



SPECIAL PRESENTATION

**“RESOURCE ALLOCATION, REINVESTMENT, AND
EDUCATION REFORM”**

**ATTRACTING AND RETAINING EFFECTIVE
TEACHERS IN HIGH POVERTY SCHOOLS**

MODERATED BY:

**ROBIN CHAIT, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR TEACHER
QUALITY, CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

FEATURED PANELISTS:

**RUSSLYN ALI, ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS,
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**SEGUN EUBANKS, DIRECTOR OF TEACHER QUALITY,
NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION**

**WESLEY WILLIAMS, DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF
EDUCATOR EQUITY, OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**VICTORIA VAN CLEEF, VICE PRESIDENT OF BUSINESS
DEVELOPMENT AND COMMUNICATIONS, NEW TEACHER
PROJECT**

**1:30 PM – 3:00 PM
MONDAY, MAY 18, 2009**

**TRANSCRIPT PROVIDED BY
DC TRANSCRIPTION – WWW.DCTMR.COM**

MS. ROBIN CHAIT: I'm Robin Chait, Associate Director for Teacher Quality at the Center for American Progress. I'm delighted today to be moderating this important discussion about attracting and retaining effective teachers in high-poverty schools.

Today we've been talking about using stimulus funds to advance strategic reforms. There is no area where this is more important than in the area of ensuring an effective teacher for every student. As part of the stimulus bill, states are required to take steps to improve teacher effectiveness and to ensure the equitable distribution of qualified teachers for all students, particularly students who are most in need.

Although federal policy has focused on the equitable distribution of teachers before, requirements were barely enforced until 2006 which means that states haven't done much yet to tackle this issue. But the key word is "yet."

Both President Obama and Secretary Duncan have made statements indicating that this time is different and they plan to focus on creating new pathways to teaching and new incentives to bring teachers to schools where they're needed most.

Why does it matter that states ensure that every student has access to an effective teacher? Well, as I'm sure this crowd knows, there's a significant body of evidence indicating that among all school resources, teachers have the greatest impact on student achievement and that teachers vary a great deal in their effectiveness. Yet, according to many indicators, students in poverty and minority students are shortchanged when it comes to teacher quality.

So we have: one, teacher effectiveness matters a great deal; two, teachers vary a great deal in their effectiveness; and three, students in poverty and minority students are shortchanged when it comes to teacher quality.

This inequity in access to teachers is a contributor to the large gap in achievement between poor minority students and other students. And that's why this issue is such a high priority for CAP and why I wrote a report that we're releasing today entitled "Ensuring Effective Teachers for All Students: Six State Strategies for Attracting and Retaining Effective Teachers in High-Poverty and High-Minority Schools." You can access this report online on the website today.

While the strategies I outlined in the report are by no means sufficient, they're high-leverage, research-based strategies with some promise of producing results. I'm going to list the strategies now, and I'm sure that the panelists will touch on them in their remarks.

They include: analyze and report on the distribution of teachers between schools using value added estimates and other measures; design a model evaluation system for measuring teacher effectiveness and improving teachers performance; support programs

that offer financial incentives to effective teachers in high-poverty schools, and these include recruitment, incentives, retention, performance paid programs, recruiter ladders, provide funding and models for recruitment and preparation programs that are specifically targeted to high-need schools, provide an induction and mentoring program for new teachers in high-poverty schools, and require schools to report their budgets by actual expenditures, rather than positions.

And now I'd like to introduce the panelists who will talk more about policies and strategies for the federal, state, and local level for attracting and retaining effective teachers in high-poverty schools and how stimulus funds can be used to invest in those strategies. You have their bios, so I'll be brief.

Russlynn Ali is the assistant secretary for civil rights at the U.S. Department of Education. She was confirmed as the assistant secretary at the Department of Education on May 1st. Prior to her appointments, Ms. Ali was vice president of the Education Trust and founding director of the Education Trust-West, the West Coast partner of Education Trust. Both of these organizations work to promote high academic achievement for all students.

Wesley Williams is the director of the Office of Educator Equity at the Ohio Department of Education, a new office that focuses on implementing new strategies outlined in Ohio's Teacher Equity Plan. He has also served as the director of Teacher Recruitment and Enhancement at the Mississippi Teacher Center.

Victoria Van Cleef is the vice president of staffing initiatives for the New Teacher Project where she oversees projects that focus on building school level capacity to make effective hires and staffing chronically low-performing schools. Victoria has also served as vice president of the business development and communications for the New Teacher Project.

And Segun Eubanks is the director of teacher quality for the National Education Association. He has served in various leadership roles with national and nonprofit education organizations including as executive director of Community Teachers Institute and vice president of Recruiting Teachers Inc. Let's get started.

MS. RUSSLYN ALI: Thank you. It is my pleasure to be here today. The recommendations are right on. Now, the issue is how we take that to scale.

Clearly effectiveness is important. It can be measured. We need to get the most effective teachers to the students that are most dependent on them for their learning. How do we do this at scale given that we have 3.1 million teachers in the workforce and 530,000 of those move in and out, and half of them are due to resignations?

We have about 260,000 new teachers entering the profession. But across that flow of new teachers in and out of the profession is really where you can capitalize on moving the effectiveness agenda the most. It is both about making sure that the teachers in schools today get the supports they need to become better. Like we heard the secretary and the

president talk about, if they get those supports and they're still not as strong as they should be, they don't need to be teaching the kids that are most dependent on them for their learning.

That said, in the stabilization moneys, the Recovery Act, there is \$100 billion of unprecedented resources to help schools get better. As a result of getting that money, the federal government is asking for schools and districts to report and guarantee certain assurances. The metrics for the assurances will be published in the Federal Register shortly, June 15 or thereabouts. I know you're eager for that, so stick around.

They're asked not only to talk about the distribution of high-quality teachers in the forming of schools serving mostly students of color and students in poverty by classroom and by school. But they also take steps to get at the evaluations to find out which states or which districts are using evaluations that are based on student outcomes. For those that aren't ready to do that may be because of data systems or lack of will, we ask for a plan to get that done by 2011.

Alongside the lines of new money with recovery dollars though there is the teacher investment part. I'm sure I don't have to tell anyone in this room what that means for you what that's about. The very good news is this budget calls for five times the amount of money directed towards teachers \$500 million. There's \$3 billion in the budget dedicated to Title II in the reauthorization. Right now, not many folks including us have a real good handle on how those Title II dollars are being spent. We want to be transparent with that.

So while we know that the metrics today, highly qualified teachers are hugely important. They tell us more about who is qualified to teach in the subjects they are teaching and we've never had information about that before. We also know that we've got to push and move the effectiveness agenda that is tied directly to this report that Robin mentioned, the first recommendation around value added.

We also know that we have a lot of questions about value added methodologies which are the most effective. What do we do in high schools given methodologies there are a little bit uncertain, and we don't have annual assessments. And we know that while student outcomes ought to play a very big role in teacher evaluations, perhaps even in decisions about how long teachers stay in their field and worth their pay, there are also other factors that we need to consider too.

So, for us, while the evidence out there and the data out there is a little bit weak, some data is better than no data for sure, and we have to do a much better job at making sure that the way we are both evaluating, measuring, and assessing teachers gets at the heart of what we know their what their teaching is doing, and that is including student achievement overtime.

