

Center for American Progress



SPECIAL PRESENTATION:

**“EXTENDING SCHOOL TIME TO IMPROVE
LEARNING OUTCOMES”**

MODERATOR:

**CYNTHIA G. BROWN,
DIRECTOR OF EDUCATION POLICY,
THE CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS**

FEATURING:

**JENNIFER DAVIS,
CO-FOUNDER AND PRESIDENT,
MASSACHUSETTS 2020**

**AYEOLA FORTUNE, DIRECTOR,
EXTENDED LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES AND DEVELOPMENT
PROJECT, COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS**

**SUSAN SCHAEFFLER,
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND FOUNDING PRINCIPAL,
KIPP DC**

**12:30 PM – 2:00 PM
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2006**

**TRANSCRIPT PROVIDED BY
DC TRANSCRIPTION & MEDIA REPURPOSING**

CYNTHIA G. BROWN: (In progress) – Cindy Brown. I'm the director of education policy here at the Center for American Progress. We are so pleased that you have joined us today for our discussion of extending school time to improve learning outcomes.

We have three expert advocates and practitioners to lead this discussion, and I will introduce them in a moment.

American education is confronting serious challenges as our nation faces a newly globalized economy, rapidly changing demographics, and a lingering and widening achievement gap for minority and low-income students. It is charged with simultaneously closing two sets of achievement gaps: one at home, the other on the international stage. Most agree that our progress in closing both sets of gaps is much too slow.

Since the Center for American Progress began around two and a half years ago, it has focused on doing work that improves public education. Early on, it formed an education task force with the Institute for America's Future, and this past August we released a report called "Getting Smarter, Becoming Fairer: A Progressive Education Agenda for a Stronger Nation." The task force made a number of recommendations in four major areas including more and better use of learning time, high expectations for all students, highly qualified teachers in every classroom, and connecting schools more closely with families and communities.

This afternoon, we're going to consider one of its major areas of recommendation in some detail. It is the need to reorganize and extend learning time if we're going to improve the educational outcomes for all American students, but most especially if we are also going to close our achievement gaps here at home by catching up and accelerating the learning of those students who are now behind.

My colleague, Elena Rocha. Elena, stand up. Where are you? There she is in back – has prepared a paper for release today entitled "More Than Moments In Time" that discusses our rationale and recommendations for promoting the extension of learning time. When we talk about extended time, we are not talking about voluntary, after-school programs, but instead programs requiring attendance by all students during typical after-school hours, and/or a longer week, or school year.

We have also included another – in your packets – another recent Center publication on 15 new ideas. Two of them address K-12 issues. Our one on extending learning time makes two recommendations relevant to the reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act. The first is to redesign the Title I formula so that schools identified in need of improvement that agree to extend learning time by 30 percent or more and

commit to actions to significantly improve student achievement get extra funding that they would keep even after they improved.

The second is a demonstration grant for states concerning the reorganization and extension of learning time. While I'm glad to talk about the Center's recommendations during our question and answer session, we're really here today to demonstrate that policymakers are getting behind this notion of extending school time, and most importantly to show that when it is done well, there can be really astounding results for students.

After you hear from our guests, I hope you will become advocates for extending learning time as well, and push the kinds of financial support necessary to make it happen. Of course, spending federal money on extended learning time is allowable in many programs now, but it is not common practice, and in my judgment it will not become common practice until federal funding is increased and targeted for such use. The administration's proposal to (level?) fund the regular Title I formula and other programs does not encourage this use right now.

Today, we're going to look at what states are doing to extend learning time and what an extraordinary set of schools is doing: the KIPP public charter schools. Let me introduce our guests, who will each speak for 10 minutes or so, after which we will open the discussion for questions and answers. Bios on our speakers are in your packets.

First is Ayeola Fortune, the director of the extended learning opportunities and development project at the Council of Chief State School Officers. I used to work with Ayeola when I was at CCSSO, so it's fun to have her here with me today. She has done research on quality extended learning programs in high-poverty, high-performing schools, and provided technical assistance to state education agencies.

Jennifer Davis is the co-founder and president of Massachusetts 2020, a nonprofit foundation founded in 2000 focused on expanding educational and economic opportunities for children and families across Massachusetts. Massachusetts 2020, through both policy development and technical assistance, currently focuses chiefly on efforts to extend the school day.

Susan Schaeffler is the executive director and founding principal of KIPP DC. She is an award winning teacher, teacher trainer, and school founder. Under her guidance, KIPP DC has grown from one school opening in 2001, to schools serving over 400 students now, with a projected growth to serve over 1,000 students in the next four years. In 2001, Ms. Schaeffler founded KIPP DC Key Academy, now the highest performing public middle school in Washington, D.C.

We're going to begin with Ayeola.

AYEOLA FORTUNE: Thanks, Cindy, and good afternoon, everyone. I should start by saying that Cindy is being far too modest. She was actually my boss (laughter)

when she had her former life at CCSSO as director for the Resource Center for Educational Equity. And in many respects a lot of the work that we are doing with state education agencies and with their chiefs is part of her legacy. She initiated a lot of our efforts, and the Council owes quite a great deal to her in terms of what we've been able to accomplish over the past eight years.

As Cindy mentioned, I'm the project director for extended learning and development opportunities at the Council of Chief State School Officers. I should say that CCSSO is a nonpartisan, nonprofit association for state education leaders, and so we provide professional development and leadership, technical assistance and services, and advocacy on behalf of state education agencies across the country.

Since 1998, the Council has worked with state education agencies on the issue of extended learning opportunities. The work came out of our high-poverty schools initiative, and it has always been part of that conceptual framework—that extended learning opportunities, particularly those available and offered to students in schools in need of improvement, and high poverty contexts—high poverty schools and communities needed to be part of the range of supports and services in order to build the capacity of these schools to deliver high quality outcomes for students and close the achievement gap. So our work has always had that particular conceptual lens on it.

The work has encompassed several strategies in terms of working at the state level on this issue. One is that we've attempted to really work with states around their own capacity—to build their capacity to establish, to extend, sustain, and promote high quality extended learning initiatives. With the reauthorization of NCLB in 2002, the Council was involved in helping states as they took on the role of administering the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program, and notably supplemental educational services. We've tried to provide technical assistance to states in those areas where they have been charged with implementing key federal initiatives, as well as with their own state-based extended learning initiatives. States have been at this for a long time, and quite a few started prior to NCLB.

We've also conducted research, as Cindy noted, on highlighting effective programs in high poverty schools. They have always been our focus – schools with 50 percent or more students eligible for free and reduced meals. Some of the publications I've brought today reflect that work. The point of that work is to build awareness and understanding of the potential impact that these programs, when they are of high quality, can have on student academic and other positive outcomes. We've also, as I've said, provided technical assistance – not only to state education agencies but to the Mott Foundation, funding statewide after-school networks. In that capacity we've worked as part of a national collaborative – the After-school Technical Assistance Collaborative – to promote the development and sustainability of after-school networks that we hope will provide an infrastructure to help sustain after-school programs.

