



GOVERNORS
EDUCATION
SYMPOSIUM

A Report from the 2007
Governors Education Symposium

April 11-13, 2007

Scottsdale, Arizona



JAMES B HUNT, JR INSTITUTE
for EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP *and* POLICY

Designing strategy. Shaping policy. Driving improvement.

INTRODUCTION

The James B. Hunt, Jr. Institute for Educational Leadership and Policy held its 4th annual Governors Education Symposium April 11-13, 2007 in Scottsdale, Arizona. Former Governor Jim Hunt co-hosted the Symposium with Arizona Governor Janet Napolitano and Minnesota Governor Tim Pawlenty, current Chair and Co-Chair of the National Governors Association. The Symposium, *Education: The Economic Engine of Global Competition*, provided governors an opportunity to discuss and fine tune their education policy agendas alongside leading policy experts, researchers, and most importantly, a group of current and former governors.

During the Symposium, governors and first ladies discussed several crucial education policy issues: college readiness; the need to connect our K-12 and postsecondary systems; affordability and accountability in higher education; extra learning opportunities for students; and teacher compensation and performance. Resource experts enhanced each session with key statistical data, research findings, and lessons learned by states that have implemented various strategies. Governors shared successes and challenges in their own states, and asked tough questions to uncover promising strategies to take back home.

Tom Tierney, Chairman and Co-Founder of The Bridgespan Group, opened the Symposium with a keynote address on *The Curse of Market Leadership* – the tendency for top industries to ignore the need for change. Tierney reviewed key indicators from the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, depicting the faltering position of our higher education system compared to progress being made in other countries. Tierney urged governors to confront the facts about America's education system and to lead their states in making essential changes.

On Thursday, governors discussed the need to better prepare students for success in postsecondary education and the workforce. Throughout the day's sessions, the need to align K-12 and higher education was stressed. Governors discussed the quality of current state K-12 standards, and the gap between high school graduation requirements and the knowledge and skills that are expected of incoming college freshman. To ensure that postsecondary institutions efficiently and effectively foster student learning, funding incentives should encourage higher education to achieve state goals, such as improving rates of degree completion. To hold higher education accountable for results, data systems are needed to track value-added measurements, graduations rates, and contributions to the state workforce.



“We’ve got a huge job ahead if we’re going to be prepared to have the kind of future we want to have. If it’s going to happen, folks, **governors have got to make it happen.”**

Former Governor Jim Hunt

The sessions on Friday focused on two essential factors contributing to student achievement: teacher quality and extended learning opportunities. Governors discussed the need for quality standards and stable funding sources for afterschool programs, and the potential for an extended day strategy to restructure and modernize the school day. Resource experts explained that research on pay reform is lacking and encouraged governors to support local experimentation in pay reform and to measure the results of such efforts.

This report captures some of the key facts, issues, and potential solutions from the Symposium. Throughout the event, two key themes emerged: the need to align education systems, and the importance of data. Governors need to foster a view of K-12, community college, and university systems as a single state entity. Gubernatorial leadership is needed to ensure that P-20 efforts lead to systematic change.

The value of appropriate data was mentioned in each session, particularly a longitudinal system that runs from P-20 and links student data to teachers. To drive educational improvement, governors need to know what is working in education reform. During the sessions, governors discussed answers they are unable to obtain due to a lack of data and measures their states are taking to build an effective data infrastructure.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS: THE CURSE OF MARKET LEADERSHIP

Tom Tierney, Chairman and Co-Founder, The Bridgespan Group

America's higher education system has long been considered the best in the world, but other countries have caught up to, and even surpassed, the U.S. on some measures. Tom Tierney views this situation through two lenses: as the former CEO of a global business consulting firm, and as the current leader of a consulting firm for nonprofit organizations. He shared his thoughts on *The Curse of Market Leadership*, setting the context for the remaining Symposium discussions.

Our educational system, once the best in the world, is now threatened by the natural tendency to resist change. Great companies refuse to rest on their laurels; they are willing to

confront the brutal facts and change accordingly. In today's globally competitive economy, industries that ignore the need to change will find themselves falling from "great to good." The histories of America's steel and automobile industries provide a clear example of this threat.

Organizations such as the National Center for Public Policy in Higher Education, the Spellings Commission on Higher Education, and the National Center on Education and the Economy demonstrate remarkable agreement about the status of our higher education system. These are facts that must be confronted.



"We probably have a 10-15 year window during which we have to fundamentally change our trajectory – to overcome this 'curse of market leadership.' We have lots of great institutions; we do not have a great system. We have to address what is essentially a systems problem... This will require strong leadership."

Tom Tierney

■ **Absolute Performance: How are we doing today?**

Measuring Up 2006 paints a dismal picture of higher education's progress since the early 1990s:

- Participation: no notable progress
- Affordability: deteriorating
- Completion: modest, unimpressive gains

■ **Relative performance: How are we doing compared to our competitors?**

The quality and world market share of American higher education is rapidly eroding. Among leading countries, the U.S. ranks in the bottom half in the proportion of students who complete college.

