

Educational Leadership in the States: A Cultural Analysis

Report Authors:

Karen Seashore Louis

Karen Febey

Molly Gordon

Judy Meath

Emanda Thomas

University of Minnesota

June 2006

Acknowledgements

The following report represents the work of many individuals. Those listed as authors are the research team members who have had primary responsibility for data analysis and writing for this portion of the larger research study. There have been significant contributions from the other members of the study team in the form of data collection, coding, and reduction; document analysis; and critical feedback which has helped to shape our conceptions and conclusions.

In addition to the on-going input from our lead research team members Ken Leithwood, Stephen Anderson, and Michael Michlin, the authors would like to specifically thank the following individuals: Nancy Torrance and Suzanne Stiegelbauer (OISE) and research assistants Chad Schmidt, Sarah Frederickson, and Annie Hansen (CAREI) for their assistance with data collection, coding and compilation; and Kyla Wahlstrom (CAREI), and Bill Firestone for their valuable input into conceptualizing the research design, shaping the interview questions, and producing the final report.

Foreword

About the Research Study

Learning From District Efforts To Strengthen Education Leadership is a five-year research study funded by the Wallace Foundation designed to produce empirical evidence establishing the connection between leader performance and changes in student learning. The findings will enable practitioners, policy-makers, and education theorists to understand how student achievement is linked to leadership at all levels of the education system, from state-level policymaking to classroom practice. Evidence is currently being gathered in 9 states and 45 school districts and the research plan employs a rigorous sample design and multilevel statistical analyses of both quantitative and qualitative data. Reports of findings will demonstrate not only how superintendents and principals can most effectively drive gains in student learning, but how and why their practices result in instructional improvement in some contexts and not others.

Central to our research is a theoretical framework of nine inter-related variables reflecting what is known about the structures and processes that must work together if student learning is to be improved. The dynamic, interdependent nature of our framework suggests that we investigate the extent to which individuals and groups in all segments of the framework, from the state to the classroom, possess the capacities and motivations (the skill and the will) required to improve student learning, and to what extent do their work settings allow and encourage them to act on those capacities and motivations.

The research is a joint effort between the University of Minnesota's Center for Applied Research and Educational Improvement (CAREI) and the University of Toronto's Ontario Institute for the Study of Education (OISE). Lead researchers Kyla Wahlstrom (CAREI) and Kenneth Leithwood (OISE), along with Stephen Anderson, Karen Seashore Louis, Michael Michlin, and Blair Mascall are collaborating on one of the largest studies of educational leadership ever undertaken. Its scale offers the potential for more robust evidence of leadership effects than have been available to date. Results should be of considerable interest to policy makers, leadership developers, school reformers and leadership practitioners as findings become available between now and its conclusion in 2008.

Table of Contents

Foreword	3
Introduction.....	6
A Framework for Looking at State Leadership for Student Learning	7
Political Culture.....	8
Policy Levers.....	10
Formulating Educational Policies	11
Methodology	12
Protocols and Data Collection—State Interview	12
Protocols and Data Collection —District Interviews.....	13
<i>Selection of States and Districts for This Report</i>	<i>13</i>
<i>Data Analysis.....</i>	<i>13</i>
State Leadership in Education.....	14
Mississippi	14
<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Education Policy Initiatives.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>Summary of How Things Get Done.....</i>	<i>16</i>
Missouri	16
<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>16</i>
<i>Education Policy Initiatives.....</i>	<i>17</i>
<i>Summary of How Things Get Done.....</i>	<i>18</i>
New Mexico	19
<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Education Policy Initiatives.....</i>	<i>19</i>
<i>Summary of How Things Get Done.....</i>	<i>21</i>
Oregon.....	21
<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Education Policy Initiatives.....</i>	<i>21</i>
<i>Summary of How Things Get Done.....</i>	<i>23</i>
Texas	24
<i>Introduction.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Education Policy Initiatives.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>Summary of How Things Get Done.....</i>	<i>26</i>

Cross Case Analysis of State Political Culture and Choice of Levers.....	27
Comparing State Political Cultures	27
Comparing State Use of Policy Levers	30
Voices from Districts	32
<i>Relationships between Districts and States are Improving</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>Variation in Perception of Levers.....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>All See Policies as Under-funded</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>States Vary in Their Impact on Districts.....</i>	<i>35</i>
Preliminary Findings and Next Steps	37
State Policy and Federal Policy	37
State Policy Levers	37
Next Steps	40
References.....	42
Appendix A: Sampling.....	45
Appendix B: Inventory of State Interviews by Position	48
Appendix C: State Interview Protocol.....	49
Appendix D: Summary Charts of Policy Initiatives and Policy Cultures for Five States	52
Appendix E: Comparing Policy Levers.....	113

Introduction

In this report, we draw attention to a topic that is often in the news but which is less often subjected to systematic empirical analysis: the continuing importance of state policymaking in steering the work of schools. Much of the research devoted to the states' role in education has fallen into two distinct and useful camps: the first looks at the degree to which state policies are coherent and clearly focused on the objective of improving student learning; while the second emphasizes the limits of a state's impact, looking at the ways in which state policies are filtered through different local contexts. We take a different approach by investigating *how* state educational policies are made, and whether the *process* of policymaking is related to the kinds of policies that are emphasized and the way in which they are used by educators at the local (or district) level.

Over the last 25 years, there has been a distinct shift in educational policymaking from the local to state level. While there are historical differences in how states have exercised control over local decisions (Timar, 1997; Tyack & James, 1986), this shift is observable everywhere (Clune & White, 1992; Reeves, 1990; Timar & Kirp, 1988). In particular, during the last decade or so, all states have become participants in the “accountability movement” that has led to state curricular standards and requirements. Some states, like Texas and North Carolina, were particularly active in developing coherent systems of standards, tests, and positive or negative sanctions for districts and schools, while others, like Iowa, preferred to emphasize voluntary collaboration around standards (Louis, Febey, & Schroeder, 2005).

Since 2001, the increasingly complex policy relationship between state and local districts has been further complicated by the expansion of federal education legislation beyond its traditional role of supporting educational rights and promoting innovative practices. The broad discussion of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation enacted in 2002, began during the presidential election campaign several years earlier, and was anticipated by many states. While some regard the NCLB legislation as a dramatic shift in governance from the states to the federal government, the working out of fundamental elements of the legislation was left to states. In particular, states are responsible for defining the benchmarks and standards that schools are expected to meet, and they also provide the data, as well as the support and the pressure for increased data-based decision-making in schools.

Although states need to demonstrate compliance with No Child Left Behind, at this point relatively little is known about how states are shaping accountability legislation. Even less is known about their strategies for encouraging analysis and use of tests and other data at the school level. Thus, although many have pointed to the increased potency of the state as a political actor in educational policy over the past few decades, the role of states in interpreting national legislation as they design specific responses to these

national political trends has been treated less extensively. Most of the reports on state differences are descriptive, although some analyses suggest that more rigorous state accountability systems can raise student achievement (Carnoy & Loeb, 2002). How they do this has not, however, been explored in detail. In other words, we lack systematic information about the ways in which states are interpreting federal legislation and exercising *leadership* in adapting legislation to the specific circumstances and needs faced in their schools.

The following are the questions that drive our study:

1. How is state educational policy determined?
 - What is the policymaking process?
 - Who is involved in making policy?
2. How are state educational policies, particularly those related to leadership and accountability for student learning, as...
 - Perceived by districts and schools?
 - Translated into local policies?

In this paper we first review some of the literature that relates to state policymaking. We then outline both the methods that we have used to collect data, and the framework that we use to carry out our analysis. We present case studies of five states, organized by the framework. Finally, we draw some conclusions and implications about state policy leadership roles in an era of increasing accountability.

A Framework for Looking at State Leadership for Student Learning

To explore the role of state leadership, we draw on literature that examines state policymaking, both in education and other areas. In particular, we look at studies of state roles in promoting educational quality and at research on state policy cultures and on policy instruments available to states.

At the core of our study is a focus on two critical state leadership functions: providing direction and exercising influence. Each of these functions can be carried out in different ways, and such differences distinguish many “models” of leadership from one another. As Yukl notes, leadership influences “...the interpretation of events for followers, the choice of objectives for the group or organization, the organization of work activities to accomplish objectives, the motivation of followers to achieve the objectives, the maintenance of cooperative relationships and teamwork, and the enlistment of support and cooperation from people outside the group or organization” (Yukl, 1994).

While Yukl writes about organizational leadership, this definition is clearly applicable to the overall function of state government in providing direction for local education. States are increasingly trying to affect classrooms and student experiences, for example through the “opportunity to learn” standards (Elmore & Fuhrman, 1995), and with an increased emphasis on professional development (Dutro, Fisk, Koch, Roop, & Wixson, 2002).

There is some evidence that state leadership in these areas may pay off, by affecting classroom practice (Swanson & Stevenson, 2002). Yet, when we look at the empirical research on state leadership, we find that the link between what happens at the state and what goes on in schools—particularly as it relates to student learning—is not well understood. Some scholars argue that it is rather weak (Leithwood & Prestine, 2002), while others argue that its impact is, at least potentially, strong (Malen, 2003; Swanson & Stevenson, 2002; Youngs, 2001).

There is some evidence from the first generation of research on the effects of “strong” accountability policies that under some conditions, student test scores may increase (Carnoy & Loeb, 2002), but the link between data and improvement remains unclear (Hanushek & Raymond, 2004). In addition, other analyses suggest that state policy leadership may undermine local leadership and the democratic principles of citizen participation (Rogers, 2004).

Thus, it is clear that we lack in-depth, comparative analysis of what state leadership means. What is missing is a significant effort to understand how state policies are made, how policies differ among the states, and how these differences may affect their potential impact on districts, schools, and students. In order to explore the states’ leadership role further, we turn to the literature from political science and the politics of education. We delineate differences among the states in our study by using a framework that includes attention both to political culture and to the nature of policy instruments, or levers, that are used within the states.

Political Culture

We define political culture very generally as the repeated patterns of behavior that can be observed in the policymaking process. Political decisions occur as a consequence of the exercise of power and influence. However, decision outcomes, particularly in the case of complex policies, are not usually predicted only by who has the deepest pockets or the largest majority in congress. Rather, “culture affects political transformation by determining the context in which social actors make collective and individual political decisions” (Berezin, 1997). Political culture is more than the aggregation of individual preferences and values, but emerges from both individual and group efforts and ability “to make those preferences publicly common” (Chilton, 1988). In other words, the accumulated history of public discourse, repeated actions, and expressed preferences of groups are critical elements of the context in which decisions are made.

The core of understanding culture, furthermore, is embedded in relationships and shared values among groups, which become the backdrop of public preferences for behaviors and beliefs (Wirt, Mitchell, & Marshall, 1988). In this paper we draw on the traditional definition of political culture as the “persistent, generational patterns of political attitudes, values, beliefs, and behavior that characterize a group of people who live in geographical proximity” (Elazar, 1970; Lieske, 1993). In other words, political culture, unlike political party dominance, persists over time and affects how states address new issues (like educational accountability), as well as old issues (such as state taxation policy).

Elazar's formulation, along with later applications, reinforces the significance of four distinct dimensions of political culture (Herzik, 1985):

1. **Openness:** broad availability of political participation as contrasted with constrained or elite dominance;
2. **Decentralism:** distributed power sources; no one center versus concentration of power in the legislature or governor's office;
3. **Rationalism:** policies based on comprehensive and/or coherent solutions to social problems as contrasted with either multiple, unrelated initiatives or limited government activity;
4. **Egalitarianism:** persistent policies to redistribute resources to minimize disparities versus limited efforts in redistribution.

Each of these dimensions has a corresponding pattern of political behavior. For example, in more open political cultures, the general public has substantial influence in determining the nature of government structures and political processes, while more closed political cultures have more stringent requirements for participation that may lessen the influence of the general public. Timar and Kirp note that states exhibiting a tendency toward rationalism in their political cultures enact school reform programs to solve specific problems, while decentralist political cultures tend to place more emphasis on local control and choice (Timar & Kirp, 1988). These long-term effects of culture may not be visible in every legislative session, because no government is entirely consistent. However, they may be quite apparent over longer periods of time.

A number of studies in education have suggested other elements of state policy leadership profiles that reinforce the significance of Herzik's four dimensions, and point to their relevance in understanding state educational policy (Wirt, Mitchall & Marshall, 1988; Wong, 1989). But recent analyses point to additional factors that may be particularly important for the educational policy culture. Longitudinal research on school finance, for example, reinforces the presence of inter-state differences in school funding redistribution policies (Wood & Theobald, 2003). Wong's (1989) analysis of state fiscal policies also adds another dimension that is not emphasized in the traditional political science frameworks:

5. **Efficiency:** an emphasis on economic cost-benefits and optimization of policy performance versus limited attention to input-output considerations.

The emphasis on efficiency is particularly important in public discussions about education finance, in which some refer to the "black hole" of educational spending, while others point to the importance of applying "new public management" or business-like models to social policy initiatives (O'Toole & Meier, 2004). The public emphasis on efficiency is sometimes viewed as an "either/or" in contrast with the egalitarianism dimension (Hoxby, 1996; Johnston & Duncombe, 1998). However, in this paper we view them as distinct.

We regard quality as an additional dimension of state political culture, one that may result in different approaches to accountability:

6. **Quality:** policies establish a comprehensive state system of educational indicators, and resources are allocated to monitor them versus a less comprehensive or laissez-faire approach to determining quality.

The recent emphasis on “indicators” and outcomes in educational policy has deep roots among both liberal and conservative critics of education (Bryk & Hermanson, 1993). On the one hand, “conservatives” argue that there is a need for indicators to determine whether public monies are being well spent; “liberals,” on the other hand, often ignore inputs, but link indicators of quality to the goal of equality. The important point here is that a state’s long-term emphasis on measurable quality can be independently linked to policy actions, many of which have been observable since the late 1960s.

Finally, there are clear differences, unrelated to particular political party positions, on a key dimension of state culture as it arises in educational policy: the emphasis on choice. On the one hand, choice in some settings is inextricably tied to a strict liberal strand of political culture that emphasizes the importance of markets and private choices (Whitty & Power, 2000). On the other hand, in different settings, particularly during the early desegregation period in the northern states, choice was largely viewed as a strategy to create equality of opportunity, with an emphasis on magnet schools, inter-district transfer, and special-focus charter schools. Perhaps the most notable example is Minnesota, which has always been on the forefront of choice legislation, but which is reliably “moralistic” in its overall state policy culture (Mazzoni, 1993). Thus, we include choice as a final dimension of state policy culture:

7. **Choice:** an emphasis on increasing the range of options available to citizens (in the case of education, families) and opportunities to make policy decisions at multiple levels.

Policy Levers

The concept of the policy lever or policy instrument comes from economists, who struggle with the question of how a simple change in prime interest rates, for example, can affect a national or global economy. The underlying problem – how policymakers can use blunt instruments to achieve more subtle ends – was raised in the mid 1980s in both political science (Woodside, 1986) and education (McDonnell & Elmore, 1987). The premise that there are multiple instruments to achieve the same end is a critical idea linked to the notion of political culture. Some studies, for example, find that states differ in the instruments they use to achieve a goal that they all espouse, such as educational equity. One clear example is the wide variation in educational finance strategies that persists among states, largely as a result of enduring patterns of legislative politics, structural limitations, economic constraints, and legal context (Wong, 1989).

Due to political and economic pressures, policymakers rarely use all of the available policy instruments, even when they wish to create comprehensive reform. Instead, they typically use a narrow range of policy mechanisms that are believed to be most likely to produce positive short-term results (Rossman & Wilson, 1996). Elected officials usually have a brief time in which to propose and enact new policies. The two- and four-year electoral cycles often require that initiatives have a demonstrable impact from one election to the next. Thus, longer-term strategies are less common at the state level because of the time it takes to demonstrate significant impact (Elmore & Fuhrman, 1995). States have struggled, therefore, with finding the appropriate policy mechanisms to influence teaching and learning -- the core of educational policy, but also the most difficult and resistant to change from outside the school.

In this report we will begin to look at the variation in policy levers that exists between states as they enact policies designed to strengthen district leadership and increase accountability and improve local leadership for student achievement. The four levers proposed by McDonnell and Elmore (1987; p 137) are used to guide our initial analysis:

1. **Mandates:** enacting laws, regulations, and requirements, including sanctions;
2. **System Change:** legislating restructuring, change in governance or legal/financial relationships, including making new alternatives available;
3. **Capacity Building:** using professional development, providing access to new information or data; developing leadership;
4. **Inducements:** providing financial aid (targeted or general), special grants programs; other investments in the human or physical infrastructure.

As we look at the “views from below” in our preliminary analysis of district responses to state policies, we will also bring in a characteristic of policy instruments or levers that is prominent in much of the political science literature: the extent of regulation or coercion (Woodside, 1986). While there are differences in the degree to which coercion is superficially evident in the instruments identified in the preceding list, the importance of an underlying emphasis on persuasion or force is always apparent and well understood by those who are expected to enact any state educational policy.

Formulating Educational Policies

Educational policy is more than a set of norms (policy culture) and instruments. The process of exercising influence also determines state leadership. Thus, in order to understand state leadership, we must look at the relationships of actors in the system throughout the policy process. In education, this means giving primacy to the interaction of educational stakeholders, organizations, and entities affecting policy within the larger system of accountability reforms. Those stakeholders, organizations, and entities are primary initiators, and the loci of accommodation, visibility, and help to determine the scope of conflict or accommodation (Mazzoni, 1992).

In this report, we pay attention to the “primary initiators,” also known as the agenda setters. Kingdon (1992) identifies arenas in which actors (and their knowledge) may operate: a “problem stream” in which issues are identified and given priority, a “solution stream,” in which various competing policies are discussed, and a “political stream” that consists of potential key decision-makers. As March and Olsen (1976) note, these streams operate quasi-independently, which means that the combination of issues, solutions, and active participants is often difficult to predict.

Initiators are often politicians, especially if they are chairs of education committees, but they can also be education interest groups, governors, or policy entrepreneurs. The loci of accommodation are where the initiators propose, debate, and study the details of proposed educational legislation. Visibility is the coverage of the issue that is provided to the public about who the primary initiators are and how they are engaging in the issue in the loci of accommodation. Our objective was to find out who the important actors are in each state, and how they tend to exercise influence.

Methodology

We used a qualitative methodology to compare education-related policymaking in five states. We utilized two primary sources of data in this study: state-level interviews in 5 states (see Appendix A: Sampling), and interviews of district administrators and school board members in 4 states. The structured state-level interviews were conducted via telephone with approximately 10 education policy experts in each state between October, 2004 and February, 2005 (see Appendix B: Inventory of State Interviews). To complement the “view from above” of the state policy experts, we drew upon interviews conducted with school district administrators in the same states.

Protocols and Data Collection—State Interview

We designed the state interview instrument to elicit respondents’ assessments of the major education policy initiatives and issues of the past 10 or so years, how those policies were developed, and by whom. Probes were used to ensure that respondents remarked on any policy activity in the areas of administrator licensure, evaluation and accountability standards, and capacity development (see Appendix C: State Interview Protocol).

State interview subjects were selected based on their professional positions. We identified positions that would yield, cumulatively, a comprehensive set of perspectives on state-level education policy and policymaking. Therefore, people interviewed included congressional representatives, commissioners of education, chairs of state boards of education, teacher and administrative union leaders, faculty members at schools of education, leaders of foundations related to education, and business leaders engaged in state education initiatives. We sent potential respondents letters of invitation, followed up with phone calls to schedule telephone interviews. District respondents were also selected by position, and included superintendents, district professional staff members, school board members, and business and union leaders.

State-level interviews lasted one hour. Trained interviewers tape recorded each interview, with the respondent's consent. Interviewers took handwritten notes as well, to guard against tape failure. Only one out of 48 interviewees requested not to be taped. District interviews were conducted as part of two-day site visits by four project staff members to district administrative offices and school buildings. Interviewers also recorded these interviews, and all interviews were then transcribed for analysis.

Protocols and Data Collection —District Interviews

District interview protocols were developed to capture how local leaders view the effects of state education policy on district policy and practice. As the district interviews are part of the larger study to be completed later, they also delved into other areas of school district leadership. One question and its follow-up in the interview protocol focused on the relationship of the district and the state: What activities at the State level which have the most influence on your work? Is there more that State personnel could do to help your work? This question was asked in the context of a broader discussion about the relationships that affect district planning for accountability and leadership. All district interviews were conducted by senior members of the research team in face-to-face settings. Respondents varied by district, but included both Superintendents and other senior staff members in the district office.

Selection of States and Districts for This Report

In this report, we are comparing education policymaking in five of the nine states in the larger study, because these were the most complete data sets available. The states we are comparing are Mississippi, Missouri, New Mexico, Oregon, and Texas. In our analysis, we use district data from three of the states included in this study: Missouri, Texas and Oregon. District data were not available for Mississippi, because districts there did not participate in the study; nor was it available for New Mexico, where data collection was still underway. In addition, for the purposes of completing this part of the report, we supplemented available district interview data with information from another state in the study, Nebraska. Later reports will provide a more complete analysis of all of the states and districts.

Data Analysis

Researchers at CAREI/U of MN and OISE/U of Toronto coded interview transcripts using NVivo software. The coding scheme closely reflected the interview protocols. We reduced the data from the 48 hour-long state interviews into manageable charts which organized the major education policy initiatives for each state by key players involved and policy levers used (see Appendix D, Policy Initiative, Players and Levers for Five States). For each of the five states, we also developed a chart describing each state's political culture based on Elazar's elements of political culture (see Appendix E, Dimensions of Political Culture for Five States). From these two charts, we were able to write a case study for each state that wove together a narrative of how the major

education initiatives in a given state were developed, and by whom, within the context of that state's political culture. To round out the case studies, we examined district responses to state education policy, as extracted from the interviews with district leaders. Researchers analyzed 80 percent of district interview transcripts from Missouri, Oregon, Texas, and Nebraska to determine district leaders' views of state influence on district policy and practice. Researchers categorized district responses by themes and states, identifying key quotes and general responses. We used this chart to identify similarities and differences among the district responses to our items of inquiry.

State Leadership in Education

The case descriptions below reflect the perceptions of respondents regarding key policy initiatives, policy actors, the nature of the political culture, and the policy process in five different states, as well as the challenges faced to accomplish the various goals of the initiatives. From their responses, we've learned that for the most part, the political culture within each state has been consistent for many years. The only state which stood out as an anomaly was New Mexico. We have also learned that the degree of policy culture dimensions differ greatly among states. This section includes an overview of each state's recent history of education policy initiatives on accountability, leadership, and funding, as well as their relative impact within each state. As a summary, we have provided two tables comparing the dimensions of political culture and the use of policy levers, which were highlighted in the interviews with state policy leaders.

Mississippi

Introduction

Mississippi's education system has suffered over the years from under-funding, and student achievement consistently ranks near the bottom nationally. Policymakers have implemented broad reform efforts that have attempted to direct much-needed monies, resources, and changes into education. These reform efforts have never been adequately funded, however, despite various funding schemes passed by the legislature. There has been weak reform-oriented leadership in Mississippi from the grassroots level which has inhibited all stakeholders from having an equal voice in that process.