Finally, most notably and most recently, we've moved into the area of state level policy and practice. In the past year, the Council created a task force – a Chiefs Task

Force on extended learning opportunities, comprised of state education leaders including chiefs, assistant superintendents, and state education agency staff that had responsibility for administering 21st Century Community Learning Centers. Why did we do this? We did this because we knew that chiefs really needed to get out in front on this issue and needed to exercise leadership on this issue. We decided to revise our existing policy statement on extended learning opportunities, which was initially written in 1998, and didn't reflect many of the recent developments in the field including the transition of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program from federal to state administration.

The task force, we thought, would also be a way of convening chiefs, bringing them together, bringing state education leaders together, for the purpose of getting them to learn about promising programs and about the potential of these programs when they are embedded and connected to larger school reform and school improvement efforts. Finally, we created the task force to create a structured opportunity for chiefs to positively impact our work at the Council, so that they could inform the future direction of our efforts on this issue.

The policy statement, which was approved by our board in January and represented an official statement by chiefs, provides them with a conceptual framework – a way of thinking about extended learning, again, particularly as related to the school reform efforts that they are implementing and to closing the achievement gap. It provides a clear definition of extended learning. In doing this we wanted to be broad so that chiefs could see themselves within this policy statement and see their own initiatives reflected here, but we also wanted to have a (their/there?). We didn't want to get so broad that it really didn't have any meat there. In our view extended learning opportunities are initiatives that provide safe, structured environments for students outside of the regular school day. It includes a range of opportunities, before and after-school programs, Saturday and weekend school, summer programs, extended day and year initiatives, distance learning, and early childhood education initiatives.

We believe that these programs should offer a range of programming that include academic supports. That is key for us. It's key to the mission that the chiefs have. It can be in the form of enrichment, acceleration, and/or individualized tutoring, but it comes from a standpoint of student need. These programs might be multi-faceted and also include other components like recreation, mentoring, sports, and other extra-curricular activities. So again, we wanted to be broad and encompass a lot of different strategies. They all are focused on extending and expanding the time that students spend engaged in academic endeavor.

The policy statement also articulates the disparities that we know exist – persistent disparities in academic achievement and educational attainment based on socioeconomic status, race, ethnicity, and the challenges that students face as they try to meet new and challenging standards. But we also conceptualize that the issue of time exacerbates and deepens those inequities. We have inequality to begin with, but then time becomes an exacerbating factor, and that can be viewed many ways: have too little time in the classroom; how students use their out of school time; documented losses in

summer and learning over their summer months; limited access to enrichment opportunities; changes in family structure, and changes in employment patterns, which have resulted in increases in the number of students that are spending unsupervised time alone, outside of the school day.

What we're advocating is that we need to fundamentally rethink time and learning. Within this policy statement we posit that extended learning opportunities have a clear role to play in mitigating those challenges related to time, and the related issue of student engagement and student readiness. That's why early childhood education is conceptualized as an extended learning opportunity.

The policy statement synthesizes what we know about the potential impact of programs when they are of high quality. We focus on quality a lot because it's not just about increases in time – in seat time; it's about increases in engagement. We know that when programs are carefully designed and implemented, when there's evaluation for continuous improvement, when there is strong administration and organizational capacity, when there's a sustainable base of funding, and when programs are sufficiently aligned with the regular school day curriculum, they provide safe places for children and youth to be, offer staff ongoing, job-embedded, professional development and support, and effectively engage parents and communities. Those are the programs where we're most likely to see the positive outcomes that we want to see.

Finally, the policy statement – it wouldn't be a policy statement without this – suggests a range of actions that state education agencies can take. We want them to take decisive leadership in this area because we believe that they have a clear role to play in initiating, sustaining, and expanding these types of opportunities for all children. We know this because they have primary responsibility as the leaders within their states for making sure that students have access to a high quality education. We're asserting that this is an aspect, a component of a high quality education. States also, as I mentioned earlier, have responsibility for implementing supplemental educational services, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers, thus institutionalizing that as part of the ongoing work of state education agencies.

State leaders are well positioned to provide decisive leadership on this issue, but we need to connect it to their school reform and improvement efforts. We suggest within the policy statement a range of actions that states can take if they're interested in sustaining these opportunities in rethinking time and learning. That's one of the first things we say—to look at state policy through the lens of time and learning.

Include extended learning opportunities as an explicit part of your school reform and school improvement agendas. Support alignment efforts; maximize supports to high-poverty, low-performing schools by integrating ELO initiatives into SEA policy and programs. That means look at your own state education agency, and think about how your programs are coordinated. Make sure that the program directors have an opportunity to really collaborate across federal titles. Develop standards that set high expectations for programs. Monitor and evaluate programs, but differentiate on

outcomes between short-term and long-term outcomes. What can we reasonably expect? Encourage regular, sustained student participation. Create and sustain an aligned system of professional development for project directors, as well as line staff. Support diverse ELO initiatives that include a range of program content and opportunities for student choice, particularly important in the middle and high school years. Secure sustainable funds, but prioritize funding based on school improvement status, Title I eligibility, and concentrations of poverty. And finally, partner with other agencies and organizations to increase capacity.

I'm happy in the Q&A to answer any more questions about our work in this area, and specifically about the policy statement, but I'll turn it back over to Cindy.

MS. BROWN: Thank you, Ayeola. I wanted Ayeola to be here today to show that a major education association is taking this issue very seriously and working with its members in issuing a policy statement that there had to be consensus on. So this is just not an issue of some of us policy wonks around, it's a – we're just local folk.

But next I want to hear from Jennifer Davis from Massachusetts 2020. It was key in getting the state of Massachusetts as a matter of not only policy but program backed by money – to get on the road for extended learning. Massachusetts is leading the way and I wanted to share that news with everyone here.

JENNIFER DAVIS: Thank you, Cindy, and thank you for the Center for American Progress' leadership in making time and learning a forefront of the education agenda. I think it's critical for our next phase of educational reform in this country.

For the last five plus years, my organization has focused on extending learning opportunities for children during the after-school and summer hours. We've launched nine major initiatives including a \$26 million, privately financed initiative in Boston to expand after-school opportunities across the city. We've brought literacy coaches into after-school programs. We've analyzed the impact of after-school programs on those children that were just getting tutoring versus children that were getting tutoring plus a comprehensive array of enrichment opportunities. We've done a whole array of initiatives over the last four or five plus years.