Now, the policy gestures that we think can be used to get—to make sure that both aspiring teachers of promise come into the profession and accomplished teachers drive

increased students performance state in the profession and teach at the schools that need them the most.

The first is really working to distinguish the strongest teachers from our weakest teachers. Again, value added is a good measure, an important measure, but not the only measure. We have to get well conducted evaluations that don't shy away from that focus on student achievement. We need to invest heavily, and we will, in improving evaluation systems. We've heard about that in one of the CAP's reports recommendations. We need to get much better at differentiating incentives that is also about pay, but not only about pay.

I'm sure you know from every survey data or most survey data out there that teachers talk about working conditions. They talk about having a strong leader. They talk about other supports they need to keep them teaching the most challenged students that will incentivize them to go to schools in the first place.

Federal policy will play a key role to ensure that those incentives are done fairly and get to the teachers that need them the most so they can get to the students that need them the most.

I'm sure we'll go a little bit more in detail during the question and answer period when it comes to actual expenditures on the budget. I guess that's about reauthorization and accountability provisions and ESEA. And so, we'll talk about that a little bit more too during the question and answer.

MS. CHAIT: Thank you, Russlyn. Wesley?

MR. WESLEY WILLIAMS: Good afternoon. There is a quote that I'd like to share with you that really guides the work that I do and it's written by James Baldwin. He said, "For these are all our children and we will either profit by or pay for whatever they become." Some very strong language: for these are all our children and we, the adults in their lives, either profit by or pay for whatever they become.

When I started the work in Ohio in directing the Office of Educator Equity, that quote is really internalized in my being and I continue to think about it as I move forward with the work that we're doing in Ohio.

This afternoon, I just want to share with the comprehensive approach that we're taking in moving this work forward in our state to ensure that students of color, income disadvantaged students, and all students in Ohio are taught by highly qualified teachers.

A part of our comprehensive approach is, of course, complying with our federal component. So we have established and we continue to enhance the state's teacher infrastructure. Our infrastructure involves every community school, every school district in our state, 614 of them conducting what we call a "teacher distribution data analysis." We have provided all of those entities, the school districts and the community schools

with a teacher distribution file that they use to conduct their analysis. We also provide technical assistance to all of the district schools. Data are quite alarming around this area. We continue to try our best to be as transparent as possible in publicly recording our teacher distribution progress and our goals.

A part of data piece is that they are publicly recorded in a way that involves reporting on high-poverty versus low-poverty schools, teachers' credentials in the tested co-academic subjects, and the numbers of teachers' distribution, and the teacher distribution among new versus experienced teachers and high-poverty versus low-poverty schools.

We're doing much more than that, and another layer of our comprehensive approach is really increasing our learning about the teacher equity work. We have established and we're administering five teacher equity pilots that are really helping us to increase our learning, and I'll just mention three of them.

They're in our urban, rural, and suburban schools districts one of the pilots is a qualitative teacher equity, teacher distribution study. We're doing this in five districts throughout the state. It's a collaborative project with the Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights right here in D.C. We're working with their attorneys and research analysts. They have already visited those states and engaged in collecting qualitative data around how to take federal mandates and Ohio's teacher equity plan, and grill it down to the district level, where we can include key educational stakeholders that are influential in making the teacher equity work a success in the respective district.

Those attorneys and research assistants interviewed not just central office staff in those districts, but also their partners, their institutions of higher education partners, parental partners, teachers, parents, and even union affiliates. And we will have a final report, a draft report of that work this summer, and we will be sharing those findings with those teachers participating in the qualitative study.

Another issue that's important for us is this whole issue around managing educator talent. We have a human resource pilot in collaboration with the Learning Point Associates Organization and the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality.

We're working with their staff in three districts: a rural district, a suburban district, and an urban district all with various needs, but all very interested in engaging into this whole notion of reengineering human resource systems so that they can have a more integrated system around best practices, and recruitment, and hiring, and professional development, and compensation, and working conditions, and policy management, performance management, and teacher leadership.

This has given us a great opportunity to establish some teacher focus groups to give beginning teachers in those districts as well as veteran teachers the opportunity to participate in a teacher anonymous survey. Administrators are also participating in that survey. We're interviewing administrators at all levels of the district and taking hold of those quantitative and qualitative data and sharing that backward to districts.

And where we are now with that project, districts are actually selecting to interpret the data. They're selecting where they would like to direct their focus and fortunately, we are able to provide a subsidy grant up and move forward with the beginning of the work around reengineering their human resources system around those major components as they begin this work.

We're also trying to increase our understandings about the factors that influence teacher mobility and attrition. We have developed an anonymous online survey. We have eight districts that are participating in that right now and we're trying to continue to increase that number. As the teacher exit survey, we're very interested in what those findings are revealing to those districts.

Through across agency collaboration we're implementing and monitoring our progress in accomplishing the state's teacher equity strategies that are outlined in our state teacher equity plan. Our plan was approved by USDE as is, with no required revisions. And our plan did receive several commendations from national organizations. It was truly an effort in developing that plan from a number of educational stakeholders being a part of that effort.

At the foundation of our teacher equity plan, this is when we get into the structure of the work that we're approaching in the state. The foundation is our standards for the teaching profession, our standards for principals, our standards for superintendents, and our professional development standards.

At the core of our work, that is our guide in creating a strong human resource system in our state. These standards, as I said, serve as guidance with labor and providing high support to all the teachers throughout the lifecycle of their profession so that Ohio has high-quality educators at all levels when they enter, the proficient level, as they continue to matriculate through the lifecycle of the profession, as they move and transform into accomplished teachers, and also distinguish teachers to improve student achievement and learning. We believe that our standards provide a framework for what teachers, principals, and superintendents should know and be able to do to impact student achievement and learning.

Ohio's teacher preparation programs are aligned and more closely being aligned to the standards. And we just recently developed teacher evaluation guidelines that are also into our standards.

We are learning, and we continue to learn, from a host of our high-quality teacher initiatives in its efforts to support and ensure high-quality teachers in high-poverty schools. Because we are a TIF state with the Ohio Teacher Incentive Fund, we are really working diligently to drive and create a system of awarding teachers in full districts for high levels of performance and solid achievement with competitive compensation and career opportunities.

We have two districts that are using the TIF funds to incorporate the teacher advancement program. And I don't know about you, but when I sit in cluster meetings, I have empowered myself to watch a collaborative group of teachers come together through focused, ongoing multiple data elements to better inform them of how to enhance and improve various instructional strategies for all students in their classes. It's phenomenal to watch and to see them actively engaged in that work. We really do believe in this model and we're very excited for the work that goes into it.

We also have some districts that using the TIF funds through the establishment of an alternative compensation system model and those districts use teacher impact on student achievement and learning at the heart of its design.

The state will continue to publicly report at the building level. The districts value their growth model results on our local report card. But we're going a little deeper than that with selected districts that are participating with help for kids and drilling down this value added growth model to the teacher and student level. And we hope to have more districts participating in that.

Ohio has a principal evaluation system. We are currently piloting OPES, the principal evaluation system, in 20 school districts and 141 schools and the system is aligned to our principal standards. We really believe in supporting new teachers and new principals in our public schools. Through our entry year teacher program and our entry year preschool program, we're continuing to learn and implement best practices and mentoring induction for new teachers and principals in high-poverty schools, as well as statewide.