■ **Context: What trends are influencing our performance?**

A highly educated workforce is needed for 60 percent of jobs. In addition, traditionally underperforming groups are becoming a larger proportion of the U.S. population. Since technology now allows production to be unbundled and outsourced, many companies can improve their bottom line by hiring outside of the U.S.

These facts do not speak to higher education alone. By failing to prepare high school graduates for success in college, America's education system is squeezing hope out of young people. A low-income student in a low-performing school must struggle against system failures and resist social pressure to drop out. If the student graduates from high school, he or she still faces an extremely low likelihood of earning a degree.

- In top-quartile schools, 75 percent of graduates earn a degree.
- In bottom-quartile schools, only nine percent of graduates earn a degree.

Students know that a postsecondary degree is needed to break into the middle class, and most high school students say that they plan to go on to college. Yet only 18 percent of our students fulfill this dream by earning a college degree. When students realize they are unlikely to make it through the education pipeline, they see no reason for completing high school. Education leaders need to ensure that our K-12 system produces high school graduates who are prepared for postsecondary education.

Though it's tough to lead the charge for change, governors are in the position to do it. State leaders must confront the facts about our nation's education system and find ways to move the system beyond an incremental approach that funds disconnected programs and abandons them before results are known. To give young people hope of making it through the educational pipeline, we must ensure that our K-12 system prepares students for college and work. We need teachers who can help our students cultivate crucial skills in reading, writing, math, and science. If our educational system is to remain the best in the world, we cannot maintain the status quo while other countries find ways to educate greater proportions of their workforce.



“There is, and remains, a substantial gap between what postsecondary educators expect of entering students and what actually is occurring in middle and high school classrooms. And it’s happening in every content area.”

Cyndie Schmeiser

HELPING MORE STUDENTS ACHIEVE THE DREAM

Part A: Improving College Readiness

Session Chair: **Don Carcieri**, Governor of Rhode Island

Bill Schmidt, Distinguished Professor, Michigan State University

Peter McWalters, Commissioner, Rhode Island Department of Education

Part B: Aligning K-12 with Higher Education

Session Chair: **Janet Napolitano**, Governor of Arizona

Michael Kirst, Professor, Stanford University

Cyndie Schmeiser, President and COO, Education Division, ACT, Inc.

The global economy holds high standards for its workforce. By 2010, two-thirds of all jobs will require at least some postsecondary education.¹ Today's students understand this; about 75 percent of high school sophomores plan to go on to college.² Despite these aspirations, 32 percent of high school students drop out before even earning their high school diploma.³ Of the students who go on to a college or university, roughly 28 percent find that they must take remedial coursework.⁴ Postsecondary students who place into remedial courses are up to 50 percent less likely to earn a degree or certificate, depending on the number of remedial courses required.⁵

Our education system is fragmented, and we lose students at each of the key transition points. During this session, governors and resource experts stressed the need to ensure that K-12 standards, curriculum, and assessments are aligned with the expectations students face in postsecondary education and the workforce.

ISSUES

- **Quality of standards.** State content standards for K-12 education are a “mile wide, inch deep,” and not sequenced effectively. This is especially clear when compared to countries that outperform the U.S. in math and science.
- **Variation in coursework.** Across the nation, 286 different math courses exist, including nearly 50 varieties of Algebra. Amidst this range of options for meeting high school graduation requirements, we let students decide if and when to take Algebra I. Many students regret their decision a few years later, when it becomes clear that they are not prepared for college coursework.
- **Unclear signals.** Students, teachers, and parents are not receiving clear signals about what students must know and be able to do in order to succeed after high school. According to the ACT *National Curriculum Survey*, most high school teachers believe that meeting their state's standards prepares students for college-level work, but most postsecondary instructors disagree.
- **Remediation is costly.** Remediation rates are more than 60 percent in community colleges, and more than 30 percent in four-year universities. *Taxpayers are paying twice* for students to acquire skills they should have when they graduate from high school. Remediation courses also require students to spend tuition and time in courses that do not count towards a degree.



“Our current standards attempt to cover everything, everywhere, so that somewhere, somehow, someone will learn something. There is very little logic and structure, which causes confusion.”

Bill Schmidt



“You need standards, and they need to be tough standards. You need an assessment system that’s aligned to those to give all of us the data we need to make the kinds of judgments as to where we’re doing a good job and where we’re not.”

