



Martin J. Blank, director of Coalition for Community Schools: Good Afternoon, How's everybody doing? We have a really distinct honor today and I think another sign that Community Schools are really becoming part of the national educational conversation. Joining us today are the leaders of our nation's largest teacher organizations. They are the people that come into our classroom every day and work with our children and educate our children, and help them to learn and grow and develop, and I'm thrilled that Randi Weingarten, president of AFT (American Federation of Teachers), and Dennis Van Roekel, who is the president of the NEA (National Education Association). This is another important milestone for our work. Sometimes people talk about community schools and say there's a school and then there's a community school. That's not it. What it is, is a coherent and integrated set of opportunities for young people, both in the classroom, learning in the community, and getting all of the social and health supports they need. So this is a real opportunity for us to hear from Randi and Dennis, to see how they see community schools. Randi let me start with you. You've been very eloquent in your support of community schools, and we've been grateful for that. Tell us briefly why, why is this so important to AFT, and to your members in classrooms across America. (0:00-2:43)

Randi Weingarten: To us, if it's important to kids, it's important to us. If you think about what's going on in America right now, you'll have this double or tiple whammy. You have a system of schooling in America that is still based in the industrial age. I know there are people who say it's based on the agrarian economy, but if you think about it, I suspect everyone in this room went to high school once, right? So high schools today are like they were when I went I went to school a couple years ago. Which is, 40 min of one class, bell rings, 3 min, another 40 min etc. We're set in an old system that presumed that if you graduated that would be great and went to college, very nice, but if you didn't, you'd either be a homemaker, or you'd work in a factory. Compare that to what the economy is now. And so at the very same time as we should be transforming our schools, were in the midst of our worst budget recession since the great depression, and who gets hurt the most? Kids. And particular kids, who have all sorts of other social and economic issues visited on them. Not that they've created, but visited on them. And so, from our perspective, it's not about making poverty, or all these other social issues an excuse, it's how do we compete with it to make sure all of our kids, regardless of zip code, regardless of where they live, regardless of where they come from, how do we make sure they can compete so they can be ready for life, and college, and their dreams. So from a strictly analytical perspective of wanting to help all kids, we have to compete, we have to give them all of our children, the same things that maybe parents in suburban areas can do, and will do. And that's why community schools and the wraparound programs that community schools bring with them, becomes an essential, not an add on, but an essential piece of any real school reform effort to help children. One more issue, and then I'll stop, the other piece is this- and maybe call me a Polly Anna. I believe in a United States that has school as a center of community. And that says to parents, regardless of where they live that that neighborhood school is a school that you love. That your kids are safe in- that become a place where the community feels it's their place. And one way of making or creating that kind of premises, where I grew up, and



where my mom grew up, that the school was a center of community. The way you do that, these days, is to really not just say it rhetorically, but to create some of these programs that parents and kids need right there, instead of making parents go halfway across the city for a health clinic or other kinds of things.