What we started to think about two years ago with our after-school work was that the state budget still wasn't turning around, and what was a sustainable strategy? Where do we go from here on this whole after-school agenda? We started to think about some of the challenges with the work we had been doing. We had significantly expanded after-school for example – in 17 Boston public schools we've doubled the number of kids in after-school programs. But if you're talking about a 600-child school, you're still only having about 100 kids in these programs. We were concerned that not all students were being served in these programs.

We also had data that showed the most academically at-risk kids weren't the ones getting the service. We were concerned about the future financing of the system. The

after-school system is sliced and diced together with different funding. It's very, very complicated. And we also had done polling to figure out what really resonates with political leaders and the public around financing of the system? Of course, education is what resonated, particularly in Massachusetts.

We also started watching the charter school movement, and noticed – like KIPP Academy – that most charter schools were extending their school and their school year for all of their children. We've started to really think strategically, "Well, what would that mean for traditional, public schools in Massachusetts?"

Of course, you all know why this is so critical. Children only spend 20 percent of their waking hours in school today in America – 20 percent, and that extra time, that 80 percent when they're not in school is absolutely critical to their educational success. In fact, data going back to 1966 shows that there are so many factors outside of the school day that impact children's achievement—mainly, of course, the educational gap issues around poverty. We started to really think about it and look at the data. We knew that is just wasn't possible that every child in every school in Wellesley was doing just superbly, and every child in every school, and every teacher in Boston or Lowell wasn't.

We have to look at these other factors that are influencing children's lives and their educational achievement. We started really thinking about how do we ameliorate those factors that are causing the achievement gap. Of course, time and learning and enrichment opportunities were some of those key factors. Some of the other issues that were raised: early childhood education, starting school ready to learn, and so forth are other really important factors. We started to look at what were charter schools doing? Eighty-three percent of the charter school in Massachusetts were extending their day and year. We also looked at the most successful high schools in Massachusetts that had been identified by the Rennie Center for Education Reform, and we did an analysis of their schedules. We found every one of them also had a longer school day, and year in many cases.

We looked all over the country, and found that no one was really documenting these innovative schools around time and learning. So we put together a research study that is in your packet. We identified a set of schools – seven schools: four charter and three traditional district – that had extended their day – we call them extended-time schools – by at least 15 percent more time. And we looked at how they did it. How did they schedule their day? How did they implement teaching and learning strategies that were so successful? How did they staff it? How did they finance it? We picked the schools because of their educational success.

We found in the analysis that all of the schools had increased class time in core academic subjects. All of them integrated enrichment activities, which was a little bit of a surprise, but exciting; art, music, sports – all kinds of enrichment activities. And all of them had one-on-one or small-group instruction or tutoring. For teachers the additional time was used for professional development, for data review, and for class preparation time. There were increased costs to these schools, of course. In most cases, the cost did

not rise proportionally. I'll talk about that more in a minute. There was universal appreciation in these schools for the added time by the teachers, by the students, and by the faculty and parents overall.

We started to look at how they use that extra time. What does the schedule look like for students? So the bottom, where it says core academic subject, that's a traditional school. A conventional school week is 30 to 32 one half hours. We started to do an analysis. This isn't when the activity takes place; it's just how the time breaks down. In all of these schools the percentage of time spent on core academic subject is very significant, as you see. In fact, if we were running on a conventional schedule it would be pretty much the whole day, but because it's a longer schedule, they were able to also have tutoring and homework help. Enrichment activities, again, were very significant and, of course, other things: lunch, recess, transitions.

One of the interesting things that happened in Massachusetts before we launched our initiative was superintendents tried to eliminate recess because there wasn't enough core academic time. There was outrage, as you can imagine, by the parents. But these schools have been able to keep all of those activities and not push out the enrichment activities, and still focus on science and other subjects; not just math and English and language arts.

What did we find the benefits were? The practices were longer class periods, homework and tutoring support, additional time around math and English language arts, enrichment activities, and more professional development. And that all led to and impacted and brought benefits around increased time on task, broader and deeper coverage of curriculum, diverse student ability levels being supported, deeper relationships between teachers and students, and a lot of enrichment, experiential learning, and creative learning approaches that really engaged kids.

Of course, what's really important is that every one of these schools is an excellent school and they all have other building blocks that are critical. Without these building blocks the time would not have had the impact that it has had, but time has allowed all else to happen. In other words, the extra time allows every aspect of the school to blossom and to be strengthened.

So that was the result of our study, and there's a lot more information in the report itself. We used that research to design a public policy strategy for the state of Massachusetts. As we started going around the state and talking to legislators and mayors and the governor's people and all the ed reform groups and so forth, we started to pull out all of the old data about time and learning, right? If you remember way back to the "Nation at Risk" report where a number of recommendations were made, the time and learning recommendation was the only one – really there's been no action on systemically across the nation, at the federal level, and across state by state. The time is now. You look at the national commission report, both the "Prisoners of Time" nationally, and state by state – they were commission reports – all talking about if you're raising academic standards for children, you have to provide additional time to help them

reach those standards. But again, nothing's been done to meet that need and that requirement.

We set a vision for Massachusetts that all children will have the learning time necessary to reach proficiency and to have a well-rounded enriching education. We built a coalition to move a public policy agenda forward. We developed a policy and we worked with the legislature to enact it. We formed an advisory board made up of former governor Mike Dukakis, and the education reform leaders in Massachusetts – those who designed the reform bill and a whole range of others – partnered with all the ed. reform organizations; started to reach out and work very directly with the teachers unions; and worked with all of the associations. We did a poll, state-wide, to get a better sense of the public opinion around this topic, and a lot of media work. Some of the articles are in your packet.

We developed guiding principles for a pilot grant program and got a lot of feedback on that pilot set of principles. We felt that funding needed to go to districts that had the capacity to do this work well. In other words, they were on a positive trajectory around reform. There needed to be some local option around the structure, and there needed to be a substantial redesign of the school. It couldn't be just adding on extra time at the end of the day. It had to be restructuring the school with a significant amount of more time. We talked about partnerships and that there had to be accountable outcomes. The funding issue is key.

We were successful in 2006 to get a pilot funding pool of money in the state budget. Grants have been given to districts to help them support a planning process around restructuring their school days in a subset of their schools in now 14 districts. Preferences were given to districts with a high percentage of children in poverty, and we formed a partnership with the state DOE in order to implement this grant program. Fourteen districts are in the process now of actually developing implementation plans for a subset of their schools.

As we speak, the applicant cohort involves large districts – all the large urban districts—Boston being the largest at 60,000—and a small district—Rochester being the smallest with 556 students. So there is a real diversity, though, geographically. Most are urban, but we have a few suburban and rural. Elementary schools are the highest number, but – actually middle schools are the highest number, then elementary, and with only one high school involved at this point, and a total of 17,000 students. 85 percent of the schools are going to extend English and math as part of their redesign. All are going to extend the school day. Going into the summer is much more controversial as far as parents go, and so they are less likely to do it. Enrichment activities and professional development are a key part in these preliminary plans.