Rhode Island Governor Don Carcieri

SOLUTIONS

- **Establish a state coalition to set standards for the nation.** Governors can lead the charge to identify key foundational concepts that students are expected to know at the postsecondary level and in the workforce. Developing high-quality standards will require intensive partnerships between K-12, higher education, and business leaders. States will benefit from economies of scale as textbook and testing companies and schools of education align with this common set of streamlined, focused standards.
- **Keep the door to postsecondary education open.** Prior to 10th grade, a state’s curriculum should not differentiate between students who intend to go on postsecondary education and those who wish to enter the workforce. States should establish a core course sequence that leads to college readiness. For example, all students should take Algebra I by the 9th grade, and states should monitor course quality to ensure that every Algebra I class prepares students for higher-level math.
- **Use college placement exams to measure student progress.** Though many states have constructed high school exit exams, the true “high stakes” test is the college placement exam. To ensure that the K-12 curriculum is focused on college readiness, governors can promote alignment between college placement exams and K-12 standards and assessments. The resulting test data will help high school teachers, students, and parents better prepare students for first year college courses.
- **Get the public focused on college readiness.** Taxpayers need to understand they are paying twice when students must take remedial courses in college. Governors can inform the public by putting a price tag on high remediation rates, both in terms of the fiscal impact and the economic consequences of having fewer postsecondary graduates in the state.

NEW ENGLAND COMMON ASSESSMENT PROGRAM

In 2002, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont began developing the *New England Common Assessment Program* (NECAP). The three partner states pooled their resources to enlist the support of Education Development Center, Inc., National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment, and Measured Progress in establishing high-quality standards and assessments for grades three through eight.

NECAP is based on common grade level expectations, which were developed through an intense collaboration between leaders at the state and local levels, including district curriculum coordinators and teachers. The standards were reviewed by Achieve, Inc., vetted at the local level, adopted by each state, and are the basis of the shared assessments. NECAP also includes support materials to help teachers use the grade level expectations in the classroom.

NECAP provides an example of the advantages of interstate collaboration around standards-setting activities. The partnership has produced a high-quality set of standards, assessments, and support materials. Through effective collaboration, partner states have achieved results while benefiting from economies of scale. The NECAP partner states are now expanding on this success by developing high school assessments to measure college readiness.

ACHIEVE: COMMON ALGEBRA II EXAM

In April 2007, nine states announced their partnership to improve college and workforce readiness by developing common standards and a common assessment for Algebra II. The consortium of states includes Arkansas, Kentucky, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Rhode Island. The project is an initiative of the *American Diploma Project (ADP)*, a group of 29 states working with Achieve, Inc. to benchmark their state standards, assessments, and accountability systems against the best in the country and the world.

By developing one streamlined assessment, partner states hope to promote consistent rigor and content in high school Algebra II courses. Research indicates that Algebra II can be a significant predictor of college readiness and success. Two studies conducted by the U.S. Department of Education indicate that:

- The highest level of math taken in high school is the most powerful predictor of whether a student will ultimately earn a bachelors degree; and
- Students completing Algebra II in high school more than doubled their chances of earning a four-year college degree.

The Algebra II test is based on standards developed by Achieve, Inc. and is being developed by Pearson Educational Measurement. In late 2007, Achieve will release a set of guides to ensure that academic standards and instruction throughout high school are consistent with knowledge and skills required for success on the new test. The nine consortium states will administer the test to approximately 200,000 students in May 2008. In the future, other states will be allowed to join the partnership and administer the test.

ARIZONA'S P-20 COUNCIL

As mentioned during the Symposium, Governor Janet Napolitano created the Governor's P-20 Council by executive order in 2005. Interest in developing a P-20 system in Arizona began over a decade ago when several local business leaders identified the need for quality education across the preschool, K-12, and postsecondary sectors. Governor Napolitano now provides direct leadership to this effort by serving as Co-Chair of the P-20 Council with the Chancellor of the Maricopa Community Colleges. The Council includes representatives from the Governor's Office, the state legislature, the superintendent of public instruction, university and community college presidents, members of the Board of Regents, and groups of business, parent, and student leaders.



Judith Rizzo, Hunt Institute

Similar to alignment councils in 30 other states, the Arizona Governor's P-20 Council was established to align high school and college expectations with the skill sets required in high-growth occupations. Council members are charged with the tasks of improving K-12 content standards, strengthening high school and postsecondary accountability systems, and evaluating the need to expand four-year degree programs. The P-20 Council works closely with the Arizona State School Readiness Board and the Governor's Committee for Teacher Quality and Support.

In December 2006, the P-20 Council issued its first set of recommendations and a workplan describing several key activities – including communication and alignment as central components. To maintain communication among parallel councils, key stakeholders, and the public, the Governor's P-20 Council now publishes a quarterly newsletter to provide updates on its activities.

MAXIMIZING YOUR RETURN ON INVESTMENT: COLLEGE AFFORDABILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Session Chair: **Janet Napolitano**, Governor of Arizona

Patrick Callan, President, National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education

Dewayne Matthews, Senior Research Director, Lumina Foundation for Education

Jay Pfeiffer, Deputy Commissioner of Accountability, Research, and Measurement, Florida Department of Education

In a global economy, business seeks out low wages and an educated, innovative workforce. Since the U.S. is unable to compete with the low wages of countries such as India and China, we depend on our postsecondary education system to produce a globally attractive workforce. Though Americans spend more on higher education than any other industrialized nation, the U.S. ranks in the bottom half – 16th out of 27 countries – in the proportion of students who complete college degree or certificate programs.⁶ To remain competitive with other nations, our colleges and universities need to increase the annual rate of degree production by more than 37 percent.⁷ Postsecondary institutions need to achieve greater results with growing populations of low-income and minority students, and at a lower cost.

