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Abstract
Laura Desimone presents Year 2 findings from the Implementation Study at C-SAIL’s second annual "A Conversation on College- and Career-Readiness Standards" in Washington, D.C. on April 27, 2018. This PowerPoint presentation corresponds to a presentation video available at c-sail.org/videos.
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What Are the Policy Attributes?

- **Specificity**: how detailed or prescriptive a policy is
- **Authority**: policy’s legitimacy and status, which can be achieved through rules, laws or charismatic leaders
- **Consistency**: extent to which policies are aligned and how policies relate to and support each other
- **Power**: how policies are reinforced and enacted through systems of rewards and sanctions.
- **Stability**: extent to which policies change or remain constant over time (Porter, 1994; Porter et al., 1988).
## Interviews and Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Interviews</th>
<th>California</th>
<th>Kentucky</th>
<th>Massachusetts</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
<th>Texas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1: N = 4</td>
<td>Year 1: N = 5</td>
<td>Year 1: N = 5</td>
<td>Year 1: N = 5</td>
<td>Year 1: N = 6</td>
<td>Year 1: N = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2: N = 3</td>
<td>Year 2: N = 9</td>
<td>Year 2: N = 5</td>
<td>Year 2: N = 5</td>
<td>Year 2: N = 9</td>
<td>Year 2: N = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Interviews</td>
<td>Year 1: N = 0</td>
<td>Year 1: N = 12</td>
<td>Year 1: N = 0</td>
<td>Year 1: N = 12</td>
<td>Year 1: N = 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2: N = 9</td>
<td>Year 2: N = 11</td>
<td>Year 2: N = 5</td>
<td>Year 2: N = 8</td>
<td>Year 2: N = 9</td>
<td>Year 2: N = 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveys Participants and Response Rates</td>
<td>Year 1: 17 district admin (16%) 42 principals (32%) 221 teachers (32%)</td>
<td>Year 1: 170 principals (42%) 740 teachers (32%)</td>
<td>Year 1: 42 district admin (86%) 111 principals (60%) 417 teachers (64%)</td>
<td>Year 1: 42 district admin (79%) 149 principals (70%) 603 teachers (55%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question #1:

What are major trends in how states and districts are implementing college- and career-ready standards?
Theme: In local control contexts, greater specificity and consistency is found at the district, rather than the state, level.

State
- General guidelines for curriculum development; limited role in ensuring alignment to state's interpretation of the standards

District
- Locally developed curriculum frameworks aligned to their interpretations of the standards
Theme: State and district officials are framing accountability as support, indicating “softer power” compared to previous waves of standards-based reform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Previous Waves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Financial incentives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sanctions on districts, schools, and teachers due to underperformance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Wave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Public recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assistance and guidelines for data-driven decision making for underperforming districts/schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theme: PD is often the district vehicle for strengthening specificity, consistency, and authority
Research Question #2:

What are major implementation trends for teachers of English language learners and students with disabilities?
Theme: Specificity, consistency, and authority for ELL policies are developed through centralized state supports or through partners with national consortia
Theme: Some officials question the consistency between IDEA and the CCR policies; they also are working to provide more specific guidance for administrators and teachers of SWDs.
Year 3 Preview

• Deeper dive into innovation, policies/practices revolving curriculum, PD, and differentiation for SWDs and ELLs that enhance the policy attributes
  – Additional data collection: principal and teacher interviews, teacher focus groups, classroom observations in 5 districts

• Additional data collection of perspectives of the state-district relationship at the regional level, and how regional supports enhance state initiatives through their localized implementation approaches

• Persistent or changing implementation strategies from 2015-2016 (Year 1) to 2018-2019 (Year 3)