

SCOMM

125:15

Estimated Cost of Additional School Days

Department of Education & Early Development

Prepared January 14, 2002

E. Jeans, School Finance Manager

Additional Estimated Costs to Foundation Program:

The estimated foundation program cost to operate schools is approximately \$4.7 million daily. This was calculated by dividing the projected FY2003 Basic Need by 180 school days (\$849 million / 180 days = \$4.7 million). The per student allotment in the foundation program would have to be increased by \$22 for each additional day being added. For example:

- 1 day - student allotment increases by \$22 = \$4.7 million
- 2 days - student allotment increases by \$44 = \$9.4 million
- 3 days - student allotment increases by \$66 = \$14.1 million
- 4 days - student allotment increases by \$88 = \$18.8 million
- 5 days - student allotment increases by \$110 = \$23.5 million

Additional Estimated Costs to Pupil Transportation:

The pupil transportation program will incur additional cost for each day added. The estimated daily cost for student transportation to/from school will be \$309,000. This was calculated by dividing the projected FY2003 pupil transportation budget by 175 school days (\$54 million / 175 days = \$309,000). The pupil transportation budget would have to be increased by \$309,000 for each additional day being added that requires students to be transported. For example:

- 1 day - increases transportation budget by \$309,000
- 2 days - increases transportation budget by \$618,000
- 3 days - increases transportation budget by \$927,000
- 4 days - increases transportation budget by \$1,236,000
- 5 days - increases transportation budget by \$1,545,000

State Statute Sec. 14.17.460 District Cost Factors

Representative Peggy Wilson
State Capitol Bldg. Room 409
Juneau, AK 99811-1182

DISTRICT	DISTRICT COST FACTOR
Anchorage	1.000
Alyeska Central School	1.000
Ketchikan	1.000
Mt. Edgecumbe	1.000
Petersburg	1.000
Sitka	1.000
Wrangell	1.000
Kenai Peninsula	1.004
Juneau	1.005
Haines	1.008
Craig	1.010
Matanuska-Susitna	1.010
Annette Island	1.011
Klawock	1.017
Kake	1.025
Fairbanks	1.039
Yakutat	1.046
Hoonah	1.055
Hydaburg	1.085
Kodiak	1.093
Valdez	1.095
Cordova	1.096
Delta/Greely	1.106
Chatham	1.120
Southeast Island	1.124
Skagway	1.143
Copper River	1.176
Unalaska	1.245
Dillingham	1.254
Bristol Bay	1.262
Nenana	1.270
Pelican	1.290
Alaska Gateway	1.291
Chugach	1.294
Denali	1.313
Nome	1.319
Galena	1.348
St. Mary's	1.351
Kashunamiut	1.389
Pribilof	1.419
Aleutians East	1.423
Southwest Region	1.423
Kuspuk	1.434
Lower Yukon	1.438
Yupiit	1.469

Iditarod	1.470
Lower Kuskokwim	1.491
Tanana	1.496
Yukon/Koyukuk	1.502
North Slope	1.504
Bering Strait	1.525
Northwest Arctic	1.549
Lake and Peninsula	1.558
Yukon Flats	1.668
Aleutians Region	1.736

State Statute Sec. 14.17.460 District Cost Factors

Representative Peggy Wilson
State Capitol Bldg. Room 409
Juneau, AK 99811-1182

Subject: Committee Meeting Notice

Date: Thu, 03 Jan 2002 17:14:35 -0900

From: Representative Con Bunde <Representative_Con_Bunde@legis.state.ak.us>

Organization: Alaska State Legislature

To: Suzi_Lowell@legis.state.ak.us

BCC: Con <conbunde@gci.net>

Suzanne:

The House Special Committee on Education will be holding a worksession on Wednesday, January 16th from 8:00 am - 10:00 am. Location TBA. The committee will discuss possible topics for committee-sponsored legislation.

Do you need a formal, written notice or will this suffice?

Karen McCarthy

*This will suffice. Pls
send location when
known.*

Subject: Fiscal Note for Extending School Year

Date: Thu, 03 Jan 2002 11:38:07 -0900

From: Representative Con Bunde <Representative_Con_Bunde@legis.state.ak.us>

Organization: Alaska State Legislature

To: Shari L Kochman <shari_kochman@gov.state.ak.us>

CC: Beth Nordlund <beth_nordlund@eed.state.ak.us>

BCC: Con <conbunde@gci.net>

Shari and Beth:

Rep. Bunde would like to explore the idea of extending the school year by three days to accommodate HSGQE testing days.

Would you please send a fiscal note or, if you can't do that without a bill, some memo giving us an idea what that would cost?

Thanks!

Karen McCarthy

Subject: December Newsletter - Happy Holidays

Date: 24 Dec 2001 13:54:59 -0900

From: Chuck_Achberger

Reply-To: achberger@alaska.com

To: Dennis_DeWitt@jnu-unix.legis.state.ak.us

COMMON SENSE FOR ALASKA - HAPPY HOLIDAYS TO EVERYONE

25 years supporting a fiscally responsible Alaska

<http://commonsenseforalaska.org/csa/>

JOIN TODAY!! - <http://commonsenseforalaska.org/csa/join.shtml>

December 24, 2001

Inside this issue...

**** Whistling past the graveyard

**** Speaking of Jobs

You want "whistling past a graveyard"

Try a Knowles/Ulmer administration announcing the drop in oil revenue will mean a \$700 million dollar shortfall in the budget and by the way they will be asking for a \$170 million increase.

Or consider the Fiscal Policy Caucus proposal to cap the Permanent Fund dividend at \$1,250 a year; lower all Permanent Fund deposits to the constitutionally required 25 percent of royalties and rents; move the Permanent Fund surplus to the general fund; impose a flat income tax of about 3 percent; impose a sales tax of 2 percent; impose an alcohol tax of 5 cents a drink, a motor fuels tax of 5 cents a gallon, a cruise ship tax of \$25 a head and an employment tax of \$100; AND increase oil and gas taxes by \$100 million. Combined, all that would yield about \$900 million, just about enough to fill that hole in the budget.

Politicians regard creating efficiencies in Government or reducing its size as impossible. What they don't see is that taxes on top of a regulatory climate that borders on punitive will drive what remains of decent jobs out of Alaska, not to mention put a chilling effect on new development.

Recent statistics show that we have the largest percentage of people ever in this state under the national poverty level. If our government wants to play Santa let it be to the individuals working outside of the bureaucracy in Alaska. Find a way to create new jobs that pay a wage a family can live on. Governor Hickel once said, "If you don't have a job any environment is bleak."

We are at a time in Alaskan history where we need leaders with courage, intelligence and foresight. Not the political pundits who are afraid of losing their state job that pays \$30,000 but feeds their egos.

Speaking of Jobs

Before we succumb to the ad campaign by the NEA or the perpetual lobbying for higher wages by teachers check out the numbers. These are from a gutsy news broadcast by KTUU.

These are the median wages for cities the size of Anchorage:

Anchorage	\$50,506
Spokane, WA	\$41,808
Raleigh, NC	\$41,472
Boise, ID	\$39,035

The Anchorage Superintendent of Schools suggested these were no representational and that the cities of Seattle, Portland and Minneapolis would be better:

Anchorage	\$50,506
Seattle	\$45,463
Minneapolis	\$43,993
Portland	\$43,447

Most of our teachers are good and they work hard. Wages alone are not the reason we have a shortage of teachers or our children's test scores are low. Throwing money into this black hole will not solve the problem, again it will take leadership.

Our newsletter comes out monthly with periodic "action alerts", if your help is needed on a specific issue. If you would rather not receive our newsletter any longer, simply reply to this e-mail and write, "unsubscribe" in the subject of the e-mail message.

If you know of someone else who would be interested in receiving our newsletter please pass it on.

If you would like to support our efforts:

<http://commonsenseforalaska.org/csa/join.shtml>

Common Sense for Alaska
25 years supporting a fiscally responsible Alaska

Copyright © 2001, Common Sense for Alaskas, Inc.
<http://commonsenseforalaska.org/csa/>

Chuck Achberger - achberger@alaska.com

Estimated Cost of Additional School Days

Department of Education & Early Development

Prepared January 14, 2002

E. Jeans, School Finance Manager

Additional Estimated Costs to Foundation Program:

The estimated foundation program cost to operate schools is approximately \$4.7 million daily. This was calculated by dividing the projected FY2003 Basic Need by 180 school days (\$849 million / 180 days = \$4.7 million). The per student allotment in the foundation program would have to be increased by \$22 for each additional day being added. For example:

- 1 day - student allotment increases by \$22 = \$4.7 million
- 2 days - student allotment increases by \$44 = \$9.4 million
- 3 days - student allotment increases by \$66 = \$14.1 million
- 4 days - student allotment increases by \$88 = \$18.8 million
- 5 days - student allotment increases by \$110 = \$23.5 million

Additional Estimated Costs to Pupil Transportation:

The pupil transportation program will incur additional cost for each day added.

The estimated daily cost for student transportation to/from school will be \$309,000. This was calculated by dividing the projected FY2003 pupil transportation budget by 175 school days (\$54 million / 175 days = \$309,000).

The pupil transportation budget would have to be increased by \$309,000 for each additional day being added that requires students to be transported. For example:

- 1 day - increases transportation budget by \$309,000
- 2 days - increases transportation budget by \$618,000
- 3 days - increases transportation budget by \$927,000
- 4 days - increases transportation budget by \$1,236,000
- 5 days - increases transportation budget by \$1,545,000

M.S. JS/
H.S. /
Testing



Current statute on school days.

Sec. 14.03.030. School term.