During this session, Pat Callan, Dewayne Matthews, and Jay Pfeiffer led a discussion about the need to ensure that postsecondary education is efficient and effective. Governor Napolitano chaired the session, stressing the need for governors to “make sure everything fits together in a system that ultimately provides good jobs for people at the end.” Governors discussed potential strategies to keep costs down and to hold higher education accountable for results.

ISSUES

- **State needs are not being prioritized.** Though state and federal officials are now focused on the need to hold higher education accountable for results, budget decisions have reduced the state share of operating support for these institutions from 50 percent in the 1980s to 30 percent today. Colleges and universities now rely on greater levels of private funding, therefore taking on new demands from private donors.
- **Colleges lack incentives to focus on student success.** State funding for colleges and universities is based on current enrollment, which is unrelated to graduation rates or the knowledge and skills that a school's graduates exhibit. In addition, high tuition and exclusivity are generally considered indicators of an institution's quality, and most discussions about postsecondary opportunities are focused on getting accepted and paying the price tag. Student learning is left out of this equation.
- **No real bottom line.** When colleges and universities want revenue beyond state funding and private giving, they resort to tuition increases. Postsecondary education is a seller's market – many students are willing to enroll regardless of the cost. As such, the cost of college has surpassed the cost of living, rising 32 percent over the last decade.⁸ Despite great attention to this issue, affordability has not improved.



“We’ve talked a lot about aligning higher ed with K-12. But this is really about making sure that higher ed remains affordable and then aligning higher ed with your overall economic needs and development.”

Arizona Governor Janet Napolitano

- **Define state goals for higher education.** Governors can ensure that state investments in higher education produce graduates that meet state needs, in terms of both public service and economic demands. Governors can help to establish state goals and tie postsecondary funding to progress in meeting state objectives.
- **Develop a data system that supports an outcomes-based budget.** To hold both K-12 and higher education accountable for postsecondary success, state data systems need to track student progress after high school and into the workforce. Once a sufficient data system is in place, governors can tie funding to indicators such as the percent of students needing remediation after high school, or the percent of students earning a bachelors degree within six years.
- **Encourage colleges to be more efficient in achieving state goals.** To promote efficiency, governors need to break the mold of thinking that a good undergraduate education is only delivered at expensive, exclusive universities. Most other industrialized countries have large universities that develop postsecondary programs centrally and deliver them at a much lower cost per student.⁹ Governors should create incentives that encourage institutions to share resources and to reach more students at a lower cost.

MINNESOTA MEASURES

In 2005, Governor Tim Pawlenty and the Minnesota Legislature charged the Minnesota Office of Higher Education with developing an accountability system to measure the higher education sector's effectiveness in meeting state goals. The resulting accountability system, *Minnesota Measures*, is based on five state goals that were defined through a public process involving educators, employers and policymakers.

Minnesota Measures evaluates student success using measures such as college participation and graduation rates; institutional productivity; degrees awarded in critical fields; research and affordability; and access. The report will be updated and widely disseminated each year, and plans are being made to add assessments of student learning, affordability and access, and job placement.

"This first report gives us a baseline and helps to focus the agenda for higher education around some measurable results. In our knowledge-based economy, Minnesota relies heavily on our higher education institutions to respond to change and keep our state competitive. Every college in Minnesota must play an important role." — Gov. Tim Pawlenty

Minnesota is one of only a few states to produce a broadly vetted set of goals for higher education that are evaluated annually. The Minnesota Office of Higher Education consulted with the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems to develop the *Minnesota Measures* system.



"We have to recognize that higher education institutions are behaving rationally based on the incentive structure under which they operate... What is that incentive structure? In this country, it's defined best by Sir John Daniels's phrase, 'exclusivity of access and extravagance of resources.'"

Dewayne Matthews

OREGON'S SHARED RESPONSIBILITY MODEL

The *Shared Responsibility Model* has been one of Oregon Governor Ted Kulongoski's top priorities for the 2007 legislative session. Under this model, the cost of attending college would be distributed between students, their families, and the government based on a sliding scale. Students would be responsible for about half of their total costs and would be required to work full time during the summer and part time during the school year to contribute to their education.

In early 2004, Governor Kulongoski charged the State Higher Education Board with a focus on ensuring that a college education in this state is not limited to those who have the means to afford it. The board created an Access and Affordability Working Group, which reported that state need-based grants reached only about one-third of eligible students, failed to cover part-time and middle-income students and paid only 11 percent of students' total college costs. The panel also pointed out that tuition increases had outstripped the 14 percent increase in median family income during that period: 56 percent at Oregon community colleges, and 36 percent at public four-year campuses, between 1999 and 2003.

