



STATES' IMPACT ON FEDERAL EDUCATION POLICY  
ORAL HISTORY PROJECT

---

An Oral History Interview with

*M*ARGARET ( *P*EG ) *G*OERTZ



Interviewer: Anita Hecht, Life History Services  
Recording Date: June 2015  
Place: Pennington, NJ  
Interview Length: 2.5 hours  
– Oral History Interview Transcript –

## **Project Background**

While U.S. education policy is widely discussed and well documented, the impact of our nation's states on that policy has received much less attention. Launched in 2003 and led by the New York State Archives, the States' Impact on Federal Education Policy Project has worked to create and foster the use of a comprehensive, accessible, nationwide historical record that documents the efforts of states to affect U.S. education policy since the mid-twentieth century.

The Project has connected leaders in state and national education with archivists to ensure the preservation of and access to the record of education policy, and supported sustainable connections between the two communities. The policymakers are themselves repositories of stories and wisdom not captured in the written record. The interviews presented here enrich the written record of education policy during this dynamic and critical period. Our narrators helped to shape the course of education policy in the United States over the past decades. We invite you to learn from their unique experiences and perspectives.

## **To the Reader**

This printed transcript is a lightly edited record of the original oral history interview recorded in June 2015 between Margaret (Peg) Goertz and Anita Hecht of Life History Services, LLC, on behalf of the States' Impact on Federal Education Policy Project of New York State Archives. This transcript is accompanied by a digitally audiotaped oral history interview, as well as a narrative biographical summary of the narrator, both housed at New York State Archives.

Oral history interviews contain first-person accounts of historical events, individual experiences and significant memories. In this spirit, let it be understood that these interviews do not attempt to recount "absolute truth." Instead, they intend to relate the stories that hold meaning for the particular narrator. Interviews are not always chronological or complete with regards to specific data. Accuracy is always the goal, though there may be corrections, and certainly additions, to any oral history.

With generous support from  
The New York Community Trust – Wallace Foundation Special Projects Fund

Interviewing & Production by Life History Services, LLC  
[www.lifehistoryservices.com](http://www.lifehistoryservices.com) / 608.255.9669  
Madison, Wisconsin USA

**PROJECT NAME:** THE STATES' IMPACT ON FEDERAL EDUCATION  
POLICY ORAL HISTORY PROJECT  
Verbatim Interview Transcript

**NARRATOR:** Margaret "Peg" Goertz

**INTERVIEWER:** Anita Hecht

**INTERVIEW DATE:** June 3, 2015

**INTERVIEW LOCATION:** Pennington, New Jersey

**INTERVIEW LENGTH:** Approximately 2 Hours, 30 Minutes

**KEY:**

<b>ETS</b>	<b>Educational Testing Service</b>
<b>EPRI</b>	<b>Education Policy Research Institute</b>
<b>ESEA</b>	<b>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</b>
<b>CPRE</b>	<b>Consortium for Policy Research in Education</b>
<b>NAEP</b>	<b>National Assessment of Educational Progress</b>
<b>IASA</b>	<b>Improving America's Schools Act</b>
<b>NSF</b>	<b>National Science Foundation</b>
<b>NCES</b>	<b>National Center for Education Statistics</b>

#### **Editor's note**

This document is a verbatim transcript of the oral history interview with Margaret "Peg" Goertz conducted on behalf of the States' Impact on Federal Education Policy Oral History Project of New York State Archives. The transcript has been reviewed, edited for clarity, and in some cases, supplemented by the Narrator with additional materials or notes. Audiences listening to the recorded interviews alongside the transcripts will note slight differences between the print transcript and the recorded interview, due to this editing process. In all cases, these changes have been reviewed and approved by the Narrator.

---

## **SUBJECT INDEX**

### **HOUR 1**

<b>00:00</b>	<b>Family History</b> <b>College Years</b>
<b>10:00</b>	<b>College Friend's Influence on Coursework</b> <b>Early Interest in Academia</b> <b>Post-Bachelor Degree Studies</b>

- 20:15**                    **Teaching at Trenton State College**  
**Opportunity to Work at ETS**  
**Role of ETS**  
**Ford Foundation's Funding of School Finance Reform Studies**
- 29:50**                    **Court cases in '70s and Their Impact on School Finance Reform**  
**Changes in Federal Role in Education under Reagan Administration**
- 39:30**                    **Expanded Role of State Education Agencies**  
**States' Reaction to Feds' Equity Agenda**  
**Impact of *Nation at Risk***  
**Releasing State-by-State NAEP Scores**
- 50:20**                    ***Nation at Risk* and Increasing Standards and Assessments**  
**Feds' Monitoring of Title I Students**  
**States' Accountability and Accreditation**

**HOUR 2**

- 00:00**                    **School Districts' Use of Title 1 Funds**  
**Formation/Role of CPRE**  
**State Educational Policy Reforms in Late '80s**
- 10:00**                    **Development of National Goals**  
**Governors' Impact on Systemic Reform**  
**Beginning Emphasis on Outcomes and Accountability**  
**Work on CPRE Research Team**
- 20:20**                    **National Associations' Development of Content Standards**  
**Movement for Outcomes Based Education**
- 29:55**                    **Divisions Over Outcome Based Education**  
**States' Flexibility in Developing Accountability Systems**  
**Public vs. Subgroup Reporting**  
**Development of Congress to Classroom**
- 40:35**                    **Conclusions of Congress to Classroom Research Projects**
- 50:55**                    **NCES Study of States' Performance on NAEP v. State Assessments**

**States' Use of Goals 2000 Funds  
Difficulties in Analyzing Assessment Data**

**HOUR 3**

- 00:00**                    **Lessons Learned From Systemic Reform Movement  
Accountability Standards Under No Child Left Behind  
Race to the Top Elements**
- 10:00**                    **Feds Limited Role in Mandating State Processes  
Benefits of Subgroup Reporting and Accountability  
Increased Expectations Relative to Raised Standards  
Sanctions v. Capacity Building**
- 20:00**                    **Business Community's Influence on State Standards  
States and Feds Interplay on Systemic Reform  
Charter Schools  
Future Projections for State and Federal Educational Issues  
Disparities in School Finance**
- 30:00**                    **Obstacles in Procuring Research Funding**
- 

**HOUR 1**

**Hour1/00:00  
Family History, College Years**

*The date is June 3rd in the year 2015. My name is Anita Hecht, and I have the great pleasure and honor of interviewing Peg Goertz in her home in Pennington, New Jersey on behalf of New York State Archives and the States' Impact on Federal Education Policy Oral History Project. Welcome to this interview. Thank you for agreeing to participate. So let's start by setting your experience in the context of your life. When and where were you born, Peg?*

I was born in a hospital in Evanston, Illinois, but I lived in the northern part of Chicago, which is where I grew up. I attended the Chicago public schools, both elementary and high school, graduated from Senn High School in 1963, and then went to Oberlin College, where I graduated in 1967 with a major in what was then called government (*chuckles*) – would now be called political science.

*Tell me a little bit also about your family history and how that might have influenced your political views, your educational/academic interests.*

I was probably influenced most by my mother, who I characterize as a New Deal Democrat. She was a homemaker. My father traveled quite a bit for his work, but she was always active in the community. And I think maybe part of the interest in education became – she was always active in our local PTA [Parent Teacher Association], and she would go down with the Chicago PTA to Springfield, Illinois, to lobby on behalf of education. She was involved with the Chicago League of Women Voters. I grew up in Chicago during the – with the first Bill Daley. I grew up in an apartment building. It was large enough; we were our own precinct in Chicago. So we voted in our building, and she would work the polls (*chuckles*) for Mr. Frisbee, who was our delegate. So it was sort of that kind of exposure.

*An engagement.*

An engagement, right. So it wasn't partisan politics in the sense of going out and campaigning for somebody, but rather, I think, community level involvement.

*And what level of education did both of your parents achieve?*

My parents are both college graduates. My father graduated with a degree in electrical engineering from Rutgers and my mother with a degree in economics. They met at Rutgers as students there.

*So you came back to the native land, so to speak.*

So I came back to the native land, yeah. My parents are both born and raised in central New Jersey.

*Any ethnic or cultural influences?*

I don't think so. My grandparents came to the United States not long after the turn of the twentieth century. My grandfather was fleeing conscription into – I believe it was the Russian army. He grew up in Warsaw. It was at that point, which Poland was partitioned.

*This is your maternal –*

This is my maternal, my mother's side. And my grandmother was born and raised in Kraków, Poland. I'm not sure how they met, but he was thirty, she was twenty when they married. And then they came to the United States – I'm going to say around 1906, 1907. And my father's side I know less about because my grandfather died at a relatively early age in the influenza outbreak

in 1917. And my grandmother, who was probably close to forty when my father was born, died when I was a baby, so I never really knew my paternal grandparents.

*And they were German Protestants, I think.*

They were German Protestants. My grandfather came over to this country as a young man. I believe my grandmother was born in the United States. Her parents had come much earlier in the 19th century.

*So northern European background.*

Right, uh-huh. *(affirmatively)* And neither family was particularly religious, so even though my maternal grandparents were Jewish, they didn't belong to a synagogue. And I think my father talked about going to church as a young boy, but again, it was not a major factor in his upbringing.

*There was more civic involvement in your family than religious.*

Much more civic involvement.

*The time you grew up in was pretty interesting, too. To graduate from high school in 1963 in the heart of the burgeoning civil rights movement and Kennedy. How did that influence your views at that point in time? Were you politicized at a young age?*



I would say not really. I grew up in a very, I'd say, religiously mixed neighborhood of Chicago. I physically grew up in a neighborhood that had a number of Catholic educational institutions, and I would say the neighborhood itself was about forty percent Catholic. It was also about forty percent Jewish. A few of the parents of my friends from school had actually escaped from Europe just prior to the war. And then it was only probably about twenty percent Protestant. But it was totally white in terms of – though I should say, we did have a small number of Japanese American families who had been in the relocation camps on the west coast and came from that. Part of that resettlement was in Chicago. So I had friends who were Japanese American. I had a few friends who were Chinese American, Jewish, Catholic.

