THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

RESTORING OPPORTUNITY

Washington, D.C.

Wednesday, March 19, 2014

Introduction:

ISABEL SAWHILL
Senior Fellow and Co-Director, Center on Children and Families
The Brookings Institution

Overview of Book & Videos:

RICHARD J. MURNANE
Thompson Professor of Education and Society
Harvard University

GREG J. DUNCAN
Distinguished Professor
University of California, Irvine

Moderator:

RON HASKINS
Senior Fellow and Co-Director, Center on Children and Families
The Brookings Institution

Panelists:

MIKE CASTLE
Partner, DLA Piper
Former Government and Former U.S. Congressman, State of Delaware

SONJA BROOKINS SANTELISES
Vice President for K-12 Policy and Practice, Education Trust
Former Chief Academic Officer, Baltimore City Public Schools

JAMES H. SHELTON, III
Deputy Secretary
U.S. Department of Education

GREG J. DUNCAN
Distinguished Professor
University of California, Irvine

RICHARD J. MURNANE
Thompson Professor of Education and Society
Harvard University

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. SAWHILL: Good morning everybody. Welcome to Brookings. I'm Belle Sawhill and I Co-Direct the Center on Children and Families along with Ron Haskins who'll you be hearing from later. And we are very excited and pleased to have the opportunity this morning to help release a wonderful new book. You can see it on the screen up here, Restoring Opportunity: the Crisis of Inequality and the Challenge for American Education. Now that's a bit of a mouthful but I would say what this book is really about is the diverging destinies of children from less privileged families and those from more privileged families in the United States. And the book lays out in a very compelling way what that diverging gap looks like and then it has a lot of wonderful material in it about what we might do to help close that gap, and especially focusing on the need to improve the education system all the way from pre-K up but also to improve the lives of the adults who are the parents of these children. Now I don't read a lot of books that I don't have to read but -- and I get very depressed when I look at a book that's, you know, this thick and I can tell you that one of the things I really like about this book is it's short. And it is also very, very readable. It includes vignettes about actual children, some who've grown up in very advantaged circumstances and some who have not. And then it surrounds these stories about these young people with the actual evidence on what we know about how we might improve their lives. So not only is it short and readable and talks about real people but it also is very research based.

I think that I don't need to say a lot about the authors. You're going to hear from them in a moment. They're both --worked very long and hard in this area; I think they've been working on this project for something like five years. Greg Duncan on my immediate right here is a professor at the University of California at Irvine and Dick Murnane is a professor at Harvard. And they have I think put together a wonderful team effort here. They also have some videos that we're going to see in just a moment and so I think probably without further ado I should sit down so you can see the videos. But following their presentation and the videos we're going to also have a terrific panel and very pleased with the people that Ron will be welcoming later to talk about the book with you. So, thank you. Please welcome Dick and Greg. (Applause)

MR. DUNCAN: Thank you very much, Belle. And thanks to Belle and Dick and Ron and their staff here for putting this on. We really appreciate that. Dick and I are sitting at opposite ends of the stage but we're actually good friends. (Laughter) It's been a long process. We've been funded by the Russell Sage Foundation and the Spencer Foundation. First we produced an edited volume which was very large called, "Whither Opportunity" and then we decided to try to condense it down into a much shorter book that -- the first of half of Restoring Opportunity summarizes what 650 page of Whither Opportunity goes over. But then the second half we actually tried to do case study solutions to how education can be reformed for schools serving low income kids in ways that will help reduce the impacts of increasing income inequality. So I want to set up the problem, first half of the book, and the Dick's going to talk about our solutions.

I think everyone knows that family income inequality has increased very substantially over the last 40 eyras. This is just data from the current population survey showing cut points that the 20th percentile, the bottom 5th and then the top 5th of the income distribution. We're not talking about the one percent. We're talking about in this 15 million children living in families with incomes in the top 20 percent of the income distribution. And the incomes have diverged substantially. The average income gap has grown about $50,000 over this period. And at the same time if you look at intergenerational outcomes that are associated with this increased income inequality they've diverged as well. Test scores have diverged between high and low income kids. This shows college graduation rates for children who were adolescents in the mid '70s and the mid '90s. They're followed for 10 years and tracked according to their -- and observed for their college graduation rates. Kids in the top 25 percent of the income distribution always are an advantage relative to the kids in the bottom 25 percent. That advantage back in the mid '70s was 36 percent versus 5 percent. College graduation rates for low income kids have increased, they've almost doubled from five to nine percent. Test scores have gone up too but the problem is that at the top end of the distribution things have gone up so much more quickly. So this gap is now 54 percent versus 9 percent.

So what's going on? What role does income inequality play at the very same time? Income inequality was increasing,family structure was diverging between low and high income families so it's not necessarily the case that it's all income. So we try to construct a story based on the research in Whither Opportunity? that involves first and foremost families. Income inequality is driving a large wedge between the incomes of high and low income families. If you look at the differences in expenditures that high and low income families make on kids that's grown substantially. High income families are now in the top 20 percent of income distribution, are now spending about $9,000 per child per year on enrichment activities, things like high quality childcare, lessons, summer camps, maybe private school, $9,000 per child per year. Low income families, families in the bottom 20 percent of the income distribution are spending about $1,300. So it's an $8,000 gap per child per year in the amount of expenditures that families make on behalf of their kids.

But we wanted to bring schools into this. And to understand the school story we really have to go back to the origins of income inequality, way back 40 years ago. And there were a number of factors that contributed to it but one of the most important was changes in the macro economy where technological change began to favor high skill workers relative to low skill workers, the occupational distribution has really hollowed out. There are a lot of low paying jobs now, a lot of high paying jobs. So that by raising the wages of highly educated workers and stagnating or even dropping the wages of low skill workers contributed in large measure to income inequality. But at the same time these technological changes have upped the ante on what we require schools to do. If we want to maintain a chance for kids growing up in low income families to attain middle class status they're going to have to have a higher level of skills than used to be case and schools are going to have to provide them. So the demands on school serving kids with low incomes have increased substantially. And as well as our Whither Opportunity shows there have been ways in which income inequality has operated to the disadvantage of schools. The main reason operates through increasing residential segregation by income. Relative to 40 years ago high income kids are more likely to be surrounded by other high income kids, low income kids by other low income kids. Kids tend to attend their local schools so schools serving low income kids are more uniformly poor than before. Schools serving high income kids are more uniformly affluent. If you think about the kind of problems that causes for schools it's a combination of more kids attending low income schools that have achievement problems, behavior problems, the higher rates of residential mobility among low income kids means more turnover in these schools, it's harder to attract and retain high quality teachers into these low income schools. So that combination of ingredients has not only made it more difficult for low income schools to educate kids but it's also increased the skills that low income schools have to provide to kids if they're going to have a chance to make it to the middle class.

So that's the problem and here is the solution.

MR. MURNANE: Thank you, Greg. So when we looked at this tough question what can be done in the face of these quite dramatic changes that have happened in the economy to distribution of family income and consequently to which children go to school with which children and we wanted it to be evidence based. So what we did was we knew we wanted to say something about early childhood, elementary school, high school and supporting families, and we wanted it to be evidence based and we wanted to not be stories about single school because we know there have been stories for many, many decades that get a lot of attention in the media about individual schools that have shone brightly in a sea of despair. But if you look five years later you typically find those schools have not continued to do well as leadership has moved on. So we wanted to find interventions in schools serving large concentrations of low income children that were durable, that involved considerably more than one school that had been evaluated by using cutting edge methods and had been shown to improve academic outcomes and potentially life chances for low income students.