The working group's recommendations led to the *Shared Responsibility Model*, which includes four components:

- *Student contribution.* Students contribute \$4,750 a year for a community college (including work or loans, but not both), and \$7,500 a year for a four-year college or university (including part-time work and loans). The plan assumes \$2,750 of borrowing for four-year institutions – an amount that could be paid off in a reasonable period of time on a teacher's salary.
- *Student's parents or other bill payers.* Families with means will pay higher amounts, and low-income families will pay little or nothing.
- *Federal share.* Federal funds are acquired through Pell grants or tuition tax credits.
- *State share.* After the above payments are calculated, the State of Oregon pays the remaining cost.

The flexibility of the *Shared Responsibility Model* allows the state to respond to current conditions students are facing. If federal grants rise or family income increases, the state's contribution will be reduced. When federal aid and family income are reduced, state contributions will ensure that students are still able to pay for higher education.

According to a 2004 *Chronicle of Higher Education* poll, more than two-thirds of Americans (68 percent) believe that colleges and universities could reduce their costs without hurting the quality of the institutions.



Pat Callan, National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education



Gov. Phil Bredesen (TN)



Gov. Sarah Palin (AK)

THINKING BEYOND THE SCHOOL DAY

Session Chair: **Roy Barnes**, Former Governor of Georgia

Jodi Grant, Executive Director, Afterschool Alliance

J.B. Buxton, Deputy Superintendent, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

Chris Gabrielli, Chair, Massachusetts 2020

In today's environment of school accountability, extra learning opportunities are particularly valuable for students who struggle to stay on grade level. Former Georgia Governor Roy Barnes opened this session with a reminder that under No Child Left Behind, states must provide students with supplemental education services if their school fails to meet Adequate Yearly Progress for three consecutive years. Most of these supplemental programs take place after school, overlapping with an array of social and academic programs that are supported by philanthropic organizations and more than 150 federal funding streams. Despite the growing focus on extra learning opportunities, a national survey by the Afterschool Alliance found that 75 percent of programs are operating at or above capacity, and fewer than half of all programs have a secure funding source for the next two years.¹⁰

During this session, governors discussed afterschool and extended day strategies to give students more time for learning. Jodi Grant discussed the importance of ensuring that afterschool opportunities are high-quality. J.B. Buxton and Chris Gabrielli described statewide efforts to improve access to quality programs, both afterschool and during the school day.

ISSUES

- **The supply of high quality learning opportunities is insufficient.** Despite the proliferation of support for afterschool in recent years, many children still lack access to quality programs. Though 6.5 million children participate in afterschool programs, an additional 15 million would participate if a program were available.¹¹
- **Gaps in service are not visible.** Afterschool programs are funded by an array of federal, state, local, and private funding streams. Without a single oversight entity, it is difficult to know where additional investments are needed.
- **The traditional school day is outdated.** In China, students spend 30 percent more time in school compared to U.S. students.¹² The American school calendar, based on an agrarian society's needs, is not able to meet the needs of students in the 21st century. As a result, we have begun to rely on programs outside of the school system to help students achieve state learning goals.

SOLUTIONS

- **Develop quality standards for afterschool programs.** Though afterschool programs vary in structure, content, and focus, standards are needed to ensure that programs are high quality. A few states have adopted afterschool quality standards that address key program elements: clarity of mission; family and community involvement; balance of academics and enrichment; safe and healthy environments; stable and qualified staffing; and organization and administration.
- **Identify gaps in afterschool opportunities.** A single state oversight entity can collect information about afterschool programs that are delivered through state departments of education, health and human services, and juvenile justice. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software can be used to map population characteristics and availability of quality afterschool programs. Once high-need service areas are identified, dollars can be allocated accordingly.
- **Provide discretionary state resources.** When afterschool programs are funded with outside dollars, the funding is typically short term. Governors can provide discretionary dollars to fund afterschool programs that meet state quality standards. State funding ensures that successful programs are not lost at the end of a grant cycle.
- **Help districts build more learning time into the school day.** It is possible to provide quality extra learning opportunities by extending the school day. By rethinking the traditional six-hour, 180-day schedule, school leaders are able to provide students with one-on-one or small group tutoring, deeper coverage of core subject matter, and opportunities to experience art, music, drama, and physical education. In addition, teachers have more time to engage in collaborative planning.

North Carolina Center for Afterschool Programs

NC CAP, a statewide nonprofit, was created by Governor Mike Easley to address issues of quality, accessibility, and sustainable funding in afterschool programs. NC CAP established a network of afterschool stakeholders (state agencies, state and local policy makers, afterschool providers, and the private sector) in order to:

- Develop common standards for high-quality school-based and school-linked afterschool programs;
- Align evaluation systems of federal- or state-supported afterschool programs;
- Provide training and technical assistance to build the capacity of afterschool providers;
- Build local and state support for expanding and sustaining high quality afterschool opportunities.

