

The Rise of State Standards- Based Reforms



**THE STATES' IMPACT ON FEDERAL
EDUCATION POLICY:
NEW PERSPECTIVES ON RESEARCH AND
THE HISTORICAL RECORD**

MARSHALL S. SMITH

MAY 9. 2008

Overview



- Short history of standards
- Three kinds of standards
- The role of standards in systemic reform
- Clinton reforms: Supporting state standards-based reforms (SSBR) — Goals 2000 and IASA
- Bush 2 reforms: New directions, compliance orientation for SSBR — NCLB
- Effects of SSBR
- Where now? Questions

Short History



- Content standards: “What children should know and be able to do”
- 1970s – 1980s: Used in other nations: Japan, Australia, Canadian provinces, France
- Early 1980s, U.S. national interest: “A Nation at Risk” NCTM standards — AP
- Strong state action and interest: NY regents, Kentucky, California, Texas, NGA, CSSO
- Federal
 - **Reagan amendments to ESEA: included local performance accountability**
 - **Bush 1: Dept of Education, Humanities Endowment, NSF all sponsored voluntary national standards: NCEST, America 2000, Dem alternative**

Three Kinds of Standards



- **Content standards:** “What students should know and be able to do.” Preferably based on intersections of theories of content/discipline, human development and pedagogy. Stimulate public dialog. Regularly update. We don’t know the RIGHT way – there are many good ways.
- **Performance standards:** Specification of how we know if student has mastered content. Don’t think cut-off scores. Think reading and writing an essay on Harry Potter, solving a two-variable math problem, taking a reasoned position on federalism, reading a NY Times editorial and arguing against its thesis. Validation important!
- **Opportunity to Learn Standards:** Resources (human, material and time) needed for students to have the opportunity to achieve to high performance standards.

Standards Enable State Systemic Reform



- What motivated state systemic reform?
- Simple conception of standards with performance accountability was not enough – the system need to be changed.
- Federal and many state policies incoherent – together a cacophony of discordance
- “Two” curricula – one for poor, other for well-to-do
- Organizational theory and other nations’ experiences suggested use of standards (goals) to help bring structure and coherence – through system reform .

Why state standards based reform rather than federal?



- **Why States?**
 - **10th Amendment**
 - **Fewer layers for policy to be butchered. Top down, one size fits all doesn't work in diverse settings. Knowledge base not strong enough to support one prescription.**
 - **Federal gov't. fraught with ideology and special interests that distort policies: one bad idea affects 50 states.**
 - **States vary , often more innovative—good state policies can lead to innovation, support and high achievement for all; bad (ideological, uninformed) affect one.**
 - **Other nations' ministries generally run by and policies developed by educators: this more likely in states than at national level.**
 - **State and local governments provide roughly 93% of funding.**
- **Why not states?**
 - **Federal government traditionally more aggressive in supporting rights of minority students and those with special needs.**
 - Federal role in helping to equalize and through R&D:
 - Leave adaptive teaching/learning decisions to state/local governments.

What was the original intent of state standards-based reform?



- State Content standards: guide curriculum
- State and local Policy and governance **alignment** with standards: HR (teacher training, licensure) curriculum, assessments, resources
- Through restructured state and local governance, districts and schools would have the *resources, flexibility and responsibility* to meet student needs (OTL)
- Standards Aligned assessments (performance standards) at only three grades to reduce tight coupling and allow creativity in curriculum and instruction
- Standards Aligned and fair accountability (OTL necessary for fairness): mixture performance, professional, reciprocal accountability

Clinton Reforms



- By 1992 major support for standards-based reforms: Business, education groups. (AFT, CCSSO, NGA, others)
- G2000 (1994): Voluntary. To provide funds for states to create state standards-based reform systems. Resource, assessment, and accountability align with Content standards. (lost OTL)
- IASA (1994): Title I required states to have standards and aligned resources and assessments (SBR) for Title I students – must be the same as standards for all other students.
- Reauthorized ESEA titles support standards-based reforms.
- Other legislation work within SBR: vocational education, special education, etc.