And this led us to focus on three school based interventions and also one family support program but we focus here on the school based interventions. The Boston Pre-K program that serves about 2,100 4 year olds in 68 schools, the University of Chicago Charter School campuses -- that's much smaller unfortunately, only 4 schools in a K-12 system, and New York small schools of choice. There's almost 200 of them that are available to all children in New York City. And one of the interesting things about the small schools of choice is how they came about. Like a lot of urban school systems New York had a number of large comprehensive high schools in low income areas that had 35 percent high school graduation rates and clearly were not serving children well. What New York did in contrast to many other cities, however, in deciding to close some of those they had a design competition under which small groups of educators working with community partners were incentivized to create plans for new, small schools. And those plans that withstood scrutiny received financial support to develop the schools. And there's been a very nice evaluation by the research firm MDRC that's shows that they have significantly improved high school graduation rates for low income youth in New York City.

Now one -- and then we looked and carefully said what are these programs? Again they are different one from the other in that they serve children of very different ages. In particular what do they have in common? Well, they all take advantage of recent research on child adolescent development, they all take advantage of new insights from research about how to provide literacy skills to low income children, and they also take advantage of evidence on what does professional development, good professed development look like? Almost all school districts in this country spend significant money on professional development. A vast majority of that money is spent in a way that does not lead to changed in which teachers actually do in classrooms and consequently doesn't lead to changes in children's daily experiences and does not lead to improved achievement. I encourage you to look -- as you look at the two videos look at what professed development looks like in the Boston Pre-K program and the small schools of choice in New York City. All of these interventions that we describe in the book are characterized by a combination of consistently strong school supports. In other words it enables schools to continually get better and also what we call sensible accountability. And one criterion for sensible accountability is that it makes it more attractive for talented teachers to want to work in these schools. So one kind of simple criterion in looking at state accountability systems is it making it more attractive or less attractive to attract and retain teaching talent in high poverty schools. I think that's a simple litmus test a good accountability system should pass.

Now of course the question is why are these schools, even though they serve a significant number of children, why are these interventions exceptions? Why don't more low income children have access to the quality of education that is present in these interventions we describe? And our view is it's really that as a nation we don't have systems that provide this important combination of consistently strong supports to school and sensible accountability. We'd like to think that's what urban school districts ought to be doing but I don't think there's an urban school district in the country that does that well. A lot of charter schools have found to their dismay how hard it is to actually improve their performance. And that's why a growing number of charter schools are part of network with charter management organizations. Well, will charter management organizations do a better job in developing systems that provide this accountability and support? I think the jury is still out on that.

So we are cautiously encouraged about the possibilities for the future and we see five reasons for this cautious optimism. One, there are these existing proofs that we describe in our book, these three interventions. Second, there is a growing research evidence that we know much better at the school level what needs to be done to serve low income children well. We think the common core standards are encouraging but of course they also represent a real challenge because we already know from New

York -- and it's going to be more present in other states -- that the assessment results are going to show lower average performance than on the test they replaced and it's going to show larger gaps by income than are currently present with existing assessments. So that's going to raise tough questions for politicians, do you stick with these common core standards. And I think it's an extraordinary opportunity to improve education but an enormous challenge. I think another advantage is the country has moved towards more common acceptance that schools are to be accountable for educating all children. I think that's one of the contributions of No Child Left Behind. But how to turn accountability into sensible accountability we haven't really figured out how to do and I think the evidence from no child left behind shows it really does not do that well. There are a growing number of organizations, many of them -- most of them not for profit that were designed to support schools, Boston Teacher Residency, a New York Leadership Academy, New Leaders for New Schools. So lots of these -- now they have the potential to be -- to fragment support for schools. That's clearly not good. But they also provide a lot of expertise and if it were possible to figure out systems that provide school with the resource and knowledge to take advantage of the support offered by these organizations that could be encouraging as well.

So now I want to show you two videos. The first one is about the Boston Pre-K program. Each is six minutes long. After the first video I'd like you to spend two minutes talking to somebody or "somebodies" near you about what you see that's striking and particularly my focus on what do supports and accountability look like in each of these interventions. And I'm going to ask Stephanie to make this happen, the first video. (Laughter)

(Video played)

MR. MURNANE: Thank you, Stephanie, for bailing us out. So I'd like you now to spend two minutes talking with somebody nearby about what you saw in the video concerning this combination of school support and sensible accountability. Two minutes.

(Recess)

MR. MURNANE: Okay. This is visual view that as Marina Boni asked us to use. So one note if you found that video interesting and the one to come, and there's a third one about the elementary schools in part of University of Chicago charter schools, they're all available at our -- they're all on YouTube and you can access them through our website, Restoringopportunity.com. There are also are the transcripts of interviews with key players in each of these sites including Marina Boni, Emily Cox, Jason Sachs, and Karla Settles, the kindergarten teacher. Those transcripts are also available at Restoringopportunity.com.

So now we'll look at small high schools of choice. This is an -- and again we'll ask you for two minutes afterward. And you might think about what's similar and what is different between what accountability and supports look like in these two quite different settings.

(Video played)

MR. MURNANE: So again two minutes. What do supports and accountability look like at this school, in what respect is it similar, what respect is it different from the Pre-K program you saw at Madler Elementary.

(Recess)

MR. HASKINS: Okay. All right. We're going to start again. Thanks again for coming. I want to join Belle in welcoming the audience. And now we're joined by three other distinguished people that we want to hear their reactions and then we're going to talk a little bit among ourselves and then we'll give the audience chance to ask questions and stir up trouble if you want to. The first person who's joining us is Mike Castle, someone that Belle and I have worked with for longer than we really care to -- it's decades. He's a former republican governor of Delaware, a two term governor and a member of the House of Representatives I think for 18 years and was a senior republican on an education labor committee, and he's now a partner at DLA Piper Government Affairs Practice. Next is Sonja Santelises. Did I do okay on that?

MS. SANTELISES: You did wonderfully.

MR. HASKINS: Good. Thank you. She's Vice President of an Education Trust for K-12 Policy and Practice and she was formerly the Chief Academic Officer for the Baltimore City Schools. And then third, Jim Shelton.

MR. SHELTON: Here I am.

MR. HASKINS: Jim, right next to me, on my left appropriately. (Laughter) He's the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Education and your material says he's the Acting Deputy Secretary but the Senate let him through evidently and he's no longer acting. Um, we've had a great good fortune to work with Jim for several years now especially on a project that I've been working on administration evidence based policy. And Jim was formerly with McKinsey and with Gates before that. We've asked each of them to make an opening statement and we're going to hear those statements and then we're going to start the questioning. So let's begin with Mike.

MR. CASTLE: Thank you, Ron, and thank you, Belle, and thanks to Brookings. I'm pleased to be here. I was watching television sort of out of the corner of my eye while I was reading something the other night and a bit came on on ABC News a couple of nights ago about how some place -- I don't know where it was -- had discovered that children had trouble reading in pronunciation of words and annunciation, etcetera, did better if they read to animals. We have now set up throughout the State of Delaware where I'm from animals that the kids can read to as a way of educating them. There's -- not mentioned I don't think in the book <u>Restoring Opportunity</u> but I just thought I'd mention that for whatever it's worth.

In Delaware we had two automobile factories, a Chrysler factory and a GM factory. I toured them over the years in government on many occasions and I saw changes from individuals, mostly men putting big parts into place and building the cars that way to a technology matter which they were working computers in order to do it because they didn't do it themselves, the machines did it. Obviously a different level of knowledge if you will. I also talked to a man one night at a restaurant -- in the bar of the restaurant before we were seated who indicated to me he was in maintenance which turned out to be janitorial work at the Chrysler plant in Delaware and with overtime he was earning $100,000 a year which I thought was a pretty good sum of money. It was more than I think I was earning at the time. (Laughter) And I was impressed by that. Both those factories are gone now in Delaware; cars are being built someplace else, hopefully in the United States. That's 7,000 jobs that are gone in our state. It went from being a little bit higher tech to not being there at all. These are jobs that individuals that with perhaps a lower level of education might have been able to hold to earn that $60,000 a year to $100,000 a year or whatever it may be. But they're no longer there which just underlines the problem we have and that is that we need to educate everybody in our country as highly as we possibly can to provide economic opportunities for them because many of these jobs are not just moving, they're not coming back. In some cases they're moving and in some cases they're not coming back at all.