NC CAP identified seven Standards of Excellence exhibited by high-quality programs, and has developed a self-assessment tool to help providers chart their progress in each area.

At the request of Governor Easley, state agencies with ties to afterschool programming have put resources into NC CAP: the Department of Public Instruction; the Division of Child Development in the Department of Human Services; and the Department of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. As a 501(c)(3) organization, NC CAP is able to attract foundation support as well. In 2002, North Carolina was one of nine states to receive a grant from the Charles S. Mott Foundation to support the development of the NC CAP network.

NC CAP helps afterschool providers navigate the many different types of funding available through federal, state, local, and private funding sources. NC CAP helps providers acquire tools and skills to secure grant funding and connects providers with potential funders. The program also uses Geographic Information Systems (GIS) mapping software to identify areas of the state that lack sufficient high quality afterschool opportunities for students.

Expanded Learning Time Initiative

Massachusetts 2020, a statewide nonprofit, is partnering with the Massachusetts Department of Education to lead a statewide *Expanded Learning Time Initiative*. In 2005, Massachusetts 2020 called on school districts to rethink the traditional six-hour, 180-day school schedule. School districts were challenged to redesign their school day to provide 25 percent more learning time, structured to enable young people to master necessary skills to thrive in today's world.

Teachers, union leaders, community organizations, administrators, and parents joined together to review data and develop a new school day. They added time for literacy and math and expanded time for science and social studies. They increased enrichment opportunities that had been stripped from the school day due to a focus on testing.

In the fall of 2006, 10 schools in five districts became part of the country's first statewide initiative to expand learning time. More than 80 additional schools have been awarded state grants to plan for implementation of an expanded schedule by 2008.



“The school building is the largest under-utilized capital structure that exists in government. It’s used for part of the day. It’s generally vacant and dark at night, on the weekends, and during summer vacations.”

Former Georgia Governor Roy Barnes



“A lot of this has to do with better appraisal. (Without this) it’s very hard to have differentiated consequences of any kind, whether it’s professional development, dismissal, pay, or other ways of helping a teacher. This isn’t just about pay, it’s about improving teacher effectiveness.”

Sandy Kress

TEACHER COMPENSATION AND PERFORMANCE

Session Chair: **James B. Hunt, Jr.**, Former Governor of North Carolina, Chair, Hunt Institute

Dan Goldhaber, Research Associate Professor, University of Washington

Alice Seagren, Commissioner, Minnesota Department of Education

Sandy Kress, Partner, Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP

Research has shown that teacher quality is the single most important factor influencing student achievement. Effective teachers can make a full year’s difference in learning growth for students.¹³ However, too few of the brightest college students consider teaching as a career, and many innovative new teachers abandon the profession within five years. High-minority, high-poverty schools suffer the most. In the absence of pay incentives, teachers gravitate toward positions in more desirable schools.¹⁴ Though studies have shown that teachers are sensitive to differences in compensation, pay reform is politically and technically challenging.

During this session, Dan Goldhaber illustrated the shortcomings of the traditional pay structure and urged governors not to shy away from pay reform. Alice Seagren described key elements of Governors Pawlenty’s *Q Comp* initiative in Minnesota, and Sandy Kress shared some of the political successes and challenges faced by the recent effort to reform pay in Texas.

ISSUES

- **A single-salary system does not recognize teacher quality, training, or assignment.** Most school districts calculate individual compensation based on a teacher’s degree and years of experience. Yet, only three percent of a teacher’s performance can be attributed to his or her degree and experience level.¹⁵ Factors such as individual training, field of specialization, work environment, and actual job performance are not considered under the single-salary schedule.
- **Compensation reform often is abandoned before results are known.** Changes to teacher pay are hampered by political resistance and competing budget priorities. Few pay reforms have been sustained and evaluated, so little evidence exists about the efficacy of any particular reform structure. Yet, a few studies suggest that a more strategic use of teacher compensation could help distribute teachers more equitably and improve student achievement.



Gov. Togiola Tulafono (AS)



Gov. Ted Kulongoski (OR)



First Lady Joann Camacho (GU)



Gov. Chet Culver (IA)

SOLUTIONS

- Develop a teacher evaluation system.** To evaluate teacher performance, governors can suggest that school leaders conduct regular teacher observations to measure progress toward student and school-wide goals. An effective teacher evaluation system will include both classroom observations and professional development to help teachers raise academic achievement.
- Link teacher pay to academic growth of students.** Teachers are more supportive of systems that base pay on student growth rather than standardized test scores alone. Growth models require a more sophisticated appraisal process and data system, which must be developed at the state level. Before proposing pay reform, governors should push for a statewide longitudinal data system that links teachers to students.
- Support and study local experimentation.** Individual bonuses directly reward high-performing teachers. However, school-based bonuses are more politically palatable and include teachers of non-tested subjects. Governors can support district efforts to combine different pay alternatives, and need to study the effectiveness of these local approaches.