*So some religious diversity, but not ethnic diversity. I mean –*

Not as much ethnic diversity. And no racial diversity.

*Okay. Thank you for giving us the little bit of context here. When you graduated in 1963 from high school, I assume you expected to go on to college?*

Definitely. My parents were both college educated. My brother, who's four years older than I am, let's see if I am getting the dates right, had just graduated from college. He went to Columbia College. And so there was no question I'd go onto college.

*And you chose Oberlin?*

I chose Oberlin for a couple of reasons. I wanted a small co-ed college. My brother having gone to Columbia – those were the days when the Ivy Leagues were segregated by sex, and I just didn't want the social pressure of the dating and that type of thing that happens. So I wanted co-ed, I wanted small, and I wanted a place that was politically liberal, I think, as part of my upbringing. So Oberlin fit the bill.

*What were your interests and goals at the time?*

I don't know if I had goals. *(laughter)* Interests – I loved history. I was very good in math in high school, so I was also interested in mathematics – obviously, to some extent, in government and political science. When I went to college, basically your first two years you had to take courses in required areas. So you had to take courses in philosophy, in religion, in social science, in sciences, and in math – unlike today, so you get exposure to –

*It was real liberal arts.*

It was very liberal arts, right, right.

*And so you studied government.*

Right.

**Hour 1/10:00**

**College Friend's Influence on Coursework, Early Interest in Academia, Post-Bachelor Degree Studies**

*And at any point in your undergraduate career did you become aware or interested in education? Education policy or pedagogy?*

Not particularly education as pedagogy. My mother wanted me to become a teacher. *(laughter)* I decided I did not have the patience to be a teacher. It was also, as you mentioned, it was the civil rights era. Oberlin was very active, vis-à-vis that and voting rights. And so I think picked up a lot on that in college. For the '64 election, the faculty or the other students would organize students to go out and register voters. And we'd go to nearby communities to do that. So I'm not sure, really, where the education piece came back into play. I think when I did my senior paper, or thesis, it was as much around issues of voting behavior, and it was around how individuals voted on a school election and what were the factors that led them to vote for or against, rather than it being specific to education.

*For or against a levy?*

A particular – a levy. I think it was a – at that point, they voted on the school levy.

*And you go on, then, to graduate school in hopes of becoming an academic?*

Well, I sort of started at Oberlin the beginning of what I'll call an old girls' network. *(laughter)* Oberlin had a structure of what they call junior resident advisors in the freshman dorms. My JR,

who had the room next to mine in my freshman dorm, was also a government major. Her name is Cindy Brown. In addition to the whole civil rights era, the college at the time held what they called mock conventions in terms of simulating Democratic and Republican conventions. And she got me involved in that. Actually, we were assigned to be Republicans. *(laughter)* She had come from a Republican family in Ohio. And somewhere in the Oberlin archives is a picture of me standing on a chair waiving a Goldwater sign. *(laughter)* So it really was playing it out. But she really had an influence in some of the courses I took. She graduated two years ahead of me. She went onto Syracuse to the Maxwell School to get a master's in public administration. And so originally my goal when I graduated was to get a job in government. She recommended that I go to the Maxwell School, and I basically sort of followed in her footsteps to go there. And then, to sort of – a little bit ahead of the story – when she finished her master's degree, she went down to Washington and started to work there on civil rights issues within the government, Office of Educational Opportunity, and became very connected with sort of the civil rights community in Washington. And later on got me also connected with that group as well.

*These connections and influences are important in a life history.*

Yeah. Well, and the other connection was before I went, she contacted some of her former classmates, who had stayed at Syracuse to work on their doctorate, one of whom was Donna Shalala.

*Oh really?*

And basically wrote Donna, and told Donna to take good care of me. (*chuckles*) So that became sort of another part as sort of this continuation of how I ended up where –

*You ended up.*

Where I ended up, right. So I went through the MPA [Master of Public Administration] program. It was a one year program. There were three tracks within it. Metropolitan studies was one, and that was the one I was interested in, being a city kid. One was general public administration, and one was international. I had gotten, through Syracuse, a fellowship from the Department of Housing and Urban Development which, at that point, was fairly new. And they were funding students to prepare them for government. I really got interested in the academic side of it, and I was able to get my HUD fellowship extended –

*For a Ph.D. program?*

For a Ph.D. program. And so stayed and did that program.

*So academia then kind of grabbed you.*

Sort of, yeah – grabbed my attention.

*At this point still, not quite though, on any education issues or interests yet?*

It was, again, through coursework. Some of the faculty were involved in education, particularly

Scotty Campbell, who went onto to become the dean while I was there. So I started my doctoral work. I had a graduate student office in an old house that was the center for the metropolitan studies program. There was sort of, again, a cohort of students. Some, like Donna, were also a couple of years ahead of me. Another was a man named John Callahan, who went on to work first for the National Council of State Legislatures and then became a staffer – I forgot who it was . . . whatever. I'm trying to remember in terms of – I think it was eclectic interests.

*Yes.*

There was a constitutional convention going on at the time in New York State and Scotty and some of the students were very involved in doing that. Education was a piece of that. I did sort of a broad range of policy areas, really with a focus on metro studies and urban studies.

*And were you doing quantitative research or qualitative, or how would you describe?*

No. I was much more of a qualitative researcher. Back in those days, the quantitative work was a lot more basic. Computers, computing power – when I was doing my research my junior and senior year in college, we used to say there was a hierarchy in terms of who got on the computer in the computer lab. *(laughter)* Political science was one from the bottom, with sociology being the bottom, so it was *(laughter)* –

*Who was on top?*

I think it was psychology. I think it was psychology, economics, political science, and then sociology. And the same thing when I got to graduate school. It was a different world.

*Yeah; absolutely. So you get your Ph.D. in '71?*

'71.

*And go to teach.*

In the intervening time, I met my husband at Oberlin. He was two years behind me. And again, it was this JR. He was a freshman. The men ate in the women's dorms at the time. I was a junior resident advisor in a freshman dorm where he ate, and that's how we met. We married in '69 when he graduated. He moved to Syracuse while I was finishing my degree, and then in '71, he entered a doctoral program at City University of New York. So I started to look for jobs in the New York City area. I actually looked both at going back into public administration and at teaching. And what panned out was a teaching job at what was then Trenton State College. It's now The College of New Jersey, and teaching political science. They particularly wanted somebody in – they were developing an undergraduate program in public administration, so that was my attraction to them.

**Hour 1/20:15**

**Teaching at Trenton State College, Opportunity to Work at ETS, Role of ETS, Ford Foundation's Funding of School Finance Reform Studies**

*Was it a tenure track?*

It was tenure track. At that time, it was a very short tenure. (*chuckles*) It was after three years. Part of it was it had been a state teachers' college, and in the mid '60s, they converted them to four-year colleges. But they still used the same tenure clock that K-12 teachers had. (*laughter*)

*So you got tenure.*

So I got tenure, right. And taught. I was in a political science department of six people, and we each specialized in a different area. We had to, because we were very small. And I really had nobody to talk to or work with on issues I was interested in. So going back to the old girl network, I had gone into New York, had dinner with another graduate student friend, and Donna was there. I was telling her – she was teaching, I think, at Baruch at the time – about my dilemma. About two weeks later I get a phone call, and she said another one of our graduate school colleagues named Joel Berke had just gone to work at Educational Testing Service, and it was in Washington. And she said, "He would love to have you come for a year, take a year's leave, and come work in the Princeton office." So again, it was those Syracuse connections that led me to ETS [Educational Testing Service]. And so I thought I'd take a year and work on education issues in the research division there.

*And it turned into sixteen years.*

And it turned into sixteen years. (*laughter*)



*Can you describe ETS and what it did in those days when you got there.*

It was obviously –

*ETS is Educational Testing Service.*

Right. And it was best known then for developing and administering the SAT [Scholastic Aptitude Test] exam, though it had a range of other testing programs.

*Funded by?*

Well, the SAT is actually a product of the College Board. ETS is a non-profit organization. They have a research division.

*Which is what you came there for.*

Which is what I came into. At the time, that's where the psychometricians and the statisticians who worked on assessment issues were housed. They also did research for some of the other programs. They were running the Graduate Record Exam at the same time. I think they still had the Law School Admissions Test at the time. So they were what we called program research people. They would do research for the specific programs. And there was sort of an interest in developing a policy research group.

*Related to testing, or –*

No. Related to education policy. I'm trying to think again of the chronology, but Jim Kelly of the Ford Foundation I think had something to do with it. I can't remember – Greg Anrig, who had been the commissioner of education in Massachusetts – I don't remember what year – he came and became president of ETS. But it was in the air at the time. And so they created a very small – there were basically two of us (*laughter*) in Princeton.

*Ed policy researchers?*

Ed policy. And the core group was in Washington where Joel was. We created what we called EPRI – Education Policy Research Institute – EPRI within ETS. And the funding for that came initially from foundations. Ford was an initial funder of what we did. So a lot of the early work I did, because of Ford's interest in school finance reform, was on education finance.

*And was it particular to any state or to all states?*

We followed the money. (*laughter*) One of the challenges was we had to generate our funding externally. Unlike other researchers who would get their money from ETS testing programs, we had to look outside. This would have been . . . I went there in . . . 197–?

(197)6?

(197)6. So there was a lot of activity around school finance reform. Ford was funding studies in a couple of states. The federal government, which they had the equity project at the time, was giving grants to some states to also do school finance equity studies. My first one was in Vermont. That was a federally funded one. Worked on one in Connecticut, and I'm not sure. I think that was federally funded. I can't remember. And then one in New Hampshire, which was funded by Ford because the conservative politics in New Hampshire at the time was not going to basically generate state money for doing that. And we would go in, and in Vermont and in Connecticut, we worked with commissions that were composed of basically state legislators and state department of education people. We would do a study of the equity of their system, as a report to those commissions.

*This is a time maybe you can put into context for us. It's the late '70s. Carter is president.*

Um-hmm. *(affirmatively)*

*Title I dollars are flowing. What it seems to me, is that the focus in those years was really on equity.*

Yes.