As far our profession development standards, our standards develop, and are continuing to advance, a rigorous system of evaluation of districts that use of Poverty Based Assistance Funds. Some of our high-poverty districts receive those funds and as a part of that process, districts are required to describe their professional development. We then evaluate their PD against our PD standards for approval.

This whole notion of having a teacher recruitment and incentive package for teachers is vital. We're beginning that work through the Ohio Teacher Corps Program whereby we're incentivizing new teachers who are teaching foreign language, math, science to teach in hard to staff schools. We are doing this by offering them a \$20,000 signing bonus or loan forgiveness programs for a five-year commitment. Also, coupled with that is support through our entry-year teacher program and all of the supports that the local district is providing new teachers.

Now, what does the road ahead look like for us in Ohio? The road ahead in high-quality teacher distribution in Ohio involves several new implementations. Ohio is developing a multi-tiered licensure system to provide opportunities for teachers to advance in their careers. Right now, this is a proposal and we are working very diligently on the points in that proposal.

So far, we have four licenses being proposed, starting with a four-year resident educator license. New teachers will receive this upon graduation and they will be engaging in differentiated best practices of mentoring and induction as they matriculate through a four-year cycle holding this license.

They will then receive a professional educator license issued upon the completion of the Ohio Teacher Residency Program. They will have opportunities to advance in their careers with acquiring the senior professional license and then the lead professional educator license.

We also have a proposed teacher Ohio program which will provide an Ohio teaching fellow scholarship as a tool to recruit undergraduates into the teaching profession but to also provide some support for them through some meaningful summer enrichment programs as they're matriculating through their undergraduate teacher preparation programs.

There are also the 20 districts that are participating in the pilot, the Ohio Principal Evaluation System, which is aligned with the state's principal standards. This will continue to provide us with a strong basis for leading and expanding this work throughout our state. We are certainly hopeful that OTIF will be able to expand the Ohio Teacher Incentive Fund, to expand that work in more Ohio districts that are really interested in redefining their teacher evaluation systems and empowering teachers to participate in these collaborative teams.

We are continuing our work with the New Teacher Center because we're learning more and more about how we can continue to provide resources in schools and the best practices in providing high-quality mentoring and induction to support the teachers.

There is also the educator standard score. We have a board in Ohio that is developing a teacher evaluation system model that is aligned to our standards for the teaching profession. We hope that that model will serve as a model for districts, and that districts will have the opportunity to use that model as they begin their effort to redesign their teacher evaluation system.

And finally, we have a teacher leadership endorsement. We will be piloting this teacher leadership endorsement in four districts to provide differentiated leadership roles for teachers and the teacher leadership endorsement is in line with standards for the teaching profession.

As I close, another important quote for me is from Horace Mann, the first president of the prestigious Antioch University, Yellow Springs, Ohio. And he said, "Be ashamed to die until you have won some victory for humanity."

Although the road ahead for Ohio's teacher quality and equity work to ensure an equitable distribution of effective teachers is both promising and challenging, the state is hopeful that its educators, its educational stakeholders, our institutions of higher

education, our school districts, and communities work diligently to win this victory for our students. Thank you.

MS. CHAIT: Thanks, Wesley. It's really helpful to hear about such a rich array of activities at the state level addressing teacher equity. Victoria?

MS. VICTORIA VAN CLEEF: Hi. My name is Victoria Van Cleef. I work with the New Teacher Project. We are a national nonprofit organization that's focused on closing the student achievement gap by closing the teacher quality gap.

We spend the bulk of our time trying to broaden the pipeline for urban school districts around the country to make sure that we put the highest-need schools in a position to being selective when it comes to hiring their new teachers. And so, a lot of our work is focused on recruiting career changers in shorted subject areas to bring their content knowledge into teaching profession.

We also work with our school district partners to kind of take historically highest-poverty, lowest-performing schools and to service as their staffing specialists to say, let us really focus a lot of effort on the match that's made between a new hire going into that building and the needs of that particular school and see if we can do something to kind of stabilize these environments and build stronger instructional teams in these buildings.

I think one of the challenges we have seen is that in about 12 years of trying to do this work, we've come to a conclusion – this may more negative more than I mean it to – but basically the goal of universal teacher effectiveness, of placing an effective teacher in every classroom, is pretty near impossible in the context of the current capital policies and practices that we see deployed in industries across the country today. We see a lot of bright spots, and I'm going to talk about those, some of those today.

But the challenge is that when you are not focusing on the whole, what do you want the spectrum to be, activities, the value chain, everything from the pipeline, everything that gets high-quality people into the classroom and then effectiveness management, everything that's going to keep those folks there and keep them growing and developing. If we don't have an integrated effort that touches on all of those, then I think you need incremental gains. In my opinion, those incremental gains reflect the incremental gains of student achievement. We're all getting the three to five, five to seven months annually. We're not getting full-scale change that's going to help us close this gap in a meaningful, and I think faster, way that most of us are hungry for.

What am I talking about when I say this? It's really that the foundational system, everything that's kind of responsible for generating and maintaining quality is almost universally misaligned with the goal of putting an effective teacher in our classroom. And so, in any given year we're working with anywhere from 25 to 28 urban districts across the country. We are embedded in our district partners and we sit in HR. We're not consulting outside, we actually have desks side-by-side with the teacher staff.

And one of the things that we consistently see is that when it comes to something like recruitment and selection, there is not necessarily any special recruitment or screening efforts given to our highest-poverty schools. It's not like anybody is looking at the applicant pool, tiering, prioritizing it, and sourcing out the top of that talent in high-poverty schools. The capacity hardly exists to do that in HR systems.

And when you look at post-hire selection rigor, there is a little focus there. What is the decision point that's made when it comes to granting tenure? In many of the districts that we see, we don't even see a standard defined for tenure. Basically, the lever gets pulled when you're in attendance. It's not about quality or effectiveness.

I think when it comes to hiring time, we see the most archaic slotting procedures which treat teachers like a widget. You are a plug-and-play entity, and it doesn't matter where I put you because you can be as good in that environment as you can in that. I think anybody who's a professional knows that's not the case. I'm going to work better with a certain kind of team, manager, structure, setting. There is not thought being given to the match. It is not happening by and large in our urban districts.

I think we really see it right now in economic times like this, where these universal freezes are coming on. You're getting hire freezes. There are these rolling scales where you can hire—no, wait—nobody can hire. You get a freeze. And no district is matching up their surplus pool to say, all right, how many math teachers are in this surplus pool? There probably aren't that many. So you let the highest-poverty schools continue hiring in the shorter subject area because you aren't going to have a misplaced pool in those subject areas. That kind of logical assessment to diagnosis it, break it down, tier it, and prioritize it, approach to high-poverty schools. We don't see that happening there as well.

Our evaluation systems don't evaluate. They don't differentiate performance. They're really not designed to benefit or develop anyone. They're pretty much compliance structures.

And when it comes to leadership, we see very little human capital training. We know that our highest performers typically leave the profession the earliest, and yet you don't see leaders getting training in how you maintain your top performers. How do you develop your middle performers? There really is not a lot of focus on how these folks act as human capital developers and managers and supporters. And so, it's not a surprise that we struggle to get effective teachers in front of the children who need them the most.

