

APPENDIX A: CREATING THE NEW MYTH

The Education Trust (ET) is a non-profit organization based in Washington, D.C. and part of the Business Roundtable's educational reform network. Funded in part by the Knight Foundation and the Pew Charitable Trust, ET has teamed up with the National Association of System Heads to replace the old myth— Some-Can and Some-Can't— with the new myth -- Everyone-Can meet the “high academic standards” being institutionalized by the new statewide testing systems. In the document *Thinking K-16* (Fall, 1999), ET outlines what they hope to achieve.

The authors of *Thinking K-16* (Fall, 1999) argue that the purpose of ET is to “transform schools and colleges into institutions that genuinely serve all students.” They are “concerned with the quality of education provided to our neediest young people” and want to “focus on schools and colleges most often left behind in reform efforts” (p. 2). Their main concern is “excellence and equity” and “closing the education gap.” These broad ideals are in sharp contrast to the very narrow “action items” that the document details. Members of ET have teamed up with “State Education CEO's” to engineer an alignment of state tests required for high school graduation with state university admission requirements or placement tests (p. 4).

To do this, they believe, requires specifically defining and standardizing (at a “high level”) the content of a high school “knowledge and skills core curriculum” (pp. 3, 14) that, if mastered, allows students to enter college without “wasting valuable time” in remedial courses. For example, “admission without remediation” means at least mastery of Algebra 2 because this course is most commonly required by postsecondary institutions for placement into credit-bearing mathematics” (fn., p. 4). “Equity and excellence” means “educating all students as if they were bound for college and the workplace” (p.2). “Closing the Education Gap” will occur when standards are raised. Raising standards raises all students scores while closing the gap between whites and nonwhite students. The “evidence” that supports such a myth is “El Paso test scores” gathered by the El Paso (Texas) Collaborative for Academic Excellence from 1992 to 1998 (p. 9).

In spite of very little reality to support their theory of education reform, state and K–12 “system heads” seem to be going ahead with the implementation of curriculum alignment. *Thinking K–16* (Fall, 1999) documents the success that “K–12 and higher education CEOs “have had in promoting “high academic achievement for all students at all levels.” In New York, the high school graduation test (the Regents Exam) has been required of all students, cut-off scores have been raised and the City University System (soon to be joined by the State University System) has begun to use the Regents exam scores to place students in college courses. In Maryland, a plan is being formulated to develop a high school exit exam that will simultaneously be used as an admission and placement exam in the state university system. In Massachusetts, ET is delighted that the state’s colleges are using the writing portion of the MCAS for writing course placements (p. 4).

The movement for higher standards narrowly defined seems to have taken on some of the characteristics of a religious war. ET identifies four Commandments, uh, Commitments that need to be made by those pursuing “equity and excellence”:

Commitment A: We will ensure that all high school graduates meet high standards.

Commitment B: We will accept only teachers who can bring all students’ performance to high standards.

Commitment C: We will accept into college only students who meet high standards.

Commitment D: We will ensure that all teacher candidates we produce are prepared to bring student performance to high standards (p. 11).

The success of this strategy seems to rest upon the zealous worship of the myth that if the “ceiling becomes the floor” then all students will respond by learning all the same things since “college attendance will probably be near universal” (p. 11). Every One Can Succeed. Those who don’t? Then the failing must reside within the individual or the parents of that individual. If ET has its way, all high school students will not graduate from high school unless they can pass a test that qualifies them for admission into a college or university. The students must stay in high school until they learn what is needed to pass such a test.

Every Student Seen To Need College Prep

By Debra Viadero

Education Week, October 10, 2001

<http://www.edweek.org/ew/newstory.cfm?slug=06high.h21>

"High school graduation should become the finish line for a rigorous learning experience and a launching pad for postsecondary study," said Gov. Paul E. Patton of Kentucky, the chairman of the 29-member National Commission on the Senior Year. The group, a public-private panel formed by then-Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley, issued its final report here during a press conference held Oct. 4 at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce.

When the commission was called together 16 months ago, its charge was to study ways to keep students and schools from frittering away learning opportunities in the final year of schooling. But the group quickly concluded that the problems confronting high schools go deeper than "senioritis."

Underpinning the group's work all along has been the idea that students need more than a high school diploma to raise a family in a fast-changing, technology-driven economy. "We must put forth the radical idea that Americans, whatever their background, must have 15 years of education and training over the course of their lives," the report says. To remedy the problem, the panel calls on high schools to make the college-prep track the "default" curriculum for students. Educators should be required to obtain parental permission, the panelists say, before assigning a student to a less academic track — regardless of whether that student's future plans include a technical college, a community college, or an Ivy League university.