*And whether or not low-income, minority kids were going to have the same kind of opportunities. Is that correct?*

That's correct yeah.

*Tell me a little bit more about that context, first of all, as you saw it and experienced it.*

Well, the activity – not only that, but it was a time in which the state funding systems were being challenged in state courts. We had had the Serrano I and II decisions in California, which I want to say was '72 and '73. The first school finance decision in New Jersey, Robinson I, was in 1973. My boss, Joel Berke, had actually worked on the Rodriguez case in Texas, which was the one that was shot down on the federal equal protection clause. Again, Ford was funding – Jim was funding basically a set of scholars to do research in these areas. He was also funding groups within states, plaintiffs, in order to challenge those. So in New Jersey, it was the Education Law Center, for example. It was a big policy area at the time. And I think building on and coming out of the Brown v. Education, the Title I, and the focus less on race but now really on education – economically disadvantaged children.

*When we think about our topic of states' impact on federal education policy, were these cases that you're mentioning and these state activities, you think, informing what you saw happening at the policy level?*

**Hour 1/29:50**

**Court cases in '70s and Their Impact on School Finance Reform, Changes in Federal Role in Education under Reagan Administration**

I would say it was a network of states, and the impact really was on state policy. With the Rodriguez decision in Texas in '72, it basically had taken the federal government out of school finance equity litigation. They made it clear that it was a constitutional responsibility of the states, and the federal equal protection clause didn't apply to it. And Title I was, from my perspective, was running on somewhat a different but parallel track in terms of – it was giving funds to states and to communities in order to provide additional educational services to poor and low achieving children, very much a funding flow at that point. The state cases were very much, because they were around state education clauses, were really around state responsibility for educating children. And most of the litigation purposely would exclude federal funding because the argument was – that's supposed to be supplemental to what state school funding systems should be providing to their students.

*So when you were looking at the flow of dollars for these state studies, did you come to any conclusions about whether these systems were having the intended outcomes of – whether it was Title I or whether it was school finance? I guess I'm trying to set the stage before the tide shifts in the '80s.*

Right, yeah.

*Was it working? Did you see it going in the direction –*

It really depended upon what the state legislative response was to the litigation. So in states where the cases were successful, and if there was the money, then basically you would see more

money going into poorer school districts. Most of the longitudinal work I did was in New Jersey. A lot of that early work, again, was funded by Ford. And because of the nature of the very strong court decisions and governors who were responsive to that, we did see a shift in funding. But in terms of looking more nationally at that, there are other researchers that have done that. But as I think about my own research, because I did do work on two Title I resource allocation studies, that was, in some ways, almost separate from the state school finance work I was doing. So I guess in my own mind, I never really brought those together.

*And tell me about those a little bit, about the Title I studies.*

We, and again, this was a bid on a contract from – so the first one was in – well, the first study I did really involving Title I and, more broadly, education policy was in the early 1980s.

*Okay.*

That was not a finance. That was a policy study.

*So let's get to the early '80s then.*

*Okay.*

*By late '70s, there's a lot of federal activity still because there's programs, and categorical programs. And even the Carter administration establishes the Department of*

*Education.*

Um-hmm, right. Right.

*Did you have a sense of how the states reacted to that?*

Um . . .

*I mean, that made a difference in your subsequent working life, right? The Department of Education then funded –*

Well, in that sense, it may have. I really can't comment on that. I think because my own work was really very much focused on state school finance through about 1980, that's really hard for me to say. I think a big turning point in terms of the political side was really the election of Reagan. There's always been this constant debate over what the appropriate federal role is in education. And from '65 certainly through 1980, it was very much about supporting equity, whether it was through ESEA [Elementary and Secondary Education Act], which was enacted in 1965, the civil rights legislation, 94-142, which was the original program for students with disabilities – it was trying to get more resources to students with special needs, whether it was due to economic circumstances or particular student needs. I think with the election of Reagan and sort of a conservative push, this whole role became questioned. So this is even before *A Nation at Risk*. So there was a question of, first of all, should they spend less? And we did see during the Reagan years that the federal share did drop by several percentage points. But also

about – was the federal government being too prescriptive in states in terms of the programs? Should we go to block grants? Just give the money to the states, let them do with it what they want. And so that was the policy context of the study that ETS did in the early 1980s, which is one that was called, *Interaction of Federal and Related State Policies*. That was responding to concerns over administrative burden, administrative overload. And so what we looked at was basically how states were administering sort of a wide range of federal programs. It ranged from civil rights, which was obviously legally, very prescriptive, to vocational education, which had – the first federal money for that was, I think, in 1912 or 1915, and that had always been a state program with federal money but very little federal oversight. So we sort of looked at that whole gambit. That's where I think it became clear that there had been some states, like New York and Massachusetts and California, where, due to I think the political leadership, the political culture, of the states, they had been early supporters of programs like state compensatory education, or even some people say that 94-142 was modeled on the Massachusetts's special education laws. But in a lot of other states, it was the federal government really. They were providing the only resources for poor students and students with special needs. This was just not on a policy agenda for the states.

*So if I follow you, there were certain states that were active, like California, who developed programs that influenced and shaped, then, the federal law in things like compensatory education?*



Well, not in compensatory education because ESEA, in 1965, was sort of a brand new – that was in response to the War on Poverty type of thing. But I think in terms of having any kind of state programs that would go beyond that, would go beyond the federal –

*Okay.*

**Hour1/39:30**

**Expanded Role of State Education Agencies, States' Reaction to Feds' Equity Agenda, Impact of *Nation at Risk*, Releasing State-by-State NAEP Scores**

I think another point to make that a lot of people aren't aware of is one focus of ESEA in 1965 was building state education agency capacity. Title V gave money to the states because they wanted to build the capacity of the states to administer these programs. By the time we were out in the states in 1981, large portions of state education agency people were federally funded. Now their primary job was to oversee and monitor these federal programs. But it really led to – that was one factor that led to an expanded role of state education agencies. Another – going back to the school finance litigation – as state funding for education increased as a result of finance cases or finance reform, state governments also got more involved in education policy in their states. Prior to '65, the state involvement in education was not high. It was very much a local enterprise. So we see the state role expanding starting in '65, as well as the federal role.

*And there's a natural communication back and forth between the states and the feds.*

Right.

*So in this early study of your interaction of federal and state policies at ETS, you said you looked at administrative burden, coming out of the late '70s whether or not that was a big issue. What kind of conclusions did you come to in that study?*

We found that administrative burdens were not an issue.

*Really?*

Yeah.

*That's interesting.*

Yeah.

*Given the Reagan –*

Given the whole Reagan push, right. Part of it had to do with what one can call sort of the vertical bureaucracy, which is you had the federal programs, you had federally funded staff in the state education agencies that are administering it, and you had federally funded staff in the districts – your district Title I coordinator – was also federally funded.

*So they had a vested interest.*

So they had a vested interest, and they were communicating up and down the system. Where we saw more of a disconnect was in those states that did have their own programs, let's say their own state compensatory education programs. There was not necessarily a meshing between the two. They would run somewhat on separate tracks.

*What I'm trying to understand – tell me if this is fair to say – that when Reagan comes into office, that change towards less government or less federal involvement or less money is actually a top down change. It's not because the states are saying – we want you out.*

I think the Reagan is a political shift. The perception was that the federal government was too involved in the states. And what we found, at least with these programs we looked at, was the issue was not "administrative burden." The tension really, I think, was around the equity agenda, and the federal government coming in and saying basically – you need to serve these children. So I think it was more of a policy (*claps hands*).

*So there was a reaction by some states against the equity agenda?*

I think it was a reaction or basically trying to ignore it. The federal programs came in, they did their thing, and the states sort of kept their hands off of any other –

*It's so interesting. And part of the argument was that the changes should happen at the state level. I mean, the Reagan –*

Right. Very much a devolution back to states, yeah.

*Okay. This was one study you did. Anything else on that study in terms of looking at federal and state policies and how they interacted?*

That was pretty much it in terms of that study and that kind of interaction. I'm just looking at the other things that I worked on.

*Do you have any sense of what the impact of *The Nation at Risk* report was?*

Well, I was going to say, I think sort of the next big piece of it was *The Nation at Risk*, which really shifted the agenda away from equity towards "excellence." That had I think a major impact on the country and on states. That really, I think, was the shift of focus was then back to the states because it was really a bully pulpit kind of policy from the federal government with the report. States put together their own commissions to look at what they were doing and what they needed to do to respond to *A Nation at Risk*. This is really about the point at which CPRE [Consortium for Policy Research in Education] comes, in 1985. So *Nation at Risk* is in '83. You have a lot of activity in the states in the mid '80s.

*Because they're also losing funding, right? Was that partly what was spurring activity?*

No. I think it was the whole message of *A Nation at Risk* about international competitiveness. There's the whole thing about the Japanese are going to take over. (*chuckles*) At the time, the SAT score decline.

*And you're at ETS. This is right in the midst.*

Right. And there's also, if you want to talk about "early data driven policy agenda setting," there was also the National Assessment of Education Progress [NAEP]. They were basically showing that students weren't doing very well either on that assessment.

*Does ETS take over NAEP at that point, sort of in the '80s?*

It comes in during the '80s.

*Okay.*

And I'm trying to remember exactly what year it was. It was about around that time. It was around the mid '80s.

*So did ETS itself have interactions with state leaders around NAEP, or policy makers?*

No. NAEP was run out of the US Department of Education. Again, that was a competitive contract. It had been held by Education Commission of the States. ETS bid on it with a totally sort of new assessment design and won the contract. And so their interaction around NAEP was always with the federal government. There was a big issue at the time about whether they should be releasing NAEP scores by states.

*State-by-state.*

State-by-state. And one of the things that I recall now was – and again, sort of the role of data for better or for worse – was the US Department of Education came up with something that became known as the wall chart in 1984. And because they didn't have NAEP data state-by-state, they reported what they had, which was SAT scores and ACT [American College Testing] scores.

