AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

S. HRG. 111–885

ESEA REAUTHORIZATION: THE IMPORTANCE OF A WORLD-CLASS K–12 EDUCATION FOR OUR ECONOMIC SUCCESS

HEARING

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

ON

EXAMINING ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (ESEA) REAUTHORIZATION, FOCUSING ON K–12 EDUCATION FOR ECONOMIC SUCCESS

MARCH 9, 2010

Printed for the use of the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

55–474 PDF WASHINGTON : 2011

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

VerDate Nov 24 2008 12:22 Mar 14, 2011 Jkt 035165 PO 00000 Frm 00001 Fmt 5011 Sfmt 5011 S:\DOCS\55474.TXT DENISE

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

TOM HARKIN, Iowa, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, Connecticut
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island
BERNARD SANDERS (I), Vermont
SHERROD BROWN, Ohio
ROBERT P. CASEY, JR., Pennsylvania
KAY R. HAGAN, North Carolina
JEFF MERKLEY, Oregon
AL FRANKEN, Minnesota
MICHAEL F. BENNET, Colorado

MICHAEL B. ENZI, Wyoming
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
LAMAR ALEXANDER, Tennessee
RICHARD BURR, North Carolina
JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
JOHN McCAIN, Arizona
ORRIN G. HATCH, Utah
LISA MURKOWSKI, Alaska
TOM COBURN, M.D., Oklahoma
PAT ROBERTS, Kansas

DANIEL SMITH, *Staff Director*
PAMELA SMITH, *Deputy Staff Director*
FRANK MACCHIAROLA, *Republican Staff Director and Chief Counsel*

VerDate Nov 24 2008 12:22 Mar 14, 2011 Jkt 035165 PO 00000 Frm 00002 Fmt 0486 Sfmt 0486 S:\DOCS\55474.TXT DENISE

C O N T E N T S

STATEMENTS

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 2010

	Page
Harkin, Hon. Tom, Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, opening statement	1
Enzi, Hon. Michael B., a U.S. Senator from the State of Wyoming, opening statement	3
Schleicher, Andreas, Head of Indicators and Analysis Division, Education Directorate, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, France	4
Prepared statement	7
Roekel, Dennis Van, President, National Education Association, Washington, DC	15
Prepared statement	16
Butt, Charles, Chairman and CEO, H–E–B, San Antonia, TX	33
Prepared statement	35
Castellani, John, President, Business Roundtable, Washington, DC	36
Prepared statement	37
Dodd, Hon. Christopher J., a U.S. Senator from the State of Connecticut	46
Alexander, Hon. Lamar, a U.S. Senator from the State of Tennessee	49
Murray, Hon. Patty, a U.S. Senator from the State of Washington	51
Reed, Hon. Jack, a U.S. Senator from the State of Rhode Island	53
Sanders, Hon. Bernard, a U.S. Senator from the State of Vermont	54
Merkley, Hon. Jeff, a U.S. Senator from the State of Oregon	58
Franken, Hon. Al, a U.S. Senator from the State of Minnesota	60
Bennet, Hon. Michael F., a U.S. Senator from the State of Colorado	61

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

Statements, articles, publications, letters, etc.:	
Senator Brown	67
Senator Casey	68
Response by Andreas Schleicher to questions of:	
Senator Mikulski	69
Senator Casey	69
Response by Dennis Van Roekel to questions of Senator Casey	70
Response to questions of Senator Casey by Charles Butt	74
Response by John Castellani to questions of:	
Senator Dodd	75
Senator Casey	76

VerDate Nov 24 2008 12:22 Mar 14, 2011 Jkt 035165 PO 00000 Frm 00003 Fmt 0486 Sfmt 0486 S:\DOCS\55474.TXT DENISE

ESEA REAUTHORIZATION: THE IMPORTANCE OF A WORLD-CLASS K–12 EDUCATION FOR OUR ECONOMIC SUCCESS

TUESDAY, MARCH 9, 2010

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to the notice, at 3:04 p.m., in Room SD–430, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Tom Harkin, chairman of the committee, presiding.

Present: Senators Harkin, Dodd, Murray, Reed, Sanders, Merkley, Franken, Bennet, Enzi, and Alexander.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR HARKIN

The CHAIRMAN. The Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will come to order.

I would like to thank all of you for being here today for the first in a series of hearings focusing on reauthorizing of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Again, I apologize for the time delays, but we had votes on the floor of the Senate that held us up.

Testimony from educators and experts today and in subsequent hearings will guide us as we undertake the process to reshape this bill. Now, we have learned a lot since No Child Left Behind was passed 9 years ago, and I look forward to working with my colleagues here to protect the goals of the bill while fixing the things that are not working.

I appreciate the opportunity to collaborate with our Ranking Member, Senator Enzi, on this issue. His knowledge and commitment on education issues make him a very valuable partner in this endeavor. We have a lot of expertise, as a matter of fact, on this committee, including one former Secretary of Education on this committee.

Today's hearing on the economic importance of having a world-class K–12 education system should remind us of the critical importance of this reauthorization. In the coming weeks, we will hold additional hearings to explore specific topics related to ESEA, but today I think it is important for all of us to remember what is really at stake as we kick off this process: the competitiveness of our children and grandchildren in the global marketplace and the future well-being of our country.

Well-educated Americans are the single most important factor in maintaining our productivity and global leadership, and in pre-

VerDate Nov 24 2008 12:22 Mar 14, 2011 Jkt 035165 PO 00000 Frm 00005 Fmt 6633 Sfmt 6633 S:\DOCS\55474.TXT DENISE

paring our children to contribute to their communities and our Nation at their full potential. It is projected that by 2014, right around the corner, 75 percent of new jobs will require some post-secondary education. Many are questioning whether the United States is falling behind relative to the progress of other countries.

Well, U.S.-college completion rates are flat. Twenty years ago, the United States was first in the world in post-secondary attainment. Our Nation has now fallen to 12th.

In recognition of this, President Obama has set an ambitious goal for Americans to reclaim the world's highest rate of college attainment by 2020. And the only way that we can meet the President's goal is to ensure that our children are leaving high school with the tools they need to be successful in college and beyond.

The changing global economy in the information age is putting new demands on the workforce. Businesses are putting a premium on workers who can think critically and problem solve, skills that are developed and honed during a student's formative years. Moreover, new technology makes the physical location of workers less important, meaning American workers are being forced to compete for jobs with workers in other countries more than ever before.

Despite this challenge, American students are falling behind their international counterparts. Recent studies rank American 15-year-olds 24th in the world in terms of math achievement. As a consequence, since 1975, we have fallen from 3rd to 15th place in the world in turning out scientists and engineers, careers that are ever more important in today's economy.

However, our challenges extend beyond the critical fields of math and science. Forty years ago, the United States had one of the best levels of high school attainment. Today we rank 19th in the world in high school graduation rates.

Until recently, the education of all students was seen more as a civil rights or moral imperative than as an economic issue, and quite frankly, that still is an issue. It is a moral imperative, and I believe it is also a civil rights imperative, but it is also an economic issue. Recent studies show that the main reason we are falling behind other countries is because of the achievement gap, or the difference in academic achievement between minority and disadvantaged students and their White or affluent counterparts.

At the same time, U.S. demographics are shifting. The Census Bureau says that by mid-century over 60 percent of school children will be minorities. A study by the Alliance for Excellent Education found that if the Nation's high schools and colleges were to raise the graduation rates of Hispanic, African-American, and Native American students to the level of their counterparts by 2020, the increase in personal income across the Nation would add more than $310 billion annually to the U.S. economy.

I look forward to hearing from our witnesses about these and other issues. As we move forward with the ESEA reauthorization process and as we immerse ourselves in the details of this complex bill, we should keep the big picture in mind.

And with that, I will turn it over to Senator Enzi for his opening statement and then introduce our witnesses.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ENZI

Senator ENZI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank you for starting this series of hearings on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Beginning with a hearing on the importance of world-class K–12 education for our economic success is an appropriate way to initiate our review of the issues surrounding reauthorization. It sets the stage as we move forward to develop legislation that builds upon what we have learned from No Child Left Behind and fixes what is not working.

I know that there are those who complain about No Child Left Behind because it seems to focus on failure rather than success. I also know that there are those who applaud it for the positive changes it has created in the K–12 education system. At a minimum, it has managed to change the way we look at the achievement of our students, emphasized teacher quality and parental involvement, and required accountability for results.

One thing I know everyone agrees with, however, is that our children deserve to receive the best education our country can provide for them. Yet, too many of our students continue to be ill-served by the schools they attend and either fall behind or, worse yet, drop out of school. This is not good for their future, nor is it good for our country's future.

Our economy depends on an educated and skilled workforce to be successful in the global market. In the United States, we face two major challenges for students entering the workforce. First, a growing number of jobs require more than a high school education. Second, over the past 30 years, one country after another has surpassed us in the proportion of their entering workforce that has at least a high school diploma.

Every day in our country, about 7,000 students drop out of high school. Even for those students who do stay in school and earn a high school diploma, there is no guarantee that they have learned the basics needed to succeed in post-secondary education and the workforce. In fact, nearly half of all college students must take remedial courses after graduating from high school before they can take college-level course work. This lack of preparation means that our college students spend more time and money in tuition just to catch up. It is hard for them and it is hard for our country to get ahead if we are playing catch-up.

Each year, more than 1 million students enter college for the first time with the hope and expectation of earning a bachelor's degree. Of those, fewer than 40 percent will actually meet the goal within 4 years; barely 60 percent will achieve it in 6 years. Among minority students, remedial course participation rates are even higher and completion rates are even lower.

There is no question that some education and training beyond high school is a prerequisite for employment in jobs and careers that support a middle-class way of life. Lifetime earnings for individuals with a bachelor's degree are, on average, almost twice as much as high school graduates.

Once first in the world, America now ranks 10th in the proportion of young people with a college degree. Less than 40 percent of Americans hold an associate or bachelor's degree, and substantial

racial and income gaps persist. The projections are that within a decade, 6 out of every 10 Americans must have a degree or recognized credential to succeed in the workforce. This being the case, we are facing a major deficit of skilled workers which, in turn, threatens our ability to grow economically. We used to have the best educated workforce in the world, but that is no longer true.

That is why I am excited about beginning our work on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA. Funds provided through the act assist schools in meeting the needs of our most disadvantaged students and providing them with a quality education. The skills students learn in the earliest grades are the building blocks to their success in high school, college, and in the workforce. Our country cannot continue to be competitive in the global economy if we do not have an educated workforce.

I want to welcome and thank all the witnesses who are here today, and I look forward to hearing from you. Again, I thank you for getting these hearings started.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Senator Enzi. I look forward to getting this reauthorization started and done.

Well, we have a good group of witnesses to kick off our series of hearings. I thank them for being here. I will say that your statements will be made a part of the record in their entirety and ask each of you to sum up your testimony in order. We will start first on my left, your right.

First is Andreas Schleicher, who is the Head of the Indicators and Analysis Division, Directorate for Education, in the Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, the OECD. Mr. Schleicher is responsible for developing and analyzing systems that allow the OECD to compare the relative achievements of students internationally.

Next, we have Mr. Dennis Van Roekel, the President of the National Education Association. Mr. Van Roekel is a 23-year teaching veteran of high school math and a longtime activist and, of course, advocate for our children and public education.

Then we will next hear from Charles Butt, the CEO of H–E–B Supermarket based in San Antonio, TX. Mr. Butt's privately held company has 315 stores, $15 billion in sales, employs 70,000 individuals, and donates 5 percent of pretax earnings to public and charitable causes.

Finally, John Castellani will wrap up our testimony. Mr. Castellani is President of Business Roundtable, an association of chief executive officers of leading U.S. corporations with a combined workforce of nearly 10 million employees and $5 trillion in annual revenues.

Again, thank you all very much for being here, and Mr. Schleicher, welcome, and as I said, if you could sum up your testimony in 5 or 7 minutes, we would sure appreciate it.

STATEMENT OF ANDREAS SCHLEICHER, HEAD OF INDICATORS AND ANALYSIS DIVISION, EDUCATION DIRECTORATE, ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT, PARIS, FRANCE

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Thank you very much.

The OECD are now putting a lot more emphasis on education because we are seeing a growing impact of skills on the economic success of individuals and nations. We are also seeing that the increase in knowledge workers OECD countries has not led to a decrease in the pay, which is what happened to low-skilled workers. And finally, the yardstick for educational success is no longer simply improvement by national standards, but the best performing systems globally.

If you look at international systems comparisons, they show you what is possible. For example, the International PISA test showed Canadian 15-year-olds to be well over a school year ahead of 15-year-olds in the United States. They also show socially disadvantaged Canadians to be much less at risk of poor performance than is the case in the United States, and even some countries as diverse as the United States come out with a smaller achievement gap. There is a lot to be learned.

International comparisons also give you an idea of the pace of progress that can be achieved. People often dismiss the stunning successes of countries like Singapore or Korea because they are hard to replicate in a western context. But think about Poland. Poland raised the literacy skills of its 15-year-olds by the equivalent of almost a school year in less than a decade. Poland also succeeded in cutting the variability of school performance in half over that period.

If the United States would do what Poland has done and achieve a similar level of increase in performance, that could translate into the longer-term economic value of over $40 trillion in today's GDP. If the United States would close its large achievement gap by ensuring that the quarter of students that, according to our accounts now, do very poorly, reach at least the PISA baseline level 2, you would talk about $70 trillion in additional national income.

Let me add that we have very recent evidence showing that those who do not reach this baseline level of proficiency actually face very serious risks for the transition to work and also for subsequent educational opportunities. The education gap just widens as people get older.

A couple of points worth making about those systems doing well. Many of them have developed educational standards to establish rigorous, focused, and coherent content across the entire system, across all levels. They have often coupled this with actually devolving more responsibility to the front line, encouraging schools to take much more responsibility and responsiveness to local needs.

Of course, the United States has a decentralized system too but, while many systems have decentralized the delivery of educational service by actually keeping quite tight control of the definition and management of outcomes, the United States is quite unique in having decentralized both the delivery of service and the control over outcomes.

Of course, the common core standards currently being developed might change all of that and address one of the big issues of widely discrepant State standards and also different cut scores, which mean that a student's success depends more than anything on where they are located, which is quite different from many other countries.

That is just one side of the coin. The harder part actually is to create an environment for standards to translate into better instructions. Many countries have developed quite strong support systems that help individual teachers to better identify where the weaknesses are, seek to provide them as evidence and advice on what best practices are, and finally motivate them to make the necessary changes. That goes actually quite well beyond material incentives.

Second, while performance data in the United States is often used for punitive accountability purposes, other countries tend to give greater weight to guide intervention, reveal best practices, and identify shared problems in order to encourage teachers in schools to develop a more productive environment. They also seek to intervene in the most troubled schools first rather than identifying too many schools as needing an improvement, which you consider a drawback of the current NCLB system by international standards.

Another drawback of the current NCLB system is sort of what we call the "single bar" problem that leads to a lot of focus on students nearing proficiency while not valuing achievement growth through the system, and many countries address that through accountability systems that involve progressive learning targets that extends through the entire system, which lay out the steps that learners follow as they advance.

The global trend here actually goes to what we call multilayered, coherent assessment systems that extend from classrooms to schools or local levels, regional levels, national levels, and international levels that are part of well-aligned instructional services and systems and provide information that students, teachers, and administrators can actually act on.

Third and finally, many of the high-performing systems often do four things well. First of all, they have means to attract the best graduates into the teaching profession, realizing that the quality of the system cannot exceed the quality of the teachers. You have some countries getting the top 10 percent of graduates becoming teachers, and that is not primarily about money and salaries. They develop those teachers into effective instructors through, for example, coaching classroom practices or moving teacher training much more to the school and to the classroom, and they put in place incentives and differentiated support systems to ensure that every child is benefiting from that kind of instruction. And finally, they build networks of schools that stimulate and spread in a way you can share best practices.

Let me make one final point. Many of those policy drivers that our analysis identify are actually not about money. In fact, spending in the United States is actually quite high by international standards in education. It is much more about investing the resources where they can make most of the difference, attracting the most talented teachers into the most difficult schools. It is about those kinds of things. The bottom line is that economic returns to improve learning outcomes—I gave you some numbers—actually exceed by far any conceivable cost of improvement.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Schleicher follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ANDREAS SCHLEICHER

SUMMARY

A GROWING IMPACT OF EDUCATION FOR ECONOMIC SUCCESS

The relative importance of knowledge and skills for the economic success of individuals and nations is rapidly increasing. In addition, in the global economy, the yardstick for educational success is no longer merely improvement by national standards, but the best performing education systems internationally. International comparisons can drive educational improvement in several ways:

• By showing what is possible in education, they can help optimize policies but also to reflect on alternatives to existing policies. For example, the international PISA assessments show Canadian 15-year-olds, on average, to be well over a school year ahead of 15-year-olds in the United States. They also show socio-economically disadvantaged Canadians much less at risk of poor educational performance than is the case in the United States.

• They can assist with gauging the pace of educational progress and help reviewing the reality of educational delivery at the frontline. For example, Poland raised the reading performance of its 15-year-olds by the equivalent of almost a school year in less than a decade. It also succeeded in halving performance differences between schools. The long-term economic value of a similar improvement in outcomes for the United States could be equivalent to over $40 trillion in additional national income. If the United States were to catch up with the best performing education system, Finland, the U.S. economy could gain $103 trillion. The international and national achievement gaps are imposing on the U.S. economy an invisible yet recurring economic loss that is greater than the output shortfall in the current economic crisis.

• They can help set policy targets in terms of measurable goals achieved by other systems and help to identify policy levers and to establish trajectories for reform.

Education systems in the industrialized world have improved more rapidly than the United States. Over the last decade, the United States has fallen from second place to 14th in terms of its college graduation rate. While primary-grade school children tend to do well by international standards, the latest PISA assessments show U.S. students performing below the OECD average. The United States also has a comparatively large achievement gap, which signals serious risks for students in their initial transition from education to work and of failing to benefit from further education and learning opportunities in their later life.

EDUCATION STANDARDS

National educational standards have helped many of the top performing education systems in important ways to establish rigorous, focused and coherent content at all grade levels; reduce overlap in curricula across grades; reduce variation in implemented curricula across classrooms; and facilitate co-ordination of various policy drivers ranging from curricula to teacher training. Countries have often coupled the establishment of standards with devolving responsibility to the frontline, encouraging responsiveness to local needs. The United States is, of course, a decentralized education system too, but while many systems have decentralized decisions concerning the delivery of educational services while keeping tight control over the definition of outcomes, the design of curricula, standards and testing, the United States is different in that it has decentralized both inputs and control over outcomes. Moreover, while the United States has devolved responsibilities to local authorities, schools themselves have less discretion in decisionmaking than is the case in many OECD countries.

The establishment of "common core standards" in the United States is an important step that could address the current problem of widely discrepant State standards and "cut" scores that have led to non-comparable results and often mean that a school's fate depends more than anything else on what State it is located. Do you want to focus this on students' fates, too?

ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS IN OTHER COUNTRIES

While performance data in the United States are largely used for punitive accountability purposes, other countries tend to give greater weight to guide intervention, reveal best practices and identify shared problems in order to encourage teachers and schools to develop more supportive and productive learning environments. They also seek to intervene in the most troubled schools, rather than identifying too many schools as needing improvement—a drawback of the current NCLB system.

Another major drawback of the current NCLB system, the "single bar" problem that leads to undue focus on students nearing proficiency rather than valuing achievement growth, is addressed in many countries through assessment and accountability systems that comprise progressive learning targets which delineate pathways characterising the steps that learners typically follow as they become more proficient and establish the breadth and depth of the learner's understanding of the domain at a particular level of advancement. The global trend here is leading towards multi-layered, coherent assessment systems from classrooms to schools to regional to national to international levels that: support improvement of learning at all levels of the system; are increasingly performance-based; add value for teaching and learning by providing information that can be acted on by students, teachers, and administrators; and are part of a comprehensive and well-aligned instructional learning system that includes syllabi, associated instructional materials, matching exams, professional scoring and teacher training.

AN EFFECTIVE TEACHING FORCE

Third, many high performing systems share a commitment to professionalized teaching. To achieve this, they often do four things well: First, they attract the best graduates to become teachers, realizing that the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers. For example, countries like Finland or Korea recruit their teachers from the top 10 percent graduates. Second, they develop these teachers into effective instructors, through, for example, coaching classroom practice, moving teacher training to the classroom, developing strong school leaders and enabling teachers to share their knowledge and spread innovation. Third, they put in place incentives and differentiated support systems to ensure that every child is able to benefit from excellent instruction. Fourth, they place emphasis on building various ways in which networks of schools stimulate and spread innovation as well as collaborate to provide curriculum diversity, extended services and professional support and foster strong approaches to leadership that help to reduce between-school variation through system-wide networking and to build lateral accountability.

INTRODUCTION

The Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD) is placing increasing emphasis on education and training, as the relative importance of knowledge and skills for the success of advanced economies is rapidly increasing. In addition, in the global economy, the yardstick for educational success is no longer merely improvement by national standards, but the best performing education systems internationally. International comparisons have thus become an important tool to assess and drive educational change:

- By showing what is possible in education, they can help to optimise policies but also to reflect on more fundamental alternatives to existing policies, which become apparent when these are contrasted with policies and practices pursued by other countries. For example, the OECD PISA assessments[1] show Canadian 15-year-olds, on average, to be well over a school year ahead of 15-year-olds in the United States in key subjects such as mathematics or science. They also show socio-economically disadvantaged Canadians much less at risk of poor educational performance than is the case in the United States.
- They can help set policy targets in terms of measurable goals achieved by other systems and help to identify policy levers and to establish trajectories for reform. Just on February 24, for example, the United Kingdom's Prime Minister announced the goal to raise student performance in the United Kingdom to Rank 3 on the international PISA mathematics assessment and Rank 6 on the PISA science assessment, together with a range of policies to achieve these targets.[2]
- They can assist with gauging the pace of educational progress and reviewing the reality of educational delivery at the frontline. For example, Poland raised the performance of its 15-year-olds in PISA reading by the equivalent of almost a school year in less than a decade. It also succeeded in halving performance differences between schools. The long-term economic value of a similar improvement in student performance for the United States could be equivalent to over $40 trillion in additional national income.

---

[1] PISA stands for the OECD Program for International Student Assessment, a test of student knowledge and skills that are administered by the OECD on behalf of participating governments on a 3-yearly basis in now 70 countries.

[2] The announcement was made on February 24, 2010, see *http://www.number10.gov.uk/Page22580*.

• Last but not least, they can support the political economy of educational reform, which is a major issue in education where any pay-off to reform almost inevitably accrues to successive governments if not generations.

This paper (1) provides an analysis of where the United States stands, compared with the principal industrialized countries internationally, (2) quantifies the economic value of improvements in learning outcomes, and (3) identifies some policy levers for educational improvement that emerge from international comparisons and transcend economic and cultural settings.

THE UNITED STATES IS LOSING ITS EDUCATIONAL ADVANTAGE

Among the 30 OECD countries with the largest expansion of college education over the last decades, most still see rising earnings differentials for college graduates, suggesting that an increase in knowledge workers does not necessarily lead to a decrease in their pay as is the case for low-skilled workers (OECD, 2008). The other player in the globalization process is technological development, but this too depends on education, not just because tomorrow's knowledge workers and innovators require high levels of education, but also because a highly educated workforce is a pre-requisite for adopting and absorbing new technologies and increasing productivity. Together, skills and technology have flattened the world such that all work that can be digitized, automated and outsourced can now be done by the most effective and competitive individuals, enterprises or countries, wherever they are.

No country has been able to capitalize on the opportunities this "flat world" provides more than the United States, which can draw on the most highly educated labor force among the principal industrialized nations, at least when measured in terms of formal qualifications. However, this advantage is largely a result of the "first-mover advantage" which the United States gained after Word War II by massively increasing enrollments. That advantage is now eroding quickly as more and more countries reach and surpass United States qualification levels. In fact, many countries are now close to ensuring that virtually all young adults leave schools with at least a high school degree (OECD average 82 percent), which the OECD indicators highlight as the baseline qualification for reasonable earnings and employment prospects. Over time, this will translate into better workforce qualifications in these countries. In contrast, the United States (78 percent) stood still on this measure and among OECD countries only New Zealand, Spain, Turkey, and Mexico now have lower high school completion rates than the United States. Even when including qualifications such as the GED (Graduate Equivalent Degree) that people can acquire later in life to make up for unsuccessful school completion, the United States has slipped from rank 1 among OECD countries for adults born in the 1940s to rank 11 among those born in the 1970s. Again, that is not because completion rates in the United States declined, but because they have risen so much faster in many other countries. Two generations ago, South Korea had the economic output of Afghanistan today and was at rank 24 in terms of educational output among today's OECD countries. Today it is the top performer in terms of the proportion of successful school leavers, with 96 percent of an age cohort obtaining a high school degree. Similar trends are visible in college education, where the United States slipped between 1995 and 2005 from rank 2 to rank 14, not because U.S. college graduation rates declined, but because they rose so much faster in many OECD countries. Graduate output is particularly low in science, where the number of people with a college degree per 100,000 employed 25- to 34-year-olds was 1,081 compared with 1,376 on average across OECD countries and more than 2,000 in Australia, Finland, Korea and Poland (OECD, 2009a). Whether the United States can continue to compensate for this, at least in part, through utilizing foreign science graduates will depend on the development of labor-markets in other countries. The developments will be amplified over the next decades as countries like China or India are raising their educational output at an ever-increasing pace.

QUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES IN THE UNITED STATES

Quantity matters, but quality is even more important. The OECD Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) extends the picture that emerges from comparing national degrees with the most comprehensive international assessment of student knowledge and skills. PISA represents a commitment by 70 countries that together make up close to 90 percent of the world economy to monitor the outcomes of education systems in terms of student achievement on a regular basis,

within an internationally agreed framework, and in innovative ways that reflect judgments about the skills that are relevant to adult life.[3]

On the 2006 PISA science assessment of 15-year-olds, the United States ranked 21st among the 30 OECD countries[4] (OECD, 2007). Moreover, while the proportion of top-performers in the United States was similar to the OECD average, the United States had a comparatively large proportion of poor performers: 24.4 percent of U.S.-15-year-olds did not reach Level 2, the baseline level of achievement on the PISA scale at which students begin to demonstrate the science competencies that will enable them to participate actively in life situations related to science and technology.[5] A longitudinal follow-up of 29,000 PISA students in Canada suggests that the absence of foundation skills below the PISA Level 2 signals serious risks for students in their initial transition from education to work and of failing to benefit from further education and learning opportunities in their later life. For example, the odds of Canadian students who had reached PISA Level 5 in reading at age 15 to achieve a successful transition to post-secondary education by age 19 were 16 times higher than for those who had not achieved the baseline Level 2, even after adjustments for socio-economic differences are made (OECD, 2010a).[6] By age 21, the odds were even 20 times higher, suggesting that the advantages of success in high school are growing further as individuals get older.

Students who did not surpass the most basic performance level on PISA were not a random group. The results show that socio-economic disadvantage has a particularly strong impact on student performance in the United States. Indeed, 18 percent of the variation in student performance in the United States is explained by students' socio-economic background—this is significantly more than at the OECD average level and contrasts, for example, with just 8 percent in Canada or 7 percent in Japan. This is not simply explained by a socio-economically more heterogeneous U.S. student population, but mainly by an above-average impact of socio-economic differences on learning outcomes. In other words, the United States is among the OECD countries where two students of different socio-economic background show the largest difference in learning outcomes. Other countries with similar levels of disparities included only France, New Zealand, the Czech Republic, the United Kingdom, Belgium and Germany. It would perhaps be tempting to attribute the performance lag of U.S. students to the challenges which socio-economic disparities and ongoing immigrant inflows pose to the education system. However, while the integration of students with an immigrant background poses significant challenges in many countries, among the countries that took part in the latest PISA assessment there are several with a larger immigrant intake than the United States which, nevertheless, scored better.

THE COST OF THE ACHIEVEMENT GAP

The international achievement gap is imposing on the U.S. economy an invisible yet recurring economic loss that is greater than the output shortfall in what has been called the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. Using economic modelling to relate cognitive skills—as measured by PISA and other international instruments—to economic growth shows that even small improvements in the skills of a nation's labour force can have very large impacts on the future well-being of countries. A recent study carried out by the OECD in collaboration with the Hoover Institute at Stanford University suggests that a modest goal of having the United States boost its average PISA scores by 25 points over the next 20 years—which is less than the most rapidly improving education system in the OECD, Poland, achieved between 2000 and 2006 alone—could imply a gain of U.S.D 41 trillion for the U.S. economy over the lifetime of the generation born in 2010 (as evaluated at the start of reform in terms of real present value of future improvements in GDP). Bringing the United States up to the average performance of Finland, the best performing education system in PISA in the OECD area, could result in gains in the order of U.S.D 103 trillion. Narrowing the achievement gap by bringing all students

[3] PISA seeks to assess not merely whether students can reproduce what they have learned in science, mathematics, and reading—which is easy to teach and test—but also how well they can extrapolate from what they have learned and apply their knowledge in novel situations.

[4] The confidence interval extends from the 18th to the 25th rank.

[5] To reach Level 2 requires competencies such as identifying key features of a scientific investigation, recalling single scientific concepts and information relating to a situation, and using results of a scientific experiment represented in a data table as they support a personal decision. In contrast, students not reaching Level 2 often confuse key features of an investigation, apply incorrect scientific information, and mix personal beliefs with scientific facts in support of a decision.

[6] No such data are available for the United States.

to a level of minimal proficiency for the OECD (i.e. reaching a PISA score of 400), could imply GDP increases for the United States of U.S.D 72 trillion according to historical growth relationships (OECD, 2010b). The predictive power of student performance at school on subsequent successful education and labour-market pathways is also demonstrated through longitudinal studies (OECD, 2010a). In either case, the evidence shows that it is the quality of learning outcomes, as demonstrated in student performance, not the length of schooling or patterns of participation, which contribute most to economic outcomes.

The gains from improved learning outcomes, put in terms of current GDP, far outstrip today's value of the short-run business-cycle management. This is not to say that efforts should not be directed at issues of economic recession, but it is to say that the long-run issues should not be neglected.

SOME LESSONS FROM HIGH ACHIEVING COUNTRIES

Perhaps the most important lesson to be learned from PISA is that strong performance, and indeed improvement, is possible. Whether in Asia (e.g., Japan and Korea), in Europe (e.g., Finland) or in North America (Canada), many countries display strong overall performance and, equally important, show that poor performance in school does not automatically follow from a disadvantaged socio-economic background and that the achievement gap can be significantly narrowed. Furthermore, some countries show that success can become a consistent and predictable educational outcome: In Finland, the country with the strongest overall results in PISA, the performance variation between schools amounts to only 5 percent of students' overall performance variation, so that parents can rely on high and consistent performance standards in whatever school they choose to enroll their children.[7]

Performance on international comparisons cannot simply be tied to money, since only Luxembourg spends more per primary student than the United States and only Luxembourg, Switzerland, and Norway spend more per middle and high school student. The results for the United States reflect rather a range of inefficiencies. That point is reinforced by the fact that in international comparisons of primary grade school children the United States does relatively well by international standards which, given the country's wealth, is what would be expected. The problem is that as they get older, children make less progress each year than children in the best performing countries. The issue is therefore not just poor kids in poor neighbourhoods, but about many kids in many neighbourhoods. It is noteworthy that spending patterns in many of the world's successful education systems are markedly different from the United States. These countries invest the money where the challenges are greatest rather than making resources contingent on the economic context of the local communities in which schools are located, and they put in place incentives and support systems that attract the most talented school teachers into the most difficult classrooms. They have often reformed inherited, traditional and bureaucratic systems of recruiting and training teachers and leaders, of paying and rewarding them and of shaping their incentives, both short-term and long-term. They often also devote a higher share of spending to classroom education than is the case in the United States and, different from the United States, often favor better teachers over smaller class sizes (OECD, 2009a).

Looking beyond financial resources, PISA suggests that schools and countries where students work in a climate characterized by high performance expectations and the readiness to invest effort, good teacher-student relations, and high teacher morale tend to achieve better results. Interestingly, U.S.-15-year-olds usually rate themselves comparatively highly in academic performance in PISA, even if they did not do well comparatively. In part that may be due to culture, but one interpretation is also that students are being commended for work that would not be acceptable in high performing education systems. Many countries have pursued a shift in public and governmental concern away from the mere control over the resources and content of education towards a focus on outcomes. This has driven efforts to articulate the expectations that societies have in relation to learning outcomes and to translate these expectations into educational goals and standards. Educational standards have influenced many of the top performing education systems in various ways, helping them to establish rigorous, focused and coherent content at all grade levels; reduce overlap in curricula across grades; reduce variation in implemented curricula across classrooms; facilitate co-ordination of various policy drivers ranging from curricula to teacher training; and reduce inequity in curricula across socio-economic groups. The establishment, by States, of "common core standards" in the United States, which can be considered among the most innovative and evidence-

[7] For the United States, the corresponding figure is 29 percent, the OECD average is 33.

based approaches to standard-setting in the field, is an important step in that direction that could address the current problem of widely discrepant State standards and cut scores that have led to non-comparable results and that often mean that a school's fate depends more than anything else on what State it is located and, perhaps even more importantly, that students across the United States are left on an unequal footing as to how well they are prepared to compete in the U.S. labor-market.

Coupled with this trend have been efforts in countries to devolve responsibility to the frontline, encouraging responsiveness to local needs, and strengthening intelligent accountability (OECD, 2009a). The United States is, of course, a decentralized education systems too, but while many systems have decentralized decisions concerning the delivery of educational services while keeping tight control over the definition of outcomes, the design of curricula, standards and testing, the United States is different in that it has decentralized both inputs and control over outcomes. Moreover, while the United States has devolved responsibilities to local authorities, schools themselves have less discretion in decisionmaking than is the case in many OECD countries. In this sense, the question for the United States is not just how many charter schools it establishes but how to build the capacity for all schools to assume charter-like autonomy, as happens in some of the best performing education systems (OECD, 2007).

What further distinguishes the approaches to professional accountability developed in Finland, the use of pupil performance data and value-added analyses in England, or the approaches to school self-evaluation in Denmark, is that these strike a different balance between using accountability tools to maintain public confidence in education, on the one hand, and to support remediation in the classroom aimed at higher levels of student learning and achievement on the other. These countries have gone beyond systems of test-based external accountability towards building capacity and confidence for professional accountability in ways that emphasize the importance of formative assessment and the pivotal role of school self-evaluation, the latter often in conjunction with school inspection systems that systematically intervene with a focus on the most troubled schools rather than dispersing efforts through identifying too many schools as needing improvement which one could consider another drawback of the current NCLB system. In some systems, strategic thinking and planning takes place at every level of the system. Every school discusses what the national standards might mean for them, and decisions are made at the level of those most able to implement them in practice. Where school performance is systematically assessed, the primary purpose is often not to support contestability of public services or market-mechanisms in the allocation of resources. Rather it is to provide instruments to reveal best practices and identify shared problems in order to encourage teachers and schools to develop more supportive and productive learning environments.

Another major drawback of the current NCLB system, the "single bar" problem that leads to undue focus on students nearing proficiency rather than valuing achievement growth, is addressed in many countries through assessment and accountability systems that incorporate progressive learning targets which delineate pathways characterising the steps that learners typically follow as they become more proficient and establish the breadth and depth of the learner's understanding of the domain at a particular level of advancement. One of the earliest approaches in this direction, the "key stages" in England, for example, provides a coherent system that allows measuring individual student progress across grades and subjects, thus also avoiding the problems associated with the "multiple measures" defining annual yearly progress in NCLB that have tended to lead to an undue emphasis on reading and mathematics.

The global trend is leading towards multi-layered, coherent assessment systems from classrooms to schools to regional to national to international levels that:

- support improvement of learning at all levels of the education system;
- are increasingly performance-based and make students' thinking visible;
- add value for teaching and learning by providing information that can be acted on by students, teachers, and administrators;
- and that are part of a comprehensive and well-aligned instructional learning system that includes syllabi, associated instructional materials, matching exams, professional scoring and teacher training.

Drawing a clearer line between assessments, on the one hand, and individual high-stakes examination systems helps countries to avoid sacrificing validity gains for efficiency gains, which tends to be an issue for the United States that is also mirrored in, by international standards, an unusually high proportion of multiple choice items.

Second, in most of the countries that performed well in PISA, it is the responsibility of schools and teachers to engage constructively with the diversity of student interests, capacities, and socio-economic contexts, without having the option of making students repeat the school year, or transferring them to educational tracks or school types with lower performance requirements. To achieve this, education systems seek to establish bridges from prescribed forms of teaching, curriculum and assessment towards an approach predicated on enabling every student to reach their potential. Many high performing education systems have developed elaborate support systems that, first of all, help individual teachers to become aware of specific weaknesses in their own practices, and that often means not just creating awareness of what they do but changing the underlying mind set. They then seek to provide their teachers with an understanding of specific best practices and, last but not least, motivate them to make the necessary changes with instruments that go well beyond material incentives. Of course, the United States has some of the most innovative schools and teachers that have tailored curriculum and teaching methods to meet the needs of children and young people with great success for many years. However, what distinguishes the education systems of, for example, Victoria in Australia, Alberta in Canada, or Finland is the drive to make such practices systemic, through the establishment of clear learning pathways through the education system and fostering the motivation of students to become independent and lifelong learners. Obviously such "personalized learning" demands both curriculum entitlement and choice that delivers a breadth of study and personal relevance. But the personalization in these countries is in terms of flexible learning pathways through the education system rather than individualized goals or institutional tracking, which have often been shown to lower performance expectations for students and tend to provide easy ways out for teachers and schools to defer problems rather than solving them.

Third, many high performing systems share a commitment to professionalized teaching, in ways that imply that teachers are on a par with other professions in terms of diagnosis, the application of evidence-based practices, and professional pride. To achieve this, they often do four things well: First, they attract the best graduates to become teachers, realizing that the quality of an education system cannot exceed the quality of its teachers. For example, countries like Finland or Korea recruit their teachers from the top 10 percent graduates. Second, they develop these teachers into effective instructors, through, for example, coaching classroom practice, moving teacher training to the classroom, developing strong school leaders and enabling teachers to share their knowledge and spread innovation. Singaporean teachers, for example, get 100 hours of fully paid professional development training each year. Third, they put in place incentives and differentiated support systems to ensure that every child is able to benefit from excellent instruction (McKinsey, 2007). The image here is of teachers who use data to evaluate the learning needs of their students, and are consistently expanding their repertoire of pedagogic strategies to address the diversity in students' interests and abilities. Such systems also often adopt innovative approaches to the deployment of differentiated staffing models. Examples include teacher selection processes as seen in Finland, highly specified professional development programmes as with the National Literacy Strategy in England, and teacher promotion based on professional competence as in Canada or Sweden.

These efforts move away from traditional educational models that often still operate like a heavy bureaucratic production chain, where year after year new reform ideas are placed on top; where in the middle layers unfinished and incoherent reforms pile up; and where at the bottom, schools and teachers are confronted with incoherent regulation and prescription that they cannot make sense of and for which they feel no responsibility. High performing education systems tend to create a "knowledge rich" education system, in which teachers and school principals act as partners and have the authority to act, the necessary information to do so, and access to effective support systems to assist them in implementing change. Of course, everywhere education is a knowledge industry in the sense that it is concerned with the transmission of knowledge, but a recent OECD study on teachers, teaching and learning suggests that education is often still quite far from becoming a knowledge industry in the sense that *its own practices* are being transformed by knowledge about the efficacy of its own practices (OECD, 2009b). In many other fields, people enter their professional lives expecting their practice to be transformed by research, but that is still rather rare in education. There is, of course, a large body of research about learning but much of it is unrelated to the kind of real-life learning that is the focus of formal education. Central prescription of what teachers should do, which still dominate today's schools, may not transform teachers' practices in the

way that professional engagement, in the search for evidence of what makes a difference, can.

External accountability systems are an essential part of all this, but so are lateral accountability systems. Among OECD countries, there are countless tests and reforms that have resulted in giving schools more money or taking money away from them, developing greater prescription on school standards or less prescription, or making classes larger or smaller, often without measurable effects. What distinguishes top-performer Finland is that it places the emphasis on building various ways in which networks of schools stimulate and spread innovation as well as collaborate to provide curriculum diversity, extended services and professional support. It fosters strong approaches to leadership and a variety of system leadership roles that help to reduce between-school variation through system-wide networking and to build lateral accountability. It has moved from "hit and miss" policies to establishing universal high standards; from uniformity to embracing diversity; from a focus on provision to a focus on outcomes; from managing inputs and a bureaucratic approach to education towards devolving responsibilities and enabling outcomes; and from talking about equity to delivering equity. It is a system where schools no longer receive prefabricated wisdom but take initiatives on the basis of data and best practice.

CONCLUSION

In one way, international educational benchmarks make disappointing reading for the United States. But they also indicate a way forward. Results from PISA show that strong performance is possible. Whether in Asia (e.g., Japan and Korea), in Europe (e.g., Finland) or in North America (Canada), many countries display strong overall performance and, equally important, show that poor performance in school does not automatically follow from a disadvantaged socio-economic background, even if social background is an important challenge everywhere. Furthermore, some countries show that success can become a consistent and predictable educational outcome, with very little performance variation across schools. Last but not least, Poland demonstrated that it is possible to achieve performance gains equivalent to three-quarters of a school year within less than a decade. This paper has identified some of the policy levers that are prevalent in high performing education systems.

The international achievement gap is imposing on the U.S. economy an invisible yet recurring economic loss that is greater than the output shortfall in what has been called the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. Using economic modelling to relate student performance—as measured by PISA and other international instruments—to economic growth shows that even small improvements in the skills of a nation's labour force can have very large impacts on future well-being. A modest goal of having the United States boost its average PISA scores by 25 points over the next 20 years—which is less than the most rapidly improving education system in the OECD, Poland, achieved between 2000 and 2006 alone—implies a gain of U.S.D 41 trillion for the U.S. economy over the lifetime of the generation born in 2010 (as evaluated at the start of reform in terms of real present value of future improvements in GDP). Bringing the United States up to the average performance of Finland, OECD's best performing education system in PISA, could result in gains in the order of U.S.D 103 trillion. Closing the achievement gap by bringing all students to a level of minimal proficiency for the OECD (i.e., reaching a PISA score of 400), could imply GDP increases for the United States of U.S.D 72 trillion according to historical growth relationships. The predictive power of student performance at school on subsequent successful education and labour-market pathways is also demonstrated through longitudinal studies. In both cases, the evidence shows that it is the quality of learning outcomes, as demonstrated in student performance, not the length of schooling or patterns of participation, which makes the difference. The gains from improved learning outcomes, put in terms of current GDP, far outstrip today's value of the short-run business-cycle management. This is not to say that efforts should not be directed at immediate issues of economic recession, but it is to say that the long-run issues should not be neglected.

Addressing the challenges will become ever-more important as the best education systems, not simply improvement by national standards, will increasingly become the yardstick to success. Moreover, countries such as the United States will not simply need to match the performance of these countries, but actually do better if their citizens want to justify higher wages.

REFERENCES

OECD (2004). *What Makes School Systems Perform.* Paris: OECD.

OECD (2006). *Assessing Scientific, Reading and Mathematical Literacy. A Framework for PISA 2006.* Paris: OECD. OECD (2007). *PISA 2006. Science Competencies for Tomorrow's World.* Paris: OECD.
OECD (2008). *Education at a Glance—OECD Indicators 2008.* Paris: OECD.
OECD (2009a). *Education at a Glance—OECD Indicators 2009.* Paris: OECD.
OECD (2009b). *Creating Effective Teaching and Learning Environments.* Paris: OECD.
OECD (2010a), *Pathways to Success.* Paris: OECD.
OECD (2010b), *The High Cost of Low Educational Performance.* Paris: OECD.
McKinsey and company (2007). *How the world's school systems come out on top.* New York: McKinsey.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Schleicher.

Now we will turn to Mr. Van Roekel, National Education Association.

STATEMENT OF DENNIS VAN ROEKEL, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. Thank you, Chairman Harkin, Ranking Member Enzi, and members of the committee. Thank you very much for the opportunity to be with you here today.

As a 23-year high school math teacher, I have the honor to represent 3.2 million people who absolutely believe in the power of education to transform lives. The passion and the commitment that brought them into the profession is what they bring to classrooms from pre-K to graduate every single day despite incredible challenges.

As you deliberate about the reauthorization of ESEA, I hope you spend some time reflecting on a very fundamental or basic question. What do you believe is the purpose of public education for the United States for today in the 21st century?

When I think of my grandchildren, I think about what it is it ought to provide them for their life. I want to visualize a circle divided into four quadrants. One of those quadrants I would assume would be academics, and when I think about what might be in there, I think of a very broad curriculum, 21st century skills, understanding what a student needs to know and be able to do in this coming century. It would be rich with arts and science, geography, history, health, and PE. As we talk about a global society, we must make sure that they have the ability to compete. I know there would be foreign language in there.

Yet, when you look at the current system, the entire quadrant for academics has been narrowed to a very small sliver and we look at math and reading as if somehow measuring that will determine the success of a student, a school, or even a district.

I would think one of the other quadrants for the purpose of American public education has to do with justice and equal opportunity. For someone who grew up in a small rural community in Iowa with 1,700 people in my town, I have the opportunity to be here today. The system that Government provided gave me the opportunity to my American dream, and so part of that purpose is to ensure that every student in America has access to that possibility and those opportunities.

I would hope that another quadrant in that purpose would be to take the ideas and the ideals and the responsibility of citizenship in a democratic society and move them to the next generation. I would hope that part of that purpose would reflect the development

of the whole child not just the academic as they grow into productive adults who can balance work and family and faith and community but as part of all of that.

It is so important to reflect on that purpose because until you do that, it is very difficult to determine the standards for accountability and assessment of the system.

In my written testimony, I spoke in detail of the inextricable link between investment in education and a strong economy and a competitive Nation. Education is the driver for individual and national success. Students in impoverished communities too often do not attend safe schools, do not have safe passage to and from, and do not have access to great teachers on a regular and consistent basis. Our challenge in reauthorizing ESEA is to ensure those benefits reach all students in all communities.

Three things I would mention in the reauthorization:

No. 1, codify those things that we know work based on research and the people who work there. Children are not experiments. Policies on accountability, assessments, and transforming schools should follow research not dogma. Accountability and flexibility are not mutually exclusive. We are encouraged by Secretary Duncan's remarks about being tight on goals and loose on means, providing flexibility of how to achieve it, and we would encourage Congress to make laws that honor that pledge.

No. 2, the Federal Government should only incentivize initiatives in which collaborative plans from beginning to end involve all essential stakeholders. In the last 25 years, one thing we know, as we look at places that succeed, there is a common thread that you must have collaboration. You must have management, the board, the employees and their unions sit down together and say what is it that we need to do to transform and make it right for the students in our school. They must then reach out to parents and the community. We cannot afford to fail. Our students cannot afford us to fail, and the status quo is unacceptable.

And finally, in the true spirit of the original ESEA from 1965, Federal law and regulations are the only way to eliminate vast disparities. There is a corridor of shame in every State. Therefore, as a condition of receiving Federal money, all States should be required to submit a plan for remedying those disparities in all the key areas that make a great public school, publish them, post them on the Web, total transparency, and then allow the citizens to hold the State and local governments accountable for implementation of that plan.

The road is a difficult one, but it is worth the effort. I want you to know that 3.2 million people stand ready to move on this journey and work with our partners to transform public education.

Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Van Roekel follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DENNIS VAN ROEKEL

SUMMARY

The public education system is critical to democracy. Its purpose is to:

• maximize the achievement, skills, opportunities and potential of all students by promoting their strengths and addressing their needs, and

• ensure all students are prepared to thrive in a democratic society and diverse changing world as knowledgeable, creative and engaged citizens and lifelong learners.

Our public schools need a wholesale transformation with the resources to match our commitment. We cannot leave a generation of students behind by continuing to deny them the best education this country has to offer.

K–12 EDUCATION IN THE U.S. ECONOMY

There is no disagreement that there is an inextricable link between investment in education and a strong, competitive nation. Individuals who go further in school see higher earnings throughout their lifetime. But, the spill-over effects of a quality public education extend beyond individuals. The higher earnings of educated workers generate higher tax payments at the local, State, and Federal levels. Consistent productive employment reduces dependence on public income-transfer programs and *all* workers, regardless of education level, earn more when there are more college graduates in the labor force. In today's economy, investing in education will help prevent harmful cuts in programs, preserve jobs and reduce unemployment.

REVITALIZING THE PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM

We must address opportunity gaps to strengthen our economy and build the educated workforce necessary for the 21st century. We should codify those things that we know work based upon research and the guidance of those closest to children. Children are not experiments. Policies on accountability, assessments, and turning around schools should follow research, not dogma.

REDESIGNING SCHOOLS FOR 21ST CENTURY LEARNING

Educating every student so they can succeed is not enough. We live in a global society and our students will have to compete with people from across the world. We need a world class education system that will prepare students to become critical thinkers, problem solvers, and globally competent.

REVAMPING ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS FOR 21ST CENTURY LEARNING

States should have well-designed, transparent accountability systems that authentically assess student learning and the conditions for its success, focus on closing achievement gaps, help to monitor progress, and identify successes and problems. We should not continue the unhealthy focus on standardized tests as the primary evidence of student success. Educator voices are key to any successful transformation. We cannot discount the experience and knowledge of those who work in classrooms every day. The Federal Government should only incentivize initiatives in which collaborative plans—designed from start to finish by all essential stakeholders—are assured.

ENSURING SUSTAINABILITY OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

If we are to be true to the spirit of the original ESEA, Federal law and regulations are the only way to eliminate vast disparities in educational opportunity. As a condition of receiving Federal money, *all* States should be required to submit a plan for remedying disparities in the key areas that make a great public school. Transforming America's public schools is a daunting task. It will take the concerted efforts of all stakeholders and the commitment to continue the effort until every student has access to a great public school.

Chairman Harkin, Ranking Member Enzi, and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak with you today about the essential role of preparing students for success in the 21st Century and how the Elementary and Secondary Education Act must be redesigned to achieve this goal. I commend the committee for convening a hearing on this very important issue.

As a 23-year veteran classroom math teacher, I have the great honor of being here today representing 3.2 million members who all believe in the power of education to transform lives. NEA members include teachers and education support professionals, higher education faculty and staff, Department of Defense schools' educators, students in colleges of teacher education, and retired educators across the country.

Today, I will talk about K–12 education in the U.S. economy. I will also present NEA's views on revitalizing the public education system, redesigning schools and re-

vamping accountability systems for 21st century learning, and ensuring sustainability of public education.

The public education system is critical to democracy. Its purpose is to:

• maximize the achievement, skills, opportunities and potential of all students by promoting their strengths and addressing their needs, and

• ensure all students are prepared to thrive in a democratic society and diverse changing world as knowledgeable, creative, and engaged citizens and lifelong learners.

However, today, students' success in school depends in large part on the zip code where they live and the educators to whom they are assigned. There are great teachers and education support professionals at work every day in this country who show up excited to teach students and feed them nutritious meals, help them travel safely to and from school, and make sure they attend schools that are safe, clean, and in good repair.

Students who struggle the most in impoverished communities too often don't attend safe schools with reliable heat and air conditioning; too often do not have safe passage to and from school; and far too often do not have access to great teachers on a regular and consistent basis. We must address these opportunity gaps if we are to strengthen our economy, prepare our students to compete, and build the educated workforce necessary.

What we have today is an interdependent, rapidly changing world, and our public school system must adapt to the needs of the new global economy. Every student will need to graduate from high school, pursue post-secondary educational options, and focus on a lifetime of learning because many of tomorrow's jobs have not even been conceived of today.