Education Policy Initiatives

The most sweeping education reform legislation in Mississippi in the past 25 years was the 1982 Mississippi Educational Reform Act, considered the most comprehensive in the United States at the time. The act directed the State Department of Education to formulate an accountability plan, which called for a uniform state curriculum, accountability standards, and school improvement plans. This act, initiated by the

governor and a group of legislators, also established a formal State Board of Education, which helped diffuse the power of the governor in this traditionally centralized state. The State Department of Education wrote the standards and curriculum; the state commissioner and superintendents' organization crafted its implementation.

Another significant piece of accountability legislation was the Mississippi Adequate Education Pact (MAEP) of 1997 which held schools, not local districts, accountable for student learning. Stakeholders were largely grateful for the infrastructure, resources, and testing that MAEP provided Mississippi, as the state needed few adjustments to its accountability system once the U.S. Congress passed NCLB. Also in 1997, the legislature passed the Reading Sufficiency Act that mandated reading tests for third and fourth graders as a means of identifying students in need of supplemental literacy services. This act served as the impetus for benefactors who created the non-profit Barksdale Reading Institute, which provides research-based reading training for teachers and administrators to improve student literacy skills. The Institute also funds scholarships for socio-economically disadvantaged students and supports an endowed faculty position at Mississippi State University for literacy education.

In an effort to hold a broader range of stakeholders accountable for student learning, legislators passed the Mississippi Student Achievement Improvement Act in 1999. This act required the State Board of Education to implement a performance-based accreditation system for schools and districts, and growth-based performance standards for individual schools. A subsequent 2000 initiative provided "teeth" to the 1999 improvement act by basing accreditation on annual growth expectations for students and requiring measurements of the percentage of students proficient at grade level.

Initiatives aimed at the development of educational administrative leadership do not have as long a history as the initiatives related to accountability. One of the first significant leadership policies in Mississippi addressed the issue of capacity building and the supply of quality school leaders. In 1997, legislators passed a bill that allowed for the creation of the School Executive Management Institute. The Institute provides training for administrators and school board members and requires administrators to complete 95 renewal or continuing professional development hours over five years.

Also in 1997, the legislature passed the Mississippi Adequate Education Pact that the State Board of Education took the lead in writing. Although the Republican governor and some Republican legislators unsuccessfully opposed the bill based on its high cost, the legislature enacted MAEP with considerable grassroots and bi-partisan support in both the state house and senate. The driving force behind MAEP was accountability, but its creators recognized that schools could not be held accountable for student learning if they did not have the necessary resources. MAEP is regarded as the most ambitious effort to fund education in the state to date as it was designed to provide foundation funding to all schools, regardless of the tax base in a district's locality. Even with the law's designation of equality in funding, however, the pact has never been fully funded.

It is not just MAEP that concerns stakeholders when talking about educational funding—they view the current governor and legislature as uninterested in fully addressing the severe lack of education funds, especially the amount of monies generated by property taxes. However, legislators have attempted to address educational funding through means other than the MAEP legislation. In 1990, after the state’s oil industry had collapsed, the state made gambling legal in off-shore casinos. By 1995, the casino dollars began providing supplemental funds for education, which increased the state’s per pupil expenditures. In 1992, the legislature passed a one percent sales tax increase that created the Education Enhancement Fund. Its purpose was to help schools renovate buildings, improve bus fleets, and purchase equipment and teaching supplies.

Most recently, in a special session during summer, 2005, Mississippi legislators passed a \$145 million increase for K-12 education, which was more than the current Governor Haley Barbour proposed. Several stakeholders interviewed noted that this amount was not sufficient, but that became moot after the devastation of Hurricane Katrina set back education funding in 2005. Monies were diverted to rebuilding damaged school facilities and assisting displaced students. The hurricane also destroyed revenue-producing off-shore casinos.

It is a point of pride for policymakers in Mississippi that the state is one of the few that has not had any lawsuits related to funding disparities. This lack of litigation is remarkable, as Mississippi has one of the lowest per pupil rates of expenditure in the U.S. The centralized policy culture of Mississippi is evident in the relative power of various groups to affect funding issues. Teachers’ unions, for example, keep teachers informed about educational legislation and advocate for greater professionalism but they have little control over teacher salaries, which are still among the lowest in the United States.

Summary of How Things Get Done

Education policymaking in Mississippi is centralized and closed to new participants. The Mississippi Education Forum, a coalition of business groups, has influenced the policymaking agenda with its concern for developing a highly skilled workforce for the state. Inadequate funding continues to stymie education reform efforts. Closely related to the chronic shortage of education funding is Mississippi’s severe shortage of teachers and administrators. This shortage was addressed by the 1998 Critical Shortage Act, which provided scholarships, grants, home loans, and moving expenses for teachers and administrators to work in the Delta Region and other rural and low-performing areas. The act is an example of the piecemeal policymaking culture of Mississippi.

Missouri

Introduction

Missouri, the “Show Me” state, has an individualistic culture that generally favors government decentralization. Over the past decade, the state has lacked comprehensive leadership in education policy, which allows tenacious groups to influence the content of policy. Without an encompassing or visionary plan for the education system overall, the result is a piecemeal set of policies representing the multiple competing interests of the state’s department of education, the legislature, and external groups such as professional associations and business groups. Business interests, in particular have influenced legislation related to the funding of education. Education policies in Missouri tend toward mandates for greater accountability by students, teachers, and administrators.

Education Policy Initiatives

The most sweeping piece of education legislation in Missouri in the past 20 years has been Senate Bill 380, the Outstanding Schools Initiative of 1993. The bill emphasized accountability by establishing statewide assessment standards and revising teacher and administrator certification rules. But Senate Bill 380 went beyond the standard accountability measures of testing and licensure; districts were required to develop comprehensive improvement plans, and the bill directed considerable funds (one percent of the state’s education budget) toward professional development. Governor Mel Carnahan and Senator Harold Caskey were key advocates of Senate Bill 380, and the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) was the main architect. Other groups that influenced aspects of the bill included teacher and administrator associations, the State Board of Education, and the State Chamber of Commerce. Universities played a role too, in stipulating and providing professional development. Although the state imposed a number of accountability measures, the particulars of implementation were left to districts, following the state’s tradition of decentralization.

Since 1993, education policy in Missouri has been less comprehensive and more narrowly focused on accountability. In 2001, the state legislature enacted legislation requiring the reporting of virtually all educational statistics at the building level, and in 2003 passed legislation aligning Missouri state tests with the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). DESE played a key role in these initiatives. In recent years, DESE, with some assistance by the Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals, produced a new model for performance-based principal evaluation; however, because of Missouri’s tradition of decentralization, this new model was not required, but is used by some districts. The state’s efforts to enforce accountability standards through strengthening teacher certification have been thwarted to some degree by the difficulty of retaining teachers and the corresponding need to broaden or soften certification rules.

The void in legislative leadership in the state’s education system seems to be reflected in the ad hoc efforts to develop leadership among educational administrators. These efforts are not integrated in an overall plan, and thus sometimes are narrowly conceived. For example, the Leadership Academy for administrators was established by DESE in 1988, and is the state’s mechanism for implementing professional development requirements for administrators by publicizing certification and licensure rules, and providing

opportunities for fulfilling those requirements. Efforts to develop administrator leadership are thus subsumed under the department's accountability measures.

Private foundations have also made efforts to develop administrative leadership in improving learning. The Missouri Superintendent's Forum, founded by the Kauffman Foundation in the mid-90s, hosts superintendents from across the state in an effort to develop skills (in management and data use, among other things) to improve school quality and student learning.

Educational funding has been disputed for decades. In the 1970s, a school funding formula was devised in an attempt to ease disparities in funding levels among districts. School funding based on property taxes resulted in "rich" and "poor" districts. In 1980, court-ordered desegregation began in an attempt to rectify racial inequities in quality of education. Numerous court battles have been fought over who pays for desegregation and how education is funded by district. Efforts to improve education funding are not limited to the legislature. The Danforth Foundation established the City Academy in 1999 to provide high-quality education to disadvantaged urban children. The reach of such efforts is limited by the fluctuations of private funding. Senate Bill 380 of 1993 revised the school funding formula in an attempt to address disparities in the education funding levels among districts. One change was the way total number of students was defined; another was shifting the definition of disadvantaged students from families using AFDC to students eligible for a free or reduced lunch.

State funding policies more recently reflect the influence of the Missouri business community. In 2004, the Missouri legislature passed a transportation bill that earmarked \$180 million of the general fund for roads, essentially ensuring that these funds would not go to education. The Missouri Chamber of Commerce and Industry helped to formulate this bill and lobbied for its passage. One effect of the resulting budget shortfall in education was the reduction of state-mandated tests from four core areas to only two, communication arts and math.

Summary of How Things Get Done

Missouri's education policymaking process is not impermeable, but only a few tenacious and well-funded organizations end up having a role. According to most of our respondents, education policy is formulated by a relatively small group of state-level actors: the Commissioner of Education, members of the legislature, the governor, and interested external groups such as the state's three teachers' associations and the business community via the State Chamber of Commerce. The insularity of the policymaking process, together with the fact that the Commissioner of Education is typically selected from established leaders within the Missouri Association of School Administrators, an organization that was described by a number of actors as conservative, has resulted in a state education system that is slow to adopt innovative or comprehensive change. Philanthropic foundations have initiated programs to reduce educational inequity and develop administrative leadership, but these efforts have not gained traction, due in part to their weak links with state policy, which would expand their reach.

According to a number of respondents, Missouri's competitive political environment permeates election rhetoric and the legislative process, privileging party line rhetoric over substantive discussion of serious educational issues. Policymaking is logical but piecemeal, not guided by a comprehensive vision. There is agreement that the decades-long struggle over how to deal with educational inequity, particularly in urban centers has not been satisfactorily addressed with accountability legislation.

New Mexico

Introduction

With the election of Bill Richardson as governor of New Mexico in 2003, education has become a part of the major policy forum for the first time in nearly 30 years. Consequently, many education and legislative initiatives have been enacted as a result of this new focus of state level decision-making. This increase in education policy activity at the state level has involved numerous stakeholders and focuses on increasing comprehensive methods of reform to improve equity as well as efficiency.

Education Policy Initiatives

Prior to 2003, New Mexico made limited efforts to create a comprehensive solution to educational issues in the state. Governor Gary Johnson's main interests were to promote voucher plans and to pilot a school choice program. Discussion, however, began on the issue of creating state standards and accountability systems. After Governor Richardson was elected in 2003, he created a major impetus in the educational policy arena. In his State of the State address in 2003, he outlined his education goals by speaking on topics such as improving test scores and graduation rates -- but his primary focus was on putting a quality teacher in every classroom.

The majority of respondents spoke about the passage of New Mexico House Bill 212, the School Reform Act, which included accountability provisions and measures. The New Mexico School Reform Act also outlined a plan for increasing teacher salaries, a top priority for Governor Richardson, and the most frequently mentioned policy in the interviews. The bill illustrates a three-tiered teacher licensure system with teacher pay based on specific levels. For example, level one teachers' starting salary went from \$22,000 to \$30,000; and level three teachers' salaries now range from \$60,000 to \$70,000. In addition to creating teacher pay scales, House Bill 212 also included professional development provisions that were required for licensure advancement.

Principals did not benefit as much as teachers from the 2003 New Mexico School Reform Act. Although a provision was outlined to enhance principal salary packages based on school size, it did not pass. Recently, this part of the bill was being rewritten to include a more rigorous evaluation system for administrators. In 2005, the governor proposed an amendment to House Bill 212 which may lead to additional legislation and the

development of strong professional development standards based on student test scores. A task force has been formed to create a policy framework for professional development, as required by current state law.

The creation of the 2003 New Mexico School Reform Act involved a large number of top and mid-level policy and political leaders including New Mexico State Board of Education members, the Secretary of Education and the staff of the New Mexico Public Education Department. Support for the initiative also came from the New Mexico Business Roundtable for Educational Excellence, the Governor's Council of Teachers, the Greater Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce, and the elected New Mexico Public Education Commission. Stakeholder groups are able to participate in other education policy initiatives as well. For example, the Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) holds meetings throughout the state and businesses host roundtable discussions on key educational issues. Thus, although much of the political power in New Mexico is concentrated in the governor's office and other departments, it is also evident that many players are able to come to the table to voice opinions on educational policies.

Increased stakeholder involvement in discussions has been accompanied by increasing centralization of decision-making authority. In 2003, Constitutional Amendment 1, introduced by the governor, LESC, and the Senate Education Committee, called for a change in educational governance. The amendment, which was passed by voters, shifted power from the Superintendent of Public Education and the state board to the State Secretary of Education and the New Mexico Public Education Dept (NM PED). The State Education Secretary effectively replaced the State School Superintendent. The post was appointed by a 15 member state board which gave the governor significantly more power over educational issues. To complement House Bill 212, the Office of Education Accountability was created to provide independent sources of information about the progress of education reform. Included in the bill was a shift in hiring personnel from the local school boards to district superintendents. This policy was contested in smaller districts where hiring was no longer a community process.

Although state leadership for school improvement is recent, New Mexico has a long history of finance equalization. For example, in 1974, New Mexico's State Board of Education and legislature passed the Public Schools Finance Act which included a School Equalization Guarantee. Funding differences are statistically insignificant across the state, and the formula is viewed as highly equitable. Constitutional Amendment 2, also introduced in 2003 and passed by voters, increased the distribution from the Land Grant Permanent Fund for Education to pay for the increased teacher salaries instituted by Governor Richardson. By 2004, New Mexico finished its legislative session with a six percent budget increase for public education. Governor Richardson also proposed an increase in spending for K12 education for 2005, which included putting \$35 million in a lockbox for future improvements, increased spending on charter schools, and a requirement for reallocating 1% of local spending to classroom instruction.

Other important New Mexico reforms illuminate the recent flurry of activity in educational policy. In 2003, New Mexico enacted the Indian Education Act (SB115) to

create an Indian Education Division within the Public Education Department. An assistant secretary was appointed to spearhead an Indian Education Advisory Council, whose focus was on assisting in the evaluation, coordination, and consolidation of all activities related to educating New Mexico's Native American students. A Charter School Bill was passed in 2005 which is currently in the design phase. In 2005, New Mexico passed a Pre-K Initiative (HB 337a) and was allotted \$5 million dispensed for implementation (\$2.5 million by PED, \$2.5 million by CYFD). This initiative is part of an Early Childhood Education Initiative and includes a voluntary pre-K program component. In addition, another initiative for full-day kindergarten, tied to the ECEI, has been proposed with continued support by all districts.

Summary of How Things Get Done

There is a virtual consensus among respondents that the political culture of New Mexico is a break from the previously low-key environment for educational policy in New Mexico. Most of this is due the leadership of Governor Bill Richardson, whose efforts have opened the education policy arena to both new and old actors. This activism has been accompanied by increased centralization of government decision-making, in contrast with the history of localized citizen control except in matters of funding. New policy initiatives are quite comprehensive and focused on addressing social problems by dealing with issues of equity, efficiency, and quality of education. Finally, choice is an increasingly important issue as well. While the governor is active in trying to change the policy culture of the state, it is too soon to tell whether this new reality will remain after he is no longer in office.

Oregon

Introduction

Oregon has a history of local control, comprehensive policy reform and broad grassroots participation in educational policymaking. Furthermore, the progressive political culture of Oregon is evident by its early start on creating a unique approach to standards and accountability many years prior to NCLB. By 1993, the state began taking responsibility for creating standards for Oregon schools. This focus on accountability and an openness to participation in education policymaking are integral to understanding education policy initiatives and how things get done in this state. Also important is the undercurrent of concern about state funding policies, which have shifted control of how schools are funded away from districts, providing greater power to the state.

Education Policy Initiatives

In 1993, Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century helped launch the creation of standards-based curriculum across grade levels. Although the state played a large role in helping to create standards, school districts were left to design their own assessment methods. In 1999, Oregon established school report cards. These reports focus on the calculation of a student's progress over time and are not based on the results of any one

particular test. A larger shift occurred in 1995 when, following recommendations of national experts, the state tweaked the Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century reform by adding two levels of high school certification: the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) and the Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM). Students receiving the CIM have shown that they met the minimum skills and knowledge established for graduating high school; the state's requirements were narrowed to mathematics, science, and English in 2003 in order to align it with NCLB. The implementation of the CAM, which is intended to demonstrate that students have taken more rigorous classes and have participated in community support projects and/or internships, has been delayed until 2008. The CAM is viewed as a certificate of distinction that will assist students with post-high school planning, whether it is continued education or work.

Leadership, however, is also firmly situated at the local level where superintendents have considerable influence over how they interpret state policies. Community members are typically invited to local meetings where they are able to participate in discussions of education issues. In one district, for example, the superintendent has invited community members to "listening sessions" where they discuss local policies and give suggestions for improvement. So, although there are power players in the system, coalitions and groups of citizens, including business and grass-roots organizations, provide much of the actual leadership in education policies and reform.

Like most states, there is a history of support for licensure requirements, but no formal policies requiring continuing professional education exist. Currently, the state of Oregon does not have any rules or statutes regarding leadership performance or preparation. In 1999, the Teacher and Administrator Mentor Act was introduced but it did not pass. Although the Act was revised, re-introduced, and enacted in 2003, the legislature did not fund it.

Beginning in 1989, Oregon's history of local control shifted with the state's decision to alter its funding structure dramatically by removing fiscal responsibility from school districts to the State Department of Education. This shift can be illustrated by two policy initiatives that many respondents referred to. First, Measure Five, which was adopted in 1991, put a 1.5 percent property tax limit on education. This shift allowed the state to decide how much money each district was going to receive based on the current state revenue. Second, when the state established Education Service Districts (ESDs), they were originally conceived as an infrastructure to support local districts, and they were expected to operate like entrepreneurs, applying for their own grant money. In 1999, however the state changed the funding allocation structure so that the regional education service districts became funded by through a 5 percent allocation from the overall Oregon Department of Education budget.

Since the adoption of Measure Five, K-12 school funding remains a dominant issue of discussion. Pressure from districts forced legislators to review their Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century. The speaker of the house was authorized to develop a measure of education outcomes based on ideal schools and funding. One of the key findings in this report found that if the state fully funded education, then 90 percent of students

would achieve at or above grade level. In the same vein, then, the speaker argued that the numbers of students passing at each grade level would decrease based on how much funding came from the state. The current funding formula allocates 70 percent from the state and federal grant fund and 30 percent from local property taxes. In essence, the state's economic performance determines the amount of K-12 funding. This formula, ultimately, limits education spending substantially if the state economy falters. To keep a tab on district spending, the state requires districts to develop their spending plan for federal and state funds prior to the state determining the amount each school district will receive. This centralized and unstable allocation of resources has placed a tremendous financial burden on districts that continues today.

Many players come to the table to discuss and decide educational policy. For example, the Oregon Business Council (OBC) is highly active and visible in education. The group had a role in the development of the 1993 initiative, Oregon Educational Act for the 21st Century, as well as the CIM/CAM laws. Businesses in Oregon are well represented on education committees at the state level, lobbying for the enactment of various policies. For example, the OBC lobbied for the Teacher and Administrator Mentor's Act that was enacted but not funded by the legislature. Another group involved in education is the Oregon Business Association (OBA) although not to the extent of the OBC. Political participation is encouraged in Oregon and there are many grass-roots organizations with interests in particular policy issues. For example, The Chalkboard Project is a coalition of five major foundations that have developed a process of civic engagement education focused on the role of public education in Oregon. In essence, the project seeks to raise awareness of the challenges in education and, through the use of polling and focus groups, ask citizens their opinions as to what's happening or not happening in the state. Out of that information-gathering, the group plans to recommend issues to focus on during the 2006 legislative session.

The Oregon Education Association (OEA) has a long history of working with professional educators and the state in lobbying for the interests of teachers and administrators. The OEA has been influential in all of the major funding initiatives in the state and was active in helping create the CIM/CAM and school report cards that are linked to the state standards. OEA works in collaboration with the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA) to lobby the legislature to increase school funding.

Oregon's governors have, historically, played a less prominent role in educational policy than in some states. A recent scandal involving a former Democratic governor continues to be a political weapon and is credited with the current influence of the Republican party. As is often the case in Oregon, the parties share power: The Senate is controlled by Republicans and the House of Representatives is controlled by Democrats which has deeply divided the state on many issues, including education.

Summary of How Things Get Done

According to the respondents, Oregon has remained consistent in its political culture throughout the years, even with shifts in political party dominance and the changes in funding. Oregon policymakers describe the state as having a populist mentality, fueled by a preference for local control and a fear of any one group gaining too much power. Oregon is a collaborative state where groups, rather than individuals, are recognized as state policymakers. Collective action rather than competition is viewed as the preferred way of developing new initiatives and, as a consequence, most organizations must collaborate with others in order to be viewed as legitimate policy actors.

Because of the tradition of decentralized policymaking, local players in education appear to have as much or more power than the state over interpretation and implementation of new policies. Local leaders do not see their job as part of a state-wide program to improve education, but as policymakers at the local level. Community is also highly influential in education initiatives as well. Nevertheless, the state's emphasis on high standards determines the performance expectations of districts and their students. How districts achieve those goals, however is determined at the local level.

Texas

Introduction

Accountability has been the ongoing priority in Texas educational policy for thirty years. Legislative efforts to reform education have been broad, addressing myriad elements of the system, from funding to student assessment and administrator preparation, but accountability-related mandates have been the most consistent tool used in attempts to improve education in Texas. Although the state has developed comprehensive accountability programs, they have struggled to deal with the legacy of significant inequities in resources and performance.

Education Policy Initiatives

Texas' most ambitious education reform initiative of the 1980s was the 1984 Educational Opportunity Act (HB 72), which was initiated by Governor Mark White in response to "A Nation at Risk," the National Commission on Excellence in Education's report that painted a dire picture of the state of education in the U.S. Earlier, in 1983, Governor White and the Texas Legislature established the Select Committee on Public Education (SCOPE), headed by businessman Ross Perot and charged with studying public education in Texas in order to develop a comprehensive school improvement plan; this plan eventually became HB 72.

HB 72 influenced many aspects of the state's public education system, from curriculum to governance. Class sizes were decreased and early childhood education programs were introduced for 3, 4, and 5-year-olds. Statewide testing requirements, although not new to the state, were fortified with a provision for data collection. The Educational Opportunity Act also transformed teacher education by restricting the amount of pedagogy taught in

preparatory programs to 12 credit hours. Inducements were offered to teachers for improving their instruction through the Teacher Career Ladder, which assigned salary supplements for demonstrated improvement based on a local assessment (the Career Ladder was eliminated in 1993-94). The Bill also dramatically increased state funding for compensatory education, from approximately \$50 million to more than \$300 million per year.

Perhaps the most significant aspect of HB 72, however, was the reorganization of governance roles in state education policymaking. The authority of the elected State Board of Education was increased when it became the oversight agency for the Texas Education Agency, headed by the commissioner. A new governing entity, the Legislative Education Board, was created to oversee the State Board of Education, and it included the lieutenant governor, speaker of the house, chair of the House Education Committee, and chair of the Senate Education Committee. Later, in 1991, the responsibility for appointing the commissioner of education shifted from the State Board to the governor's office, and the commissioner was given rulemaking authority. Thus, although governance was distributed among multiple offices at the state level, the shifts concentrated authority in the legislature and governor's office.