We have a lot of significant problems. You have the home circumstances; you have single parent households often and very low income situations, uneducated in many instances. You may have a mother or perhaps a mother and father or some other relative who's not particularly educated who is taking care of that particular child. That child then goes on to school and at some point is exposed to neighborhood problems because they're living in that neighborhood as was stated in the presentations we just heard. These individuals are associating with other individuals such as that and perhaps leading to a life of crime or drop out or whatever it may be. We need to counteract that. I personally think we need to start as early as possible. There have been efforts to do this and some have worked perhaps better than others. You'll see studies both way on this but my sense is that they all work to some good. Early Head Start is one of those programs which is very early in life through the first 36 months. Head Start for four year olds is also of vital importance in terms of trying to give kids some sort of an educational advantage. And I'd like to see them have a greater educational component. We worked on that in Congress a little bit. Pre-kindergarten is important. You saw the significance of a pre-kindergarten program in Boston and you heard how beneficial many people believe that is going to be, and I believe it will be as well. Some states, some school districts offer pre-kindergarten, not all of them but some do and it's proven to be effective. And some unusual states, like Georgia, have done a lot in early education for example and feels very strongly about all of this. Kindergarten is also vitally important in terms of what we are doing. I've been involved a little bit through my law firm with a program called EduCare which has about 20 schools but there happens to be one right here in Washington, D.C. which takes kids at a very young age through the first four years or so-- for five years and educates them and does all they can with them. We've seen the various things that have happened at the federal level, No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top. The common core standards are not a federal program they are a state program. There is some opposition to that primarily from the conservative side but that was developed by the governors of the country with others which is vitally important.

So what can we do to resolve all this? I first of all think we need all the parental involvement we can get. You get into the whole discussion of single parents and that kind of thing but the bottom line is we need parental involvement. I think we need proximity to schools. We have that problem in Delaware with desegregation. Kids are going 30 minutes to be bused to schools going by 20 schools that they could be going to and I think that's a bit of a problem too. We need to use the data and the research that we've heard about in the Restoring Opportunity and read about, those which have read it, which is vitally important. We need committed leadership in the districts and schools. We need to have trained, dedicated and retained teachers. And that may be an economic issue. We need to have those teachers coached as well as possible. You have all kinds of funding and management decisions. You have the overlay of the federal government, local districts, the schools themselves, you have the union which are a strong influence, and you have the administrators who are maybe not quite as organized who are also a very strong influence in terms of what's going on. And that needs to be worked out so the people are talking to each other and instilling the kinds of programs that we saw here today, particularly in the videos. I believe the media needs to be more involved. I think the media needs to connect economic opportunity and education. By media I don't mean somebody writing some sort of a column about it, I mean TV shows and things that people actually watch particularly in lower income communities that will somehow perhaps subtly stress the significance of education and what it could mean as far as opportunity for children is concerned. I think that's vitally important. I think we need to learn from successful programs. Charter schools have worked in some instances and not in others. We saw a couple of successful programs here on the screen. I think we need to learn from them as well as far as our opportunities to advance and to be able to go forward all the way from kindergarten to 12th grade and provide that opportunity particularly to the low income children of America who obviously need more help. Thank you.

MR. HASKINS: Thank you, Mike. Sonja?

MS. SANTELISES: So first I do want to congratulate both Greg and Dick on the book but I particularly want to call out -- and I said this when Mike and Jim and I were sitting down, I said, you know, Dick's pedagogy has increased in quality through years of professional development, now visiting schools. And I just want you to know when he taught me economics we didn't do turn and talks (laughter) like you guys did. And so he has clearly learned from all of the classrooms that he has visited. So I got a good chuckle imagining a turn and talk at a Harvard economics class. But anyway I wanted to commend you on that one. (Laughter)

MR. MURNANE: It would have been perfect if our audience were all fifth graders.

MS. SANTELISES: That's right, it would have been, it would have been. But one of the things that I want to note about some of the context of this discussion in the current -- kind of the current frame work that we're operating in in this nation is (1) there is now a kind of growing cacophony and questioning of whether or not it's all about poverty, right, and whether we need to shift talking about the influence of schools and only talk about poverty and how it impacts kids, or whether we "hold the line" and just focus on it's all about the schools, it's all about the schools. And what's refreshing about the way that this discussion is handled within the confines of this book and the studies that it references is that it actually -- as in most things for those of us who have actually been in schools, it's not an either or but it is this push for complexity, for nuancing, for what the interaction is between institutions of schooling that have traditionally been seen as a real lever to economic opportunity but not dismissing the influences of poverty. And what we who lead institutions have the responsibility for and thinking frankly far more creatively than we often do about some of these issues.

So a couple of things that I will -- I'd like to point out is (1) this question about the concentration of poverty as it pertains to school based people. And as a former assistant superintendent in Boston as the early childhood program that you saw there, the pre-K program was being rolled out. I actually -- I said to both Greg and Dick I got a little teary eyed. I remember sitting in my office when Jason Sachs came in and said I want you to look at this Little Red Hen Makes a Pizza unit and now to kind of see it on screen and see kids actually engaged in it was refreshing. But this idea of the concentration of poverty has to become a far more fine tuned analysis. Often times the way that our policies continue to operate is we treat schools that have -- for example like my daughter's public school in Baltimore City has about 30 percent students free and reduced lunch. And depending of if we were to cross the border and go to Montgomery County or Anne Arundel County in Maryland that might actually be considered low income. Well, I'm here to tell you if you have Hopkins professors' kids in your building in critical mass that is not the same as a school where you have 90 percent concentration of kids from free and reduced lunch. So the impact of the concentration of poverty requires us to think I think in far more nuanced ways about how we're funding and supporting schools differently rather than lumping schools in large categories, be it at the federal, state or frankly even the district level.

The second piece that I would like to focus on is this idea that there actually are leadership actions that were implicit in some of the videos and that were highlighted in the book. So often times we get lost in this whirlwind of oh, my god what are we going to do. We're almost like Chicken Little, kind of stay with the poultry theme, right? We run around (laughter) and we say what can we do. And actually there are concentrated and fine tuned leadership actions that not only the videos but the book highlights in some of the best practices that actually I think beg for us -- those of us in leadership both at the district, school, state, and federal level to actually lay hold of. And so I'd highlight a couple that I think are worthy of further examination and consideration.

The first would be this idea of coherence and consistency. We often talk about the many factors frankly that contribute to inconsistency within how schools are managed, how they are supported. A lot of those decisions is someone who has sat and actually made those decisions we had within our power. So this question of large concentrations. One of the issues we study a great deal in my current organization. The education trust is the concentration of novice teachers in schools with large percentages of children from poverty background. Thank you. And that's a great example of where quite frankly there are leadership actions that can be taken to mitigate that. And anyone at a school based level or a district level who does not admit that there are decisions we make everyday about which leaders, do we put novice leaders in schools with novice teachers therefore helping to create the churn and the outflow of those teachers, would actually be selling you a bag of tricks. That is not always an outside influence. That's an influence that we actually have more control over than we say and that we often cite outside examples. Boston public schools has one of the strongest teachers unions in the country but somehow we figured out how to make sure the teachers had two hours of professional development that you saw in the video that those pre-K teachers have. So part of what I want to kind of provoke us to think a bit about is what actually are the leadership actions that we have control over. Instead of kind of getting in the swirl of everything that goes wrong around schools.