I think we can all agree that our public schools need a wholesale transformation with the resources to match our commitment. We cannot leave a generation of students behind by continuing to deny them the best education this country has to offer. Instead of being first in the world in the number of inmates, let's work to be first in the world in the number of high school and college graduates.

As President John F. Kennedy said in 1961 and it still holds true now:

> "Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity. The human mind is our fundamental resource."

Simply put, we need a new vision of 21st century learning. My testimony today will lay out the inextricable link between investment in education and a strong, competitive nation and will discuss how we must approach ESEA reauthorization from an economic development framework.

But I would be remiss if I did not point out that the best laid plans for 21st century learning will not succeed without a true partnership of change between educators, school boards and school districts. Simply put, reform in schools does not succeed without true collaboration among all those involved in creating, funding, and delivering quality education services to our students. We have to all shoulder the responsibility and hard work it will take to be sure schools improve dramatically, particularly for students who need the most. And we cannot continue to shun proven school improvement models because they don't generate as much press coverage as others.

We know schools improve when educators are respected, treated as professionals, and given the tools they need and the opportunity to improve as a team for the benefit of their students. For example, Broad Acres Elementary School in Silver Spring, Maryland is a high-poverty, previously low performing school. In April 2001, all staff at Broad Acres Elementary School had the option to make a 3-year commitment to the school and its students. This commitment included working the equivalent of 15 extra days paid by a supplement to be used to extend the workday every Wednesday until 6 p.m. for planning sessions, study groups, and examining student work. Sixty percent of the staff elected to stay. According to the school district's Web site, students met the proficiency standards for adequate yearly progress in math and reading for the most recent year available. The student body is 99 percent minority and 88 percent qualify for free and reduced price meals. Furthermore, at Broad Acres, 30 percent of the teachers have more than 15 years of experience, 52.7 percent have 5–15 years, and only 16.4 percent have less than 5 years of experience. It appears from those numbers that Broad Acres has successfully retained experienced educators and probably also attracted newer ones who are staying.

K–12 EDUCATION IN THE U.S. ECONOMY

Every child and young adult has surely heard the following: "To get ahead in life, get an education." This is a belief often repeated among noted economists and education experts, and is borne out by numerous studies. As Paul Krugman, *New York Times* columnist and Nobel Prize winner has said, "If you had to explain America's economic success with one word, that word would be 'education' . . . Education made America great; neglect of education can reverse the process." Former Treasury Secretary Henry Paulson has also stated, "The best approach is to give people access to first-rate education so they can acquire the skills needed to advance."

Besides the benefits to individuals, society as a whole also enjoys a financial return on the investment in higher education. In addition to widespread productivity increases, the higher earnings of educated workers generate higher tax payments at the local, State, and Federal levels. Consistent productive employment reduces dependence on public income-transfer programs and all workers, regardless of education level, earn more when there are more college graduates in the labor force. (Education Pays, The College Board, 2007.)

The provision of a quality K–12 public education plays a crucial role in the individual and economy-wide acquisition of "human capital." The economic payoff to individuals of increased schooling is higher earnings throughout their lifetime—a market-based individual benefit. In addition, a considerable number of benefits from a quality K–12 public education—the spillover effects extend beyond individuals. Wolfe and Haveman (2002), economists noted for their efforts to put a monetary value on some of education's spillover effects, argue that the value of these spillovers for individuals and the economy is significant and that it may be as large as education's market-based individual benefits. For example:

• Cutting statewide public K–12 expenditure by $1 per $1,000 State's personal income could: (1) reduce the State's personal income by about 0.3 percent in the short run and 3.2 percent in the long run; (2) reduce the State's manufacturing investment in the long run by 0.9 percent and manufacturing employment by 0.4 percent. Cutting statewide public K–12 education per student by $1 would reduce small business starts by 0.4 percent in the long run. Cutting statewide public K–12 expenditure by 1 percentage point of the State's personal income would reduce the State's employment by 0.7 percent in the short run and by 1.4 percent in the long run.

• A reduction in a State's aggregate home values is likely if a reduction in statewide public school spending yields a decline in standardized public school test scores, if in the long run people leave or do not enter the State because of test-score declines. A 10 percent reduction in various standardized test scores would yield between a 2 percent and a 10 percent reduction in aggregate home values in the long run.

• Reduction in a State's aggregate personal income is also likely if a reduction in statewide public school spending yields a decline in "quality" of public education produced and a long-run decrease in earning potential of the State's residents. A 10 percent reduction in school expenditures could yield a 1 to 2 percent decrease in post-school annual earnings in the long run. A 10 percent increase in the student-teacher ratio would lead to a 1 to 2 percent decrease in high school graduation rates and to a decrease in standardized test scores.

Investing in education will help prevent harmful cuts in programs, preserve jobs and reduce unemployment, thereby strengthening State and local economies.

• According to the National Governors' Association, "Long-term prospects for strong economic growth are hampered by the high school dropout crisis . . . Dropouts costs the United States more that $300 billion a year in lost wages and increased public-sector expenses . . . the dropout problem is a substantial drag on the Nation's economic competitiveness."

• The latest study from the Alliance for Excellent Education, *The Economic Benefits from Halving the Dropout Rate* makes a powerful connection between easing the dropout crisis and strengthening local economies. Over time, for example, budgets that provide education and other basic services to economically disadvantaged people can increase their chances for solid jobs and productive lives and thereby reduce income inequality. Social spending, including education spending, often has a positive effect on GDP, even after weighing the effects of the taxes used to finance it.

• A series of careful studies presented at the Teachers College Symposium on Educational Equity at Columbia University found that, among other things that a high school dropout earns about $260,000 less over a lifetime than a high school graduate and pays about $60,000 less in taxes. These same studies also found that America loses $192 billion—1.6 percent of our Gross Domestic Product—in combined income and tax revenue with each cohort of 18-year-olds who never complete high

school. In other words, for each year's high school graduating class, the amount they would contribute to this Nation's economy over their lifetime in terms of their income and the taxes they pay would be larger by $192 billion if all of their same-age peers completed high school as well. The annual loss of Federal and State income taxes associated with the 23 million U.S. high school dropouts (ages 18–67) is over $50 billion compared to what they would have paid if they had graduated.

• A survey for the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston showed that an educated, qualified workforce was by far the most important consideration of firms when deciding where to locate.

• And a study for the World Bank showed that public investments in K–12 education yielded an annual return of 14.3 percent in additional revenue and reduced expenses, while the long-term return on common stocks was only 6.3 percent a year.

• Two Harvard economists, Lawrence F. Katz and Claudia Goldin, studied the effect of increases in educational attainment in the U.S. labor force from 1915 to 1999. They estimated that those gains directly resulted in at least 23 percent of the overall growth in productivity, or around 10 percent of growth in gross domestic product. (What's the Return on Education, Anna Bernasek, The *New York Times*, December 11, 2005). They found education programs have contributed to economic growth while also increasing opportunities for individual advancement. Near-universal public education has added significantly to U.S. economic growth, boosted incomes, and lowered inequality (Goldin and Katz, 2008).

It is clear that when faced with the choice of: (1) increasing revenue statewide to continue supporting the provision of quality public K–12 education; or (2) cutting support statewide to public K–12 education to forestall a tax increase, a State's long-term economic interests are better served by increasing revenue. (NEA Working Paper, *K–12 Education in the U.S. Economy: Its impact on Economic Development, Earnings, and Housing Values.* Thomas L. Hungerford and Robert W. Wassmer, April 2004). Yet, according to NEA's own research, almost no States are currently funding their educational systems adequately and most States are around 25 percent short of funding their systems at a level adequate.

These findings take on a particular significance in the current economy. State budgets typically lag any national economic recovery by a year or longer and, as a result, budget gaps will continue into fiscal year 2011 and beyond. In fact, the aggregate budget gap for fiscal year 2012 is expected to be larger than the 2011 gap, largely due to diminishing Federal stimulus funds. For many States, 2011 will mark the third consecutive year in which budget balancing actions will be needed to close sizable budget gaps. According to the Congressional Budget Office's (CBO) just issued *Policies for Increasing Economic Growth and Employment in 2010 and 2011*,

> "Many States have experienced a high degree of fiscal stress and are expected to have large budget gaps in the next few years. Eighteen States have budget gaps larger than 20 percent of general fund expenditures. . . ."

The Federal Government, which, unlike most State governments, is not prohibited from running an annual budget deficit, is best suited to help State and local governments maintain educational funding during cyclical downturns. According to CBO,

> "Federal aid that was provided promptly would probably have a significant effect on output and employment in 2010 and 2011. Such aid could lead to fewer layoffs, more pay raises, more government purchases of goods and services, increases in State safety-net programs, tax cuts, and savings for future use."

The evidence is clear that investment in education is essential for a strong economy and a well-prepared workforce, and that the Federal Government must step up at this critical juncture. This sort of investment in education as a means to stimulating economic growth is not unprecedented. In the last century, both the G.I. bill and the National Defense Education Act of 1958, which appropriated $1 billion for science education, helped propel economic growth.

Leaving States to cut education more deeply to balance their budgets without additional Federal aid is short-sighted. Lessening the quality of education a student receives today as a result may be irreversible. Long-term productivity growth and a higher standard of living are dependent on an educated workforce. Investing in education is investing in the future growth of the country.

Additional funding for public primary and secondary schools, however, will not generate greater student achievement unless the funds are used wisely. The remainder of this testimony will focus on how we must retool our education system for the 21st Century.

REVITALIZING THE PUBLIC EDUCATION SYSTEM

It is important to recall that 1965 was one of the notable years in the history of education in America. That year, as part of his War on Poverty, President Lyndon Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) to reduce inequity by directing resources to poor and minority children and signed the Higher Education Act (HEA) to provide more opportunities and access to post-secondary opportunities for lower- and middle-income families. "Poverty has many roots," Johnson said, "but the taproot is ignorance."

Poverty is still an issue in this country, and unfortunately we still have schools that lack resources, committed and effective leadership, and enough great teachers and education support professionals to reach every student. Schools in struggling communities too often have high dropout rates, and the cycle of poverty continues.

The Federal Government must be engaged in these issues, offering the only remaining leverage point to hold States accountable for remedying these untenable inequities. Later in this testimony, I will address our recommendation that the Federal Government require States to put together adequacy and equity plans that outline how they will address these inequities.

NEA also stands ready to help do something about it—we must break this cycle of poverty. And we are ready to work with our partners, community by community, to revitalize the public school system and redesign schools for the 21st century.

REDESIGNING SCHOOLS FOR 21ST CENTURY LEARNING

To be clear, however, educating every student so they can succeed in *this* country is not enough today. We live in a global society and our students will have to compete with people from across the world.

We need a world class education system that will prepare students to become critical thinkers, problem solvers, and globally competent. To prosper, graduates must learn languages, understand the world, and be able to compete globally, and we must benchmark our educational goals against other nations with strong education systems. If we collectively work toward that outcome, it is expected that the United States gross domestic product will be more than one-third higher in the next 70 years.

To meet the challenges of the 21st century, we must transform the system by demanding sweeping changes that changes the dynamic—significantly higher student achievement and significantly higher graduation rates for all groups of students.

Our vision of what great public schools need and should provide acknowledges that the world is changing and public education is changing too. NEA's Great Public Schools (GPS) criteria require not only the continued commitment of all educators, but the concerted efforts of policymakers at all levels of government. These criteria will prepare all students for the future with 21st century skills; create enthusiasm for learning and engaging all students in the classroom; close achievement gaps and increase achievement for all students; and ensure that all educators have the resources and tools they need to get the job done.

The criteria are:

• **Quality programs and services that meet the full range of all children's needs so that they come to school every day ready and able to learn.**

• **High expectations and standards with a rigorous and comprehensive curriculum for all students.** Curriculum and assessments must focus on higher order thinking and performance skills, if students are to meet the high standards to which we aspire. Students will be better prepared for the rigors of life and citizenship after school if they have had access to a broad, rigorous, relevant curriculum that prepares them for a variety of post-secondary educational and career options. Students' access to core academic content areas that incorporate 21st century skills as well as fine arts, civics, and career and technical education helps inspire their creativity, helps connect their school work to their outside interests, and can help keep them engaged in school.

We must support innovative public school models of education that inform and accelerate school transformation efforts and prepare students for citizenship, lifelong learning, and challenging post-secondary education and careers. The Federal Government can play a critical role in increasing educational research and development and providing a clearinghouse for innovative promising practices.

• **Quality conditions for teaching and lifelong learning.** In an effort to obliterate the "corridors of shame" that exist and repair or rebuild crumbling schools, we also must focus resources on infrastructure. President Obama's administration and Congress already have taken a giant leap forward in this respect when they passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). ARRA included billions of dollars in aid that can be used to help update schools. We are pleased that

both the House and Senate have passed legislation to extend and strengthen this program.

We also know that if we are to revitalize our public schools, we must address the design of public schools. Schools today must work for students in rural, urban, suburban, and exurban areas. In rural areas, for example, broadband access is key to ensure students have access to virtual, supplemental material and support that is not available in their physical location. By creating this technology gateway, educators can also obtain high-quality professional development to which they might otherwise not have access.

Schools and classrooms designed for 21st century learning also must be designed for universal access to ensure the inclusion of the widest spectrum of students. Every effort should be made to reduce the barriers to learning so that every student reaches his or her potential and dreams.

• **A qualified, caring, diverse, and stable workforce.** Investments in teachers' and leaders' knowledge and skills are essential to all other reforms, and pay off in higher achievement. Strong preparation, mentoring, and professional development, as well as collaborative learning and planning time in schools, are the building blocks of any successful reform. We must ensure students have access to accomplished educators by requiring high standards for entry into the profession and by offering incentives to teach in hard-to-staff schools. We recommend creating a prestigious national education institute and provide incentives to States to create world-class teacher preparation programs that attract the top tier of college graduates nationally.

Teachers and education support professionals must be respected as professionals by ensuring they are part of critical decisions affecting students, schools and themselves. We also need to encourage school leadership to be effective in both operational and instructional leadership.

• **Shared responsibility for appropriate school accountability by stakeholders at all levels.** We must obtain the full commitment from all policymakers—at the Federal, State, and local levels. We also must involve our communities and partners, including governors, State legislators, mayors, county officials, business partners, the faith-based community, the civil rights community, and parents and families, to name a few. It will take the concerted effort of all of these stakeholders working with superintendents, school boards, and educators to ensure that all of our schools become the modern, safe, vibrant centers of the community that they can become.

• **Parental, family, and community involvement and engagement.** Through more than 125 initiatives in 21 States, NEA's Public Engagement Project is demonstrating the essential role of school-family-community partnerships in student achievement. Our findings echo those of a 6-year-long study of multiple data sources conducted by the Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University: such partnerships contribute to increased student attendance, improved performance on standardized tests, higher high school graduation rates, and college-going aspirations.

• **Adequate, equitable, and sustainable funding.** Resources must be adequate and equalized across schools. We cannot expect schools that lack strong and prepared leaders, well-qualified teachers, and high-quality instructional materials to improve by testing alone. We must ensure adequate and equitable funding for schools and fully fund critical programs such as title I and IDEA and we must help States and districts to identify disparities in educational resources, supports, programs, opportunities, class sizes and personnel (including the distribution of accomplished educators) through required Equity and Adequacy plans.

NEA is part of the Partnership for 21st Century Skills—a unique public-private organization formed in 2002 to create a successful model of learning for this millennium that incorporates 21st century skills into our system of education. The members of this Partnership believe that policymakers today have an opportunity—and an obligation—to move forward with a new direction for teaching and learning in the 21st century (*The Road to 21st Century Learning: A Policymakers Guide to 21st Century Skills,* Partnership for 21st Century Skills).

As laid out in the Partnership's guidebook, *The Road to 21st Century Learning: A Policymakers Guide to 21st Century Skills http://www.21stcenturyskills.org/downloads/P21_Policy_Paper.pdf*) we see:

> ". . . a growing sense of urgency that the Nation must act now to ensure that future generations of Americans can participate fully in the democratic process and the competitive global economy. Education is the foundation of democratic institutions, national security, economic growth and prosperity—and Americans cannot be complacent about improving the quality of education while competi-

tors around the world are focusing on preparing students for the demands of this century. Only recently, the National Science Board, a Federal advisory panel established by Congress, warned that the United States faces a major shortage of scientists because too few Americans are entering technical fields and because of the burgeoning ranks of highly competent scientists in other nations.

". . . America risks losing its long-standing pre-eminence in science, engineering, technology, medicine, defense, business and even democracy. Without many more highly educated, highly skilled young people to carry the torch of inquiry, innovation and enterprise into the future, American dominance in these and other endeavors may fade. . . .

"There is broad consensus among educators, policymakers, business leaders and the public that schools today must do a better job of preparing young people for the challenges and expectations of communities, workplaces and higher education. Moreover, there is broad consensus about the knowledge and skills that are essential in the world today—and about the educational model that would make schools more relevant to the world again as well. This model emphasizes that students today need 21st century skills to guarantee America's success tomorrow."

Incremental changes yield incremental results. We must be bolder. A legislative tweak here or a regulatory toggle there will not lead to the fundamental and transformative changes in education we all seek. When we address change, we have to focus on significant *and* sustainable improvement in the rates of achievement for all students, but especially poor and minority students.

According to the Partnership for 21st Century Skills, integrating 21st century skills into K–12 education will empower students to learn and achieve in the core academic subjects at much higher levels. These skills, in fact, are the learning results that demonstrate that students are ready for the world. It is no longer enough to teach students the 3Rs; we must also teach the 4Cs of creativity, collaboration, communication, and critical thinking.

The Partnership calls on policymakers to imagine:

- A place where all children master rigorous core academic subjects.
- A place where teaching and learning are relevant to life outside of school.
- A place where all children understand and use the learning skills—information and communication skills, thinking and problem-solving skills, and interpersonal and self-directional skills—that lead to high performance in school and in life.
- A place where vital new academic content is part of the common core curriculum.
- A place where professional development and teaching strategies enable educators to help students gain the knowledge and skills they need.
- A place where every student, teacher and administrator has on-demand access to 21st century tools and technologies and uses them to work productively.
- A place where 21st century tools and context are embedded in core subjects and assessments.
- A place where all students—including those with learning or physical disabilities and those who are learning English—can show what they know and can do with all of the knowledge and skills that are valued in the world.

The Partnership members know that schools like these would be intellectually stimulating environments for students, teachers and administrators alike. Communities, employers, colleges and universities would be proud to welcome graduates of 21st century schools as the best prepared generation of citizens in American history. Reaching this vision is both important and possible—and it rests in the hands of policymakers today. It is this vision that Congress should have at the forefront as you reauthorize ESEA.

REVAMPING ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEMS FOR 21ST CENTURY LEARNING

In order to support public school improvement, States should have well-designed, transparent accountability systems that authentically assess both student learning and the conditions for its success, focus on closing achievement gaps, help to monitor progress, and identify successes and problems. We should not continue the unhealthy focus on standardized tests as the primary evidence of student success.

Achievement is much more than a test score, but if test scores are still the primary means of assessing student learning, they will continue to get undue weight. This is especially problematic because the tests widely in use in the United States, since NCLB narrowed the kinds of tests in use, typically focus on lower level skills of recall and recognition measured with multiple-choice items that do not adequately represent higher order thinking skills and performance. These are unlike

the assessments that are used in high-achieving nations that feature essays, problem solutions, and open-ended items and more extensive tasks completed in classrooms as part of the assessment system. Achievement must take into account accomplishments that matter in the world outside of school, such as: Are you prepared for college or trade school? Can you form an opinion about something you read and justify your opinion? Are you creative? Are you inventive? Can you come up with a variety of solutions when you're faced with a problem?

The Federal Government should use the ESEA implementation process, along with those associated with other Federal programs, as mechanisms to incentivize States to devise comprehensive accountability systems that use multiple sources of evidence (including rich, meaningful, and authentic assessments, such as developing and/or using native language assessments as appropriate for students until they gain proficiency in English as determined by a valid and reliable measure). Instead of the current NCLB system that has resulted in a significant narrowing of the curriculum, State accountability systems should be designed to support efforts to guarantee every child has access to a rich, comprehensive curriculum. Such systems also should:

- Align with developmentally appropriate student learning standards;
- Require the use of multiple, valid, reliable measures of student learning and school performance over time and assess higher-order thinking skills and performance skills;
- Replace AYP with a system that recognizes schools that make progress toward achieving learning goals and correctly identifies struggling schools in order to provide needed support instead of punishment;
- Recognize the unique instructional and assessment needs of special populations, including students with disabilities and English language learners by designing standards and assessments that are accessible for all students; and
- Foster high-quality data systems that are both longitudinal and complete and that protect student and educator privacy and improve instruction.

These State systems should evaluate school quality, as well as demonstrate improvements in student learning and closing of achievement, skills, and opportunity gaps among various groups of students. NEA has developed a comprehensive diagnostic tool called KEYS to assess school climate and success using a variety of indicators. There are also important and highly informative surveys such as the Teacher Working Conditions survey (pioneered by the Center for Teaching Quality) and the Gallup student survey that should inform States' educational approach and accountability system as it relates to school system quality.

As States design these evaluation systems, the design team must include practicing educators to ensure that the system can yield clear and useful results. The results of these evaluations should not be used to punish and sanction schools. Results instead should be used to inform State, local, and classroom efforts to identify struggling students and problematic school programs so that States, districts, and educators can provide appropriate interventions and supports for improvement.

When considering individual schools that need significant reform or turn-around efforts, I strongly urge you not to be too prescriptive—as we believe the U.S. Department of Education's regulations in Race to the Top have been—in outlining specific methods of transforming schools. For example, we believe that turnaround assistance teams, such as those so successfully employed in North Carolina and Kentucky, serve as a highly effective, proven model of turning around low performing schools. We also believe that teacher-led schools have shown remarkable results in improving student learning. These two models were not included in the RTTT rules as allowable turn-around approaches. Such narrow prescriptions for school overhaul are predictive of one thing: diminished opportunity and tools to reach and turn around MORE schools.

ENSURING SUSTAINABILITY OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

Transforming America's public schools is a daunting task. It will take the concerted efforts of all stakeholders and the commitment to continue the effort until every student has access to a great public school.

At the core of this effort is ensuring the fiscal stability of the educational system so that the energy of stakeholders can be spent on how best to serve students.

As we have said in the past, the Federal Government should require States, as part of their application for Federal education funds under ESEA, to develop "Adequacy and Equity Plans." Through these plans, States will demonstrate where there are disparities in educational tools and services, as well as opportunities and resources. The plans will outline steps underway or planned to remedy the disparities. The process of developing the plans should bring together stakeholders within the

State to devise a plan to meet adequacy and equity goals, and for the first time significant Federal resources could serve as a powerful incentive that spurs action on this issue. This effort will help elevate the commitment to all students and build a shared understanding of what it will take to support them.

The design of Federal approval and monitoring should be one that sensibly supports adjustments and flexibility as States pursue their goals and work toward eliminating disparities, without ever losing sight of the fact that the richest country in the world can provide every student with a quality education.

CONCLUSION

We know the road to economic stability and prosperity runs through our public schools, and we know that every student deserves the best we can offer. It is now time to deliver. NEA stands ready to do its part.

Attached to this testimony are a series of fact sheets on key elements of ESEA reauthorization, as well as NEA's overriding principles for reauthorization.

Thank you.

ATTACHMENT *

NEA'S MESSAGE TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS ON THE REAUTHORIZATION OF ESEA

The purpose of public education

The public education system is critical to democracy and its purpose is to:

• maximize the achievement, skills, opportunities and potential of all students by promoting their strengths and addressing their needs, and

• ensure all students are prepared to thrive in a democratic society and diverse changing world as knowledgeable, creative and engaged citizens and lifelong learners.

To fulfill the purpose of public education, we must:

1. Promote Innovation in Public Schools

• Support innovative public school models of education that inform and accelerate school transformation efforts and prepare students for citizenship, lifelong learning, and challenging post-secondary education and careers.

• Increase educational research and development and provide a clearinghouse for innovative promising practices.

2. Provide Students With Multiple Ways to Show What They Have Learned

• Require the use of multiple, valid, reliable measures of student learning and school performance over time.

• Replace AYP with a system that recognizes schools that make progress toward achieving learning goals and correctly identifies struggling schools in order to provide needed support instead of punishment.

• Foster high-quality data systems that are both longitudinal and complete and that protect student and educator privacy and improve instruction.

• Recognize the unique instructional and assessment needs of special populations, including students with disabilities and English language learners by designing standards and assessments that are accessible for all students.

3. Elevate the Profession: Great Educators and Leaders for Every Public School

• Respect teachers and education support professionals as professionals by ensuring they are part of critical decisions affecting students, schools and themselves.

• Ensure students have access to accomplished educators by ensuring high standards for entry into the profession and by offering incentives to teach in hard-to-staff schools.

• Encourage school leadership to be effective in both operational and instructional leadership.

• Create a prestigious national education institute and provide incentives to States to create world-class teacher preparation programs that attract the top tier of college graduates nationally.

4. Champion Adequate, Equitable, and Sustainable Funding for All Public Schools

---

* NEA's Initial Legislative Recommendations for Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—March 26, 2010 may be found at *www.nea.org/assets/docs/NEA__ESEA__Proposals.pdf*.

• Ensure adequate and equitable funding for schools and fully fund critical programs such as Title I and IDEA.
• Help States and districts to identify disparities in educational resources, supports, programs, opportunities, class sizes and personnel (including the distribution of accomplished educators) through required Equity and Adequacy plans.
• Provide support and foster research-based turnaround strategies for high priority schools.

1. PROMOTE INNOVATION IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS

It is clear that if we are to achieve world-class schools for every student within the next decade, we will need fresh approaches and ideas that produce dramatic leaps in achievement and growth among students, educators and communities. The Federal Government must embrace its role as a supporter of local and State initiatives to transform schools, rather than a micro-manager.