At the same time that policymaking was increasingly centralized, the state began to change the definition of local responsibility in education. In 1990, Governor Ann Richards was the primary force behind the enactment of Senate Bill 1, which instituted site-based management in Texas' public schools. There was a shift away from the principal as an administrator to the principal as the leader of the school. Decision-making committees were formed on school campuses and they consisted of teachers, administrators, parents, and community and business members. In the early 1990s, education policymaking in Texas shifted towards greater attention to accountability as a chief policy goal. During 1990-91, a new "high stakes" accountability system was introduced by Richards, the state legislature, and the Commissioner of Education, with the support of the Texas Business Education Coalition. This program included the replacement of the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) with the more rigorous Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS). Reporting became more intense as the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) replaced previous annual reports. In 1992, TAAS expanded to include grades 3-8 in reading and math.

In 1995, the Texas Education Code (TEC) sidelined the comprehensive, far-reaching 1984 Educational Opportunity Act. The TEC resulted in more centralized policymaking by further curtailing the authority of citizen oversight through the elected State Board of Education. The new Code also authorized charter schools and increased both teacher salaries and district funding. The TEC reflected a policy shift away from comprehensive reform towards a greater focus on accountability to improve student assessment scores. The TEC established the State Board of Educator Certification (licensing board), reduced in-service and prep time for teachers, and stopped lifetime certification for teachers, changes that were sharply criticized by teacher associations.

The TEC's focus on accountability resulted in professional development narrowly conceived to improve student test scores. In 1995, a coalition of the then-Commissioner Mike Moses, the Texas Business and Education Coalition, and two principals' associations promoted the Texas Principals Leadership Initiative. The Initiative required principal assessments followed by targeted professional development. Similarly, the Texas Reading Initiative of 1996 required professional development for teachers, based on student test scores. Student testing also became more rigorous when TAAS was replaced with the Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS); then-Governor George W. Bush, the legislature, and the business community accomplished this development.

Funding for public education in Texas has been controversial, as in many other states. The 1984 Educational Opportunity Act drastically increased funding to districts for bringing underachieving students "up to speed." Since then, funding formulas have been contested in the courts. The most controversial funding plan, implemented in 1993, was known as the "Robin Hood" School Finance Plan. This plan equalized funding for public schools; schools were no longer funded by local property taxes, but rather through a complicated redistribution scheme to make quality education more equitably accessible. The "Robin Hood" plan was quickly challenged multiple times over the next decade, and in December of 2005, the Texas Supreme Court declared the plan to be unconstitutional. Education funding is currently under debate in the Texas Legislature.

Over its long history of grappling with educational reform, the central policy players in Texas have always been governors and the legislature. Although the political power in the state has shifted between the two major political parties, the power and the tendency for concerted action between key legislative committees and the governor has been pronounced. This coalition is often joined by the Texas State Education Agency, and occasionally by other groups (such as business coalitions), but they tend to be regarded as secondary actors. The governor/legislature coalition has, over the past 35 years, consistently emphasized standards and accountability both for students and schools, with a secondary emphasis on increasing the quality of teachers and school leaders. In the 1990s, the consolidation of influence was cemented by a system change that removed the appointment of the Commissioner of Education from the State Board to the governor's office.

The exception to this pattern is in the area of school finance, where the core coalition has struggled to find solutions to the consistent court findings that the state's finance system is unconstitutional. Here the courts are in control, and the elected and appointed policy makers have been unable to form a coalition to support a solution.

Summary of How Things Get Done

Education policy in Texas in the past 20 years has been comprehensive in that large pieces of legislation have addressed multiple facets of the education system, from governance and funding to curriculum and professional development. Policymaking is fairly centralized, with the governor and legislature having considerable influence. The

system is only somewhat open to more diverse stakeholders, to the degree that legislators and department of education personnel consult a number of business and education groups in the development of education policy. Despite the breadth of the education policy agenda, the levers used in Texas to improve education are not very diverse. The state-issued mandate, which is the most common tool used in Texas education policy, translates into accountability measures for students, teachers and administrators.

Cross Case Analysis of State Political Culture and Choice of Levers

Our interviews focused on learning the nature of political cultures and the use of policy levers within each state. Here, we provide a cross case analysis of these issues based on the perceptions of state level officials. Overall, we learned that the political cultures across the states are very different among each of the domains, except for quality. We also learned that among the various policy levers used to influence policy implementation, mandates, without exception, were most often cited; the use of other types of levers varied more across the states.

Comparing State Political Cultures

There is great variation across almost all seven dimensions of political culture based on the policies discussed as being most influential (See Table 1). From the interviews, we learned that quality was valued most similarly by each state. Within the remaining six dimensions, there was a great deal of differentiation in what types of policies were most influential and how policies were enacted.

Openness: Oregon and New Mexico were the only two states that allowed for multiple actors to participate in the policymaking process. Texas, Missouri and Mississippi did not allow for broad political participation.

Decentralization: Missouri was the only state that distributed power across different levels. Oregon simultaneously utilized decentralization, giving school districts a great deal of decision-making power, and centralization, with key decisions made at the state level. Mississippi and New Mexico also used decentralized decision-making.

Rationalism: The states differed in the degree to which their policies were based on rational comprehensive solutions. Policies in Missouri and Oregon were highly rational while those in Texas were seen as narrowly rational. Mississippi policies were recognized as ad hoc rationalism. In New Mexico, policies have more recently been based on rational comprehensive solutions to problems.

Egalitarianism: Oregon was the only state with high equity; however, school funding in the state was low overall. On the other hand, Mississippi had high inequity as well as low funding. Policies in New Mexico are recently beginning to address equity concerns.

Texas and Missouri were very different from the other states in that efforts to increase equity in each state were a result of court decisions.

Efficiency: Texas had the greatest history of policies focusing on efficiency. New Mexico has recently implemented policies that are expected to increase efficiency. Missouri has tight fiscal control and emphasizes standards for efficiency. Mississippi's policies emphasize outcomes rather than efficiency. Finally, in Oregon, efficiency proposals have been rejected because of costs.

Quality: In this study we have defined a quality culture as one that emphasizes accountability for results. In most cases, states interpret this as establishing and monitoring standards for student learning. District officials from Texas, Missouri, Oregon, and Mississippi all said that they were utilizing standards to monitor student achievement prior to NCLB. Each continues to use a different method of standards and resources to determine the quality of education. In Texas, comprehensive indicators are used for students as well as teachers. In Missouri, the emphasis is on testing and licensure, while in Oregon, standards and resources are used to monitor student achievement through the CIM/CAM programs. New Mexico is currently striving to establish comprehensive indicators.

Choice¹ ~ The availability of school choice was supported by policy initiatives in Texas and New Mexico. In Missouri, Oregon, and Mississippi, choice was not viewed as a policy priority.

Table 1 summarizes the comparison of political cultures across states.

¹ Our analysis is corroborated by Education Commission of the States. (2005b). *School Choice State Laws: State Comparisons*. Retrieved online on December 29, 2005 at <http://mb2.ecs.org/reports/Report.aspx?id=206>.

Table 1: Cross Case Analysis of Political Cultures

Political Culture	Texas	Missouri	Oregon	Mississippi	New Mexico
Openness:	Decisions made by a few key people	Considerable special interest group activity	Open	Not very open	Opening
Decentralism :	Traditionally centralized	Decentralized	Both	Centralized	Until recently laissez-faire
Rationalism:	Narrow rationalism	Rationalism	Comprehensive rationalism	Ad hoc rationalism	Recent rationalism
Egalitarianism:	Court driven efforts to create more equity	Low equity; protracted court-driven	High equity, low funding	Low funding, high inequity	New policies addressing equity issues
Efficiency:	Policy initiatives expect efficiency	Tight fiscal control; emphasize standards for efficiency	Efficiency proposals rejected because of costs	Emphasis on outcomes rather than efficiency	Newer policy initiatives expecting efficiency
Quality:	Emphasis on standards and teacher licensure	Emphasis on testing and licensure	Comprehensive indicators beyond focus on single tests	Emphasis on improving quality through standards limited monitoring	Striving for comprehensive indicators
Choice:	School choice supported by policy	Not a policy priority	Not a policy priority	Not a policy priority	New opportunities for school choice

Comparing State Use of Policy Levers²

State policymakers were asked to describe significant education policy initiatives in the recent past, although in most cases we were referred to initiatives that occurred several decades previously. Levers were ranked, based on the number of times they were discussed in the interviews. This ranged from individual levers not being discussed at all as a method of policy implementation in a state, to many policies in one state utilizing one particular type of lever. We assessed the frequency of lever use by categorizing how many times a type of lever was discussed as an element of legislation that was influential for policy implementation. After identifying the frequency of use of policy levers in each state, we categorized each state's use of each policy lever as low (policy lever used in one or two policies discussed), medium (policy lever used in three to five policies discussed), or high (policy lever used in six or more policies discussed). For example, if the use of mandates in a state was discussed in the context of seven different policies, we would characterize that state's use of mandates to influence policy implementation as high. This analysis suggests that the use of alternative policy levers varies greatly, both within and between states (See Table 2).

Interviews revealed that state leaders in Texas were heavily involved in school change as a result of the very large number of policies enacted by the legislature. Among the states, Texas relied most heavily upon mandates to influence local school practices. Eleven different policies were highlighted in state level interviews as major initiatives that utilized mandates to influence policy implementation. Five policies were highlighted as impacting schools using the lever of system change. Four policies relying upon inducements and capacity building were also highlighted.

In Missouri, state officials pointed to three significant mandates as influential policy levers affecting local educators. Policies incorporating capacity building were also highlighted in discussions regarding three policy initiatives. System change was discussed only in the context of one policy initiative. Inducements were not highlighted as policy levers that were influential in policy implementation in this state.

In Oregon, there was equal emphasis on the use of mandates and system change. Each lever was emphasized in five different policies. Capacity building was not mentioned frequently as a state-level initiative and inducements were not highlighted at all.

Responses from state officials in Mississippi show that mandates, inducements, and capacity building are frequently used. Mandates and capacity building were each highlighted in four policies. Inducements were highlighted in discussion of five different policies. System change was a less frequently used lever, highlighted in only two policies.

² Other analyses confirm our findings: see Education Commission of the States (2005) and Goertz & Duffy (2001).

In New Mexico, all policy levers were highlighted as being influential to a similar degree. Mandates and capacity building were each highlighted in three policies. Inducements and system change were each highlighted in four policies. As noted previously, virtually all of these policies have been enacted in the last few years, so it is too soon to determine whether this is a long-term pattern.

Overall, mandates were identified most frequently as policy levers that were used to influence policy implementation across the states in this sample. Capacity building was also frequently used among the states, although to a lesser degree in Oregon. The use of system change policy levers was greater in Texas, Oregon, and New Mexico. However, recent policies in Missouri and Mississippi have begun to rely on system change to influence policy implementation. Finally, inducements were discussed frequently in Texas, Mississippi and New Mexico, but not at all in Missouri and Oregon.

Table 2 summarizes the analysis of the use of policy levers. It is important to emphasize that we confined our analysis to those policies that were mentioned by two or more respondents in the interviews, and the conclusions may not, therefore, be generalizable to all educational policymaking in the sampled states.

Table 2: State’s Use of Policy Levers					
Policy Levers	Texas	Missouri	Oregon	Mississippi	New Mexico
Mandate	High	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium
Inducements	Medium	Absent	Absent	Medium	Medium
Capacity-Building	Medium	Medium	Low	Medium	Medium
System Change	Medium	Low	Medium	Low	Medium

Voices from Districts³

This section draws from a single question that was asked in interviews with administrators and school board members in eight districts. District-level interviews reveal four key themes in the influence of state leadership on districts:

1. From the districts' perspective, district-state relationships are improving through partnerships and state support;
2. States differ in their use of levers to influence policy implementation;
3. States set policies that are often under-funded; and
4. States vary in their impact on districts as a consequence of their leadership and policies.

Each of these factors affects the role districts play toward improving student achievement. In addition to interview responses from district leaders, this section provides a discussion of preliminary findings from survey responses from school principals and assistant principals, based on what they explain are key factors of how state leadership affects their roles as school leaders. We do not identify the states of the district respondents in order to preserve their anonymity.

Relationships Between Districts and States are Improving

A somewhat surprising finding, given a consensus in the media that increased state policy activism has led to stresses at the local level, is the general sense that district-state relationships are getting better. In all of the districts and states, at least some respondents (and in some cases most of the school district employees) reported that there were increased partnerships and support. While this was, in some cases, a result of state initiatives, districts also reported making their own efforts to foster better relationships:

“I think that much of the time, the state is helpful... often the state does not really understand what we're dealing with, unless we involve them with issues in an urban school setting... one of the things that I did was to contact people at the state level who supervise special education ... They were just wonderful, and really excited about being involved in the process from the beginning, rather than being told what we had done at the end... We can involve them in ways like that...when we're making changes, when we're trying to progress – invite them in. We can't be afraid of them...we've got to be partners in this work...” (district administrator, State Three)

³ Missouri, Oregon and Texas were included as representatives from the states discussed in previous sections. At the time this analysis was carried out we did not have complete data from Missouri or New Mexico. Nebraska was added as a fourth state to enrich the composition of responses from district level interviews.

Most of the respondents from State Three highlighted the existing or improved relationship between their district and the state, and most affirmed that it was important for districts to initiate contact with the state to enhance their relationship. It became clear that having a relationship with the state where district and state officials work together was a new phenomenon that is still developing and that is having a positive impact on the roles of district officials. District officials from another state also highlighted the initiator role they played in developing this relationship with the state:

“Typically, in bigger districts, they’ve had some adversarial relationships with the state. I’ve really tried to turn that around. So we work really closely with the state. We try to support their major initiatives. They try to support ours.” (Superintendent, State Four)

In this state, it had been uncommon for the state to work closely with school districts, which prided themselves on their autonomy. With increased state policy activism, respondents reported that superintendents were increasing their initiative in developing a positive relationship with the state. This was also reported in the State Two districts:

... As far as any problems that I have or any concerns that I have with different procedures or regulations, I usually call them. And then when I cannot get in touch with them, I call myself... And I have to say, that they are very good..." (district administrator, State Two).

District actors in all of the states acknowledged that the improved relationships and initiatives that they were making were deliberate efforts to cope with the changed policy environment. As a State One superintendent noted, “Well, I think they've been very supportive of us getting to where [we need to be] ...but they also are leading you down the road that the state is providing you.”

Variation in Perception of Levers

Although our analysis suggests that states vary in their emphasis on capacity building as an instrument for school accountability and leadership, respondents from each district highlighted some form of capacity building as a primary lever that has been influential in their efforts to meet the needs of schools. This difference can be easily explained, however: In many cases, this capacity building support was provided as part of the state’s efforts to implement a mandate or a system change. In some cases, the support provided was substantial, as in the case of a rural district in State One:

“We literally could not have done it without them, I believe. They provided the positions that we've [had to] cut to get the job done and to be the leaders...there's a principals’ retreat sponsored by [the state]... They

fund our [regional service district]⁴ which is here in town...They'll do staff development types of things. They do technology, infrastructure kind of things...But they have now begun to do in-service training for the county and region.... We're starting to see some more literature come down from the state”

This district respondent and others in the state noted, in particular, that this is a change – in the past, small districts have struggled in the past to receive such support.

Respondents from State Three also highlighted state-provided capacity building as the main lever that influences their work:

“...in addition to that, they provided all kinds of resources for us, because through the [regional service district], they were able to say, 'We have a person here and a person there that you can contact when you need help. You don't even have to call us at the state department. We have someone right here in your city who can help you...”

As in State One, capacity building was regarded as the state’s lever to encourage policy implementation. However, mandates, primarily state standards, were often mentioned as major factors affecting priorities and expectations in this and other states. In particular, in State Two the new emphasis on capacity building and training was acknowledged, but pressure from state mandates was seen as too strict, and guidance and support too limited. Even in this state there were positive comments about capacity building delivered through the regional service districts, which were branches of the state’s education agency.

State Four was differed from the first three due to the emphasis that district officials placed on the state’s system change policies, which altered the balance of state control and district autonomy, and a perceived decline in capacity building:

“One of our legislators has really been hot on kind of chopping the knees off of our education service districts. That’s one of the organizations that over the past 20 years...all of the small districts really depend on those [regional service district].” (District Administrator, State Four)

This was the only state within this sample where district officials expressed decreasing state funded capacity building as a concern.

In summary, the view of state policy levers from the districts suggests that local administrators distinguish between the legislative lever (usually mandates or system change) and the implementation lever (more often capacity building). The significance of support and capacity building is that it often stems from efforts by the districts to find and get resources from the state to help manage state demands. These resources are

⁴ To preserve anonymity we use the generic term “regional service district” for all regional offices that provide educational support to districts.

often, although not always, delivered through regional service agencies. In general, however, the emphasis on capacity building corresponds to the general view that “relations with the state are improving.”

All See Policies as Under-funded

District officials were consistent in linking state policies to funding problems. In State Two, for example, district officials explained:

“Mainly they’re tying our hands right now. They’re not providing us the ability to generate the resources that we need.” (Assistant Superintendent)

“...teacher raises are killing us. ...and unfunded mandates... They’re meddling more and more ... We’ve increased class sizes several times at the secondary level. We can’t do that at the elementary level, because there’s a mandated student-teacher ratio...” (School Board President)

District officials from State One also discussed under-funded policies as it relates to increasing state expectations:

“Our teachers are just worked to death. That’s been the hardest part...They keep asking for more and more... there have been so many cuts that everybody feels that pain.” (Director of Special Education, State One)

“There’s a state formula that is used to determine how much money the school district gets. ...it’s not enough money. Until [larger metropolitan school districts] are really, really suffering, then they kind of forget that you’ve got the smaller schools down here.” (School Board, State One)

In State Three, respondents expressed deep concerns about the weak connections between district and state priorities. District officials viewed state funding policies as not only inadequate, but poorly targeted at local problems:

“...we find ourselves in a lot of funding that could be directed towards more critical pieces... Our kids are illiterate. And we still have schools that teach home economics, you know.” (District Administrator)

State Four, like the others, pointed to a gap between decreasing funding and existing mandates linked to student achievement.

States Vary in Their Impact on Districts

Although we have emphasized some of the similarities in district responses, the discussion above does not fully capture the differences in district’s perceptions of state leadership for change. District respondents in the four districts from State One and State

Three explained that the state leadership had had a generally positive impact on their role as a district.

“They met regularly with us, and as we were about the process of restructuring, they could stop us and say, ‘Watch it, you know, because there are these guidelines and those guidelines, and we have to stay within this framework.’ And so, that was very, very helpful to us.” (District Administrator, State Three)

“The State Department of Education is the reason we’re doing this, because without that pressure and push, I think, you know, no matter how driven we all are to see student achievement, unless there is that leadership at the greater level – the state or federal level – it’s really hard to convince our constituents that that’s where the money needs to go...without the bigger leadership, we can’t – it’s hard to convince people who don’t understand that need that we’ve got to spend the money for this... It’s almost as if the pressure from the state, or the leadership from the state is being provided at just the right time with people who have the ability.We have leadership.” (Superintendent, State One)

District officials from these states did not say that they agreed with every state level policy. However, they explained that districts were looked toward the state direction, and that state support helped them to accomplish district priorities.

Administrators and school board members from State Two and State Four saw their states’ roles differently. In State Four, the responses of district officials revealed that the state impacts policies, but not how policies are implemented:

“...the state sets up some of the ground rules you have to play by. And we’re not opposed to most of those. ...They do what they have to do to serve a pretty diverse population,... Their board has a hard time, I think, understanding issues, just like our board does. And they’re a lot further away from classrooms than our board is... And you know they are interpreting NCLB for us....the [district] board ...they’re not too concerned typically about what the state says...the board doesn’t get pushed around by the state or legislatures.... (district administrator, State Four)

In State Two, district officials most frequently expressed disdain regarding state leadership:

“Because of the things that they’re choosing—they’re putting a lot of mandates on us that they’re not funding... They’re causing us to be in [the capitol] a lot to try to talk to them. We meet with them regularly...our local legislators, to talk with them about our concerns about what they’re doing. But they have a lot of influence on what happens. And they’re trying to have even more influence....no positive influence from the governor or

legislators...also, state expectations for professional development is below what the district expects...” (School Board)

District officials from this state generally felt as though the state exercised too much control over districts (particularly around funding) and thus tended to undermine the district’s capacity to address the needs of students.

We also encountered some within-state variation in district perceptions of state influence. In States Two and Four, for example, respondents from one district in each state claimed that district priorities for improvement were driven more by locally determined needs and goals than by state policy.

In summary, the view of states and their policy levers from this early and limited sample of districts suggests that what districts see and what states intend is not always well matched. However, there are signs that, aside from the perennial problem of funding, increased state activism in educational policy is generally accepted at the district level. Districts, in general, see themselves as participants in an effort to improve education, and see the states, at least to some extent, as working with them. The relationships are not without strains in any case, but in three of the four states, many respondents at the district level saw themselves and the state as engaging in a common task of improving schools. Irritation over unfunded mandates was high, but overall districts appear to accept the new role of states in guiding school improvement.

Preliminary Findings and Next Steps

As we noted at the beginning of this report, our analysis is in its preliminary stages. In future reports, we will expand the number of states included in the analysis to ten, and there are district- and school-level interviews and survey results that will be added as data sources. Even so, it is useful to reflect on what we have learned that may help, in later reports, to trace the links between state policy leadership and efforts to improve leadership for learning within districts and schools.

We can briefly summarize the preliminary findings and implications:

1. A state’s policy culture will condition its responses to federal legislation and the changing national policy conversations;
2. A state’s lever choices are conditioned in part by federal legislation and national policy conversations, but are also affected by the history and expectations associated with the state’s previous educational policy actions;
3. The chosen levers are important in determining the relations between the district and the state. How state leaders enact legislation and establish programmatic priorities is reflected in the district and school responses to them; and

4. This, in turn, affects district and school policies and eventually has an effect on teachers and classroom practices.

State Policy and Federal Policy

Our interviews deliberately avoided direct questions about No Child Left Behind (NCLB) because we wished to focus on the state role in school improvement. This proved to be relatively easy because state officials and key observers generally describe themselves on a policy course that was set before the federal No Child Left Behind legislation was enacted. All states had some form of accountability legislation in place prior to 2001, and were addressing state curriculum frameworks, testing, and sanctions or rewards for low-performing schools. Most were already considering or had implemented some expectations for increased student performance. Although No Child Left Behind was not seen as requiring major shifts in state policy, it has been influential in increasing requirements, methods and sanctions for accountability.

Essentially, NCLB is at the forefront of instigating nearly every educational action now being taken by states. For example, in the five states considered here, definitions of adequate student progress toward state objectives were less formalized than federal Annual Yearly Progress measures, and systems of sanctions for lack of progress were less well developed. Also new to the states was the requirement to disaggregate data in order to highlight the performance of different groups of students. Finally, while some states had a variety of leadership initiatives in place, most focused on teachers rather than on developing the capacity of administrators. For example, none of the states in this report had a formal, state-sponsored principal leadership center.