Another piece is this idea of this focus on instructional quality. And the fact that we still have at schools, district levels and even state levels a fascination with moving the blocks of everything other than the instructional core. And I can say that as a former chief academic officer, I can say it as a former school based person that working with low income communities we often get fixated on some of the issues that we don't have control of in the schoolhouse instead of actually focusing on what is the quality of the learning experiences and the preparation of the educator's call to serve those communities. A great example, again you saw in those two videos, right, and this doesn't even get to me for an educator what was one of the more fascinating issues of kind of the integration of support services in schooling. If you were to just take the classroom experiences that you witnessed in this video one of the things that you would see are actually deliberate supports, right, that actually mean more for kids in poverty. And I'll just give you a quick example. The literacy enriched environments. One of the examples that I always give to teachers is my three daughters has collections each of a 100 storybooks when they were in utero. They had not even arrived (laughter) and they each had collections.

MR. MURNANE: But did they read them?

MS. SANTELISES: But they didn't read them, right. (Laughter) We know that low income young people come from homes where there are not heavy rich text environments. What you saw in both of those videos are classrooms in schools where's there's heavy, heavy text, right. There are real books, not photocopied books, not just little decodables that are black and white; they're real textbooks, the same kinds of storybooks and texts that my three daughters had the advantage of before the even arrived. So why then do we allow decisions to be made at certain levels, right, that spend on other things, right, that spend on test prep books instead of the books that we know that low income students are less likely to have access to. So I'll end with this question that it's fine to look at these examples but I think the real question that we need to carry is what are the corresponding leadership actions that we do have control over that allow us to have the kind of impact that we saw in the schools and the classrooms in those videos.

MR. HASKINS: Thank you. Jim Shelton.

MR. SHELTON: Thank you. Good morning.

AUDIENCE: Good morning.

MR. SHELTON: Okay. See, that's what I figured. Let's try it one more time. Good morning.

AUDIENCE: Good morning.

MR. SHELTON: Okay. So I'm always glad to go last because I, you know, have things I want to say when I get here and then I hear people saying much smarter things than I was going to say and it lets me have a chance to adjust. The first thing actually I wanted to highlight though is the most important thing to me about both what we saw today and what those of you read the book have is that there's two things that are really important I think in our work and especially where we are right now. Um, I often say that, you know, whenever want large social change you notice there are actually two factors in mind. One is that there's a significant amount of outrage or anger and then there's a certain amount of hope that you can actually make things better. And without that opportunity to believe that you can actually make things better you wind up either with turmoil or with learned helplessness. With the two combined you often wind up with determination. So what I think that the book does and what our conversation ought to do, and particularly what that video did was to give you that right combination of things where we see the problems that we're facing both at large and in particular communities and yet we see time and time again now examples where we know that we ought to be hopeful about what the opportunity is. Now what's important though is it's not hopeful in the way that a great individual story about an individual kid is but in fact you're looking at interventions that have a certain amount of scale to them. And it's interesting when you think about it that there is not broad scale adoption of the things that we have seen that have this evidence. We don't have a ton of them in education but you would think as desperate as we seem to be for solutions that those things that seem to have a base that they work would get broad scale adoption. I should do full disclosure. I used to work for the Gates Foundation; I did participate in the funding of the small schools but you know how they say that success has many fathers, like I'm the godfather of one of the most orphaned children in school reform. And it's interesting because I've just launched -- the President launched his My Brother's Keeper Initiative focused on boys and men of color. Lots of people are now focused on what's happened in New York with the Young Men's Initiative. The most interesting thing if you look at that data about what's happened is it's picked up about three years ago with the Young Men's Initiative, if you look at the preceding years you noticed this incredible climb in the graduation rates for boys of color in high school. That came from the work in the high schools. So we're -- the work that we're talking about not only is it broad scale in terms of its application to improve the outcomes for children but in particular for the children who we often find when we follow the data are most at risk. We have interventions that we know work if we're willing to do them. So that's where I want us to take the rest of the conversation which is this book and the presentation and the conversation that we started off is going to lead us in the direction of there are more things that have evidence that work, what will take as Sonja said for us to exhibit the leadership that it requires for us to start to adopt on that scale, that scale in districts and in schools and in classrooms.

Let me highlight just a couple of other things that I thought were important in both the book and -- and by the way I probably wouldn't have read the book but I actually gave up TV for lent and so (laughter) I actually -- those hours in the middle of the night when I can't sleep I actually was -- anyway, it was good. The two things I wanted to actually focus in on, one is that you saw it here in the video, is that the conversation that Dick tried to get us to focus on in terms of the support versus the accountability. And you saw the conversations that the teachers had in that classroom about their performance and the young man said, yup, because we're all focused on the same goal I was very happy to get that feedback. And we all look at that and we go that makes sense, people ought to be doing that, teachers ought to be doing that. I like as well to step back and reflect on our own workplaces and how often in your own workplace people sit around and let people say and do things that are ridiculous without saying anything about it, recognizing that it detracts from your core mission and work. That is actually a very difficult behavior. Building that kind of culture of accountability where both people are open to receiving that kind of feedback and where people exhibit courage to give that kind of feedback is actually extremely difficult. Even when you have a fact base on which to rely that says there is a much better way to do this. So I don't want us to have happy talk about what it would be like if everybody just followed the evidence because the role of leadership in actually doing this work, not just at the big macro level of the policy levers that we have to pull but the day to day level of when you are making those decisions about what to say, what not to say, what to put in the classroom, what not to put in the classroom. What is it going to take for us to have those kind of conversations in order for the day to day experience of young children to be different? That is what the outcome of this conversation needs to be.

The last thing I'll say is that sitting at the federal level the question for me is, you know, everything that we do from the federal level is a triple bank shot. All right, it is. How do we do something so states will do something, so districts will do something, so district schools will do something that winds up in something being better for kids? So the most we can hope to do is to create macro incentives that encourage people to do things. One is to care a lot about exactly what's happening with young children. And this is one of the reasons I'm actually hopeful about our ability to get -- whenever we get to a new accountability system, a better accountability system. The first part is that we already now care about all kids from No Child Left Behind. But what we're going to do now, most everyone recognizes the importance of focusing on growth. And why is that so important? One is with growth every kid matters, every kid matters. If you're ahead of the curve they still have to care about whether you're growing. And if you're behind the curve they still have to care about whether you're growing. Every kid in that context matters and in fact the incentives start to line up really, really well with getting the resources in the ways that are going to have the best opportunity to get the maximum growth out of each kid. Kids who are behind, you have a significant incentive to get them more resources to have them move. The second thing is though that we have to create the incentive for people to choose what works. That is not unrelated to the accountability system. But it also means that we have to fill the supply side. We have to fill the supply side so that when people are looking for solutions that meet their needs and in their context they can find that thing that works. We have that opportunity. We don't fund enough research, we don't fund enough evaluation and we don't even require it in the places where we spend a lot of money. That is starting to change. We could flip a switch tomorrow and have it happen a lot faster, a lot faster. That again is about leadership. And with that I'll end.

MR. HASKINS: Thank you very much. I want to do a little advertisement here first. Brookings had the good fortune to be involved in this project. Some of you may remember Becky Blank who is now the Chancellor at the University of Wisconsin was working originally with Dick and we had a chance to follow all the way through and I want to mention this book -- I think Belle mentioned it -- but this is -- I swear this is the best edited book I've ever read. It's complex but it addresses every aspect of schooling, not just within the building but within neighborhoods, teachers, parents, it's a spectacular book. And if you're smart it will take you a year to read it well because you need to reach each of the chapters two or three times. That was the first product and then as Greg pointed out they decided to do something that all the rest of us who are not geeks could actually profit from and that's what Restoring Opportunity is. So you get a slight feel of these hundreds of pages here in the beginning of Restoring Opportunity but then concrete examples of how to do it. Okay. First question I want to ask you is what is accountability? I didn't see anybody taking a test; I saw no direct measurement of kids. I always thought accountability was measuring kids. What is your vision of what accountability should be?