"Institutionalizing" innovation is a paradoxical goal, and yet this is the Federal Government's solemn responsibility: it must craft policies that are strict in their flexibility, incentivize change as a fixed concept, and establish continuity in the pursuit of continuous transformation.

How can we promote innovation in schools?

The Federal Government should increase and sustain funding in programs that are designed to foster innovation (such as the Investing in Innovation (i3) program funded under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009). Innovative proposals should be developed in collaboration with educators and include a sustainability plan. We believe that research, development and pilot programs in the following areas are particularly useful and necessary:

• Unique governance models for public schools, including staff-led schools.
• Wraparound, before- and after-school, summer programs and services.
• High-quality formative student assessments.
• Curricular reform that includes 21st century learning skills.
• Effective and rigorous teacher preparation and induction.
• Education delivery systems for students in rural or low-income school districts.
• Incorporation of education technology into classrooms and schools.
• Educator evaluation systems based on multiple, valid measures of performance and used to improve educators' practice through use of professional development systems that are job-embedded, aligned, and research-based.
• Longitudinal data systems that assist in determining students' instructional and other needs.
• Alternate structures to the school day and calendar year.
• Magnet and themed public schools—e.g., science, technology, the arts.
• Flexible high school pathways integrating preparation for career technical education and higher education.

In addition to incentivizing pilot activities in the above areas, the Federal Government should sponsor its own research and establish a public clearinghouse for innovation and promising practices.

What kinds of innovative models of education have proven successful?

We know that successful, innovative and autonomous models of public school education already exist. Such models invariably include deep and mutually beneficial partnerships with government, higher education, parent and community organizations, education unions, and businesses or philanthropic entities. These models also have produced new and imaginative ways to develop professional development, deliver student instruction and assessments, and offer time for team curricular planning.

One promising example is the Math & Science Learning Academy (MLSA), a new, union-designed, teacher-led public school within the Denver Public School System. Other examples of innovation that feature strong union-administrator-school district partnerships include:

• Say Yes to Education Foundation (Syracuse, NY).
• Evansville Vanderburgh School Corporation (Evansville, IN).
• Hamilton County Public Schools (Chattanooga, TN).
• University of Connecticut—CommPACT Schools (Hartford, CT).
• Milwaukee Partnership Academy (Milwaukee, WI).
• Seattle Flight School Initiative (Seattle, WA).

Why should we care about school "transformation" as part of innovation efforts?

School "transformation" is not a silver bullet. Rather, it entails numerous, coordinated and aggressive changes in policies, programs and behavior within school systems. School transformation must address school organization and structure; leadership and governance; staff recruiting, development and retention; instructional and curricular practices; support services and resources; parent and community involvement; overall school infrastructure, culture and climate; and other factors.

While intervention models that call for the replacement of existing leadership and the majority of staff, reorganization as a charter school or school closure are avenues to consider in limited circumstances, in many communities and regions they are not feasible options. Moreover, the choice of an intervention "model" alone does not equal reform: all of these models must be accompanied by transformation strategies described above if they are to improve and sustain student achievement and growth.

NEA Recommendations to Congress:

• Support and promote innovative public school models and programs that accelerate school transformation efforts and prepare students for citizenship, lifelong learning, and challenging post-secondary education and careers.

• Encourage innovation developed through partnerships—primarily between educators' unions, administrators, and school districts—that focus on helping students thrive and develop critical 21st century skills.

• Increase educational research and development to provide a clearinghouse for innovative promising practices.

2. PROVIDE STUDENTS WITH MULTIPLE WAYS TO SHOW WHAT THEY HAVE LEARNED

There is widespread consensus that NCLB placed a necessary focus on the achievement gaps between advantaged and disadvantaged student populations. It, however, has wreaked havoc on schools by mislabeling successful schools as failing, under-serving those schools that are truly struggling, and placing undue emphasis on federally mandated standardized student assessments as the accountability yardstick for entire school systems. This has resulted in intense discontent among educators and parents and scant, if any, gains in a narrow range of skills and content areas among students.

The next iteration of ESEA must prize authenticity above all else. That is, it must transparently identify and scale up valid measures of student learning in its totality—not just student performance on a test, and not just student growth in a series of tests, but all essential components of student learning as demonstrated by reliable and varied sources of evidence, beginning with the professional "assessment" of the classroom teacher. These valid measures of student learning must then be analyzed as one, but not the only, important facet of overall school effectiveness.

Accountability systems should be used primarily as part of a continuous improvement system designed to improve instruction rather than to punish schools. Promising instructional methods should be shared among colleagues and scaled up, and assessment systems should be used to identify which struggling schools are most in need of support, with the goal of delivering that needed support. Most importantly, accountability systems must be limited so as not to subsume the character of education itself. We must measure school performance, but we must do so in a way that enhances, rather than stifles, the educational process.

Can States develop authentic assessment systems that use multiple measures of student learning and school performance?

A complete and balanced authentic student assessment system is one factor essential to education improvement. A complete system should incorporate the concept of assessment purposes encompassing assessment *of, for, and as* learning. This concept is espoused by several experts in student assessment, and is used by several high-achieving countries such as Singapore, New Zealand, and Canada.

Research and evidence show that the current test-and-label system under NCLB is fundamentally flawed and recommend that States be allowed to develop their own accountability systems using student growth models instead of having to demonstrate "adequate yearly progress" by group status or successive group improvement (currently NCLB "safe harbor"). Beginning in 2005, the U.S. Department of Education approved a pilot program to allow States to use growth models to measure AYP. Twenty-two States and the District of Columbia have since applied to use growth models, and 15 States now have approved growth models: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, and Texas. We recommend that all States

be given the option to set attainable performance goals and be given credit for demonstrating growth in student learning.

In addition, we recommend three important changes to the current accountability framework:

(1) *Expand the current student growth models to include other valid indicators of student learning.* Student growth on standardized assessments is but one out of multiple indicators of student learning. Evidence of student growth (as measured by accurate and reliable assessments and differentiated by subgroup) must be augmented with other measures, which may include district-level assessments; school-level assessments; classroom-level written, oral, performance-based, or portfolio assessments; grades; and written evaluations. All measures must be rigorous and follow common protocols to allow comparisons across classrooms.

(2) *Require States to monitor multiple indicators of school performance beyond student learning.* These include graduation rates; post-secondary and career placement rates; attendance rates; student mobility or transfer rates; the number and percentage of students participating in rigorous coursework (including honors, AP, IB, dual enrollment, early college); and the number and percentage of students participating in sciences, STEM, humanities, foreign languages, creative and fine arts, health, and physical education programs. This robust system would provide the public with a more complete picture of the performance of schools in their community and their State, instead of the current system, which holds schools accountable based solely on how many students reach an arbitrary cut score on a standardized test in reading, math, and science on a particular day.

(3) *Replace the current "AYP" system*[1] *and corrective framework with a Continuous Improvement Plan that features multiple indicators to help States accomplish the following goals:*

- recognize areas of growth in all schools and States as part of a continuous improvement paradigm that all schools can improve;
- identify schools and programs that may offer innovative approaches or platforms for other schools;
- provide basic feedback to all schools on areas of possible growth or improvement (including support in one or more areas if warranted); and
- identify which schools are or are at risk of becoming high priority (i.e., either "persistently low-achieving" or that demonstrate "significant educational opportunity gaps") in order to direct intensive resources and intervention supports to them.

High priority schools (as identified by the State) would be required (*and* would be provided additional resources) to collect and submit additional data related to key school climate and success factors, including: leadership and staff experience and turnover statistics; class size (student-teacher ratio); number of National Board certified teachers; number of certified counselors, nurses and other support staff per student; school building and environmental ratings; school bullying violence statistics; descriptions of professional development and instructional improvement strategies, description of access to libraries, science laboratories, quality health care in the community, nutritional meals, before- and after-school, and community and family engagement activities. The primary purpose of providing such additional data would be to direct appropriate resources and interventions to such schools. Such schools would have to provide such additional data until they are no longer deemed a high priority school.

Can States and/or districts establish reliable longitudinal data systems that inform student learning and instruction in a timely manner?

The NEA supports State and local efforts to achieve high-quality longitudinal data systems that connect early learning to post-secondary (P–16) education systems and that provide timely and accurate information to educators about students to improve instruction. We support key aspects of high-functioning data systems, *provided that* such data systems sufficiently protect both student and educator privacy. No educational or performance data related to any individual should be made public, nor should ratings or levels be made public if there is a significant possibility that indi-

[1] NCLB currently requires schools to attain 100 percent student proficiency in math and literacy by the 2013–2014 school year. Schools must demonstrate AYP by setting and attaining increasingly higher target goals. Improvement must occur for every subgroup of students, i.e., low socioeconomic status, racial and ethnic groups, students with disabilities and students with limited English proficiency. Schools that receive title I funds and consistently fail to make adequate progress are then subject to a series of progressively harsher sanctions that range from allowing students to transfer to higher achieving schools and funding private tutoring to reconstitution, dismissal of staff, or even closure.

viduals could be identified through such publication. All ratings of educators informed by data systems that connect students to individual educators should be developed by and with educators, based on multiple means of evaluating educators, and should be aligned with collective bargaining agreements. All data systems must be associated with job-embedded professional development and planning time as an essential component in order for the data to be used for its intended purpose of improving instruction.

Can current efforts to revamp standards and assessments actually improve accountability systems?

The NEA supports the current effort among States to band together in consortia to voluntarily adopt a common core of high-quality standards and high-quality assessments aligned to those standards. Standards and assessments must be aligned with each other and with curricula, teacher preparation and professional development, and they must address the whole student and foster critical and high-order thinking skills and knowledge that will prepare students for a global and interdependent world in the 21st century and beyond. Assessments must include formative and summative components and be designed from the outset to accommodate the needs of special populations, including students with disabilities and English language learners.

Can we revise accountability systems to recognize the individual needs of students, such as those with disabilities or who are English language learners?

Recent developments in education have converged to create a critical need for valid, reliable, unbiased methods for conducting high-stakes assessments for all students, including those with disabilities and English language learners (ELL). Foremost is the movement toward ensuring accessibility, fairness and accountability for all students. In this effort, assessments play a key role in supplying evidence to parents, policymakers, politicians, and taxpayers about the degree to which students meet high standards.

To appropriately assess students with disabilities and ELLs, States should: (1) ensure that appropriate accommodations are available for students who need them, (2) use the principles of universal design for learning (UDL) in developing assessments for all students to increase accessibility, (3) ensure that valid, alternate assessments are available for those students who are unable to participate in regular assessments, (4) ensure that Individualized Education Program (IEP) teams understand the impact of alternative assessments on students' programs and graduation options, and (5) include measures of growth toward grade level targets, such as growth models that represent student progress over time.

NEA Recommendations to Congress:

- Require the use of multiple, valid measures of student learning and school performance.
- Use student growth over time—not simply a one-day snapshot of standardized test performance—as one component of student learning.
- Replace AYP with a Continuous Improvement Plan system that recognizes schools that achieve growth and correctly identifies struggling schools in order to provide meaningful support.
- Foster high-quality, longitudinal data systems that improve instruction and protect student and educator privacy.
- Recognize the unique instructional and assessment needs of special populations, including students with disabilities and English language learners.

3. ELEVATE THE PROFESSION: GREAT EDUCATORS AND LEADERS IN EVERY PUBLIC SCHOOL

A growing body of research confirms what school-based personnel have known for years—that the skills and knowledge of teachers and education support professionals (ESPs) are the greatest factor in how well students learn. In turn, the presence of strong and supportive school leaders is one of the most important factors for recruiting and retaining accomplished teachers and ESPs. But for too long, we have neglected the most important factors in ensuring a strong and healthy pipeline of qualified educators. Today, the average person will change jobs between three to five times in a lifetime.[2] Half of all teachers leave the classroom after 5 years.[3] Fewer schools have experienced educators. As an entire generation of educators en-

[2] See Department of Labor.
[3] See National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

ters retirement, there is an urgent need to address all aspects of working in public schools. It is time to elevate the profession.

The Federal Government must assist States to help seed future generations of educators at the earliest stages of undergraduate education and teacher recruitment all the way through teacher placement and retention. In particular, it is clear that we need a bold new center of excellence to bring prestige to the teaching profession: a national education institute to attract top college graduates and second-career professionals from across the country.

Also, we know that even the best teachers struggle to perform well without the presence of an effective instructional leader. Primarily principals and other administrators, school leaders could include other colleagues who serve as mentors and coaches. Federal policies, therefore, must foster well-prepared and effective administrators as well as leadership skills within school professionals of different ranks and positions. And it is time that we recognize and support education support professionals, without whom no school would be able to succeed.

Finally, we must ensure that great educators exist in every school, whether high- or low-achieving. The Federal Government must develop policies and provide funding that enables struggling schools and districts to offer incentives and conditions that will attract and retain the best educators in the Nation.

Why should we focus on each stage of the pathway from undergraduate education all the way to retention of veteran educators?

Research shows that, in order to infuse the educational system with great educators, each segment of the educator pipeline is important, including undergraduate education, recruitment of top graduates, graduate preparation, rigorous standards for entry into the profession, induction and placement, certification and licensure, mentoring, professional development, advancement and retention. Ultimately, we must develop systemic ways to recruit legions of top undergraduate students and professionals leaving other professions, to prepare them effectively, and to nurture and safeguard their path to and longevity within the classroom.

Can we foster excellence while establishing attainable standards within the teaching profession?

Teachers need to receive more than high-quality preparation within schools of education. The bulk of their learning comes from their experience in the classroom. We need policies that foster continuous learning in the form of high-quality, job-embedded professional development, mentoring programs, common planning and reflection time, and timely and continuous feedback from peers and school leadership.

Funds should be provided so that more teachers receive the opportunity to earn certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards; Board-certified teachers should be deemed highly qualified for accountability purposes.

Federal policy also should recognize that some teachers must teach multiple subjects because of their geography or student population. This may include rural, special education, or elementary and middle school teachers. Therefore, teacher quality standards, while rigorous, also must provide accommodations for teachers in special circumstances and give them reasonable, common sense opportunities to improve or increase their skills and breadth of certification.

What can we do to improve school leadership?

Similar to other educators, we must ensure that school principals and other administrators receive adequate preparation, mentoring and continuous professional development and support to improve their craft. They must receive timely and useful feedback from school staff as well as other administrators and be evaluated fairly and comprehensively. And they must have the resources and the staff necessary to manage a successful school.

We must also advance policies that advance the leadership skills of teachers and education support professionals. All staff benefit from opportunities to both exhibit and receive leadership and mentoring within their specific profession or job category.

Why do we need a national education institute as well as State and local reform within teacher and principal preparation programs?

Elevating the profession means ensuring that the most talented individuals in the Nation have access to world-class education preparation programs. The establishment of a National Education Institute (NEI), a highly competitive public academy for the Nation's most promising K–12 teacher candidates in diverse academic disciplines, would allow the Federal Government to attract and retain top undergraduate scholars as well as second-career professionals and prepare them as leaders of school reform within school systems around the Nation. NEI would provide

an intensive 1-year path (free tuition, room and board in exchange for 7-year commitment to service in select public schools) to full licensure, school placement, induction and lifetime professional development and mentoring opportunities from NEI faculty/graduates/master teachers, and annual meetings with other NEA alumni.

NEI also would partner with existing teacher preparation programs to establish a highly competitive "National Scholars" program in select universities and to foster regional and local excellence in teacher preparation, licensure and induction.

NEI would also sponsor a principal or leadership development program for top candidates who have served as teachers for at least 3 years and wish to enter an intensive program to become a principal or school leader in a priority school.

Can we do more to recognize and support education support professionals?

Education support professionals (ESPs) comprise a critical part of the education team. They include school secretaries, custodians, bus drivers, teacher aides, food service personnel, paraprofessional laboratory technicians, telephone operators, medical records personnel, bookkeepers, accountants, mail room clerks, computer programmers, library and reference assistants, audio-visual technicians, and others. Schools cannot function without high-functioning ESPs. The Federal Government should create incentives and provide funds to recruit certified and qualified ESPs, and ensure they are included in job growth and professional development opportunities.

Can we recruit and create incentives for high-quality educators to work in hard-to-staff schools?

The NEA supports financial and other incentives to encourage top educators to work in hard-to-staff schools. Such incentives are most effective when they are voluntary, locally agreed upon, and include non-financial incentives such as the availability of continuous professional development, mentoring, paraprofessional assistance, effective school leadership, sufficient resources, planning time, class size reduction, and other factors that improve job quality and effectiveness. Inexperienced or new teachers should not automatically be placed in hard-to-staff schools until they have attained sufficient preparation and classroom experience.

NEA Recommendations to Congress:

- Focus on intensive efforts in the areas of undergraduate preparation and educator recruitment, preparation, certification and licensure, induction, professional development, mentoring, tenure, advancement and retention.
- Foster continuous learning and rigorous yet attainable standards within the teaching profession.
- Prioritize school leadership at all levels and positions within schools.
- Create a prestigious national education institute and provide incentives to States to create world-class teacher preparation programs that attract the top tier of college graduates nationally.
- Recognize and support the contributions and achievement of education support professionals.
- Offer financial and non-financial incentives to teachers who teach in hard-to-staff schools.

4. CHAMPION ADEQUATE, EQUITABLE, AND SUSTAINABLE FUNDING FOR ALL PUBLIC SCHOOLS

States and local school districts play a critical role in providing adequate and equitable resources to all of their schools. Likewise, the Federal Government must play an active supporting role to ensure that a student does not miss out on key opportunities by virtue of their zip code. Programs like Title I and IDEA must be fully funded because they are critical in providing necessary and sustained funds to schools serving disadvantaged students and special populations. States must be required to develop "adequacy and equity" plans that would measure and address disparities in educational resources, opportunities, programs and quality among communities and districts. Additionally, the Federal Government should reserve a portion of its funds to provide intensive support to struggling schools and provide research, assistance and guidance to foster sustainability of high-quality education programs, even in times of economic hardship.

What is the Federal role in ensuring adequacy and equity in schools?

The original goal of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was to provide educational opportunities to poor and disadvantaged students. That goal should endure in the future. While the bulk of educational funding comes from State and local coffers, the Federal Government must increase, concentrate and sustain formula funding in schools whose students lack the same opportunities and resources as

other schools. In addition, it can provide competitive funding to encourage States to bridge gaps in educational, skills and opportunities among schools.

Finally, it can develop policies that encourage States to play a more active role in monitoring and addressing (through "Adequacy and Equity Plans") specific success factors and disparities in schools that are persistently low-achieving or that have significant educational opportunity gaps. By requiring States to detail plans for helping close these fiscal and resource gaps in their Adequacy and Equity Plans, the U.S. Department of Education and the public can begin to provide critical support for State and local efforts to provide adequate and equitable funding for all schools.

Can we reserve our most intensive focus and resources for our high priority schools?

The Title I School Improvement Grants (SIG) Program should be revamped to require use of only research-based models of school reform to help meet the needs of more high priority schools—those at risk of becoming persistently low-achieving or that have significant educational opportunity gaps. The SIG program should be modified to allow State and local educational agencies clearer and immediate access to use local, State or regional turnaround teams, to provide for intensive team teaching and collaborative instructional strategies rather than firing half of the staff, and to require parental/caregiver and community engagement rather than closing a school or turning it over to a charter management organization.

NEA Recommendations to Congress:

- Ensure adequate and equitable funding for schools, and sustain and fully fund critical programs such as Title I and IDEA.
- Help States and districts to identify disparities in educational resources, supports, programs, opportunities, class sizes and personnel through Equity and Adequacy plans.
- Provide support and foster research-based turnaround strategies for high priority schools.

PRINCIPLES FOR THE REAUTHORIZATION OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (ESEA) 2010

The reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) must focus on policies that would help transform public schools into high-quality learning centers by recognizing the shared responsibility among local, State, and Federal Governments. Given the law's complexity, each proposed change must be carefully considered to fully understand its effect on our Nation's schools and students. Therefore, the National Education Association encourages Congress to listen to the voices of educators in developing legislative proposals and offers these principles for ESEA reauthorization:

- **The Federal Government should serve as a partner to support State efforts to transform public schools.**
  - The 21st century requires a partnership among all levels of government—Federal, State and local—to make up for the historic inequitable distribution of tools and resources to our Nation's students.
  - We should support effective models of innovation (such as community schools, career academies, well-designed and accountable charter schools, magnet schools, inclusion of 21st century skills, and educational technology), and create a more innovative educational experience to prepare students for challenging post-secondary experiences and the world of work.
- **The Federal Government plays a critical role in ensuring that all children—especially the most disadvantaged—have access to an education that will prepare them to succeed in the 21st century.** The Federal Government should focus on high-quality early childhood education, parental/family involvement and mentoring programs, as well as quality healthcare for children to help overcome issues of poverty that may impede student progress. It should support community school initiatives in an effort to address these issues comprehensively; must invest in proven programs such as knowledge-rich curricula and intensive interventions; and must provide resources to improve teaching and learning conditions through smaller classes and school repair and modernization.
- **A revamped accountability system must correctly identify schools in need of assistance and provide a system of effective interventions to help them succeed.** The schools most in need of improvement deserve targeted, effective, research-based interventions designed to address their specific needs. States and school districts should be given significant flexibility through a transparent process to meet agreed-upon outcomes, using innovative data systems and a variety

of growth models based on movement towards proficiency. School quality and student learning must be based on multiple valid and appropriate measures and indicators.

• **The Federal Government should respect the profession of teachers and education support professionals by providing supports and resources to help students succeed.** Hard-to-staff schools, especially those with high concentrations of disadvantaged students or those that have consistently struggled to meet student achievement targets, need significant supports and resources, including additional targeted funding to attract and retain quality educators; induction programs with intensive mentoring components; and professional development for educational support professionals.

• **The Federal Government should require States to detail how they will remedy inequities in educational tools, opportunities and resources.** Funding should be targeted to schools with the highest concentrations of poverty. To build on the historic investment through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, the Federal Government should guarantee funding for critical Federal programs, such as Title I of ESEA and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

• **State and local collective bargaining for school employees must be respected.**

• **Targeted programs that support students and schools with unique needs—such as English Language Acquisition, Impact Aid, rural schools and Indian education—should be maintained and expanded.**

• **The Federal Government should serve as a research clearinghouse, making available to educators a wealth of knowledge about how best to teach students and help schools improve practices.**

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Van Roekel. I was remiss in not mentioning that you came from the Ice Cream Capital of the World.

[Laughter.]

For those of you who do not know, that is Le Mars, IA.

Mr. Butt, welcome.

STATEMENT OF CHARLES BUTT, CHAIRMAN AND CEO, H–E–B, SAN ANTONIO, TX

Mr. BUTT. Good afternoon, Senator. It is truly an honor to address this distinguished committee.

Our business had its beginning in 1905 when my grandmother established a little grocery store to keep her family afloat, and we are still going in Texas today.

Recently, a major manufacturer, which opened a plant in Texas, had 100,000 job openings. Less than 5 percent of the applicants made it through the selection process. This illustrates our national dilemma.

A McKinsey & Company study, which has been mentioned here, showed an education gap with the top countries such as Korea and Finland of $3 billion to $5 billion per day. I repeat the number because it is an astonishingly big number. In McKinsey's opinion, the existing gap in achievement imposed the equivalent of a permanent national recession.

Now, their methodology is based on the supposition that in the 15 years after the 1983 report, A Nation at Risk, we had lifted student achievement to what they consider achievable performance. They then asked what was the economic impact in the 10 following years between 1998 and 2008 of not having raised achievement levels. In addition to the massive gap with global leaders in education, they identified three internal gaps. The racial gap between whites and African-Americans and Latinos. They estimate that at 2 to 4 percent of GDP. From students with families below $25,000 in household income to those with higher incomes, estimated at 3 to

5 percent of GDP. And for States that are below the national average, if they were brought up to the average, again 3 to 5 percent of GDP.

Now, these are big numbers and hypothetical ones, but they do strike a responsive chord in me. A very small town, a very poor town on the Texas/Mexican border, Hidalgo, Texas, through great leadership has sent students to top national schools year after year.

An urban, highly diverse, 50 percent economically disadvantaged district in the Houston area with over 100,000 students and 98 language and dialect traditions is tied for first place in graduation rates in the United States among the 100 largest districts. Success in large urban public school settings is clearly possible.

Let us say the McKinsey numbers are overstated and the economic gap is less than they say, which I personally doubt. It is still devastatingly unaffordable for our Nation. Even if you divide it in half, it is unaffordable.

In the success stories I mentioned, leadership is the key. In one case, it is a long-serving mayor who is dedicated to a great school. In the other, it is a smart, energized superintendent who uses data well, innovates extensively, and is not daunted by challenges.

Now, if you have sat in a high school class recently, you will be impressed with the fact in a low-income school, particularly, but not exclusively, that schools are inheriting an over-entertained, distracted student. This is the product of the shallow learning culture that we have all created. This calls, in my view, for a more powerful role on the part of the teacher than he or she has ever played before, what I call a leadership teacher. Perhaps it is unfortunate that the schools are required to play this social role, but in my view it is important to our success.

School boards often micro-manage but they miss their macro responsibility of choosing a superintendent and supporting her or him. In their defense, our system has produced too few superintendents who drive results. Our debate frequently misses where the vital choices are made—school boards and choices of superintendents who impact the principals and ultimately teachers. The appropriate role of Federal, State, and municipal government and funding are, of course, crucial issues. Technology and full-day, quality pre-K are big missings. Title I funds are vital.

The diversity of views from education writers is wide, from charters to blow up the system, test more, test less. A key point is that we have success models now but are not replicating them. If you can find a way to stimulate the rapid development of results-oriented superintendents and principals, it will be impactful because they are the ones who fight to find and keep great teachers, which is where it counts.

Underlying it all, Senator, is America's will to win. Your leadership and stimulation of our national thought process about education and its vital role can be transformative. It is crucial that we see education as an investment and not a cost.