There are huge, huge challenges to implementing this initiative. Labor management relations are an example, and I'd be happy in the Q&A to talk about that. I'm facilitating the negotiations between the Boston Teachers Union and Boston Public Schools on this initiative. Gathering support from parents in the communities where

there's some middle-income has been very controversial. Parents are concerned about cutting into other kinds of enrichment activities if you change the schedule. How you finance community partnerships is also different. There are a number of challenges around the curriculum redesign and very few schools to look to for models. Schools are really struggling with – how do we really do this? How do we implement it? Of course, the funding and the timeline.

Two slides, quickly, on voter support and interest in this initiative. Some of our polling tried to get a sense of where the public was and, as you see from here, there was fairly significant support for using state money to extend the school day and to add enrichment activities. That was important to know.

In one of the local districts where we're working – I'm not going to mention which one because they're going through a challenging time – 70 percent of parents who received the survey and returned it showed strong interest in seeing two of their schools go to the extended day, even though there was a very vocal but small group of parents actually working against it. It's a real challenge in some districts around change. Change is hard. Many challenges: the planning process, the implementation issues, legislative and political issues in making sure we have long-term funding for the initiative in the state's budget, and of course evaluating the impact, which is critical to the success.

We do have some good news as of a couple of weeks ago. Our organization tries to reach out on a bipartisan basis, and we were able to secure the Republican governor's commitment to this initiative. He is now talking about it as he travels the country. We need to put \$15 million in the budget. We're working, of course, with the state legislature – legislative leadership are Democrats, and we're very optimistic that we're going to have funding to implement this initiative this September, and we're working on the long-term strategy for the implementation.

So that's a very fast overview, and I'd be happy to take questions during the Q&A time.

MS. BROWN: Great. Thank you, Jennifer. It's great to hear about Massachusetts.

Now I want to turn to Susan Schaeffler, and she's going to discuss with us – there are many things she could discuss with us about KIPP, but she's going to talk with us especially about their approach to time, and give us a profile of KIPP as well.

SUSAN SCHAEFFLER: Well, it's great to be here, and I'm not used to using a microphone. I'm used to standing up and talking like a teacher, so if it's too loud or too quiet, let me know. (Laughter.)

At KIPP, here in Washington and all throughout the country, it's not about just extra time. It's making sure that we're putting that extra time to good use. It's been great to hear that message clearly across the panel.

What is KIPP, DC? We're a D.C. public charter school. We serve grades five through eight. Over 80 percent of our kids receive free and reduced lunch, and 98 percent of our kids are African-American. So we're serving students in educationally underserved communities primarily from east of the river in Wards 7 and 8. We are the highest performing public middle school in Washington, D.C. We currently have two campuses and we're opening up the third campus here in Washington, D.C. this summer.

KIPP nationally started in Houston, Texas, by Mike Feinberg and Dave Levin. They are two Teach for America alumni who set out to make an impact and realized that they needed to do more in order to actually achieve significant gains. So they started this KIPP program and it's basically based on five pillars. Any KIPP school that you walk in to whether it's in the District or in Houston or in Lynn, Massachusetts, you'll see the five pillars. Not having collaborated with these guys earlier (laughter) I'm hearing a lot of the same language which is great. But high expectations for all students; choice and commitment for students; more time in the classroom; the power to lead by the school leader; and focusing on results. And today there are 45 KIPP schools across the country that are based on these five pillars.

How did KIPP get started in Washington, D.C.? I taught in D.C. public schools and in Baltimore city public schools and was getting very frustrated with the traditional system. I realized very quickly as a young teacher, then, that I wasn't getting the job done. The bell would ring at 2.45, 3.15 and I would send the kids home and we hadn't even gotten to science yet. So I realized, myself, we needed more time to address math, reading, science and social studies, not to mention PE and music and other things. It was a school-wide problem, but it's really a systems problem. We've got all these great teachers in the building that are struggling with morale. We're not collaborating as a group. I was doing great things in my classroom and I then would send them to another subject and the class would fall apart. That's a problem, and it was because we weren't working collaboratively to manage the students. So I wanted to create a school system that would address the time issue, the morale issue, and a collaborative approach to running a school.

I trained through the KIPP's Fisher Fellowship Program. I was in the charter corps. It's a year-long training program that starts really at a business school. It was at Haas School of Business out at Berkeley and I was there for the summer. One thing KIPP has realized is that it takes more than just the love of children to operate and run and manage a school system or a school. You need the business sense as well. Then I spent four months training at both the KIPP school in Houston and in the Bronx to then bring KIPP here to Washington. We opened in the basement of a small church in Anacostia and we now have the two campuses that are open, and we're looking for a third facility.

Our mission is pretty simple. It's to prepare students with the academic, intellectual, and character skills that are necessary for high school, college, and the competitive world beyond. And we realize there's a lot that goes on after 8th grade that we need to focus on as well.

What do we do with our extra 12 hours a week? We're almost in school for two full traditional school days more a week. We start school at 8 o'clock. Some KIPP schools start at 7.45. We start at 8 and we stay until 5. On Fridays, we're out at 3.30. We spend seven hours a week in both reading and math, so we really do address the core subjects heavily as well as additional writing courses and the social sciences. We introduced foreign language in 6th grade and they take that through 8th. Students learn how to use computers. Music is introduced to 5th graders; they all learn how to read music. By 7th and 8th grade, they are taking orchestra three hours a week.

And then there's individualized instruction, which is crucial to KIPP's success in the test scores. We can talk about that a little bit in the question and answer section. Not only are the kids in school longer each day, they're also in school on Saturdays. That is our opportunity to address ballet and chess and football, in classes that other students in the suburbs would be exposed to. We wanted to make sure that students in the inner city are also exposed to those resources and in fact, we make it mandatory because we do feel that it's absolutely essential to be competitive as adults that they be exposed not only to math and reading, but foreign language and orchestra and other things.

Then, just to round it off, we extend the year as well. So it's an extended day, week, and year program. We do have a mandatory summer school program. As opposed to doing it at the end of the year, we do it in the beginning of the school year. Instead of saying, "Okay, well, all the kids who struggled this year are going to be going into summer," and wonder why there's a morale problem, we've decided everybody's coming. And let's do it at the beginning of the year, so that they're excited, and they're enthusiastic. They're getting their new grades, their new books, their new teachers, their new uniforms; and we just get a jump start on the new school year.