A school term begins and ends on the dates fixed by the governing body of a school district. A school term shall include not less than 180 days in session, unless with the approval of the commissioner,

(1) a day used for in-service training of teachers is substituted for a day in session, up to a maximum of 10 days;

(2) an "emergency closure day" is substituted for a day in session because of conditions posing a threat to the health or safety of students;

(3) a school board adopts a school term of not less than 150 days for a school if the commissioner finds that

(A) the shorter term is necessary for abating health hazards in the school; and

(B) the school board has submitted an acceptable plan under which students will receive the approximate educational equivalent of a 180-day term; or

(4) the school board adopts a school term of not less than 170 days for a school if the commissioner finds that the school board has submitted an acceptable plan under which students will receive the approximate educational equivalent of a 180-day term.

Sec. 14.03.040. Day in session.

Each day within the school term is a day in session except Saturdays, Sundays, and days designated as holidays by or according to AS 14.03.050. A school board may approve Saturdays as a day in session. The day in session in every school shall be at least four hours long, exclusive of intermissions, for the first, second, and third grades and five hours, exclusive of intermissions, for all other grades. The commissioner may approve a shorter day in session for any grade. The period of the day in session shall be devoted to the instruction of pupils or to study periods for the pupils.

Sec. 14.03.050. School holidays.

(a) Public schools may not be in session on school holidays, which are Labor Day, Thanksgiving Day, the day immediately following Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Years Day, Memorial Day, and the Fourth of July. If one of these holidays falls on a Saturday, the Friday immediately preceding is a school holiday. If one of these holidays falls on a Sunday, the Monday immediately following is a school holiday. A teacher may not be required to perform employment services on these holidays, nor may the salary of a teacher be diminished because the teacher does not perform employment services on a school holiday.

(b) The public schools shall be in session on all other holidays falling upon school days and shall conduct appropriate exercises in recognition of the day.

(c) The governing body of the school district may declare additional holidays.

Sec. 14.03.060. Elementary, junior high, and secondary schools.

(a) An elementary school consists of grades kindergarten through grade eight or any appropriate combination of grades within this range.

(b) A secondary school consists of grades seven through 12 or any appropriate combination of grades within this range. The establishment of one or two grades beyond the 12th grade is optional with the governing body of the school district.

(c) Grades seven through eight, nine, and ten or any appropriate combination of grades within this range may be organized as a junior high school.

(d) This section does not prevent a high school from issuing a diploma to a student who has completed the 12th grade.

Sec. 14.03.070. School age.

A child who is six years of age before August 15 following the beginning of the school year, and who is under the age of 20 and has not completed the 12th grade, is of school age.

Sec. 14.03.075. Secondary student competency testing. [Effective February 1, 2004].

(a) A student may not be issued a secondary school diploma unless the student passes a competency examination in the areas of reading, English, and mathematics or receives a waiver from the governing body. A governing body may not grant a waiver to a student before the student's final semester of attendance. The department shall determine the form and contents of the examination and shall score completed examinations.

(b) A student who fails the examination required under this section shall be retested at least once during a school year on those portions of the examination that the student has not passed. A student who passes any portion of the test may not retake that portion of the test. A student who, when retested, passes the portions of the test not previously passed and who meets any other graduation requirements shall receive a diploma from the school district. This subsection does not apply to a student who is a child with a disability if the student's individualized education program team recommends that the student not be retested.

(c) Notwithstanding (a) of this section,

(1) a student who is a child with a disability and who does not achieve a passing score on the examination required under (a) of this section, with or without accommodation, is eligible to receive a diploma if the student successfully completes an alternative assessment program required by the student's individualized education program or required in the education plan developed for the student under 29 U.S.C. 794; an alternative assessment program must, to the maximum extent possible, conform to state performance standards established for the competency examination required under (a) of this section; this paragraph does not apply to a student unless the department determines that the student has taken and failed to pass the competency examination with or without accommodations and the department approves the student's alternative assessment program described under this paragraph; and

(2) a student who transfers into a public high school in this state shall receive a diploma if the student

Con- I pulled some of the suggestions from the committee report - those that would require legislative action. K.

**Possible Legislative Solutions to the Problems of Teacher Recruitment and Retention
Proposed During October's House Special Committee on Education Hearings**

Financial Incentives:

1. Increase funding to school districts so they can:
 - a. Increase wages
 - b. Reimburse moving expenses (Rep. Guess may suggest this.)
 - c. Improve health and retirement benefits
 - d. Create and expand new teacher mentoring programs (Rep. Stevens may suggest this.)
 - e. Provide stipends for coaching and other extra-curricular work
 - f. Create and expand job training programs like Mat-Su's Pathway's Program
2. Re-institute Loan Forgiveness program (Rep. Green's HB 43 and Rep. Stevens' HB 37)
3. Abolish waiting period for PFD for new teachers from out of state
4. Create merit pay program
5. Forward fund education budget (Rep. Guess may suggest this.)
6. Provide grants or scholarships for education professional to go out of state for training
7. Allow teachers to vest in retirement program earlier
8. Require same amount of time to vest in TRS and PRS
9. Provide AHFC home loans to teachers (Rep. Rokeberg's HB 239)
10. Create teacher health insurance pool (Rep. Guess might suggest this.)
11. Create Education endowment fund
12. Allow retired education professionals to "double-dip"
13. Improve infrastructure

Teacher Support:

1. Mandate less stressful work conditions for new teachers
2. Improve teacher preparation and professional development opportunities (Rep. Guess may suggest reviewing mandatory subjects for in-service classes.)
3. Mandate statewide maximum number of students per class

Organizational Changes:

1. Encourage distance learning for students and teachers through the University system
2. Streamline and expedite certification process
3. Review cut scores for Praxis I test.
4. Create lifetime teaching certificate
5. State take-over of recruiting for all districts
6. Allow unconditional reciprocity for teachers in hard-to-fill specialty areas

University & Student Loan Assistance:

1. University:
 - a. Create programs to train physical and occupational therapists, teachers of severely disabled, etc.
 - b. work as a team with school districts
 - c. recruit more heavily for MAT program
 - d. be more responsive to needs of teacher aides
2. Student Loan Program:
 - a. Remove financial aid barriers to certificate programs (special ed, principals, etc.)

Subject: Stevens' Native Education Amendments Passed

Date: Wed, 19 Dec 2001 12:16:26 -0900

From: "Karen McCarthy" <karen-mccarthy@ak.net>

To: "Karen McCarthy" <Karen_McCarthy@legis.state.ak.us>

December 18, 2001

Contact: Melanie Alvord

(202) 224-1028

For Immediate Release

Stevens' Native Education Amendments Passed:

Bill Headed to the President for Approval

The Senate today passed the No Child Left Behind Act, which includes an amendment authored by Senator Stevens to increase authorized annual funding and expand activities authorized under the Alaska Native Education Act. A related amendment cosponsored by Senator Stevens authorizes funding for educational, cultural, and apprenticeship programs at the Alaska Native Heritage Center and the Inupiat Heritage Center in Barrow.

Stevens' amendments were originally offered during the Senate's consideration of the Better Education for Students and Teachers Act in June, which reauthorizes and restructures elementary and secondary education programs. This bill was conferenced with the House's version, where both of Stevens' amendments were retained, and the bill was renamed the No Child Left Behind Act.

"I'm pleased that the Conference Committee agreed to retain these important amendments that expand the educational opportunities for all Natives in our State and provide needed training for parents and teachers," said Stevens. "My amendment also continues the Rose Cultural Exchange Program, which for the first time this year allowed students in urban areas of Alaska to go to school and live with Native students' families in the Bush."

Activities authorized for funding through the Stevens amendment to the Alaska Native Education Equity Act:

- Remedial and enrichment programs to assist Native students in performing at a high level on standardized tests.
- Education and training of Native students enrolled in a degree program that will lead to certification or licensing as teachers.
- Parenting education for parents and care givers of Native children, including parenting education provided through in-home visitation of new mothers (\$1 million for FY2002 and each of the six succeeding fiscal years).
- Cultural education programs operated by the Alaska Native Heritage Center (\$1 million for FY2002 and each of the six succeeding fiscal years).
- The Rose Cultural Exchange Program, designed to share Native culture with urban students in a rural setting (\$1 million for FY2002 and each of the six succeeding fiscal years).

- Activities carried out through Even Start and Head Start programs, including the training of teachers.
- Dropout prevention programs (\$2 million for FY2002 and each of the six succeeding fiscal years).
- The Alaska Initiative for Community Engagement (Alaska ICE) Program (\$2 million for FY2002 and each of the six succeeding fiscal years).
- Career preparation activities to enable Native children and adults to prepare for meaningful employment, including tech-prep, mentoring, training, and apprenticeship activities.
- Operational support and authorization of construction funding and equipment to develop regional vocational schools in rural areas of Alaska, including boarding schools for Native students grades 9 - 12 and higher levels of education.

Under the cultural organizations amendment the Alaska Native Heritage Center and the Inupiat Heritage Center are each authorized to receive a minimum of \$2 million in funding in FY2002 and in each of the six succeeding fiscal years. These funds are for the development and implementation of educational and vocational programs and cultural exchanges aimed at increasing the understanding of cultural diversity and multicultural communication.

###

Alaska Digest Email News

December 24-30, 2001

Statistics Left Out Of Tolerance Commission's Take On Rural, Urban Student Funding

By Dermot Cole

If the Governor's Tolerance Commission had shown greater tolerance for statistics, Alaskans would have a better basis upon which to judge the commission's conclusions.

For example, the commission claims that Alaska's educational system "favors funding of urban schools over rural schools."

All that's missing from this sweeping generalization is the evidence to back it up.

The governor's commission also said that changes made in the school funding formula in 1998, in a bill signed by Gov. Tony Knowles, shortchange rural districts and send the "clear message that a rural student is 'worth less' than an urban student."

The governor has added to the confusion. In November, he released a statement saying, "future funding for many rural school districts is based on a lower per pupil amount than most urban schools. That's wrong and it must change," Knowles said.