Thank you for your service to the Nation.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Butt follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF CHARLES BUTT

SUMMARY

All industries are brutally competitive today, especially during this recession, and most companies, like ours, have multiple productivity, process and efficiency efforts underway. Workplace-ready high school graduates are crucial to driving these programs forward. Firms are pushing for more college-bound people in math, science and technology.

Companies need both and it's vital for the Nation that we produce both.

A 2009 McKinsey & Company study showed that our education gap with top performing nations costs the United States $3 to $5 billion per day in GDP.

Today the existing gaps in educational achievement impose the equivalent of a permanent national recession, as demonstrated by McKinsey's study of the Economic Costs of the Achievement Gap.

If by 1998, 15 years after the publication of A Nation at Risk, we had improved African-American and Latino performance to that of white students, U.S. GDP would be $310 to $525 billion larger annually.

If we had lifted the performance of students with family incomes of less than $25,000 to the same level of students with families earning more than $25,000, our 2008 GDP would have been $400–670 billion larger. And for individuals, avoidable shortfalls in academic achievement impose heavy and often tragic consequences via lower earnings, poor health, and higher rates of incarceration.

Only 20–25 percent of new jobs in Texas require a 4-year college education. Nevertheless, much of the impetus continues to be focused on the vital national goal of preparing high schoolers for college.

Developing globally competitive workplace skills calls increasingly for "teaching as leadership" rather than solely communicating subject content. Great teaching can open young minds to a wider, challenging world.

Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, it's a *great honor* to address you and this *distinguished* committee.

Our business had its beginning in 1905 when my grandmother opened a small grocery to keep her family afloat. Since the 1930's, we've given 5 percent of our pretax income to public and charitable causes and consider ourselves close to the communities we serve. We now employ 75,000 and are the largest private employer in Texas.

Recently a major manufacturer opening a large new Texas plant had 100,000 applicants. Less than 5 percent made it through the entire selection process for these new manufacturing jobs. This illustrates the dilemma of a society less than well-prepared for this century.

A 2009 McKinsey & Company study showed that our *education gap with top performing nations* costs the United States *$3 to $5 billion per day in GDP*.

In McKinsey's opinion the *existing gaps in educational achievement impose the equivalent of a permanent national recession*.

The McKinsey methodology is based on the supposition that in the *15 years after the 1983 report A Nation at Risk we had lifted student achievement to what they consider "achievable performance."* What then, they asked, was the *economic impact in the 10 following years, between 1998 and 2008, of not having raised achievement levels*?

In addition to the $3 to $5 billion daily gap (accumulating annually to 9 to 16 percent of GDP) with nations that are global education leaders, they identified three major internal gaps in our own country.

- The racial achievement gap between Whites and African-Americans and Latinos is estimated to have been 2 to 4 percent of GDP—$300 to $500 billion annually.
- The achievement gap between students from families with income under $25,000 and those with higher incomes is estimated to have been 3 to 5 percent of GDP or $400 to $600 billion.
- If States performing under the national average had reached the average we would have gained 3 to 5 percent in GDP— again in the range of $500 billion based on McKinsey's model.

Obviously, these are big numbers and hypothetical ones but they strike a responsive chord with me.

Nevertheless, a small, *very* poor town on the Texas/Mexico border, Hidalgo, TX, through great leadership, has sent students to top national schools year after year.

An urban, highly diverse, *50 percent economically disadvantaged district* in the Houston area with over 100,000 students and *98 language and dialect traditions* is

tied for first place in graduation rates in the United States among the 100 largest districts. *Truly inspiring! Success in large urban public school settings is clearly possible!*

Senators, these things jump out at me.

Let's say the McKinsey numbers are overstated and the economic gap is less than they say, which I seriously doubt— it's still devastatingly unaffordable.

In the success stories I mentioned, leadership is the key. In one case a long serving, dedicated Mayor, in the other a smart, energized superintendent who uses data well, innovates extensively, and isn't daunted by challenges.

School boards often micromanage but miss their macro responsibility of choosing a superintendent and supporting her or him. In their defense our system has produced too few superintendents who drive results.

Our debate is too often missing where the vital choices are made: school boards and choices of superintendents who impact principals and ultimately teachers.

The appropriate role of Federal and State Governments and funding are, of course, key issues. Technology and full-day, quality pre-k are big missings. Title I funds are vital.

The diversity of views from education writers is wide—from charters to "blow up the system," test more, test less. We have success models now but we aren't replicating them.

In the business world leadership is key. Many business ideas don't apply to education but I believe this one does.

If you can find a way to stimulate the rapid development of results-oriented superintendent and principal leadership it will be impactful because they are the ones who fight to find and keep great teachers—which is where it counts.

Underlying it all is America's will to win—your leadership and stimulation of the national thought process about education's vital role can be transformative.

As a nation, it's crucial we see education as an investment, not a cost.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Butt.

Now we will turn to Mr. Castellani.

STATEMENT OF JOHN CASTELLANI, PRESIDENT, BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. CASTELLANI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Enzi, members of the committee. I very much welcome the opportunity to appear before you today to address this vitally important task of reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I am appearing on behalf of the Business Coalition for Student Achievement. BCSA is a business-based education reform coalition jointly led by my organization, the Business Roundtable, and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The coalition is chaired by Accenture's CEO, Bill Green; State Farm CEO Ed Rust; and the former CEO of Intel, Craig Barrett. Our members include business leaders that represent every sector of the U.S. economy, all of whom believe that improving America's K–12 education system is necessary to provide a strong foundation for both U.S. competitiveness and for individuals in the country to succeed in today's rapidly changing world.

The Business Coalition includes grassroots involvement from local and State chambers, roundtables, and business groups in rural, suburban and urban communities across the country.

The recent deep recession and the currently painfully high rates of U.S. unemployment have cast longstanding U.S. weakness in education into sharp relief. Lagging U.S.-education attainment has real-world consequences for individuals and for the economy as a whole. Workers with less education suffer the highest rates of unemployment and an under-educated workforce reduces economic growth.

The current U.S. unemployment rate announced last week is 9.7 percent, which we know all too well. For Americans who do not have a high school diploma, it is 15.6 percent compared to 5 percent for college graduates, an almost 11 point differential. In the world that our companies and our members face every year, which has been cited by other panelists, where the gap between what we are able to achieve here in the United States and what our competitors are able to achieve around the world—it is a gap that is not standing still. It is not static. The world is not standing still. Despite the recession that is global in scope, the worldwide knowledge-based economy continues to advance and more and more of today's jobs require an even higher level of skill and education, not just the high-tech and professional jobs but all jobs.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that the fastest-growing occupations are those that require higher levels of education and greater technical competence.

We all have a stake in the success of the American public schools and the students, and that is why our coalition used reauthorizing ESEA as a top priority for Congress. Today we are releasing our principles for reauthorization, and they are included in my written testimony.

The No Child Left Behind Act focused attention on the need to close the achievement gap and help all students reach the highest grade level proficiency in reading and math. Now we believe is the time to ramp up evidence-based reforms and innovations to close the two achievement gaps. We need to close the gap in education performance between poor and minority students and their more advantaged peers in the United States. We also need to close the gap between U.S. students and their international peers.

The bottom line is that U.S. students should graduate from high school ready for post-secondary education and training without the need for remediation by post-secondary educators, employers, or the military.

Education reform is in our view an economic security issue, a national security issue, and a vital social and moral issue. We believe it is not the time to point fingers and play a blame game because we believe we all can and must do better.

On behalf of the Business Coalition for Student Achievement, I urge you and your colleagues to move ahead with a bipartisan approach to reauthorization of ESEA. I would point out that we come to this—and I certainly come to this—not as an education expert but as employers who understand the importance of strong and successful public schools.

We look forward to working with you and the members of the committee to enact reform that does right by our students and prepares America's future workforce for the jobs of tomorrow. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Castellani follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOHN CASTELLANI

SUMMARY

Mr. Chairman, Senator Enzi, members of the committee, my name is John Castellani and I serve as President of Business Roundtable, an association of chief executive officers of leading U.S. companies. I welcome the opportunity to address

the vitally important task of reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) on behalf of the Business Coalition for Student Achievement. BCSA is a business-based education reform coalition jointly led by Business Roundtable and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The Business Coalition includes grassroots involvement from local and State chambers, roundtables and business groups in rural, suburban and urban communities across the country.

The recent deep recession and current painfully high rates of U.S. unemployment have cast longstanding U.S. weaknesses in education into sharp relief. Lagging U.S. education attainment has real-world consequences for individuals and for the economy as a whole.

Workers with less education suffer the highest rates of unemployment and an undereducated workforce reduces economic growth. The current U.S. unemployment rate announced last week is 9.7 percent, but for Americans who don't have a high school diploma it is 15.6 percent compared to 5.0 percent for college graduates—a 10 point differential. According to a McKinsey analysis, if America had closed the international achievement gap between 1983 and 1998 and raised its education performance to the level of nations such as Finland and Korea, U.S. economic output would have been between $1.3 trillion and $2.3 trillion higher in 2008, an increase equal to 9 to 16 percent of GDP.

More and more of today's jobs require ever-higher levels of skill and education—not only high-tech and professional jobs, but all jobs. The Bureau of Labor statistics reports that the fastest growing occupations are those that require higher levels of education and greater technical competence.

That is why the Business Coalition for Student Achievement views reauthorizing ESEA as top priority for Congress. Today we are releasing Principles for Reauthorization—they are included in my written testimony. Now is the time to ramp up evidence-based reforms and innovations that close two achievement gaps. We need to close the gap in education performance between poor and minority students and their more advantaged peers in the U.S. We also need to close the gap between U.S. students and their international peers.

The bottom line: U.S. students should graduate from high school ready for post-secondary education and *training* without need for remediation by post-secondary educators, employers or the military. Education reform is an economic security issue, a national security issue and a vital social and moral issue. This is not the time to point fingers and play the blame game. We all can and must do better. On behalf of the Business Coalition for Student Achievement, I urge you and your colleagues to move ahead with a bipartisan approach to ESEA reauthorization.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Enzi, members of the committee. Good morning. My name is John Castellani and I serve as President of the Business Roundtable, an association of chief executive officers of leading U.S. companies with more than $5 trillion in annual revenues and more than 12 million employees. Business Roundtable member companies comprise nearly a third of the total value of the U.S. stock markets and pay more than 60 percent of all corporate income taxes paid to the Federal Government.

I welcome the opportunity to appear before you today to address the vitally important task of reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act on behalf of the Business Coalition for Student Achievement (BCSA), a business-based education reform coalition jointly led by Business Roundtable and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. The coalition is chaired by William (Bill) D. Green, Chairman & CEO of Accenture, Edward B. Rust Jr., Chairman & CEO of State Farm, and Craig Barrett, former Chairman & CEO of Intel.

BCSA's members include businesses of every size and grassroots business organizations, including local and State chambers of commerce and business roundtables. The small, medium and large businesses that comprise the coalition represent every sector of the U.S. economy in rural, suburban and urban communities. They have joined the coalition because they believe that improving America's K–12 education system is necessary to provide a strong foundation for both U.S. competitiveness and for individuals to succeed in today's rapidly changing world.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that you are holding this hearing today because BCSA believes that reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—or ESEA—should be a top priority for Congress. The No Child Left Behind Act, as the most recent iteration of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, helped focus attention on the need to close the achievement gap and help all students throughout the Nation reach at least grade-level proficiency in reading and mathematics. It put a spotlight on the need to improve results for special needs students and English Language Learners.

We believe that now is the time to build on No Child Left Behind and ramp up evidence-based reforms and innovations that close two achievement gaps. We need to close the gap in education performance between poor and minority students and their more advantaged peers in the United States as well as the achievement gap between U.S. students and their international peers.

The recent deep recession, the current painfully high rates of U.S. unemployment and underemployment, and the reordering of the world's economy in the wake of a global financial crisis have cast longstanding U.S. weaknesses in education into sharp relief. America's low high school graduation and college completion rates represent systemic failure that leaves our children inadequately prepared in an increasingly competitive world.

According to the U.S. Department of Education, only 19 percent of American ninth graders graduate from high school and then enter and graduate from college on time. Only 28 percent of American students pursuing associates degrees complete them in 3 years and only 56 percent of American college students complete a bachelor's degree within 6 years. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the United States, which once enjoyed the world's highest rate of high school completion—a status it lost 40 years ago—ranks 18th out of 24 developed nations in terms of high school graduation rates. Similarly, as recently as 1995, America was tied for first place in terms of college graduation rates but now ranks 14th. Worse, the United States is now the only developed nation with a younger generation that has a lower level of high school or equivalent education than the older generations.

Lagging U.S. educational attainment has real-world consequences for individuals and for the economy as a whole. Workers with less education suffer the highest rates of unemployment. According to the most recent data released last week, the current U.S. unemployment rate is 9.7 percent, but unemployment among Americans with less than a high school diploma is 15.6 percent while unemployment among college graduates is 5.0 percent. The difference is staggering—and we know those workers with less education will be the last hired as the economy recovers.

McKinsey and Company has modeled the impact of low educational attainment on national economic performance. According to their analysis, if America had closed the international achievement gap between 1983 and 1998 and raised its performance to the level of nations such as Finland and Korea, U.S. economic output would have been between $1.3 trillion and $2.3 trillion higher in 2008, an increase equal to 9 to 16 percent of GDP.

Two months ago, the Alliance for Excellent Education released a study of the economic impact of reducing the dropout rate by half in 45 major metropolitan areas. The impact on personal earnings, consumer spending and local and regional job creation is undeniable. I would expect to see similar results in rural communities.

The world is not standing still. Despite a recession that was global in scope, the worldwide knowledge-based economy continues to advance. More and more of today's jobs require ever-higher levels of skill and education—not only high-tech and professional jobs, but all jobs. In December, Business Roundtable released the findings and recommendations from The Springboard Project—an independent commission it convened—to ensure that American workers thrive after the economy rebounds. As part of the project we conducted a survey of employers in July of last year which revealed that employers perceive a large and growing gap between the educational and technical skills requirement of the positions they need to fill and the preparedness of U.S. workers to fill them. Their perception is, in fact, reality. The Bureau of Labor statistics reports that the fastest growing occupations are those that require higher levels of education and greater technical competence.

The situation is clear. Jobs increasingly require higher levels of educational attainment and technical proficiency and Americans are increasingly less qualified to fill them. It is this growing mismatch that motivates business leaders like Bill Green, Craig Barrett and Ed Rust to become so personally involved in education reform. They, together with many other U.S. business leaders, have rolled up their sleeves and joined BCSA's effort to advocate for an ESEA reauthorization that does a better job for America's children.

In many respects, the education reform landscape is very different since the No Child Left Behind Act was signed into law 8 years ago. Consider these four noteworthy developments:

• The Common Core State Standards Initiative, led by the National Governors Association and Council of Chief State School Officers, is finalizing a draft of K–12 standards in math and English/Language Arts. This voluntary effort by States to develop a common set of internationally-benchmarked, college- and career-ready standards that all students, in every grade, in every State and community across

the United States should meet in two core subjects, with science coming next, is truly remarkable.

• Better transparency and public reporting of student achievement data have put a spotlight on high school graduation rates, and particularly on the approximately 2,000 high schools (about 12 percent of American high schools) that produce more than half of all U.S.-high school dropouts.

• Likewise, it is no longer acceptable to obscure achievement gaps by reporting a school's average student achievement without disaggregating the data on performance results for all groups of students. States and school districts have deployed new data systems to measure and track student, teacher and school performance.

• The stimulus bill included $100 billion in Federal support for new and existing K–12 education programs at the State, school district and individual school levels. Since the Administration established performance-based requirements to obtain competitively awarded "Race to the Top" and "Investing in Innovation" Federal education grants, we have seen how competitive grants can provide incentives to change long-standing education policies.

Taking account of this changed landscape, and the need to get more than incremental improvement BCSA has developed principles for effective, results-oriented education reform in the context of ESEA reauthorization. We are releasing the following principles today:

Expect Internationally Benchmarked Standards and Assessments to Reflect Readiness for College, Workplace and International Competition.—The standards and assessment provisions in a reauthorized ESEA must:

• Incorporate challenging State-developed common internationally benchmarked standards and aligned assessments tied to college and workplace readiness.

• Continue annual assessments of student achievement in math and reading, while working to establish annual assessments of student achievement in science.

• Invest in R&D to develop a next generation of assessments to measure progress in other subjects and skills needed for college and workplace readiness.

• Base annual progress measurements on rigorous measures of year-to-year growth in academic achievement tied to specific goals, including goals for specific subgroups of students.

• Provide for the fair and comprehensive participation of special needs and English language learning students with particular focus on "at-risk" students and schools.

Hold All Schools Accountable While Putting a Laser-like Focus on Ending "Dropout Factories."—Schools must continue to be accountable for getting all students (and subgroups) proficient in at least science, mathematics and reading. In addition, special attention must be placed on the less-than-3 percent of high schools that produce half of America's dropouts. Specifically, this must include:

• Maintaining the current law's consequences for schools that are chronically under-performing and ensuring that States and districts undertake proven interventions to put an end to "business as usual" at chronically low-performing schools.

• Increasing support for the School Improvement Grants program, while simplifying current Federal guidance to target resources and support to those schools in most dire need of reform.

• Supporting initiatives to develop new personnel and governance policies in low-performing schools.

• Targeting distribution of effective educators to high-needs schools through updated incentive programs.

Measure and Reward Teacher and Administrator Success.—High-performing schools need highly effective teachers and administrators, and the best way to do that is to:

• Change the current law's definition of "highly qualified teachers" to the definition of "highly effective teachers" used in the Race to the Top Fund.

• Redesign and strengthen ineffective professional development programs to make them more "teacher-driven" using research proven strategies that boost student achievement.

• Improve the use of data systems to measure teacher effectiveness and design compensation systems based on pay for performance models, not just seniority and additional training.

• Implement policies and practices to fairly and efficiently remove ineffective educators.

• Continue to focus on policies that promote equal distribution of highly effective teachers. Align teacher preparation at the post-secondary level with expectations for

teacher effectiveness and common, internationally benchmarked, college- and career-ready standards.

• Invest in high quality alternative certification initiatives and programs that bring talented individuals, including majors in STEM fields and second career teachers, into the teaching pool.

• Expand the Teacher Incentive Fund with a priority on STEM.

Foster a "Client-Centered Approach" by Districts and Schools.—Good organizations, whether public or private, know that without an intensive focus on its clients, long term success is impossible. ESEA should require the following "client-centered" provisions:

• Easy to understand report cards that include data on the performance of each student group and that do not rely on the use of statistical gimmicks and sleights-of-hand to sugar-coat results and undermine accountability measures.

• High quality Supplemental Educational Services (SES) programs that require districts to provide students and parents with timely and easily understood information on their options to choose either free tutoring or the ability to move to higher performing public schools.

• Increased support for parent involvement programs.

• Additional involvement of community and business groups in school improvement, transformation, and turnaround activities.

Leverage Data Systems to Inform Instruction, Improvement, and Interventions.—The use of data to inform and improve student learning has been one of the most important developments in education reform over the past decade. ESEA reauthorization should build upon these efforts, including recent efforts supported by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA), and develop fully functioning statewide data systems that:

• Enable teachers to access user-friendly data to help support instruction.

• Offer timely, accurate collection, analysis and use of high quality longitudinal data that align to district systems to inform decisionmaking and improve teacher effectiveness and student achievement.

• Provide educator training on the use of data to differentiate instruction for students, especially for those who are not yet proficient and those who are more advanced.

• Integrate existing data systems so that teachers and parents get a comprehensive and secure profile that includes information necessary to customize instruction.

• Provide leadership with the full range of information they need to allocate resources or to develop, enhance or close programs.

Invest in School Improvement and Encourage Technology and Other Innovations to Improve Student Achievement.—Improving schools in the 21st century is not a static process, it requires constant innovation and research focused on what works. ESEA must include support for high-quality research and proven reform initiatives by:

• Using the competitive approach in the Race to the Top and Investing in Innovation funds to support the next generation of partners (non-profit *and* for-profit) to assist with school reform efforts.

• Supporting R&D to improve school, educator, and student performance as well as reforms that revamp unproductive school governance, compensation regimes, and building use.

• Supporting expansion of high-quality charter schools and virtual schools and holding them accountable for improved academic achievement with the same expectation that we have for public schools.

• Supporting academic-focused extended learning time initiatives (including after school and summer programs) for at-risk students.

• Reforming secondary schools and holding them accountable for increasing the graduation rate (using the common definition adopted by the Nation's governors), and graduating students who are ready for college and work.

• Offering opportunities for students to enroll in advanced coursework (such as Advanced Placement or International Baccalaureate), early-college high schools, or dual enrollment programs that prepare students for college and careers.

• Engaging students by demonstrating that standards based curriculum has real world applications in acquisition of knowledge and increased opportunities for career exploration and exposure.

• Utilizing advanced communications technologies to improve delivery and increase effectiveness for students and teachers with optimization of online learning tools and multi-platform devices and systems.

• Encourage parent engagement by using technology to provide information about their child's achievement and how to best support remediation or determine the need for increased support where appropriate.

Establish a Dedicated Strategy and Funding Stream to Improve STEM Education.—For students to graduate from high school with the foundation, knowledge, and skills they need in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), ESEA should:

• Support a targeted "innovation fund," which focuses funds towards taking proven STEM programs to scale while encouraging the development and research of new strategies to increase student achievement in STEM subject areas.

• Support collaborations (schools, districts, States, communities and businesses along with other partners) to develop high-quality online and in-person professional development for STEM teachers.

• Continue development and support of student curricula, inquiry-based learning, project-based learning and hands-on activities in addition to other proven strategies to improve student achievement in STEM.

As you can see from these principles Mr. Chairman, BCSA has gone to some length to develop comprehensive recommendations for ESEA reauthorization. We believe this is one of the most important issues you will address this year. We strongly endorse ESEA reauthorization. Education undergirds everything we do, as individuals and as a society. We cannot make sustained progress on creating stable, long-term employment, on boosting economic growth or in solving our greatest national challenges, such as responding to terrorism or addressing climate change and the need for energy security without addressing the underlying weakness of our educational system. Absent serious, effective, results-oriented reform, America's underperforming educational system will continue to fail many of America's youth and hold back the U.S. economy. Education reform is an economic security issue, a national security issue and a vital social and moral issue. This is not the time to point fingers and play the blame game. We all can and must do better.

Mr. Chairman, I applaud you for holding this hearing today. On behalf of the Business Coalition for Student Achievement, I urge you to move ahead with a bipartisan approach for ESEA reauthorization. We come to this not as education experts but as employers and taxpayers who understand the importance of strong and successful public schools. Companies and local, State and national business organizations are committed to ensuring U.S. high school graduates are prepared for post-secondary education, careers and participation in our democracy. We look forward to working with you and the members of this committee to enact reform with bipartisan support that does right by our students and prepares America's future workforce for the jobs of tomorrow.

Thank you again Mr. Chairman, Senator Enzi and members of the committee. I appreciate this opportunity to express Business Roundtable's views on this important legislation. I welcome your questions.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Castellani. Thank you all for your excellent testimony and for being here.

We will start a 5-minute round of questions.

Mr. Schleicher, you pointed out that in some of the OECD countries—I do not know how many, but they tend to track the top 10 percent of their graduating classes to be teachers. I assume you are talking about the top 10 percent—is that out of college or out of high school?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. College.

The CHAIRMAN. Out of college. Now, I do not know how they do that because, Mr. Van Roekel, you talked about the fact that it is teachers who are going to impact our students and we want to have the best teachers. I do not understand how you do that. How do they attract the top 10 percent when in this country, if you are in the top 10 percent, you go out and make a lot of money. How do they do that? You said it was not just payment.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. You have countries where it is payment. If you look to Korea, Korea pays its teachers about twice GDP per capita, twice as much as the United States in relative terms.

Finland, the country that has the most attractive teaching profession, does not pay teachers very well but creates a set of incentives and a working environment that is very attractive for knowledge workers, a working environment that offers lots of opportunities for professional development, has well-defined career paths. It is not sort of a single job, but you can move up, and it is very open outward and inward mobility. The field of work is very, very attractive for people who are knowledge workers despite average pay. They are not that well paid, but they get 9 to 10 applicants for each post now.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Van Roekel, how do we attract the top 10 percent into teaching?

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. I think there are two things that we should be looking at. No. 1, we will have to deal with the issue of compensation because in our economy here in the States, we are competing with other occupations that require a college degree, and we simply are not competitive. A friend of mine who is an attorney—we both started the same year. As an associate, he started at $11,000. I started at $6,100. I asked him just about 6 months ago, what does an associate make in your law firm now in Phoenix, and he said about $125,000. We cannot get teachers at $35,000 starting. It is four times as much. That is one thing.

The second thing is that within the teaching profession, we have many first-generation college graduates. Many of my colleagues—we were the first in our family to have the honor and privilege of going to college. The top achieving one-third of students who are in the poor category have the same probability of going to college as the lowest one-third in academic ability for those who have resources. I think there is a great potential in reaching out to those very high achieving who have commitments to their community, they are first-generation, and would love to have an opportunity to go to college, and I believe that is a great source of future teachers.

The CHAIRMAN. In all my years dealing with education and being involved in different experiments and trials and things like that, the one thing that has always come through—every time I talk to teachers—I am talking about elementary school teachers, not so much high school—especially those that are just starting out—they have just been there 1 year, 2 years. We have a big drop-off. They are there 1 or 2 years and then they leave. The biggest single factor that has come through to me time and time and time again is the size of the classroom. It is how many students they have to teach. I cannot tell you how many times I have talked to teachers who have in elementary school, first, second, third, fourth grades, 10 or 12 kids and it is wonderful. You talk to others that have 25 and they are just inundated. They just give up.

We had a goal one time. This Congress stated the goal of reducing elementary classes down to, in the early grades, less than 15, if I am not mistaken. I could be corrected on that, but something like that. Do you find that as a factor, Mr. Van Roekel?