MR. MURNANE: I'd like to try and respond and I'm hoping Sonja might pick up on what I say and I'd love to hear what she has from her perspective in leadership positions in Boston and Baltimore. You know, I think, you know both Greg and I are economists and economists are hardwired to think incentives are important. So you want to create incentives and I think that's part of accountability for people to do -- to work as hard as they can toward important organizational goals. And the -- in the New York small high schools their students are subject to the state accountability systems. They have to demonstrate progress in having their students score proficient levels on the Regents exams and actually in five different areas. So that is present. But I think the most immediate evidence of accountability you see is really internal accountability. That is there are a wide variety of opportunities. They look quite different with -- at the preschool level in Boston than you saw in the high school but in both cases it's taking advantage of the growth opportunities to the fullest extent possible and it's really responsible to one's colleagues to be all you can to promote the common goals of their team. If you notice the work of teaching in both of these -- and it's true in the third video in a quite striking fashion is the job of teaching looks quite different in these schools than it does in a great many high poverty schools. I don't know -- do you want to respond on accountability?

MS. SANTELISES: No. I mean I actually think you hit it right on the head. And it is this idea of understanding that you have to have systems, you know, as Jim referenced, you know, when you're trying to go to scale you have to have systems that allow you to have snapshots of how kids are performing. Part of why right now it feels for a lot of educators as if it's just this kind of bludgeoning that's occurring is because the lack of those intermediary accountability pieces that I usually call mutual accountability. So the kinds of conversations that we saw occurring to me are the best example of mutual accountability and, you know, we cited in our little small group talk the fact that it's actually far more impactful to know that you've got to come back and present to your colleagues what you did differently than what you're going to submit -- no disrespect to the federal government whose five layers removed, right. Because my colleague is someone who's sitting there next to me who is going to see me next week, who knows what's going on in my classroom. The question is what are the factors, what are the -- again what is a principal? What skills does a principal need to have to be able to develop that kind of culture that we saw here? We got to see the finished product. The question is how you build that along the way. And I think in schools where you see that kind of mutual accountability those tend to be schools -- again no disrespect -- who could really care less about the outward accountability because they believe it's going to come. They know that kids are going to achieve, they're not really concerned about a two point dip this year or a five year -- they're looking at the overall trajectory. In schools and districts where there's a great deal of incoherence, right, they tend to be far more idiosyncratic, right. Because there's not that intermediary stage of an accountable as a part of a community they tend to revert back to the test prep book that helps me keep my job and helps my principal keep his or her job for another. So I think you're actually right on point in that.

MR. HASKINS: Greg, what is the role of testing students and improving student scores and a system of accountability that you would offer as an ideal system?

MR. DUNCAN: I think it's vital. In the third video, in the Chicago charter schools, elementary school, they had a very sophisticated literacy curriculum, balanced literacy, but they also had a very sophisticated assessment system where the teacher would sit down with the student three times -- every student three times a year and develop a profile of where that child's literacy was. And it was a step system. You had kids dispersed across -- some were fairly proficient, some were not very proficient. And the teacher was implicitly accountable for advancing a student in a number of steps. And given the step the student was currently positioned there were a number of curricular supports geared towards students at that level. So it was a very conscious assessment tool, a formative kind of assessment that was used in instruction and in geared not toward bringing everyone up to step nine because that's impossible but having every single child advance a significant number of steps.

MR. HASKINS: And everyone agrees that that is a crucial part of an accountability system.

MR. MURNANE: Can I just add two things to that? You know, I think -- I mean there's no question we want to use evidence on student assessments to see whether every student in every class is making progress. I think the -- what we often don't pay enough attention to is when we see that that's not happening in a particular school. Rather than immediately assume it follows from that that we want to do some draconian "X" we need to figure out why that's happening. And this is an insight from W. Edwards Deming, you know, was the business guru on process improvement. You want to use data to figure out which systems are working, which systems are not. But then you want to be agnostic about why something isn't working until you do the homework to really figure that. Is it for example that the most junior teacher was assigned a classroom with the most troubled kids? Well, if that's the problem we need to face that rather than simply firing that novice teacher, putting another novice teacher in exactly the same setting.

So one other point is the third video which you didn't get to see which is the, you know, the elementary school in Chicago, the way they do their formal evaluations of teachers is the school principal has a -- sits in the class and the class is videotaped. While she watches the class she types everything everybody says, students and teacher. So she has a transcript of the class. Then she sits and looks at the video and the transcripts and highlights particular points that she wants to talk about with the teacher, very specific behaviors. Were you waiting long enough for a student to answer, be able to process that? Then she gives the transcript and video to the teacher ahead of time, then she sits with the teacher and they talk through and very specifically what didn't go well, what might done differently. That could happen everywhere. But of course it does require significant skill on the part of the school principal. But videoing the class and a video is -- you can do -- doesn't cost very much anymore.

MR. HASKINS: Jim and Mike, do you want to add anything about accountability?

MR. SHELTON: I'll let us get to the next question.

MR. HASKINS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CASTLE: I'd like to add something.

MR. HASKINS: Yeah, go ahead. (Laughter)

MR. CASTLE: Just very briefly. I just think when you talk about accountability -- assessments I sort of understand are reasonably immediate but I think when you're talking about accountability one thing that's lacked in education often is the longer term look at this and even the middle term look at it. In other words there may be a child who on substance does not do that well in perhaps one of the two programs we saw or the Chicago program we didn't see but we may learn that later that child blossoms for some reason or another, or perhaps in the case of the New York smaller schools more kids from low income circumstances are going to college or whatever it may be. And I think that when we talk about accountability we often need to look beyond just the immediate assessment of how they are doing from tests from day to day, week to week, year to year, and take a look at the longer term aspect of it to see if a program really is working or not.

MR. HASKINS: Okay. Second question. You mentioned this but I want to draw this out and hear what your answer to this is. The teachers in these schools that you feature are more skilled than the teachers I had when I was in school. The teachers I had some were really good at controlling the classroom, but they basically stood up there and told you stuff. They told you to read a book and they'd ask a question once a while. But you're expecting these teachers not only to be able to assess the kids but to know to respond when they assess them, to make -- they didn't seem to have a count of number of decisions a teacher has to make in say 30 minutes in one of those classrooms. Where are we going to get those teachers? We don't pay teachers very well, they don't have very high respect in our society and we need much better teachers than we have. Where do we get them?

MR. MURNANE: I'll go ahead -- you want to -- I can take a crack at that if --

MR. HASKINS: Go ahead.

MR. MURNANE: So first of all I think these are much better jobs in the videos that we observed and on the Chicago video as well. If I were 35 years younger and had more energy than I have now boy I'd love to work in this high school. It's such a radically different place than the high schools I did work at almost 40 years ago. So think again, you know, well were kind of stuck I think in what Congress might call a low level equilibrium track. We have our teachers who are in many places are not very well paid. They have jobs that are - - where they don't have opportunities to learn to get better and so consequently it's not attractive to talented people to stay for very long. But we do have a lot of young people. You know, Teach for America attracts -- 10 percent of Harvard's graduating class applied to Teach for America. So again they only stay typically for a couple of years and but I think if we created jobs like the jobs that we saw I think we could attract much more talent and I think with more success we might develop a situation in which taxpayers are willing to pay teachers better.