These statements may give people the false impression that less is being spent per student in rural areas than in urban areas.

In August, the state Department of Education and Early Development gave a document to the Tolerance Commission that said "most school districts in the state are receiving more revenue per student under the new formula than they would have under the old."

The department added that the 10 school districts that received less money had reductions for reasons that included "expanded correspondence programs, declining student populations and school closures due to fewer than 10 students."

In deciding if Alaska is indeed sending a message that a "rural student is 'worth less' than an urban student," any analysis must include a tally of how much is spent per student in Alaska's school districts.

I suspect these numbers aren't offered as evidence because they show that substantially more money is provided to rural districts on a per student basis and that would require more

restrained political pronouncements.

Everyone knows that rural schools cost more to operate. The real debate is over how much more they should receive on a per student basis than schools in urban areas.

The Department of Education used to include tables in its annual reports showing how much was spent per student at school districts across the state. The Knowles administration has not publicized that information, but it should resume the practice to clear up some of the confusion.

Meanwhile, Sen. Gary Wilken is preparing a detailed report on funding sources for education that will show how much is spent per student and the sources of the money.

The tables in his draft report show that Fairbanks received \$4,341 per student from the state in fiscal year 2000, which is on the low end of state support per student. Anchorage received \$4,104 per student from the state.

Forty-five of the 53 Alaska school districts received more money per student than the Fairbanks district.

If you look at the per student spending in rural areas near Fairbanks, you'll find that Delta received \$6,218 per student. In the Lower Yukon school district, the state spent \$7,813 per student, while in Tanana the figure was \$11,883. In the Yukon/Koyukuk school district, the state spent \$12,126 per student, while in the Yukon Flats School District, the figure was \$12,381 per student.

Wilken's report also contains details on total per student spending, which includes state, local, federal and other sources for operating funds.

If you look at total revenue per student, Fairbanks spends about \$7,500 on each one of its 15,000 students.

In many rural districts, the total per student spending is substantially higher. In the Yukon/Koyukuk district, the figure was \$17,032 per student, while in Tanana it was \$15,468 and in the Yukon Flats it was \$19,875 per student.

Obviously, the per capita student spending totals are not the only statistics to consider.

The cost of living is higher in the villages and the economies of scale that exist in Fairbanks and Anchorage don't apply. Small schools cost much more to operate on a per student basis than large schools.

Plus, many small schools are in areas where there is not much of a tax base for local support and where people resist forming local governments and say they can't afford to pay anything

for schools, so much of the burden is shifted to the state.

It may be entirely appropriate for the state to spend two, three or four times as much per student in rural areas as in urban areas.

But Alaskans should not tolerate political debate that talks about students being "worth less" while excluding an open discussion of the spending statistics. This is a complicated issue.

A big part of the problem is that the government reports that try to describe where the money goes are as easy to digest as the rules governing the Bowl Championship Series.

Since the education reports are impossible to read, the political debate about school funding has a life of its own, independent of the facts.

In this matter, improved communication by state officials would be the first step to greater understanding.

Dermot Cole can be reached at cole@newsminer.com or 459-7530.

[MAIN PAGE & INDEX](#)

aft EDUCATIONAL ISSUES POLICY BRIEF

NUMBER 13 / SEPTEMBER 2001

Beginning Teacher Induction: The Essential Bridge

Introduction

The AFT has a longstanding commitment to improving teacher quality as a means to improve student achievement. The union's official policy statement on teacher quality, adopted at the 1998 biennial convention, states in part:

To assure a high-quality teaching force, the union must play a role in developing and/or implementing quality preservice education, effective recruiting and hiring practices, *strong induction and mentoring programs*, high-quality professional development, meaningful evaluation, and, when necessary, fair, timely intervention and dismissal procedures [emphasis added]. *AFT Resolution on Improving Teacher Quality*, July 1998.

AFT policy recognizes induction for new teachers as one of the essential building blocks of teacher quality. The union's position on new teacher induction was reinforced in the resolution on teacher education and teacher quality adopted in July 2000. Derived from "Building a Profession: Strengthening Teacher Preparation and Induction," the report of the AFT K-16 Teacher Education Task Force, the resolution states:

Graduation from a teacher education program...cannot be considered the end of training for teachers. The demands of the pre-college degree—acquiring subject matter knowledge, pedagogical content knowledge, and clinical training—do not allow sufficient time for teacher candidates to develop the

skills and experience necessary for completely independent practice in their initial teaching assignments.... Nonetheless, after graduation most new teachers are assigned a class, often with the most hard-to-reach students, and left to "sink or swim" on their own. By contrast, other countries with high-achieving students induct new teachers into the profession through clinical, real-world training processes...by which inductees develop and perfect their teaching skills under the mentorship of more experienced and skilled colleagues. ...Resolved that the AFT call for an induction program for all beginning teachers.... *AFT Resolution on Teacher Education and Teacher Quality*, July 2000.

This policy brief provides the underlying research-based rationale for the AFT's policy on beginning teacher induction—why induction matters. It then focuses on state statutes and regulations on induction, outlining the attributes of effective statutes and reporting on the results of a 50-state AFT analysis of induction policies. The brief ends with a set of recommendations.

Why Induction Matters

The attrition rate for beginning teachers (those with three to five years of experience) hovers at 20 percent to 30 percent, and can be as high as 50 percent in urban districts (Darling-Hammond, 1997). Novice teachers leave the profession for many reasons: Salaries are low, working conditions are difficult. Among the most often-cited reasons young teachers leave teaching is lack of

AFT EDUCATIONAL ISSUES DEPARTMENT
555 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

support. Induction, with mentoring, goes a long way toward filling the support gap and retaining teachers in the profession.

Research shows that teachers who have no induction program are twice as likely to leave within the first three years of teaching (Baccalaureate and Beyond Longitudinal Study 1992-93), as cited in "Quality Counts 2000." Those with induction not only are more likely to stay, but also are able to move more quickly beyond issues of classroom management to focus on instruction (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996).

The evidence in support of induction as a means of retaining young teachers is compelling. California's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA), a mandatory two-year induction program, has reduced beginning teacher attrition in that state from 39 percent to 9 percent.

In Rochester, N.Y., induction is part of the union-negotiated peer assistance and review program. As of 1998, fully 95 percent of teachers who had begun their careers in Rochester a decade earlier and had participated in induction as new teachers were still teaching in the district (Koppich, Asher, and Kerchner, 2001). Other districts with similar programs—Toledo and Cincinnati, Ohio, and Poway, Calif., for example—can cite equally positive results.

Induction provides a hands-on opportunity for beginning teachers—under the guidance of experienced mentors—to link the theory of instruction learned in their teacher preparation programs with the practice of classroom teaching. There is little question that induction programs pay dividends in terms of teachers who are better prepared for their jobs, more confident in their professional skills, and more likely to remain in teaching.

States can send a powerful message. With thoughtful, comprehensive statutes, they can convey to districts, schools, and beginning teachers the importance of deep and rigorous clinical experience as the final step in teacher preparation. Alternatively, through weak language or silence, states can communicate their relative indifference to this important component of improving teacher quality.

Five characteristics, as described in the next section, are common to effective state statutes on induction for beginning teachers. It should be remembered, however, that the distance between statutes, even exemplary

statutes, and successful programs may be wide indeed. Transforming the language of policy into effective practice requires, at a minimum, agreement on what constitutes good teaching.

Characteristics of Effective Induction Statutes

Data from the National Center for Education Statistics show that 56 percent of teachers participate in an induction program in their first three years in the profession (Darling-Hammond, 1997). The quality and duration of these programs, however, vary considerably. For some teachers, induction is mere nuts and bolts: where supplies are kept, where restrooms are located, school rules and procedures. Other teachers are fortunate enough to experience real mentoring with experienced colleagues who pay careful attention to the novice's developing professional practice.

Effective induction statutes, those that shape successful programs, share the following characteristics:

1. All beginning teachers participate.

All beginning teachers need induction, whether they are licensed through traditional or alternative means. Even, perhaps especially, those teaching on "emergency" licenses (or whatever term the state uses to signify individuals who have neither adequate preparation nor training for teaching) ought to be required to participate in an induction program.

This is not meant to suggest that the AFT condones emergency licensure. There is no substitute for a rigorous preparation program that lays the foundation for good teaching. However, as long as states continue to use emergency certification as a means to fill classrooms, all reasonable opportunities must be provided for these teachers to develop the knowledge and skills that will enable them to promote student learning. An induction program, while not sufficient, can help in this regard.

2. The program lasts at least one year.

Research shows that when it comes to beginning teacher induction, longer is better than shorter. A one-to two-year period of induction can make the difference between a teacher who succeeds early in her career and one who does not, and between a teacher who remains in the profession and one who does not.

Induction that lasts at least as long as a full school year affords the novice teacher an opportunity to experience all of the rites of school—opening the year, planning and teaching complete instructional units, adjusting teaching to meet students' learning needs, assigning grades, closing out the school year—in the semi-sheltered setting an experienced mentor can provide.

3. All beginning teachers are assigned qualified mentors.

Mentoring is a crucial component of any induction program. Beginning teachers need the support, advice, and guidance that only experienced teachers can provide. But not just any experienced teacher should be assigned as a mentor. Mentors need to be screened carefully and should be required to meet designated criteria that ensure only high-quality practitioners assume this role. Wherever possible, mentors should be "matched" for both grade level and subject area to the individuals they are assigned to mentor. And, in order to create the time necessary for mentors to devote to their task, they should be given reduced teaching loads and be assigned a reasonable number of new teachers to supervise. Finally, in recognition of the important work they are doing, mentors must be fairly compensated for their efforts.