And all of the problems around that – SAT was bi-coastal, ACT is the middle of the country, not all high school students take SAT or ACT. At that point, the college-bound population was much smaller than it is now. So this sort of began to generate discussion so the states could see where they ranked relative to each other on this. But I think a lot of it was the international competition and the concerns of the states about being economically – beginning of the whole discussion of the economic competitiveness of the states.

**Hour 1/50:20**

***Nation at Risk and Increasing Standards and Assessments, Feds' Monitoring of Title I Students, States' Accountability and Accreditation***

*And you, as a researcher, did you come down on one side or another in terms of NAEP testing*

*state-by-state? That was a big debate. I don't know if ETS got involved in that debate, or was it simply doing what was in the contract with the government to do?*

Well, I think the ultimate decision whether to do – I mean, I do remember there being technical discussions among people within ETS, but that ultimately was a decision made by the US Department of Education.

*Did you think it was a good idea to do the state-by-state?*

I don't recall at that point. *(laughter)*

*That's fine.*

I just remember having that wall chart hanging over my desk when it came out *(chuckles)* because there were so many problems. There were so many problems with that. The locus of policy activity really shifts back to the states and around this issue of excellence.

*And data, it seems like, becomes more and more important.*

It does, yeah. It's probably, I think, one of the early uses of data.

*What strikes me as though the data is on sort of outcomes and not as much on input.*

Right.

*The Reagan era didn't seem – and maybe I'm wrong here, too. Were the states also talking about – since the federal government wasn't – how to improve the inputs? Whether its teacher preparation –*

Well, at this point again, it was during the Reagan administration, so the federal government was trying to basically, I think, pull back from the federal role and basically say it's the states' responsibilities. One of the things about *The Nation at Risk* – and I was going back and looking at some of the work we did around the question about standards – was they really – they were saying we had a mediocre system of education, and we had to increase standards. And what most of the policy focus was around, was things like high school course work requirements, student testing, doing more student testing, the quality of teachers. There it had to do with both teacher preparation, certification and licensure, length of the school day, and that type of thing. So it really, at that point, wasn't as much around the content. I mean, if we put it in the context now of the Common Core.

*Right. It wasn't about curricular content.*

It wasn't about the curricular content necessarily. This whole idea of raising standards tended to be pushed more by assessments than it was about curriculum. And I think part of that was just due to the long tradition of local control over curriculum and teaching and learning. The other thing that sort of was going on at the time, if we go back to the mid '70s, when there was a concern about – Johnny can't read. And so some states begin to put into effect, minimum basic



skills tests. It's also – and this is really part of the federal influence – the federal government in the late 1970s starts to want to look at some of the outcomes of Title I and begin to hold states and districts accountable for how the Title I students are doing. So states have to test all their Title I students. And in some states, that gets expanded to all students.

*And what timeframe are you talking about?*

This is sort of the mid to the late '70s. So you have going into *A Nation at Risk* a lot of the states already doing sort of basic skills testing, and in that sense, having very basic skills objectives for students.

*And what about accountability measures from the federal side?*

It was all around Title I and around Title I students. There were some requirements to districts to do improvement plans, but it was for their Title I students. I think this is going to become important as it sort of feeds into the reauthorization in 1994. You have some states that the only accountability is for Title I, other states where they're testing all kids, even though it's on basic skills And you have some early state accountability systems.

*And how were they held accountable in those early days? I'm interested, too, in accountability and how that definition changes over time.*

Most of the accountability at the time was still – historically, was input accountability through

accreditation. So all states had ways in which they accredited their schools. Generally, it was their high schools. And that was very much input based – the number of books in the library, minimum number of staff, possibly minimum number of support staff.

*So the tests didn't have any repercussions, in a sense.*

It didn't have repercussions, really, outside of Title I.

*But inside of Title I?*

It didn't have repercussions outside of the Title I students.

*Right. And inside Title I, though, did it have?*

It was more planning than anything. Nobody threatened to take money away for doing that. But one of the things, sort of cycling back to *The Nation at Risk*, one of the things I did at ETS in the late '80s with a colleague is we began to do a survey of state standards.

*Already?*

And we did them in '86, '88, and '90.

*Interesting.*

And when I went back and pulled it, because I was curious to see whether we had done it around curriculum. And it really was around those things that *Nation at Risk* focused on: student testing, high school graduation requirements, which were both testing requirements and coursework requirements, attendance, teacher standards around preparation requirements. That was generally – did teachers have to pass a test before they entered a teacher training program? Did they have to pass a test to be certified or relicensed? – any kinds of standards around staff development for teachers, and then curriculum requirements. But as I was looking at the most recent one we did, which was 1990, a lot of that would be states – some states had developed curriculum frameworks.

*California.*

California being an example of an early state. Florida had actually done it early on. But in a lot of other states, it really was related to their state testing programs. So if there were curriculum requirements, it was a basic skills test. It would be very much basic skills focused.

*And there was huge state variability, it sounds like.*

Yeah, there was, as to what states were doing.

*So there were many states that were more active than others, do you think?*

Right; around that.

*Impact on the feds on all of those state standards yet?*

Not at that time.

*Okay.*

This is something certainly Mike Smith could speak to, but coming out of some of that early CPRE work – so CPRE begins a set of core state studies.

*Okay. Well, let's end hour one here.*

Okay; sure.

*And we'll pick up with CPRE in hour two.*

Okay

**Hour 2/00:00**

**School Districts' Use of Title I Funds, Formation/Role of CPRE, State Educational Policy Reforms in Late '80s**

*This is hour number two of my interview with Peg Goertz on June 3rd, 2015. We're sort of in the mid 80's.*

Okay. *(chuckles)*

*Are there other things you want to mention about your time at ETS? We should also pick up on CPRE because it was at about this time they formed.*

Right. The only other thing in terms of what I did at ETS, and this was part of my parallel track with school finance, was I directed a study of how school districts allocate Chapter 1 resources. Title I became Chapter 1, I forgot, with one of the reauthorizations. And that was a congressionally mandated study. And again, is one that we bid on and we won. And that was looking at how school districts allocated their Title I dollars to schools, how they determined what students were served, and so what were the factors behind the level and intensity of Title I services?

*Do you want to comment in terms of how money was being used by different states or differently, and how that may have impacted federal policy or shaped [it]?*

I don't know whether and how it impacted federal policy. It was again a story of a lot of discretion and variation within school districts. Under the federal funding formula, monies would be allocated to school districts based upon student poverty, and then the states would determine – would or would not develop guidelines for how districts would identify schools and identify students, as long as it met the requirement that the money was concentrated in schools of highest poverty. Some school districts decided to concentrate it in certain areas, like some might have put it all in a reading program. Others would spread it between reading and math. One of the things that came out of studies like this, and I can't say it was particular to this study, was the money was being focused primarily on elementary schools. And in subsequent reauthorizations of ESEA, there was a requirement that money be directed to high schools. Originally it was for very high poverty high schools, and then I think that has also changed over time.

*Interesting. I guess that also begs the question for me on how education policy research outcomes are used by the feds and the states. Did you have a sense of that?*

Not at the time. Again, it was the – you're a researcher, you produce it. We tried very hard to disseminate the findings. So I think rather than just saying we're going to publish it in a journal article and then let people access it as they would like, we tried to get the findings out broadly. Whether and how they get picked up (*laughter*) –

*That's another study.*

That's another field on knowledge utilization, right, as another study, which we never did.

*(laughter)*

*So tell me a little bit about CPRE then, and what happened in the mid '80s.*

CPRE was formed in 1985 as a consortium of several universities. Their focus on their first five years of funding was on state policy and looking at how, basically, states were responding to *A Nation at Risk*. What came out of that was that there was a lot of activity at the states, but it wasn't necessarily coherent or aligned policy within the states. While they talked about trying to raise standards for students, there was still a focus on basic skills. It didn't necessarily lead to more rigorous standards. It led to more coursework, and students had to take more math and English and maybe science, but it didn't address at all the content of that coursework. Mike Smith was one of the researchers. He was one of the founding partners of CPRE. So I think some of that led to the development of his – and Jennifer O'Day was working with him at the same time – of their conceptualization of systemic reform, which has been viewed as sort of the father of what we now called standards based reform, where they argued for states setting more rigorous standards, more rigorous content standards, and then aligning it with their assessment and teacher policy. The other movement that was happening at the time in the late '80s was sort of a bottom up reform movement, so it looked towards restructuring the governance of education, letting the professionals decide and schools decide what should be taught and how to teach it, and basically scale up from what successful schools were doing. So there was this whole discussion of what an appropriate governance structure would look like. It didn't talk about the federal role. It talked about what the relative role of states and local school districts would be in

terms of implementing high standards. So the argument that Smith and O'Day were making was that state policy should set those standards, it should create instruments to assess how kids were doing on those standards, build the capacity of teachers and local school districts, but then let the professionals decide how to get kids to those standards. So it was reflecting that counter movement of bottom up reform that was happening at the same time.

*And that was happening at the state level. Particular states more than others?*

That I don't know in terms of that's something we didn't really look at. That's something I think it was a little bit hard to capture. And there were a lot of people who were sort of looking at the issue of site-based management and restructuring. It was sort of another current of education research that was going on.

*So in that formulation, that left out how the feds were going to play a role.*

Exactly. Yeah, that came out of the effective schools research of the mid 1980s. So there was all this stuff sort of floating around.

*There was a lot in the mix.*

There was a lot in the mix, right. (*chuckles*)

*And you became the director of the entire ed policy research division at ETS?*



Yes.

*In '87?*

'87 or –

*I think that's what I have in your resume.*

Whatever the resume says. (*chuckles*)

*Did you decide on research questions, then, as the director?*

No. It was a very eclectic mix of researchers. Not everybody in my division did traditional policy research. And because we were all externally funded, it was almost more of an academic university model where individuals would pursue their own lines of research, bring in their own lines of funding. So I had a small group of colleagues that worked on policy issues, but there were others in the division that were working on different kinds of things.