For 5th graders, in the summer we do a lot of culture building. For 6th, 7th and 8th graders, we reinforce the culture because that is an ongoing process. And they get a jump start for the upcoming year academically. It also gives the teachers a great snapshot of what we're going to be dealing with in September. So we get to meet all of our students in July. Then we have August off and we start up again in September. It gives us a month as teachers to sit back and say, "Hmm. Let's not put those two kids in the same class, or this group works really well, or we're noticing that this group is deficient in reading, so let's beef up their reading program." It really gives us a chance to strategize for the upcoming school year.

What KIPP is known for is their outstanding test results and that is definitely something we're excited about. But it is bigger than that. It is culture, music and all the other pieces that help us be well-rounded adults. But because everybody loves our test scores, I thought I'd show them to you. You can see our incoming scores are coming in low when the students are starting. We pre-test them as incoming 5th graders and they're scoring in the 22nd percentile in reading, in the 31st percentile in math. After one year, the growth that they're making with the extended time, plus few other things, grows significantly growth into the 62nd percentile and the 94th percentile. These are

phenomenal gains. And yes, we cannot do it without the extended time, but it's using that time wisely as well.

This is our original group of incoming 5th graders that are now freshmen in high school that you can see a steady progression in both areas. And yes, we know our 94 fell into 92 in their 8th grade year. We were devastated, but it's a good problem to have. Keeping these test scores in the 90s long term is always a challenge, but one that we embrace and one that, again, we have to attribute back to more time in the classroom.

Our high school placement process right now: 100 percent of KIPP D.C. students are attending a school of choice. They did not go back to their neighborhood schools if those schools were not high performing. The majority, unfortunately, are not. They're – depending on high schools – whether they'll be boarding, independent, day, parochial or public schools or public charter schools. And last year, our students actually earned over \$1.5 million in scholarships to attend private schools.

Where are they? They are all over the country but mostly up and down the East Coast from Deerfield to here at Medeira, Sidwell, St. Albans. We've got some great parochial schools as well, and then specialized public schools that have shown promise in terms of getting kids into colleges.

Basically, summarizing why I think I'm here today, is to ensure successful use of extended time is absolutely essential. I've seen off programs where they extend a day and everyone's in the gymnasium playing basketball. That's not effective. The extended day programming has to be constructive. It's not after care. Yes, it's convenient for parents, but, no, that was not our intended mission. That needs to include academic classes and extracurricular activities that enhance reading comprehension, expose students to new subjects, and provide remediation and review for the students that need it.

The faculty must be invested in the longer day. That is essential to have a successful program. Quality supervision and instruction should be provided by fulltime faculty. It's not about bringing in a slew of volunteers, although we loved volunteers. This is school, it's extended day programming, so if you're in school at 4 o'clock at KIPP, you can walk into a science class. It's not just tutoring; it really is extended academic programming.

The programming should be mandatory and it should be consistent. You need to have it consistent on the schedule. It can't be Wednesday – every other Wednesday from 4 to 5. It needs to be every day, Monday through Friday, Monday through Thursday. Whatever it is, it needs to have some consistency to it. And the extended day programming should be supported by the school administration and the school system in order for it to have sustainability and success.

Thank you.

MS. BROWN: Thank you. That's great.

I want to turn to questions and answers, and I want to start with a couple of questions I have and then I will open it up to everyone. First of all, financing. I don't think Susan said, but I know from KIPP publications that you're basically extending time 62 percent.

MS. SCHAEFFLER: That's correct.

MS. BROWN: And I'm also interested in the financing that Massachusetts 2020 found in your study because I'll give you a preview of what they found. They were looking – they found that the costs were not one-to-one; that it was about 50 percent. I'll let Jennifer explain it, and then we'll let Susan talk about financing for KIPP because I know it's an issue.

MS. DAVIS: We use several methods to analyze the cost of the extended day and in the report that you have in your packets, there are several charts that kind of go into the analysis. The bottom line is the average cost of extending the school day by a minimum of 30 percent – excuse me, between 15 and 30 percent was \$1,300 per child.

Now, we're going to have to analyze that as these new schools in districts unfold as far as their implementation, but basically what we found was in the seven schools we looked at – and we did a hard look at their numbers – that's basically what we found. We found that they weren't proportional increases by the proportional time. So in other words, if a school was adding 30 percent or 60 percent more time, it wasn't costing 30 percent or 60 percent more, and that is because the major costs, of course, are staff time. That's what we analyzed. But you don't have increased cost for health care or transportation or some of the basics. There might be a small amount of cost for utilities, but for the most part you don't have the same kind of significant increase. You have a lot of the backroom operations already in place and so forth.

Now, we're getting some push back from some of our districts in Massachusetts about that number, frankly, Boston because Boston is actually putting in place a proposal that will increase their time more than 30 percent, and because of their complicated issues around transportation and so forth. It's adding costs that we didn't anticipate and we didn't find in our analysis. So I'm just saying that right now in our legislative package, \$1,300 is the number that's being used. But we're going to need to continue to look at that number over time.

And again I want to say that in none of these schools were teachers working 30 percent more time if it was 30 percent more time because there were an array of partnerships and other kind of structures that were in place with higher education institutions, community-based organizations, and so on and so forth. So that significant cost of teacher time wasn't the same proportion as the extra time.

MS. SCHAEFFLER: We do recognize the extended time with our staff and we pay them a stipend. For KIPP D.C. Academy, it would equate to about \$180,000 to \$200,000 a year for covering them from 8 to 5 as well as Saturday school and summer

school. If I had a calculator, I'd quickly whip that out, but it's on average \$6,000 to \$7,000 per employee over what they would traditionally make at D.C. public schools.

MS. BROWN: Is that the biggest extra cost for you?

MS. SCHAEFFLER: Actually, that's a very small portion of our budget. Really our facilities, by far, are our greatest cost, but it's worth every dollar. It's just \$180,000, I guess, I should say. It's really not much if you look at the overall budget for a middle school, that's \$3 or \$4 million.

MS. BROWN: For KIPP to operate, you have to get – excuse me, some private funding, right?

MS. SCHAEFFLER: We do. We go out and raise about 8 percent of our overall budget, which really is not significant. It really is just for the extended time, and facilities, which is a whole other conference. (Laughter.)

MS. BROWN: Yes. Some of you may have read in the *Washington Post* the article that profiled Susan and the difficulties they're having with facilities here.

I'll just ask one other question. Will you talk about, in the Massachusetts program and particularly in KIPP, what the relation with parents is and are they engaged in the school?

MS. SCHAEFFLER: It is a school of choice and we do ask parents to sign a commitment that they will indeed allow their child to stay through to 5:00 and let them participate in Saturday school and summer school because it is part of our core programming. It's not optional. So in order for a child to attend KIPP, the parent does need to agree to allow us to keep the students until 5:00. For most of them, it's not a huge argument, and they're just grateful for the fact that their kids are in a safe place through until 5:00.