In the third video you didn't see there's an interesting woman named Shannon Keys. She's a young African American second grade teacher. And she is really from the community. In fact if you read the transcript of her -- it was in the video she talks about that when she was young she was a student who didn't learn to read very soon. Well, she left the school to come to this school because she -- in a visit there from her prior school she saw how they were doing balanced literacy in ways that were really so much better than in the place where she was working. She actually took a pay cut -- left a teaching job to become an apprentice teacher at NKO, this school. And she initially had an awful lot to learn and that's talked about in these transcripts. Well, if you look at this video you see, boy, she really got a whole lot better. So this idea that our teachers are born not made, sure, I mean you need a good education, you need good pre service training but you -- but nobody is a good teacher in their first year on the job I would suggest. And the issue is putting people in settings where they can continue to grow and we don't do that very well. But again I think that's as Sonja said earlier a lot of that is subject to the control of leadership.

MR. HASKINS: Jim? Mike?

MR. SHELTON: I mean, one, I couldn't have said it better. The reality is we often times talk about the shortage of great teachers that we have. I think we have a much greater shortage of great places that great teachers want to work.

MS. SANTELISES: Yeah.

MR. SHELTON: And so that's why we see the kind of turn over that we see and people make rational decisions when -- who wants to go in and be unsuccessful? Who wants to stay in a job where they feel unsuccessful? Who wants to be in a job where they don't feel supported? Who wants to be in a job where -- like no one wants to do that. And it takes people who are willing to in some cases martyr themselves to want to stay in those conditions. And that's what we often times are asking people to do. And so I think we need to be very real about the circumstances we're asking teachers to step to into at the same as we're having a conversation about what kind of professionals we need them to be in order to serve our children well. So just -- let me just put that on the table. That said there are things that we know about what we need to do to better prepare teachers who are coming in to the profession, to attract more folks into the profession that have other opportunities that are higher performing, had a good educational background themselves so they can pass that on to the kids that they're serving. We can do more about that but if you look at the broad swath of teachers pretty quickly you see that there's a big middle. And the big middle is about what kind of context is being created for them, what kind of supports do you have them, and then what kind of tools do you have for them so that we can reduce the burden that we place on teachers when they're in that classroom? And I'll end on this note, when you think about the complexity of problem solving instruction for individual students in the classroom, especially where you have a wide variance in the current performance level of those students and other issues that the students are bringing to the table that cognitive load -- forgive me -- is huge. It's just huge. It's an incredible problem solving challenge and it's amazing when teachers do it really well. Part of the question is how do we give them the tools to reduce that cognitive load? How do we make it easier for them to solve that problem? What we ask them to solve every day is go in there and differentiate, go in there and differentiate, here's some colored markers, thank you very much, have at it. We need to come up with better tools to help them do that job well.

MR. HASKINS: Okay. So something that's common to all --

MR. DUNCAN: Could I just add one thing, you know, to speak to that? And that is to bring in teacher education programs which I think are -- play a potentially important role and to connect it with some opportunities from the common core. Common core is coming in and laying out a very thoughtful set of learning goals in math and literacy grade by grade that in mathematics stresses both conceptual knowledge as well as procedural knowledge. We typically just focus on procedural kind of knowledge now. So for the first time all the teachers that we talked with in these schools welcomed the common core. Finally there is an explicit setoff learning goals. I'm a third grade teacher; I know what the second grade teacher is covering. And when you have that kind of clarity it provides opportunities for schools of education who are training the teachers to teach a much more explicit kind of curriculum for the teachers because instead of having to train teachers for an infinite number of curricula, right, there's a much better defined set of learning goals that you can train teachers for as well as stressing this conceptual knowledge as well as applied knowledge. So I don't know if we'll be able to pull this off but implicit in the common core movement is this chance to reform teacher training, it's a chance to reform assessments so that we get a uniform set of assessments again focused on both conceptual knowledge as well as procedural knowledge. It's a huge opportunity that I hope we don't squander.

MR. HASKINS: Let's just spend one second on --

MR. CASTLE: Can I make a --

MR. HASKINS: Go ahead.

MR. CASTLE: -- just a very brief comment on -- one is I think you have to expand the question to not only where are we going to get more teachers but where are we going to get more male teachers. It concerns me a great deal that a lot of particularly young men, perhaps young men and women who come from these lower income circumstances go to school and in many instances they really haven't seen a man in their life anywhere near as much as their mother and as a result of that the fact they're not exposed to men in school and then the first group of men they're going to be exposed to are perhaps troubled in some way or another in their neighborhood is a problem. And I think we need to actually take a look at that. And I also have thought for some time that we don't stress the positives of teaching. One positive is in virtually every teaching job I know of in this country there is an actual pension as opposed to a 401K or whatever it may be which is admirable. Secondly you have summer vacations. Most teachers say well, we have to work because we don't earn enough money and that may be -- that probably is accurate if I had to guess. But they maybe work -- able to work at something different. An opportunity to do something different than what they've doing which I think can be very positive as well. I think there are more positives to all that than people will sometimes realize.

MR. DUNCAN: So I would love to see more men go into the teaching profession, I'd love to see more men of color go into the teaching profession. I'm much more concerned about our ability to get highly effective teachers into the classroom with the kids that need the most than I am about either of those issues. So I'd love to see it but recognizing that some kids have been taught really, really well for years without that I would just love to see more effective teachers in front of the kids who need it most. And that -- I mean and you'll -- you've seen in the -- those of you who follow the budget know that that is a very explicit proposal for this year for what rates at the top and focus on. And I think it's critically important that we figure out how to support the kids that want to do that work.

MR. HASKINS: All right. So I want to ask a brief question, maybe two of you respond to this and one of them should be Jim, on something that just came up. And then I want to ask a broader question and then go to the audience.

So the thing that just came up, common core -- this is Washington, we love to have conflict and we love it when people yell at each other. There's a lot of yelling going on about common core. I mean 45 states approved it -- boom, like that. But now there are some problems. Arizona is having trouble, Tennessee, several other states. Tennessee I've read articles saying they're probably going to delay its implementation at least two years and maybe do even worse than that. So what's the resolution to making sure that common core actually takes place and yields all the advantages that you've mentioned? Jim? (Laughter)

MR. SHELTON: So what I'll say is I started off kind of broad about what it takes to make major social change and I'll come back to that point which is that most major social change is a greatest risk because the people of the silent majority, the people who sit quietly by while people who have adamant opposition are really, really loud. And they just let it go. And they let it go at the peril of the kids that need it the most without even recognizing that they put themselves in peril. And that is what puts frankly the common core and frankly I will say the entire reform agenda at risk. I keep -- I will go all the in and just say I was hoping somebody -- I am hoping somebody will say for the first time in the last five years people who had actually given up hope about the ability to transform our education system into one that will serve our kids were starting to get hopeful again. And we are at great risk of going back to the bad old days. Big time unless people do something. And it doesn't matter what front you're looking on, whether it's successful charters getting kicked out of their schools, or people trying to tear down the common core, take your pick. People are going for it and nobody's standing up.

MR. HASKINS: Okay. With that --

MR. MURNANE: How about Sonja?

MR. HASKINS: Okay.