“Don’t think about this solely as pay for performance. Also consider other, broader issues such as pay to encourage teachers to work in disadvantaged schools. Pay for performance is certainly not the only piece.”

Dan Goldhaber

Q Comp

Q Comp was proposed by Governor Tim Pawlenty in January 2005 and adopted by the Minnesota legislature later that year. *Q Comp* is a five-component effort to reform the traditional system of teacher compensation, modeled after the Milken Family Foundation's *Teacher Advancement Program*. The components include:

- Career Ladders or Career Advancement Options
- Job-Embedded or Integrated Professional Development
- Performance Pay
- Teacher Evaluations
- Alternative Salary Schedule

Under *Q Comp*, at least 60 percent of pay increases must be tied to teacher performance measures based and student academic achievement. Half of this amount is based on professional growth, as demonstrated by changes in teacher practice. The other half is based on standardized test scores and school-wide student achievement.

Participation in the program is voluntary; districts apply for funding from the Minnesota Department of Education. More than one-third of Minnesota's school districts have expressed interest in *Q Comp*. *Q Comp* provides \$260 per student for implementation. Though *Q Comp* requires districts to meet specific goals, districts have flexibility to distribute performance awards in a manner that works best to meet local needs.

Though the Minnesota state teachers union generally did not support *Q Comp* on the legislative level, local teachers and unions have praised the system for its classroom results, professional development, and incentive pay.



Alice Seagren, Minnesota Department of Education

Excellence in the Classroom

In 2006, the Texas state legislature adopted several recommendations of the Governor's Business Council. The comprehensive plan, *Excellence in the Classroom*, includes the development of a system based on pay for performance and differentiated pay, while stressing the need to improve teacher evaluation methods and enhance professional development opportunities for teachers. Components of the plan include:

- Development of a fair, accurate, and sound method of evaluating teacher performance, based on the academic growth of students.
- More pay for teachers who perform well and take on greater and more difficult assignments.

Approved under HBI, the pay reform plan combined \$600 million in a pay raise for all teachers and \$300 million towards pay for performance. This combination was instrumental in building support for the effort.

Just one year after the legislature adopted these recommendations under HBI, the House voted to take funding away from the pay-for-performance component. Though the program has been preserved in the Senate, this incident serves as a reminder that pay reform efforts are fragile until a culture change occurs within the education system. It is tempting for policymakers to shift funding back to other pressing state needs, and many local districts are hesitant to engage in pay reform if state aid is not secure long term.

CONCLUSION

The 2007 Governors Education Symposium was a tremendous success. Governors had the opportunity to reflect on key research findings and statistics, ask questions of national resource experts, and engage in lively, candid discussion with one another about successes and challenges in their own states.

Throughout the Symposium, governors were encouraged to seek solutions from one another and from the resource experts at the table. Tennessee Governor Phil Bredesen pushed his peers to focus on solutions throughout the Symposium, explaining, “I would love to walk out of here with some very specific ideas. I have four more years as governor – we have term limitations. I need to go back and do some things on Monday.”

Many tangible solutions arose, such as using a longitudinal data system to monitor student outcomes along the educational pipeline, mapping out gaps in afterschool services using Geographic Information Systems, and implementing a teacher evaluation and professional development system to help teachers improve their practice. These strategies presented governors with clear action steps to improve decision making and educational outcomes in their home states. However, other solutions called for a new vision for the education system. Governors discussed the need to coordinate and align the efforts of policymaking bodies that often operate in silos: K-12, community college, and higher education. Governors also discussed the need to change public perception of quality postsecondary education from “expensive and exclusive” to a focus on efficient, effective student learning.



(L)First Lady Sue Carceri (RI) and Gov. Ruth Ann Minner (DE)



Gov. Anibal Acevedo Vilá (PR)

Some of the proposed solutions could be undertaken directly by governors; others would require governors to use their influence and convening authority to bring critical parties to the table. In either case, no solution presents an easy fix. When legislation is passed and new strategies are adopted, governors must continue shepherding the reforms through implementation to prevent competing interests from reclaiming sought-after funds. As Sandy Kress reflected, “One of the great challenges is just as you’ve planted the little tree and it’s just beginning to develop some roots, it is vulnerable.”

The former governors at the table stressed the need for today’s education governors to take risks and lead the way to change. Governor Hunt asked governors to consider the gains that have been made in K-12 education, reminding them that gubernatorial leadership has played a crucial role in many major achievements.