And our parent buy-in – you know I can't speak for all KIPPs, but for KIPP in the District, we really need for the parents to do their jobs at home. And that is, when the child goes home at 5:00 and gets home at 6:00, that they're providing quality time for them to do their homework. They need to sign off on their homework. We ask them to sign weekly behavior reports and we ask them to come up for parent meetings at a time when the staff requests it. That's really the three areas that we ask for parent involvement and the permission and the support to have their children stay longer.

MS. BROWN: Do you do any parent training?

MS. SCHAEFFLER: Not consistently. We may offer a program here or there on banking or partnering with community groups, but no, we don't get into helping them to figure out some of the issues with adolescents, although we do meet individually with parents all the time.

MS. DAVIS: The Massachusetts grant program requires that the districts and the schools show parent commitment to the restructuring of the schools that run a longer school day and year. We feel that's really important to the success of the school and that's been a component of how we've proceeded to go about the implementation process.

MS. BROWN: Okay. We're going open for questions and answers. We're going to perhaps – I want you to speak directly into a microphone and wait for it to get there. I want to begin by asking if there are any representatives of the media that want to ask questions first?

Yes? And please say who you are and where you're from.

Q: Sarah Sparks. I'm from *Education Daily*. I was wondering what experience you've had with the energy level of the students, whether there's any problems with the kids getting tired after a longer day or burnt out. Anything like that, or do they tend to be more energized?

MS. SCHAEFFLER: Quality of instruction plays into that greatly. With energetic teachers, well-planned lessons, it's not – I mean, to be honest, the kids are up anyway. So let's have them up and doing something productive and guided and supervised. To be honest, we don't see that as a major issue. There is a transition period from our 5th graders who come in who can't sit still at all, to our 8th graders who are pretty cool and don't want to move around too much. It kinds of goes in a roller coaster of adolescents. Sometimes are bouncing off the walls and other times, they're so sedate that we need to put more oxygen in the room. So it's not a problem.

MS. DAVIS: We've seen the most successful schools are ones that really, again, integrate the day with enrichment and diverse activities. So after a double class period around mathematics, for example, there might be a class period that's more around community service or maybe even a sports or a recess break. But it's the integration of the day in a way that a child's needs are met along the way. So there's a snack time during the after school period, the afternoon period, and so forth. I think that's the successful part where you really think about the day in a strategic way so that you break up the core content with other activity.

MS. BROWN: Any other media questions? Okay. We'll open it – yes?

Q: My name is Adnan (unintelligible). I'm a journalist, Washington, D.C. Ms. Davis, Mass 2020 was and remains of very controversial program in Massachusetts, and that's primarily why you got the attention of the *Boston Globe* and the Republican governor. You yourself said that according to your studies, it showed that a substantial number of parents have objected to this program. What was the crux of the objection raised by parents?

MS. DAVIS: Well, first of all. I don't agree with you nor does our polling data agree with you in our analysis district by district about the controversy. There's a small group of parents in some of the upper middle-class in middle-class schools that are attempting to do the redesign that are concerned that the after-school type of activities that their children now participate in, whether they be ballet, karate and so forth, won't – their children still won't have access to those kinds of activities. What schools are trying to do are really to build partnerships to ensure that those kinds of offerings are still available to students.

Many of the schools in those circumstance are also not extending their day as late into the afternoon, so that parents can still ensure that their children have access to those activities. That's the main push back. We're not getting any push back from parents in the urban districts. They're very concerned. In Boston today, middle schools get out at 1.30 in the afternoon. Parents are very frightened by that to be honest with you. They want their children to be in an engaged, safe learning environment after school, so we have a great deal of support across the board.

Again, there's a small subset of parents who are worried that it will cut into their family time and their enrichment time that they structure for their children. But in Massachusetts 70 percent of women work and so it's a very small subset of families that are actually available to care for their children during after-school hours. So I wouldn't actually agree with your analysis about the controversy.

MS. BROWN: Okay, over there.

Q: Just a quick observation and question.

MS. BROWN: Tell us who you are.

Q: Greg Robertson with Children and Youth Investment Trust Corporation.

MS. BROWN: Okay.

Q: Local funder of after-school programs in the District. Philosophically, I agree on extended day. I have a little problem with the cookie cutter approach around academics and let me say why. Because when you look at the extended day, you have to look at other factors that young people are engaged in, such as health issues. Are there opportunities to be very flexible around what that day looks like after 3:00 health – other type of activities?

One of the concerns that I have is that it seems like right now that kids are disconnecting from schools, especially boys of color: 55 percent of boys of color in this country drop out of school. Are there opportunities within that extended day to reconnect young people back to school whether it be workforce investment opportunities, job skills, health, psychosocial needs of young people, as well as academics? Just having some type of opportunity to mix all those things together in a way during that extended day would

be a very rich – although it will change the way we do business in schools if we have to bring health professionals and other types of professions into the school building itself. So I just wanted the panel to comment on that.

MS. BROWN: I want to ask Susan to answer that, but could you also talk about differences in programming between KIPP middle schools and the high schools that exist and does that take account in some of his issues?

MS. SCHAEFFLER: That's a really big question.

MS. BROWN: Right.

MS. SCHAEFFLER: And one I want to be careful in answering. Really, extending the day isn't going to cause more problems with African-American male students not wanting to be in school. That problem actually needs to be addressed in overall school culture, attitudes within the community, with how the parents perceive education, with how the children themselves perceive education, and what the expectations of the administration and the teachers in that building are for the students regardless of where they live or what families they're coming from. The expectation of excellence has to be there.

In order for our students to be competitive, there must be more time for us to close this achievement gap, to address the fact that our students are coming to us, as 5th graders, two and three grades behind where they should be. So if you come to a KIPP school and you talk to our 8th grade students who have been in KIPP for four years, nine hours a day, six days a week, 11 months of the year, you will see kids who want to be in school, who want to be successful, who will know what year they're going to college. That has a lot to do with school culture and, yes, we have more time to build school culture and we have more time to talk about why college is important, why we value education the way we do, why there are no shortcuts to success, and why we can't make any excuses when we don't meet our targets. We need to just work harder and the extra time that we have allows us to teach that and math and science and social studies.

Unfortunately, I think a lot of times when we turn to address health issues, nutrition issues, morale issues, self esteem issues, it gets taken out of math time. It's not an either/or. Both need to be addressed and there needs to be a sense of urgency in doing that because we can wait a whole year in the child's life to decide to address the self esteem issue, but we certainly can't wait a whole year to address the fact that they're not reading on grade level.

So I really appreciate your question, but it is really a big issue to address and it's not necessarily, I think, related to more time in school. I do think if a child's unhappy in school and then you drag the day up for two more hours, they are going to be really unhappy, but we need to go back and figure out why – what is the real problem here? And we certainly could use some more time to figure it out.