More significant than the specific effects of federal legislation, however, is the clear finding that *the states' adjustments to accountability policies are being made in the context of their policy cultures*, which are stable and well understood by state level officials. Thus, their responses to NCLB differ, depending on the historical, political and cultural framework of the state. With the exception of New Mexico, which is experiencing a range of new initiatives as a result of a keen interest by the governor in improving education, the respondents in this study see their policy work as an extension of what was done in the past. Varied state approaches to accountability and leadership are viewed as appropriate adaptations based on local cultural norms. In other words, NCLB does not appear to have disrupted existing state policy cultures, nor was it perceived in any of these states to have caused a major shift in conversations or initiatives that were under discussion. When differences were mentioned, state level officials were more likely to emphasize that NCLB expectations and standards were lower than those preferred by the state.

A second finding is that *the choice of policy levers associated with accountability policies* – their relative emphasis on mandates (including sanctions), restructuring, capacity building, and inducements – *is based on patterns that reflect their sense of “the way we do things around here.”* Even though NCLB is viewed as a mandated lever by state respondents, if the normal way of encouraging change was primarily through

capacity building, such as staff development, this continued to be the strategy that was described as a useful way of promoting the goals of NCLB.

Fostering improved district and school leadership is not a major element of the NCLB legislation, but it has been a significant feature of policy discussions in many associations, such as the Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Governors Association, and the Education Commission of the States. Even a cursory perusal of their websites and publications reveals that supporting leadership is seen as an important state policy priority. However, in our interviews in these five states, statewide policies promoting leadership were mentioned less often by state policymakers, although we explicitly asked about them. We do not conclude that leadership is regarded as less important, but that states are still feeling their way in the murky task of promoting a “soft” agenda such as leadership for school improvement. Many states are emerging as active players in this area, some with support from the Wallace Foundation’s State Action for Educational Leadership Program (SAELP), but these do not receive the attention of policymakers to the same degree as does accountability.

State Policy Levers

Another clear finding is that states differ in their use of policy levers. Some of the five states’ respondents emphasize the importance of mandates and sanctions to encourage school improvement, while others de-emphasize mandates in favor of inducements or pilot projects. Our data suggest that while states have more than one kind of hammer to forcibly address the problem of school improvement, the levers that are most often emphasized in state policy depend in part on historical and cultural factors. For example, Oregon, with its long history of working through grass-roots initiatives for improvement is more likely, when faced with increased demands for accountability, to emphasize capacity building than is Mississippi, which has a more limited history of sponsoring such activities, and a higher public tolerance for variability between schools. In Mississippi, the only major capacity building initiative is privately funded.

We do not have complete policy inventories for any of the five states reported here, but only those that can be found in our interviews or on state websites. We focused in our data analysis on those policies that our respondents consistently mentioned as important to their state’s school improvement aspirations – in other words, those that knowledgeable people in the state see as typical examples of key strategies, both past and present. This analysis reveals clear differences.

Not surprisingly, district and school leaders are more aware of the levers used by the state than they are of the state’s policy culture. There are a variety of likely reasons for this. First, most of the district respondents are “locals” in the sense that they have worked in the same state throughout their professional careers. Thus, they are familiar with the policymaking environment and history, but it is the only one they know. District respondents are keenly aware that the state’s policy initiatives represent both opportunities and constraints on what they can do, and they have little difficulty

differentiating between a mandate with associated sanctions and an opportunity to apply for professional development funding.

The choice of levers represents more than an abstract distinction for districts. While most district and school respondents have a moderately positive view of their state's capacity for fostering improvement, those states in which mandates and associated sanctions appear to be the predominant policy levers may generate lower levels of trust in school districts and more uncertainty about how best to respond. In other words, the state's lever choices are important in determining the relationship between districts and states, but this, in turn, is conditioned by historical expectations at all levels. New mandates/sanctions associated with NCLB may be viewed differently in a state with a limited history of a mandate-driven school improvement policy than would the same mandates in a state with a longer history of mandates and sanctions.

Next Steps

The purpose of studying state leadership for school improvement is to understand how initiatives that are formulated at the state level can affect what happens with students in classrooms. Given this purpose, our findings are preliminary and suggestive because they focus primarily on the nature of state policies and the policymaking process. Furthermore, our current analysis is based only on data available at the time we began our analysis. The individual state case studies require additional analyses of the core policies that are driving the state educational agenda, as well as further examination of their implementation. In addition, we will have interviews available soon from the five additional states that are part of our larger study, and we will be adding case study descriptions and the background material presented in the appendices to this report. At the very least, these additional, diverse state cases – from Indiana, Nebraska, New York, New Jersey, and North Carolina – will enrich and deepen the findings presented here. We also anticipate that they will shed new light on the differences and similarities in state policy cultures and the use of policy levers.

As we move ahead, our focus will turn to an examination of the actual linkages between state policies and actors, and the development of policies and programs in districts and schools. First, to better understand how state policies affect student learning, *we need to look more closely at the ways in which district and school actors make sense of the expectations and demands that are generated in legislatures, governors' offices, and state agencies.* Thus, during 2006, we will be conducting interviews with district and school administrators that focus more pointedly on the state policy context as it affects their own aspirations and efforts to raise student achievement. Based on our analysis to date, we anticipate that these responses to state initiatives will vary, at least to some extent, by state.

Second, during the fall of 2006 into early 2007, *we will explore the more direct impact that states may have on district and school practice by interviewing key employees of state education agencies whose work involves assistance to the school districts in our*

sample. Thus, we will be able to turn to the question of how state policies for accountability and leadership are translated into practical advice and support.

The goals of additional data and analysis will enable us to provide a better, comparative understanding of the strength and limitations of state policy as a force for improving the conditions for student learning. If knowledge is power, then the power to shape educational outcomes may rest on leaders' knowledge and understanding of one's state political culture and the means by which change is best enacted. Through better understanding of the differences in approach used in each state, and the subsequent effects on districts of different size and demographics, we hope, through this study, to ultimately contribute to increased capacity of educational leaders for effective policy-making at multiple levels of the educational system.

References

- Berezin, M. (1997). Politics and Culture: A Less Fissured Terrain. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 23, 361-383.
- Bryk, A., & Hermanson, K. (1993). Educational indicator dystems: Observations on their structure, interpretation, and use. *Review of Educational Research*, 19(4), 451-484.
- Carnoy, M., & Loeb, S. (2002). Does external accountability affect student outcomes? A cross-state analysis. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(4), 305-331.
- Chilton, S. (1988). Defining Political Culture. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 41(3), 419-445.
- Clune, W. H. (1987). Institutional Choice as a Theoretical Framework for Research on Educational Policy. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 9(2), 117-132.
- Clune, W. H., & White, P. A. (1992). Education Reform in the Trenches: Increased Academic Course Taking in High Schools with Lower Achieving Students in States with Higher Graduation Requirements. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 14(1), 2-20.
- Dutro, E., Fisk, M. C., Koch, R., Roop, L. J., & Wixson, K. (2002). When State Policies Meet Local District Contexts: Standards-Based Professional Development as a Means to Individual Agency and Collective Ownership. *Teachers College Record*, 104(4), 787-811.
- Education Commission of the States (2005) *Recent State Policies/Activities: No Child Left Behind—Consequences for Schools*. Denver: Education Commission of the States. www.ecs.org/html/Document.asp?chouseid=3937. Last retrieved 2/25/2006
- Education Commission of the States. (2005b). *School Choice State Laws: State Comparisons*. <http://mb2.ecs.org/reports/Report.aspx?id=206>. Last retrieved 2/25/2006
- Elazar, D. J. (1970). *Cities of the Prairie*. New York: Basic.
- Elmore, R. F., & Fuhrman, S. (1995). Opportunity-to-Learn Standards and the State Role in Education. *Teachers College Record*, 96(3), 432-457.
- Elmore, R. F., & Fuhrman, S. H. (1995). Opportunity-to-Learn Standards and the State Role in Education. *Teachers College Record*, 96(3), 432-457.
- Goertz, M & Duffy, M (2001)
Assessment and accountability in the 50 states: 1999-2000. Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education, report rr46.
<http://www.cpre.org/Publications/rr46.pdf>. Last retrieved 2/25/2006
- Hanushek, E., & Raymond, M. (2004). The effect of school accountability systems on the level and distribution of student achievement. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2(2), 406-441.
- Herzik, E. B. (1985). The Legal-Formal Structuring of State Politics: A Cultural Explanation. *The Western Political Quarterly*, 38(3), 413-423.
- Hoxby, C. M. (1996). Are efficiency and equity in school finance substitutes or complements? *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 10(4), 51-72.
- Johnston, J. M., & Duncombe, W. (1998). Balancing conflicting policy objectives: The case of school finance reform. *Public Administration Review*, 58(2), 145-158.

- Leithwood, K., & Prestine, N. (2002). Unpacking the challenges of leadership at the school and district level. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *Challenges of school leadership (NSSE yearbook)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lieske, J. (1993). Regional Subcultures of the United States. *The Journal of Politics*, 55(4), 888-913.
- Louis, K. S., Febey, K., & Schroeder, R. (2005). State mandated accountability in high schools: Teachers' interpretations of a new era. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*.
- Malen, B. (2003). Tightening the grip? The impact of state activism on local school systems. *Educational Policy*, 17(2), 195-216.
- Mazzoni, T. L. (1993). The Changing Politics of State Education Policy Making: A 20-Year Minnesota Perspective. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(4), 357-379.
- McDonnell, L. M., & Elmore, R. F. (1987). Getting the Job Done: Alternative Policy Instruments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 9(2), 133-152.
- O'Toole, L. J., & Meier, K. J. (2004). Parkinson's law and the new public management? Contracting determinants and service-quality consequences in public education. *Public Administration Review*, 64(3), 342-352.
- Reeves, M. M. (1990). The States as Polities: Reformed, Reinvigorated, Resourceful. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 509(American Federalism: The Third Century), 83-93.
- Rogers, J. S. (2004). Creating a public accountability for California schools. *Teachers College Record*, 106(11), 2171-2192.
- Rossmann, G. B., & Wilson, B. L. (1996). Context, Courses, and the Curriculum: Local Responses to State Policy Reform. *Educational Policy*, 10(3), 399-421.
- Swanson, C. B., & Stevenson, D. L. (2002). Standards-based reform in practice: Evidence on state policy and classroom instruction from the NAEP state assessments. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(1), 1-27.
- Timar, T. B. (1997). The Institutional Role of State Education Departments: A Historical Perspective. *American Journal of Education*, 105(3), 231-260.
- Timar, T. B., & Kirp, D. L. (1988). State Efforts to Reform Schools: Treading between a Regulatory Swamp and an English Garden. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 10(2), 75-88.
- Tyack, D., & James, T. (1986). State government and American public education: Exploring the forest primeval. *History of Education Quarterly*, 26(1), 39-69.
- Whitty, G., & Power, S. (2000). Marketization and privatization in mass education systems. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 20(2), 93-107.
- Wirt, F., Mitchell, D., & Marshall, C. (1988). Culture and Education Policy: Analyzing Values in State Policy Systems. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 10(4), 271-284.
- Wong, K. K. (1989). Fiscal Support for Education in American States: The "Parity-to-Dominance" View Examined. *American Journal of Education*, 97(4), 329-357.
- Wood, B. D., & Theobald, N. A. (2003). Political responsiveness and equity in public education finance. *Journal of Politics*, 65(3), 718-738.
- Woodside, K. (1986). Policy Instruments and the Study of Public Policy. *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 19(4), 775-793.

- Youngs, P. (2001). District and state policy influences on professional development and school capacity. *Educational Policy*, 15(2), 278-301.
- Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in organizations* (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendix A: Sampling

State Sampling

Our research design targeted 45 school districts across nine states (5 districts per state). We selected the states randomly within four geographic regions, while taking care to ensure that the final sample of states contained adequate variation on a range of variables that we believed were potentially relevant to understanding leadership at the state and local levels, and that would be consistent with variation across the country. We also wanted to ensure that a sub-set (4) of the states selected were beneficiaries of the Wallace Foundation's grant program, State Action for Education Leadership Project (SAELP). Procedurally, we divided the country into geographic quadrants (Hawaii and Alaska were excluded for cost reasons; Washington D.C. was excluded because of atypical governance circumstances). States within each region were numbered and randomly sequenced. For a basic pool of 16 states we selected the first SAELP-funded state and the first three non-SAELP-funded states from each quadrant, and identified the next SAELP and next two non-SAELP states as alternates.

To determine the range of variability in key variables in this pool of 16 states, we created a contextual database for the initial 16-state pool, drawing from existing national data sources and state websites. The variables across which we sought representation were: student population, poverty levels (e.g., free/reduced lunch, Title I students), student racial/ethnic diversity, number of school districts, per pupil spending, state board governance structures (e.g., elected versus appointed, length of term), principal certification requirements, principal shortage levels, National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores in reading and mathematics, minority achievement and graduation rate gaps, state accountability systems (e.g., grade and subject level scope of curriculum standards and testing, reporting and performance rating policies, sanctions and incentives, high stakes testing, alignment of standards and tests), and number of charter schools. We constructed a matrix that enabled us to display and compare the variability within our randomly generated sample for the first two states from each of the four regions (one SAELP-funded state, one non-SAELP-funded state).

We were satisfied with the range of variation achieved with our initial sample of 16 states, but identified a few contextual variables for which the degree of variation could be enhanced with the selection of a ninth state. The ninth state, Texas, was strategically chosen from among the remaining states in the initial pool because it best complemented the variation obtained with the first eight. Ultimately, eight of our nine states were chosen in this initial selection process (Indiana, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Oregon, and Texas). Lack of success recruiting school districts in one Southern state and the devastating Hurricane Katrina in the replacement state, Louisiana, eventually resulted in the addition of North Carolina, one of the alternates from the original randomly generated state sampling pool.

District and School Sampling

We sampled 45 districts (five for each of the nine states). The 45 districts were to reflect variation on three variables associated with differences in leadership practices: district size, poverty, and diversity. We based district size on student enrollment, using definitions from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES): small was up to 2,499 students, medium was from 2,500 to 24,999, and large was 25,000 and above. Within the small category, we also decided that districts with fewer than 600 students would be dropped from the sampling pool as having too few teachers and administrators for our research purposes. Nationwide, large districts account for about a third of the student population, medium districts account for about a half, and small account for about a sixth. As our measure of poverty, we used the percentage of students in the district who were eligible for free or reduced price lunch. As our measure of diversity, we used the percentage of nonwhite students in the district – the lower the percentage of white Non-Hispanic students, the higher the diversity. For both poverty and diversity, we stipulated our own ranges to mirror the size parameters. We defined high poverty and diversity as 66% and higher, or the top third. We defined mid-level poverty and diversity as from 18 to 65% – about half the distribution – and low poverty and diversity as less than 18%, about one-sixth the distribution.

To select the 45 districts, our target was a sample of 15 large, 15 medium, and 15 small districts balanced for high, medium, and low poverty and diversity to the degree possible. First, we took the four Wallace funded LEAD districts from the four designated states that had SAELP monies: three were large districts and one was medium. We then sampled the remaining large districts as they were the most restricted, relatively speaking, with just 55 across the nine state, and those not evenly distributed among them: two states had only one each, three had two each, two had three each, one had four, and one had the remaining 37. To condition our sampling procedure, we agreed that for each state we would sample two districts at each of two of the size levels and one district at the third level. We also agreed that within a size level, six states would contribute two districts and three would contribute one. After sampling the 15 large districts, we then sampled the 15 medium and 15 small districts trying to balance poverty and diversity across the three levels of size. The initial sample of districts resulted in 17 high poverty, 16 medium, and 12 low poverty and 10 high diversity, 17 medium, and 18 low diversity. We used SPSS software to randomly draw the districts and schools in those districts.

For the school sample, we selected four schools from each of the 45 sampled districts, for a total sample of 180 schools, or 20 from each of the nine states. We wanted most district samples to include one high school, one middle school, and two elementary schools. We restricted the school draw to those buildings designated in the NCES data base as “1-Regular School” and not, for example, alternative schools, charter schools, magnet schools, schools for students in the criminal justice system, and so on. We decided not to take schools that had only one or two grade levels in the building, and to match as nearly as possible school characteristics on poverty and diversity to those of the district. Finally, in the case of small districts, if they had only four regular schools, we took all four. If they had only three schools, we took the three and turned to a medium or large sampled district in that state to provide another school (for survey purposes only)

with the same characteristics on poverty and diversity as those of the small district in question. We anticipated that not every sampled district or every sampled school in those districts would agree to participate. As sampled districts (or schools) declined to participate, we strove to resample districts having the same size, poverty, and diversity characteristics.

Appendix B: Inventory of State Interviews by Position

Position	Mississippi	Missouri	New Mexico	Oregon	Texas
Commissioner/ State Superintendent	1	1		3*	2 ^a
Other Dept. of Ed staff	2*		1		
Legislator	1	1	1	2	
Board of Ed	1	1	1	2	2
Teacher Union	1	1	4 (2+2*)	1	1
Admin Union		2	1	1	
Foundation	2	1		1	
Business/Chamber of Commerce		1	1	1	1
Higher Ed	1	2	1	4 (2+2*)	1
Consortia					
Citizen Advocacy					
Total Number of Interviewees	9	10	10	15	7

Note:

* = Single interview with multiple interviewees

^a = Includes one District Superintendent

Appendix C: State Interview Protocol

Wallace State Interview Protocol (12/05)

Respondent and title: _____

State: _____

Date: _____

Interviewer: _____

I. Introduction

- a. Purpose and scope of study
- b. Assure confidentiality

Confirm position.

How long in this position?

How long have you been working in education in [state]?

II. Policy Issues (*Our primary focus is on recent state policy initiatives in areas that have impacted directly on district and school leadership. Federal mandates, and their relationship to state policy priorities, may also be important from state leaders' perspectives, but our first line of questioning is at the state level*)

- a. We are particularly interested in any state policies that directly affect people in educational leadership roles in districts and schools. In this regard, which major educational policy issues or reforms have been most influential in [state] in the past few years?

Probe for:

- i. administrator licensure
- ii. evaluation and accountability/standards (with/without NCLB)
- iii. professional development
- iv. policies that have a significant effect on school boards, unions, or state administrators groups professional development unions

- b. Any other state (or federal) policy initiatives that you think are important?
- c. What are the effects of student achievement trends on state policy initiatives?

III. Policy Actors (*Our primary interest is in who most influences the larger state policy context that, in turn, shapes leadership priorities and behavior at the district and school levels. We want to know who the "movers and shakers" are at the state level*)

- d. In your experience, what groups or individuals in [state] are currently most influential in determining the direction of educational issues and how are they exercising their influence? [** Note: Probe for which policy stage interviewees are talking about: bringing issues to the table, moving it through the Legislature, making the public aware of it, helping with implementation, etc.*]
 - i. If only people in formal elected or appointed roles are mentioned, probe for other influential individuals or groups: (e.g., business leaders, non-profit groups, educational associations, lobbyists, academics, or people who have just been around for a long time and know everyone?)
 - ii. Have these groups or individuals always been influential in helping to determine what issues are on the top of the educational policy agenda in [state]? Have there been any recent changes?
- e. What role do you see your organization having in influencing educational issues and policies in [state]?
 - i. At what level—state, district, or building do you think your organization has had the most influence?
- f. What role do you see yourself as having in influencing the role of educational issues and policies in [state]?
 - i. At what level—state, district, or building do you think you have had the most influence?
- g. How do you learn about educational needs in [state]?

IV. Political Culture and Collaboration (*Our primary research interest is in the nature of collaboration or conflict between and among leaders and groups at the state level. However, we are also interested in the relationship between state leaders and district leaders*)

- a. How do the individuals and groups that you mentioned work together to get educational policy initiatives enacted and implemented?

- i. Are there groups that consistently collaborate around educational policy issues? Consistently oppose each other?
 - ii. Of the groups that consistently collaborate, what is the nature of their influence on educational policy issues?
- b. What are the mechanisms of collaboration between state level actors and local stakeholders in efforts to promote effective teaching? (e.g., joint strategic planning committees; electronic networking; consultation on new policy initiatives; state-district conferences)
- c. What are the major challenges to collaboration between state education officials and local stakeholders in efforts to promote effective teaching?

V. Capacity Building (*We are primarily interested in the state's role in promoting leadership effectiveness in districts and schools, e.g., skills and knowledge, working conditions and commitment*)

- d. What do you view as the state role in helping to build the skills and knowledge of principals and teachers throughout the districts in your state? Follow-up: What strategies and policies exist to help carry out the role you just outlined?
- e. What do you see as the state role in improving school and classroom conditions that will sustain educational quality in [state]?
- f. How do state level stakeholders go about building the commitment (motivation) of those teachers and principals to sustain quality themselves?
- g. What are the greatest challenges you face in working to improve education in the state?
- h. Is there anything else we should know about educational leadership in [state]?

**APPENDIX D: SUMMARY CHARTS OF POLICY INITIATIVES AND
POLICY CULTURES FOR FIVE STATES**

<i>D.1 State Key Policy Event Chronologies: MISSOURI</i>				
Date/Name	Content	What Office (Inner Circle)	Near Circle	Other Actors
1993 – Senate Bill 380 (Outstanding Schools Act)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> established a statewide curriculum framework with more decentralization of implementation to the local level changed relationship between state and district so that laws are no longer prescriptive and allowed districts more latitude to implement procedures included a state monitoring/ evaluation system 1% of state education budget set aside for professional development (PD) and 1% of district money had to be set aside for PD, which provided \$40m for PD that had never been available before; local districts had to establish PD committees to coordinate the PD mapped on to Goals 2000, seen as more a systemic reform effort to address inequalities stimulated partly by a lawsuit/court order, but 380 addressed funding inequalities across districts required that all districts have comprehensive improvement plans, and included 12 separate standards that schools were assessed on every 3 years, and schools had to meet at least 10 of the standards to keep their certification, but if 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE) Gov. Carnahan was in office at this time and signed 380 in to law 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Board of Ed.(played role in implementation by starting Partnership for Outstanding Schools) ; Missouri State Teachers Association; MO Federation of Teachers (branch of AFT) State universities that direct the regional professional development (PD) centers, especially the MO Professional Development Center at Missouri State University, head of “Congress” of PD that includes leaders from local PD centers, but many questions about how effective those PD centers have been 	

	<p>they met all 12 (focused in math and English) they were designated as “Standards of Excellence,” [Standards described as not very detailed]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • also addressed strategies for dealing with St Louis and Kansas City • partnership for Outstanding Schools: nonprofit established by two State Board members after SB 380 was passed in 1993: Missouri known as a “slow state”, and since the implementation of 380 had to move quickly, it was problematic in garnering citizen buy-in, so the Partnership was established to encourage its full implementation 			
Strengthening/ Changing Teacher Certification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • after first 4 years of being certified, teachers can get a Continuous Professional Certificate that is good for 10 years if certain criteria are met • allows more options for recertification. • there have been efforts to strengthen teacher certification which have not gone anywhere, for example: making teacher training a graduate degree, not a BS or BA • for alternative teacher certification, can only have 10% of non-traditionally prepared teachers in any one school 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missouri State Teachers Association; • “Certain legislators who carried a lot of weight” • DESE is a key player in looking at ways of strengthening certification requirement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interstate Commerce Commission
Within last 5 years, DESE provided new model for performance-based principal evaluation. (Not required but used by some districts.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • state is part of the Interstate School Leader License Consortium (ISLIC) for administrative preparation 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals 	

Leadership Academy for Administrators: 1988	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a state-run academy for administrators that provides professional development and networking opportunities 			
Administrative Certification As of late 2004, rule was out for public comment. State Bd. of Ed. was to rule on it in 2 or 3 months.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> rule will align administration certification with the teacher model of the last 2 years removes specialist as a requirement for certification as a building level administrator requires mentoring for first two years as an administrator expands options for administrative licensure beyond college coursework, but little clarity on this now, to be a superintendent, you have to have a degree in leadership of some sort 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Board of Education approval, by DESE controls this 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals; Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC); 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment; Missouri Professors of Educational Administration (MPEA);
State education budget cuts last few years		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Chamber of Commerce (anti-education since budget got so tight) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Republican party 	
Effect of funding cuts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> state mandates for testing have changed from 4 core areas to only 2: communication arts and math 12 districts have recently filed suits that the formula for distribution of education money is not fair 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DESE 		
Effect of funding cuts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “significant money” raised to conduct a study of adequacy and equity in Kansas City, MO schools one reason for funding cuts is that money was diverted from a general revenue toward roads so less money available for education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kansas City, MO Civic Council (“a business community group”); Education round table (Am. Federation of Teachers, Missouri National Education Association, and Missouri State Teachers Association), 		

		superintendents, elementary and secondary principals associations, school boards association, and state PTA.)		
Missouri Superintendent's Forum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Founded in the mid-90s, consists of 35 superintendents from low-income communities, place to provide supers with skills to improve students' achievement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • - Founded by the Kauffman Foundation 		
No Child Left Behind, resulting in MO state legislation to align MO's standards with NCLB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MO's standards were higher than NCLB, so was ahead of the legislation • uses the <i>Show Me Standards</i>; is a performance-based tests so students apply knowledge to real world problems that have more than one right answer, known very rigorous • concern that that standards that MO set for sub-groups of AYP, there will be too many schools on the failing list 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DESE • Former Gov Carnahan was integral in developing these standards • Legislature: lowered standards this past yr b/c <i>Show Me Standards</i> were much higher than NCLB standards 		
200 – legislation re: MO state tests' alignment with NAEP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • greater alignment with NAEP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DESE; State Board of Ed.; 		
Currently (as of 11/04) proposed high school graduation changes, requirements, exit tests		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missouri Association of Secondary School Principals 		

- MO has 532 school districts
- Dating back to the Civil War, MO has had highly segregated schools. For example: When Ashcroft was governor and attorney general, he filed briefs on appeal of both the St. Louis and Kansas City desegregation cases, which have had implications for what happening now in MO
- Kansas City and St. Louis have about 35% of the total state population, and 80% of the students in those districts are high-need, high-risk, Title I eligible, and large numbers of black male youth who don't graduate from high school.