4. Beginning teachers have reduced teaching loads.

Beginning teachers cannot effectively learn to teach while they are managing a full teaching load. In order to hone their professional skills, novices need both the time and the opportunity to observe other teachers teach, confer with colleagues, work with their mentors, and reflect on their own teaching. In this same vein, beginning teachers should not be given the most challenging assignments. To the extent possible, novices should have teaching assignments that offer someone with fledgling skills the chance to succeed.

5. A summative review completes the program.

Successful completion of induction should require a summative review of teaching. Ideally, the mentor should conduct this summative review. It should be based on established standards of effective practice, such as those derived from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Successful completion of induction, including a positive summative review, should be a licensure requirement.

The AFT 50-State Analysis

By means of a 50-state review, the AFT analyzed state policies on induction. The data search included reviews of state statutes and regulations as well as conversations with appropriate personnel in the state department of education or other agency responsible for teacher licensing. We checked our findings against those reported in *Education Week's* "Quality Counts 2000." (See Table 1 for a summary of the findings.)

We analyzed state policies specifically for the extent to which they do, or do not, "map" against the five criteria of effective induction statutes.

Two caveats:

1. Only state-level data were collected.* Many districts maintain their own induction programs, separate from state policy, but these are not part of the data used for this policy brief.

2. Collecting data on the quality of implementation of state-specified induction programs was beyond the scope of this study. While we have information on what state law or regulation says, we cannot verify the extent to which actual programs are faithful to the letter or spirit of the policy.

The questions we sought to answer with this analysis are:

- How many states have state-authorized induction programs for new teachers?
- Who participates in induction programs?
- What is the length of induction programs?
- Do beginning teachers have reduced teaching loads?
- Are qualified mentors part of induction programs?
- Does completion of the induction program require a summative review of teaching? Is completion of the program linked to licensing?

How Many States Have State-Authorized Induction Programs?

In the past two decades, induction has become quite popular with state policymakers. In the 1980s, just 15 states had induction programs for beginning teachers on the books (Hirsch, Koppich, and Knapp, 2001). By

*The state statutes and regulations we analyzed generally did not reflect changes that may have been made during the 2000-01 state legislative sessions.

2001, that number had more than doubled. According to the results of the AFT analysis, 33 states have induction policies. Programs specified in statute range from California's Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA) to Connecticut's Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST) to Kentucky's Teacher Internship Program to North Carolina's Beginning Teacher Induction Program.

While the number of states paying attention to induction for beginning teachers is encouraging, closer examination of the statistics reveals a more troubling picture. Of the 33 states with induction policies, only 22 mandate and fund these programs. In the remaining one-third of the states with induction policies, these policies function only as good intentions, neither mandated nor financially supported. And more than 34 percent of the states—17 states in all—are silent on induction, offering neither policy guidance nor funding.

Who Participates in Induction Programs?

State policies vary widely as to who participates in induction programs (see Table 2). States tend to specify categories of teachers who are included and those who are exempted sometimes within their statute or regulation on teacher licensure. All states with induction policies appear, at first glance, to cover under their policies individuals new to teaching. However, on further examination, it becomes clear that it is the statutorily "exempted" categories that create problematic loopholes.

California, for example, exempts "pre-interns," individuals with no background or training for teaching, from its induction program. Idaho, Kentucky, Louisiana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Pennsylvania exempt emergency-certified teachers. Virginia exempts teachers who completed teacher preparation via an alternative route.

As a result, those most in need of help—teachers with little or no preparation for teaching—are often excluded from induction. Of the 33 states with induction policies, 20 (60 percent) specify exemptions. Add this to the number of states that have no induction policies at all, and the number of teachers who are unlikely to benefit from these programs is indeed large.

What is the Length of Induction Programs?

As previously indicated, induction programs can be effective if they are of sufficient duration. Too brief and the program may have little more impact than a stint of student teaching.

Of the 33 states that have induction programs in statute, 11 do not specify the program length. Fifteen states specify that induction programs should last one year; three states specify two years; and five states authorize more than two years for induction. When a program length is specified, the norm is one year.

Do Beginning Teachers Have Reduced Teaching Loads?

Only one state has policy language on reduced teaching loads for new teachers. New York specifies that, "... beginning teachers are required to carry no more than 90 percent classroom instruction assignment to allow

Table 1
Summary of Induction Policies by Selected Categories

Category of Analysis	Number of States
State mandates induction program	22
State does not mandate induction program	11
State does not have statute on induction	17*
State-funded program	22
Grant-based program	13
Mentor assigned to beginning teacher	29
Support team assigned to beginning teacher	12
State criteria for mentors	21
Mentors required to receive training	17*
Mentors required to receive stipend	12
Reduced teaching loads for beginning teachers	1
Reduced teaching loads for mentors	1
Summative review of teaching practice required	4
Favorable summative review required for full licensure	4
Program completion required for full licensure	21
State required to evaluate induction programs	7

*The 17 states without statutes or regulations on induction are: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Hawaii, Illinois, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Dakota, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming.

for mentoring activities to occur."

Three other states—Connecticut, Iowa, and Nebraska—have statutory language on release time for novice teachers. Connecticut's BEST program requires that, "...the district must provide beginning teachers with at least eight half days to observe [other teachers]...or for professional development related activities."

Iowa requires that school districts submit plans to receive state funding for induction. These plans must include "the minimum amount of release time for...beginning teachers." And Nebraska authorizes that "grant funds [for new teacher induction] may be used for substitute salaries for release time."

North Carolina's Beginning Teacher Induction Program does not provide for reduced teaching loads for new teachers, but does describe "optimum working conditions," including assignment in the area of licensure, a limited number of preparations, a limited number of "exceptional or difficult" students, minimal non-instructional duties, and "no extracurricular activities unless the...teacher requests the assignment in writing."

A few states, then, recognize that beginning teachers need different teaching circumstances than do their more experienced colleagues. Most states, however, continue to expect novices to learn their craft without designated (or compensated) time for reflection, consultation, observation, or further study, and while working under the same difficult conditions even seasoned professionals find challenging.

Are Qualified Mentors Part of Induction Programs?

Statutes in 29 states (89 percent of the total number of states with induction policies) require that mentors be part of induction programs (see Table 3). Of these 29 states, 21 have established criteria for mentors. North Carolina, for example, offers guidelines for mentor teacher selection, including successful teaching in the area of licensure, appraisal ratings "among the highest in the school," and strong recommendations from principal and peers.

Kansas specifies that a mentor must be "...a certified teacher who has completed at least three consecutive school years of employment in the school district [and] has been selected by the board of education of the school district on the basis of having demonstrated exemplary teaching ability as demonstrated by criteria

established by the state board." Oregon's statute requires that a mentor teacher "...has successfully taught for three or more years as a licensed teacher in any public school...[and] has demonstrated a mastery of teaching skills and subject matter knowledge."

Seventeen of the states with induction policies (51 percent) require that mentors receive training. Even those statutes that require mentors to receive training are fairly unspecific. Most simply say something like, "Mentors must complete a training program developed by the school district." Maine's statute is among the most specific, stating that mentors must receive "orientation and training... in peer observation and assessment techniques."

Some states recognize in policy that providing mentors is a necessary but insufficient condition. Those mentors must be superbly prepared for their role. Two-thirds of the states that have induction programs in state policy, however, fail to specify standards for mentors. Half the states with induction policies have no training requirement for mentors.

Twelve states (one-third of the total with state-authorized induction programs) require that mentors receive stipends—generally from \$500 to \$1,000 per year. The remaining 21 states with induction policies have no requirement for mentor stipends. Whether districts are expected to compensate mentors or mentors are expected to perform these extra duties without extra pay is not clear from state policy.

Just two states—Kentucky and New York—authorize mentors to have reduced teaching loads. New York state law requires that, "Mentors...continue to provide classroom instruction for at least 60 and no more than 90 percent of their time, or they may mentor full-time for no more than two out of five consecutive years." Kentucky state law requires release time (time away from a teacher's regular classroom) and expects the district to fund it: "Mentors must spend at least 70 hours working with a beginning teacher, 20 hours in a classroom setting. *Districts must provide substitutes for release time [emphasis added].*"

Indiana has statutory language that implies, but does not mandate, reduced teaching loads or release time: "Mentors [must]...have adequate time to observe beginning teachers in the classroom." The remainder of the states with induction policies provide neither direction nor guidance on reduced teaching loads for mentors.

Twelve states (36 percent of those with induction policies) assign support teams to beginning teachers. Oklahoma, for example, creates a "residency committee" ("resident" is Oklahoma's term for a beginning teacher). The committee, by state law, is to be composed of a mentor teacher, a school level administrator, and a teacher educator from a local institution of higher education. The role of the team is to support the resident teacher in issues of "classroom management and professional development" and, upon completion of the one-year residency, to make recommendations regarding whether the beginning teacher should be licensed.

Maine also has a provision for support teams for beginning teachers. Under state statute, the team, which is to be composed of a majority of classroom teachers, is to provide "...services to facilitate good teaching and classroom management skills."

Does Completion of the Induction Program Require a Summative Review of Teaching? Is Completion of the Program Linked to Licensing?

Only five of the 33 states with policies on beginning teacher induction—Idaho, Indiana, New Jersey, North Carolina, and South Carolina—require that teachers receive some sort of summative review as a condition of completing the program. Indiana's law, for example, specifies that mentors "...evaluate the progress of the beginning teacher in attaining [teaching] competency...[and] discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the beginning teacher's skills and practices...." The school principal must, at the end of the school year, determine whether the beginning teacher has successfully completed the internship.

Twenty-one states (64 percent of the total with induction policies) require completion of induction for full licensure. Kentucky, for example, specifies that, "A teacher...who has not successfully completed the internship [induction program] and has exhausted the two-year provision for participation in the Kentucky Internship Program shall not be eligible for a Kentucky teaching certificate...."