MS. DAVIS: We feel really strongly that the redesigned schools cannot be more of the same. I would like to describe one of the schools I'm working with in Boston, a middle school. They're putting in place six academies as a part of their extended day approach: an academy on citizenship, arts and culture, experiential learning and physical fitness, and science and environmental education. There's one other I can't remember. But one of the reasons the teachers and the staff are so excited is because they are designing this approach in a way that they know will engage their kids more than they are today in their educational approach and in their school. One of the huge challenges we face in Massachusetts in implementing this initiative is making sure that those other building blocks of excellence in these schools are part of the whole redesign. That's a huge technical assistance endeavor that we're trying to build some capacity to help these schools around.

But, Greg, I totally agree with you that if we don't address some of these other issues – one of the principals contacted me the other day about the mental health needs of his school and of his students and how can we leverage resources to make sure those needs are met too as a part of the initiative, and we're looking at that. So there're a lot of issues that have to be addressed to make these schools a success. One of the huge benefits of after-school programming and what we've learned is that kind of engaged learning approach. We've got to look at ways of integrating that into these schools because that's what excites kids and that's what keeps them in school and keeps them focused and keeps them coming. That's a really key part of all of this.

MS. BROWN: Woman in the red coat.

Q: Thank you. My name is Annabelle Fisher (sp). I'm interested in this, having worked in some schools in D.C. and in Boston and in Seattle. I appreciate your approach and I think the KIPP program provides the structure and boundaries that these kids need, but what I don't hear from Ms. Davis, and I'm going to ask Ms. Fortune as well to address – as you provide policy and you're looking at changing attitudes and behaviors in schools for the children, I don't hear any talk about the parents of the children who may be at risk or low income who cannot read. They want to teach the children all the subjects and have them well prepared, but you don't talk about including the parents or guardian that these children are going home to. That's the first question.

And the second question relates to extended time – and three of you could answer this. As you want extended time for teachers, legislation is pushing for teachers to have Masters degrees, so if the teacher has to work at a school that goes from 8 to whatever. When is a teacher going to have time to get it? I have friends who are teachers – have been teachers who've had to get their Masters degrees. My niece is a teacher. When are they going to have the time to do this: to study for their Masters degree because that's what's being mandated and then have the time for their families or themselves to do what they want to do and have a life? I don't hear anyone addressing the issues. And then the third part, of course, would be the unions that are going to push for, a change in education that I got when I was younger except we didn't have computers.

Thank you.

MS. FORTUNE: You want to go first or –

MS. SCHAEFFLER: I'll answer the second question, but –

MS. FORTUNE: Okay. I'll try to tackle the first on the parent engagement piece. I think in our policy statement we addressed that issue because we feel strongly that parents are partners and that they have to be treated as such. There is a space in extended learning opportunities to have successful parent engagement and outreach efforts. Some of the programs that we've looked at and profiled in high poverty contexts engage parents in a myriad of ways, not just as consumers of their child's education and engaging them in an effort really that's focused on what our expectations are for your child, understanding the standards, come and learn about this. There's that piece of it and you have activities that are better focused on that. But also there are activities for the parent as a direct consumer of opportunities. There is a school in the Bronx on 125th and Grand Concourse. A lot of the things they were offering were directed at parents: literacy courses. About 70 percent of their student population was Latino and they were offering GED, computer literacy, ESL. They not only opened up a school on the off hours to the students, they also opened up that school to the parents of those students. They got them connected in ways that were very meaningful and the principal saw the family as the economic development unit. You see that in pockets, and you see this as a space for that to happen during the, the non-school hours. That's why we advocate for that strongly as a piece of any extended learning opportunity.

MS. SCHAEFFLER: I'm addressing the teacher question on burn out or have the ability to attend classes, have families, get Masters. One, we do support our teachers in scheduling classes to do that because we want them to know state-of-the-art, innovative teaching. We do have partnerships with local universities. A lot of those classes start at 7:00. I know that could be long day but, it can be done. We can sit here and come up with a hundred reasons why it can't be done, but the bottom line is we need to just get started, get to it, and extend the day to 5:00.

I think most high performing teachers don't leave at 3.30 with their students. Most of them are there until 4:00 or 5:00, 6:00 at night. I know when I taught in D.C. public schools and Baltimore city schools, I wasn't the only person leaving at 6:00. It's just nice that at KIPP they actually get a stipend for it. I don't think it's a huge issue and it certainly isn't one that should stand in the way of the test scores that we can get. We need to work as administrators to support our teachers who have kids. I personally have two kids myself, one is a two-year-old. I've some pictures. (Laughter.) No, just kidding. But it is absolutely imperative that we recognize family balance and balance that high instruction and quality programming with the ability to have a life outside of the school.

MS. DAVIS: I work with the teacher's union and with teachers. Extended day schools aren't for every teacher. What we've worked out in some of our district negotiation with the unions is at least at the beginning of the implementation year, in

other words, year one, that there is no requirement for teachers. Teachers volunteered to participate in the extended day. That wasn't our initial hope. We had hoped to have a structure more like what KIPP is doing now, but that's the reality of the direction we're going.

But the new teachers that come to the school will be working the revised schedule. That is the way for a public district transition. We are going to have to have some flexibility around this because teachers do have families. They have other obligations. But I also agree with what was said about the need to move in this direction if we're going to ever close the achievement gap and reach some of these other goals. It's a critical, new aspect of our reform agenda.

MS. FORTUNE: I would just jump in by saying a couple of things. One thing is that partnerships really go a long way toward building capacity; that teachers do not need to do all of what takes place. I say this as a former teacher as well. All of what takes place after the quote, unquote "regular school day" and those non-academic, non-core and core academic subjects, there are opportunities to partner with local community-based organizations and museums and parks and rec to really go to scale and increase capacity. I don't think teachers would object to being paid their hourly rate if they're able to use that time for planning time, for grading time, for additional professional development because they are essentially getting paid for work that they do anyway. In some of these models, that's really where it's at in terms of, extending the time for teachers. It's focused on what their needs are as well as professionals.

MS. BROWN: Right. Let me just make a comment, too, because this has been one of my gripes for a long time. We need more flexible human resources policies about the employment of teachers. We need teachers who will have limited days. We need teachers who come in later in the day, stay later in the day. We also I'll never forget Bob Slavin saying to the secretary of education where there was a discussion of the teacher shortage, he said: "You know, one of the greatest untapped reservoirs of certified teachers in this country are young moms who want to work part-time." School districts have not in this country traditionally encouraged part-time employment of teachers. We just have to be more flexible in our employment options that we offer teachers, just like other employers are beginning to do.

Other questions? Guy with the long, black hair. (Laughter.)