- **Report on: "Raising Student Achievement in the St. Louis Public Schools" Executive Summary:**

"The school district has no instructional focus. It lacks a plan for raising student achievement. Its instructional staff is poorly organized, and its sense of direction has splintered."

"The district is also marked by little sense of urgency for improving achievement, no accountability for results, and very low expectations for children. To make matters worse, the district has piled one program on top of another for so many years, that one cannot tell what the system is trying to do academically or why."

"In short, the St. Louis school district has had trouble raising student achievement any faster than it has because it does not have its resources and people pointing in the same instructional direction. With almost all who work for the district, and claim that their work is consistent with the goals of the organization, no matter what they are doing, the result is incoherent effort and predictably low performance."

"Only 23 percent of the district's third graders, 13 percent of its seventh graders, and five percent of its 11th graders were reading at or above the proficient level in the state's test in 2003. Math scores are a little better."

- Very few government collaborations continue to survive

Dimensions of Political Culture	Framework for Analyzing State Political Culture: Missouri
Openness (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - DESE viewed as very closed—white, male, feeding from elites from the State Superintendent’s Assc - Commissioner of Ed appointed a task force (30 people from a variety of sectors) to develop a plan of what education should look like in MO in 2010 (for DoE and State Board), all want to make stds more rigorous - Disconnect between state and local levels, misunderstanding between the state’s mission and what local people perceive the mission to be - SB 380 gave districts more leeway in implementation of the state curriculum framework - St Louis District: many district office folks are insiders, very closed, insular system, - Business groups and GOP have much sway in education, along with MSTTA - DESE described as extremely close with the superintendent’s assoc. since they recruit many of the

	<p>employees from there: funneling of elites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State Board of Ed described as not being very open toward working with other educational stakeholders - “Missouri has had a long history of having schools – chief state school officers who generally come from rural school districts. And when they are then appointed, they bring to the Department of Education their colleagues who they have worked with. So, they are all of somewhat similar mindset.” –Koff, Director for the Center for Advanced Learning at Washington University, St. Louis
Decentralism (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MO described as a decentralized state, but with a tension between the local and state levels - SB 380 significant in its mandate to establish a statewide curriculum framework and move implementation to the local level; which changed relationship between state and district since laws weren’t since they allowed districts more latitude - Many orgs still described as being “good old boy networks” and closed to those outside of those networks
Rationalism (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SB 380 identified as a rational solution to funding inequalities - Push for improved student achievement comes partly from mandates to increase capacity of teachers, administrators, search for alternative options for certification
Egalitarianism/ Equity (E, G, W)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In 1999, MO courts declared that the St Louis school system is unitary, and there’s now \$120-160m in funds not yet paid to the district b/c the Legislature won’t increase taxes - State budget a driving force the past few yrs: previous Dem governor withheld education funds out of fear of a budget shortfall, but GOP legislature told everyone there were ample funds, then during local levy elections 80% passed, then governor released those funds shortly after election: so money was there but the governor was waiting for the local elections to build support for education, then that governor lost in primary to another Democrat but then GOP Blunt won in November - After latest round of budget cuts, 12 districts have filed lawsuits that the formula for distributing education money from the state is unfair - Money from general fund diverted from education to infrastructure - Effort to address inequalities stimulated partly by a lawsuit/court order, but SB 380 addressed funding inequalities across districts
Efficiency (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Show Me Standards</i> increased accountability of all in schools, and also make implementation of NCLB more streamline - Business stakeholders and Chamber of Commerce have been very influential in purporting their view of how well-trained workers should be educated, and how education should be funded—fight new taxes for education

<p>Actors/ Influence (M)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MSTA is anti-union because they think it increases the inefficiency in education - Secondary Principal's Association drove Assessment Centers that all principals had to go through, had much collaboration from profs in higher ed, but then it collapsed because professors weren't willing to participate any more - GOP: reductionist view of education, collaborates much with the State Chamber of Commerce, belief that all that needs to be done is get back to the basics, current Gov. Blunt hasn't had much influence on education yet because he was just elected, GOP majority in both houses and the governor is as well, pledge of no new taxes has severely cut funding to schools, just recently gained control of the Governor's office and both houses for first time in 50 yrs, - School Board Association: conservative, not very proactive, - State Chamber of Commerce, National Alliance of Business, National Federation of Independent Businesses: have strong base of influence in education, works directly with DESE to make recommendations from business perspective, very interested in tax perspective of education and if they don't like a proposal they will fight the tax to pay for it, - NEA, AFT, and MSTA have little influence because of fragmentation; much conflict among them, - MSTA has teachers and administrators in it, known as being most conservative, aligned with GOP but do support candidates from both parties in elections, and most powerful, the unions only have a meet and confer requirement, - AFT largely in the cities, works closely with DESE to influence education finance policy, does not believe in collective bargaining because "it's more important to collaborate," leader desires more collaboration among the various education associations in MO - NEA in the rest of the state, previous governor (Dem) issued order for state employees to have collective bargaining, but it may be rescinded with the new governor (GOP), NEA born out of conflict with MSTA back in 1974, known to be more of a driving force with education policy, traditionally is more liberal - Higher Ed: very little influence, but had more power when professional centers were being developed, but have formed <i>Partnership for Education Renewal</i> which aims to improve education of students in school and the education of teachers, and works through superintendents and school board members who have same agenda, but more power, has most power at the district level by producing administrators with graduate degrees, some education deans have much influence, lots of collaboration among profs who teach in EDD program in the U of MO system and described as a good ole' boys network - UCEA: close collaboration with higher ed., housed at the U of MO-Columbia, national headquarters for
---	--

	<p>the organization that has 73 university research members, director is Michelle Young who has much sway in MO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Superintendent’s Association or MO Assc of School Administrators more powerful in comparison to the Assoc. of Secondary Principals (just by virtue of size), but comparatively not that much power, describe themselves as conservative, work together much with the Missouri School Boards Assoc., like with lobbying and educating members on issues, also works closely with DESE - DESE: very close with Superintendent’s Assoc. because many superintendents retire, then work for DESE, partly because they have different retirement systems so it’s possible to collect retirement as a superintendent, but still get \$45k p/yr working for DESE, good old boy network, described as having very haphazard collaborative relationship with those at the local level, described as part of culture that a retired school superintendent will become the commissioner - State Board of Education: perceived as arrogant toward other educational stakeholders, once education legislation is passed, they have the role of “molding” it, interpreter of policy, works very closely with DESE - Legislature: Education committee and the Appropriations Committee very powerful, just got term limits in 2002 so no one can be in office longer than 8 yrs, “that's kind of changed the dynamic. People are in a little bigger hurry to get involved as far as their political career. They're on a clock” -Sharpe - Governors: Carnahan viewed as very pro-education, but current governor (GOP) doesn’t understand education that well and not perceived as being very well informed on educational issues - Danforth Foundation: ran what was called "The Missouri Legislative Seminar" to meet with leadership from both parties, from both House and Senate in the Legislature to plan a policy agenda and talk about key issues, Danforth Foundation interested in the state's role in promoting leadership effectiveness in districts and schools: skills, knowledge, working conditions, and commitment - Kauffman Foundation: started the Superintendent’s Forum and “First Things First” which is running in KSC, MO and it helps schools use the resources they have in a different way to improve students achievement
Quality (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - Apparent from SB 380: mandated that 1% of all state education monies had to be spent on PD and local districts had to establish PD committees - - Required that all districts have comprehensive improvement plans, with 12 standards to be assessed every 3 years, and schools had to meet at least 10 to keep their certification; if they met all 12 (focused in math and English) they were designated as “Standards of Excellence,”

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - - MO's standards were higher than NCLB, so was ahead of the legislation, but recently lowered those standards, partly out of fear that too many schools would be labeled as "failing" - -As of 11/04, proposed changes in high school graduation requirements, including exit tests - After first 4 years of being certified, teachers can get a Continuous Professional Certificate, good for 10? years if certain criteria are met. Allows more options for recertification.
Choice (M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Less opportunity for choice as there are inadequate resources: for example:. There was a major review, by the Council of Great City Schools, which reported that there isn't a climate in the school system to support necessary changes to improve student achievement, especially in the St Louis District - Local districts have much choice in the manner that they provide their teachers with PD from the 1% of state ed money - Some districts dictate curriculum to the schools, going so far as stipulating the dates each curricular module will be taught. - MO's <i>Show Me Standards</i> were higher than those required by NCLB, so there was leeway in changing the standards

Openness: Availability of political participation to those outside the inner circle of education policymaking

Decentralization: power is distributed among many centers, which often have their power protected under the law, those power sources are inter-dependent, and there is not one center that is much more powerful in comparison to the others

Rationalism: opposite is incrementalism, based on the belief that problems can be rationally and logically identified, so solutions are based on all information available and analyses of alternatives. This approach makes sense to stakeholders, i.e., a technical problem deserves a technical solution.

Incrementalism allows for partial, politically acceptable changes in public policy, not usually comprehensive ones

Equity: usually means the use of public resources to redistribute public resources to satisfying disparities; involves two stages—a disadvantage or other measure of the gap between the norms of social life and the needs of citizens in public services, then public resources are applied through programs to close the gap between norm and need

Efficiency: Appears in two forms: economic: the effort to minimize costs while maximizing gains to optimize program performance; as an accountability form by mandating of those means by which superiors in an authority system can oversee and hence control their subordinates' exercise of power and responsibility.

Actors/Influence: Those who are involved in the policy process, as measured by their distance from the traditional policy makers, the primary group of actors are the insiders, near circle, far circle, sometimes players, and oft-forgotten players

Quality: public policy matches the public view, involves two-stage behavior: First, the state will mandate the need for certain standards of 'excellence' or 'proficiency', or 'superior ability', then, in order to achieve these standards, public resources are applied across districts, or within districts across schools, with typically uneven distribution of resources.

Choice: The presence of a range of options for action, as well as the ability to select a preferred option, a mandate that offers education stakeholders the opportunity either to make policy decisions or to reject them.

D.2 State Key Policy Event Chronologies: MISSISSIPPI

Date/Name	Content	What Office (Inner Circle)	Near Circle	Other Actors
1982 – Mississippi Educational Reform Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • most comprehensive in US at the time, and most significant in Mississippi’s history • uniform state curriculum and standards for all schools: • School Improvement Plan that included indicators of effective schools • public kindergarten • stronger attendance laws • a formal State Board of Education • Teaching Assistant program for K-3 to increase math and reading achievement • raised teachers’ salaries to Southeastern average • directed MS Department of Education to come up with an accountability plan • accountability system has been based on this, and has gradually progressed from this 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Winter initiated with group of legislators called “Boys of Summer” • State Education Superintendent from 1985 was key in its implementation, as he was hired to implement it • State Superintendent’s Organization was key in getting this off the ground 		
1992 – Sales tax increase to fund education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one percent increase in sales tax that created the Education Enhancement Fund to help schools renovate buildings, improve bus fleet and purchase equipment and teaching supplies • people could vote on whether to built casinos and use revenues for schools 			
1997 – Mississippi Adequate Education Pact (MEAP)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • holding schools accountable is only possible if they have adequate resources: • funding schools so that all students can receive an adequate education regardless of demographic or ethnicity • put 100m extra into classroom, 22% raise for teachers, including 700m in bonds for school facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Board of Education is the “program manager” of the grant and wrote the regulations for it • Superintendent of Education came back as interim superintendent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GOP Senator helped write House version of it, then later called for full funding of it 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Democrats and GOP in House and Senate largely supportive • Some GOP thought it was

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • has <u>not</u> been fully funded, especially 2004 • holds each school, not district acct, so didn't have to do much to meet NCLB, used as model for NCLB • decentralization: giving districts the money they were given through this act, could leverage the money • Mississippi is one of 5 states in US not sued over education funding as a result of this bill • has a formula to determine how much an "adequate" education costs (\$3957 in '05) • overall goal was sufficient funding so all students could attend a school with at least a Level III accreditation • not funded with a tax increase • model for US Department of Education for NCLB 	<p>and was instrumental in its implementation when he returned to MS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Legislature was a strong supporter as they overrode a veto from Gov. Fordice to pass MEAP. (Cost of the bill was the reason for the governor's veto.) • Democratic Lt. Governor was a strong supporter 		<p>too much money to be spending</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Now, Legislators have approved a commission to study its effects, partly as a way to keep the Governor out of the process, whom some view of unsupportive of maintaining MAEP • Mississippi Association of Educators supportive
1997 – School Executive Management Institute	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all school leaders required to attend once they receive administrative licensure • they need 95 renewal or continuing education/pd unit hours over 5 yrs • study management needs of local school districts • based on needs assessment and research from districts and education leaders 			
1997 – Reading Sufficiency Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • used to help implement the Barksdale Reading Institute by providing professional development • all students in 3rd and 4th grades have to be tested for reading ability, if that ability is low, those students will be provided with supplemental services • initiative had much funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Education Superintendent • State Board of Education 		
1998 – Critical	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides scholarships, grants, home loans, and moving 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mississippi Teacher 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mississippi Public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education

Shortage Act	<p>expenses for teachers and administrators willing to work in the Delta and other shortage designated areas. (attracting high quality teachers to this area is a main challenge of MS education)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> also included a measure for a sabbatical program 	Center, which is part of the Mississippi Department of Education	Education Forum— problem definition, legislation based on a study of theirs, based on State Board of Education’s definition of critical shortage areas	stakeholders in the MS Delta Region
2000 – New accountability standards (SB 2488)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> made teachers more accountable via students’ performance on standardized tests (got attention of all teachers in the state) aimed to connect with and raise standards in every school district, highlighted each school’s performance, not just that of the whole district had a big effect on those in leadership roles aimed to get administration more involved with instruction labels schools as priority schools if they need extra help, then provides them with improvement plans if improvement plans are not met, principal may be dismissed and the Superintendent’s salary is capped capped class sizes at 28 for grades 1-4 if a priority school partly because of this act, became 6th state in U.S. to meet NCLB policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislature mandated MS Department of Ed and State Board of Ed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate Education Committee Chair, In formulating it, the State Board reviewed suggestion from the State Dept. of Ed. and from other education leaders <p>MS Ed. Working Group drafted amendments to the legislation to provide for systematic participation of parents and community leaders in evaluations of local schools</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have conducted town meetings related to it to get citizen input
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> education bill to increase teachers’ pay during Musgrove’s term 			
1996: National Board for Certification of Teachers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> teachers paid for applying for certification and given \$6,000 a year more for 10 years if they earn certification way to recognize exemplary teachers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Primarily governor’s office 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gov. Fordice (R), one of only education initiatives he really supported, he was very interested in the privatization of education 	

Dimensions of Political Culture	Framework for Analyzing State Political Culture: Mississippi
Openness (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Few opportunities for teachers - State Department of Ed good about soliciting input from the district level - For the passage of MAEP, there was much grassroots support to fund education more, which helped pressure governor and Legislature - Barksdale Reading Institute (has become influential in improve reading achievement) depends on grassroots support and cooperation from administrators and teachers - Alternative routes for administrative certification for those wanting to come into schools from other professions
Decentralism (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recycling of elites, MS known as having a “plantation system” so is very top down - Though more decentralization seen with new accountability measures (which were in place pre-NCLB) that placed more responsibility on individual schools for results - No collective bargaining, teachers have comparatively less power than in other states, anti-union bias with very top-down districts
Rationalism (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public Education Forum instrumental in problem id, then suggesting courses of action, though which they have a “pipeline” with traditional insider groups like the State Board, Dept of Ed, and many legislators - 2000 accountability legislation is example of this as they hope to identify individual schools struggling, not just overall districts, and by identifying those schools, they can put them on an improvement plan -
Egalitarianism/ Equity (E, G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Demographically, state is rural and among the poorest in the US, as is its funding per/student (even with MAEP passed), the Delta region is the poorest region in the state, and the Legislature/current governor are viewed as uninterested in fully addressing issue of severe lack of education funds, especially from property taxes - State superintendent (Johnson) was a strong proponent of giving merit pay to teachers at schools that show the most improvement (part of reason was flak he got for having a salary higher than the governor) - Voters allowed to choose if they want casinos, which they can use to take revenues for funding schools - In a special session this summer (2005), MS legislators passed a \$145m increase for K-12 education, more than Gov. Barbour proposed, and not enough to make a substantial improve in ed financing for the upcoming year, this \$145m is \$88m less than an advocacy group headed by former Gov. Winter was advocating

Efficiency (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Anti-union bias in state is clearest example of this - Strict accountability put on buildings prior to NCLB - Extremely high emphasis on testing as how to hold all accountable - Current governor is in favor of increased privatization in education - Legislature is calling on districts to streamline their administrative structure (and are considering consolidation) to lower the costs of educating students
Actors/ Influence (M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With new accountability policies, administration and teachers have become more involved with student learning than in the past - Unions: little influence over teachers' working conditions, but do much lobbying at the state capitol, keep teachers informed about key educational issues, pushes for greater professionalization of education, and pay raises which must be approved by the Legislature - Power of governor over education varies significantly, MS is a weak governor state, but if the governor can hold sway over the Legislature, their power increases significantly, Lt Gov has much more power (traditionally) than governor. - Legislature traditionally strong, not trusted by teachers, but House Speaker viewed as strong ed supporter - Strong connections with elites in North Carolina - State Superintendent's Association: pushing for more education of teachers and administrators, more community college classes, pushing for alternative administrative licensure program - Not as much influence from corporations in comparison to other states - Mississippi Education Forum—much sway in agenda-setting phase of policy to ensure a highly skilled workforce, this group represents the business community and is part of the state chamber of commerce - MS DoE: has a stakeholders group, includes the School Board Association, the teacher associations, educational organizations that work together to look at the research, understand the concepts, then present them - Barksdale Reading Center: legislative action supports its existence, noted for quickly building much grassroots support since they started in 2000, and Jim Barksdale announced (Summer 2005) that he would fund scholarships for some students in schools where Barksdale tutors work - Current Governor Barbour not willing to spend any money on education - State Ed Superintendent: (Dr. Henry Johnson) just tapped by Bush to be DoE's Asst Secretary for Elem and Second Ed, so MS is now looking for a replacement
Quality (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Apparent beginning in 1982 with the MS Education Reform Act that directed the State Dept of Ed to

	<p>write clear acct stds and curriculum for improved student results, which if not met, would result in consequences</p> <p>-</p>
Choice (M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No clear evidence of choice at the grassroots level once policy is implemented - Barksdale Reading Initiative is example since schools can choose if they want to be a part of this initiative - Current Governor Barbour in favor of vouchers

* High level of segregation in public schools, and also a strong division between those attending public vs private schools

Openness: Availability of political participation to those outside the inner circle of education policymaking

Decentralization: power is distributed among many centers, which often have their power protected under the law, those power sources are inter-dependent, and there is not one center that is much more powerful in comparison to the others

Rationalism: opposite is incrementalism, based on the belief that problems can be rationally and logically identified, so solutions are based on all information available and analyses of alternatives. This approach makes sense to stakeholders, i.e., a technical problem deserves a technical solution.

Incrementalism allows for partial, politically acceptable changes in public policy, not usually comprehensive ones

Equity: usually means the use of public resources to redistribute public resources to satisfying disparities; involves two stages—a disadvantage or other measure of the gap between the norms of social life and the needs of citizens in public services, then public resources are applied through programs to close the gap between norm and need

Efficiency: Appears in two forms: economic: the effort to minimize costs while maximizing gains to optimize program performance; as an accountability form by mandating of those means by which superiors in an authority system can oversee and hence control their subordinates' exercise of power and responsibility.

Actors/Influence: Those who are involved in the policy process, as measured by their distance from the traditional policy makers, the primary group of actors are the insiders, near circle, far circle, sometimes players, and oft-forgotten players

Quality: public policy matches the public view, involves two-stage behavior: First, the state will mandate the need for certain standards of 'excellence' or 'proficiency', or 'superior ability', then, in order to achieve these standards, public resources are applied across districts, or within districts across schools, with typically uneven distribution of resources.

Choice: The presence of a range of options for action, as well as the ability to select a preferred option, a mandate that offers education stakeholders the opportunity either to make policy decisions or to reject them.