*Was there anything in the late '80s that you haven't mentioned that were of particular interest to you in your own research?*

**Hour 2/10:00**  
**Development of National Goals, Governors' Impact on Systemic Reform, Beginning Emphasis on Outcomes and Accountability, Work on CPRE Research Team**

Again, I was traveling those two parallel tracks of sort of state policy, state implementation of policy, and then school finance being a separate track.

*So after Reagan, how do things shift in the big context of federal –*

That would have been . . .

*Bush I.*

Bush I.

*This is late '80s.*

Late '80s. So you have the Charlottesville summit of governors coming together. That was 1989. And I think, again, this was – you had a set of "education governors," largely from the south – so you had Lamar Alexander, you had Bill Clinton, you had Dick Riley – really concerned about education as a tool for economic development in the south and bringing the concern about how do you improve the quality of education in their states, together? So come together at Charlottesville summit. Out of that comes the development of the National Goals. And I'm not going to, off the top of my head, remember, but it was about – by year X, we will be the best in the world in math and in reading and in science and so on and so forth. So I think that was really the beginning shift towards more outcomes-based focus on education. This was not about what we were going to provide the kids. It was not just about giving them more courses, improving the

quality of the teaching force, but really what the kids know, and what should kids know and be able to do. I think that's sort of part of the Bush I agenda.

*Well, he claimed to be an education president, right?*

Right, yeah.

*Which was different than what the Republicans had previously said about themselves?*

Yes. Yeah, I think so.

*Did you have a sense that this governors' activity had an impact at the federal level?*

I'm trying to think sort of beyond the promulgation of the goals. There was an increase in federal funding under Bush I, yeah, so you do see it coming back up. And that continues basically pretty much throughout the succeeding administrations, whether Democratic or Republican. In terms of state policy, what I was trying to sort of place was where systemic reform hit the federal agenda. And I think part of it was through the governors bringing it to the national attention, the business community becoming part of that discussion as well. I think [it was] very much an economic imperative discussion, just as *A Nation at Risk* was an education imperative. But it doesn't formally hit federal policy until the 1994 reauthorization.

*Until Clinton.*

Until ESEA. Now that may have just been a timing issue. The prior reauthorization had been in 1988. Under that, there was an increased focus, again on student outcomes. It was on Title I students. But the Title I program was beginning to be increasingly concerned about holding schools and districts accountable for the outcomes for their Title I students. So there's sort of a movement towards outcomes accountability.

*And when you say by holding schools and districts responsible, was that part of the reform movement, too? I know I read somewhere about the Opportunity to Learn standards, where schools were [not] only asked to raise standards, but were also asked to have the capacity to [do so].*

Well, that's becomes a political debate. And this is where my chronology breaks down. Because I'm trying to remember when the Goals panel came into being, whether that came out of the Charlottesville summit, prior to actual Goals 2000, which was money that was in the Clinton administration.

*Right. Well, there's America 2000 under Bush.*

Under Bush, okay.

*And there's Goals 2000 under Clinton.*

Yeah. The America 2000 I know was setting the goals. And I know the Opportunity to Learn standards come up as part of the discussion somewhere in the early years of the Clinton administration.

*Right.*

Around '92.

*And then they were dropped.*

But then with the '94 elections, got dropped. But I'm not exactly sure about the chronology of where that fit in. Yeah, a lot of political concern about Opportunity to Learn. And it was interesting, because I was still working on school finance litigation. Concern that if those were promulgated, the plaintiffs and states could actually use that as a way of establishing – saying that the state's responsibility for education now is to provide these opportunities, which were a much higher level of input standards than most states had been doing.

*So there was some opposition.*

There was, yeah, opposition, and as I said, it did not survive the 1994 congressional election.

*So you left ETS in –*

Early in '92.

*Because?*

Well, Susan Fuhrman, who was the director of CPRE and was at Rutgers at the time in New Brunswick, she and I had been talking for several years about working together. And again, I was going to take a one year leave from ETS (*laughter*) and work at CPRE and then come back. I extended it into a two year leave, and they finally told me I had to fish or cut bait. And so I started to commute up to Rutgers and became part of the CPRE research team. And the first thing I worked on was a study of "systemic reform," which I did between – which I guess I started it just before I left ETS – 1991 and 1994. And that was also funded by the US Department of Education. It was one of, I think, eight or ten studies. They were trying to look at education nationally. And I did it with a colleague from Michigan State named Bob Floden, and then with Jennifer O'Day, who was affiliated with Stanford at the time. And it was really an early look at – and this is prior to IASA [Improving America's Schools Act] in 1994. So it was, in a way, a continuation of the CPRE core, looking at three states, but trying to look at focusing as much on reforming school districts within three states that had very different approaches to systemic reform. So we looked at Vermont, Michigan, and California. So you had California, which had been doing this for a while – and some would say that California was almost the model that Mike Smith used in terms of conceptualizing systemic reform.

**Hour 2/20:20**

**National Associations' Development of Content Standards, Movement for Outcomes Based Education**

And Vermont, that was just beginning to go on this journey, and then Michigan, that was sort of somewhere in the middle. And that's what I was trying to sort of look at what we were – so did that study, and then – oh, another thing, just to put in the context of standards based reform – so in 1989, the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics – NCTM – publishes a set of content standards for mathematics. And they begin to disseminate that through their professional organizations. So every state has a state NCTM, which is comprised of state and district mathematics curriculum people, to a lesser extent, mathematics teachers, particularly high school teachers. The language arts community is working on developing language arts standards. You have AAAS – American Association for the Advancement of Science – has Project 2061.

*Which is what?*

Which was their effort to define what a scientifically literate American should be. They came out with their own set of standards in what should be taught in science. So you have these national professional organizations in the late '80s, early '90s, developing content standards, not unlike what we saw with the development of the Common Core standards. These are being picked up by states during the late '80s and the early '90s. Then the National Science Foundation created an initiative called their Statewide Systemic Initiative, where they gave grants to a certain number of states to basically develop and implement math and science standards. So this is all going on at the same time that you've got the development of the federal policy. It isn't really any one thing driving another. Again, there's just a lot of mix.

*They're informing each other.*

They're really informing each other.

*So there's national associations developing content standards.*

Right.

*There's states developing curriculum –*

Well, the states are developing – states have always had some – or not always, but have had some type of curriculum frameworks. But partly in response to *A Nation at Risk* in the late '80s, they're reviewing them, they're revising them, they're expanding them. This provides them content with which to do those kinds of revisions. And you had the state-based professional organizations who were the ones who were disseminating these out to educators as well. So there's a diffusion of these standards going on through educators.

*Right. It's complex.*

It's complex. And then you have NSF [National Science Foundation] providing funding to a certain number of states to create a systemic approach to develop and implement these math and science standards that are out there.

*And then, is it by '93 that Goals 2000 starts providing federal funds to put up –*



Um . . . is it '93 or '94?

*Assessment strategies?*

Well, so the Goals – okay, I couldn't remember if that was in the –

*It's separate from the reauthorization.*

It's separate from the reauthorization.

*Yes.*

Okay. So that's providing money to states also to develop content standards and other pieces of systemic reform.

*Which includes the assessments?*

The states could use it for just about anything. You were asking, actually, whether we had done a look at that, and the answer is yes, in the context of another study that we did. There's interest in both studying systemic reform, I think, by the feds, and also facilitating it through the NSF initiative and then certainly through IASA in '94.

*There's all this movement in the direction of developing standards and assessments. How about accountability measures at this time?*

The states are at different places around accountability. A lot of the outcome-based accountability is really focused on students through high school graduation requirements. Some states have developed accountability systems for districts, but that's very much a state context type of thing. So I'll use New Jersey as an example. As a result of the first round of litigation, the *Robinson v. Cahill* litigation in the '70s, the court required the state to define what a thorough and efficient education would be. And so the state set up a system of beginning to monitor what districts were doing. It was very much a process monitoring. So that was one form of accountability. Beyond the student testing, I didn't really look at the accountability part of it much before 1994 and IASA.

*Who was against systemic reform? Do you have a sense of opposition? Because you're talking about content standards, and what gets taught can be political, too.*

This sort of goes back to some of the CPRE – and again, this was before I was at CPRE – tracking some of the early curriculum standards. There was a movement in, I want to say the late 1980s, early 1990s, for outcomes based education, and states like Pennsylvania and Minnesota developed outcomes based education. That became very controversial because it got wrapped up in – this wasn't just about testing math and reading.

*So can you define outcome based, or was that –*

I'd have to –

*Okay.*

Yeah. That's something I'd have to go back and really look at. I was hoping that it was in here.

*But was it controversial because of the content that was included?*

**Hour 2/29:55**

**Divisions Over Outcome Based Education, States' Flexibility in Developing Accountability Systems, Public vs. Subgroup Reporting, Development of Congress to Classroom**

The content that was included, right; whether it was becoming more non-cognitive than it was – in terms of students' beliefs. And there was a conservative backlash to that. There was also a controversy around what I'll call the national professional standards as well. There were divisions within the professional community. So you had the reading wars, you had the math wars, going on. Part of the English language arts was – I'm trying to think of what that was about – about how you taught kids reading and whether they'd eventually learn on their own, or how you taught them writing. So it wasn't all sort of a phonics based approach to that. And the math wars against were hands on ways of teaching math versus the traditional rote learning of math. So there were disputes both within the professional community as well as, I think, among the public.

*But in terms of the Clinton years – and we'll talk about the reauthorization – is it accurate to say they were funding the development of standards but not as focused on the content of those standards, weren't dictating what states would set as standards?*

Well, the issue of who was "funding" the standards – again, the feds weren't developing the standards.