And I think Robin's paper, which I hope you're all going to look online, really summarizes the research very well that at this point, this is kind of criminal because the research is very clear about the powerful effects that a teacher has on a child's life.

Robin does a great summary of what we now know. One of the pieces of data that always sticks out in my mind is work done by Ed Trust, I believe. Students in Dallas all finished second grade all about the same place in math, 55 percentile. Three years later, depending on the quality of the teacher they had, those kids are 50 percentile points apart. These are

vastly different life circumstances, and you can predict a lot of things—from dropout rate to future incarceration to future earnings—based on those different outcomes.

And it's we who put them on these different life paths. It's—we set them out on—it's not the home. It's not the circumstance at home or poverty or the other kinds of things that happen. It was the teacher in the classroom that's going to create a vastly difference on the life circumstances for those kids.

Given what we know about the powerful effects of teacher quality, if we want to realize sustainable gains in student achievement, then effectiveness has to be at the heart of all of the decision making points when it comes to human capital management. We've been thinking about three simple metrics that we might start to measure all in these decisions points that we think could help us make faster progress.

The first one might just be the number and percentage of teachers who are trained or hired and demonstrate effectiveness. We've got to shift our systems to where we're measuring the preparation. What are we producing? And are we producing folks who are able to actually raise student achievement in the classroom?

There are a number of states who now have built data systems that use value added data and other measures to be able to get three years of data on a teacher and then look back. What university or program produced that person? That has implications of all kinds of things in terms of how we grant tenure and what supports are put in place to improve the universities that aren't necessarily producing folks who are able to produce gains in the classroom. Then how do you look at those programs that are doing well and blow them out and expand what's working?

A second measure metric might be the retention rate of top quartile teachers versus bottom quartile teachers. And if you just look at kind of a bell curve, you know that teachers are going to fall out of range. They're going to have some who are extraordinary, you're going to have a bunch in the middle, and you're going to have some who aren't performing as well. And unlike the soft market, the research is pretty clear that past performance is a predictor of future outcomes when it comes to teaching.

And I know Tom King has done some research on this that's really documented that by the second year we kind of know how well you're going to do, so maybe we need to start to look at how many of the best are we retaining and how many of the worst are we entering in the profession.

And then overall, the average improvement and retained teachers' effectiveness overtime could be a third measure that we've got to make sure that the vast majority in the middle are getting support and development so they get better all the time. And move this whole – that we shift this whole bell curve up.

I think right now, about the only time we kind of see effectiveness factors into decisions is when it comes dismissal and unfortunately, that's not an appropriate time to be doing it. And even there, we know that we've got a long way to go.

We recently studied 12 districts. One of the most aggressive districts that use their dismissal policy and had linked it to effectiveness data, but we saw over five teachers only nine teachers were removed for poor performance. And that's one end of it but I guess that's not the point at which you want to be filing this data in. You want to be it on the development side.

And so the converse of that is we also asked the folks in these districts, asked the teachers, when you get your feedback back from the evaluation process, do you know where you got feedback and what were the things they told you to improve? We put in "don't know" as kind of a safety net, and we were stunned that it was the highest checked box. Folks didn't even know what they marked to improve on. So the very feedback you're supposed to get to improve is not being used as a tool to really help folks grow.

I think the last example I'll give of kind of how painful this is, before I get to some good news, is we are involved in a study with seven districts right now involving a large financial incentive, \$20,000 for a high value-added teacher to move to a low-performing, high-poverty school. Last year was the pilot year and this year was the first year of implementation.

And this is the most painful thing we're seeing time and again. We get these lists of these datasets of who's high value-added in targeting grades and we have an information session to talk about this program. We say, "would you be willing to transfer? Here's the money that's going to be involved." And consistently, across seven districts, the teachers are telling us, this is the first time anyone has ever told them that they were high value-added. They didn't realize that they were better than their peers or that they were doing a really good job.

One of the most painful events recently was with a man at the end of his career. He's about to retire and he said that he was going to frame his letter because it was so great at the end of his career to be told he was doing well. And he said with no bitter irony. He meant it. The superintendent was in the room. We were all very uncomfortable thinking that this was a source a shame, but he was thrilled to get his letter.

And so what's painful is that districts and cities have this information and have information on effectiveness, but we're really not using it to the degree we need to. I was writing down a bunch of the things Wesley said were going on and I want to look at some of the standards that they're using. I would love to see us doing activities like coaching as you're talking about, having those teacher leadership roles at scale, so that it is a true career path, not just a handful of things picked here and there.

How do we get these folks that are strong, pair them up with novices, and put them in a classroom together while carving out very conscious development time with teams that

are led by people who have demonstrated effectiveness? Just being much more thoughtful about the data that we have is one of the things that excites me about ARRA. It's going to bring attention to this and hopefully help us move in that direction.

I will talk about some of the smart things that I think we've seen some districts do, and these are places that have realized that there is no more powerful tool to have to raise student achievement than a teacher in the classroom. It's not the textbooks. It's not the school site. It's not anything else. It's who's in front of the classroom.

And so we have been working with places like San Francisco and Milwaukee, who sat down with the union leadership to say, we need to figure out a different way for our poor, our failing schools. There were schools who were in the sixth year of not meeting AYP and they really wanted to do something differently.

In both those districts, they basically prioritized hiring in the high-poverty schools. They carved out a cohort of about 25 schools in San Francisco and a smaller subset in Milwaukee where they get first crack at the pool. And so, they can move in the absence of the district's hiring, which is mutually agreed upon by the district and the union. Other schools have got to wait until surplus teachers are placed, while these folks can go ahead and hire.

What we have seen, certainly in San Francisco and Milwaukee, is that these schools, started hiring much earlier—in February and by the end of March. They were getting far more applicants than they had gotten in prior years, so there was more interest because these were the only vacancies that were posted. These were the positions that folks from outside the system could see. They were able to look at the surplus pool too. So now they had the access to both and that's the best for both worlds.

In San Francisco, it was also kind of coupled up. There was a referendum that gave money for areas with shortages. Teaching in these schools gave you a little extra money as well. And so, one of the bright spots has been that we have seen these staffing initiatives stabilize the environment.

When we started working with the schools in San Francisco about two years ago, it was about 20 schools that represented a quarter of all turnovers in the district. The basic level separation in the district was coming out of these 20 schools. And in two years, we've cut that down to 12 percent. So by being very thoughtful about the hiring, we we're able to stabilize the environments.

Now, we have to do this related to effectiveness. Are we going to a student outcome on the other end? I believe we will. It would be nice if these efforts were integrated and that would just happen by design rather than by who's got time to go look.

Another place I'd love to highlight, just because he was here this morning and speaking, is Baltimore. Baltimore has been another place that we've worked with for a long time where they were very conscious to expand their pipeline. They knew that they are high

need. They are competing with the suburbs. They had to expand their pipeline because we did not have the teachers in the shortage subject areas that they needed.

We've been working with them for a long time, both to recruit in the shortage subject areas but also to staff 40 of their historically lowest-performing schools. And these were schools that have been opening for about four years in a row now fully staffed, while the district as a whole has been opening with anywhere from 100 to 70 vacancies across the board.