Current Governor Barbour not willing to spend any money on education

In a special session this summer (2005), MS legislators passed a \$145m increase for K-12 education, more than Gov. Barbour proposed, and not enough to make a substantial improve in ed financing for the upcoming year, this \$145m is \$88m less than an advocacy group headed by former Gov. Winter was advocating

D.3 State Key Policy Event Chronologies: NEW MEXICO

Date/Name	Content	What Office (Inner Circle)	Near Circle	Other Actors
1974 – Public Schools Finance Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> included School Equalization Guarantee - independently reviewed in 1996 - “New Mexico public school funding formula is a highly equitable formula... [S]pending disparities are less than in other states and statistically insignificant.” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Board of Education NM legislature Executive 		
late 1990s – Task Force on Teacher Shortages/Salaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> task force struck to look at teacher shortages and salaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor Gary Johnson Bipartisan education reform task force representing education leaders and business leaders 		
1998 – Roundtable on K-16 Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> roundtable on K-16 partnerships for teacher preparation and development to identify strategies to improve preparation and ongoing professional development of public school teachers and enhance higher education’s role in supporting public schools, teachers and students led to a formal statement of philosophy and an action plan, supportive legislation and a federal grant (Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant) for implementation of integrated 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NM Commission on Higher Education (CHE) NM State Board of Education (SBE) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> leaders in education, government and business 	

<p>2003 – School Reform Act: House Bill 212</p>	<p>system of educational reform</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • higher teacher pay - was top priority for Governor Richardson • 3-tiered teacher licensure system • starting salary for Level 1 teacher now \$30,000, up from 22,000 • for Level 3 now ranges from \$60,000 to \$70,000 • Professional Development Dossier for licensure advancement • requires State Board to adopt academic content and performance standards for Grades 1-12 in accordance with NCLB • requires SBE to establish statewide assessment and accountability system aligned with state academic content and performance standards to measure Adequate Yearly Progress for students, schools and districts (in line with NCLB) • enacts process for ranking of schools and requires schools ranked in need of improvement create a school improvement plan within 90 days of notification • NM accountability system includes the creation of the Office of Education Accountability (provides: independent source of information about the progress of education reform; leadership assistance to Governor, Legislature, Secretary of Education, state and educational agencies; evaluation/enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • previous governor - discussions for Ed Reform began in 2000 under Johnson who was vocally opposed to public schools and promoted voucher plan. • current governor's (Bill Richardson) top election priorities education, improving teacher salaries • NM State Board of Education, then, after their creation, Secretary of Education & NM Public Education Department (for implementation) • Rick Miera, Chair, Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) • Legislative Finance Committee • Senate Education Committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM Business Roundtable for Educational Excellence (Larry Langley, President & CEO) - seen as more involved in early stage (policy enacting) of reform efforts but less involved with implementation • Governor's Council of Teachers (advisory to governor and secretary of education) • Greater Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce, (Terri Cole, President) • NM Public Education Commission (elected commissioners) - communication from local districts and advisory to Sec of Ed • Association of Commerce and Industry (statewide chamber of commerce) • Secretary's Advisory Council (50 people representing state, districts and teachers, has an Executive, Council and Assembly) once formed • parent groups, NM PTA most active (parent 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM Federation of Educational Employees (Christine Trujillo, president, state affiliate of American Federation of Teachers - AFT) • Albuquerque Teachers Federation (Bernstein) • [concern that State works "in a way that would cause less damage than more damage" - governor seen as paying "lip service" / "surface attention"] • Federation of Labor - AFL/CIO) • College of Education, UNM • College of Education, NM State University • NM Coalition of School Administrators • NEA - NM (National Education Association - New Mexico) • ISLLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, part of Council of State School Officers) • Association of Commerce and Industry • NM PTA (part of nat'l
---	--	---	--	--

	<p>of Assessment and Accountability Act; oversees teacher licensure system) - arm's length from governor's office and NM PED (Public Education Dept.) - works with Department of Finance and Administration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Principals enhanced salary package (linked to school size - did not pass - now being rewritten, will require more rigorous evaluation system for administrators - Sullivan) • personnel hiring authority moved to Superintendents from school boards - wreaked havoc in smaller districts - hiring no longer a community process 		<p>groups not seen as a major influence "act more as partners than players")</p>	<p>PTA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM School Boards Association • Albuquerque Public School District • NM Superintendents Association
2003 – Indian Education Act / SB115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • created Indian Education Division within the PED and position of Assistant Secretary • creates and defines membership of Indian Education Advisory Council to assist in evaluating, coordinating and consolidating all activities related to education of New Mexico's Native American students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate Education Committee 		
Constitutional Amendment 1 (2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governance - Move to cabinet-level public education department • amendment passed by voters to change governing system from Superintendent of Public Education to Secretary of Education (cabinet position) and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Bill Richardson • Chair, Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) • Senate Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce • NM Business Roundtable for Educational Excellence 	

	<p>NM Public Education Dept (NM PED)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Board of Education became Public Education Commission, acting as an advisory rather than having authority- no longer worked on design of curriculum or accreditation • ongoing changes to statutes 	Committee		
Constitutional Amendment 2 (2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased distribution from the land grant permanent fund • amendment passed by voters to tap more of endowment fund to pay higher costs of increased teacher salaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Bill Richardson • Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor’s Council of Teachers 	
2003 – House Bill 745 - Limit School District Cash Balances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • designed to set practical limits on the amount of operational cash balance that a district or charter school can retain • includes amendment of School Equalization Guarantee (equalizes the funding formula for every school district) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair, LESC 		
2004-2005, ongoing from 2003 – House Bill 212 - may lead to additional legislation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ongoing work developing strong professional development based on students’ test scores and students’ success • required by state law to have a professional development (PD) framework - task force will bring policy framework into existence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM Public Education Department (PED) • PD Task Force or Council appointed by Secretary • Assessment and Accountability Division of NM PED • College of Education, UNM • College of Education, NM State University • NM Business 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NEA - NM represented on a sub-committee studying professional development (National Education Association - New Mexico) but “Policies not in place that are in alignment with the 3-tiered licensure and evaluation system, let alone the kinds of individual PD that would be really 	

		Roundtable for Educational Excellence	related to teaching and learning environments.”	
2004-present – Sufficiency Study proposed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to review current funding mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM PED • Legislature 		
2004-present – Study on school administrator shortages/retention	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • looking at principal turnover rate, shortages, depth and quality of applicant pool, incentives for new principals 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Office of Education Accountability • NM Coalition of School Administrators (NMCSA) • University of New Mexico 		
2004-2005 – development of 2005 assessment instrument	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • once assessment developed, reporting practices to be aligned, then support to Districts in understanding student test data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Division of Assessment and Accountability (NM PED) 		
2005, ongoing work from 2003 – House Bill 212 - on proposed legislation around administrative salary structure and administrator evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhance principal qualifications • recommendations brought to legislative committee to provide more effective model for admin salary structure indexed against teachers’ schedule (rather than, as previously, size of school). • will require development of a rigorous evaluation system • scheduled to be completed by end of Summer 2005 • “unfinished business and it has no political support” according to President of Albuquerque Teachers Federation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) • NM Public Education Dept (PED) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM Coalition of School Administrators • College of Education, UNM • College of Education, NM State University • Office of Education Accountability 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ISLLC may have become involved (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, part of Council of State School Officers)
2005-present – Charter School Bill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • deciding who the chartering authority is - local Board or PED - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair, Legislative Education Study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Mexico School Boards Association 	

	<p>and who is responsible for them, what authority they have - currently all charter schools are public schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • also looking at changes in athletics and activities for charter and home school students - making local school activities available to them. 	<p>Committee (LESC)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretary of Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • individual charter schools 	
2005 – HB 337- Pre-Kindergarten Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$5 million to be dispensed, \$2.5 million by PED, \$2.5 million by Children Youth and Families Department (CYFD) • part of Early Childhood Education Initiative • voluntary pre-Kindergarten pilot program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair, Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) • Department of Education • Children, Youth & Families Department 		
2005 – Full-day Kindergarten	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • continued support for full-day K in all districts • part of Early Childhood Education Initiative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • governor • LESC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM Public Education Commission • NM Business Roundtable for Educational Excellence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM Federation Of Educational Employees • NM Federation of Labor
2005 – House Bill 745 - Higher Education Department Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creates Higher Education Department - Secretary to be appointed by governor • also creates Higher Education Advisory Board 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM legislature • Governor Bill Richardson 		
2005-present – SB 215 American Indian Advanced School Curriculum	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bill directs Indian Education Division to develop a challenging, culturally relevant curriculum for Native American students in K-6 • working on a number of initiatives relating to native students and students in rural communities, e.g., inter-tribal education summits 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indian Education Division, Assistant Secretary • Rural Education Division, Assistant Secretary 		

2004-present /	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new legislation contemplated around teachers' Professional Development - business interests hope to see PD as part of teachers' work day, with increase in work to 40 hrs/wk and 200 days/yr 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM Business Roundtable 		
----------------	--	--	--	--

Dimensions of Political Culture	Framework for Analyzing State Political Culture: New Mexico
Openness (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • bipartisan, extensive involvement from stakeholders across the state in drafting and pushing through School Reform Act • team of about 50-60 people appointed by legislature to start reform process, draft HB 212 - half were legislators, half educators and business community • Legislative Education Study Committee (LESC) - ongoing committee meets throughout year - Chair Miera takes meetings all over state - local school boards, superintendents, teacher unions bring their community's issues to table - speaks to accessibility of policymakers. • NM Business Roundtable influential in drafting - worked with Albuquerque Chamber of commerce and several statewide organizations - involved collaborative work of several groups lobbying and pushing through legislation, especially groups from greater Albuquerque area. Initially Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce worked independently - creating their own reform bill advocating a business model (CEO with "close to carte blanche over hirings and firings") - teachers' unions backing other sorts of reforms - leadership of LESG and Senate Education Committee insisted on consensus bill - led to more collaborative approach • UNM and NMSU faculties of education working with Office of Education Accountability, Public Education Department and NM Business Roundtable to develop improvements to Professional Development opportunities • advice of teachers sought through Governor's Council of Teachers - President, Albuquerque Teachers Federation feels they have little effect on enactment of policy. Governor pays lip service, surface attention to teachers on issues of funding and testing - rather mirroring Bush's work on expanding testing into high schools. It is professional educators and some leaders at PED that are striving to make policy work positively. • BUT NEA-NM feels they have a great deal of input by making sure their members are on implementation

	<p>committees - lobbies on a platform that is approved by members annually - also lobbies for “grassroots teachers” to be on working groups in addition to representatives from state level organization. NEA-NM believes local school districts and local unions can negotiate in collective bargaining the conditions under which education reform will take place - also helpful that Secretary of Education spent whole first year traveling the state making citizens more aware of policy, what’s going on and that there is a “central locus” where they can go to discuss policy - PED uses press effectively for public education.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a working group with representatives from Council of School Administrators, Public Education Department, university faculty and legislative staff assigned to legislative committee are working together on legislation to increase salaries and create more rigorous evaluation system for school administrators - to be completed Summer 2005. • BUT quote from member of NM School Boards Association “With our new governor, it’s just whatever he wants to do.” and “If you agree with the governor, you’re effective. If you don’t agree with the governor, he really doesn’t want to listen to you.” • Public Education Commission - elected from districts around the state - role is to communicate with Secretary of Education about what they’re hearing in districts • information available on PED website <i>Teach New Mexico</i> around teacher licensure and evaluation - hold several conferences a year • School Board Association, Coalition of Public School Administrators, state district superintendents all have lobbying teams - meet with teacher unions on a regular basis to discuss legislation - meet as “education partners” - try to find common issues to take to legislative committees
Decentralism (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • state government is heavily centralized - all money comes to the center of the state, then is disbursed to local districts - considered “antithetical to site-based or school-based or district-based PD” by NEA-NM • power has become more centralized with change in governance - formerly State Board members had some policy-making role in curriculum design and accreditation - now Public Education commissioners <i>advise</i> Secretary on standards and benchmarking according to PEC commissioner • cabinet-level Secretary of Education is directly accountable to Governor • School districts no longer control hiring and firing of school employees - role of superintendents (who are appointed by district boards) - an issue in small communities where hiring and firing of school employees was an important community process • state sets policies around licensure requirements, system of accountability - Governor sets the agenda for the

	<p>Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • state working with faculty at colleges of education on development of teacher competencies, special ed, IDEA, early childhood education and bilingualism initiatives - seen as collaborative by Dean of Education, UNM • Director of Licensure publicly recognized contribution of UNM to licensure system • NM Business Roundtable - Business able to “hold governor and secretary of education more accountable” than previous governance model (with elected state board) according to Roundtable President. • teachers’ unions and Council of School Administrators seen as very influential when they work together (President, CSA)
Rationalism (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to improve quality of teaching and thereby raise student achievement levels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 3-tiered teacher licensure system and increases in teacher pay to offset NM’s teacher shortage and apparent low qualifications ○ mandatory PD dossier for promotion through tiers • Office of Education Accountability established to oversee licensure system • Assessment and Accountability Division of PED oversees the State Accountability System - Annual Yearly Progress targets - sets requirements for student, school and district performance - produces AYP decisions for all public schools • newly established Graduation Progress Report - new system “will increase accountability for graduation rate reporting” from schools • union view: public debate around teaching - not always informed - issues are complex - danger of simple fixes that do more harm than good
Egalitarianism/ Equity (E, G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all public school funding comes from the state - “equalized but inadequate” • legislators seen as comfortable pushing for equitable distribution - “distribution is equitable but has never been adequate” - need to find substantial money to fund education in coming years • issue - NM is largely rural, large Native American population (with second language issues) - only one metropolitan area (Albuquerque) - difficult to get qualified teachers and administrators to smaller and more rural districts • Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce tended to force their own issues - “bullied” or “ran roughshod” over other Chambers of Commerce - much less of a problem now than in the past • NM has recently appointed 2 Assistant Secretaries that are part of the cabinet, one heads Indian Education

	<p>Division, one Rural Education Division - dealing with issues of poverty, language and culture - at inter-tribal education summits, policymakers work with governors of various tribes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recent implementation of full-day Kindergarten in all districts - seem as beneficial to children from rural communities and to second language learners (tend to be from low socio-economic areas, pockets of high poverty) • new initiative will fund pre-K program • some attempt to shift funding into effort to reduce number of minority and second language students dropping out after Grade 10.
Efficiency (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NM had an accountability system in place prior to NCLB - ranking of schools, criteria for improvement that is largely mirrored in NCLB <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ latter part of NCLB has negative effects around standards for teachers - many teachers especially in rural areas are not qualified according to NCLB but NM has a reform strategy for developing teacher capacity in 3-tiered licensure system ○ NCLB requires student testing that differs from the standards-based testing NM had developed prior to NCLB - cost to change to new system is so far being borne by the state. ○ NCLB requires that schools achieve certain standards in terms of student testing - not given adequate credit for making significant gains - many schools were way below standard - still are below despite increases of as much as 20% ○ “we were doing pretty well, moving right along... and then we have to start doing their kind of testing and shutting down schools and having.. individual takeovers. I mean, all that is not conducive to team-building and moving schools forward.” (Miera, LESC) • relatively poor performance in student achievement led to state Board changing from elected Board to governor-appointed Secretary of Education and Public Education Department reporting directly to Governor - more accountability - also created Deputy Secretary for Learning and Accountability • change in governance from elected State School Board (with 5 appointees and 10 elected members) and Superintendent to Public Education Department headed by Secretary of Education (cabinet level position) who is directly accountable to the governor - previous school board is now NM Public Education Commission (commissioners all elected) and is advisory to Secretary on issues of standards and benchmarks, no longer policy makers designing curriculum or dealing with accreditation • push from business for school districts to run on a business model, with Superintendent in role of CEO -

- looking for more autonomous and effective local authority
- superintendents now make decisions over school employee hirings and firings - school boards restricted to the hiring and firing of superintendent - created problems in small districts where school staffing was important community process
- establishment of Office of Education Accountability, part of Department of Finance and Administration (not PED) - oversees implementation of accountability measures - teaching quality and data quality of districts
- Assessment and Accountability Division of NM PED - oversees development of assessment instruments and will develop practices for using assessment data with the goal that assessment come to be seen as part of the instructional process, not as a separate event that happens
- “cost-conscious” about putting steps in place like appropriate governance (President, Business Roundtable)
- funding issues:
 - more money will be needed to sustain reform efforts, to fund full implementation - will there be improvements in the economy, enough resources?
 - using money from transfer of permanent land grant fund in ways intended
 - more funding needed for next budget cycle to replace one-time land grant transfer funding
- union view: complexity of problems requires depth of knowledge about teaching and learning - no simple fixes.
 - several policy layers - federal, state, local - intended to answer to each other - danger of over-prescription - false accountability and paperwork create burdens for teachers and schools that they can “feel they are dying under the weight of.” (from a Grade 1 teacher: “If only these damn kids wouldn’t show up, I could get my work done.”)
- currently developing format for evaluation of school administrators (based on school achievement, standards, scores, NCLB, etc) as part of salary compensation package - issue: will superintendents be doing the evaluations? Reform legislation intends that superintendents have authority over principals, not school boards as previously - legislation will be complete summer 2005
 - Albuquerque Teacher Federation view: despite importance of school leadership to school improvement and good teaching - lack of will to date to find funds to attract and enhance school leadership - need to attract good leaders and find ways to keep them for schools to improve especially in poverty-ridden communities.

<p>Actors/ Influence (M)</p>	<p>Inner circle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Richardson - elected on platform of education reform, increasing teacher salaries, improving teaching quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ sets policy agenda for Department - quote “With our new governor, it’s just whatever he wants to do.” • Legislative Education Study Committee, Rick Miera, Chair - will draw other actors in to support proposed legislation (unions, coalition of education partners, and so on) • Legislative Finance Committee • Secretary of Education, Veronica Garcia - reports directly to governor; Deputy Secretary for Learning and Accountability, Kurt Steinhaus; Don Moya, Deputy Secretary for Finance and Operations; NM Public Education Department. Secretary of Education will ask for input from other actors on a regular basis - meets formally with coalition of education partners 4 times a year • BUT “NCLB is <i>the</i> major driver in a lot of ways around changes in state policies.” (NEA-NM) <p>Near circle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Mexico Business Roundtable (Larry Langley, President) • Association of Commerce and Industry - state-wide Chambers of Commerce • Greater Albuquerque Chamber of Commerce - now more collaborative than formerly - seen to carry a lot of weight because it is biggest school district and has largest number of students - also majority of legislative representatives from Albuquerque - supports vouchers and charter schools - districts and unions tend to unite in opposition • New Mexico Public Education Commission (elected Commissioners) - acts in advisory role • Governor’s Council of Teachers (advisory role - recommends but cannot set policy) • Secretary’s Advisory Council (about 50 members) - Executive is made up of recognized leaders in the state and districts, superintendents and principals. Many members also serve on various task forces. <p>Far circle:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unions - Albuquerque Teachers Federation (Bernstein); NM Federation of Education Employees, affiliated with AFT (American Federation of Teachers); NM Federation of Labor - NM Federation of Teachers(?); National Education Association; National Education Association of New Mexico (NEA-NM) - grassroots organization - relies on teachers to bring issues to them which they then bring to state level;
----------------------------------	--

- NM Coalition of School Administrators - when unions and NMCSA work together - “very influential”
- NM School Boards Association - frequently works with Coalition of School Administrators - School Boards Association concerns with charter school movement
- above groups work together in a coalition - effective if they get governor’s support - close working relationship with chairs of two education committees (LESC and SEC), with legislative staff, and with governor’s office and his education adviser - work with other education groups/agencies on some issues (PTA, University women’s group)
- PTA - parent groups not as well organized as in some other states - PTA most noticeable but not representing a huge number of parents across the state

Sometimes players:

- some individual parent groups advocate for vouchers, moving public money to private activities - run counter to the other groups - NM legislation has kept charter schools within the public system.[moved from section above]
- other unions?
- College of Education, UNM (Dean Viola Florez)
- ISLLC (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium, part of Council of State School Officers)
- Parents Reaching Out - supports families of children with disabilities

Different actors depending on stage of reform initiative - raising issue; enacting policy; overseeing implementation:

- significant actors in terms of raising issues and enacting policy are local school boards, superintendents association and teacher unions, as well as local Chamber of Commerce
- significant actors in terms of implementation are Secretary of Education and NM PED at the state level and superintendents and then principals at the local level
- parents feel comfortable bringing local issues to LESL - passed on to local superintendent to deal with.

NEA-NM sees policy makers in very positive light right now - Governor and leadership in Legislature support public education and will fund it - change in leadership (Governor, Legislature, PED) could have a negative impact on public system.