However, more than half (29) of all states have no requirement that a teacher complete a successful year or two of teaching in order to be fully licensed. Even in states that maintain induction policies, it is not clear whether a positive appraisal of a teacher's competence is a condition of licensure. Only four state statutes man-

date a favorable summative review at the end of induction as a prerequisite to licensure.

Recommendations

Induction provides the essential bridge for a beginning teacher between being a student learning about teaching and becoming a professional teacher. Effective induction statutes have five common characteristics: inclusion, adequate length, reduced teaching loads for participants, qualified mentors, and a summative review.

A few states have statutes that meet these criteria. Most, however, fall short on one or more dimensions. Seventeen states do not even recognize beginning teacher induction as a state policy priority. This situation is a cause for concern.

Due to surging enrollments and increasing retirements, this nation needs to recruit 2 million new public school teachers by 2008-09. It will profit us little if we recruit these individuals (a formidable challenge in itself) only to have them leave at the very beginning of their careers—and then have to recruit and train a new cadre all over again.

Research confirms what experience shows. Support and assistance in the initial years of teaching produce teachers who are better equipped for the challenges of the classroom, have a greater likelihood of becoming high-quality teachers, and are more likely to remain in the profession. Induction programs represent a good investment, one that is likely to pay dividends for students far into the future.

1. States should develop statutory policy that reflects the importance of induction for beginning teachers.

All states should have on the books a policy statement that stresses the research-backed importance of induction programs for beginning teachers. If states are committed to reinforcing the link between deep clinical experience for beginning teachers and quality teaching, then it is likely that the necessary time, attention, and resources will be devoted to support beginning teachers in the early years of their careers.

2. States should strive for comprehensive induction policies.

As indicated in this policy brief, effective state

statutes on induction have a common set of characteristics. States should work toward statutes that embody these attributes: All beginning teachers should be included in the program, which is at least one year in length. Beginning teachers also should have reduced teaching loads, be assigned qualified mentors, and receive a summative review of their practice as a condition of completing induction. Although it may not be possible for all states to immediately develop laws that include all of these elements, it is important for all states to begin somewhere and to have a plan by which all of the elements of effective induction statutes are in place by a specified time.

3. States should at least partially fund induction programs.

If induction is simply another unfunded state mandate, it is likely to have less-than-optimum reach and force. Most school districts already have an enormous number of claims on their overburdened budgets. If states supply at least a portion of the funding for required induction programs, they not only reinforce the importance of induction as a state priority, they also lay claim to having some say over the shape of these programs.

4. States should consider induction policies as part of the teacher quality "accountability loop" that includes school districts and institutions of higher education.

Guaranteeing the quality of teachers just entering the profession ought to be a shared responsibility among states, teacher training institutions, and school districts. Well-crafted induction statutes should serve, at least in part, as a way to cement cooperation among these three and operate as a kind of "check and balance" mechanism ensuring that newly licensed teachers meet high and rigorous professional standards.

5. States should look to other states for guidance.

There is no need to reinvent the induction-statute wheel. A number of states are well on their way to comprehensive beginning teacher policies. States can borrow a page from other states' books, learning from one another and making improvements as they go.

References

- Darling-Hammond, L. (1997). *Doing What Matters Most: Investing in Quality Teaching*. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Education Week*. "Quality Counts 2000," Jan. 13, 2000.
- Hirsch, E., Koppich, J., and Knapp, M. (2001). "Revisiting What States Are Doing To Improve the Quality of Teaching." Seattle: University of Washington, Center for the Study of Teaching and Policy.
- Koppich, J., Asher, C., and Kerchner, C. (2001). *Developing Careers, Building a Profession: The Rochester Career in Teaching Plan*. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- What Matters Most: Teaching for America's Future*. (1996). New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.

Table 2
Teacher Participation in Induction Programs*

State	Program name	Teachers included	Teachers not included	Notes
Alabama				
Alaska				
Arizona				
Arkansas				
California	Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA)	First- and second-year teachers with a valid credential; first and second year interns (1)	Individuals with pre-internship certificates (2)	(1) Interns follow the alternate route to licensure. (2) The pre-internship certificate replaces the emergency permit.
Colorado	Induction Program	Teachers with provisional licensure	Teachers with type I authorization (adjunct teacher), type II authorization (intern), type III authorization (emergency), type IV authorization (extension), type V authorization (substitute), type VI authorization (temporary)	
Connecticut	Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST)	Holders of initial educator certificates, interim educator certificates, or temporary 90-day certificates (alternate route)	Teachers with at least three years of successful teaching in a public or nonpublic school, holders of durational shortage area permits (1)	(1) Section 10-145d-422 of the regulations conditions the reissue of the durational shortage area permit on completing the BEST program. However, a permit holder who has met all the requirements except completing the BEST program may be issued an initial educator license.
Delaware				
Florida				
Georgia	Mentor Teacher Program	Teacher with fewer than three years of experience or who needs support and guidance (1)		(1) Georgia has one-stage licensing.
Hawaii				
Idaho	Support Program	Teachers employed under a Category 2 contract (certificated personnel in the first and second years of continuous employment with the same school district)	Teachers employed under a limited one-year contract, holders of a one-year Letter of Authorization Approval (emergency certificate)	
Illinois				

* The information in this table is based on state statutes and regulations as of December 2000.

State	Program name	Teachers included	Teachers not included	Notes
Indiana	Beginning Teacher Internship Program	Teachers who receive an initial standard or reciprocal license; are employed as a teacher by the district; have not already successfully completed an internship program; have fewer than two years of teaching experience outside of Indiana; are employed for at least three hours per day.(1)	Individuals employed on a temporary teacher's contract for an expected length of fewer than 120 days, on a supplemental services contract, or as a substitute teacher.	(1) Districts must provide holders of limited (emergency) licenses with supervision on a regular basis by a teacher assigned to the same school building as the holder of the limited license; who has at least five years of teaching experience; who will serve as an informative resource for the holder of the limited license; and who will not conduct or be involved in the evaluation of the performance of the holder of the limited license. The state does not issue alternative licenses.
Iowa	Beginning Teacher Induction Grant Program	Individuals, new to the profession, serving under an initial or provisional license		
Kansas	Mentor Teacher Program	Probationary teachers (i.e., without contracts)		
Kentucky	Kentucky Teacher Internship Program	New teachers and out-of-state teachers with less than two years' experience seeking initial certification; candidates who complete an alternative certification program	Teachers with emergency certification (1)	(1) Teachers who are judged unsatisfactory by the internship program may not be issued emergency certification.
Louisiana	Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program	Teachers employed for the first time in the state who are seeking to acquire or retain a regular teaching certificate	Candidates hired under the Interim Emergency Policy for Hiring Full- and Part-time Noncertified Personnel; Temporary Teaching Assignment Only; Temporary Employment Permit; Emergency Permit; and Out-of-State Provisional.	
Maine	Teacher Support System	Teachers holding provisional certificates and conditional certificates	Candidates with visiting teacher permits	
Maryland	Teacher Mentoring Grant Program	Teachers during their two-year probationary period, with a one-year extension for teachers holding professional, provisional, or resident teacher certificates		
Massachusetts	Beginning Teacher Induction/Mentoring Program	First-year teachers	Holders of hardship waivers	
Michigan		Teachers during their first three years of employment (1)		(1) It is unclear whether teachers are required to participate for all three years.
Minnesota	Teacher Mentorship Grant Program	Teachers new to the profession or district		

State	Program name	Teachers included	Teachers not included	Notes
Mississippi	Beginning Teacher Support Program	Individual who possesses a teaching license issued by the Commission on Teacher and Administrator Education, Certification and Licensure and Development; is employed at least half time, primarily as a classroom teacher, by a school district; and has taught fewer than 90 consecutive days, or 180 days total, as a licensed teacher in any public school		
Missouri	Beginning Teacher Assistance Program	Any teacher who does not have prior teaching experience		
Montana				
Nebraska	Mentor Teacher Program	First-year teachers, individuals entering K-12 teaching in their first year of contracted service in any school, public or private	Those not employed for the instruction of pupils, or those who do not have teaching endorsements	
Nevada				
New Hampshire				
New Jersey	Induction Program	Provisional teachers holding a Certificate of Eligibility (CE)—alternate route; or a Certificate of Eligibility with Advanced Standing (CEAS)—traditional route	Teachers with emergency licenses	
New Mexico		New teachers, including those with alternative licensure		
New York	New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Program	First- and second-year teachers holding provisional or permanent certificates, temporary emergency licenses, regular licenses, or temporary per diem certificates (for a field in which licensed teachers are unavailable) (1)	Teachers with Transitional A certificates (alternative certification for teaching a specific career and technical subject); teachers with more than two years of teaching experience	(1) Teachers with the Transitional B certificate (alternative certification for all titles in the classroom teaching service) and the Transitional C certificate (alternative certification for career changers and others holding a graduate academic or graduate professional degree) are required to receive mentoring, but not under this program.
North Carolina	North Carolina Beginning Teacher Induction Program	Novice teachers with an initial license; teachers with lateral entry license (alternative route)	Teachers with provisional certificates (emergency credentials)	
North Dakota				
Ohio	Entry Year Program	New teachers with provisional and alternative licenses		
Oklahoma	Resident Teacher Program	Licensed teachers; holders of alternative placement licenses	Teachers with provisional or emergency certificates (1)	(1) Unless such teachers have taught for less than one year.
Oregon	Beginning Teacher Support Grant Program	Beginning teachers who possess a teaching license; are employed at least half time, primarily as classroom teachers, by a school district; and have taught fewer than 90 consecutive days, or 180 days total, as a licensed teacher in any public, private, or state-operated school		