And one of the nice things we have seen by sitting in HR is that the number is going down. It used to be 120, and then went to 110. Now it's going to be 70. So by us working together, we were able to share our strategies with the other HR staff to try to spread these improvements across the districts. We've enabled them to track the same metrics as we focus on. Here you have 40 of the lowest-performing schools in the district opening fully staffed.

The other huge metric we tracked was when vacancies are identified. These are schools in which 50 percent of their vacancies used to pop up after July 15th. If you are a historically low-performing school in a hard to staff area and you're searching for your math and science teachers in August, who do you think you're likely to get that late in summer? Over the course of time, the identification of those vacancies is down 20 percent. Twenty percent of vacancies now are popping up after July 15th.

And a big piece is that, if anyone was in the high school piece for this conversation, it's about the culture in the buildings. It's not about policy or money. It is about the leadership and the culture in those buildings that have led to an honest conversation around, we really want you to stay. In January and February having conversations with teachers saying, "I really want you to stay. Are you willing to stay and make improvement in high school. If you're leaving, will you tell me now? Don't wait until the summer. Tell me now so I can then properly fill that vacancy." It's taken four years to get principals to learn how to have that conversation.

I think teachers rightfully distrusted principals in the past. There was a lot of time where teachers would see abuse where if teachers told the principal that they were leaving, then you'd get the crummy assignments for the rest of the school year. So they were not going to tell the administration that they were leaving.

It took principals working to build trust in those buildings and to have honest conversations about asking to teachers to leave their letter of intent early on so that they can plan thoughtfully. We're seeing that number come down. It's a very important metric for high-poverty schools.

I think one of the important things is to look at what the situation looks like at a school level. And I have an example, Patterson High School. A huge high school in Baltimore. It was widely recognized as one of the lowest-performing schools in Baltimore City. Annually, it turned over a quarter of its staff every year, so it was huge turnover for the

kids. Less than 8 percent of the students were earning a passing score on the Maryland high school assessment tests in English, algebra, biology, and government.

That situation has changed dramatically over the course of four years. We've got about 28 of the career changers recruited—folks who we screen for their content knowledge in those positions. We've got about 28 teachers in areas like math, science, and Spanish. The number of positions that we have had to fill in that school over time has decreased. The first time we worked with them we had to fill 33 vacancies. That was down to eight this year. So again, that's stabilizing the workforce, when you really thoughtful about the hires, has been occurring.

But most importantly, it's a place where we've been able to look at the student achievement data. We went from fewer than 8 percent passing, to about a 440 percent increase in the kids' scores. The gap in student achievement between Patterson and Baltimore City averages in algebra and English has narrowed significantly, and the passing students are outperforming BCPS averages in biology and government.

So I think it's one of those places where when you do link it to the data, that's what sustains the reform. That's also what helps you survive turnover in leadership and all the other kinds of things. You're able to point to the most critical metric: student outcomes.

With the exception of San Francisco, most of these improvements have been made without any financial incentives. It's really been done through a very thoughtful focus on quality and a lot of training at the school level. We really work with principals, APs, and teachers who work on hiring committees, department chairs, and whoever is going to be involved in hiring. We want to really work with a set of the tools on how we define who's the right fit for our building, see their competencies, and then how do we make that right match.

The thing that excites us so much about ARRA is the focus on differentiating performance for both principals and teachers, based on evaluations. This excites us since the requirement of evidence of student achievement outcomes is going to move us quickly in a better direction. We hope that it means teachers will get much more meaningful feedback about what they need to do to improve.

We pretty much universally agree with a lot of the recommendations that Robin put in her paper, particularly on analyzing and reporting data on the distribution of teachers between schools using value added data and some other measures.

We think the stimulus money could be instrumental in a handful of ways that could really help us move the needle on this. For example, we could change the system by aligning the metrics with the professional development teachers to their evaluation systems. These things are often distorted. At this point, everybody gets a satisfactory or excellent rating. If this is the case, how is your professional development differentiated to each teacher's unique needs?

In doing some of their alignment, schools should think about using the stimulus money to ensure that the implementation of their current principal evaluation systems is done with fidelity. You know, even when the research tells us that first- and second-year teachers struggle, we see folks earning high ratings right out of the box. You're earning a satisfactory rating from the get-go and we know that you're not in that first and second year. We need to really drill down on how you use the tools that your district has with some fidelity.

We should be holding principals accountable for doing these evaluations, and perhaps even training other mentors and observers. We also should think about if others can go and do these meaningful observations to give teachers feedback.

When it comes to staffing, we can do things like schools centrally screening their candidate pools, as I talked about in the beginning. We should think about using the stimulus money to tier and prioritize that pool, and to get folks out to the highest-need schools first. Certainly, that has to be done with teachers who were evaluated. As I said earlier, we have to look at preparation programs to see who's effective and who's producing. Not only programs that produce teachers, that can produce outcomes in the classroom, but produce them in high-need schools as well.

At the end of the day, if we want to attract and retain top talent to high-poverty and high-need schools, it really is about building teams of teachers and a vigorous professional culture in which folks are working together to change the outcomes for kids. It's got to be an integrated effort. You kind of have to touch on all of these pieces if we really want to be meaningful and sustainable.

MS. CHAIT: Thanks, Victoria, for your insight into district using resource systems and it's definitely an area of challenge, but an area of opportunity as well. Segun?

MR. SEGUN EUBANKS: Good afternoon. I've been asked to bring the "union perspective" to the conversation today. I'd like to remind folks that while the National Education Association is indeed a union, we are also a membership organization of 3.4 million folks who include teachers, education support professionals, college professors, students, and retirees. NEA has worked throughout much of its history, particularly over the last 50 years, around an agenda to ensure that there was a qualified teacher in every classroom.

I'd like to brag that if you really look at the time, energy, and efforts spent on working on issues from recruitment and retention to licensure, professional development, and so on, there probably isn't an educational organization in the history of America that has done more to promote the profession than NEA.

Nonetheless, the issue of where the union stands and what we ought to be doing around ensuring the equitable distribution of teachers is a valid important one. I hope we can talk about the principles that we promoted and some of the congruence that we have with many of our colleagues around what it takes to address this issue.

First, I couldn't agree more with what much of my colleagues and what Victoria said about the systems. I'd like to remind folks, as our president Dennis Van Roekel so often does, is we often think about the fact that the system that our kids most in need and our teachers who are teaching them are part of a system that is not broken. It is working precisely as it had been designed to do.

In fact, it works quite well for most of America's children. It works quite well for those children of affluent families. It works quite well for those families in need and works quite well for those teachers who are part of many of these systems in America's most affluent public schools.

Our previous president used to remind his audiences that 80 percent of America's most affluent families send their children to a public school. Those public schools don't suffer from the types of inequities that we're here to talk about. And clearly, we recognize that those inequities are there, but that the system has not been designed to address them. So without question, there's a lot of that needs to change.

We've been working on this issue for quite a number of years, and I'm going to talk about this briefly. Hopefully we can engage in a good dialogue about this, about a couple of efforts in particular, what some of the recommendations that we've had, and how they align to what we talked about here today.