Quality (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teacher shortages and low salaries (made hiring and retention difficult) seen to be creating crisis in schools - belief that poor quality teaching was contributing to poor student performance - HB 212 addressed issue by substantially increasing teacher salaries and mandating 3-tiered Licensure System and PD Dossier System for advancement through tiers • - to improve teacher hirings and retention, tapped into permanent land grant fund to raise money for increases in teachers' salaries • Teacher Licensure System - teachers at Level 1 required to qualify for Level 2 status within 3 years - advancement to Level 3 is optional • introduced mandatory Dossiers for promotion review - dossier review required for advancement to next tier - for Level 3, an advanced degree + 6 years of teaching experience are required - requires strong PD plans be in place. • Dossiers to include: demonstration of leadership in school; involvement in curriculum development; school improvement plans; evidence of significant advances for their students in terms of achievement levels; submission of student work that demonstrates how they have intervened to make students more successful (evidence of value-added - difference between pre- and post-intervention performance. • Office of Education Accountability - part of NM Accountability System - arm's length from governor's office and NM PED, part of Dept of Finance and Administration. - authority to enforce state testing - oversees mandated implementation, teacher licensure system - reviews decision-making policies of schools and districts around recruitment and retention of staff - stated goal of making sure educational staff are qualified and supported. • School and Student Assessment Bureau - responsible for developing, implementing, and managing a variety of programs that assess and evaluate the performance of students and programs in schools - programs include the statewide high school competency examination, student achievement tests, writing assessments, and reading assessments. [responsible for field-testing and reviewing tests to assure quality of assessment] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ issues around testing - not necessarily true picture of student success - shift to criterion-referenced tests to fit NCLB(?) - some see current tests as less valid than tests NM had developed prior to NCLB • Assessment and Accountability Division of PED oversees the State Accountability System - Annual Yearly Progress for schools, and districts - sets requirements for student, school and district performance - produces AYP decisions for all public schools - includes achievement indicators, attendance levels, graduation rates, etc.
-------------	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Assurance Bureau - monitors schools that have been identified as not doing well - to ensure that required changes are implemented - Accountability System sets consequences for failure to meet AYP up to and including developing a school improvement plan, replacing most or all of the staff in a school, making school a charter school, turn management of school to PED, make other governance changes • current work being done on legislation to set higher salaries for administrators: work group brought recommendations to legislative committee to provide more effective model for admin salary structure indexed against teachers' schedule - Legislative committee wants more rigorous evaluation system for principals and vice-principals. • concern that there may not be enough funding to hire the staff needed to fully deal with compliance and regulatory issues - problem prior to Governor Richardson - not enough funding - not enough state level staff - little accountability
Choice (M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • licensure system is seen as <i>pretty</i> to <i>very</i> rigid re: moving from one level to the next - teachers have to be at Level 2 within 3 years or they are out of system - but Level 2 teachers have choice about moving to Level 3 - can stay at Level 2 indefinitely • mandatory state-wide evaluation system • there is currently a system on the books for the evaluation of administrators with state-wide indicators - the system is not applied uniformly across districts - nothing requires that staff be engaged in the evaluation of their supervisors although this occurs in some districts. • charter schools are part of Public Education Department - have choices in setting their curriculum • relatively poor performance in student achievement led to state Board changing from elected Board to Governor-appointed Secretary of Education and Public Education Department reporting directly to Governor - more accountability - also created Deputy Secretary for Learning and Accountability

D.4 Key State Policy Chronologies: OREGON

Date/Name	Content	What Office (Inner Circle)	Near Circle	Other Actors
1989 – State established intermediate school districts, known as Education Service Districts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education Service Districts (ESD) established • funded separately, so not part of ODE (Oregon Department of Education) budget • in past operated as entrepreneurs that could apply for their own grants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Legislature</i> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republican Dominated Legislature
1991 – Measure Five	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 ½ % property tax limitation – shifted responsibility from local districts to states. (Education suffers in OR based on state economy) • state decided how much money each district was going to get; shift of authority from districts to state (state taking more responsibility) • state annually requires districts to develop their spending plan for federal funds (which state determines amount) • school boards no longer had the ability to raise money locally 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature • Oregon Department of Education (ODE) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republican Dominated Legislature • Anti-Tax Groups
1993 –"Bringing Oregon Schools into the 21st Century"	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • created standards based curriculum across grade levels • districts left to create own assessment methods 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE • Oregon Education Association (OEA) • Senate Education Committee (SEC) • Oregon Business 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher’s Union • Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA) • Oregon School Boards Association (OSBA) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republican Dominated Legislature

		Council (OBC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon Business Association (OBA) 	
1995 – Tweaked “Bringing Oregon into the 21 st Century” Added the Certificate of Initial Mastery (CIM) and Certificate of Advanced Mastery (CAM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIM – students need to meet a set of skills and knowledge that contains the so-called “bottom line skills” for every high school student • CAM – students who go above and beyond the CIM – includes a more robust curriculum and involves more community involvement • CIM/CAM envisioned as a requirement beyond a regular diploma – assessment includes a combination of paper and pencil test (10th grade assessments) and student work samples 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE • OEA • Oregon Board of Education (OBE) • OBC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher’s Union • COSA • OBA • Associated Oregon Industries (AOI) • OBC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republican Dominated Legislature
1999 – Quality Education Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • speaker of the House, Len Lundquist was authorized to come up with a measure of education outcomes based on ideal schools and funding • key finding: if the state fully funds education, then 90% of students would achieve at the expected level, the numbers would go down by percentages based on how much funding came from the state – so if only fund 70%, then can’t expect 90% of students to perform at level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature • Voter Initiated • Governor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker of the House • Coalition for School Funding Now (grassroots) which is a group of schools, parents, local elected officials and business leaders who advocate for school funding in the legislature. • OBC • COSA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republican Dominated Legislature
1999 – School Report Card	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • focuses on progress over time – provides a snapshot of percentage of students meeting standards every year -- but 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE • OEA • OBE (Oregon Board of Education) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OBC • AOI (Associated Oregon Industries) • OBA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Republican Dominated Legislature

	calculated over time			
1999 – Teacher and Administrator Mentor Act	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> this act is not funded by the Legislature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ODE OEA OBE (Oregon Board of Education) OBC (Oregon Business Council) State Universities 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Republicans controlled both Houses, Democrats controlled the Governor (Governor made large amounts of vetoes during his term)
2001 – NCLB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CIM/CAM initially had been across all subject matter including art, but with NCLB, the state ended up narrowing the focus so that it would align with NCLB requirements different measure than state report card because it only provides a snapshot of data by aggregated subgroup but is not calculated over time (incompatibility between State Report Cards and NCLB in OR) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ODE OEA OBE (Oregon Board of Education) OBC (Oregon Business Council) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Republican Dominated Legislature
2003 – Revised Teacher and Administrator Mentor Act; Amended CIM/CAM		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ODE OEA OBE (Oregon Board of Education) OBC (Oregon Business Council) State Universities 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Democratic Senate, Republican House
2003 – Education Service Districts; overall funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ESDs receive 5% of the total funding that K-12 receives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Coalition for School Funding Now 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Democratic Senate, Republican House

tweaked	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OR went from a 30% state general fund to 70% local property tax (in ballpark terms). They just flip-flopped, now OR is at a 70% state and federal general fund and 30% local property tax. So, the role of the legislature and the state agencies (but to a lesser extent) has really changed. 		(grassroots)	
---------	--	--	--------------	--

Dimensions of Political Culture	Framework for Analyzing State Political Culture: OREGON			
Openness (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The “Chalkboard Project” – group of nonprofit organizations including the Meyers Memorial Trust (Gates grant for SLCs) – right now they are going around the state and studying Oregon schools. They are specifically asking the question “What are the things that would make the most difference for OR schools.” With this information, they will not recommend policy, but they will initiate meetings they will call “Civic Engagement Processes” around the state to discuss their findings and ask for suggestions on what to do next. Another non-profit group has formed call the E-3 Group - Employers for Educational Excellence; OSBA has helped create E-3 to try to build some more community will for change in the schools and to help communities develop plans and move more aggressively to make the changes necessary so more kids can meet the standards. 			
Decentralism (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> OR has a populist mentality – a fear of any one group getting too much power, so has a history of localized control – even with the shift of the funding structure and the moved to state mandated standards and reforms, the mentality of Oregonians remains populist State Superintendent of Public Instruction is elected, but is not part of the governor’s cabinet. OR has not had the same President of the Senate for more than 2 sessions in the last 15 years. The same thing goes for the Chair of the Senate and House – they change almost every session OR is does not have a centralized policy making structure; instead many people and organizations from 			

	across the state discuss what needs to be done, however, there is less local control now because of the shift in how resources are allocated
Rationalism (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality Education Commission – although it seems along the lines of rationalism, the way it was carried out is more incremental.
Egalitarianism/ Equity (E, G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the current funding structure – everyone in OR feels equally underfunded
Efficiency (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature directs districts to establish the standards and the assessment system; They require a uniform chart of accounts of the school budgeting process; However, this gets complicated because districts still have a relative amount of autonomy in the way they set up their assessment methods
Actors/ Influence (M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ODE • OEA • COSA • OSBA • OBC • Legislature (to a smaller extent, the governor) <p>Others mentioned, that have less direct influence on policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Susan Castillo, Superintendent of Public Instruction • Vicky Phillips, the new Superintendent of the Portland Public School District <p>Grassroots Lobbying:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chalkboard Project • Our Oregon • Coalition for School Funding Now
Quality (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CIM/CAM • State Report Card
Choice (M)	

Openness: Availability of political participation to those outside the inner circle of education policymaking

Decentralization: power is distributed among many center, which often have their power protected under the law, those power sources are inter-dependent, and there is not one center that is much more powerful in comparison to the others

Rationalism: opposite is incrementalism, based on the belief that problems can be rationally and logically identified, so solutions are based on all information available and analyses of alternatives. This approach makes sense to stakeholders, i.e., a technical problem deserves a technical solution.

Incrementalism allows for partial, politically acceptable changes in public policy, not usually comprehensive ones

Equity: usually means the use of public resources to redistribute public resources to satisfying disparities; involves two stages—a disadvantage or other measure of the gap between the norms of social life and the needs of citizens in public services, then public resources are applied through programs to close the gap between norm and need

Efficiency: Appears in two forms: economic: the effort to minimize costs while maximizing gains to optimize program performance; as an accountability form by mandating of those means by which superiors in an authority system can oversee and hence control their subordinates' exercise of power and responsibility.

Actors/Influence: Those who are involved in the policy process, as measured by their distance from the traditional policy makers, the primary group of actors are the insiders, near circle, far circle, sometimes players, and oft-forgotten players

Quality: public policy matches the public view, involves two-stage behavior: First, the state will mandate the need for certain standards of 'excellence' or 'proficiency', or 'superior ability', then, in order to achieve these standards, public resources are applied across districts, or within districts across schools, with typically uneven distribution of resources.

Choice: The presence of a range of options for action, as well as the ability to select a preferred option, a mandate that offers education stakeholders the opportunity either to make policy decisions or to reject them.

D.5 Key State Policy Event Chronologies: TEXAS

Date/Name	Content	What Office (Inner Circle)	Near Circle	Other Actors
1979 – Senate Bill 350 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • school finance reform • Texas Assessment of Basic Skills (TABs) implemented statewide • redirection of compensatory education program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • legislation enacted to make school finance more equitable • statewide basic skills assessment program was implemented to measure student achievement • districts required to use student performance data from state-mandated tests and implement compensatory education services • districts held accountable for local use of state compensatory education money 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature 		
1981 – House Bill 246	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • established first statewide curriculum in Texas • 12 subject areas intended to provide a well-balanced curriculum through Grade 12 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor W. Clements • State Board of Education 		
June 1983 – SCOPE Resolution adopted	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • established the Select Committee On Public Education (SCOPE) to undertake a comprehensive study of the state’s public education system (Ross Perot, governor- appointed Chair) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Mark White • Texas Legislature 		
July 1984 – House Bill 72: The Educational Opportunity Act of 1984 enactment of SCOPE recommendations (the Perot Reform)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • statewide student testing with provision for data collection • 22-1 class size • “no pass - no play” in high school • teacher testing - caused “major dust-up” (according to TSTA) • improvements in school funding • began 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old programs in early childhood education • mandated reduced class size in first three years of schooling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Mark White • SCOPE, Ross Perot, Chair • Texas Legislature • chair, Senate Education Committee • chair, House Education Committee 		

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> transformed teacher education by restricting amount of pedagogy taught in a teacher preparation program to 12 hours plus student teaching instituted “draconian” requirements around teacher time - attempted to micro-manage teacher behavior (President, University of Texas, Pan American) created Career Ladder - required continuous education - since done away with (source: Miller) set up Legislative Education Board (lieutenant governor, speaker, chairs of senate and house education committees) over the State Board of Education, [LEB later dissolved] set up accountability system with check and balances from 3 levels, LEB at top, then SBOE, then commissioner and TEA. 			
1985 – TEAMS implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills implemented administered to students in odd-numbered grades 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Legislature 		
1987 – Referendum on Election of State Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> overwhelming support for a permanently elected Board from public 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Perot Governor 		
1990-91 – Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> introduction of a new accountability system TAAS replaces TEAMS (Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills) new criterion-referenced program AEIS district and school reports replace previous annual reports high stakes for educators and students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Governor Ann Richards State legislature Commissioner of Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Texas Business Education Coalition 	
1990 – Senate Bill 1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> shift to site-based management shift away from principal as administrator to principal as leader of local campus decision-making committees on all school campuses consisting of teachers, administrator, parents, community and business members (site councils) during Richard’s tenure, Texas instituted site-based decision-making in its public schools 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Senate passed legislation enacted by Governor Richards 		

1991 – Appointment of Commissioner of Education by Governor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • governor appoints, for the first time, the Commissioner of Education (Lionel ‘Skip’ Meno) • new law grants the commissioner rulemaking authority 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Richards • previously Commissioner of Education was appointed by the State Board of Education (SBOE) 		
1992 – Texas Scholars Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides statewide incentive for students to complete the high school curriculum • model for new statewide high school curriculum - Recommended High School Program (1993) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioner of Education Meno • endorsed by State Board of Education • Texas Business and Education Coalition (TBEC) 		
1993 – Recommended High School Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • one of three high school graduation plans (others are Minimum Requirements and Distinguished Achievement Program) • follows TBEC’s Texas Scholars Program 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texas State Board of Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBEC 	
1992-93 – TAAS expansion/transition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAAS transitioned from fall to spring testing program • expanded to include grades 3-8 in reading and math • writing test moved to grades 4 and 8 • exit level test moved from grade 11 to grade 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBEC 	
1993 – Senate Bill 7, part 1: “Robin Hood” School Finance Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aimed at equalizing funding for Texas public schools - declared unconstitutional by state court in Sept 2004 • Texas Supreme Court had ruled in May, 1991 that the previous funding system was unconstitutional - SB 7 was a response to this 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Richards • Senate Education Committee • Texas Legislature 		
1993 – Senate Bill 7, part 2: new statewide-integrated accountability system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creation of new state-wide accountability system including ratings of campuses and districts • inclusion of TAAS in accountability system • public release of performance results • TAAS - exit-level requirement for graduation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Legislature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBEC 	
1993 – Legislation on Principal Certification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • requires principals to have their professional knowledge and skills assessed every 3 years • followed by policy for a PD program that targeted areas that needed PD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBEC 	

1994 – Texas Learning Index	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • aligns passing standards at grades 3-8 with standard being established at exit level • helps districts determine if students yearly progress is sufficient to meet minimum expectations on exit level reading and math tests in grade 10 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Board of Education 		
1995 – Senate Bill 1: Texas Education Code (rewritten)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increased local control over education process • authorized charter schools, home schools and ability of parents to transfer children out of low-performing schools • established licensing board for educators, State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) • increased minimum salaries for beginning teachers and those with more than 20 years of experience • provided increased district funding, new standards for local tax administration, the Tax Assessment Practices Board, and state equalization for poor districts • required mandatory course costs (including textbooks, fees, etc) be paid by the school districts • reduced in-service and preparation time from 10 days to 8. • established two new committees - one to supervise tax assessment practices and one to develop a revised model for financing state public education programs • created curriculum and listed what had to be in curriculum by law • increased Commissioner’s powers - reduced powers of SBOE, e.g., no longer authority over TEA (G. Miller, SBOE) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Bush • Legislature 		
1995 – Edgewood IV: Edgewood vs. Meno - Texas Supreme Court	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texas Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Senate Bill 7, the Robin Hood system for school finance - judged it was “not unconstitutional for districts to supplement their program with local funds even if such funds are unmatched by the state” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texas Supreme Court • Edgewood ISD • Commissioner of Education 		
1995 – Texas Principals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • created by an education and business coalition and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioner Mike Moses 		

Leadership Initiative (TPLI)	approved in 1995 by the state Education Commissioner, provides assessment driven professional development for Texas principals.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texas Business and Education Coalition • 2 principal associations 		
1996-2005 – Texas Reading Initiative [early intervention program] - reaffirmed 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bush challenged Texas educators to get all third graders reading on grade level or higher by the end of 3rd grade - initiative used assessments for targeting children’s reading skills; provided research-based information to educators; targeted professional development (K-3 teachers received PD beginning with K teachers in 1999; principals also received PD on methods of reading instruction); and aimed to increase parent involvement. • Reaffirmed and supported by Governor Perry with 6 components: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • early reading assessments • accelerated reading instruction • teacher reading academies • administrator overviews • snapshot of local district • TEKS (Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor George W. Bush • Governor Perry continues to support this initiative • Texas Legislature 		
1999 – Senate 103 - TAKS (assessment) and TEKS (curriculum)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • begins developing more rigorous testing program, TAKS - Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills (TAKS), to be aligned to new student learning standards, the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) • TAAS to be phased out by 2002 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Bush • Senate Committee on Education • House Committee on Public Education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Business community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implemented by Texas Education Agency in 2001/2002 • State Board of Education
1999 – Student Success Initiative - House Bill 4: Texas Education Code, Chapter 39 and 28: TAKS / TEKS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bill ends social promotion - at 11th grade students will have to pass TAKS to receive high school diploma - students in grades 3 (reading), 5 and 8 (reading and math) must demonstrate proficiency on state assessments and achieve passing grades to advance to next grade • legislature appropriated \$82 million over a 4-year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Bush • House Committee on Public Education • Commissioner of Education 		

	<p>period to help fund reading academies. Gov. Bush: “Texas leads the nation when it comes to improving public schools. We are raising standards, strengthening accountability and funding early intervention so that every child learns to read and no child is left behind.”</p>			
<p>1999 – HB 713 Texas Gateway to the Future Grant Program and Teach for Texas Pilot Program - alternative teacher certification</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Toward Excellence, Access, & Success (TEXAS) grant program - legislation for financial aid, grant and scholarship programs to encourage more students into higher education • Teach for Texas Pilot Program provides grant money to students in teacher-training programs in areas where shortage has been designated by SBE and authorizes development of alternative certification programs (subject to SBEC verification) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature 		
<p>2001 – Senate Bill 218: Amendment to Education Code (Chapter 39.201-204) to establish fiscal accountability system</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establishes the nation’s first public school fiscal accountability system, beginning with 2003-04 school year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Perry • Senate Education Committee • Texas Legislature • Joint Select Committee on Public School Finance 		
<p>2001 – House Bill 6: Charter School Reform Bill</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • placed restrictions on methods of operation for charter schools • capped number of open enrollment schools at 215 • gave Commissioner of Education power to close charter schools that endanger the safety, health or welfare of students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texas Legislature 		
<p>2001 – House Bill 1144: - Texas Math Initiative - Recommended High School Program</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • supported improved math instruction in grades 5-8 through teacher Professional Development - patterned after Texas Reading Initiative • recommended High School Program mandated for all students - to take effect beginning with Grade 9 students in 2004-05 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Perry • Texas Legislature 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • implemented by TEA
<p>September 2002 – Legislative</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • teacher shortage crisis addressed - research showed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Senate Committee on 		

Report -report on the study of teacher education shortage	number of teachers had doubled, yet more were uncertified than certified; 40% of teachers who left the profession did so within the first five years of teaching	Education		
2002-2003 – TAKS (becomes statewide assessment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAKS field-tested across state - last administration of TAAS • TAKS becomes new statewide assessment program replacing TAAS • exit level test for high school graduation moved to 11th grade from 10th 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texas Education Authority 		
2003-present – Vouchers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • since 2003, several attempts to create “virtual charter schools” - voucher program for home-schooled students 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Speaker of the House • Lieutenant-Governor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CEO America • Texas Public Policy Foundation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coalition for Public Schools opposed • Texas Freedom Network opposed
2004-2005 – Recommended High School Program - legislation takes effect	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • all students beginning with Grade 9 students in 2004/05 to begin high school with a plan to complete the state’s Recommended High School Program - also requires Personal Graduation Plan for students who fail TAKS • enactment of 2001/ HB 1144 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioner of Education • Texas Business and Education Coalition 		
2004 – new state accountability system	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • new state accountability ratings for schools and districts • includes dropout rate in 7th and 8th grade, graduation rate in grades 9 through 12, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texas Education Agency 		
2004-2005 – Lawsuits over funding	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • three groups of school boards have taken the state to court over funding - judge found in favor of school districts - appealed to Texas Supreme Court • In November 2005, Texas Supreme Court ruled that the tax structure currently funding public schools is unconstitutional and set deadline of June 1 2006 for state to fix the problem of face school closures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texas Supreme Court • West Orange-Cove Plaintiffs (47 districts) • Edgewood Intervenors and Alvarado Intervenors (282 districts) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commissioner • Legislature 	
2005 – House Bill 2: School Finance Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase education spending • mandates that schools spend minimum of 65% of budget on classroom instruction - 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Rick Perry (called special session of legislature) • State Legislature: Public 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Texas Public Policy Foundation

- defeated July 26 2005		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education Committee • Senate Education Committee • Conference Committee 		reports vigorous opposition from school district administrators
2005 – House Bill 3: School Finance - defeated July 26 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower school property taxes offset by higher sales and business taxes • expected results to be tax breaks for highest-earning Texans and tax increases for lower earners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Rick Perry (called special session of legislature) • State Legislature: Public Education Committee • Senate Education Committee 		
2005 – Senate Bill 8 - Public School Reform - introduced after SB 2 pulled - hearing Monday August 1 2005	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB 8 offered as a compromise after SB 2 pulled amid opposition from educator groups • lower school property taxes • increases in teacher salaries • incentives to teachers to reward academic achievement • increased accountability measures for schools and charter schools (responsibility for academic performance) and districts (links financial health with academic performance) • rate schools on ability to prepare students for post-secondary success • increase funding for new facilities • requires districts spend 65% of available funds on instruction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair of Senate Committee on Education • Senate Committee on Education • Lt. Governor 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBEC opposed - “reforms should be set aside for now” and agreement worked on in Legislature for a basic funding package (Exec. Director, TBEC) • education groups opposed including TASA, Superintendents 	
2005-present – Expected focus on leadership Development for principals and superintendents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expected to be a focus in 2005 legislature • Commissioner expects to be given more authority to remove principals and superintendents in poorly performing schools/districts • hopes for increased funding for competitive salaries and compensation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislature • Governor’s Business Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TBEC • TPPF 	

Dimensions of Political Culture	Framework for Analyzing State Political Culture: Texas
Openness (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • large number of coalition groups from business and education communities are consulted on a regular basis - business community drives much of the reform agenda - e.g., TBEC, TBC considered influential in getting Recommended High School Program enacted - Governor’s Business Council (100 CEOs from state corporations, businesses) more influential currently than TBEC - • elected State Board of Education had more influence and power after Educational Opportunity Act of 1984 - effectively sidelined by the rewritten Texas Education Code of 1995 - now more of an advisory role - but according to G. Miller (SBOE) “the state Board is unique in this area, where we are really the body of people that the citizens - parents, students, teachers ... we are accessible, in other words.” [if SBOE has been sidelined, have these citizens been sidelined as well?] • education groups and organizations (teacher unions, administrator and superintendent organizations, coalitions) are frequently consulted - unclear whether key legislators and Commissioner are influenced • Legislature, in response to opposition from educator groups to House Bills 2 and 3 (2005, special second session), defeated both bills in the House (July 26, 2005)
Decentralism (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fairly centralized - top-down system in legislature although interests of business community considered influential • Governor Rick Perry exercises control over state bureaucracy: by appointing Commissioner of Education, control over the policy direction of the Texas Education Agency; control over licensure issues by virtue of appointing members of State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) • Speaker of House and Lieutenant Governor - some control of legislature (although not able to get vouchers, which they both support, passed legislature) • Governor consults with Governor’s Business Council - 100 CEOs of state businesses • business plays a major role especially in area of finance - difficult to move tax legislation around business issues - problem for getting resolution to school finance issue • some key Republicans supported by far-right and religious-right fundraisers - e.g., James Leininger considered influential in moving policies through current leadership (supports school vouchers, privatization) • Texas Business and Education Coalition formed in 1989 - was very influential in the 1990s - may not be

	conservative enough for current leadership - opposes vouchers, privatization
Rationalism (E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Robin Hood School Finance Plan - comprehensive change in distribution of funds to districts intended to equalize funding for public schools - previously tremendous disparities in what school districts were spending per child on schools. • The Educational Opportunity Act of 1984 (follows from SCOPE report, also called Perot Report) - major rewrite of policy - led to first statewide student testing and data collection, reduced class size (20 or 22-1?), “no pass-no play” in high school, and teacher testing (Texas Examination of Current Administrators and Teachers); created 3 levels of governance - 1) Legislative Education Board (lieutenant-governor, speaker, chair of House education committee, chair of Senate education committee), 2) State Board Of Education with enhanced authority, then 3) commissioner and TEA; established Teacher Career Ladder (salary supplements from level 2 or higher on ladder, advancement based on local assessment, required PD and years of service), which was eliminated in 1993-94. • Texas Education Code of 1995 changed governance (dissolved LEB, Commissioner answerable to Governor, SBOE authority curtailed); authorized charter schools; established State Board of Educator Certification (licensing board); increased teacher salaries; increased district funding; reduced in-service and prep time; new standards for taxation and equalization.
Egalitarianism/ Equity (E, G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Robin Hood” School Finance Plan - 1993 - equalized funding for public schools - declared constitutional in 1995 by supreme court in Edgewood vs. Meno - but declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court in December 2005 - legislature has until October 2005 to remedy system - current school finance and reform crisis in Legislature • school finance has been controversial issue for decades - funding plans have been declared unconstitutional several times in state Supreme Court • Texas Business Education Coalition - adopted a recommendation “that was as forceful on issues of equity as it was on effectiveness” (President, Univ. of Texas, Pan American) • high-wealth districts do a better job of coalescing around business issues than do low-wealth districts
Efficiency (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • economic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ school finance and accountability is hot button issue in state ○ many attempts to get vouchers enacted have narrowly failed in the legislation ○ “If you ask any legislator now, they’ll tell you the number one issue this time, is school finance and school reform. In other words, we don’t mind paying, but we want more education for our money, not more money