State	Program name	Teachers included	Teachers not included	Notes
Pennsylvania	Induction Program	Full- and part-time, regularly employed teachers engaged in their initial teaching experience; candidates with intern certificates (alternative certification); substitute teachers and newly employed teachers with prior teaching experience may also be required to participate	Candidates with emergency permits	
Rhode Island	Mentoring Program	New teachers	Not specified	
South Carolina	Induction Program	Teachers with a valid teaching certificate with less than one year of public school teaching experience	Teachers employed on a part-time basis for fewer than 152 days hired under a letter of agreement	
South Dakota				
Tennessee				
Texas		Beginning teachers, including those with alternative certification and emergency permits		
Utah				
Vermont				
Virginia	Mentor Teacher Program	Probationary teachers	Teachers with provisional licenses (alternative route)	
Washington	Teacher Assistance Program	Individuals holding state-issued teacher's certificates; beginning teachers with fewer than 90 days experience under contract to any school district; teachers with short-term daily substitute experience (1)	Individuals holding temporary permits (those with missing documentation), teachers in districts that do not operate a program	(1) Districts have flexibility to decide who is included in the program.
West Virginia	Beginning Educator Internship Program	Teachers with professional teaching certificates	Teachers with five years experience in another state; individuals with temporary teaching or temporary vocational teaching certificates; provisional professional teaching certificates, permits, authorizations	
Wisconsin	Peer Review and Mentoring Grant Program	Initial educators	Holders of substitute teacher permits, charter school instructional staff permits, professional teaching permits	
Wyoming				

Table 3
Mentors and State Induction Policies*

State	Program name	Mentor assigned to beginning teacher	Support team assigned to beginning teacher	State criteria for mentors	Mentors required to receive training	Mentors required to receive stipend	Amount of stipend
Alabama							
Alaska							
Arizona							
Arkansas							
California	Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment Program (BTSA)	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Colorado	Induction Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Connecticut	Beginning Educator Support and Training Program (BEST)	Yes (or support team)	Yes (or support team)	Yes	Yes	No	
Delaware							
Florida							
Georgia	Mentor Teacher Program	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Hawaii							
Idaho	Support Program	No	No	No	No	No	
Illinois							
Indiana	Beginning Teacher Internship Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$600 annually
Iowa	Beginning Teacher Induction Grant Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$500 per semester
Kansas	Mentor Teacher Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Up to \$1,000 annually
Kentucky	Kentucky Teacher Internship Program	Yes (resource teacher)	Yes (beginning teacher committee)	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$1,000 annually
Louisiana	Teacher Assistance and Assessment Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$400 per person
Maine	Teacher Support System	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Maryland	Teacher Mentoring Grant Program	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Massachusetts	Beginning Teacher Induction/Mentoring Program	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	
Michigan		Yes	No	Yes	No	No	
Minnesota	Teacher Mentorship Grant Program	Yes	No	No	No	No	
Mississippi	Beginning Teacher Support Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Missouri	Beginning Teacher Assistance Program	No	No	No	No	No	
Montana							
Nebraska	Mentor Teacher Program	Yes (or support team)	Yes (or mentor)	Yes	No	Yes	\$15 per hour or \$120 per day
Nevada							

* The information in this table is based on state statutes and regulations as of December 2000.

State	Program name	Mentor assigned to beginning teacher	Support team assigned to beginning teacher	State criteria for mentors	Mentors required to receive training	Mentors required to receive stipend	Amount of stipend
New Hampshire							
New Jersey	Induction Program	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	\$550 to \$1,100
New Mexico		Yes	No	No	No	No	
New York	New York State Mentor Teacher Internship Program	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
North Carolina	North Carolina Beginning Teacher Induction Program	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	\$1,000
North Dakota							
Ohio	Entry Year Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Oklahoma	Resident Teacher Program	Yes	Yes (residency committee)	Yes	No	Yes	Not more than \$500
Oregon	Beginning Teacher Support Grant Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	
Pennsylvania	Induction Program	Yes	Yes (induction team)	No	No	No	
Rhode Island	Mentoring Program	Not specified	No	No	No	No	Not specified
South Carolina	Induction Program	Yes	Yes (assistance team)	No	Yes	No	
South Dakota							
Tennessee							
Texas		No	No	No	No	No	
Utah							
Vermont							
Virginia	Mentor Teacher Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	
Washington	Teacher Assistance Program	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Not specified
West Virginia	Beginning Educator Internship Program	Yes	Yes (professional support team)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Minimum of \$600 annually
Wisconsin	Peer Review and Mentoring Grant Program	Yes	Yes (review team)	No	No	No	
Wyoming							
Yes		29	12	21	17	12	
No		3	21	12	16	21	
Blank		17	17	17	17	17	
Not specified		1					



[Home](#) [Defense](#) [Education](#) [International](#) [Economics](#) [Cuba](#) [Immigration](#)
[Regulation & Env't](#) [Corporate Governance](#) [Postal Reform](#)
[What Works](#) [Biographical Information](#)

Indispensable Tests: How a Value-Added Approach to School Testing

Could Identify and Bolster Exceptional Teaching

by Robert Holland

December 2001

Executive Summary

Most parents want the comparative information that tests supply about students, schools, and school districts. Tests also serve as a hedge against grade inflation, and help ensure that education standards are more than mere suggestions.

However, high-stakes tests do raise legitimate concerns. By excluding large numbers of disabled or limited-English-proficient children from the testing cohort, school officials sometimes can game the tests to pad scores and reap favorable publicity. In addition, another kind of unfairness arises when raw scores from a school serving an affluent neighborhood are compared straight-up with those for a school serving the most impoverished families.

A technique of using test data to determine the value that teachers add to the learning of each student – that is, how much they help the child progress academically – could become an important tool for building better teachers and better schools. Value-added assessment makes it possible to isolate the impact of the individual teacher and to respond with appropriate rewards or corrective training. It ensures that teachers are not penalized for accepting the challenge of raising the learning level of the most socially and culturally deprived children. The deeds of those who add great value to children's learning are brought to light, as is the work of teachers who make little or no impact.

Former University of Tennessee statistician William Sanders, who pioneered value-added research, has demonstrated that pupils' ability to succeed in school is severely crippled when they draw poor teachers three years in a row. Value-added assessment offers a way to ensure that as few children as possible suffer such a disadvantage.

Details follow.

Indispensable Tests: How a Value-Added Approach to School Testing Could Identify and Bolster Exceptional Teaching

by Robert Holland

High-stakes testing of students has become the sharpest arrow in the quiver of would-be reformers of public elementary and secondary education. Not without justification. No matter how high standards are set for English and math and history and science, education requires some form of measurement to confirm that students are mastering the material. Unless there are consequences for failure on these tests, students and school staffs will not take them seriously. Without testing, standards are mere suggestions.

Moreover, as public opinion surveys have repeatedly shown, parents by substantial margins support standardized testing. A survey done for the Committee on Economic Development found that about three-fourths of respondents thought the quantity of student testing in their communities was either about right or not enough. (CED 2000). Parents believe testing yields valuable information. They want to be able to compare their children and their schools to other children and their schools. Information is power. Tests provide information to consumers, and results will be critical as education begins to operate more like a free market. Objective testing is like an annual doctor's check-up, or an audit by an external auditor.

Tests also serve as a valuable confirming device for grading systems that vary from school to school and teacher to teacher. Bill Evers, a research fellow at the Hoover Institution and member of Hoover's Koret Task Force on K-12 education, observes that a pupil's grade is based not merely on achievement and exertion but what the teacher expects from students in his or her class. One teacher may have lower expectations for students than a second teacher. One teacher may want to grade students more leniently than another teacher. Grade inflation may result in many students receiving As and Bs without actual improvements in achievement.

"A divergence between grades from classroom teachers and scores on standardized tests," notes Evers, "can be a wake-up call for parents, taxpayers, and school boards – telling us that students don't really know the subject matter and that teachers are too soft in their grading practices. Getting rid of standardized tests is like getting rid of thermometers, X-ray machines, and blood-pressure gauges in a doctor's office." (Evers 2001)

Although data from mass testing may jolt schools into the first stirrings of reform, problems undeniably accompany so-called high-stakes testing. There is, for instance, the political element: How high a rate of school failure is politically acceptable? When Virginia launched its Standards of Learning testing in 1998, for instance, fewer than 3 percent of public schools initially could meet the seemingly modest requirement that 70 percent of each school's students pass the tests of core-subject knowledge. The passing rate has gradually climbed (reaching 40 percent in Spring 2001) but Virginia still faces the prospect of stripping accreditation from hundreds of its public schools as the 2007 deadline approaches, or lowering the standards it has been pushing the schools to achieve. Similarly, the complex formula for Title I testing in the version of federal reform recently negotiated on Capitol Hill had Washington's policymakers puzzling over just how many schools they could afford to fail. Moreover, the problem of failing schools pales in comparison to the problem of what to do when high numbers of students cannot pass end-of-course or graduation tests.

The bottom line is that high-stakes tests increase the likelihood of school officials and policy-makers gaming tests to attain the results desired. Simply by excluding from the testing

large numbers of disabled or limited-English-proficient children, a local district or a state may pad the scores and reap undeserved praise in the press. Another kind of unfairness occurs when scores from a school serving affluent families are compared straight up with scores from a school serving children who've grown up in the poorest of neighborhoods.

Value-Added and the Difference It Makes

A fair and objective system would identify the difference that schools and teachers make with the individual children they serve – the value that they add to each child's learning, so to speak, regardless where that child started in school or what kind of advantages or disadvantages he or she brings to the classroom.

So-called value-added assessment holds much promise of being that method of testing. Properly refined, it could have its greatest impact on the quality of teaching in American K-12 schools ? revolutionizing the way teachers are trained, hired, evaluated, retrained, rewarded or encouraged to enter another line of work.