Eighteen states, from Georgia to Oregon, have established such "P-16" systems to increase access to higher education and align curricula at all levels of schooling. "It seems that only 10 states have aligned their high school graduation requirements in English and only two in mathematics," the report says.

To keep students from getting lost in the school pipeline early on, the commission also calls on teachers, administrators, counselors, students, and parents to draw up "formal learning plans" for every student, probably beginning as early as sixth grade, and to update them annually. If students reach tenth grade and they're still too far behind, the report suggests, schools may need to perform some academic triage and provide extra help and double doses of troublesome core courses.

APPENDIX B: NEWSPAPER DATABASE WITH FILEMAKER PRO

Below is a copy of one of the 740 records I made with a FileMaker Pro (3.0) application. Each record represents one newspaper article from the *San Francisco Chronicle* (from 1980-2001) unless otherwise noted in the “reporter” field. I coded each article based on the issues raised in the contents of the article. By doing “finds” on each issue, I was able to get a general sense of which of the issues represented significant trends and during which particular times between 1980-2001.

APPENDIX C: WASHINGTON STATE'S 1998 SCHEDULE OF COMMUNICATION ACTIVITIES (BRT, 1998; p. 30)

Activities	AUDIENCE		
1. Broad Public Information	Opinion Leaders	Parents	Educators

Publications

Thematic quarterly newsletter	•	•	•
Parent's & teacher's guides: 4 th grade and 7 th grade test scores		•	•
Easy to read parent's brochure		•	
Flyers to parents		•	
Comparison guide to old vs. new tests	•	•	•
One-page overview of education reform	•	•	•
Business person's/employer's guide to education reform	•		
Explanations of certificate of mastery and new accountability	•	•	•
Postcard to "supporters" on PFL mailing list	•	•	•

Targeted Advertising

PSA campaign for Spanish-speaking parents		•	
---	--	---	--

Media

Meetings with editorial boards	•		
Assorted op-eds: 4 th grade test scores and 7 th grade tests	•	•	•
Newsletter articles to community groups and businesses	•	•	•

Video/Internet

Video explaining 4 th grade and 7 th grade tests		•	•
Maintain and update web site	•	•	•

Research

Follow-up 1996 poll with 3-4 questions on standards and testing	•		•
Focus groups on communicating about accountability	•	•	•

**Washington State's 1998 Schedule of Communication Activities
(continued)**

	Opinion Leaders	Parents	Educators
2. Community Support and Grassroots Development			
Community Outreach			
Community breakfasts (Everett, Spokane, Yakima, Tri-Cities)	•	•	•
Summer workshop for school district communicators		•	•
Fall workshop for new legislators	•		
Briefings to community leaders on accountability recommendations	•		
Meetings/follow-up with 30 chamber of commerce	•		
“Business Sector” meetings with Bergeson	•		
“Brown bag” lunches with employees on tests		•	
Community Advisers (8 cities)			
Local events to explain new tests	•	•	
Speaker’s bureau	•	•	
Outreach to local churches/minority groups	•	•	
Support for locally-developed communication plans	•	•	•

**From Assessing and Addressing the “Testing Backlash” (BRT report,
Spring 2001; pp. 23-24)**

Washington: Making Standards Work

The centerpiece of the Partnership’s work is an annual study of rapidly improving schools — those making the greatest progress in helping students meet new standards, especially with disadvantaged student populations. An independent researcher performs the study, and the results show the steps schools take to help their students meet the standards. The research report helps communicate the positive ways many schools are using the new standards and tests to improve student learning. The report is disseminated

broadly in the media and directly to elected officials, school leaders, parents, activists, and community leaders.

This year, the Partnership also prepared a companion video that, along with a discussion guide, was sent to all PTA chapters and every school principal. The video was designed carefully to address some of the most pressing concerns from teachers about the state standards and tests. Using the voices of principals and teachers at schools that have helped disadvantaged students improve test scores, the video contradicts the arguments that some kids cannot meet higher standards and that standards force teachers to be less creative or standardize their teaching.

Appendix D: Sample Alternative Perspectives on the Direction Education Reform Should Take

Arnstine, D. (1995). Democracy and the Arts of Schooling. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.