*Right.*

Under federal law, they're not allowed to develop anything that has to do with the content of curriculum. What the feds began to, in '94 – this is what I would call sort of equity and excellence begin to interact and come together – is that you have the states doing their own thing. They're responding to *A Nation at Risk*, they're raising standards, but they're doing it in very different ways. So if you were to look at what was a content standard across the states, it was very hard to find consistency across that, or what was in a curriculum framework in terms of the detail of what was in there, the kinds of objectives that were in there, was all over the map across the states – whether they even had "content standards." I think more states had content standards than I think the public was aware with the '94 authorization. But it was to basically ensure that all of the – so the '94 reauthorization – ensure that all of the states did have content standards, that they had assessments aligned to those standards. Because what was happening is again, you had – Title I required the states test Title I kids. States may or may not have been testing non-Title I kids in grades other than high school. So for example, many states left it up to districts to assess their kids in elementary and middle school. They wanted to get some – I don't want to say

uniformity – but sort of consistency across the states and what states were paying attention to – that they had standards, that they were developing aligned assessments, that they had some way of holding – they were developing accountability systems for schools and school districts, but never really specifying what was going to be the content of those things. So it was a way of trying to – and it was always incentives, because it was always tied to Title I money – incent states to develop more coherent, standards based systems of education. So they left a lot of flexibility up to the states. And the requirements were still, you only had to test once in each of three grade levels: reading, math, and science. Science was in – I'm not sure science was in IASA. They had to develop accountability systems, but they didn't say – unlike No Child Left Behind – they didn't say what those had to actually look like.

*And I assume that this flexibility also came – it's hard to sometimes separate states' impact on federal policy when a lot of the people working in federal policy came out of states.*

Exactly. Well, you had the president, the secretary of education, Dick Riley, the former governor of South Carolina. Mike Smith came in from California – the father of systemic reform.

*So there's the states' impact!*

Yeah. So they're bringing to the federal policy, yeah. This is sort of best practice in the states. This is what we think all states should be doing. The other piece, and the equity piece, again, was that the states would apply these standards and assessments to all kids. They were not to have

separate systems, sets of standards and/or accountability systems for Title I versus non-Title I kids.

*Did they separate the data or disaggregate the data yet, then? Because I know that was talked about.*

What IASA required was subgroup reporting. There were very few states that were doing that. So by racial ethnic group, by economic, Title I, non-Title I. IDEA – I'm trying to remember when that got reauthorized, but you had to report out by special ed students.

*'97 that was.*

That's '97, okay. So that was the first; they had subgroup reporting in there. They did not have subgroup accountability. So the accountability would be applied to a school, but not to subgroups within the school, the idea being public reporting would be sufficient to shine a light on what was happening to different groups of students.

*So there was alignment or an attempt to get states to align systemically.*

Right. *(chuckles)*

*Standards, assessments, and accountability.*

And accountability.

*But not really that kind of alignment across states.*

Correct. So states were still free to set their own standards, as long as they had them in math and reading, to develop their own assessments that were aligned to their own standards, to set their own performance standards, which means the cut score on that assessment, which would determine whether a student had learned the content, and develop their own accountability systems as well. So it left a lot of flexibility to the states.

*Was there great variability among the states in what you learned, in terms of the difficulty of the standards they set, or the ambitiousness of the frameworks?*

Yeah. The next round of CPRE funding – this would have been around '95 to 2000 – we had a project that I directed [that] we called grandly *Congress to Classroom*. (laughter) And it was a combination. It was some of our CPRE funding from the Department of Ed, and then we got foundation funding from the Pew Charitable Trust and from the Annie Casey Foundation. We looked at – we went to eight states and within each of those eight states, three school districts, and then a couple of schools. I forgot exactly how many schools within each of those districts. So what we did was to look at what, basically starting with what, the state policies were. We did most of the data collection about '95 to '98, so we were looking at the early years of implementing IASA and then to look at alignment down through the system. What were districts

doing? To what extent? Were they responding to state policy? Going into schools seeing what teachers were doing.

**Hour 2/40:35**  
**Conclusions of Congress to Classroom Research Projects**

*Interesting.*

Sort of a bottom up look from what factors were influencing teacher practice in terms of state standards, the assessments, their own professional vision of what the students needed. Getting into the classrooms, you could really get a sense of the materials they were using and to what extent they were aligned with the state curriculum. And in many cases, to what extent were the state assessments basically driving the instruction. I remember being in a classroom in Kentucky and sitting at the teacher's desk while I was watching her teach. And she had on her desk a blotter and the frame around it had the Kentucky assessment standards and what was being required. I forgot – it was a third or fourth grade classroom – probably fourth grade, because they were assessing them, so we were in fourth grade classrooms – and the materials you would see – a textbook that would say – it was a commercial textbook that would say on the cover, “This is aligned with the Kentucky state standards.” (*chuckles*) And get a sense of sort of what that looked like. But there was also, again, within the education profession, we'd be in, again fourth grade classrooms across different states, and we'd come together at our research team meetings. And we'd say, you know, "Our teacher used this approach to teaching." "Well, so did mine." "So



did mine." "So did mine." Well, it turned out it was so-and-so's, an educator's, basically commercial curriculum that they were using. *(laughter)*

*So is this a positive or a negative effect? Did you have any value judgments of what you were learning? Did this kind of standardization actually improve achievement or learning, or did it dumb it down? I don't know whether one can say so blanketly.*

One of the members of our team – Suzanne Wilson at Michigan State, who's a teaching and learning person – really sort of helped us analyze the teacher data. And I forgot the term she used. It was a chapter in our book. But basically it was a blending of the new and the old. The teachers would bring in the new, and then they would, especially the more veteran teachers would, incorporate it with their old way of teaching. One of the examples was "M&M's math." *(laughter)* You would see kids – this was actually a lower grade we were observing – and it was using hands on math to teach concepts. Well, in a lot of cases, they were using M&M's to just teach basic computation. *(laughter)* So instead of writing the numbers on the board and adding them up, they would have groups of M&M's. And they would add them up, but there was nothing really conceptual about – the kids weren't learning conceptually anything different about it. So it was a blending, really, of the new and the old. One of the things that came out of that study and a subsequent one we did, which was focused on high schools between 2000 and 2005, is that teachers liked standards. That in most cases, they felt that that was what they wanted their kids to know and to be able to do. There may have been issues for students with disabilities if they felt they may not have been appropriate for students with certain learning disabilities, but rarely did they quibble with the content of the standard. What they were more concerned about

was the press of the assessment and the accountability, and whether the state assessment was really a fair assessment of what their kids learned, versus the information they would gather on a day-to-day basis learning about the children in their classroom.

*So it was the testing piece that –*

So it was the testing and the accountability piece that was really more troubling to them. But the accountability was also sort of a double-edged sword because they also liked it because they said it really showed – because they all knew the strengths and weaknesses of the faculty within their school. And if they felt there was a faculty member who really wasn't delivering, it would sort of bring that to the fore. And they felt that was an important thing. It was no longer an anecdotal statement about Mrs. Jones or Mr. Smith or whatever.

*So standards did matter.*

Standards did matter, yeah.

*The testing –*

Testing didn't because of the type of the test, when they got the information, and particularly, I think, the stakes attached to it was not as helpful to them. I think they would have had other ways of – and I think we're revisiting that debate right now with the Common Core. Is it about the

Common Core, or is it about the way we're assessing it and the accountability? Especially now that accountability is on teachers. Is that what's creating some of the backlash?

*So the accountability at that point was more on the schools? And districts?*

It was, right. There was no teacher accountability at that point. It was on the schools and it was on the districts.

*Other outcomes or what came out of your studies?*

As an adjunct to that, two of my colleagues and I, at a request of the Department of Ed, did a fifty state survey of assessment and accountability systems in '99/2000. And I think it documented what people in the federal government already felt by doing visits to states, which was – there continued to be a great deal of variability, because they gave states the discretion to have a great deal of variability. So some states were setting high standards, other states were setting low standards. The way in which the –

*And I imagine poorer districts had a harder time implementing reforms.*

Yeah, but before I even get to districts, just on the state level, one of the goals of IASA had been – This is about all kids. Yet there were some states that were still running separate accountability systems for Title I kids than for their non-Title I kids. I think that No Child Left Behind was not something that came just full blown out of Texas with Bush II. But at the end of the Clinton administration, when they were beginning to – because ESEA is supposed to be reauthorized

every five or six years – so they were looking at reauthorization as well. They were concerned about the variability. And I remember somebody saying, it may have been Mike Cohen, that the states just were not doing what they had sort of expected. The states were not meeting the requirements of IASA. And I think there was something published around 1999 to that – maybe out of the Department of Ed, basically saying that only "X" number states have met all of the requirements of IASA. Now some of that was around alignment of assessments and standards. I'd forgotten what some of the other elements were. So they were already, I think, developing proposals for reauthorization that was going to tighten federal regulations around standards and assessment and accountability. So you allow flexibility, you're going to get variation. It's really the lesson of [this], right? *(laughter)*

**Hour 2/50:55**

**NCES Study of States' Performance on NAEP v. State Assessments, States' Use of Goals 2000 Funds, Difficulties in Analyzing Assessment Data**

*Right. And in your study of the fifty states, that's basically what came out of that?*

That's what came out of that. And that was just on assessment and accountability. I'm trying to think about that time, there was – I'm trying to think when the first mapping study was.

*The first what study?*

Mapping. So in 1990, we went to state-by-state. There's a new state assessment where every state would take NAEP. There was a study done, commissioned by NCES [National Center for

Education Statistics] that looked at state performance on NAEP versus the percent proficient on state assessments – excuse me, 1990 wasn't the first state NAEP, but NAEP set these achievement levels – the percent proficient, percent basic. There was a report that came out that showed some states where twenty-five percent of the kids were proficient on NAEP, and eighty-nine percent of those kids were proficient on the state assessment. They call it the snake diagram. And then there were other states – Massachusetts was one – where the percent of kids proficient on both NAEP and the state assessment were very close.

*Because the state assessments were harder.*

The state assessments and/or the cut points were much more rigorous. And the wide band of states fell into, basically, basic. So a kid who was proficient on the state assessment may have been at the basic level on that. That was sort of another piece of information that was put out there that questioned rigor of state standards.

