
OFFICE OF GOVERNOR RONNIE MUSGROVE
INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: BOYD
FROM: RILEY & BENTLEY
SUBJECT: NGA CONFERENCE CALL ON RAND REPORT
DATE 7/24/00
CC: FILE

Kristen Concklin (NGA from Natl cntr for higher ed pol) – conf call 8/24/00

David grissmer to summarize – late 1998 “Expl late achievement gains” – to be released tomorrow

Grissmer: prima message is that pub ed is rformable – 5 years ago quet as to payoff of reform emasures – this say money invested in right way s can sig ipr ach esp for disadvantage students – reforms esp in math – key finidng that improv teacher work condit can increse techr prod and achievement – long term we need strenth of research seyste

Fidnigns:

Data used is 1990-1996 staet nate scorres – 7 tests given, 3 8th math, 3 4^t math and 3 4th reading; voluntary participation, so every state didn’t take – tyr to measure 1) what raw ach scores tell (p. 14 chart of report) top northern urban good , southern tend to be bottom – Maine was highest and MS was lowest (35th nationally) – mainly family chara explain where staets lie – states at top have high par ed and income, lowere min student and lowere ten preg and sing par ffamily; 2) how well is school system doing? Sores are family, so measured/est what scores would be forstuent of sim families – answer is pa. 68 of report – TX is at top, CA is at bottom – diff is 11 percentile points – realizes that 5 or 7 poitns is not significatnt – group of states tx to ga that statitstically look like doing better, group at bottom looks sign worse – what important is that TX is in top group and CA is in bottom group - North south dist gone away – southern states in top and bottom – qual of schools doesn’t have orth /south feel - 3) how are there improvements in scores form 90 to 96? P.62 table 5-4 – for math tests only b/c had 5 tests. Math shows on average making 1 per point per gain a year and most staes making gains – col 3 sows gain – rate of gain does vary – nc and tx making 2 perc point gains while states at bootm are flat – most staes hae made gaibns 4) why staes have diff scores for sim fam and what gaoins about: why diff scores? B/c resources differ – states w/ highe rs cores have high pub exp, smaller ratio, more part in K, teacher resorucs, low teacher turnover. Tx and ca

differ (p. 83) in systems. Ca has largest pup/tchr (25) ratio while tx avg (18) which explains 2/3rd of difference – tx had greater K – tx teacher. Accountably syst in TX probab account for some more of different – resource matter if applied to right programs esp for more disad stud SO, what explains large gains over time? What outside resource affect? The reform efforts probably. Assess, account, stnd sitting process are probl most plausible casue of gais, but resrch needed – can't explain gains w/ smlr clas size or more \$, have to be systemic reform effort 5) cost effeticve anlysis – most cost eff is targeting techr/pup reductin in early grades (K investment) and teaher resources (but not sure what each resonse thinginig of when asked aobut reourcs) pre-K epk and smaller eratios have more bang for buck – but teaher resrouc may be more across the board – disc treacdhher resrou workth exp try – 6) recs on research efforts should go

Most remarkable thng about report is \$\$ do0es matter more for disad student and have to spend in right way; pessism about reform not right, there is poss of achievedment gains over 10 years or so

??s

Kim McDougal in FL – is working condi of teacher impr? Part?

Class size is key and size depends on what type of students and expressed ad3q of resourees is another issue – small amount of disc spending passed on down to teahers – sense of rpot is teacher knows what to do if resources given to them, so need more disc resource and larger voice – most techers spend \$500 perosn money each eyar – K gives better prepr students

Kim – Tx has site based deci making and NC?

Yes, decentral deic making passed to schools

Jim Nelson – TX Cmsnr – 1998 data show same

Reading not making the same gains, but 1998 scores as far as rerouces stay the same w/ minor resghuffling as to scores – CT and KY did well in reading – no state dramatl dropped

Floyd Cmnsr in OK – teacher qualifications as far as high school

4th and 8th grade only – no data on certifiation, etc., so unable to address techer qual, his rese shows subje specific, mastery and content imp in HS, but not sure w/ lowere levels, we did not address trhe techr qual issue other than didn't fined effect form masters degree of tchr and exp effect is that first 3-5 years of teaching has effect

Floyd? Any decline form 4th to 8th?

Found that gains in 8th grade somewhat larger than 4th, but not that much. Gains at both levels.

Vicki Boyd from NH – how measure Pre-K partici measured?

Yes. Dealing w/ 4th and 8th graders who tested 1996, so went back to when 4 year olds, so kids would have been in K in early 1990's – lots of variations among K partic among states then – measured states' partici when kids were pre-K level

Vicki – data broken down by state

Yes – appendix A – p. 138 and all variables broken down by state

Maraget Lamontine – TX – press spin/discussion

Don't know – same spill as above –

DANE – when analyzis form 1998 will be finished?

Finished now, but under review, probabl w/in 6 motnhs or sooner

Linda – NV – effects of more \$ for lower for lower socio econ, any differentiaition between middle and hguehr

Foun dcontinuous curve – kids tend to benefit from lowere class size w/ no cut off – smaller and smaller gains the samller you go in techer/pup ratio – threshold depends on type of kids taught – med level, no gain at 16 or 17 – higher, no gain at 21 or 22 – wise invt of resources rqu better targeting

Ed in WI – CA and TX? 2/3 of change explained, more expl on accoutnatibliy

When look at gains, change in resources can account for very little of gains across states, so dist of score has to be epx outside of family and school resrouces; in reforms, sturctual, gains in TX and CA w/ their long term programs, most plausibly rsult of whole standard setting proc, assess, accountabilitu –s tates got early start – leaves 1/3 of diff on aerge – cA had poor resources and reform efforts didn't hang together – tx and nc coherent from beginning of reform – ca not contintuous or coherent – can't positiv id exactly the 1/3, but most plausi

Debra from tx – doing calss size reduction for 17 eyars, gains explained more from acocutn than class size reduction

Ca't epx large gain by simply clSS size, some has to be reform/accountability, accountabi reinformeces other resources – can't have one w/out the other – do have to have resourc and accoutnyabilty – account rein class size red

Linda NV – can differ between 15 ws/ 1 teacher and 30 w/ 2

No cannot – quasi exper in WI

Alex Mulner in UNIV of WI in Milwauk – targeted pup teacher reduct to very low disadvant groups – went to 2 teachers in citries

Kristen from nga – why no effect w/ tacher salear

- 1) when teahers chose where to teach, don't say what stae do I wonat to teach in, don't often cross –choie, so no storng cross stae choice 2) no sthoratege 3) most diff to sep teacher sal eff from fam eff b/c often sim 4) doesn't' pay for chara most conntected to achievement – stronger salary effects when look inside staes and do across school districts – have to raise salaries in futeur b/c of demand/supply in next 10 eyars

Peter in WI – for successful states in closing family gap, how successful

Didn't address gap clsing across staes – will be next report – result we have suggest a comob of reour and acoutn can make dent in gap measured – some work on scores in staes between urban and rural ares, but prelim research – mos treason disad have lower student is stae they live in not where in stae they live – that is why we have Title I – think the gap closing issue is primarily a between state issue

Marageret – info from WI for us?

Yes (Dane)

1999 EPA journal Alex on classsize results in WI –

Bonneell Hewitt NM – news release on web site

Ed Sontagen in WI – better graphics

Yes, nga will have