L-to-R: Judith Rizzo; Former Governor Roy Barnes; First Lady Joann Camacho (GU); Gov. Janet Napolitano (AZ); Gov. Don Carceri (RI); Gov. Sarah Palin (AK); Gov. Bill Ritter (CO); Gov. Ted Kulongoski (OR); Gov. Chet Culver (IA); Gov. Togiola Tulafono (AS); Gov. Phil Bredesen (TN); Gov. Aníbal Acevedo Vilá (PR); First Lady Nancy Schweitzer (MT); Gov. Dave Freudenthal (WY); Gov. Ruth Ann Minner (DE); Former Gov. Bob Wise; Former Gov. Jim Hunt

Endnotes

- ¹ Carnevale, A. and Desrochers, D. (2003). *Standards for What? The Economic Roots of K-16 Reform*. Educational Testing Services.
- ² Ingels, S.J. et al. (2005). *A Profile of the American High School Sophomore in 2002: Initial Results from the Base Year of the Education Longitudinal Study of 2002*. National Center for Education Statistics.
- ³ _____. (2004). *The Educational Pipeline: Big Investment, Big Returns*. The National Center on Public Policy and Higher Education.
- ⁴ Basmat Parsad and Laurie Lewis. (2000). *Remedial Education at Degree-Granting Postsecondary Institutions in Fall 2000*. National Center of Education Statistics.
- ⁵ _____. (2005). *The Condition of Education 2005*. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences.
- ⁶ Callan, Patrick. (2006) *Measuring Up 2006*. The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education. Data are from the Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development, 2003.
- ⁷ _____. (2007). *Hitting Home: Quality, Cost, and Access Challenges Confronting Higher Education Today*. Lumina Foundation's Making Opportunity Affordable Initiative. Estimate comes from the National Center for Higher Education Management Systems.
- ⁸ _____. (2007). *Trends in College Pricing 2006*. College Board. Accessed online at www.collegeboard.com/trends.
- ⁹ Matthews, Dewayne. (2005). *Toward a new way of thinking: Quality, productivity, and college costs*. Published in *Course Corrections: Experts offer solutions to the college cost crisis*. Lumina Foundation for Education.
- ¹⁰ _____. (2006). *Uncertain Times: Funding Security Puts Afterschool Programs At Risk*. Afterschool Alliance.
- ¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹² Pennington, Hillary. (2006). *Expanding Learning Time In High Schools*. Center for American Progress.
- ¹³ Hanushek, Erik. (1992). *The Trade-off between Child Quantity and Quality*. Journal of Political Economy 100(1), 84-117.
- ¹⁴ Lankford, H. Loeb, S., and Wyckoff, J. (2002). *Teacher Sorting and the Plight of Urban Schools: A Descriptive Analysis*. Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis 24, 37-62.
- ¹⁵ Goldhaber, Dan. (2007). Presentation during the Governors Education Symposium.

GOVERNORS EDUCATION SYMPOSIUM SUPPORTERS

Funding for the 2007 Governors Education Symposium was generously provided by:

The Broad Foundation is a national venture philanthropy established by Edythe and Eli Broad, a renowned business leader who founded two Fortune 500 companies, SunAmerica Inc. and KB Home. Based in Los Angeles, The Broad Foundation's mission is to dramatically improve K-12 urban public education through better governance, management, labor relations and competition.

The Wallace Foundation

The Wallace Foundation seeks to support and share effective ideas and practices that will strengthen education leadership, arts participation, and out-of-school learning. The Wallace Foundation has grown to become the 28th largest private foundation in terms of assets in the United States. Through an integrated, team-based approach involving research and communications, in addition to grant-making, the Foundation extends its influence beyond its direct grantees. Recognizing that significant and sustainable change in our education and cultural systems requires information and insight, the Foundation is becoming a "knowledge center" for policymakers and practitioners in its areas of focus.

The Atlantic Philanthropies

Believing that all children deserve the opportunity to lead fulfilling lives, regardless of economic circumstances, The Atlantic Philanthropies seeks to make lasting improvements in the lives of disadvantaged children and youth through preventive programs in the United States, Ireland, Northern Ireland and Bermuda. Program objectives differ by region, but focus consistently on keeping disadvantaged children and youth engaged in learning, healthy, and connected to key supports. The Philanthropies support: learning opportunities that prepare the whole child for adulthood; comprehensive, preventive healthcare for adolescents; mentoring programs that foster personal responsibility and help families understand and access benefits; and early education and care to begin nurturing young minds.

State Farm Companies Foundation

The State Farm Companies Foundation was established in 1963 as an independent private foundation. The Foundation is primarily committed to education, helping to raise the level of student achievement in our elementary and secondary schools, as well as supporting key higher education initiatives. A separate nonprofit organization funded by the State Farm Mutual Company, the Foundation provides funding for its Education Excellence initiatives that are national in scope:

- K-12 Public Schools
- Service Learning
- Systemic Improvement
- Teacher Excellence

The Foundation also supports higher education initiatives through scholarships and a matching gift program.



140 Friday Center Drive | Chapel Hill, NC 27517 | p: 919.843.4085 | f: 919.843.2557
www.hunt-institute.org