MS. SANTELISES: So what I'll say about common core is (1) that if we -- and I mean it at local levels, right, because at some -- it's great having folks at a national level, right, talk about the common core. Where I think we need to focus more attention is (1) how do parents and how to teachers understand the common core? So we know, if you look at all of the surveys, if you look at everything that most teachers still support the common core in concept. Where we're tripping up, and I think that there's been too much noise about the trip up but that -- I'll leave that aside -- where we've tripped up is on implementation, right, overwhelmingly. We had a majority of support and had that majority stayed -- and I do agree with Jim that you have to have people speaking out -- but where people are starting to waiver a bit is in what does it actually look like on the ground? What we know is that in communities where -- and I mean communities and states where there has been an on the ground effort to make sure that the common core is understood in very plain ways, not in, you know, not in the way that I talk about common core and curriculum standards and scope and sequence, but just in very supermarket on the ground ways, do you want your children to understand this kind of mathematical problem? I don't care whether I'm in Cherry Hill or whether I'm in Roland Park in my neighborhood in Baltimore, I have 90 percent agreement. The problem is the cacophony of voices are obscuring the issue. So what's happening -- I'll give you a great example -- a state like Alabama, right, where you had on the ground work with a local translation of the common core, right, where it was -- I think it was the Alabama grid, they did a fantastic job, right. And you would assume by the geographic of where Alabama is situated in the country that they would long had this eruption. Up until very recently you haven't heard a lot about Alabama going back on common core in part because of the ground level war, right, that people were fighting in terms of folks' conceptual understanding. Now that some of the legislative battle is beginning to surface in Alabama, what's different there than say in states like Arizona is that you actually have -- you have a critical mass of people who understand it who now can rise up and counter, right, the fringe attack. So the attack is coming but you have a critical mass of people who understand it. So where teachers, where parents, where community members understand what it means. When I hold up a book so, you know -- I mean look, I did a -- you know, we talk about everyday people, I went to a forum at Brown University, I was speaking. You would assume everybody at least there had a four year degree and I had somebody raise their hand and ask me does this now mean that small kids aren't reading literature anymore. And I'm like, what? Are you kidding me? They can still read The Trumpet of the Swan. No one's taking away Sarah, Plain and Tall or Roll of Thunder, Hear my Cry. Those are all still on the list if you want to read them. And just like the wave of relief. Now these are highly educated people and I had somebody ask me that question. So part of it is also the translation of not having it just be up here, right, in terms of all of these things it's going to do. If we talk about it in plain terms nine times out of ten people who were wavering actually then go to support. And I think that's where the issue is. That we'll always have people who counter something. But if we can mobilize our support in the way that we need to we're finding that in those ground battles - -that's what happened in Michigan. Michigan was a hot bed and we turned -- we kept common core in there. Again same is happening in Alabama. And in places where it's not, a la New York, right, for all its liberal democratic leanings, right, where that fell down -- and I love John dearly -- a lot of that fell down because of the assumption that everybody was just going to go with what you wanted to do because some elite somewhere said this is the best thing for our kids. And you had people push back and say, uh uh, that's not enough, I want to understand what it means. So I think that's the piece of the common core conversation that we need to give far more attention to.

MR. HASKINS: Let me just say for those of you who don't know if you go and Google common core and look at the actual standards you will be amazed. They are really, really detailed. And I can imagine them being a very essential part of a future education curriculum that at last we know second graders in math, here are the 11,467 things they need to know. Look at it, it will really surprise you.

So I'm going to dispense with my last question in the issue of time here and turn it over to the audience. I want to tell the audience in the statements as we are in questions. Try to be fairly brief so we can get as many people as possible. Raise your hand, stand up, tell us your name. Let's start right over there. Where is the mic -- yeah, right behind you, good.

MR. MCCRAE: Chris McCrae. I'd like to take things in the two presenters' questions and see if I understood --

MR. HASKINS: Can you hold the mic a little closer?

MR. MCCRAE: Are we talking about developing a social movement of change to free teachers to do different things? Because the dynamics look very different in your two videos, and how to scale that. If we are the examples abroad where they do this, like if we want Montessori kind of group things to go all the way through schooling system now, Lucknow has a 50,000 schooling system that does that. Or if we want a sort of corporate partner in high schools, Google is a corporate partner across the South African curriculum which has been changed so that a million jobs are created by high schools in South Africa. Both of those cases I know the people who founded those systems if you wanted to research how they have created such a movement.

MR. HASKINS: Okay. Well, let's answer the question.

MR. MURNANE: I must confess, I'm not sure I understood the question. If someone else does can -- that would be great.

MR. MCRAE: I'm sorry, just to --

MR. HASKINS: Jim is shaking his head. Let's see if Jim --

MR. MCRAE: But just to take the case of Lucknow in India when you have 50,000 children all using a Montessori type school system but through higher education as -- so, you know, your reflective, your group, all those sorts of dynamics you then have 2,000 teachers who are becoming a majority. So they're free to do those kinds of things rather than it being the isolated teacher in an isolated school who's having to do the pioneering type of work.

MR. HASKINS: Does that help?

MR. SHELTON: So --

MR. HASKINS: Or perhaps, Greg why don't you -- go ahead.

MR. SHELTON: So here's what I would say. I would say. I would say I would not just characterize it as social movement though I do think that creating context for people to take on different difficult work which this work is incredibly important. So that kind of momentum and movement is really important. The policy and regulatory frame work that creates the incentives for people to move in the right direction, also critically important. The systems of support at every level to actually enable people who have not worked in a system like that before to get to that place, also critically important. So I don't want this to feel like this is about a campaign. This is about creating the kind of ecosystem that's going to allow that large scale transformation to take place. If I understand the examples that you're giving one of the advantages that the places that you're talking about have and that the partnerships that you're talking about have is they figured out how to bring people together who are going to work at scale on something. And in doing so they create their own community which given a set of outcomes they've all agreed on can work together on it. We have that opportunity here, the standards allow that but almost every school system in and of itself is a large enough community to do that too. So I don't think everything has to scale at that level.

MR. HASKINS: Next question. The mic right here in the middle.

SPEAKER: Here you go.

MR. HASKINS: On your right -- right there, yeah.

MR. GORMLEY: Bill Gormley from Georgetown University. Just briefly I'd like to associate myself with Congressman Castle's remarks about the importance of having more male teachers. There's a lot of evidence that boys are really struggling in our schools at all levels. And I wrote an op ed about this in USA Today about a year ago, it's called, A Few Good Men, if anyone's interested in that.

My question for Greg and for Dick has to do with the New York City school example. Is the lesson we're to draw from that that despite the Gates Foundation that smaller schools are actually better or is the lesson that community partnerships can excite and stimulate and focus students and that those partnerships may be more likely or more feasible in smaller schools?

MR. HASKINS: Greg or Dick?

MR. MURNANE: I don't think either one is exactly right, Bill, either one of those. And I though the comment Bob Hughes made at the beginning is really important. And his interview transcript is really worth reading. He was one of the architects of this system of small schools along with Michele Cahill. And the idea of creating -- of this design competition under which small group of educators -- they did have to have community partners, they didn't always work together. And then -- but creating systems where likeminded educators could come together, the design competition, there were a set of principles that design teams had to pay attention to that reflected understanding of adolescent development principles. But then I think what you saw in (inaudible) you saw first of all the partnerships. What's really interesting about their partnerships is that they're not add-ons, rather the things they do, this dog bite trial that the student was talking about is integrated fully in the curriculum, that's the first thing. But the second is and you -- if you listen carefully, you know, they've talked about the pre reading procedures, remember they had the boy read. They talked about annotation. So the SLJ teachers have agreed on a set -- on focusing on developing students' literacy skills, common practices across the curriculum. And so building the reading skills of ninth graders is not the English teacher's problems, it's the ninth grade teams challenge and they work very intensely in these weekly ninth grade team level sessions to be sure that they are coordinating, that they're developing consistency across the curriculum. So I'd say it's that building consistency and coherence with enough support to make that happen. So they have these two hours per week in these grade level team meetings. They also have regular departmental meetings. One of the things when you read the transcript with Suzette Dyer, the school principal, the principal, the assistance principal and the head of each grade level team meet every week where they work out in detail how every minute of these common planning times is going to be used. You may have seen where she clicked the timer for 10 minutes. So common planning time is very common. Common planning time used well is very uncommon. They make sure that it's used very well which is critical because for a classroom teacher, you know, time is the precious resource. So when that's used very well people get the message you come, you be prepared and when the ninth grade teacher, Merilee Valentino, says bring in next week something you've adapted the way Matthew McRae did you realize that's part of my job.