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. Absolutely. One of the longstanding research projects came out of Tennessee, and at the beginning of that, all teachers and all students were selected for this research were all totally done by random. The only variable was the size of the class in K through 3, and they tried to keep it below 20. They have done

over a 25-year follow-up with all of these students, by every measure, high school graduation, college-attending, graduation from college. By every one of those measures, they do better. Class size makes a huge difference, especially in those lower grades.

I can tell you right now, as you go across the country with the economic situation the way it is, and with States facing their biggest challenge in 2010–2011, because the State stabilization funds that were the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act will not be there—layoffs are starting to come through. There are schools now with class sizes up to 40.

I always said that I can teach just about any size group, but how I teach and what I am able to do varies immensely.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Schleicher, you did not address this. What are the class sizes in OECD countries? I am talking about in the early years, first, second, third, fourth, fifth grades.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Actually the United States has below average class sizes. The United States would be a country that has relatively small class sizes. If you look at some of the best performing systems, they actually trade in better salaries, better working conditions, more professional development against larger classes. If you look, for example, at some of the best performing systems like Finland, like Korea, they do actually have larger classes than the United States and they use that money to actually buy other things like more attractive environments for teachers, more individual personalized learning opportunities.

The CHAIRMAN. Do these countries allow every child into those classes? Kids with disabilities, kids with learning disabilities are all in these classes too just like in America?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. There are different philosophies in countries. There are some countries where they are in special classes in schools, some in which they are integrated. If you look at the Nordic countries in Europe, you have a much higher degree of personalized learning opportunities. You have large classes in general, but then you have 30 percent of instruction time that is devoted outside formal classrooms, not just for students with disabilities, but also for students with special talents. It is just engaging with diversity in a different way.

Our research actually does not support that smaller classes are the most effective investment to raise learning outcomes. That is not something that international comparisons would support. You can spend your money only once, and you have to make choices between better salaries, more learning time, smaller classes. Smaller class size is not often the most effective choice. That is what our comparisons would tell you.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I will have to take a look at that data. I went over my time.

Senator Enzi.

Senator ENZI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the testimony of all of you, particularly your complete testimony. There are a lot of good ideas in there.

Mr. Butt, the McKinsey report highlighted NAEP scores in both Texas and California, and Texas outscored California on all fronts, but also spends about $900 less per student. In your opinion, what

changes could be made today in educational systems that would cost little but have a big impact on closing the achievement gap?

Mr. BUTT. I do not think I can answer that for you, Senator, but I will try to respond by letter.

I would like to say one thing about teaching. There are two issues in the pay issue. One is the starting pay and one is the pay to which teachers can look forward, and you have to address both to be competitive in the marketplace for bright leadership people which I think are needed today.

And second, KIPP, which is so touted for its success, pays a few thousand dollars more but the teachers are crazy about their principal. They really follow him or her. We have principals today, unfortunately, that when they get a bright, new teacher, it is actually a problem for them because they have to manage that new energy in the classroom and it is disruptive for them. That is why I feel leadership at the superintendent and principal level is so critical.

Senator ENZI. Thank you.

Mr. Castellani, your testimony highlights the recommendations of the Business Coalition for Student Achievement, BCSA, for the reauthorization. Can you talk a little bit more about what BCSA means by a client-centered approach? Does this translate into more involvement by business in the schools or something else?

Mr. CASTELLANI. Yes, I can. The good organizations, whether public or private, know that without kind of an intense focus on their clients, long-term success is impossible. What we have recommended is first, easy-to-understand report cards that include data on performance of each student group and that do not rely on the use of statistical gimmicks and sleights of hand to sugar-coat the results and undermine accountability measures.

Second, SES, Supplement Education Service, programs that require districts to provide students and parents with timely and easily understood information about their options to choose either free tutoring or the ability to move to higher performing public schools.

Third, increased support for parent involvement programs which we believe are very, very important.

And fourth, additional involvement of community and business groups in school improvement, in transformation, and in turnaround activities, get the communities more involved.

Senator ENZI. You also mentioned specifically recruiting retirees as teachers and promoting teaching as a second career. Can you elaborate on that idea?

Mr. CASTELLANI. Yes. There are many, we believe, skilled retired business people, retired from all sectors, who have degrees in science, who have degrees in mathematics, who have degrees in English and history, who are living longer, are much more active longer, and looking for ways to give back to the community. We think that the school systems should look at being more flexible in teacher certification requirements and that post-secondary education particularly be expanded so people in those circumstances who can bring both their history and knowledge and their passion into the school room and into the schools have a pathway to do that, whether it is a post-retiree from the private sector or from the military sector.

Senator ENZI. Thank you.

Mr. Schleicher, in your comparison of countries, I am wondering how similar the systems are to one another. For example, compulsory education in some countries goes to fourth grade, in some countries it goes to sixth grade. We do a lot of our statistics clear through high school, even though the compulsory education requirements often do not go that far. When you are doing those comparisons, is that taken into consideration? I know that it motivates kids a little bit if they know they can be left out at fourth grade, but it is a disservice too and we do not recognize that.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. To get around this, we actually compare age groups. We take an age group across countries and compare that. For example, our PISA comparisons look at 15-year-olds. Enrollment is universal across OECD countries except for Turkey and Mexico. So we do have a comparable basis.

In fact, if you are very precise about it, in most OECD countries enrollment at age 15 is higher than in the United States. The United States takes a slight advantage out of those comparisons. But those differences are very small.

Taking an age group gets you around the problem of having different educational structures across countries.

Senator ENZI. It is also my understanding that your report indicates that relatively small improvements in the skills of a nation's labor force can have large impacts on the country's future well-being. Can you elaborate on those findings and explain what this means specifically to education and workforce policy in the United States?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Yes. If you take the example of Poland, over the last 6 years, Poland raised its achievement by 29 points on our PISA scale, which is three-quarters of a school year. It is a relatively modest level of improvement. If you would translate that in the U.S. context, you raise everybody's performance by this rather modest amount over the next 20 years, being very generous with reform time implementation, you are talking about $40 trillion in additional economic income over the lifetime of people born today. You can really see how small improvement in the skills over time translates into better workforce qualifications, which then have a very significant impact on the economic outcomes in terms of the historical gross relationship. That is something that surprised us as well, but these results come out quite consistent.

What is important in this context is that the relationship between educational success and economic success tends to become tighter and tighter over time. That is, the benefits for those who are well-educated continue to rise. The penalties in terms of labor market and earning outcomes for those who do not succeed in school actually have become quite a bit larger as well across OECD countries. That is a quite clear picture.

Senator ENZI. Thank you. I will certainly be paying more attention to your report and to the work of others on the panel. I thank you and I have exceeded my time as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Dodd.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DODD

Senator DODD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Just great testimony, really fascinating to hear from all of you.

First, we have got some wonderful people on this committee, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, Lamar Alexander, former Secretary of Education of the country, and Michael Bennet, our newest member of the committee, was the superintendent of schools in Denver, CO, and having talked to them, they have some wonderful and thoughtful ideas about education as well. We have got some rich talent here on the committee that can contribute to this debate.

A couple of things. If somebody said to me I am going to give you the power, Senator, to do one thing and one thing only on education, what would you do, the one thing I would do, would be to increase parental participation in education. If parents could be more involved, I cannot think of anything that would have a more salutary effect than if you could engage the parents in their children's education. We do that with Head Start. We have a requirement that programs encourage parents to be involved. Yet, by the first grade in this country, parental participation in the average family drops significantly and continues to decline to almost zero over time.

Let me begin with you, Mr. Castellani, because I think the business community—George David, who is a good friend of mine—and you know him well from United Technologies—did some remarkable things in higher education. I appreciate your comments today about the changes we would like to see occur in terms of the improvement of K–12.

To what extent can the business community help the people who work for the business community? I cannot think of a better contribution that business can make than to be supportive of the parents that are employed by the major corporations of this country and others to have the time and the ability to be able to engage with their children.

I authored the Family Medical Leave Act years ago, and it was a controversial bill. We have talked about improvements to it over the years. In fact, Patty Murray I think made some suggestions along these lines. Where there is an illness of a child—people do not want to debate that and clearly, their parents ought to be there. To what extent do we provide any kind of time for parents to be with their children, for instance, at an athletic contest or to be there at a parent-teacher conference at school?

What ideas do you bring to the table on how the business community—if you agree with me, that the parental gap that exists in terms of being involved in their children's education, what can the business community do about that?

Mr. CASTELLANI. Well, as I said in my response to Senator Enzi's question, this is one of the things that we think, among a lot of others, that should be examined and could help improve the quality of education. So you are absolutely spot on.

One of the problems we have in the workplace is the mismatch in time demands, which are very considerable on any family, but also the structure of the timing, the work day, compared to how it is structured with the school day. The school day and a work day do not match. The school probably has less ability to be flexible but needs to be flexible in terms of its timeframe to engage the parents, and clearly in the workplace as employers, we have to be flexible.

What you are seeing more and more in the workplace, at least within the private sector, is a greater reliance on flexible time, on telecommuting, on changing the rules. For example, in some organizations, we had very rigid rules about what were sick leave days, what were vacation days, what were personal days. And we are seeing some very innovative companies just say here is the amount of time you have off. Wherever you want to take it, you take it. You do not have to tell us what the reason is.

It is providing more opportunity to use technology to be able to work remotely. It is providing more flexibility within the working hours. It cannot work across all. You cannot say to an emergency room physician, you can leave in the middle of this procedure and go off and watch a soccer game, but it is using technology and providing more flexibility.

Senator DODD. I would be very interested if you could ask your members at the Business Roundtable to submit to you and then to us what some of the ideas individual companies are doing to expand parental involvement so we might promote some of these ideas.

Mr. CASTELLANI. We would be delighted.

Senator DODD. Now, if I was given a second chance to do something else in education, it would be with principals. I want to commend Mr. Butt for your comments about the superintendents and principals, but particularly principals, it seems to me. Again, we have wonderful teachers who get elevated to be principals. The skill sets to be a teacher and to be a principal are very different in my view. It does not mean the leadership is not important in the classroom, but leadership in the school is as well. I do not think we do enough to really train and to promote the notion of identifying people who are good school principals.

Are there some things that you are familiar with that might help us do a better job?

Mr. BUTT. I think the schools of education have a role to play here, Senator. I do not have a definitive comment on what that is, but I think there is something there.

Senator DODD. Well, if you have any ideas, let us know. I think that is a gap that we do not address well.

Mr. BUTT. Well, this is maybe an anathema to the educational community, but some of the best superintendents have an M.B.A. It is really an enormous management job, and it is really quite different from teaching, as you point out. Some people go into it from academia and do great, but others do not.

Senator DODD. I will come back to that at some point.

Last, you said something to Senator Harkin, Mr. Schleicher, that I am curious about. I thought I heard you say just grades 1 through 3, the class size—I think it surprised a lot of us here when you indicated the class size was less relevant in other grades in your experience. Did I hear you say just in grades 1 through 3, does class size have the greatest impact, or through the entire K–12 comparable age group?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. In fact, I was talking about the entire education system. I mean, class size is important, everything else being constant. There is no question about that. But when you have to make a tradeoff, when you have to decide how do you in-

vest your money, our analysis suggested investing resources in reducing class is often less effective than investing it in other parts of the entire system. That is, I think, the tradeoff to be made.

On your point on instructional leadership, I mean, that is what our research supports as well. It is a very important variable determining success and many countries actually do have a separate career path for school principals, in fact, even separate institutions to educate those people.

Senator DODD. What about the parent thing? Do you do anything on the parent side of this thing?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. It is harder to measure, harder to quantify. You do have some countries that are very successful in this. If you look to Japan, the most powerful organization in Japan, in terms of influence on the reality in the classroom is the parent-teacher organization, and they sit in every school. They have a real role to play. They are not just sort of at the football match, but they are really involved in the life of schools and have a major influence. It is just one example where a country has drawn on that resource in a very systematic way.

Senator DODD. Thanks.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Alexander.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR ALEXANDER

Senator ALEXANDER. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Castellani, in 2005 a bipartisan group of Members of Congress asked the National Academies to recommend to us steps that would help increase American competitiveness. They gave us 20. We spent a couple of years and passed most of them. One was to increase support for advanced placement programs. That was already going on here. Senator Harkin has long pushed that. So has Senator Hutchison.

In the current budget, President Obama suggests eliminating funding for this program and consolidating it into a larger, competitive program for school districts to choose which programs to fund. As a former Governor, I am sympathetic to that kind of thing.

What would your advice be about whether to target advanced placement programs or whether to turn over to States and local districts that amount of money and let them choose how to spend it?

Mr. CASTELLANI. Well, one of the things that the Academies pointed out and were dealing with—you asked the question, as you know very well—was a very substantial gap in the production of STEM-capable students and the needs that we have for science, technology, engineering, and mathematics capable students within business.

The answer is you really need both quite frankly. We very much need a very intense focus which comes on some dedicated funding at the Federal and quite frankly the State and local level. Because of all of the hierarchy of what we need in terms of output from our education system, the highest need right now are those people who have those kinds of skills, those people who have analytical skills. So it really is a matter of doing both, quite frankly.

Senator ALEXANDER. Mr. Van Roekel, 26 years ago when I was a Governor, in a fit of naivete, I helped our State become the first State to pay teachers more for teaching well. We created a master teacher program, raised taxes to fund it, paid teachers a lot more, and 10,000 teachers went up a career ladder. It would be an underestimate to say that in doing so, I had a street brawl with the National Education Association, not so much with the American Federation of Teachers. Al Shanker said, "Well, if we have master plumbers, we can have master teachers." It was hard to do because the teachers unions were against it. The colleges of education said you could not tell a good teacher from a bad teacher, and that left us politicians with a very difficult job. Ten thousand teachers went up that career ladder.

I had a pleasant experience a couple of years ago, even though after I left the Governor's office, it was eliminated primarily with the affiliate of the NEA urging it. Five representatives of the Tennessee Education Association came to see me and thanked me for it. They were all master teachers. They said it was a good idea.

A lot has happened over that period of time. Both the NEA and the FT worked with Governor Hunt of North Carolina and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to try to find a way to encourage outstanding teaching. Many local school districts have done that. Senator Bennet did it in Colorado, what Senator Corker did when he was mayor of Chattanooga, making agreements with local NEA affiliates to try to find fair ways to reward outstanding teaching.

The Teacher Incentive Fund, which is a part of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, has had a number of success stories in Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, and North Carolina where local school districts working with teachers unions have found fair ways to reward outstanding school leadership and outstanding teaching. I agree with Senator Dodd. Parents are first, but if parents are first, teachers and school leaders are second.

My question is, have we not got to find a way to pay good teachers and good school principals more for teaching well and to find fair ways to reward that? Is the Teacher Incentive Fund, which really allows local school districts to figure out how to do it in each case, is a good way to do it? Do you support that, or do you have another suggestion for how we should go about it from here? Or do you still think, as the NEA did 30 years ago, that it is just wrong to pay some teachers more than others based on the quality of the teacher?

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. You mentioned that much has happened in those 25 years. The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards—I was talking to Jim Kelly one day, and he talked about over 20 years they had spent about $200 million developing good assessments so that they could assess the practice of teaching from early childhood to high school. I think that was money well spent.

I believe very much in the profession, and there have been many attempts to change how we pay teachers over time. We have supported many of those. We support paying teachers who achieve National Board certification. We differentiate pay on a lot of different ways. The only one I would say that we really have opposed, especially recently, is when they want to pay a teacher based on a sin-

gle high-stakes test score. I think it is important to develop those. It is something that must be done at the local level in cooperation.

You mentioned a career ladder. In my own experience in Arizona, we started one in 1985. It was discontinued this year due to finances and the lawsuit. From the time it started, it was far more expensive, and they had 14 districts and then allowed 20, but never more than 20. In this past year, one of the districts sued and said we want to be in this too. They lost in court. They said you are right. If you are going to provide it for some, you must provide it for all, and the legislature said, yes, it is a good idea but it costs $175 million and we are not funding it. So they eliminated it from the 20 that had it and for the future.

The issue of compensation, as mentioned before, when I was talking with Senator Harkin is very important. We have got to be able to compete. I think developing good compensation systems is very important. It just comes down to really three steps to me. No. 1, you have to define what you are going to pay for. Is it skills, knowledge, responsibility? In many of those career development plans, they define those in the area of skills and knowledge.

Senator ALEXANDER. My time is up.

Teachers Incentive Fund. Are you for it or against it?

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. We support what is done at the local level by our local affiliates. The answer is——

Senator ALEXANDER. Is that a yes or a no?

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. Yes. It is a yes. We support what our locals do at the local level.

Senator ALEXANDER. Excuse me for interrupting. I saw my time was up.

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. That is all right.

Senator ALEXANDER. Thank you very much.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Murray.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MURRAY

Senator MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having this very important hearing as we begin our Elementary and Secondary Education discussions. I really want to thank all of our distinguished witnesses today for your testimony. I am personally glad to see we have teachers and business and the global perspective represented here today.

Career and college readiness has long been a focus and a passion of mine, and I think the voices we have here really are an essential part of making sure that our students are truly prepared for the next steps to make sure our economy is strong and they have the skills they need. I think that that link between education and the workforce is more important now than ever before as we face a crisis in how many students are actually prepared, once they get through school, to get those jobs that we need them to have in their own communities.

For the past two Congresses, I have introduced legislation called the Promoting Innovations to 21st Century Careers Act, which is focused on building better connections between the education, business, and workforce communities. By creating these partnerships, we can provide better student access and really do the right thing for our economy as well because the goal of the bill really is career

and college readiness. I am fortunate my bill has been supported by a lot of diverse groups, teachers, Chambers of Commerce, workforce development representatives. When I was developing this bill, I went out in my community and held roundtables to bring together K–12, higher education, workforce, and economic development stakeholders.

One of the things I heard when I was developing this bill was that there is a lot of barriers to collaboration between all these different entities. I think that we have got to have people talk together in their own communities to make sure that what the kids are learning in school actually helps them be successful when they get out.

One of the things I hear from employers all the time, and actually universities and economic folks too, is that reading and math are important skills for kids to have, but it is not enough, that we need students who are able to communicate and do critical thinking and problem solving and not just learn the core basics, but those skills as well.

My question to all of you today is what do you think students need to be able to know today for our education system to be considered world-class and for our students to have the skills they need to be able to succeed? What do they need to know? I will open it up to any of you.

Mr. BUTT. I think one of the conflicts, Senator, is trying to do workforce-ready and college-ready. A lot of the establishment has pushed college-ready, which would be favorable to you and all of us, during recent years. Workforce-ready in my opinion has gotten somewhat lost in the backwash, and it is challenging to do both in the same school. That is clear. It requires a very specialized curriculum and great leadership. I think that that is an issue on which you may want to focus because the two groups are often at odds with each other.

Now, we testified last year, along with about 10 major national companies, for more workforce-ready people. That is the reason that this company I quoted did not get enough people to fill their jobs. Both are badly needed. Clearly, we want more college graduates and community college graduates. In Texas, only about 25 percent of the new jobs, maybe 20 percent, require a college education.

Senator MURRAY. They do require some kind of skill training is my guess.

Mr. BUTT. They do. They require a good high school education, but they do not necessarily require college.

Senator MURRAY. What kind of skills do they need?

Mr. BUTT. Well, they need math. They need grammar and they need interpersonal relationships.

Senator MURRAY. Math, grammar, interpersonal relationships.

Anybody else? Mr. Schleicher?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Thank you, yes. In fact, if you look at skill utilization, which is often a good indicator for the demand for skills, you see that actually there has been a quite rapid decline in routine cognitive skills. Things that are easy to teach, things that are easy to test are actually less important now than they were in the past. The rises in demand are, first of all, in what we call non-rou-

tine analytic skills, the capacity not to reproduce what you have learned, but to extrapolate from that and apply your knowledge in a novel context. We also see sort of interpersonal skills, having a rise in importance.

At the OECD, we use a framework that categorizes this in sort of ways of thinking, problem solving, creativity, and decision-making, and so on; ways of working, collaboration, communication; tools for working. That is about ICT and instruments like this. Then there is sort of living in the world in a heterogenous world, civic competence and global citizenship and so on. Those are four categories which we actually do not put in contrast to math and science and reading and so on, but we look at the intersection. When you look at mathematics, knowing the formulas is less important today, but understanding how mathematics——

Senator MURRAY. Because you can look it up on Google.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Yes. But understanding how mathematics is——

Senator MURRAY. You have to know how to get there.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Yes.

Senator MURRAY. You need to know how to communicate it.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Well, there is a global trend toward broadening the concept of school subjects in many countries now.

Senator MURRAY. Mr. Van Roekel.

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. Senator, I would say that you really incorporated that into your question. There is a need, I believe, for a solid curriculum that is broad, and I mentioned some of those in my opening from foreign language, history, civics education. All of that is important. It should be done in the context of 21st century skills. Creativity is something that is very much needed. Collaboration, which requires the interpersonal skills. Communication skills are getting more important and it seems almost a contradiction in this age of technology that communication is more important, but it is. And then the critical thinking.

Using these new skills and all of these subject matters I think is what we have to prepare students for. Young students on a YouTube I saw the other day mentioned that in times of old, information was very expensive. Only a few had it. It was very valuable. Now it is for everyone. What are the skills you need in order to separate the wheat from the chaff, as we used to say, and figure out what is needed in a certain situation?

Senator MURRAY. My time is up. I would just say, Mr. Chairman, that one of the things we try to do in my legislation—I hope we can look at it—is try and bring local people together from business and workforce and schools to make sure that they are actually learning those skills that they need to go into those jobs.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator Reed.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR REED

Senator REED. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony.

Mr. Schleicher, just I think a technical question. As you do your country comparisons, do you control for income disparities and racial disparities?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Yes. Actually we do not know how to control for racial disparities because they are hard to measure in a global context, but we look at socioeconomic background like parental education, parental income, and factors like this. You can basically look at this and you can look at the impact those have on outcomes and can you control for them. That is actually done in many of our comparisons.

Senator REED. Do you not—and I know it is probably very difficult—look at the distribution of income in a country? I would suspect if an average pay of a teacher is X in a country but the highest pay is only one and a half times that where in some countries it is 100 times that, that is a different context.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. You mean in terms of the wage distribution for teachers?

Senator REED. Yes.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Yes. That is much harder to do. Actually the way we look at this is we look at salaries of people with similar qualifications. For example, teachers usually have a masters degree qualification, so you can compare with salaries of a person with a masters qualification.

Senator REED. Frankly, thank you for your insights. They have been very valuable, and it is a very difficult area to make these and as a whole sort of subject area of culture. I think you have given us some extraordinarily good insights, and I thank you for that.

Mr. Van Roekel, you have talked about collaboration in your testimony, but also I think you emphasized research-based approaches to reform. Could you identify what you consider are some of the more promising research-based approaches to reform?

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. Well, what I reference that is—for example, there is a real debate right now about charter schools. Should we remove the cap? Should we have more? I think it is the wrong question. What does research say about whether they are doing better or worse? Instead say, what is it in the practice of those schools that changes that?

One of the comments earlier was that in these schools that are highly successful, they have networks where they share the practice. That to me is where the collaboration really works. It is taking knowledge—if, for example, in my math class, I get better results than others who are teaching the same class, what we ought to do is to share that practice and figure out why. As we look at other countries around the world, they spend—far more of a teacher's time at school is done in collaboration about determining the best practice and the way of presenting lessons instead of always being isolated with students by themselves. The value of collaboration is over all aspects of education.

I am such a believer in the profession that it is my practice. It is not a test score. It is what I do diagnosing what a student needs. How am I able to adjust my instruction to meet their needs?

If I could wave my magic wand and do just one thing, as Senator Dodd said, I would have the adults in every building in America connected with the parents and community members, spend 1 week together before every school year, and say, based on where our stu-

dents are, what they need, what are we willing to do together to ensure that it changes? I believe you would transform education.

Senator REED. Thank you.

Mr. Butt, first, let me commend you for your public service. You have a pretty big job running your grocery chain, but you have spent many years in Texas, as I see from your resume, trying as a citizen to move education forward. One of the comments that impressed me was the notion that a lot of this is leadership style. A lot of this is having command of the school and command of the classroom, and those things are not necessarily taught in education schools or measured in terms of the performance. I wonder if you could comment on how we can do a better job of teaching those skills and measuring those skills.

Mr. BUTT. Well, it is multifactorial, obviously. I think State commissioners of education should be advocates for education and they should be intimately involved in the big districts and as many as possible in their State. In Texas, we have 1,030 school districts. They cannot be involved in all of them, but the commissioners should know the superintendents of all the big and middle-size districts and have an opinion about how they are doing, find a way to express that to board members, and play a constructive role in raising the standard.

I think schools of education have focused mostly on teaching. They have some programs on superintendents and principals. I think more of that is needed. I think if our university systems—higher education and public education have become pretty separated in this country, and higher education does not take much responsibility for pre-K–12. North Carolina, I think, has a K–16 system, but few States do. I think that would be an opportunity.

Senator REED. Thank you, sir. And thank you, John, for your testimony.

Mr. Chairman, my time is up.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Sanders.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SANDERS

Senator SANDERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let me thank all of the panelists for their excellent testimony.

Let me start off with Mr. Schleicher. Mr. Schleicher, in this country, to go to a good college costs maybe $50,000 a year at a time when many working families do not make $50,000. How much does it cost to go to college in Germany?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Actually, that is an easy country. Nothing.

Senator SANDERS. Ah, nothing. I see. Nothing, zero.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. You do have wide variability. The United States is a class in itself with very high levels of tuition. Japan would come second, and then sort of the European countries in the middle.

Senator SANDERS. And Scandinavia is nothing or very, very little.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Scandinavia actually pays you to go to university. You get a subsidy——

[Laughter.]

Mr. SCHLEICHER [continuing]. For your living costs.

Let me just add one point. Actually we calculate the public investment and look at the public returns, and actually governments

get more in tax receipts, even in those countries, than they actually spend on that.

Senator SANDERS. Well, that gets back to the point that Mr. Butt made a moment ago as to whether or not we consider education a cost or an investment. Presumably those countries, far removed philosophically from where we have been, actually believe that if you have a well-educated workforce, you do better. Everything that all four of you have said have indicated that. But we do not do that.