*In general, would you say that the states responded favorably to the funding they received from the federal government to develop assessments though? Texas, I think, got a hundred million dollars.*

We sort of skipped over Goals 2000. Part of this *Congress to Classroom* study is we did interview Goals 2000 people at the state and at the district level. I think that was one of the questions that you had raised. Two things: one, it was only in the first year of the funding where a lot of the money could be used at the state level. Then, under the law, ninety percent of the

money had to go to the districts to support standards based reform. And so we did do a paper – we never published it, but I could find it in my files – for the eight states we were in, how they used that money really depended upon where they were in having developed standards. So the "mature" states, the ones that already – you know, the Texas and the – we weren't in Massachusetts – the Californias – we didn't do New York. Our eight states, but those states' standards – been there, done that, whatever – so Texas used their money, as I recall, for a big reading initiative in order to support implementation of the reading standards.

*So the money went after the first year to the districts?*

To the districts.

*To develop standards, too?*

Well, states submitted plans for the federal government to approve on what the districts could use their money for. And then the districts submitted plans to the state. I can't remember if it was – it may have been competitive from the district up to it. So a lot of it would go down to the districts to support professional development, for example, or districts aligning their curriculum with the state curriculum. Getting back to the thing about assessments – and some of the states used the money to develop, not develop, but revise their state assessments. That was sort of the first round of money that came for that. I'm trying to remember whether IASA also had money to support state assessments, or whether that was in No Child Left Behind. I think it may have been No Child Left Behind when they required grade-by-grade testing. I think they may have given

money to the states to do that. But again, until No Child Left Behind – but under IASA, there was still a lot of, ‘Let fifty flowers bloom’ approach to this. *(chuckles)*

*So there's the great variability, great flexibility. That seems to be the legacy of these years.*

Right. *(chuckles)*

*You're not at ETS anymore.*

Right.

*But was there an increase in student achievement?*

There are people who are good quantitative researchers that sort of ask that question about – what have been the effects of standards based reform on student achievement? – I think primarily using NAEP data. I think once you got state-by-state NAEP, that was the only common metric across states that one could use. There are people that have tried to analyze it.

*But within states, were people analyzing – I mean, you have the assessment data within states.*

Right.

*And I'm just curious if there was a –*

Well again, the assessment people would argue when you put a new assessment in, it's not a linear kind of thing. So in the first year or two, sometimes you see a drop and then you'll see an increase as people get –

*It needs time to –*

Well, people get familiar with the test. And if you talk about teachers teaching to the test – so that's a real empirical issue, a measurement issue, about how do you basically assess change? Now, NAEP being independent of state standards, because their framework hasn't changed since 1992, at least for grade four and eight, you have seen – since, I think it's through. . . I'm trying to remember the data – from 1990, you have seen a big drop in the number of kids below basic and an increase in the percent of kids proficient. At the same time, you're seeing changing demographics. That's the other problem with doing this. We have a student population that's becoming much more racially and ethnically and language diverse, and the poverty rates sort of go up and down – and so trying to hold that constant while looking at NAEP. There are others who can answer that question better than I can. *(laughter)*

*And that's where we're going to end hour two then.*

Okay.



## **HOUR 3**

### **Hour 3/00:00**

#### **Lessons Learned From Systemic Reform Movement, Accountability Standards Under No Child Left Behind, Race to the Top Elements**

*This is hour number three on June 3rd, 2015, with Peg Goertz. We're kind of to the end of the Clinton administration, and you're at CPRE. Do you have any thoughts about the lessons learned from the systemic reform movement and Congress to Classroom, what you learned about how standards and assessments were being developed and applied, whether the state and the federal structure at that moment in time was effective in creating these mechanisms? Any thoughts on what you learned?*

Well, I think the lesson of IASA was that the extent to which you give states flexibility, they're going to use it, and you're going to get variability. I mean going back almost to the '60s, the extent of that variability, the nature of that variability, is going to reflect the priorities of the state, the political culture of the state, the demographic composition of the state, particularly of the students, and I think of the state leadership and where they want to see education going. I think the lesson of No Child Left Behind is that when the federal government becomes prescriptive in a way that's not aligned with the needs of the states, things go awry. And I think the best example was the requirement to have all children proficient by 2014. It wasn't just the goal, but the very heavy handed accountability that went with that in terms of identifying schools as in need of improvement. And because they had incorporated subgroup accountability, that meant six, seven years down the road, you were going to have very large numbers of schools

identified for improvement and in various levels of improvement processes and eventually reconstitution. So I think it got taken to the extreme. I think one of the good things about No Child Left Behind was the concept of accountability for subgroups, going beyond public reporting and having to have some sort of consequence tied to that. The question then becomes – what should those consequences be? Especially when you had schools that had like forty different subgroups! (*chuckles*) Take a high school in Miami, for example – between the racial ethnic and the poverty and the special education and everything else, you can cut it and dice it. They were just being held accountable for too many different things. Then you see a couple of things happening – states begin to game the system. States continued to run parallel accountability systems. And so the feds required, under No Child Left Behind, your accountability system had to look like "X," and every state had one of those in place. But then you had states like Florida, California, that continued their existing state accountability systems. And because they were measuring different things or different groups of students, were producing counter results. So you would have schools in Florida, for example, that were getting grades of "A," but being identified as ‘in need of improvement,’ partly because of the subgroup accountability. Also because Florida had measures of bringing kids up from the bottom. It wasn't about bringing everybody up to proficient, but you got credit for bringing kids way from the bottom up towards even just basic proficiency. So in some sense, you lost some of the experimentation, the lessons you would have learned from some of the innovation and experimentation going on in the states.

*With No Child Left Behind?*

With No Child Left Behind. And I think it created a lot of skepticism of –

*Standards, or –*

No. I think skepticism about the accountability system . I think there was less questioning about the standards than there was about the accountability press. And so I think you see a few things happening as a result. Again, talking about state influence on federal policy. I think the inclusion of growth models, for example, in No Child Left Behind probably – so that you give credit for changes in student achievement as well as meeting an absolute cutoff – I think may have come out of, and I couldn't track this directly back – but there were states that were doing that.

California, again, is an example, or Florida. So that they could use that measure as well, and that got incorporated into the No Child Left Behind accountability system.

*And that was a good thing, you think?*

Well, I think it's a good thing. It gets to this issue about multiple measures – measuring movement within different parts of the distribution. I think the press for waivers has partly been due to the fact – nobody's met the 2014 [goal], and therefore the feds have become sort of more "flexible" with the states. So I think that's one of the lessons. The conditions placed on the waivers, however, which really came out of the 2010 Race to the Top and the four pillars from the Obama administration –

*Just for the record, state what –*

So the four pillars had to do with teacher quality and teacher equity, standards, focusing on the lowest performing schools, and I forgot what the fourth was. But these were elements in the Race to the Top competition, and then they increasingly got embedded in guidance and then regulation, along with the waivers – have created problems. And I think that's what's also creating a lot of the current backlash, particularly around teacher evaluation. The assessments aren't necessarily designed for holding teachers accountable, the tested grades only cover about thirty percent of the teachers, requiring states to try to figure out how to measure growth on untested subjects. It's basically unworkable. It was an idea that was far ahead of the technology, apart from the politics of it. *(laughter)*

*And as a researcher, it seems probably completely impossible to track.*

Yeah. And there's been a lot of good research and writing around the whole use of value added measures for evaluating teachers, evaluating kids. That's driven a lot of that business, and there's been some good work around it. But from a policy perspective, I think it was the policy being ahead of the technology and certainly ahead of the political support for it. And I'm going to hypothesize that in many places, it was the press for teacher evaluation that has led to some of the backlash on the Common Core, and particularly the Common Core tests. So you see it happening in states like New York, where there's been a real battle between the state and the teachers over the teacher evaluation. That's another lesson, is basically how far can you press the states to go?

**Hour 3/10:00**

**Feds Limited Role in Mandating State Processes, Benefits of Subgroup Reporting and Accountability, Increased Expectations Relative to Raised Standards, Sanctions v. Capacity Building**

*How far can the feds press?*

Can the feds press the state. And actually, when I was rereading the Moore, Goertz, and Hartel article, the one we did back in the early '80s, and some of the conclusions, that was almost the conclusion that came out of that study.

*Out of the '80s?*

Out of the '80s! I mean, it's some of the same issues because the states are in control. The federal government cannot mandate curriculum. They cannot mandate assessments. And so all they can mandate are processes, which is what they've been doing.

*And that's an appropriate role, you think? More so than the –*

It depends on how it's used. Certainly with civil rights, I think it's very appropriate, I think, with an equity agenda of ensuring that all kids get equal educational opportunity. But the question is – how you go about doing that in a way that reflects the political conditions within states and the wide variability within states is difficult. The backlash is, from what I've read of the Senate reauthorization bill, is it looks like we're going right back to IASA, except we'll have grade-by-

grade testing. But no longer having subgroup accountability, going back to subgroup reporting. The states, as they were doing under the waivers, setting their proficiency targets in terms of what percent of kids need to be proficient by the year "X." So we're going to go back to that variability. That's got equity consequences because it was the equity advocacy community that pressed for a lot of what was in No Child Left Behind around subgroup accountability. And I think a lot of that's going to get lost with the next reauthorization.

*Do you have views on what should be lost and what should be kept? It sounds like the subgroup reporting and accountability has been positive in terms of just knowing what is happening.*

Well, the subgroup reporting is certainly a first step. The question is – is reporting enough in order to ensure that the kids in those subgroups receive the opportunities they need? And that's a hard question to answer, because we went from a public accountability, which is what reporting is, to heavy sanctions. I think that it will be interesting to look at what's happening under some of the waivers. And I'm sure there are groups that are looking at the effects of the waiver. Some of the waivers mandate gap closing. That may be one approach to doing it, so it's not just the reporting of the subgroups, but you have to show – but it's not requiring that everybody get to one hundred percent, but ensuring that the gaps are closing between subgroups and the general population. That may be one way of keeping the focus on those children.

*It seems like one of the main components of the No Child Left Behind Act was the sanction piece.*

Exactly.

*Adding sanctions to accountability measures.*

And to unrealistic goals.

*And what is the origin of that? Do you know where that whole sanctions and these unrealistic goals came from? Was that pressed by the business community? I'm just curious about –*

I don't recall because everybody talks about Bush two having brought the Texas model. That was never the Texas model, as I recall.