Implementation of Clinton reforms



- 1994 reforms required massive efforts by states, some which generated considerable controversy.
- Challenge of creating content standards, aligned resources, aligned assessments for three grades, aligned accountability system substantial. Different states took different routes. Diversity powerful and potentially very useful. TX, NC, MA, CA, CN, VT
- Many states had to build coalitions, create state laws, fight battles over the idea of SBR, fight over nature and content of standards, contract for assessments, etc.
- Yet by 2001, reporting on data collected in 2000, six years later Ed Week found “the vast majority of states” had made substantial progress.

NCLB



- In 2002 when NCLB signed into law many states almost completely implemented IASA.
- Considerable variation in SSBR in 2001 but: general professional support of reforms, strong focus on alignment of resources, student work, innovation.
- Yet federal lawmakers frustrated: saw only small effects. Bi-partisan NCLB legislation changed focus/nature of reforms.
 - Retained shell of SSBR
 - Increased testing dramatically —2-3 fold.
 - Required stringent accountability with self-fulfilling failure structure and, via Reading First and tool kit, non evidence based instructional requirements.
 - Initiated vigorous compliance and rhetoric. Compliance seems to have created frustration and replaced innovation.

What have been the achievement consequences of the reforms? Overall effects of SSBR



- Methodology: Use Longitudinal NAEP. Focus on sub-groups: Because of changes in relative sizes, population sub-groups give better estimates of effects of policies.
- Rates of gain should be measure of effect: comparison of rates prior to 1994 with rates after.
 - For Math: no effects. Similar rates of gain before and after 1994. Rates substantial.
 - For reading: rates for 9- and 13-year-olds greater after 1994 than before. Also gap closes more. SSBR associated with positive influence.

Longitudinal NAEP for 9-year-olds: Reading



Groups	1975	1994	2004	Gains +Rate of Gains: 1975-1994	Gains + Rate of Gains: 1994-2004
Nation	210	211	219	+1 (0.05)	+8 (1.0)
White	217	218	226	+1 (0.05)	+8 (1.5)
Black	181	185	200	+4 (0.3)	+15 (1.5)
Hispanic	183	186	205	+3 (0.2)	+19 (1.9)

Longitudinal NAEP for 13-year-olds: Reading



Groups	1975	1994	2004	Gains +Rate of Gains 1975-1994	Gains + Rate of Gains 1994-2004
Total	256	258	259	+2 (0.1)	+1 (0.1)
White	262	265	266	+3 (0.2)	+1 (0.1)
Black	226	234	244	+8 (0.4)	+10 (1.0)
Hispanic	232	235	242	+3 (0.2)	+7 (0.7)

Effects of SSBR before and after 2002



- Were lawmakers on right track by increasing top down requirements and pressure in 2002 NCLB?
- Use Main NAEP: Compare rates of gain for SSBR before and after 2002.
- Math gain scores: similar rates of gains before and after 2002.
- Reading gain scores different rates before and after 2002. For 4th and 8th graders rates greater before 2002: & gap closing greater.
- State NAEP similar pattern: states vary considerably in gain rates. MA 8th grade math exceeds all European nations. CA very low.

4th Grade Main NAEP Reading Scale Scores comparing rates of gain over Clinton reform years with rates during NCLB years



Groups	1994	2002	2005	2007	2002-1994 Gain (Rate)	2007-2002 Gain (Rate)
White	222	227	228	230	5 (0.6)	5 (0.6)
Black	184	198	199	203	14 (1.75)	5 (1.0)
Hispanic	186	199	201	204	13 (1.6)	5 (1.0)

8th Grade Main NAEP Reading Scale Scores: Comparing rates of gain over Clinton reform years with rates during NCLB years



Groups	1994	2002	2005	2007	2002-1997 Gain (Rate)	2007-2002 Gain (Rate)
White	265	271	269	270	6 (0.75)	-1 (-0.2)
Black	235	244	242	244	9 (1.1)	0 (0.0)
Hispanic	239	245	245	246	6 (0.75)	1 (0.2)

Where Now? Questions



- How can the federal government support greater equality of results, support school improvement, help build capacity, and stimulate innovation without dictating policy?
- Suppose that the federal government stopped requiring SSBR including accountability. What would the states do?
- The world has changed dramatically since 1994—how should the federal role change? Is anyone talking about this? Technology, communication, increasing poverty.
- In the last two decades we have learned a lot about learning and what affects student achievement—how might the federal government help states *use* that information?