Atwell, N. (1987). In the Middle: Writing, Reading, and Learning with Adolescents. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Barber, Benjamin R. (1992) . An Aristocracy Of Everyone : The Politics Of Education And The Future Of America . New York : Ballantine Books.

Barber, Benjamin R. (1984) Strong Democracy : Participatory Politics For A New Age . Berkeley : University of California Press.

Bastian, Ann. (1986). Choosing Equality : The Case For Democratic Schooling . Philadelphia : Temple University Press.

Dewey, J. (1944). Democracy and Education. New York: The Free Press. (originally published in 1916).

Dewey, John. (1938). Experience And Education. New York: The Macmillan Company.

Dewey, John. (1939). Freedom And Culture. New York: G. P. Putnam's sons.

Goodman, Paul. (1962). Growing Up Absurd : Problems Of Youth In The Organized Society. New York : Vintage Books.

Gitlin, T. (1995). The Twilight of Common Dreams: Why American is Wracked by Culture Wars. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Giroux, H. A., & McLaren, P. (1989). Critical pedagogy, the state, and cultural struggle. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Greer, Colin. (1986).The Great School Legend: A Revisionist Interpretation Of American Public Education. New York: Basic Books .

Gutmann, Amy. (1999). Democratic Education . Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press.

Hode, B. H. (1937). Democracy as a Way of Life. New York: MacMillan.

Hutchins, Robert Maynard. (1999). The Conflict In Education In A Democratic Society. New York: Harper.

- Hutchins, Robert Maynard. (1954). Great Books, The Foundation Of A Liberal Education. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Katz, Michael B. (1971). Class, Bureaucracy, And Schools; The Illusion Of Educational Change In America. New York: Praeger.
- Kozol, J. (1986). The Night is Dark and I Am Far from Home: A Political Indictment of the U.S. Public School System. New York: The Continuum Publishing Corporation
- Makarenko, A. S. (1973). The road to life; an epic in education. New York,: Oriole Editions.
- McNeil, L. (2000). Contradictions of School Reform: Educational Costs of Standardized Testing. New York: Routledge.
- Meier, D., & and others. (2000). Will Standards Save Public Education? Boston: Beacon Press.
- Neill, A. S. (1960). Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Child Rearing. New York: Hart Publishing Company.
- Noguera, P. (1996). Confronting the Urban in Urban School Reform. Urban Review, 28(1), 1-19.
- Pateman, Carole. (1970). Participation And Democratic Theory. Cambridge [Eng.] University Press.
- Perlstein, D. (1999). If Not Now, When? In B. Peterson & M. Charney (Eds.), Transforming Teacher Unions: Fighting for Better Schools and Social Justice (pp. 86-92). Milwaukee: Rethinking Schools.
- Plato. Republic.
- Popkewitz, T. (1991). Educational Reform as a Discourse of Social Organization and Regulation: The proposals for the 1980's, A Political Sociology of Educational Reform: Power/knowledge in teaching, teacher education and research (pp. 136-155). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Rosenthal, A. Ed. (1969). Governing Education: A Reader on Politics, Power, and Public School Policy. New York: Anchor Books.
- Rousseau, J. J. (1979). Emile (Allan Bloom, Trans.): Basic Books.
- Taylor, D. (1993). From the Child's Point of View. Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann.

Timar, Thomas. (1999). The Invisible Hand Of Ideology : Perspectives From The History Of School Governance . Denver, Colo. : Education Commission of the States.

Sandel, Michael J.(1962). Democracy's Discontent : America In Search Of A Public Philosophy . Cambridge, Mass. : Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Spring, J. (1998b). Conflicts of Interest. New York: McGraw Hill.

Uno, E. (1979). Community Participation in Education: A Minority Viewpoint. In C. Grant (Ed.), Community Participation in Education (pp. 162-175). Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Welter, Rush. 1962). Popular Education And Democratic Thought In America.. New York: Columbia University Press.