MR. HASKINS: Greg?

MR. DUNCAN: So I would just generalize this a bit. So it's not small schools, it's what you do in the small schools. It's not pre-K. As you well know there are some high quality pre-K and some low quality pre-K. It's not charter schools, right. The Chicago schools were charter schools but we know there are some bad charter schools. It's actually what Sonja said, it's this relentless focus on the nature of the instructional experience, the learning experience for the kids in the classroom. And somehow all these schools and with this planning process that Bob Hughes helped put in the place, the system of schools in New York had figured this out in ways that led to a sharp focus on the quality of the educational experience and that led to the outcomes.

MR. HASKINS: Belle?

MS. SAWHILL: This follows up a little bit on Bill Gormley's question and I think in the book you talk about green fields and brown fields. Anyway about newly created schools versus older schools that need restructuring or redesign. And I understand that what happens in the classroom is critical. Everything that you just said, both of you, but I also think that what Jim is talking about is you've got to have the ecological frame work in which it's -- there's a higher probability that these good things are going to happen at the classroom level. So tell us a little bit more about that and especially about your thoughts on whether it's good to -- one of the things that charter schools do is at least they break up the mold and they force people or the allow people to try new things. How important is that?

MR. MURNANE: I'd say one of the -- I'd love to have Sonja follow whether she would --

MS. SANTELISES: It's not planned by the way.

MR. MURNANE: We are -- it's clearly, you know -- organizational theorists always talk about it's easier to start new than to change an existing organization and that's true in Ford plants just as well as it is in schools. I talked with the principal of a turnaround school in Boston a week ago that actually has made considerable progress, Orchard Gardens, and Sonja knows that the principal spent four years and what he -- you know, and under this turn around legislation there is the opportunity to dismiss -- the new principal to dismiss faculty and recruit new faculty and what he says, he interviewed very teacher and what the most was focused on was their sense of whether it was possible to really change. And whether all the problem was the kids are poor, they come from poor families, things can't be better. And that led him to dismiss more than half the faculty and start anew. Because this business of building a culture where you really can change, and there's terrific stuff in these transcripts again about this doesn't happen naturally. You know one principal talks about that you need to get teachers to the point where they will comment directly to each other where one teachers says, you know, the way you handled that parent interview you really weren't very respectful; we really need to do that quite different. And the principal says I can't be the only person who's making these hard statements. And so I think, you know, I think turnaround shouldn't be probably the first resort but I do think creating this culture is tough particularly when you are in a school where teachers have felt beaten down for a lot of years.

MR. HASKINS: Go ahead.

MS. SANTELISES: I'll just add quickly that I think the same -- kind of same reference that Greg used applies here. There are schools that have existing cultures where you give leaders the opportunity to shift, make partnerships. So there a number for example of existing schools in Boston and Baltimore and other cities where you have a knowledgeable leader and an ecology that allows for partnerships to make a real difference on things like healthcare, on things like job opportunities for parents. But it actually -- it can work either way. But I've also seen new schools that start up with brand new spanking buildings, hoards of partnerships and still somehow they can't turn the corner. So the real question is how do you build the ecology within the school, whether it's starting anew or turning around to actually have the kind of environment that you can make that level of change.

MR. HASKINS: Next question. You --

MR. SHELTON: Just really quickly because I think Sonja touched on it earlier. Sonja has kept using this word coherence, all right, being able to create common vision and common practice and common culture inside the building. And you combine that with the notion of creating a new environment or a changed environment that allows people then to see that new vision and buy into it. So the adult choice -- people focus a lot on the kid choice -- but the adult choice to buy into this vision of coherence. When you see that done well that is one of the things that is hard to capture in the research that I would be a lot of money being one of the big contributors to success versus failure where that fails to emerge.

MR. HASKINS: Yes, right in front of you Quentin.

SPEAKER: I'd like to go back to something Mr. Castle said at the very beginning when he talked about the 7,000 jobs being lost in Delaware. I have a question, how can this movement be sustained unless we also talk about jobs? Over time if people think well, education's not really going to get me anyplace, you know, why should we continue investing so much money in it, why should I make such an effort when we know there's little job creation in this country and most of the job creation is in relatively low paying jobs that require little education. So you wind up with a lot of well educated people in poverty and I don't think that's the outcome we're looking for.

MR. HASKINS: Well, Greg, this sounds like a question for an economist to me. (Laughter)

MR. DUNCAN: It is. This economist has looked at the changing occupational distribution over the last 40 years.

MR. MURNANE: Well, I think if you look at education related earnings differential, you know, they widened enormously. You know, college graduates earnings have on average been stable over the last 15 years, they haven't risen but they do -- but they have been stable, they have not declined. So I think -- I mean your point is right that we -- I mean we need to separate -- you know, the lingering effects of this great recession are still very much there. You know, you've got four million long term unemployed. I mean that's a pressing problem, it's -- you know, it's an incredibly pressing problem. And that's very much there and I think not enough has been done to deal with that. It still has been -- there are a lot of these new artisans jobs as David Otter, my friend and colleague at MIT talks about, that require some post secondary education short of a four year college degree but that actually require people to leave high school with the ability to learn efficiently in post secondary education and training programs. So there are new jobs. They're not in the steel plants. They're very different. They often are in new industries, in biotech, in technology with -- so there are jobs. I think there aren't enough of them because of this recession but I do think the evidence is still pretty good that education pays off.

MR. HASKINS: One more question. All the way in the back.

MS. TORNEY-PURTA: Hi, I'm Judith Torney-Purta from the University of Maryland and I do research on international large scale assessments which you've all heard about in the news I'm sure. I wanted to say that the idea of responsibility to colleagues within a school community strikes me as a wonderful place to begin accountability and to point out that some of the countries in Northern Europe that we like to compare ourselves with on external accountability assessments is -- as a matter of fact use some of those very methodologies. And in fact recently some Estonians and Germans and others in that area have been talking about ways of building within school accountability, sometimes buttressed by what they call school inspections but not always.

And I wanted to ask if there's any way of leveraging that to get us off the question of who ranks higher, Finland or whoever, and go get us onto kind of saying the kind of international comparisons we should be doing are of some of these very kinds of school communities that you're describing. If you can suggest even one or two steps to more in that direction I would be very pleased.

MS. SANTELISES: So I actually think that you have hit upon a really interesting and potentially powerful kind of way to recalibrate this discussion particularly with the new consortia, right, of Park and Smarter Balanced -- for those of you -- I'm assuming people know but I shouldn't but that would be the common core line test, right -- and that I think now that we have almost a bit of a staying period where people are rethinking what accountability can look like, I think this is actually a great time to enter that conversation with what does the support look like? Like what are the corresponding expectations once those tests come out? Because exactly what Greg and Dick mentioned is going to happen. It happened when Massachusetts did it and there was like mass outcry across the state initially. And so I think if we prepare for that and there's a consortia of a number of organizations including EdTrust and Achieve and some others who are actually as we kind of get through this initial ground war on common core and staying the course are already starting to think about those intermediary steps that help states and schools and districts begin to process what should the next steps be as we frankly experience a falling off of the cliff. So I actually think this kind of -- this time of transition is actually a great opportunity to press some of what you're talking about because people aren't yet sure of what the ground's going to look like and are a lot more open to looking at alternatives.

MR. HASKINS: So I thank the wonderful panel we've had and Belle for introduction. And please join me in thanking them. (Applause).

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2016