Speaking before the metropolitan school board in Nashville in January 2001, Tennessee statistician William Sanders rattled the education establishment when he disputed the connection commonly made between poverty and low student performance. "Of all the factors we study – class size, ethnicity, location, poverty – they all pale to triviality in the face of teacher effectiveness." (Long and Cass 2001) Such a pronouncement rubbed against the grain of doctrine instilled in many educators during their training and retraining. As the perceptive education historian Diane Ravitch has documented, the dominant education progressivists long have maintained that many children shouldn't be pushed to absorb knowledge beyond their limited innate capacities; that they are better off with teachers who help them get in touch with their feelings and find a socially useful niche. (Ravitch 2000.) But teaching matters. It matters a lot.

Sanders wasn't just being contrarian for the sake of being contrarian. He had more than a decade and a half of research in identifying the difference that teaching makes to back up his assertion. In 1983, when Tennessee first ventured into legislated education reform by emphasizing basic skills and a version of merit pay for teachers, Sanders and a colleague (Robert A. McLean) at the University of Tennessee began independently exploring the feasibility of employing a statistical mixed-model methodology to overcome the usual problems in using student achievement as an instrument of assessment – problems such as transient students, missing records, shifting teacher assignments, and the blurring of individual input with team teaching. (Horn and Sanders 1994).

The Tennesseans drew on volumes of student achievement data from Knox County to build a statistical tool of analysis. They were able to detect measurable, consistent differences among teachers regarding their effect on student performance, and these did not seem to be predictable according to where the school was located. And under effective teachers, students could make gains no matter what their ability or achievement levels were when they started.

Why not, then, a system taking into account the value that each teacher added, no matter the starting point of her pupils? Why not value-added assessment? Thus, when the State of Tennessee went into its second phase of results-oriented education reform, the assessment system honed by Sanders and McLean was ready for prime time. With the enactment of the Education Improvement Act in 1991, the Tennessee value-added assessment system (TVAAS)

gained a key role in analyzing data on how public education was doing its primary job of raising student achievement. (Recently Sanders took a position as Manager of the Value-Added Assessment Group at SAS in School, a private software company in Cary, N.C. However, he continues to develop data for TVAAS while assisting other states in developing their own value-added approaches.)

Basically, TVAAS works like this:

- Each spring, students take the norm-referenced state tests ? a customized version of McGraw-Hill's Terra Nova test ? in five core subjects (math, science, reading, language, and social studies). Fresh, non-redundant test items are added each year in an attempt to discourage blatant "teaching to the test."
- Each fall, districts receive a report card broken down by school and grade showing progress in each subject in the context of three-year averages. The system records student achievement gains in scale score points and in the form of comparisons to local, state, and national averages. School and district reports are reported to the public.
- Each teacher receives a report card – one that is *not* released to the general public – showing the year-to-year progress of his or her students. Supervisors also receive these reports. It is this application of these data that holds the greatest promise for building a better teacher.

Here is a portion of an actual TVAAS report for an individual 4th grade teacher in a recent year:

Estimated Mean Gains and (in parenthesis) their Standard Errors					
	Math	Reading	Language	Social St.	Science
USA Norm Gain	26.0	21.0	11.0	22.0	19.0
State Mean Gain	25.0	20.4	19.3	21.4	21.4
1995 Teacher Gain	22.7 (4.8)	24.0 (3.8)	22.3 (4.2)	30.6 (4.9)	28.3 (4.1)
1995 System Gain	12.3 (2.9)	22.5 (3.4)	19.8 (3.0)	27.9 (3.8)	27.5 (3.1)
1996 Teacher Gain	33.3 (4.9)	28.5 (4.0)	28.4 (3.8)	18.3 (5.8)	26.8 (4.0)
1996 System Gain	32.6 (3.0)	28.6 (3.6)	29.5 (3.2)	17.4 (4.0)	28.3 (3.3)
1997 Teacher Gain	15.6 (5.7)	18.7 (4.9)	17.8 (4.9)	17.9 (5.7)	25.6 (4.5)
1997 System Gain	16.3 (3.1)	19.1 (3.6)	16.0 (3.2)	18.1 (4.0)	26.1 (3.3)
Teacher 3-Yr-Avg	23.9 (3.0)	23.7 (2.5)	22.8 (2.5)	22.3 (3.2)	26.9 (2.4)
System 3-Yr Avg	20.4 (1.7)	23.4 (2.0)	21.8 (1.8)	21.1 (2.3)	27.3 (1.9)
Teacher 3-Year-Average Gain Comparisons					
Teacher vs. Norm:	NDD from Norm	NDD from Norm	Above Norm	NDD from Norm	Above Norm
Teacher vs. State:	NDD from Mean	NDD from Mean	NDD from Mean	NDD from Mean	Above Mean
Teacher vs. System:	NDD from Mean	NDD from Mean	NDD from Mean	NDD from Mean	NDD from Mean

(Note: NDD stands for "not detectably different.")

The Tennessee system expresses achievement gains in scale score points, and renders comparisons of local, state, and national averages. In the sample teacher report on the previous page, the teacher has produced gains that are impressive in language and science, but less so in math. The data help shed light on where improvement is needed.

East Tennessee State University scholar John Stone, founder of the online Education Consumers Clearinghouse and that rare education professor who is also a keen critic of the government K-12 monopoly, points out that value-added assessment could be used by education's decision-makers "to isolate and assess the effectiveness of everything from the latest curricular innovations, to the preparedness of novice teachers, to the quality of the programs in which teachers were trained." (Stone 1999)

Two specialists in teacher evaluation, James H. Stronge and Pamela D. Tucker, believe that using this sophisticated form of statistical analysis of year-to-year student achievement gains is a more accurate way to identify good teachers than the PRAXIS exams for entering teachers. (Stronge and Tucker 2001) PRAXIS I measures a teachers' basic reading, writing, and math scores. PRAXIS may usefully screen out near-illiterates from teaching but what

about the creative teacher who despite falling a few points below a passing mark in, say, math inspires students to write coherent essays? Should such a teacher be able to prove his or her mettle through an on-the-job value-added analysis?

Which Model to Use?

Two value-added models have evolved over the past decade. One, used at the district level in Dallas, compares student growth to that of other students with similar socioeconomic characteristics. (Kanstoroom, 2000). In contrast, Tennessee's VAAS compares each student's test-score gains to his or her own previous growth rate while trying to weed out any influence of extraneous factors. Stronge and Tucker contend that TVAAS is "conceptually the simpler and more accurate" of the two models. Marci Kanstoroom of the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation says whether to incorporate the confounding factors of student background into the mix is "a charged and complicated question." Those who favor the Dallas model contend socioeconomic background affects not only where students begin, but how much progress they make from year to year. Low income and minority students will make less progress over time. But Sanders argues that "student background is not strongly correlated with gains a student will make, once the student's test scores in previous years are taken into account." Sanders' view is that the quality of teaching trumps the other factors.

This is seemingly a question to make policy wonks scratch their heads: Is omitting socioeconomic variables unfair to schools or teachers with high proportions of disadvantaged students? Or does taking these into account bring into play the "soft bigotry of lower expectations" decried by George W. Bush in his presidential campaign? That is, do educators too often harm poor and minority students by failing to expect as much academic progress from them as from more privileged children?

Actually, both the Sanders "mixed-model" version of value-added analysis and the Dallas system, based on a statistical technique called "regression analysis" that is more familiar to education researchers, take socioeconomic status (SES) into account. They just do so differently. The Sanders model is conceptually simpler and geared more to the individual than group identification. TVAAS effectively compares each student's annual scores with his or her scores over the past several years – scores that have been influenced by whatever SES, IQ, genetic, motivational, or other conditions that influenced the individual during that period. Thus, it takes into account not only SES but other factors that have influenced achievement over time. The Dallas approach, by contrast, attempts to ensure fair assessments of gain by comparing scores of individual members of a given SES group (such as black, urban, low-income) not to their own prior performance but to a mark adjusted by the average performance for their "group."

Undoubtedly, more value-added research worthy of peer-reviewed publication is in order. In quest of the highest degree of statistical accuracy, there could be variations or hybrids of the current methods. But the Sanders/TVAAS model appears to be more in tune with the ideal of individualism, as opposed to group stereotypes and entitlements.

School and accountability systems could use the value-added approach in a diagnostic rather than punitive way to help weak teachers as opposed to suddenly imposing arbitrary standards. In addition, value-added comparisons could yield valuable consumer information to help parents know how well their schools are helping their children improve, and even enabling them to make choices among competing schools.

Individual Improvement

For his part, Sanders believes the worst of all possible uses for test data is the simple reporting of raw test data as newspapers often have done. Socioeconomic factors confound the straight use of such data. "Students within a school, serving primarily a low socio-economic community, could be making wonderful academic progress, yet their average test scores could be considerably lower than the district's average, leaving the erroneous impression that this is a woefully ineffective school. Students from another school, serving a population from more advantaged homes, could be 'sliding' and 'gliding,' nevertheless leaving the naïve impression that this second school is 'better' than the first because its average test scores are higher than the first school." (Sanders 2000.)

This may be one of the most overlooked problems of modern education. Well-to-do families may conclude their children are receiving superb instruction because their norm-referenced test scores are relatively high. Yet, many of those young persons may be coasting and accomplishing little or nothing. Because schools fail to challenge them, they don't have to study and find themselves with lots of time on their hands. If constructive activities like sports or part-time jobs fail to fill the void, they may entertain themselves with destructive activities.

Models that attempt to take socioeconomic factors into account through the use of such "predictors" as ethnicity or the percentage of students eligible for free or reduced-priced school lunches are a "vast improvement" over use of raw test data, Sanders believes. Yet he has serious qualms about such an approach. Using such numbers to leaven raw data could unintentionally encourage a lowering of expectations for youngsters who come from disadvantaged backgrounds. Achievement gains come from urban housing projects, the hollows of Appalachia, and millionaires' homes alike, even though the proportions of high achievers may not be the same from each segment of society. Hence, he strongly believes that the best method of evaluation simply uses each student as his or her own "control," focusing on the academic improvement that each child makes over time. (Sanders 1994.) Thereby value-added provides a way to diagnose individual learning problems and to isolate the impact of teaching so that a good teacher's work may be rewarded and an inadequate teacher's flaws may be corrected.