In terms of child care, one of the issues, Mr. Chairman, we have not talked about either. We are talking about kids mysteriously at the age of 5 or 6 going into school. What happens in their previous 5 years? In this country, one of the untold stories that we absolutely do not focus on enough is the disaster in child care. My guess is you got millions of kids today right now sitting in front of a television set with an untrained child care worker, and that is the first 5 years of their lives. If I were in Finland right now or in Denmark and I had a baby, what child care is available to me?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Coverage in some OECD countries go up to 90 percent in terms of sustained early childhood education and child care.

Senator SANDERS. Are the child care workers trained?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Pardon?

Senator SANDERS. Are they well-trained?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. In some countries—I mean, it is easier to measure the pay. In some countries, they get paid and have an education like a primary school teacher. In other countries, it is more a child care job.

Senator SANDERS. In this country, people leave child care to get a job at McDonald's to see a raise in pay.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Let me just sort of put——

Senator SANDERS. I do not mean to interrupt you because I have other questions as well.

My point is, I think if you are going to talk about education, there are millions of kids who are 10 years old who understand they aren't ever going to go to college because they cannot afford it. There are other kids who, by the time they walk into the first grade, are already so far behind they are never going to catch up. The point to be made, in comparing—I know some of my Republican friends put down Europe, Europe, Europe. But I think they have something. They have taught us something, that investing in kids—what about the crime rate? What about the percentage of young people who end up in jail compared to the United States? Do you have any statistics on that?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. They exist, but I do not have them.

Senator SANDERS. Well, it is far higher in this country. So we put them in jail rather than investing in child care and an education.

I want to ask Mr. Butt a question because, again, it talks to a broader issue. You used the term "shallow learning culture." Now, I am going to ask you what you mean by that. Back home in Burlington, VT, I got 50 channels on my TV and I turn them on, go through the 50 channels. There isn't nothing much to watch. Do you think we really are serious about—do we respect education in

this country? How do you move forward in a serious way if we do not respect education? Maybe you want to comment on that.

Mr. BUTT. Well, if I had the answer to that, Senator, I would have certainly shared it with you. I think it is the challenge of all affluent nations. You know, we get a little too big for our britches and think that we do not have to keep doing what we used to do. I wish I had the answer to that. Maybe this recession will make us more aware of the necessity of going back to our roots with a hardworking attitude toward learning.

Senator SANDERS. Thank you.

Mr. Castellani, do you think we should emulate Europe and put a great deal of money into child care and early childhood education? In some countries, I think in France it is—I mean, God did not create public schools at the age of 5. Now you have 70–80 percent of women who are working and kids are forced to go to child care. Do you think we should do what Europe does and fund child care the way we do public education?

Mr. CASTELLANI. Senator, I think the broader question is how do we achieve the kinds of things that make students ready for learning, that have students that are ready for learning, indeed, get a very strong education, and have those who get the right education to be able to get——

Senator SANDERS. No, but that was not my question.

Mr. CASTELLANI. My answer is it has to be, as all of our things are here, uniquely American.

Senator SANDERS. Well, but uniquely American is failing. We do not want to be the only country where our educational standards can not compete with the rest of the world.

My question was a simple one. Is child care important in your opinion?

Mr. CASTELLANI. Child care is important.

Senator SANDERS. Do you think an average working family can afford child care at 300 bucks a week?

Mr. CASTELLANI. No. I think it is very difficult.

Senator SANDERS. All right. Do you think that we should consider early childhood education as they do in many other countries as part of the overall public policy, that we should invest in that?

Mr. CASTELLANI. Early childhood education?

Senator SANDERS. Yes. Child care as well.

Mr. CASTELLANI. Yes.

Child care as well? That is difficult.

Senator SANDERS. Why?

Mr. CASTELLANI. Again, it is a question of what is affordable and what is appropriate.

Senator SANDERS. All right, but many of these other countries have said that was a good investment. Do you think so?

Mr. CASTELLANI. How would you pay for it?

Senator SANDERS. By raising taxes on wealthy individuals.

[Laughter.]

Mr. CASTELLANI. Fair enough.

Senator SANDERS. Fair enough. All right, good. Note that for the record, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Merkley.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MERKLEY

Senator MERKLEY. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

I appreciated your testimony here today. I was one of those children who was the first in their family to go to college, and I can tell you that I had that opportunity because I had good public schools in a working class community. I always felt pretty good about the chance to go to a major university and be able to compete with folks from much more elite backgrounds. I want to see that type of opportunity exist for every child in America. It is a real privilege to be here for this discussion of No Child Left Behind.

I can tell you that in the course of running for the Senate, I talked to parents, school administrators, teachers, school boards, and I heard a consistent set of problems with No Child Left Behind.

The first was that the testing was mostly designed to compare apples to oranges, that is, one class of third graders with another class of third graders, rather than tracking an individual student through the process so that teachers would have the type of information able to best help them assist a student, identify where they are struggling and advance them.

Second, the curriculum would be narrowed to those items that were being tested, which was not necessarily in the student's best interest, but that was driven by the test results.

And third, there was a pressure to teach to the bubble, and by that, I mean, children fall into three groups: those who easily exceed the standards, those who might exceed the standards with a lot of coaching, and those who are far away. Teachers were focusing on the bubble boys and girls that they might be able to get over that boundary but perhaps neglecting the educational advancement of those who already could meet that test or who they felt were too far away from meeting the test.

And then finally, the system under No Child Left Behind was penalizing schools that needed help rather than helping schools that needed help.

I would just like to ask whoever would like to jump in to address their perspectives on whether those concerns are legitimate as we launch this discussion of how to improve upon our system.

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. Let me take a crack at that very quickly. In the last 8 years, I have been in schools all across this country, and I have never been in one that they did not bring up No Child Left Behind and the things they say are exactly the four you say, that the testing is overemphasized and the apples-to-oranges, the timing of giving the results make it not informative in terms of informing practice. Narrowing the curriculum was a big deal. Teaching to the golden band or the bubble——

Senator MERKLEY. What did you call that? The golden?

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. Yes. One principal called it the golden band.

Senator MERKLEY. The golden band.

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. At the beginning of the year faculty meeting, he said this year we know these kids are already there, and there is a group down here who will never make it. We are going to take this golden band, those that we think we can push over that proficiency line, and that is going to be the focus of all of us for all

year long. And they hate that. They believe it violates what their professional responsibilities are to the students.

I totally agree with all four of your points.

Senator MERKLEY. Other folks? Mr. Schleicher?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Yes. In fact, I cannot comment on the gravity of the issues that you outlined, but I think these are all issues that can be quite easily addressed. There are many countries that have actually successfully addressed them.

If you look at the single bar problem, that you only value sort of people nearing proficiency, many countries have systems that look at learning progressions, that look at sort of key stages, how you move through the system. You look to England and Nordic countries in Europe, lots of examples on this. They choose a different balance between formative and salutive assessments like you have school-based assessment plus sort of high-stakes assessment and that balance creates a different set of incentives for teachers to use and actually understand what those results mean.

That also addresses part of the issue of teaching to the test. I mean, my impression is that the United States often sacrifices validity gains for efficiency gains in the testing process, and that I think is something that is——

Senator MERKLEY. Expand on that just a little bit. Validity versus efficiency.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Basically I mean measuring things that you can measure cheaply through multiple choice tests rather than measuring things that are really what matters, what counts.

Those things can be addressed. I do think we have many good examples of very sort of intelligent accountability systems that actually measure progress comprehensively and that also measure the fields of study quite broadly, not necessarily sort of high-stakes accountability tests. Countries usually use multiple instruments within a coherent framework of national standards or regional or State standards.

Senator MERKLEY. Mr. Chair, amazingly my time has disappeared, but could the other folks answer this question, if they would like to? Do we have time for them to do that? Please be very brief, if you would like to answer, because I have colleagues who want to—

Mr. CASTELLANI. Sure. Very briefly, we supported No Child Left Behind, and we do agree it can be improved. It should reflect the experience that we have had with it, that there are some issues. The underlying concept is something that we still believe is vitally important if we are going to be successful, and that is that we have to set high standards for our education system and the outcomes of our education system and we have to test the performance against those standards appropriately.

Mr. BUTT. We have to set high standards, but we have to have the resources to let the students reach the high standards.

Senator MERKLEY. Thank you all very, very much. I may follow up or have my team follow up with you all to expand on how we tackle those issues. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Senator Franken.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR FRANKEN

Senator FRANKEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing, the first of, I hope, many on this reauthorization.

Mr. Butt, thank you for talking about principals and talking about superintendents and talking about leaders and leadership teachers. You talked about new grade teachers that come in and are crazy about their principal maybe in a charter school, but then you have a new grade teacher come in in some schools and a not-so-great principal looks at the teacher as a threat.

I believe in leaders, and I believe that principals lead the school and they should not just be custodians or administrators of a building.

I have introduced a bill called the School Principals Recruitment and Training Act. What this does is it gives competitive grants to school districts and schools to find principals who want to work in high-needs areas. That is what Mr. Schleicher was talking about is what they do in these OECD countries, is they focus on these high-needs schools and mentor.

I know Senator Dodd asked you for some ideas. One idea that we have talked to a lot of principals about is to have a mentoring system where for a year you recruit a principal who wants to be a principal. Maybe the teacher comes from somewhere else and is mentored for a year and there is follow-up.

This is not a question. I am just plugging my bill. OK?

[Laughter.]

Enough of that.

I want to get into testing. I talked to some principals a few weeks ago, and one of the principals called the current No Child Left Behind testing where you give the test in April and you get it in June right as the kids are leaving—he called these tests—he said they have a name for them—"autopsies," which I think is pretty significant.

Mr. Schleicher, this is a question. You are talking about progress. There is a test in Minnesota that all the teachers love and all the superintendents love, a computer test. You cannot use it because in No Child Left Behind because not every kid gets the same test because it gets harder if you answer right and it gets easier when you answer wrong. You get the results instantly, and they can give it three times a year. And you can measure each kid's progress. Is this the kind of thing they are doing in the countries that are more successful than we are?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Yes. There are many electronic testing systems that provide real and immediate feedback to a student's teachers and schools. In some other countries, they may not use electronic testing, but they have more school-based assessment. Basically within a framework of national standards, schools devise complementary international tests, their own instruments, and have, therefore, instruments where they know the results very quickly. They are not high-stakes accountability tests, but basically tests for the school to figure out what its relative strengths and weaknesses are. So it is not all electronic. It is often just also school-based.

Senator FRANKEN. Mr. Castellani, you said your group was in favor of No Child Left Behind. Does it make sense to you to maybe

have three tests a year where you can use it diagnostically? I think that is what every parent in the country thought when they heard No Child Left Behind. I think they went, great, my kid is going to be tested. My teacher is going to look at the results. It will be diagnostic. My teacher will be able to teach my kid by the results. This is great. Instead, they get tested at the end of the year and all the data is aggregated to see if the school is failing or not.

We had a school up in Cass County, MN that was named one of the top 100 high schools in America by U.S. News and World Report. Two weeks later, they failed the annual yearly progress. This is ridiculous the way this is working.

Mr. CASTELLANI. Senator, one of the principals or two—actually several of the principals that I have included in our written testimony get right to this point. We have to have timely, accurate analysis of the testing data. We have to have accurate and timely tests in and of themselves that are relevant. We have to have better data systems so that teachers can use it not only collectively but for individual students and how they can change their approach to teaching that class. Absolutely, improving that data, improving the value of the data and the timeliness of the data—

Senator FRANKEN. One thing I think everyone agrees we need to be looking at in this new reauthorization is how we do this testing. I would advocate for testing that can be done several times a year and that teachers be measured on the kids' progress. From 1 year to the next, you do not know—the population changes. So you really cannot measure anything by that year-end test about progress.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator Bennet.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BENNET

Senator BENNET. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for allowing me to be part of this conversation. I cannot tell you how much I look forward to working with you on this.

When I was superintendent of schools in Denver, I spent a lot of time wondering why everybody in Washington was so mean to our teachers and to our kids. What I have discovered actually is that they are not mean, at least when it comes to education, that everybody here is well-intentioned, and that there is a universal agreement that we really do want our kids to achieve. So that is good.

We also know a lot of what works. All of you have touched on things that work here and work in other places as well, and I have seen it.

I know that the children in America's cities have the intellectual capacity to do the work we are asking them to do because I have spent a lot of time with them.

Here is the question, but I am not going to let you answer yet. The question is what do you think are the biggest impediments to preventing these successes from scaling across our school districts and schools?

Let me just say first when I became superintendent of schools, on the 10th grade math test that we administer, there were 33 African-American students proficient on that test and 61 Latino

students proficient on that test. Fewer than four classrooms of kids proficient on a test, that if we are honest with ourselves, measures a junior high school standard of mathematics in Europe in a district of 75,000 children and in a city of 550,000 children.

A fourth grader today, as we are sitting here today, in a low-income neighborhood, low-income ZIP code is already 2 or 3 years behind her peers. She has a 1 in 2 chance of graduating from high school and a 1 in 10 chance of graduating from college.

I do not think anybody in the Senate would accept those odds for any of our kids or grandkids. In fact, probably we would resign our seats and run home to make sure that was not what the outcome was going to be.

In view of all that, my question to you is, what is getting in our way to scaling the successes that we know we have in the United States of America? We will start with you. Go ahead.

Mr. CASTELLANI. Senator, it is a very difficult question and I have to say I feel a little like Ebenezar Scrooge. You are the one I fear the most, the last.

[Laughter.]

Senator BENNET. They put me here for a reason.

Mr. CASTELLANI. No, no. I am the son of two teachers, one of whom went to the dark side to become a school administrator like you. My 94-year-old father who still calls me up and says, "what do you in the business world know about teaching and running a teaching system?"

We have had long discussions about it and we have thought about it a long time.

Senator BENNET. All I can say, Mr. Castellani, I spent about half my career in the business world and then half doing this other stuff, and it probably means I do not know much about any of it.

Mr. CASTELLANI. That is all right. I am sure it is to the contrary.

One of the things that strikes me that is very difficult is the contrast between how the rush to implement the best practices, the most innovative practices, the most successful practices is a basic—in an operating circumstance in the business world and it is not in a lot of other worlds, including education because in the business world, you do not have those kind of impediments. They tend to be just resource-limited or time-limited because in order to be competitive, you have to adopt them.

I think the difference is because the reward structure is very, very different, and that is, if you adopt very rapidly the best practices in the business context and the economic context, the presumption is you will be rewarded because you will get more customers, you will have higher margins, you will be more profitable, which will result in more return for your shareholders. We do not have a way to translate that within the education system, and I think that in part is why people are not rushing to do what we do in this other sector regularly.

Senator BENNET. Mr. Van Roekel? Oh, I am sorry, Mr. Butt. I will just go right down the table here, as long as the chairman will let us.

Mr. BUTT. Thank you, Senator.

Three reasons. One, general apathy, which is due to the culture that I mentioned. You had a big crowd for the Academy Awards

Sunday night. A teacher event, education event draws a big yawn, not sexy, and we are nationally over-confident. So that is one.

The second is that the establishment has moved away from the public schools either through multiple districts, which achieve *de facto* segregation, or having their kids in private schools. In Texas, we have 5 million kids, nearly 10 percent of the national student group, of which, 4.6 million of those are in public school. The other 400,000, which include much of the affluent and voters and the people that influence the politicians, are in private schools. We have lost the leadership of the establishment—whatever it is worth, good or bad, and that is a matter of debate—to the public schools.

And third, parents lose interest after their kids graduate from school. Parents and grandparents are not interested in the schools anymore. They are opposed to raising taxes, but they really do not care about the schools.

Those would be my three reasons that it is difficult to penetrate and get change to elect good people to school boards and to elect State legislators and leaders that really care about education.

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. Senator, I would say, No. 1, it is turnover especially in our high-needs schools, the turnover of staff and of principals and superintendents. It is impossible to have an integrated, well thought-out plan that continues on for a long enough time to really impact it.

Senator BENNET. By the way, I completely agree with your idea about having people come early for a week or two, parents and teachers.

Mr. VAN ROEKEL. A second thing is that too often a new culture or environment is created and it is personality-driven, and when that personality leaves, so does the whole plan and a new one comes in. It is impossible as a faculty member—it is a new reading program, it is a new math program, it is a new discipline program, it is new this, and we never just sit down and put it in place.

The third thing I will say is that we tend to focus on activities that we think will change the system, instead of going at a systemic approach and really looking at coming up with that common purpose of what we are trying to achieve. I think that is where business has an advantage over us. They know what it is they are trying to achieve in their enterprise, and we do not talk enough about that. What happens is somebody says, "oh, look, this school is doing well, and they have uniforms. Let us put uniforms in this school." They have no idea why they have uniforms—the discussion is about what it is they were trying to achieve.

That is why I talk so much about collaboration. One of the things that happens in successful places—Syracuse, New York where Say Yes Foundation came in and they are changing the whole district. They do memorandums of understanding so that the management, the school board, and union all sign onto that, so when one of the big three players changes, they cannot suddenly go off in a new direction. There may be better ideas, but you have to come back and say, together, "let us decide if there is a better place."

Those are my three best impediments.

Senator BENNET. Mr. Chairman, one final thought. I would just stitch together what Mr. Van Roekel just said with what Mr.

Castellani just said, and you can put this in the "whatever it is worth" category. But, I do think there is enormous reform fatigue that goes on in these school districts, and part of it is because we have not applied the approach of continuous improvement that you would think of in the business world. I think it is very important for us to keep that in mind because I think there is a lot that our school districts could gain from a continuous improvement approach in our teachers and our kids.

Mr. Butt, I would just say I completely agree with your observation, and I think that we as a country are going to rue the day unless we think about the children that are living in poverty in the United States, no matter who we are, as our own children. This is the next generation of Americans, and we are not going to be able to compete in the 21st century if we do not address these issues. The path to doing that runs right through the urban school districts of the United States.

Thank you for being here today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for letting me go over.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Senator Franken.

Senator FRANKEN. Mr. Chairman, thank you for indulging me.

One short question since you are here, Mr. Schleicher. I read your written testimony and thank you for it. I just want to know if you saw any correlation because a lot of the OECD countries—I guess they all have universal health care. Many of the high-needs schools that we have are under-performing, and we have a lot of the dropouts coming from there. Kids do not have health insurance. Is there any correlation that you saw—maybe this was not part of your study at all—between having health insurance as a kid and doing well in school?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Since, as you say, health care is universal in most of the countries—actually I think in virtually all of the countries—you cannot see any correlation basically. You can only study correlations when there is variability.

Senator FRANKEN. OK. You did not study all those countries versus us, but they are all improving and we are not.

Mr. SCHLEICHER. Not all countries are improving. There is quite some variability in performance.

Senator FRANKEN. OK. But we are falling in regard to the rest of the OECD countries. That is fair to say, right?

Mr. SCHLEICHER. What you can say is that social background, socioeconomic difference in the United States make more of and have a stronger impact on learning outcomes than is the case in——

Senator FRANKEN. My contention would be that a kid with an ear infection who does not have insurance is less likely to get it treated and more likely to miss school. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Senator Franken.

I thank our panel. I could sit here for another hour and go over a lot of things with you. I think we had a good discussion here to kick off our series of hearings.

I sent down for this book. It is called The Unfinished Agenda: A New Vision for Child Development and Education. I remember this very well. This came out in 1990. I had just been elected to the

Senate in 1985. I was not on this committee at the time. I came on a little bit later. President Reagan had been re-elected that same year in 1984.

Around 1986 President Reagan wanted to find out—he said we have all these studies on education. He said we need a study on education on an economic basis. What do we need to do in education today so that we will have a solid future economically for America? I do not remember all his words, but in his own way, the President said something like, "I do not want a bunch of those pointy-headed guys doing this either. I want solid, strong business people that will tell us what we need to do."

The Committee on Economic Development formed this subcommittee on education. The chair of it was James Renier, chairman of Honeywell at the time. This has got all the members. These are all CEOs and chairmen of some of your largest corporations and companies, Ciba-Geigy, First Commerce, Aetna, the Freeman Company, Texas Instruments, Smuckers, Arco Chemical. You get the idea. And Jim Renier became the chairman.

I never met this man, but in 1990 I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations on Education, the one I chair now, aside from this committee. One day this person wanted to come see me by the name of James Renier from Honeywell. Well, I figured, Minnesota is next door, what the heck, I will see him. He wanted to see me about education. He came into my office and reminded me of what had been going on.

This committee had been set up in the 1980s. They had done all these studies and interviews and panels, and they really took their work very seriously. He handed the executive summary to me, and on the outside it had one paragraph. "We must understand that education begins at birth and the preparation for education begins before birth." That is in this book.

I can read it to you.

> "The report urges the Nation to develop a comprehensive and coordinated strategy of human investment, one that redefines education as a process that begins at birth and encompasses all aspects of children's early development, including their physical, social, emotional, and cognitive growth."

Well, here are all these hard-headed business people. What did they say? Get to those kids early. Get to them early. That is what this whole book is.

So, I sent for it again; they found it in my file in Des Moines, and now I am going to keep it close by.

I would like to bring this up about health care. In 1991, I said that the problem with health care is we are patching, fixing, and mending. We are putting all of the money into sick care, not into health care. If we really want to control costs, do prevention and wellness. Get at it early. Now, a lot of private companies have done that. Talk to Pitney Bowes. Talk to Safeway. Talk to companies that have actually done that, and they will tell you they save a lot of money.

The same, I submit to all of you, is true in education. We have got to get to these kids early.

What did you say, Mr. Butt? You said something that just really caught my ear—by the way, I thought your testimony was just

great and so were your responses. Our kids coming to school—they are over-entertained. And what was the rest of that?

Mr. BUTT. Distracted.

The CHAIRMAN. And distracted. That is right. We have to get to these kids earlier than we are now. By the time they come, they are already way behind. Somehow we have just got to focus more on that. I do not have the answer. I just know where the problem lies. The problem lies with kids before they actually get to school. Now, I suppose some of it has to do with social structures and things like that, but if we do not crack that nut, we are just going to continue to patch and fix and mend, and we are never going to get out of the hole that we are in.

I submit this to you and I would ask for your thoughts on this later. Perhaps we need to re-define elementary and secondary education. Does elementary education really begin when kids enter kindergarten, or should we expand the thought of what elementary education really involves? I invite your thoughts on that in any regard, in any way you want to transmit them.

This has been great. This has just been a wonderful kickoff to a whole series of hearings that we are going to have on this. I invite you later on, as we go through our hearings, if anything comes up that you want to get in, get it to our committee and to us. I could not have asked for a better beginning of the process. Thank you all very much.

[Additional material follows.]

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR BROWN

Thank you, Chairman Harkin and Senator Enzi for kicking off the HELP Committee's consideration of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with a focus on a fundamental truth—a world class education for our students is directly linked to a world class economy for our Nation.

I would also like to thank the witnesses for joining us today. Your statements clearly illustrate that standing still in education means losing ground in the 21st century economy.

Last month, the HELP committee held a hearing on the reauthorization of the Workforce Investment Act. We heard testimony that between 2008 and 2018, nearly two-thirds of all job openings would require at least some post-secondary education and that there was a growing mismatch between the skills of our workers and the demands of the workplace.

Our long-term jobs strategy must address education.

We know that there are persistent gaps in educational outcomes for students based on family income, race, language, and special needs. Ohio is no exception. National Assessment for Education Progress results show little progress in narrowing the gaps in math, science, and reading achievement over the last 10 years.

We must do better.

The No Child Left Behind Act helped shine a light on the achievement gaps. Reauthorization gives us the opportunity to move beyond just identifying long-standing gaps in opportunity and achievement and move towards a smart, strategic system for closing the gaps and improving achievement across the board.

As we look to renew the law, I hope we strengthen it in several key areas, including:

- Moving from merely collecting and reporting data to using today's sophisticated tools to harness the power of information for improving teacher practice and personalizing learning for students;
- Building school-community partnerships to deliver the full range of supports that students and families need to be successful; and
- Making the connection to college and careers real for all students.

In Ohio, we have seen progress in all of these areas, but there is more work to be done. Ohio has made great strides in moving to a fully integrated data system that will enable us to analyze how students progress through elementary and secondary school to college and into the workforce.

Local philanthropies and community leaders such as STRIVE in Cincinnati and the Cleveland Scholarship Programs have demonstrated the power of collaboration in improving outcomes for young people.

Just this past January, President Obama—the first sitting president to visit Lorain County since President Truman—saw firsthand how we can connect students to college and careers. He visited Early College High School Students at Lorain County Community College's Fab Lab.

After the visit, one of the students, Paula Jones, blogged,

> "The FabLab is a creative and hands-on-learning experience. It is a great resource for geometry class because we can get accurate and precise measure of angles and shapes by using the laser cutter and the other utensils in the lab. There are many Fab Labs throughout the world, and I am glad to have had the opportunity to share this experience with not only my peers, but the President."

Education is more than the sum of test scores or a collection of data points. Students must be able to apply their knowledge and skills in the real world. The students at the Fab Lab have already learned that lesson.

We know what success looks like. We just need to build the capacity in our communities to deliver it for all students. Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is our opportunity to support success.

Thank you.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR CASEY

Good afternoon. First, I'd like to thank Chairman Harkin and Ranking Member Enzi for holding the first in a series of hearings which will provide an opportunity to hear testimony, examine data and evidence, and debate ideas for education reform. I think it is entirely appropriate to begin with a focus on the importance of education to the long-term economic health of the United States, and I appreciate you providing us with this framework.