Q: My name is Tyler Lewis. I'm from LCCR. Question I have for Ms. Davis is: is part of your initiative to integrate the teaching staff as well? Since all of you seem to be working in low-income areas that tend to have large numbers of minorities, how do you handle attracting teachers of color and women to come teach the children? And men, yes.

MS. DAVIS: Don't forget the men.

MS. BROWN: Right. They probably have women. (Laughter.)

MS. DAVIS: I mean that's a great question and I wanted to say that we're really lucky to be working with some of the districts that we're working with because they have a very strategic approach to that kind of recruitment. Again, I'm closest to Boston but some of the other districts are doing some wonderful work around teacher and principal recruitment and diversity.

I have to say I think one of the reasons we've been successful with the work we've done is in part we've been very focused. There are many other education areas like parent engagement, like teacher recruitment and so forth, that we care about and we're a part of meetings around and so forth. But that's not part of our agenda as of now. As we start working more directly with these schools and ensuring that they're successful in their implementation, those are some issues we might take on but we're not working on those issues at this moment.

Q: Hi. I think your KIPP academy started as itself. Basically, you started on this time frame when you opened the school and everybody coming in knew that. Most of the schools that I can think of who might be interested in this sort of restructuring are going to be schools in need of improvement who are required to restructure. What challenges and what differences do you see in how you implement the structure when you're dealing with a kind of broken system to begin with?

MS. BROWN: That probably gets to your charter strategy which you may want to comment on.

MS. SCHAEFFLER: One thing that KIPP does is we do start fresh. So we don't go in and take over a failing school. We basically start with 5th grade and we grow it through to 8th grade to establish a strong school culture throughout the students and the staff and the parents. That has been a major reason on why we're successful. But, again, it's not an excuse because maybe public schools can't say, "Okay. We're going to erase everything and start all over again." But you do need to get the buy-in of that faculty and once you have a staff that is motivated and excited to deliver quality education for an extended period of time, that's very contagious. It's contagious to the parents, the kids, just as negative energy is. We find that if you have the right teachers delivering the message, it will work. So I would hate for people to use that as an excuse as to why traditional schools can't extend the day. I think they can and if they have the right people on board, it would be very successful.

MS. BROWN: I think it's a very important question you asked and that's why we here at the Center are recommending this change in the Title I formula for extending learning time in schools identified in need of improvement. At the same time a there must be a commitment on paper and a strategy to turn around the school.

Now, we're going to do more work in thinking about what our proposal would like to do this, but I we have to learn from success. The leadership aspects of KIPP academies and other high performing, high-poverty schools that have extended time can

teach us something about what we need in the leadership and the teaching force in those schools and how they become strong and successful. We've got to start learning from these lessons. Part of the work for our organization is to try to capture some of that and make proposals that make sense. That's why we have this panel today, because we want to make this issue more visible and get more people struggling with how we can duplicate and grow the success that some of these schools have seen. So we don't have an answer today, but hopefully we will.

MS. DAVIS: Cindy, can I just say that one of the complexities about No Child Left Behind, of course, is that different schools are labeled different things for different reasons, okay? As we've analyzed some of those schools, we've basically said we don't feel this initiative is right for those schools that are most struggling. They don't have the leadership in place; they don't have the other building blocks in place. But we've found the deeper we looked at some of the schools that are on the restructuring list and so forth is that they actually do have many of the building blocks in place. They have a subset of their students, whether their English language learners or special ed kids, that just are not making the grade.

Part of the analysis that I think we have to be thoughtful about is what needs to be in place for a school to take on this kind of restructuring. I think that's a really critical question. But again our experience is that there are a number of schools that we're working with in some of the districts who are on some of AYP list actually are poised for this kind of change. With the extra time and the extra support, we feel they are going to make tremendous progress. We can't use the No Child Left Behind and the AYP status as a blanket statement. This kind of restructuring is right for them or it's not. It's really looking deeper school by school at what their challenges are in our experience.

MS. BROWN: Ruth?

Q: This is partly a – Hi, Ruth Wattenberg, AFT. This is partly bouncing off Jennifer and Cindy. It has to do with this generalized effort to try to increase time. There is now a general consensus that more time – I mean, it's an old consensus but finding a new life that if you're behind, you need more time. I think it's a critically, critically important piece to put on the table. And I think KIPP over time has shown these incredible results and as everybody up there has said, including the woman from KIPP, it's partly about time, but it's hugely about how you use the time.

I'm listening to this discussion and it reminds me so much of block scheduling. Everybody was so much for block scheduling and everybody changed the size of the time block that went to the different subjects. But nothing much really changed in it a lot of effort was spent on this. I can just feel all of those wheels turning that we're going to add time, and I know all of you have been very clear that it's not just about time, and yet I worry. I'm sorry I missed your presentation, so I don't want to leave you out, but clearly KIPP has this huge structure in place that assures that every minute of that time is being used in a systematic way.

My question to Jennifer is, with such a more flexible program, how do you achieve that? A point to Cindy and to everybody is how do you play this out in ways that really force people to keep track of whether or not they are getting results in the way that KIPP has so that we can make this a strategy that really produces results instead of a strategy that five years from now, people say, “Oh, well, turns out extra time really doesn’t do anything after all.”

MS. DAVIS: Ruth, it’s great to see you again. I want to say that one of my biggest fears is that we will not put in place the technical assistance capacity in the state department of education and in organizations like mine to provide the kind of support that these schools and these districts need to this well. And I think that’s a real danger. I think we have a real danger of doing that. I’m actually on one of the KIPP boards in Lynn, and I see the struggles even a quality school has in making sure you have the infrastructure and the support you need to do this well.

Any kind of federal reform, and certainly we’re working on this at the state level, is that we have to build capacity in the state agencies, we have to build capacity in the districts, and we have to build capacity in the technical assistance organizations to support these schools to make sure that the time is used and structured well. All the other building blocks – the teacher professional development approaches, the leadership training, on and on – have to be a part of this.

If we don’t do that, I’m afraid we will fail. I feel strongly that we can’t let that happen, but it is a huge challenge and I feel blessed to be in Massachusetts because we do have one of the oldest ed reform infrastructures in place with major investments and with a strong state department, although it got decimated in the ‘90s as far as their staff capacity and so forth, and with strong leaders at the superintendent level and so forth. Many states don’t have that kind of infrastructure in place, unfortunately, so it’s going to be even harder.

But I think Ruth’s point is really important and we need to keep that in mind as we think about public policy agendas at the federal level and at the state level to make sure it’s not just more time.

MS. BROWN: Thank you for those cautionary comments, Ruth. They’re very important.

We’re going to have to end this now, but we’re all going to be here for a few minutes, and so please – we didn’t ask the question about virtual learning. I told you to ask it. (Laughter.) I have it right here. Come up and we’ll talk to you about it. But thank you very much. We hope that you will continue to engage with us on this very important topic.

(END)