Plainly, good teaching matters. (Unfortunately, poor teaching also has a profound impact.) Sanders and other researchers have found that students unlucky enough to have a succession of poor teachers are virtually doomed to the education cellar. Three consecutive years of 1st quintile (least effective) teachers in grades 3 to 5 yield math scores from the 35th to 45th percentile. Conversely, three straight years of 5th quintile teachers result in scores at the 85th to 95th percentile. Put another way, students with three straight years of effective teachers had 60 percent greater achievement than those unfortunate enough to have a succession of ineffective teachers. (Stronge and Tucker 2001) Having a string of ineffective teachers for three years can essentially ruin a child's chances of succeeding in school. A chart from a 1997 TVAAS study reveals that students assigned ineffective teachers three years running scored more than 50 percentile points below their peers who were lucky enough to be assigned highly effective teachers three years in a row. To avert the damage wreaked by back-to-back-to-back poor teachers, Sanders advocates building a "teacher assignment sequence" into school planning to the effect that no student has an ineffective teacher more than once. Even better, of course, would be an assurance that students *never* encountered an ineffective teacher,

though that ideal may never be reached. (The chart is reproduced at the end of this study.)

Within school systems, perhaps the greatest boon of value-added is to teachers who do a superior job helping low achieving students. Often they labor in obscurity now, their work unappreciated or even denigrated by lack of public understanding of the difficult challenges they face. By focusing on gains, value-added can identify good teachers who are successful with low achievers as well as poor teachers who permit high achievers to coast. Fair comparisons could help students at the low and high ends of the achievement spectrum, while helping teachers too.

The "No Excuses" schools identified by an ongoing Heritage Foundation project – high-poverty schools where outstanding pupil achievement defies stereotypes about race and poverty – bolster Sanders' contention that teaching matters. Consider, for instance, Frederick Douglass Academy, a public school in central Harlem that has a student population 80 percent black and 19 percent Hispanic. *The New York Times* recently reported that all of Frederick Douglass' students passed a new, rigorous English Regents exam last year, and 96 percent passed the math Regents. The grades 6-12 school ranks among the top 10 public schools in New York City in reading and math, despite having class sizes of 30 to 34. And what makes the difference?

"Committed teachers," said principal Gregory M. Hodge – teachers, he said, who come to work early, stay late, and call parents if children don't show up for extra tutoring. The disciplined yet caring climate for learning set by Dr. Hodge and principals of other No Excuses schools also is due much credit. (Holland 2001)

A Ramp to Learning

In building better teachers such as those at Frederick Douglass Academy, the value-added approach recognizes the transforming potential of individual differences as opposed to one-size-fits-all standards.

"I believe we should visualize the curriculum not as stair steps, but rather as a ramp," Bill Sanders asserts. (Hill, 2000). "I want all kids to go up the ramp but I recognize that not all kids are going to be at the same place at the same time. What I want us to hold educators accountable for is the speed of movement up the ramp, not the position on the ramp."

Adds Sanders: "Society has a right to expect that schools will provide students with the opportunity for academic gain regardless of the level at which the students enter the educational venue. In other words, all students can and should learn commensurate with their abilities." (Hill 2000)

To be sure, value-added assessment has its critics: Some of them complain the statistical analysis is too complicated. Some say teaching entails too many intangibles to be quantified. Knee-jerk opponents of standardized testing object to using norm-referenced, multiple-choice tests. And what about learning that takes place at home? Not all a child's gains or deficits can be attributed to a teacher.

Sanders concedes that "there is no way you can measure all of the important things a teacher does in the classroom." But, he adds, "that doesn't mean you shouldn't be measuring the things that can be measured." (Hill 2000). No doubt family does influence a student's

learning, but unless there are severe disruptions, such as serious illness, the influence of home tends to be a constant that would not negate value-added assessments of a teacher's impact on learning.

Value-added assessment holds promise of being one important tool in the building of a better teacher for American schools.

References

Center for Economic Development (CED). 2000. *Measuring What Matters: Using Assessment and Accountability to Improve Student Learning*. New York: Statement by the Research and Policy Committee of the CED.

Bill Evers. 2001. "What Do Tests Tell Us?" Hoover Institution, Weekly Essay, August 20-27, 2001. www.hoover.stanford.edu/pubaffairs/we/current/evers_0801.pdf

Diane Long and Michael Cass. 2001. "Analyst Rocks Education Boat." *Nashville Tennessean*, January 11, 2001. www.tennessean.com/local/archives/01/01/01776708.shtml

Diane Ravitch. 2000. *Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms*. New York: Simon & Schuster

Robert Holland. 2001. "How To Build a Better Teacher." *Policy Review*, April & May 2001, No. 106.

William L. Sanders and Sandra P. Horn. 1994. "The Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS): Mixed Method Methodology in Educational Assessment." *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

J.E. Stone. 1999. "Value-Added Assessment: An Accountability Revolution." In Marci Kanstoroom and Chester E. Finn, Jr. (Eds.), *Better Teachers, Better Schools*. Washington, DC: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation.
http://www.education-consumers.com/articles/value_added_assessment.shtml

James H. Stronge and Pamela D. Tucker. 2001. *Teacher Evaluation and Student Achievement*. Education Consumers Consultants Network.
www.education-consumers.com/briefs/march2001.shtml

Marci Kanstoroom. 2000. *Value-Added Assessment: Ready for Prime Time?* Washington, DC: Education Leaders Council.

William L. Sanders. 2000. "Value-Added Assessment From Student Achievement Data: Opportunities and Hurdles." *Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education*. The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

David Hill. 2000. He's Got Your Number. *Teacher* magazine.
www.teachermagazine.org/tm/tm_printstory.cfm?slug=08sanders.h11

Other Education Information

[Back to the main page](#)

Regional Learning Centers:

Current educational situation in Rural Alaska

- Few Teachers
- Little opportunity to feel a part of the work-force
- Limited frame of reference for students

Opportunities provided by RLC's

- Exposure to different environment
- Potential to earn additional, college-level credits in Vo-Tech programs (possibly)
- Opportunity to experience being part of the work-force
- Opens students eyes to opportunities in hub communities

How it relates to HSGQE

- May provide for additional years, should students NOT pass exam by grade 12.

Boarding Schools:

- Desire across state LAST YEAR

- Mt. Edgecumbe had 291 completed applications for 144 spots
 - Project Education (Galena) had 150 applications for 32 spots
 - Nenana just started, but had more than twice the applications for the spots available (mostly 9th grade applications, 9th and 10th started out full, 11th and 12th did not)

Desire by districts, across state, for some form of Regional Learning Center, per LB&A report:

- Fairbanks, Nome, Kotzebue, Bethel, St. Mary's, McGrath/Takotna, Seward, Seldovia, Kodiak

What Districts are doing now:

Chugach School District – Anchorage House

- 2 – 6 bedroom houses in Anchorage, where kids learn to transition successfully to the world of work, business ownership, or post-secondary education
- Kids start as early as 5th grade, going for 3 days at a time
- 4 phase approach – student directed, advancement based on achievement
- 97% of eligible Chugach students participate.
- 92% placement of participants in one of 5 acceptable outcomes: post-secondary education, entrepreneurial, service learning, vocational
- Now beginning to bring parents in to learn how to support their children when they do transition.
- Open to other districts, as well as Chugach students.

Lower Kuskokwim – Bethel Alternative Boarding School (BABS) and Yuut Elit Naur Diat

BABS

- Started after 1997 shootings in Bethel, to meet needs of at-risk kids
- Open to kids within the region, not just district.
- 35 students

Yuut Elit Naur Diat

- Has not yet opened (they are hopeful it will in 1-2 years)
- Grades 9-14
- Open to region, not just school district
- 200-250 student capacity
- Grant from USDA and U.S. Department of Interior, and \$900k in Governor's Budget
- Consortium of 19 organizations/corporations to provide vocational education in areas needed in the region, including Health, Trades (construction, electrical, etc.), Technology and Education fields.
- Year round program

updated version 2-6-02
By Rep. Joule

Galena – Project Education

72 students from all over state

Been running for 5 years

97% return rate

Focus on post-secondary education and careers

Vocational – Aviation arts and technology, auto/engine repair, computer tech., culinary arts, beauty school, wood shop, welding, carpentry, drafting.

Partnerships with U.S. Air Force, Suzuki, General Motors, Compaq, Frontier Flying

Strict policies re: attendance and maintaining G.P.A.

Students who do not pass one or more portions of HSGQE required to go to 1 hour of tutoring after school every day.

Bering Straits & Nome – Beltz Facility

Bill on this last year – HB 239 (Rep. Foster).

Want to create a Regional Learning Center where students would come for short-stays, with intensive training in vocational areas

Northwest Arctic Borough – VoTech Center

Looking at the possibility of expanding current facility to include High School age students from district

No current dormitory facilities for High School students (Boarding School Stipend?)

Grades 9-14

Students could attend Kotz. High while attending the VoTech Center for career training

Aleutians East Borough – Live, Interactive Video Teaching

Coming on line next year

Teacher in one community can provide course to multiple sites, real-time, interactively

Student in one community raises hand, teacher sees that via a monitor, and calls on student, as though they were in the same community as the teacher

Cost – Approx. \$400,000. Paid for through E-rate (90% of their students are on school lunch programs) Cost to district - \$40,000 per year – pays for equipment, Broadband, etc.

Can be utilized in partnership between districts – maybe one district could pay another district for seats in a class.