*With strong sanctions –*

Well, they had sanctions. They certainly had school and school district accountability, but one of the interesting things about Texas was whenever they put higher standards in, they always phased them in over time. My recollection – Texas was one of the states when we did the study in the late '90s. And they went through a change. The first was you had to get twenty-five percent of the kids proficient, then the next year it was thirty-five, and so whatever. As they raised the standards, they knew fewer kids were going to be proficient, and they basically gave catch-up time. Let me say one other thing too about standards. As I've been looking at this since the mid '70s, when I was looking at New Jersey and the basic skills, we really have raised standards in terms of what the expectations are for our kids. They may not be high enough. I can't answer that. And I think that's also reflected in the growth of the NAEP data. We really are

expecting more. And we've brought more kids, definitely, into the system. So I think the good thing about IASA and Title I was accountability for all kids. You don't have separate accountability for poor kids versus non-poor kids. So I think that movement basically towards a unitary standards, assessment, and accountability, requiring all students with disabilities to be assessed. We can argue over whether you'll ever get a hundred percent of students with disabilities "proficient," but from the people I've talked to in the special ed policy community, for the kids with mild disabilities, it's made a big difference in terms of their access to the curriculum. Once you start assessing them on the general ed curriculum, they get exposure to the general ed curriculum. (*chuckles*) And so I think that's helpful.

*But it's sort of the sanctions piece that I keep going back to.*

It is! Yeah, it's Linda Darling Hammond's line. It's the mentality of – you just beat the dog harder. And the other issue – we were talking a little bit earlier about Opportunity to Learn – is the whole capacity issue. Sanctions are – we assume that people have the skill and not the will. I would, just based over the years of research, I would say most of the people have the will. As we increase the standards, as we change pedagogical approaches, we haven't ensured that they have the skill.

*And the resources to develop the skills.*

And the resources to develop that and the focus on that. We have focused on sanctions over capacity building. I was looking at what I've been writing over the years, and the last section



always is capacity, capacity, capacity. I don't know how that should get addressed under federal policy, but I think it is something that federal policy makers have been blind to. Now maybe it's because that has elements of resources with it, and they don't want to put the resources into it. It's the same thing with teacher accountability. The assumption is, for all teachers, it's because they don't want to; they know how to.

*One of the big policy gaps in your view, though, is this capacity.*

Is definitely this capacity issue. It's at the federal level. It's at the state level. And again, the people in teaching and learning and teacher development are the ones who can address – how should you go about doing that? But I think from a policy perspective, it's a big issue.

*And what should happen and what can happen are also two different things, and so it's interesting to hear you talk about what you think will probably happen.*

Right, yeah.

*And is some of the good stuff going to get thrown out in terms of what data is collected?*

**Hour 3/20:00**

**Business Community's Influence on State Standards, States and Feds Interplay on Systemic Reform, Charter Schools, Future Projections for State and Federal Educational Issues, Disparities in School Finance**

It's going to be interesting. This is now just sort of looking at a secondary data level, the information level, not being out in the field. There's been this big push back on the Common Core standards. But from what I've read, when you look at the states that have "replaced" them with their own, there's been a little bit of tweaking around the edges but not major retreat from the core. I think a stalwart in all of this has been the business community, going back to the beginning of the standards based reform movement in the mid '80s. They supported – they saved standards in states where there was a conservative backlash, and the business community came in and basically were able to provide the political clout that [saved] state policies.

*So by business community, you mean private sector and foundations –*

Private sector. Well, not just foundations but actual, private sector economics, because they need the educated workers. So the crystal ball five years from now – I think the standards will probably be pretty much there. What's going to happen to the assessments? I don't know in terms of this push back. To be honest, the only way we can assess these skills is by the kinds of assessments we're putting in place, and it does require kids to be tested longer and in different ways. Then there's the tension between wanting to know what every kid can do versus, again, the old IASA, which was you tested in different grades. And that was basically just a school or district accountability. So I think that alignment piece may be the piece that –

*Also, what is a good test, maybe, too? I don't know. Tests aren't going to go away.*

Yeah. The what and the how. The tests are not going to go away. How you test the kids, if you want to test for higher order skills, has to change. I mean, it has to change in the direction we're going. But we're getting back to this argument of – do you need to test every kid? And then the implications are – what does that mean for (*laughter*) subgroups?

*And do you tie that to teachers?*

You can't tie that to teachers then.

*Or schools?*

You can tie it to schools because IASA –

*Districts.*

Yeah. Well, school accountability becomes just one grade, but definitely districts, yeah.

*So what can we learn from history about how states can have an impact on federal policy, or be most effective? What works and what doesn't?*

Impact – sort of states as laboratories of democracy or innovation. I think what we saw with the standards based reform movement is states did have a definite impact on certainly what Title I became in terms of the focus on standards, attempts to do the alignment, to have standards based,

systemic reform. I think where the feds carried it beyond where the states were was on the accountability and the sanctions. I think they definitely contributed to that. And it's an interplay between the states and the federal government. I think it's the federal government that's kept the equity piece basically alive, if not front and center. So going back to Title I being the only program serving disadvantaged kids in many states in the 1980s.

*And that's an appropriate role for them.*

And that's an appropriate role for the federal government.

*And they also funded some of your research.*

Yeah. They funded a lot of the equity research, yeah.

*So that's an appropriate role –*

Definitely, yeah. That's one of the original roles of federal [role in] education is to fund that research.

*Do you want to comment at all on what we saw with Reagan and maybe more again today with the school choice movement.*

What's going to happen with that?

*Because there is also the impact of groups that don't support public education.*

Correct, yeah.

*And is that reflected in federal policy or not?*

Yes, it's reflected in federal policy, but I think it's been reflected through charter schools, which still are public schools. And the research goes back and forth on that. Again, I think there's a lot of variability across states in terms of how many charters they have, where they're established. And I don't think that's going to go away because I think that's also responded, particularly in urban areas, to the needs of parents and giving them sort of options. But they are public schools. They are supposed to be held accountable to the same.

*Laws.*

To the same outcomes and that type of thing. I don't see that going away. Certainly as an example, the Obama administration – they were as strong supporters of charter schools as the Bush administration was. But we haven't seen an expansion of vouchers at the federal level. Whether that might come about if we get a total Republican – it could be. That's total speculation. *(laughter)*

*Well, is there anything I haven't asked you that we should cover about states' impact, or appropriate roles for structuring federal/state interactions, or your hopes looking into the future? What you want to see happen, even if it may not happen?*

I think it's always sort of a two steps forward, one step back.

*That's politics.*

It's politics. But I don't think the press for higher standards is going to go away. I think whatever happens to state assessment systems in the next couple of years, and that's in total turmoil at this point, there's still a lot of attention being paid to NAEP, to the international comparisons, I think just for the economic reasons. I think there's going to be continued attention paid to quality. The one thing that the federal government has never addressed – I don't know if they can address – are the inequities between states. So all of the school finance litigation was within-state equity. And some of the recent research has shown there is now more inequity across states than there is within states. I always use the New Jersey and Alabama examples. (*chuckles*) Those are the two states I've worked in.

*Which is what?*

Well, I was involved in school finance litigation in Alabama in 1993. When I was looking at the data – and I was also still working on it in New Jersey – and I'm looking at the data, and I realize that at that time, the highest spending district in Alabama was spending less than the lowest

spending district in New Jersey. (*chuckles*) Now, even after you make cost adjustments, that's a huge gap. And that's a wealth gap, obviously. So yes, it's good to have these fifty state laboratories, but the reality is, as long as you have these disparities –

*Enormous disparities.*

Disparities in wealth among the states, it's going to be – that, I think, is sort of the next big challenge and is one that the federal government marginally addresses with Title I allocations, but that's a drop in the bucket. And so how do you really address bringing up all the kids in Mississippi as well as the low performing ones in New Jersey?

**Hour 3/30:00**  
**Obstacles in Procuring Research Funding**

*And CPRE, is it doing research to this day on NCLB [No Child Left Behind]?*

No. It's really hard to get money. Because I tried for a couple of years – both before I retired and even up to about two years ago. I just gave up – trying to look at the implementation of the Common Core. And the foundations aren't interested in it anymore. They want actionable kinds of things. Gates would be the natural place. They don't want anything to do with it. There's very little interest in knowing the whys and what's happening.

*And you think that's a change because there's just less money out there?*

No. You look at the Gates Foundation. There's plenty of money.

*Yeah! So –*

But it's priorities, and they want to know what works on the ground. So they'll invest in evaluations of – and I'm not saying what they're doing is wrong – they'll invest in evaluating district-based curriculums, for example. A lot of the money that went into the measuring effective teaching study, the MET study, to try to look at whether and how you can measure teacher effectiveness in the classroom, part of which was value added but another part just observational, I think was a good investment of money. It didn't tell us – what we learned is everything washed out. But it's just change in the leadership of the foundations. I know Mike Kirst has been – Mike and I have talked about this a lot. And he's gotten a group together in California working with faculty at some of the universities, and they can get graduate students. I said, "How's it going?" He said, "We can't get the money to do it." Those are expensive studies because they're very labor intensive. They're on the ground.

*But CPRE still exists.*

CPRE still exists. It's just doing smaller studies.

*So nobody's really looked at NCLB.*



They've done studies at looking at the implementation at the district level of how standards, more rigorous standards – Common Core's being implemented at the district and the school level. So Jon Supovitz, who's now the director of the CPRE Penn group, did a study in New York City. He had money from the GE Foundation where they looked at a couple of other school districts. It's at that level now. It's not up at the state policy level.

*So society may have retreated for a little while from its commitment to –*

To research, yeah. *(laughter)*

*And even to provide the equal opportunity for education.*

Well, I don't –

*Would you say that, or no?*

*(sighs)* Retreat – I think we're into the one step back. But I guess what makes me feel good is about the greater rigor of the standards and not seeing that go away. When we retreat, it's on things like where we set the cut scores on the tests. It's not on the ultimate goal.

*Right, okay. Well, good. Thank you very much. It's been a pleasure.*

Okay.