As we move forward to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, there are a few areas I believe we must address if we are to use education as the great equalizer of opportunity and a tool to enhance U.S. competitiveness in the global economy. First, we must expand and improve early childhood education. As President Obama has recognized in his Fiscal Year 2011 Budget Proposal, the early years of a child's life, from birth through age 5, are crucial for learning. By emphasizing early education through measures such as the Prepare All Kids Act which I have introduced, we will ensure that our children are ready to learn and increase their chances for success in grades K–12. Second, we must, as Mr. Van Roekel states in his testimony, revitalize the public education system and ensure its sustainability. Standards and assessments that will ensure accountability are critical and we must have a full and healthy debate on how best to measure student achievement and growth. Third, just as we must ensure that every child has access to quality education in the earliest years of his or her life, we must graduate every student from high school. The wealth, productivity, and growth that are lost as a result of the Nation's dropout crisis are devastating. An educated, skilled workforce is crucial to attracting employers and jobs to the United States.

I want to thank each of the witnesses today for their thoughtful testimony. Your insight and observations are fascinating and should inform our deliberations throughout the reauthorization process. Perhaps most importantly, your testimony makes it clear that we must think of education not only as a moral imperative,

but as an investment in our country's future, without which we will continue to fall behind other nations in educating our children.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, and I look forward to working with you and my colleagues on the HELP Committee on this important legislation.

RESPONSE BY ANDREAS SCHLEICHER TO QUESTIONS OF SENATOR MIKULSKI AND SENATOR CASEY

QUESTION OF SENATOR MIKULSKI

Question 1. I'd like to direct a question to Andreas Schleicher, who is doing some pretty fascinating work in looking at how we're doing relative to other countries. But, first, I'd like to thank Senator Tom Harkin for his leadership on this committee. We've been working together on these issues for a long time and I'm glad that education is one of the first things he'll have to put his unique signature on. Mr. Schleicher, through your research, I'm sure you've found that other industrialized countries are able to outperform their American peers at least partly due to the fact that they're in school longer. Their school days are longer, or their school years are longer, or both. Researchers at Johns Hopkins have been studying the detrimental effects of having such a large lag between school years for children, and they've found that the degree to which knowledge is lost during the summer months is more pronounced in youngsters from low-income backgrounds. The idea of extended learning time, or using things like after school activities, academic enrichment during the summer months, etc., is being piloted in pockets throughout the country, including my home State of Maryland. Could you please speak to the difference investing in extended learning time has played in other countries and also, what existing practices in the United States show promise for scalability?

Answer 1. Learning outcomes are a function of the quantity and quality of educational provision. The OECD provides comparative measures on the quantity of educational provision but not on the quality of instruction, other than what is measured indirectly through student learning outcomes in PISA.

It is problematic to compare the incidence and intensity of extended learning time through the summer months between the United States and other countries, because most other countries have significantly shorter summer breaks than the United States does. Among the 30 OECD countries, only France provides fewer weeks of instruction per year than the United States (see the attachment D4.xls,[1] although the comparatively low number of instructional weeks and days in the United States needs to be seen in the context of comparatively long school days). The attached tables Tab_2.xls[2] provides comparative data on different types of opportunities to learn for students at age 15 and the attached table Tab_ch3.xls[2] breaks these data down by socio-economic groups.

QUESTION OF SENATOR CASEY

Question 1. What are the three most important specific recommendations you would make to this committee for reforming education through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act?

Of all the ideas and recommendations for education reform, where do you believe there is consensus among education professionals, policymakers, academics, business leaders, and other stakeholders?

Answer 1. I will focus on those issues which internationally comparative analysis suggests can be addressed successfully in complex stakeholder environments.

First, judging from the experience of other countries, the consistent implementation of the "common core standards" in the United States could be an influential measure to address the current problem of widely discrepant State standards and "cut" scores that have led to non-comparable results and often mean that a school's fate depends more than anything else on what State it is located. Another policy goal could be a different balance between using accountability tools to maintain public confidence in education, on the one hand, and to support remediation in the classroom aimed at higher levels of student learning and achievement, on the other. While the emphasis of NCLB has been on test-based external accountability, many high performing education systems make greater efforts to build capacity and confidence for professional accountability in ways that emphasize the importance of

[1] Attachment D4.xls may be found at *www.oecd.org/edu/eag2009*.
[2] The material referenced may be found at *www.pisa.oecd.org*.

formative assessment and the role of school self-evaluation, the latter often in conjunction with school inspection systems that systematically intervene with a focus on the most troubled schools rather than dispersing efforts through identifying too many schools as needing improvement, which one could consider another drawback of the current NCLB system. Where school performance is systematically assessed in high performing countries, the primary purpose is often not to support contestability of public services or market-mechanisms in the allocation of resources. Rather it is to provide instruments to reveal best practices and identify shared problems in order to encourage teachers and schools to develop more supportive and productive learning environments.

Second, I consider the "single bar" problem a major drawback of the current NCLB system, as it leads to undue focus on students nearing proficiency rather than valuing achievement growth. In many countries, this problem is addressed through assessment and accountability systems that incorporate progressive learning targets which delineate pathways characterising the steps that learners typically follow as they become more proficient and establish the breadth and depth of the learner's understanding of the domain at a particular level of advancement. One of the earliest approaches in this direction, the "key stages" in England, for example, provides a coherent system that allows measuring individual student progress across grades and subjects, thus also avoiding the problems associated with the "multiple measures" defining annual yearly progress in NCLB that have tended to lead to an undue emphasis on reading and mathematics. The global trend here is leading towards multi-layered, coherent assessment systems from classrooms to schools to regional to national to international levels that: support improvement of learning at all levels of the education system; are increasingly performance-based and make students' thinking visible; add value for teaching and learning by providing information that can be acted on by students, teachers, and administrators; and that are part of a comprehensive and well-aligned instructional learning system that includes syllabi, associated instructional materials, matching exams, professional scoring and teacher training.

Third, drawing a clearer line between assessments, on the one hand, and individual high-stakes examination systems could avoid sacrificing validity gains for efficiency gains, which tends to be an issue for the United States that is also mirrored in, by international standards, an unusually high proportion of multiple choice items in the assessment systems.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS OF SENATOR CASEY BY DENNIS VAN ROEKEL

Question 1. What are the three most important specific recommendations you would make to this committee for reforming education through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act?

Answer 1. **(1) Make a decisive and immediate break from NCLB by articulating a broad purpose for the Act that encompasses the "whole student" and by creating a new accountability system that *helps, rather than impedes,* school communities in their efforts to address the whole student.**

As we stated in our recent submission to the HELP Committee hearing on Meeting the Needs of the Whole Child, NCLB shifted the emphasis of public education from developing well-rounded individuals to testing low-level, basic skills in reading and math. The real impact of NCLB was in direct contradiction to its purported goals: it labeled our schools as failures based on crude measures yet did little or nothing to help us understand why or provide help to improve. It diminished the educational experience for millions of students by narrowing the curriculum and focusing the definition of success on two narrow, one-size-fits-all tests that were given on one day during the school year. Most significantly, NCLB failed to raise the knowledge and skills of a generation of students—in fact, it left far too many behind, in violation of its own name.

Therefore, immediate and dramatic change is needed to undo NCLB's harmful effects—to refocus our education system on developing a well-educated citizenry equipped to meet the challenges of the 21st century.

NEA is calling on Congress to pass a new bill—the Great Public Schools for All Act of 2010 or "GPSA"—that would reauthorize and amend ESEA in important and dramatic ways, beginning with a new ESEA purpose statement:

> "The public education system is critical to democracy and its purpose, as reflected in this Act, is to maximize the achievement, skills, opportunities, and potential of all students by building upon their strengths and addressing their needs, and to ensure that all students are prepared to thrive in a democratic society and diverse, changing world as knowledgeable, creative, and engaged citizens and lifelong learners."

GPSA would require schools to meet the needs of the whole child by addressing multiple dimensions, including students' physical, social and emotional health and well-being, and ensuring that students are actively engaged in a wide variety of experiences and settings within—and outside—the classroom. Under GPSA, school curricula would address the knowledge, skills and dispositions necessary to master not only core academic subjects but also career and technical skills for the 21st century; effective and engaged community and civic participation; and physical and emotional health, well-being and self-actualization.

Let us be clear: *Congress must help school communities best meet the needs of the "whole child" by implementing a new foundation for the public education system's accountability system that rests on an authentic, reliable and valid system of assessments.* The new accountability system must eliminate AYP and replace it with a new system designed to foster progress in student learning, close gaps in learning among students, and improve high school graduation rates. The new system must recognize and reward "exemplary" schools and individuals who are performing well above average, and it must allow the majority of schools that are "on target" to carry on without significantly increased Federal requirements. This is not to suggest that the majority of schools should not continue to find ways to improve, but rather to specify that Federal requirements that are prescriptive or punitive are not an appropriate way to foster that improvement. The new system must also correctly identify and foster improvements in "priority" schools (addressed further below).

As for student testing, we must improve assessment systems as well as restore assessments to their proper role in the accountability system, which is to improve instruction and enhance student learning. Assessment systems should be aligned with high-quality standards, curriculum and professional development and cover much broader curricular areas (as articulated above) as well as more complex sets of knowledge, skills and dispositions within those curricular areas. They should comprise multiple components and offer multiple ways to demonstrate knowledge beyond a single, standardized test. Assessments should be developed and designed according to principles that allow their use with students of diverse abilities and diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. Finally, while State or local agencies may choose to administer their own assessments more frequently—and likely will do so in order to help improve instruction in a timely manner—standardized tests mandated *by the Federal Government* should not occur more than once in each of three grade spans (e.g., 4–6, 7–9, 10–12) during a student's K–12 career.

Schools and educators must have the time, ability and resources to complement assessment systems by establishing other systems critical to "whole child" development, such as:

- curricular and extracurricular expansion and development;
- parent, family and community engagement and partnerships;
- high-quality teacher and principal induction and professional development systems;
- systems that support qualified specialized instructional support personnel (i.e., school psychologists, school counselors, speech language pathologists, audiologists, school social workers, school nurses, occupational and physical therapists, music/art/dance therapists and adaptive physical education teachers and others involved in providing assessment, diagnosis, counseling, educational, therapeutic, and other necessary corrective or supportive services) who provide critical services to students;
- systems that support qualified education support staff to assist instruction, provide supplemental or wrap around services or activities, provide nutritional meals and safe transport to students, and maintain schools as vibrant centers for student learning;
- positive behavior support systems, a school-wide approach to improving safety and school behavior for all students;
- student health, nutrition, sports, mentoring and counseling to foster physical and emotional health and safety; and
- construction and modernization to ensure that schools and classrooms are technologically equipped and serve as comfortable and inviting spaces and facilities that meet diverse curricular and extracurricular needs.

Finally, to avoid overlapping and conflicting accountability systems, upon reauthorizing ESEA Congress must immediately replace NCLB accountability labels and requirements with a new, strengthened accountability system as outlined in GPSA. To address the obvious need for a transition to this new system, GPSA should specify what limited, NCLB-era standardized assessments must be administered pending the implementation of new assessment systems under Race to the Top and other assessment reform efforts. Furthermore, we strongly believe NCLB-era assessment results should no longer be used for Federal accountability purposes after ESEA is

reauthorized. The cessation of the NCLB accountability timeline—and the all-too-often inaccurate school labels—is critical to allow States to begin developing more complete accountability systems comprising multiple measures of student learning. States will also use this time to pilot and ramp up new assessment instruments under the new accountability system so that they may be used as soon as possible.

(2) Ensure equity, adequacy and sustainability in education funding and resources, including intensive assistance and supports to struggling schools to close gaps in student learning, opportunities, and college and career readiness.

Congress should restore the original intent of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act to eliminate disparities in educational opportunities between advantaged and disadvantaged students. It should do this in two ways:

• *Adequate, equitable and sustainable funding.* First, Congress should establish that the role of the Federal Government is to: (1) *investigate and research* to what extent and how education funding policies and practices and other external influences and events at the Federal, State and local levels lead to disparities and fluctuations in educational opportunities, quality and performance among students, and (2) *close*, to the extent possible, disparities and eliminate fluctuations in educational opportunities, quality and performance among students through direct Federal funding and assistance and through policies designed to encourage adequate, equitable and sustainable education funding and assistance at the State and local levels. (See our legislative specifications in GPSA regarding "equity and adequacy plans" which should be required under a reauthorized ESEA).

The current education jobs crisis has illuminated a dangerous and unacceptable ebb and tide in the continuity and stability of public education nationwide; such fluctuations also hinder education reform efforts. Just as safeguards against harmful fluctuations in financial institutions have been developed over time, so too should the education system—the engine of the U.S. economy—be stabilized through equitable, adequate and sustainable funding.

NCLB did a poor job at providing and encouraging sufficient and stabilized education funding for all schools. Even with ARRA, NCLB programs were never funded at their authorized levels and in the last 8 years the per-pupil funding and resource gaps between LEAs have not narrowed or closed. The NEA proposes that Congress remedy these problems in its legislation reauthorizing ESEA by closely monitoring disparities between authorized and appropriated funding levels and requiring State plans to include improvements in adequate, equitable and sustainable funding and resources as a top priority.

For ESEA reauthorization, Congress should prioritize increases in equitably distributed funding channels such as title I and the main portion of the ARRA State Fiscal Stabilization Fund. These programs enable districts to plan efficiently and provide adequate, equitable and sustainable funding to schools. While we support the need for innovation and improvement in education, we do not believe that increasing overall funding of ESEA programs primarily through competitive programs such as Race to the Top, Investing in Innovation, and the Teacher Incentive Fund—particularly in a time of State fiscal crisis—is a sound approach for improving education opportunities, services, and outcomes for students or for achieving equity, adequacy and sustainability of those opportunities in all 50 States.

Priority schools. Second, Congress should, through ESEA, address struggling or "priority schools" by requiring States to adopt plans that call for comprehensive internal and external review teams to study the operations and systems of priority schools and, based on the review, pursue a school transformation approach that emphasizes collaboration, capacity-building and aggressive improvements—not the rigid implementation of prescriptive intervention "models," as currently proposed by the Obama administration. Examples of successful transformation models may be found in the Denver Public Schools (Denver, CO), Hamilton County Public Schools (Hamilton County, TN) and Putnam City West High School (Oklahoma City, OK). For more information about successful transformation approaches, see *www.nea prioritysschools.org*.

(3) Address teacher and principal recruitment, retention and effectiveness thoughtfully and comprehensively.

Research shows that infusing the educational system with great educators requires attention be paid to each segment of the educator pipeline—from promoting education as a career to rigorous standards for entry into the profession. It also includes induction and placement, certification and licensure, mentoring, professional development, advancement, and retaining accomplished educators. Ultimately, we must develop systems to recruit legions of top undergraduate students and professionals leaving other professions, to prepare them effectively, and to nurture and safeguard their path to careers in education.

According to some estimates, a third of our Nation's public school teachers will have retired over the next several years. To compound the problem, a third of new teachers leave the profession within 3 years, and some districts replace half of their new staff every 5 years. (See *www.nctaf.org*.) We are also losing hundreds of thousands of teachers and other education employees to layoffs due to the ongoing fiscal crisis. (See NEA's synopsis of layoffs in 50 States at *http://www.nea.org/assets/docs/State_Budgets_and_Education_50_state_chart_2010.pdf*.) In short, this country needs bold ideas for how to attract and retain talented new teachers to address the looming national teaching shortage.

NEA has proposed that Congress establish a National Education Institute (NEI), a highly competitive public academy for the Nation's most promising K–12 teacher candidates in diverse academic disciplines, which would allow the Federal Government to attract top undergraduates as well as second-career professionals and prepare them as leaders of school reform around the Nation. NEI would provide an intensive 1-year path (free tuition, room, and board in exchange for a 7-year commitment to service in select public schools) to full licensure, school placement, induction, along with lifetime professional development and mentoring opportunities from NEI faculty/graduates/master teachers. NEI also would partner with existing teacher preparation programs to establish a highly competitive "National Scholars" program in select universities that would foster regional and local excellence in teacher preparation, licensure and induction. Additionally, NEI would sponsor a principal or leadership development program for top candidates who have served as teachers for at least 3 years and wish to enter an intensive program to become a principal or school leader in a hard-to-staff school.

Teacher effectiveness begins, but does not end, at the recruitment and preparation stages. We need policies that foster continuous learning in the form of high-quality, job-embedded professional development, mentoring programs, common planning and reflection time, and timely and continuous feedback from peers and school leadership. Congress should increase funding in title II to allow more teachers to become certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards or similar programs.

Teacher and principal evaluation systems must be reformed to become more useful avenues for improving professional practice. The recent release of the Administration's Blueprint compels us to raise with you our grave concerns about the Blueprint's call for a State-defined system to rate the effectiveness of teachers which must be based in significant part on student academic growth. First, it is not appropriate for Federal policy or law to mandate the terms of an individual teacher's employment. We do not, from the Federal level, prescribe to Governors or mayors how to evaluate other public employees. The Federal Government does not hire or fire public employees; therefore, instruments that impact these decisions should not be mandated from the Federal level.

Second, mandating the use of standardized test scores for the assessment of teacher performance is neither psychometrically valid, nor does it accurately capture the myriad elements of instructional practice. This is *not* because we do not believe that assessments are potentially useful instruments, or that teachers are critically responsible for improving student learning. As an educators' association, we do know the impact that we have on our students. We also know that assessments—especially if they are improved to test broader and deeper skills and to include multiple components and stages—can serve as useful diagnostic and instructional tools for both teachers and students to help improve instruction and learning.

Third, the Blueprint fails to address several other implementation problems. For example, how would a teacher effectiveness definition which is based substantially on "student academic growth" impact art teachers or music teachers or other instructional personnel who teach subjects not easily assessed by traditional methods? How would the system take into account the fact that children learn cumulatively—meaning that they learn skills from all of their educators—so how can we accurately identify which educator should be "credited" with specific levels of student growth?

In sum, we object to the Blueprint's mandated linkage between student assessments and teachers for evaluative purposes for two reasons: (1) because research does not bear out that measuring teacher performance through his or her student's standardized test score growth is accurate or reliable, to make such a link would have a devastating impact not only on teacher instruction and practice but on teacher recruitment, retention and morale nationwide; and (2) using standardized tests in this manner would perpetuate and exacerbate the effects of NCLB because they would increase the unwarranted premium and emphasis placed on such tests—which has been perhaps the most frequent criticism of NCLB voiced by our members—and divert attention and resources away from developing the "whole child" through offering a more complete curriculum as well as other activities and services.

Instead, a reauthorized ESEA should foster high-quality teacher and principal evaluation systems that are locally and collaboratively agreed upon built upon sound principles of professional practice—i.e., the essential knowledge, skills and dispositions a quality teacher or principal should possess. (See the document entitled "Ensuring Every Child a Quality Teacher" in our HELP submission on Teachers and Leaders for more information on professional practice principles.)

Furthermore, we will never cease to point out that learning is a process influenced by many people and factors in a child's life. As noted conservative education historian Diane Ravitch recently noted, "It would be good if our Nation's education leaders recognized that teachers are not solely responsible for student test scores. Other influences matter, including the students' effort, the family's encouragement, the effects of popular culture, and the influence of poverty." (*http://www.huffingtonpost.com/diane-ravitch/first-lets-fire-all-the-t_b_483074.html*) We will continue to highlight the reams of studies and evidence that supports this conclusion and urge—as we have throughout our association's 150-year history—that Federal, State, and local policies must acknowledge that the entire education system as well as communities, parents, and policymakers have a shared responsibility to address the multitude of factors that impact learning.

Teaching and learning conditions must be addressed as a key component of increasing teacher recruitment and retention as well as teacher effectiveness. Congress must take additional steps in reauthorizing ESEA through school construction and modernization funding, title II funding and other "whole child" reforms (see above) to ensure that teachers and paraprofessionals receive sufficient resources, manageable class sizes and the support of other professionals to address student health, safety, well-being, nutrition and parent and family engagement.

Finally, we must ensure that school principals and other administrators—as well as teachers and education support professionals—receive adequate preparation, mentoring, and continuous professional development and support to improve their craft. They must receive timely and useful feedback from school staff as well as other administrators and be evaluated fairly and comprehensively. And they must have the resources and the staff necessary to create and maintain a successful school.

Question 2. Of all the ideas and recommendations for education reform, where do you believe there is consensus among education professionals, policymakers, academics, business leaders, and other stakeholders?

Answer 2. There is broad consensus that we need to identify and learn from exemplary schools that are successful at sustaining high levels of student learning, graduating high rates of students, and closing gaps between student subpopulations. There is also widespread agreement that we must rally together as a community and provide intensive support to address our "priority" or lowest-achieving schools. While the ideas on how to showcase exemplary schools or help priority schools may differ, we agree that NCLB has done little to benefit either end of the school performance spectrum. Therefore, we ask Congress to reauthorize ESEA by devoting substantial attention to supporting and recognizing achievement and progress in both exemplary and priority schools.

We also agree that none of the improvements needed to create world-class centers for learning is possible without great educators and education support professionals who staff our public schools. That's why NEA is calling on Congress to stanch the current tide of layoffs and to establish policies through ESEA reauthorization that will stabilize education funding and resources and attract and retain millions of new, talented educators and education support professionals to serve the next generation of American students.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS OF SENATOR CASEY BY CHARLES BUTT

Question 1. What are the three most important specific recommendations you would make to this committee for reforming education through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act?

Answer 1. (1) If funds were available, **full day Pre-K for all low-income and ESL children** with a teacher certified in early childhood, and an aide, in a class size of no more than 22. All studies of the efficacy of Pre-K are **based on these criteria**.

(2) **Encourage the entry of leadership individuals into superintendent and principal roles** and, importantly, include continued developmental assistance throughout their careers.

(3) Enhance curriculum design to provide courses that are relevant and rigorous for students who choose not to go to college or at least not pursue a 4-year college

degree. This should not involve tracking but should provide true choice for each student. In recent years the focus has been on students that plan to go to college and **this effort should be enhanced not diminished**. At the same time we need to combat the drop-out rate by having available **more relevant courses for other students. Both can be done well if curriculum planning and school leadership are effective**.

Question 2. Of all the ideas and recommendations for education reform, where do you believe there is consensus among education professionals, policymakers, academics, business leaders, and other stakeholders?

Answer 2. Virtually everyone agrees that superior "leadership teaching" is the underlying requirement to move American education ahead. This includes:

• **Longer term career-pay opportunities** that are competitive with business and finance. Starting pay has improved in some States but few have pay for longer service teachers of outstanding ability that is competitive with other professionals.

• Currently the bottom third of SAT scoring college applicants choose teaching as a career. In the top achieving nations globally only the top 5–20 percent of all **college graduates** are **admitted** to teaching. If we aren't able to **attract our strongest young people into the field** all other efforts will be only modestly effective at best.

• Although there are many ineffective teachers not serving students well, **by whom they are replaced is the crucial question**. Rewarding a few master teachers with very high pay is still untested as a concept but even if it proves successful the starting pay and long-term career pay for a broad spectrum of teachers will be key to changing the profession. Even this will be of limited value unless the **screening** and **admission procedures are raised significantly and adhered to in a highly disciplined way**.

• Schools should be allowed to **replace ineffective teachers**.

RESPONSE BY JOHN CASTELLANI TO QUESTIONS OF SENATOR DODD AND SENATOR CASEY

QUESTION OF SENATOR DODD

Question 1. Mr. Castellani, as I have said on numerous occasions, parental involvement is vital to a child's success in school. The Family and Medical Leave Act, which I authored, allows parents to care for their newborn or adopted children or when their children are sick. However, we still need to allow parents the time they need to be involved with their children's schooling. I think business has a role to play in encouraging and increasing parental involvement. How can businesses help promote parental involvement for children of all ages? What do businesses in your coalition currently do to increase employee flexibility to allow for more parental involvement in schools? What are some innovative ideas that your members have on how to promote this in the future?

Answer 1. Companies are using innovative strategies to encourage and support parental involvement in education. For example:

• Prudential holds a series of 2-hour seminars for employees called "Prudential CARES About Education," that focuses on empowering employees to engage with and become informed consumers of public education. The seminar is streamed to Prudential employees who cannot attend at the company's headquarters in Newark, NJ. The most recent forum addressed what parents can do to help their children succeed in a global economy.

• State Farm provides a yearly paid Education Support (ES) day to volunteer in a local school. This provides a way for all employees—not just parents—to get involved in their schools.

• Procter & Gamble's flexible work options have resulted in employees reporting that their morale has increased and they appreciate the opportunity to attend parent activities at their children's schools.

• Over 200 companies in Maryland link to the Maryland Business Roundtable for Education's PARENTS COUNT Web site that provides information to their employees who are parents on how they can help their children succeed in school.

• Recent research on workplace flexibility initiatives for hourly workers sponsored by Corporate Voices for Working Families found they are as successful as those designed for professional staff. In fact, businesses that offer hourly employees flexible work options find that they enhance recruitment, retention, engagement, cost control, productivity and financial performance. While companies' use of workplace flexibility is not exclusively to provide time for parental involvement in schools, case

studies demonstrate that employees feel comfortable using the flexibility for this purpose.

QUESTIONS OF SENATOR CASEY

Question 1. What are the three most important specific recommendations you would make to this committee for reforming education through the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act?

Answer 1. The Principles for Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, developed by the Business Coalition for Student Achievement and included in my testimony, provide a set of recommendations that work together to reform education and improve student achievement. This is not a menu where you can select just three items. However, there are three basic elements that are absolutely essential: continue the focus on disaggregated data with accountability for all groups of students; incent States to raise their content and performance standards to college and career ready levels instead of lowering them to create a false impression of success; and shift from "highly qualified" to "highly effective" teachers to attract, retain and compensate top-notch teachers.

Question 2. Of all the ideas and recommendations for education reform, where do you believe there is consensus among education professionals, policymakers, academics, business leaders, and other stakeholders?

Answer 2. If our goal is *consensus* on education reform among all stakeholders, it is likely that reauthorization would turn back the clock rather than make any of the significant reforms needed to improve student achievement. Given that caveat, I believe there is consensus on the need for more emphasis on high schools, the need to remove the unintended consequence of States lowering their definitions of proficiency, and the need to measure student growth over time instead of the current comparison of the current year's students to the prior year's students at that grade level.

[Whereupon, at 4:55 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

○