White, Patricia. (1983). Beyond Domination. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

APPENDIX E: IEL GRANTS AND CONTRIBUTORS

(from IEL Web page)

Corporate Funders

Aetna Foundation
 American Express Foundation
 Anheuser-Busch Companies
 ARCO Foundation
 Automatic Data Processing, Inc.
 BellSouth Foundation
 BellSouth Corporation
 Bristol-Myers Squibb Foundation, Inc.
 Chemical Bank
 Chrysler Corporation Fund
 CIGNA Foundation
 Citibank, N.A.
 Computer Curriculum Corporation
 Exxon Education Foundation
 Fannie Mae Foundation
 Ford Motor Company Fund
 GE Fund
 General Motors Corporation
 General Mills Foundation
 Hewlett-Packard Company
 Honeywell Inc.
 IBM Corporation
 J.C. Penny Company, Inc.
 Johnson & Johnson Family of Companies
 Contribution Fund
 Lockheed Martin Corporation
 Mattel Foundation
 Metropolitan Life Foundation
 Mobil Corporation
 The Proctor & Gamble Fund

Prudential Foundation
 Rockwell International Corporation
 Ryder System Charitable Foundation, Inc.
 Scholastic, Inc.
 Sears, Roebuck and Co. Foundation
 SBC Communications Foundation
 Sprint Foundation
 Travelers Foundation
 TRW, Inc.
 U.S. West Foundation
 Union Carbide Corporation
 The Washington Post
 Xerox Foundation

Foundations which provide IEL with financial support

Annie E. Casey Foundation
 Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
 The Commonwealth Fund
 The Danforth Foundation
 DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Fund
 Ford Foundation
 William Caspar Graustein Memorial Fund
 The George Gund Foundation
 E.M. Kauffman Foundation
 W.K. Kellogg Foundation
 Lilly Endowment, Inc.
 MacArthur Foundation
 Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
 Pew Charitable Trusts
 Rockefeller Foundation
 E.C. Wareheim Foundation

Appendix F – The Reconstitution of Mission High School

The data below has been taken from a memo written by Superintendent Bill Rojas to all CSIP participants on June 19, 1997. The Memo, as a way of explanation, provided the data by which Rojas decided which CSIP participants were remaining in CSIP, which were “graduating” and which were to be reconstituted in the 1997–98 school year. Mission High School and Golden Gate Elementary were the last two schools to be reconstituted by Rojas. Lupe Arabolos was principal of MHS from 1994 to 1996. Ted Alfaro was principal of MHS from 1996-2001.

Enrolled in the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan during the 1996-97 school year	Superintendent’s Recommendations for 1997-8	Total point count of both “qualitative” and “quantitative” indicators
Cleveland Elementary	CSIP	62.6
Fairmont Elementary	Graduate	80.7
Golden Gate Elementary	RECONSTITUTE	60
Marshall Elementary	Graduate	76.1
Sanchez Elementary	CSIP	60.2
Denman Middle	Graduate	86.6
McAteer High School	Graduate	79.4
Mission High School	RECONSTITUTE	60.5

Criteria by which schools evaluated to determine CSIP status	Mission High School	McAteer High School
QUALITATIVE INDICATORS		
A. School Site Plan (25%)		
1. approved by all departments and offices that have responsibility for its review and approval	5/5	5/5
2. degree to which activities of the Plan were implemented according to Plan’s target dates	5/10	7/10
3. degree activities of the Plan addressed the achievement of all students, especially Latinos and African Americans	6/10	9/10
B. Site Visitation by superintendent and advisory panel (25%)		
4. degree of congruence between what is observed by visit, portfolio presentation and on site plan	7/10	8/10
5. evidence that direction of school’s program is positive, especially for Latinos and African Americans	9/15	11/15

C. Portfolio (25%)		
6. degree it documents the school's program direction efforts, and plans to improve achievement for all students, especially Latinos and African Americans	11.7/25	22.5/25
D. Oral Presentation to Superintendent and Advisory Panel (25%)		
7. degree of effective communication of efforts, plans, commitment to improve achievement of Latinos and African Americans	18/25	20/25
TOTAL QUALITATIVE SCORE (out of 100)	61.7	82.5
QUANTITATIVE INDICATORS		
1. Four year CTBS scores 1993-1997 [formula by which test scores converted to 25 point scale not provided in Rojas' memo]	15.75/25	18.75/25
2. Writing Samples: grade 9, pre-test (October) and post-test (March). Points awarded based on improvement from Fall to Spring: 1.25 points for each tenth of a point gain in mean scores) At Mission High School: 113 samples (out of 354 9 th graders) At McAteer High School: 135 samples (out of 326 9 th graders)	16/25	13/25
3. Alternative Assessment as it exists at school sites. This falls within the purview of qualitative indicator and could best be evaluated through school visits and portfolios	NA	NA
4. Average Daily Attendance for Fall semester: 6.25 points for either (a) at or above 97.5% or (b) at least 1% higher than the previous year. Mission HS: March 1996 = 94%; March 1997 = 93.18%. McAteer: March 1996 = 92.98%; March 1997 = 95.61%.	0/6.25	6.25/6.25
5. Suspensions: no more than 8% of student body from 8/96-4/4/97 and the percentage suspended of each ethnic group must be proportionate to the percentage of that group within the school.	6.25/6.25	6.25/6.25
6. Reduction of D, F, I and N grades from Fall 1993-1996. MHS: 37%, 40%, 41%, 39% McAteer: 41%, 41%, 41%, 32%	3/12.5	12.5/12.5
7. Dropout Rate: less than 2.5% left the school without a trace. As of 3/31/97, MHS: .5% ; McAteer: 1.0% for 1996-7.	12.5/12.5	12.5/12.5
8. Referrals to Student Placement Committee from 8/96-4/16/97. [formula not provided by memo]	5.75/12.5	7.13/12.5
TOTAL QUANTITATIVE SCORE (out of 100)	59.3	76.4
Average of sum of total Qualitative and total Quantitative	60.5	79.4

