the national average in reading and just about five years of implementing the set of reforms. In closing about half the gap to the national average in math. It is not atop the country story but it is a story of success in implementing the standards in a coherent way. We wanted to get to what the anatomy of equity in treatment is and it would really include the systemic elements of support for children. Equitable school sources. Investments in well prepared well supported educators. The 20th century that sits on top of those other elements to produce the kind of innovated and effective schools were looking for. And that is the last slide.

>> Thank you very much. That was useful and interesting. It sounded to me kind of like an endorsement of standard base reform as it was originally thought about some 30 years ago. That is about when that Smith article came out. They were all wrapped up together. They were tied together because the standards were the goal, the lead of the systemic reform and then everything came in. And then you say that it still makes sense to me but I say it worked but with a lot of variability and is the variability you pointed out as well. It raised me to the question why does it work... Are some people just not faithful to it and not trying hard or what is the deal? Why does it work sometimes and not others? And just to follow that a little bit. You use that dirty word money quite a few times and I myself like money so I can understand that. But were experiencing this pandemic I think our country is going to be busted. We're spending money and a wide way. When they get the money out to the people who need it. But we are in a heck of a hole here. If money is the key what is going on. And the third thing is this. I think more people in the United States today understand the importance of and love education and teachers in their schools because they are stuck with her kids. I think now is the time to hit them up for money.

>> I do think that many is a part of it. One of the things I showed you on the trajectory we were on in the 70s and into the beginning of the 80s and the gap closed by half. During that period of time. And then it reopens. The policies that had been behind us some of them more money and they all come back to money in some way probably. Their investments in more equitable spending. The war on

poverty and all of that. The discourse in the 1980s became that money doesn't matter. It was a very deliberate discourse that was created in the 1980s to say we don't have to worry about all of this. We are the most unequal system in the industrialized world in terms of how we underwrite schools. But we do not in most states except for the places like Massachusetts and some of the others I pointed out like New Jersey. New Jersey, Massachusetts and California are spending money equitably. If you start the schools with the greatest needs and they get a continual cycle of teachers who were untrained and do not stay very long and they get professional development and walk out the door with them. And they have other needs that need to be attended to so they can be ready to learn without anxiety and hunger and so on. When we have made this investment in other countries make those investments routinely we see much better learning outcomes it is just not true that money does not matter. Record draw sin and who Robert Johnson have done a series of studies showing how over a period of time students finance reports were coming into place, the places that put as much as even 20% more into the education of low-income kids over the 12 years of their schooling had graduation rates 20+ percentage points higher, adults greater educational attainment, elimination of the adult poverty gap that we would otherwise see. So yes money does matter. And a lot of places have said that it is just the standards. It is just having these great standards and curriculum. And tests do not teach children. Teachers do. And teachers have to be educated, enabled, supported. They have to make a living wage if you want them to stay in the profession at all. Now what about the whole we are in now? We've had trillions of dollars in recovery ask coming from the federal government. Out of all of those many trillions of dollars thus far the amount spent on education 30 billion. So way way way under 1%. We have not made the commitment to stabilize schools, to enable them to continue to work that they are doing. The money is there. And this is the question we're gonna have in the coming year and the years ahead for the United States. Are we going to allocate the money in a way that will actually help our economy in a way and variety that people are not anticipating right now in terms of spending. And just allowing parents as you said to get back to work and not have to be taking care of the kids. So we will see whether those investments are made. If they're not made it of federal level right now during the expense of this pandemic I think we're looking at the fall of Rome. I think we're looking at the beginning of the end for the United States being a world-class country in terms of good kids, education supported in a way which kisses supported. We cannot starve the kids in the system the highest needs places indefinitely. The reason why I gave the success stories, and they continue to be. These are places that are investing a lot more. Massachusetts and Vermont is often at the top as well, New Jersey, Connecticut. They are spending \$18,000 a kid. More equitably than they used to. On the education of teachers and leaders, they implement the standards in place and they are maintaining a level of resources. Whether they can continue without support in this moment is a big question. The places that have been this investing in schools are going to fall off a cliff.

>> I would underline what you were talking about when he said money matters. Money matters especially if you spend it wisely. Kansas City taught us that once a long time ago. They didn't spend it wisely did not get any benefits to student achievement. We are at the end of our time here which is too bad because it's so much time top fun talking to you. I would say standards-based reform I think for some people it is difficult to implement well.

>> Absolutely. And to do well you have got to make those investments. It is hard to do but if you make the investments. I think all children can learn I think all teachers and school leaders can learn. We do see that making the investments can make a big difference. But it's hard to do well in a sophisticated teaching as you've shown us over so many years. It takes pedagogical thinking and skill so it does not happen without very skillful investments in the learning process for the adults as well.

>> Linda thank you very much for your thoughts and your wisdom. We are at the end of our time. Thank you attendees and audience for your participation here and I have one site to show you before we go off. That is that all of this has been recorded and will be on our website. C-SAIL.org/videos. If you have any questions about today's events here's an email that you can contact. Also you can send in questions as a part of this. If you've not done so already. I encourage you to do that. Thank you again Linda, thank you James. Thank you Jackie and Nicole for setting this up and I wish you all a good rest of the day.

>> It was great to see you, and thank you.

>> Goodbye.