In 2005, NEA coordinated a group that was part of the Learning First Alliance. They were commissioned to develop a report called "A Shared Responsibility: Staffing All High-Poverty Low-Performing Schools with Effective Teachers and Administrators: A Framework to Action." When you read our report, you'll find a lot of similarities to what has been recommended in the report that Robin and CAP produced today.

We came up with eight challenges of why we have problems staffing high-need schools. Much of which you've heard other panelists talk about: the need for stronger leadership, poor working conditions, insufficient professional support, weak incentives to teach in challenging schools, inadequate preparation for work in high-poverty schools, and difficulties of hiring and placement. Victoria has lived through that daily. There is policy incoherence and inadequate funding, and we talk about a framework of how we might be able to reduce that.

The next thing we did is said, let's talk to America's most accomplished teachers and find out what it is that they have to say. And NEA cosponsored with partners in places like Ohio and seven other states. We invited every single National Board Certified teacher in each of these seven states to come and join us in a state summit to talk specifically about what it will take to get them to teach in their states', in their cities' most challenging schools.

We learned a lot from talking to over 2,000 national board certified teachers. Those are teachers who have proven, through the most rigorous process available, that they indeed

have the skills, knowledge, and capacities that they need for success in the classroom. The things that they talked about were quite clear and quite compelling. I'll talk about four of the most significant recommendations.

One, we need to transform the teaching and learning conditions in high-need schools. We've heard so much about it, but the idea that we can get and keep effective, accomplished, and committed teachers in dysfunctional school environments and environments where safety is an issue. Having environments where the basic necessities of what it takes to be successful are issues that clearly are important.

Far too often, we believe that by simply giving folks incentives or talk about the need to get rid of those teachers who are chronically underperforming, there is an assumption that there is a ready pool of talented and capable professionals willing to teach in these schools. These schools have conditions that none of us would send our children to go to school, or teach in ourselves. This is a very significant issue.

The second recommendation: prepare and support teachers for the specific challenges posed working at high-need schools. And again, this was talked about in the report. There is indeed a set of skills, knowledge, and capacity about what it means to teach children who have some of the profound needs. Many of our children have special needs in our high-need communities. There are also issues of cultural competence that are critically important to our teachers to understand. These are issues that far too often they don't learn in traditional teacher preparation programs.

Far too often, one of the things our national board certified teachers question very, very early on in this process is that even our national board of certified teachers are underrepresented in high-need schools. The idea that because these teachers are incredibly successful and effective in suburban communities, doesn't mean these teachers can transfer their skills and knowledge into America's toughest and most challenging schools. There is no guarantee that they would be able to enjoy the same level of success in these schools. Analyzing what teachers need to know and be able to do in order to be successful in these environments is critical.

The third aspect that our national board teachers were clear about is that they will not teach for a bad principal. Teacher leadership is critical, and you talked about it correctly. When you have the kind of committee leadership, our most conscious teachers said that they will follow great principals to any school in the country. But if principals doesn't respect teachers and the role that they have, are not good instructional leaders, or are unable to support the schools, then most teachers won't go there.

And finally, these teachers talk about creating a menu of recruitment incentives, definitely giving teachers more who are working in these high-need environments, but with real focus on growing teacher expertise in high-need schools. Often we have a presumption that the challenge in high-need schools is to remove a huge body of ineffective teachers and replace them with new folks. But we've seen in a lot of examples that that's not necessarily the case.

One of the pieces of research that's talked about in the CAP report and in several other reports is the Benwood Initiative in Chattanooga. This program developed a comprehensive financial incentive and support program in the highest-need schools in Chattanooga, Tennessee.

They found that when they gave teachers these incentives coupled with intensive support, they found dramatic, remarkable success. These teachers were extremely effective and their effectiveness was increased significantly.

Most importantly, two-thirds of the teachers who participated were already in these schools when the initiative started. They didn't go out and get rid of all of the teachers in those schools and bring an entirely new teacher workforce. They worked with the folks who were already there, and brought in some new blood and some new energy. But for the most part, they worked with those teachers who were already there and through that, support increased their effectiveness considerably.

I'll talk briefly about some recommendations and some issues that we think are important. The NEA and the Center for Teacher Quality will be releasing a report shortly on this very issue ourselves and a couple of issues that we think are critically important. I'll just throw them out there real quickly and hopefully maybe in questions and answers we'll get into a little more detail.

The first issue is we don't believe that fast-track improvement of teacher candidates into high-need schools is either a long term or equitable solutions to the distribution of teacher talent. Clearly these fast-track recruitment programs are replacing very critical voids that currently exist in our high-need schools.

But the real question is are we ready to give these most needy schools the same level of skill, talent, knowledge and ability that we're going to give to those most affluent schools? What we find is that our best public schools are getting teachers who are fully experienced and fully prepared.

And I talked to a woman about three months ago. She was a young African-American woman, extremely talented, who had graduated from a prestigious university. She didn't go directly into teaching. Instead, she decided about three or four years into her career that she wanted to go into teaching. She lived here in this area. As a matter of fact, her mother was one of my colleagues in the National Education Association. She found the best, most convenient, way to enter the profession was through the emergency credential program in Washington, D.C., where she started teaching. She spent, what she described as a, terrible, torturous year with absolutely no support in an extremely difficult environment.

She lasted one year there and then went to the Prince George County resident certificate program which was a special alternative certification program where she spent three years and got fully licensed. She learned her craft and then they recruited her, of course,

to Montgomery County which is one of the area's most affluent schools districts. In her words, she arrived. She had a wonderful classroom, a wonderful school, and a supportive principal.

And so, much of what we see in the data really supports this idea that we don't pay enough attention to what's going on with our cross-district issues. All our panelists talked about the need to look at that data and what it says. The other issue that I'll mention quickly is preparation for teaching in high-need schools matters a great deal. We talked about that. We know that teachers deserve more pay when teaching in high-need schools and those who are challenged may need additional skills and knowledge, but that the overall compensation pool for teachers must increase.

And at NEA we have a campaign. We believe every teacher in America deserves at minimum a \$40,000 starting salary. It seems reasonable to us. The most recent data we have, of our 14,000 locals, only 15 percent offer a starting salary of \$40,000 or more. If we were take out our strong collective bargaining states like New Jersey and California, we would be the low single digits nationally for a starting teacher salary at \$40,000 or more, so we know that that's a critical issue.

And finally, one of the issues that we want to talk about is we know that defining teacher and teaching effectiveness are critical, but that narrow answers will not work. There's so much that we need to talk about and figure out. We need to continue to vigorously pursue value-added methodologies and research but we know that there are many, many questions about that and we know so much research about what effective teacher practice looks like.

We need to have, as our colleagues have already talked about, a completely revised way to assess teachers' skills, knowledge, and effectiveness. We need to give teachers the support that they need in order to grow that effectiveness, and we think that's the key.

And I won't even bother with my concluding points, but I'm sure I'll give them later in the question and answer period. Thank you.

MS. CHAIT: Thanks, Segun. We're looking forward to your report. It sounds like there are a number of areas of agreement. So first I'd like to see if the panelists wanted to respond to comments of the other panelists. I'll just ask one question and then I'll open it to the audience. Some of you spoke about the importance of having a comprehensive approach to educator talent management, but in districts with many weak systems, where do they start? What is their entry point? What would you suggest?