**APPENDIX G: FROM THE REPORT OF THE MONITORING TEAM
APPOINTED BY THE FEDERAL COURT TO EVALUATE THE
DEGREE OF COMPLIANCE BY SFUSD WITH THE 1983
CONSENT DECREE**

(Biegel, 1997; p. 35)

The Nine Racial/Ethnic Categories of the Consent Decree
and Percentages of Each Group

(at Ida B. Wells, Lowell, O'Connell and Lincoln High Schools
as well as the district at large)

<u>L*</u>	<u>OW</u>	<u>AA</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>K</u>	<u>AI</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>ONW</u>	<u>J</u>	
<u>23</u>	<u>7.5</u>	<u>36.8</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>1.3</u>	<u>3.8</u>	<u>11.7</u>		<u>Wells 1997</u>
<u>20.4</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>39.4</u>	<u>15.7</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>3.3</u>	<u>13.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>Wells 2001</u>
<u>5.6</u>	<u>17.8</u>	<u>2.3</u>	<u>52.9</u>	<u>1.9</u>	<u>.3</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>11.9</u>	<u>1.4</u>	<u>Lowell 2001</u>
<u>68</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>9.5</u>	<u>4.4</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4.9</u>	<u>5.1</u>	<u>.4</u>	<u>O'Connell 01</u>
<u>6</u>	<u>14</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>52</u>	<u>1.6</u>	<u>.5</u>	<u>4.5</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>Lincoln 2001</u>
<u>17.2</u>	<u>16.9</u>	<u>23.1</u>	<u>19.5</u>	<u>1.0</u>	<u>0.6</u>	<u>8.7</u>	<u>11.9</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>SFUSD 1983</u>
<u>20.9</u>	<u>13.1</u>	<u>17.1</u>	<u>26.9</u>	<u>1.1</u>	<u>0.7</u>	<u>7.4</u>	<u>11.8</u>		<u>SFUSD 1997</u>

***L= Latino; OW = other white; AA = African American; C= Chinese/American; K= Korean/American; AI = American Indian; F = Filipino/American; ONW = other non-white (mostly Asian Pacific ethnicity); J = Japanese/American**

Achieving Student Desegregation
Paragraph 13

Alternative Schools Out of Compliance with the "No More Than 40%"
Requirement

The following alternative schools with enrollment percentages of a particular race/ethnicity over 40% were out of compliance either on October 12, 1996 or on May 6, 1997. It should be noted that out of the eight schools listed below, only five were out of compliance by the spring, with three of these five by less than 2 percentage points apiece.

SCHOOLS	Oct. 12, 1996	Race/Ethnicity	May 6, 1997
Lowell High	42.3%	Chinese	42.7%
Ida B. Wells	43.3%	African American	39.9%
John O'Connell	41.5%	Hispanic	39.6%
Gloria R. Davis MS	41.6%	African American	42.2%
21st Century	42.5%	African American	41.9%
Buena Vista Alt.MS	40.1%	Hispanic	39.3%
Harvey Milk ES	39.6%	Hispanic	40.6%*
Downtown	39.5%	African American	41.7%*

Regular Schools Out of Compliance with the "No More Than 45%" Requirement

The following regular schools with enrollment percentages of a particular race/ethnicity over 45% were out of compliance. It should be noted that nearly half of the schools that are out of compliance are within less than one percentage point of the required figures (Biegel, 1997; p. 36-37). [E = elementary]