	<p>for education... It's all about accountability." (S. Neeley, Commissioner).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Governor Perry, July 26, 2005 "The people demand property tax relief, more education for their money, and continued classroom reforms." ○ "But it's really difficult... I call it the 'rising tide of standards,' but there's no funding for the new standards." "The state passed the standards... Unless they want to back off them, they've got to fund them." (P. Forgione, Superintendent, Austin ISD) ● accountability <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1984: legislated teacher testing ○ state collects extensive amount of data on each school district currently attempts in Legislature to require TEA to link districts' financial health with academic performance ○ to improve quality of leadership - push from several groups (Texas Public Policy Foundation, TBEC, GBC, TBC, etc) and in the legislature to give Commissioner of Education more authority to remove or close down low performing schools, to remove poorly performing principals and superintendents (source: Commissioner of Education) ○ State Board for Educator Certification has been under review in the 2005 legislature for the second time in 2 years - Legislature "wasn't pleased with them, so they're back under review," according to Commissioner of Education - included in the current session's House Bill 2, just defeated in the Legislature, was a provision to abolish the SBEC, replace it with the Educators' Professional Practices Board which, along with the commissioner, will be able to impose sanctions on teachers - commissioner would then govern the certification of teachers and their continuing education (from TSTA website, July 21, 2005) ○ "When they shifted over to the new accountability, which really went into effect in 2003, the problem was they didn't send any new resources with it. And they really didn't give us the time to get ready for science in fifth grade. So, the new dynamic is feeling much less comfortable because it doesn't feel fair." (P. Forgione, Austin ISD) ○ Proposed 2005 legislation (SB 8) offers salary increases to teachers but a portion of this would be in the form of incentives tied to improving student performance. ○ Annual Yearly Progress targets must be met by schools and districts (result of NCLB) ○ State Board of Education - sets cut-off scores for state tests (pass rate) ○ requirement for a PGP (Personal Graduation Plan) for students who fail any part of the state tests (but unfunded according to Forgione, Austin ISD)
Actors/	Inner Circle:

Influence (M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Governor Rick Perry • Lieutenant Governor David Dewhurst (may have more influence in Legislature than governor - Forgione, Austin ISD) • Speaker of the House Tom Craddick (very conservative) • Speaker- and Lieutenant Governor-appointed public education committees, tax writing committees • Chair of Appropriations • Senate Committee on Education (Sen. F. Shapiro, Chair) • House Committee on Public Education (Rep. K. Grusendorf, Chair) • State Comptroller (Carol Keaton Rylander Strayhorn) - does some state audits of school districts - wants more accountability • Governor-appointed Commissioner of Education (Shirley Neeley) - heads Texas Education Agency - most influential in terms of implementation of legislative policy • Governor-appointed Commissioner of Higher Education <p>Near circle: (most coalitions and councils will generate legislative agendas/platforms)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State Board of Education - elected members - less power after 1995 - they do grant charters, set curriculum (within parameters of legislation), cut-offs for state testing • Texas Education Reform Caucus (non-profit formed by Rep. Grusendorf, chair of the House Committee on Public Education - influential with House Committee on Public Education • Governor's Business Council (GBC) - made up of 100 CEOs, managing directors, presidents of state businesses - advise and counsel in the development and implementation of various initiatives, e.g., the Governor's reading initiative, the Charter School Resource Center. Also studied school accountability system, use of advanced placement courses, elimination of social promotion and increased use of technology in public schools - direct access to governor and his policy people (Charles Miller, Chair, Education Committee, GBC) • Texas Business Council (TBC) • Texas Business and Education Coalition (TBEC) created in 1989 - brought business executives and education leaders together in long-term effort to improve school system - less influential than in early 1990s when it was more prominent according to Exec. Director, John Stevens - "The problem is, when the Republicans took over, even though it's a business group, you know, they're not conservative enough. You know, they don't believe in vouchers, in privatization" (Forgione, Superintendent, Austin ISD).
---------------	--

- Commissioner's Cabinet of Superintendents (advisory) - 20 regional centers across Texas - each region elects one superintendent to represent their region - meets with Commissioner of Education regularly through the year
- Commissioner's Focus Group
- Commissioner's Accountability Committee
- Education Commissioner's Steering Committee (advisory?)
- Governor-appointed State Board for Educator Certification (11 voting members for a 6-year term: 4 classroom teachers, 1 counselor, 2 administrators, and 4 citizens; 3 non-voting members also serve on the Board: 1 dean of a college of education is appointed by the Governor; 1 staff member of the Texas Education Agency is appointed by the Commissioner of Education; and 1 staff member of the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board is appointed by the Commissioner of Higher Education) - implements policy around educator certification - under threat in current Legislative session
- James Leininger, CEO San Antonio and Texas Public Policy Foundation - he is a major fundraiser and bankroller for the social conservatives and, in particular, the voucher movement - with Republican sweep of legislature in 2000 became very mainstream - influential in moving policies through current leadership - generally active in whole policy area - anti-tax, pro-voucher [not sure where to put Leininger and his organizations - perhaps only sometimes players?] (source: Kouri, TSTA)
- Sandy Curtis - was educational adviser to then-governor Bush - may still advise Bush on education - may still work in the background in Texas

Far circle: (unclear how far in or out?)

- Coalition to Invest in Texas Schools - coalition of 11 organizations (TASA, TASB, Equity Center, South Texas Association of Schools, Texas Association of Community Schools, Texas School Alliance, Texas School Coalition, Texas Association of Rural School, etc.) lobbies legislature - concern with funding issues, anti-vouchers
- Texas Association of School Boards (TASB) - hired a former Lieutenant Governor (Senator Rutliff) to lobby on their behalf.
- Texas Elementary Principals and Supervisors Association (TEPSA)
- Texas Association of Secondary School Principals (TASSP)
- Texas State Teachers Association (TSTA)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teachers of the Year - about 20 secondary and 20 elementary teachers who meet with Commissioner of Education <p>Sometimes players:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • school district coalitions around property wealth (one such coalition pushed the legal challenge that had current system declared unconstitutional) • PTA “nominally involved” according to TSTA • Coalition for Public Schools - anti-voucher network • Texas Freedom Network - anti-voucher network • James Leininger, founder of CEO San Antonio (CEO America)- raises private funds to students to go to private schools - heavily financed key political races in the state • Texas Public Policy Foundation - also founded by James Leininger - extremely right-wing think-tank - became mainstream after 2000 Republican sweep of Texas legislature - influential in bringing issues to the table - generally anti-tax, pro-voucher • League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) - oppose vouchers • Intercultural Development Research Association - oppose vouchers
Quality (G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • first statewide student testing legislated in 1984 - 1990-1993 TAAS (Texas Assessment of Academic Skills) developed and phased in • currently TAKS (Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills) proficiency required for advancement to next grade level and high school graduation • TAKS aligned with TEKS (Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills) curriculum standards - a “very aggressive reform agenda... based on state standards called the TEKS... The new TAKS is much more rigorous - I would say it’s twice as hard [as TAAS accountability system]” (Forgione, Austin ISD) • TAKS had 2-year phase-in - much more accelerated than previous system - highest stakes for high school level - concern from Texas State Teachers Association that impact will be to increase the dropout rate • current focus on teacher licensure/certification - 53,000 classrooms have inappropriately certified teachers (out of 295,000) - have been attempts to create “instant certification” legislation - have greatly expanded alternative certification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ in 1995, lifetime certification was stopped - after 1999, 5-year renewable certificates that required continuing professional education

- PD linked to accountability: Texas Reading Initiative involved an extensive training program starting in 1996 for K-3 teachers in area of reading, prior to implementing provision requiring TAKS proficiency in reading for promotion to Grade 4 - phonics-based curriculum required
- in 2001, similar program launched, Texas Math Initiative providing extensive training in math instruction for middle grade teachers (4-7?)
- many school district superintendents' contracts are tied to district accountability rating
- focus for 2005 legislative session is on student learning and narrowing achievement gap according to Commissioner Neeley
- Student Success Initiative focuses on dropout issue - state has had little success to date according to G. Miller (SBOE)
- Recommended High School Program now required for all high school students moving up the system - focus on preparation for college
- P-16 Initiative (Pre-kindergarten to 16) - "Our P-16 is a model for the nation." (Commissioner of Education)
- State Board for Educator Certification has been under review in the 2005 legislature for the second time in 2 years - Legislature "wasn't pleased with them, so they're back under review," according to Commissioner of Education - included in the current session's House Bill 2, just defeated in the Legislature, was a provision to abolish the SBEC, replace it with the Educators' Professional Practices Board which, along with the Commissioner, would be able to impose sanctions on teachers - commissioner would then govern the certification of teachers and their continuing education (from TSTA website, July 21, 2005) - appears to have been dropped from SB 8, the Senate's latest attempt at school funding and reform
- proposed Senate Bill 8 (2005, second special session) includes incentive programs for employees who are successful in improving student performance - recently defeated House Bill 2 would have made it state policy that a local district only pay above the state minimum salary schedule based on a teacher's ability to improve student performance.
- it is expected that new legislation will put resources into developing principal leadership - currently a shortage of Principals and Superintendents (source: S. Neeley, Commissioner) - not included in 2005 legislation now under debate
- to enhance educator leadership - PD is required for Board members as well as for Principals, Superintendents and Teachers
- problem with NCLB accountability system - does not align with Texas' system around alternative assessments

	<p>for special education and limited English proficiency students (capped at 1% in NCLB) - many districts appear to have 7 or 8% failure rates - schools that are exemplary under state accountability system do not meet AYP under federal system.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • misalignment between NCLB and state on defining “highly qualified” teachers - qualified, experienced teachers may not fit NCLB definition of qualified while another individual who enrolls in alternative certification program is immediately “qualified” by virtue of enrollment. • issue of NCLB mandate around special education - according to Exec Director of TBEC, school administrators feel federal government has made demands on local school districts without providing adequate resources - attention and resources that must be devoted to educating special ed student far exceeds that devoted to regular student - difficult to balance • Princeton Review ranked Texas 3rd best in nation on its accountability system - according to Commissioner Neeley, state “continues to raise the bar every year.” • one attempt to legislate continuing education for teachers failed - created Texas Teacher Career Ladder under HB 72 in 1984 - required continuing education and evaluation by administrators or peers to advance a level and receive raise in salary - repealed by legislature in 1992-93 - apparently originally supported by teacher unions but once legislated, they opposed it (Source: G. Miller, Chair, SBOE) • grades and performance levels rising since 1983-84 (Miller, SBOE) • SBOE sets minimum curriculum and cut-off scores for state tests - “broad policy” (Miller, SBOE) • to improve quality of leadership - push from several groups (Texas Public Policy Foundation, TBEC, GBC, TBC, etc) and in the legislature to give Commissioner of Education more authority to remove or close down low performing schools, to remove poorly performing principals and superintendents (source: Commissioner of Education)
Choice (M)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • charter schools have been in existence since 1995 - perhaps a reflection of the change in Texas from Democratic to Republican leadership (noted by K. Reed, President, Texas Association of School Boards) • several attempts made in the Legislature for approval of school voucher program in the past 10 years - most recent attempt (May 2005) narrowly turned down - several groups and coalitions lobby around issue of vouchers - many business groups , Texas Public Policy Forum, Governor’s Business Council and so on, are in favor; Coalition for Public Schools, Texas Freedom Network, League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), Intercultural Development Research Association are opposed.

- | | |
|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Commissioner on issue of charters, vouchers and choice - “If you’re doing a good job in the public schools, you have no reason to fear choice.” “If we’re doing the right thing and meeting the needs of the children we serve, why would they want to go anywhere else?” “We have always had choice, unless you are in a tiny district that only has one elementary, one middle, and one high school.”• according to Commissioner of Education, the Governor, Lieutenant-Governor and leadership have chosen to focus on principal leadership in the next legislative session. |
|--|--|

D.6 SUMMARY: State Political Cultures					
Policy Culture	Texas	Missouri	Oregon	Mississippi	New Mexico
Openness: broad availability of political participation	Policy making process is not very open. Small group of bureaucrats have most influence. Business coalitions such as Governor's Business Council drive much of the reform agenda. Other groups such as teacher unions and administrator organizations play a reactive but still influential role, as when educator groups opposed and effectively defeated two house bills. Opportunities for citizen input were drastically reduced by the 1995 Texas Education Code.	Lacks clear mechanisms for participation of new groups; only a few tenacious organizations end up having a role.	Many opportunities for community input; active, grassroots organizations.	Few direct opportunities; agencies solicit grassroots input.	Bi-partisan involvement; LESC holds meetings all over state; Business Roundtable collaborates; university faculty work on accountability reports; NM professional assoc. input in Governor's Council of Teachers.
Decentralization: distributed power sources; no one center	Centralized, top-down policy making process. Governor exercises control over state bureaucracy by appointing commissioner of education, as well as	Substantial discretion left to districts. Senate Bill 380 (1993) left curriculum and professional development	State controls funding, but other policies emerge from coalitions of groups.	Relatively permanent elite; key individuals sometimes reappear.	Finance and policy are centralized; most initiatives from governor/legislature.

	<p>members of state board for educator certification. Governor influences policy direction of the Texas Education Agency (Texas' state department of education). Texas business and education coalition formed in 1989 - was very influential in the 1990s but may not be conservative enough for current leadership - opposes vouchers, privatization.</p>	<p>standards to districts. Only in 2005 did the state take over accountability reporting.</p>			
<p>Rationalism: policies based on logical/rational comprehensive solutions to problems</p>	<p>Comprehensive education reform agenda has not materialized, probably due to emphasis on efficiency and to the small number of groups with power to craft policy.</p>	<p>Policy making is logical but piecemeal.</p>	<p>Policy making is aims at comprehensive solutions; policy implementation is more incremental.</p>	<p>Public Education Forum (independent business group) recently instrumental in problem analysis; has close ties to state agencies and legislature.</p>	<p>Prior to 2003, limited; Since 2003, efforts to create comprehensive (integrated finance, accountability, professional development) solutions.</p>

<p>Egalitarianism: policies redistribute resources to minimize disparities</p>	<p>Equal access to education hotly contested for decades. “Robin Hood” School Finance Plan in 1993 equalized funding for public schools, declared constitutional in 1995 by Texas Supreme Court, then declared unconstitutional by Supreme Court in December 2005. Currently under debate in Texas legislature. Focus for 2005 legislative session is on student learning and narrowing achievement gap.</p>	<p>Decades-long struggle over racial segregation.</p>	<p>Although the state is open to many voices, the unequal funding is a source of unresolved conflict.</p>	<p>Low funding/high inequity; recent increases are not supported by Governor Barbour.</p>	<p>finance equalization; major equity issue is Native American education.</p>
<p>Efficiency: economic cost-benefits and optimization of policy performance</p>	<p>Accountability very hot button issue in state. Many attempts to get vouchers enacted have narrowly failed. Currently attempts in Legislature to link district funding with academic performance. Proposed 2005</p>	<p>Tight fiscal control (traditional), recent reliance on test scores for quality measure.</p>	<p>Legislature permits districts to create own an assessment system linked to state standards; requires a uniform chart</p>	<p>Anti-union sentiments + merit pay proposals, emphasis on strict accountability through testing and reducing costs.</p>	<p>state acct. system predates NCLB; increased emphasis on business-based models; efficiency led to reorganization (elected Supt/Board to appt.); strong assessment div. In Dept. of Public</p>

	<p>legislation (SB 8) offers salary increases to teachers but a portion of this would be in the form of incentives tied to improving student performance. Many school district superintendents' contracts are tied to district accountability rating. Currently push from several groups (Texas Public Policy Foundation, TBEC, GBC, TBC, etc) and in the legislature to give Commissioner of Education more authority to remove or close down low performing schools, to remove poorly performing principals and superintendents.</p>		<p>of accounts of the school budgeting process.</p>		<p>Instruc.</p>
<p>Quality: policies establish standards and resources are allocated to meet standards</p>	<p>Emphasis on testing as quality measure. Sanctions against teachers proposed as quality levers. Current</p>	<p>Voluntary until recently; assessment standards established in</p>	<p>Heavy focus on quality with CIM/CAM and state</p>	<p>Strong emphasis on improving quality since 1982.</p>	<p>Low salaries/professionalism resulted in increased attn.; eval. Mandatory;</p>

	<p>focus on teacher licensure/certification - 53,000 classrooms have inappropriately certified teachers (out of 295,000) - have been attempts to create “instant certification” legislation - have greatly expanded alternative certification. In tandem with sanctions, recent legislation provides targeted professional development for teachers in particular subjects and grade levels.</p>	<p>1993 Outstanding Schools Initiative; emphasis on test scores.</p>	<p>report cards; little change since NCLB.</p>		<p>monitoring of weak performance (Quality Assurance Bureau).</p>
<p>Choice: range of options available; opportunity to make policy decisions at multiple levels.</p>	<p>Moderate choice available to policy makers. While the quality of the education is generally addressed through accountability measures such as testing, teacher sanctions and dismissal of administrators of underachieving schools, the option of increasing quality through professional</p>	<p>Use of parochial schools in urban areas; little emphasis on policies to promote choice.</p>	<p>Little talk in Oregon about school choice.</p>	<p>Local choice involves decisions about casinos to fund education, and voluntary participation in Barksdale Reading Initiative; current governor (Barbour) in favor of</p>	<p>Schools are chartered by NM PDE; not a major policy issue.</p>

	development is exploited as well. There is a debate about the proper amount of choice for citizens, with the influential actors promoting school vouchers.			vouchers.	
--	--	--	--	-----------	--

Appendix E: Comparing Policy Levers

	Texas	Missouri	Oregon	Mississippi	New Mexico
Mandate	<p>1984 Educational Opportunity Legislated teacher testing</p> <p>1995 Texas Education Code sidelined the 1984 Educational Opportunity Act</p> <p>1985/ TEAMS implementation</p> <p>1990-91/ Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS)</p> <p>1993/ Senate Bill 7, part 2: new statewide-integrated accountability system</p> <p>1994/ Texas Learning Index</p>	<p>1980: Court-ordered Desegregation State of Missouri required to pay half of the cost</p> <p>2001, Accountability: One step ahead of NCLB, legislation required the reporting of virtually all educational statistics at the building level.</p> <p>2003 legislation aligned MO state tests with NAEP</p>	<p>1991 “Measure 5”: property tax limit shifts funding to state - Legislatively initiated; no ODE involvement</p> <p>1999 School Report Card</p> <p>1999 – Teacher and Administrator Mentor Act</p> <p>2003 Teacher/Administrator Mentoring Act; Revised mastery standards</p> <p>1993 – "Bringing Oregon Schools into the 21st Century"</p>	<p>1982: Mississippi Educational Reform Act</p> <p>1997: School Executive Management Institute</p> <p>1997: Reading Sufficiency Act</p> <p>2000: New accountability standards (SB 2488)</p>	<p>2003 / School Reform Act: House Bill 212</p> <p>2003 / House Bill 745 - Limit School District Cash Balances</p> <p>2005/ ongoing work from 2003/ House Bill 212</p>

	<p>1995/ Senate Bill 1: Texas Education Code (rewritten)</p> <p>1999/ Senate 103 – TAKS (assessment) and TEKS (curriculum)</p> <p>1999/ Student Success Initiative - House Bill 4: Texas Education Code, Chapter 39 and 28: TAKS / TEKS</p> <p>2001/ Senate Bill 218: Amendment to Education Code</p> <p>2001/ House Bill 6: Charter School Reform Bill</p>				
Inducements	<p>1992/ Texas Scholars Program</p> <p>1995/ Senate Bill 1: Texas Education</p>	n/a	n/a	<p>1982: Mississippi Educational Reform Act</p> <p>1997: Mississippi</p>	<p>1974 Public Schools Finance Act: finance equalization</p>

	<p>Code (rewritten)</p> <p>1996 - 2005 / Texas Reading Initiative [early intervention program]</p> <p>1999/ Student Success Initiative - House Bill 4: Texas Education Code, Chapter 39 and 28: TAKS / TEKS</p>			<p>Adequate Education Pact</p> <p>1997: Reading Sufficiency Act</p> <p>1998: Critical Shortage Act</p> <p>19??: National Board for Certification of Teachers</p>	<p>2003 / School Reform Act: House Bill 212</p> <p>Constitutional Amendment 2 (2003)</p> <p>2005/ ongoing work from 2003/ House Bill 212</p>
Capacity-Building	<p>1993/ Senate Bill 7, part 1: “Robin Hood” School Finance Plan</p> <p>1995/ Edgewood IV: Edgewood vs. Meno - Texas Supreme Court</p> <p>1995/ Texas Principals Leadership Initiative (TPLI)</p> <p>1996 - 2005 / Texas Reading Initiative [early intervention program]</p>	<p>1993: Senate Bill 380 Outstanding Schools Initiative: 1% of DOE budget for professional development, statewide assessment standards, revised funding formula</p> <p>Leadership Academy for Administrators: 1988</p> <p>Strengthening/ Changing Teacher Certification – Year not specified</p>	<p>1989 – State established “intermediate school districts” ESDs</p>	<p>1992: Sales tax increase to fund education</p> <p>1997: Mississippi Adequate Education Pact</p> <p>1997: School Executive Management Institute</p> <p>1997: Reading Sufficiency Act</p>	<p>2003 / School Reform Act: House Bill 212</p> <p>2005/ ongoing from 2003/ House Bill 212 - may lead to additional legislation</p> <p>2005 /Pre-K Initiative/ HB 337a Full-day Kindergarten</p>

<p>System Change</p>	<p>1984 Educational Opportunity Act resulted in more influence for the elected State Board of Education, primary access point for citizen input in policy process.</p> <p>1990-91: Senate Bill 1</p> <p>1991/ Appointment of Commissioner of Education</p> <p>1995/ Senate Bill 1: Texas Education Code (rewritten)</p> <p>2001/ House Bill 6: Charter School Reform Bill</p>	<p>2005 House Bill 297, School Accountability Report Cards: shifts accountability reporting from districts to state</p>	<p>1989 – State established “intermediate school districts” ESDs</p> <p>2003 – Education Service Districts; overall funding tweaked Due to funding changes</p> <p>1991 – Measure Five</p> <p>1993 –"Bringing Oregon Schools into the 21st Century"</p> <p>1995 – Tweaked “Brining Oregon into the 21st Century” Added the Certificate of Initial Mastery and Certificate of Advanced Mastery</p>	<p>1997: Mississippi Adequate Education Pact</p> <p>2000: New accountability standards (SB 2488)</p>	<p>2003 / School Reform Act: House Bill 212</p> <p>2003 / Indian Education Act / SB115</p> <p>Constitutional Amendment 1 (2003)</p> <p>2005 /Charter School Bill currently being worked on</p>
----------------------	--	--	---	--	--