MS. VAN CLEEF: I think one of the things that we would say is to start with what you have. Just use what you have, and use it with trained folks. Even if you have a binary system, even if the rating is a dual rating satisfactory or unsatisfactory, there's got to be a handful of buckets that folks are getting evaluated. Differentiate the focus on those buckets and get people to give feedback in a meaningful way. Hold principals accountable for sitting down with a teacher and actually offering professional

development that is differentiated, at least on those ratings. You don't have high buckets of mandatory stuff and everybody has to go to this stuff over the other. Check with them. We comply with what is in the letter of whatever grievance we have.

I think one of the exciting things about the stimulus is there will be to come up with better tools, to come up with tools that do have student achievement outcomes wrapped into it. Blow up TAP, blow up whatever you want to pick that we can go down that road. That is the exciting thing in some ways, those are one kind of policies, you have this one to go that way. But even if you're going to start with where you are, then use what you have effectively.

MR. WILLIAMS: I concur with that. As you were talking, I was thinking about one of the districts that participated in the HR pilot which we have engaged in this year. And going through that, all of those phases in the HR pilot, and then getting to the core interpretation process where we were looking at the results of the teacher survey, the principal survey, the plethora of wonderful language and suggestions that came out at the beginning of teacher focus groups. We took all of that knowledge and those data findings and found it just confirmed what they needed to do—to redesign their teacher evaluation system.

And so, we, the Center for Teaching Profession and Equity, are providing the resource tools for them, we do have a draft copy of our TIF teacher evaluation guidance that we gave them in our state teacher evaluation conference.

I would just add that, if possible, partner with state education agencies. We're fortunate that we can partner with them because they were partnered in the pilot, and we have the tools available. We have the standards for the teaching profession and we have the PD standards. We have the teacher evaluation guidelines and this upcoming academic year we will have a model to the evaluation that hopefully districts may choose to use. I think establishing partnerships coupled with existing good things that are going on is a part of the answer as well.

MR. EUBANKS: I would just say that that teachers desperately want to succeed with all their children. Teachers desperately want feedback that will help them to improve their practice. Teachers are pretty tired of reform happening to them, however. What we've seen in many of the districts of Ohio, in the districts that have got some of the TIF grants, is that when true partnerships with teachers and teacher associations become primary, we've seen some very innovative and very creative and very successful initiatives happening in many of these districts. This only works if folks don't come to the table assuming that they're coming in with opposite agendas or assuming that we're in for a battle. It only works when teachers are truly part of the partnership. And so I would just strongly encourage that this is indeed a partnership for which teachers need to be a critical member of that partnership.

MS. ALI: I certainly concur with my fellow panelists. Behind that, though, is getting a better system of measurement. We should really invest in the data systems and the unique

identifiers for both teachers and students that are linked to one another and can gauge improvement and achievement patterns over time for both students and teachers. Working to create evaluation systems is important, so that we have evidence that these data are legitimate and can be used to evaluate licensure programs and tenure decisions.

MS. CHAIT: Great. Thank you. I'd like to open it to the audience for questions. Please, state your name and affiliation and please be concise in your questions.

Q: Yes. Charles Chen and my question is for all of the members of the panel. Could each one of you mention what are the criteria for a good teacher for the purpose of recruiting a new teacher and also for the purpose of monitoring the current teachers who are rewarded for improvement purposes? Thank you.

MR. EUBANKS: Every state has a set of standards and many, many districts have standards. I'll let my colleagues chime in, but we generally think about three different areas. Good teachers know their subject and they know it well. Good teachers know how to teach children in many different contexts. And good teachers demonstrate practice in the classroom. Surrounding those three big buckets are all kinds of other criteria and sub criteria that are part of that. The NEA has principles. We have what we call the nine principles of professional practices. Many of those fall in into those three buckets.

And then we go on to measure what a competent teacher in practice looks like. I think we're finally recognizing we're talking about things like multi-tiered licensure that once you demonstrate that level of skill, knowledge, and practice on day one, is not the same as what it looks like 10 years or 20 years later so their growth from development over time along that continuum is important to measure. There obviously is a lot of talk about then how you incorporate data around the student learning measures and student achievement measures. That's critical, and I'll probably let some of my colleagues about that.

MR. WILLIAMS: Just to add, I just want to quickly say the development of the Ohio standards for the teaching profession was developed by a comprehensive group of educators and stakeholders, and teachers worked hard at that process. So I'll just say it would take probably less than a minute just to quickly encapsulate like the big things around the standards for the teaching profession.

But in addition to what Mr. Eubanks said, teachers understand student learning and development with respect to the students that they teach. That's our first indicator. Teachers know and understand the content area for which they have instructional responsibility.

Number two, teachers understand and use various assessments to inform, instruct, evaluate, and ensure student learning. Teachers plan and develop effective instruction that advances the learning of each individual student. Teachers create learning environments that create high levels of learning and achievement for all students.

Teachers collaborate and communicate with parents, students, other educators, administrators, and the community to support student learning.

Finally, teachers truly assume responsibility for professional growth, performance, and involvement as an individual, as a member of a learning community.

From those standards, our teacher evaluation system was developed aligned with those standards. Then we got this model that our districts will embrace and use.

MS. VAN CLEEF: The only thing that makes it very challenging to use is that, unfortunately, the research does not say, you have X characteristics and you're going to be an effective teacher. And there's very little that's predictive. And so, what everyone is speaking to is achieving a holistic model. You need to have something that's going to look at the whole person and try to embrace things like a content knowledge, their verbal ability, their critical thinking, their evidence of past leadership, and their sense of personal responsibility. We want people who will make no excuses for outcomes, who own what's happening in their classroom, and has a commitment to the community. You have to be able to assess the people coming in by looking at a variety of those kinds of measures, because there's no piece of paper that's going to say that's going to be a good teacher.

MS. ALI: I think that's all right. I would add though that they actually have to do it. If they actually can produce improvement over time and then you have evidence of that in order to stay and matriculate through the profession.

I'll add to that though, while there are differentiated standards, we need much better evidence of those teachers that produce those greatest gains so we can move backwards from that, and find out what their common characteristics are across geography, across discipline, across even grade levels. That's part of the reason we need much better research and much better value added data, so we can inform what happens in schools of education with some hard evidence.

There are certain things that have borne fruit and that do matter: knowledge of what you're teaching and competency in the subject matter that you're charged with teaching. All of the research says that you've got to know what you're teaching if you're charged with teaching it. It's terribly important that no matter what the route of entry is into the profession, that there's great distribution amongst all of those features.

So as we talk about coming in, whether it is a full credential or working on full credential in a program, you're going to see great distribution amongst those fully credentialed teachers around who's the best at improving student achievement and who's not so good. The same thing with those alternate groups, whether they are a Teacher For America, or whether they are district residency programs.

So having those findings before we make broad sweeping judgments around which path of entry is the best is also terribly important. There is some good and emerging research

that says regardless of the path of entry, one thing is pretty clear: no matter how good a teacher will be, they're not going to be as good as they will become year one or two of their profession.

MS. CHAIT: Thank you.

Q: Hi. My name is Victoria Mizi. I just completed my teacher education program at an out-of-state program and am certified to teach all levels of math and I'm hoping to get a job in this area but I find it very difficult to get through all the different levels of bureaucracy and certification and jumping through all these hoops to get jobs that are apparently very abundant.