SCHOOLS	Oct. 12, 1996	Race/Ethnicity	May 6, 1997
Francisco Middle	47.0%	Chinese	46.7%
Bessie Carmichael E	46.3%	Filipino	45.2%
Bryant E	46.6%	Hispanic	46.3%
C. Stockton	46.4%	Chinese	46.7%
Cabrillo E	45.5%	Chinese	44.9%
Edison E charter	45.4%	Hispanic	45.1%
Francis Scott Key E	46.9%	Chinese	46.0%
Fairmount E	46.0%	Hispanic	45.3%
Garfield E	52.1%	Chinese	50.7%
G. Moscone E	46.7%	Hispanic	45.3%
G. W. Carver E	47.3%	African American	48.7%
George Peabody E	45.5%	Chinese	44.1%
Jean Parker E	49.0%	Chinese	48.3%
Leonard F. Flynn E	45.9%	Hispanic	44.9%
Malcolm X E	50.5%	African American	50.1%
Marshall H	46.8%	Hispanic	45.0%
R.L. Stevenson E	45.8%	Chinese	45.0%
Redding E	45.3%	Chinese	45.0%
Sheridan E	46.2%	African American	43.7%
Sherman E	45.2%	Chinese	44.6%
Spring Valley E	48.5%	Chinese	49.6%
Sutro E	45.4%	Chinese	45.5%
Ulloa E	45.5%	Chinese	45.3%
V. Valley Elementary	46.1%	Chinese	45.3%

SCHOOLS	October 12, 1996		May 6, 1997
Cesar Chavez E	44.9%	Hispanic	45.6%
Glen Park E	44.9%	Hispanic	45.3%
Jefferson E	44.9%	Chinese	45.6%
John Y. Chin E	44.1%	Chinese	45.6%
Junipero Serra E	44.6%	Hispanic	45.1%
Abraham Lincoln High	44.7%	Chinese	45.3%

APPENDIX H: TEN POINT FRAMEWORK OF THE LOCAL EDUCATION FUND NETWORK AND CORPORATE FUNDERS

The Public Education Network (PEN) is partnered with state BRT organizations and exists to support Local Education Foundations. These LEFs are the vehicles through which local business groups pursue Standards-Based Reform in their cities. Below is the *Ten Point Framework* which guides the work of LEFs as well as a list of those corporations who contribute to PEN.

Ten Point Framework

(<http://www.publiceducation.org/about/ten2.htm>, viewed 8/20/2002)

- 1. Commitment:** Everyone in the community must believe, and act as if they believe, that all children can learn at high levels.
- 2. Standards and Outcomes:** We must measure educational outcomes, rather than just inputs.
- 3. Assessments:** In order to reach these outcomes, we must have appropriate assessments in place to measure students' progress.
- 4. Accountability:** We must establish "consequences of success." If we don't have consequences, no one will take seriously the striving for success.
- 5. School-Based Management:** If we intend to hold school staff accountable, we must move decision-making down to the school level.
- 6. Good Teachers:** Recruitment, Licensing, and Continued Learning Teachers' licensure should be based on what children need to know, not on outdated credentialing programs.
- 7. School Readiness:** We must establish quality, developmentally appropriate pre-kindergarten programs for all children.
- 8. School Community Links:** Health and social services must be a part of any quality school reform.
- 9. Technology:** Technology must be included in teaching, special education, and information management.
- 10. Public Engagement and Support:** Public engagement is critical. Significant change can only be achieved with the understanding, agreement, and participation of a broad base of community members.

Corporate Donors to PEN

Corporations in boldface have been specifically mentioned in this study

(<http://www.publiceducation.org/about/funder.htm>, viewed 8/20/2002)

ABC, Inc. Foundation	Microsoft Corporation
Alabama Power Foundation	New York Times Company Foundation
American Express Foundation	Pew Charitable Trusts
Annenberg Foundation	Prudential Foundation
BET Holdings, Inc.	Qwest Foundation
BP Amoco Foundation	Rapides Foundation
Centers for Disease Control and Prevention	Joseph E. Seagram & Sons
Chevron Products Company	Sulzberger Foundation
Citigroup Foundation	Tides Foundation
Edna McConnell Clark Foundation	UPS Foundation
Epson America, Inc.	US Department of Education
Ford Foundation	US Department of Health & Human Services
Harcourt Educational Measurement	Wallace-Reader's Digest Funds
Heinz Family Foundation	Washington Mutual
James Irvine Foundation	William & Flora Hewlett Foundation
JP Morgan Chase Foundation	Working Assets
Metropolitan Life Foundation	