So I was just wondering if anything is being done to remedy that just because right now I'm being discouraged from teaching in the public board and I'm looking at private schools because they don't require me to jump through these certification hoops.

MS. VAN CLEEF: I did not pay her.

MS. ALI: There's an anecdote here. My sister is a teacher right over Prince George County who went through the residency program. She was one of those who'd been an executive in the PR world. She's one of those folks who worked hard in another profession at a younger age, and then came into the profession after she had been hugely successful outside the profession. But before she did, she had to take online geology class, and I think it was algebra online, despite the fact that she had taken calculus—it was a quirk in the system. And geology online, she has yet to use it. She says that she brings in rocks for show and tell, and that's a kind an acumen about that when the kids do it, but otherwise it hasn't really, in her mind, made a big difference in how she's teaching.

That said, as Segun mentioned, this is up to states and districts. If they think geology is important, then right now, it is. There ought to be some real streamline in alternate certification profession might provide that and I know that the New Teacher Project has some really good evidence about a quicker route into the field.

But what you raised is an issue that is often talked about and little is done at least consistently. There aren't a whole lot of federal mechanisms to try and change that, though we can through the TIF money, through the Race to the Top billions of dollars and other grant-making programs provide some incentives to so things a little bit differently. But here is where certainly our colleagues at the NEA can take great leadership to streamline the process. (Laughter.)

MS. VAN CLEEF: But you're struggling with two pieces. It's not just the rest of the policy piece. It's getting someone in the district to answer your phone call and tell you where the vacancies exist, and that is the hard part. I think what we hear time and again is, am I supposed to go to a school level or do I go to central? If I go to central, are you referring to my résumé out to the school? And they will call and say, where am I in the process? We heard time and again from candidates, no one could ever give them an

honest answer of where they were. Typically what is happening is someone says “just send me your résumé again”.

And so, I think – I would encourage you to be the squeaky wheel that gets the grease. So be persistent and work the school level. Go visit the people you wouldn’t normally consider and introduce yourself. Say this is who I am. If you’re interested in me, can you help me navigate the system? But sometimes you have to do a work around unfortunately.

MS. CHAIT: Great. The gentleman with the grey suit there.

Q: I just got a foundation in Washington, D.C., of education. Two questions: I have not heard enough if have you studied or how do you want to handle the after school part of it, out of school, and what role local communities are playing into this? I conducted some studies that are 30 different countries from Scandinavia, South Africa, Japan. So it seems it’s very important and I have a high expectation that America will help us also after school, out of school.

And second big question: have you looked at this paradigm shift, huge one towards what is called knowledge divide? UNESCO is coming this year – and looking into what is the impact on education, multicultural, and the like. UNESCO is putting a lot of money this year’s final report. So out of school, after school, then this local community role, and then this paradigm shift. Is there any impact? Thank you.

MS. CHAIT: I’d like to note that at CAP we advocate for expanding the school day and year and looking at these additional hours as part of the instructional day. So providing additional enrichment activities, academic support, and including that as a part of the children’s school day. We don’t look at after school separately.

MR. EUBANKS: Let me add and thank you by the way the opening for my concluding comments. I was figuring out how I would get to them.

Clearly, one of the things that we always talk in the education community is looking for kind of that silver bullet approach to addressing holes in the academic achievement. I think that we have ignored the critical role of teachers and teacher quality and effectiveness in what it means to help all students succeed at high levels for far too long.

The idea that this is now the answer to closing academic achievement gaps that exist, frankly, I don’t think is well supported in the research and certainly isn’t well supported in the 400 years of social, economic, and educational history.

The Educational Testing Service just came out with their new report cards on the achievement gaps. They looked at 16 in-school and out-of-school factors that impact learning and achievement. And I’m glad. There is really only a small minority of folks who are taking this narrow view of teaching and not looking at these outside the school factors.

What are the impacts of poverty? What are the impacts of preschool education? What are the impacts of what's going on in the summer and learning gains the students lose over summer? All of those are hugely influential in closing academic achievement gaps.

And so there are groups like the A Broader and Bolder Approach to Education and others that look at or focus not only on some of the issues that we're talking about here today, but truly looking at healthcare and access to healthcare, what's going on in school and families? What's happening before and after school? And those types of broad discussions are important to have.

States like Ohio, who are leading these large transformation discussions, that are looking at broad transformational issues around systemic approach to changing education are at the forefront of that. And so, it's definitely a major issue. It doesn't exclude the critical role that we're talking about in teacher effectiveness, but we have to make sure that we're talking about in a broader context.

And I'm sorry, sir, about the second part of your question because I didn't quite understand that.

Q: The issue of the way you're raising about teachers, I don't want to excuse teachers but conducting this motivation and supporting aspect of the local community endeavor much of the problems. In Japan, we had the same experience of the teachers. I'm concerned—I'm not a teacher myself. I'm not member of that profession yet, I'm concerned—you focus too much on teachers' quality. If you saw some of the problems, motivation—so this is my point of view after some years, teachers' quality problem will be viewed from a different perspective.

MS. ALI: I can just add to that that, you probably heard the secretary talk a lot about needing a longer school day and school year—that we too see it as a part of school, not separate from the academic instruction. We're really getting the beyond the agrarian calendar for which we've set. We are comparing ourselves and the time that students have in classrooms and the time that teachers have with them at school to countries around the world. And we've got to get better at it. There's also a push to think differently about what we mean by neighborhood and community schools and new dollars invested in what we call promise neighborhoods. Think of the Harlem's Children's Center and find creative ways to take that to scale.

MS. CHAIT: Thank you. We have time for one more question.

Q: I'm Courtney Halsten from the American Institute for Research. I work on the Education Statistics Services Institute. And we've talked about high-poverty schools but how do we quantify high-poverty school—what is considered to be a high-poverty school? That's what we are working on right now. We are working on what is considered and how do we measure poverty schools? Even if we look at the recent documentation,

every researcher defines a high-poverty school differently. So how would we quantify that?

MS. VAN CLEEF: The districts we worked with, there is little variation, right, between schools in Oakland. Find me the non- high-poverty school in Oakland. I think the more important thing is how do you develop policies that don't rob Peter to pay Paul. At the end of the day, we don't track as much as to where you set that benchmark. It's certainly, typically something of using a metric such as free and reduced price lunch or something like that. But what we really see is these are high-poverty communities pretty much across the board. And you've got to set this system of policies and practice in a way to support all of those schools.

MS. CHAIT: Okay. I'd like to conclude by thanking all the panelists. We keep a meaningful point from one of our panelists today. It is us who put students on vastly different life paths. So I hope that that idea continues to drive bold action in this area. And now, Cindy Brown will close out our event today.

MS. CINDY BROWN: Well, I just wanted to say thank you for joining us. Thank you for spending the whole day with us. It's a very important issue so we hope you'll join us on this journey for really major reform of our schools and to use the opportunities caused by the economic crisis to cause the kind of dramatic federal response that we have to invest in education. But we can't blow it. We have a bit \$100 billion, not all of it for elementary and secondary, but the biggest chunk of it, and all of us in this room have to work hard to make sure that money is well spent and triggers really transform change in our schools.

So thank you very much for joining us and we hope to see you along the way on that journey. (Applause.)

(END)