Dennis Van Roekel: I'm really proud that at this conference, on this topic, that the two presidents of the largest education organizations, I think it says a whole lot about what's going to happen in the future and why this is so important. For me, the journey to community schools, I feel like I've gone a full circle. I grew up in a very small town of about 1700 in the Midwest. And you know, if you live in a small enough town, you have to have a community school. There's no other place to go. It was the only place to go for vaccinations, and activities on Saturday, and the summer, adult education, services for kids and adults- it was the center of the community, and of course, there was only 1. so you couldn't go somewhere else, it was kind of makeshift, makes you wonder about some of these marvels- when they say close them and go to a different school? No, there was only one. So now, full circle I've been around a long time and I've taught in communities that are- my high school had 3 times as many kids as we had people in my home town. And now, we've come full circle we understand, why it's so important about community schools, about what it does. And I think right now, when I think of the benefits of why it is so important in 2010 to be talking about CS, is for those of you who have been in education for the last 8 years under NCLB, one of the unintended consequences, and I don't believe they wrote the law with this as its intent or purpose- but what we've seen is this incredible narrowing of the curriculum, and we don't look at all the kids. We don't worry about those who have already got proficiency, or those who are way too low. As one principal called it the golden band- those who were just below proficiency. And the consequence of this over emphasis and narrowing of the curriculum is we forgot the purpose of education. We forgot that it's about the student, it's about the child. The focus needs to be on them, not some test or test score. And see, community schools, to me one of the most positive benefits, is it gets back to understanding that we have to educate the whole child. Of course there are academics and it's much more broad than just math and reading- it's the arts, and science, and history, and civics. But there's the part about citizenship and living in a democracy. It's about educating the whole child and building a place for them as they go on to adulthood, between work, and family, and faith, and community. And so, I think what it reminds us of in a time when it's very difficult to hear that voice, about the importance of educating that whole child. And for the adults who work there, what a different environment, when in the community school, when we look at all of the needs of students, whether they be medical or social needs, and we include the family school community partnerships, what a difference it is to work in that environment. For the students, we see them as a whole, were better able to identify the obstacles that keep them from success, or from learning. We work on system instead of random acts. There is actually a thoughtful process of looking at who we are, what do our students need, and how do we corral all of the resources in the community to focus on them, and remove



obstacles. It makes parents in the communities partners. Accountability in this day in age is often used in such negative way. Accountability to me is not negative. Accountability is: are you doing what you're

supposed to be doing based on your purpose. It takes a shared responsibility. It takes parents, it takes communities, it takes policymakers, and it takes the adults who work in public schools, to work together to make it right for kids. So, I can't think of anything that more important right now, in all of that challenges, whether its economic crisis, or the whole world that we see around us, I can't think of anything that's more important right now, than to come back together, to focus on the whole child, bring all of the adults in the community and the schools together to say lets remove obstacles, let's make it right for kids.

Blank: You both describe this in a way that I suspect most of us in this room do, as something that is really good sense, and supported by research. And yet, we still have this dichotomy going on – (U.S. Education) Secretary (Arne) Duncan suggests it's a false dichotomy that what goes on in the classroom and all these supports. And then we keep reading about if only we could fix the teachers, fix the workforce, then all would be better- poverty in America will end. So help us, help the folks in this room, to how they speak to these questions and challenges, so we are both encouraging the kind of quality in the classroom that both of you are promoting every day, and also describing the context of the supports kids need. Sometimes people just want to push you onto one side or the other, that's the nature of America. We're the ultimate kind of purple strategy- we live in conservative communities, we live in liberal communities. We want strong teachers, we want student support. We have a tension in getting to that. Can you help us think about that, and what would you advise?

Van Roekel: You mentioned earlier that people get confused they see schools and community and they don't see community schools. I think one of the reasons for that is as a society, we focus on activities, we see something that's working and then we try and analyze and figure out what are the activities they're doing. And then the assumption is made if I move that activity over here, it too will succeed. Doesn't work. I mean it's like school uniforms, I get asked this question all the time. I say well, why are you doing it? What's your purpose? And what they think is if in one successful school they wear uniforms, if they put uniforms in another school they too will be successful. That's not what's causing it. And so what happens, and what missed, is the conversation among the adults. I don't think you can transform a school or community if you don't bring in management, the school board, and the employees and their union, who then reach out and engage parents in the community. I don't think you can bypass 2 or 3 of those groups and say well do it without them. It has to be all of them together. And whatever plan they design together, that will work. I believe that, from 25 years of experience watching ed-reform movements, from my own personal experience in communities where its worked, and where it hasn't, that's the common thread. To me what we have to do is begin to understand that we can't do it alone. And one group can't do it alone. Policymakers can't make it happen, until we take the shared responsibility of sitting down and looking at who are our children in our school, what's happening to them right now, and what is it that we will commit to together, and that's the accountability. What will



we commit to together to ensure the success of these students? And I think that's when you go beyond the activity level discussion, and you really start making a difference.

Weingarten: So, I think that Dennis and I spend a lot of time on panels together, and we've started to actually take a bunch of each other's words, like collective responsibility, collaboration, I'm not quite

sure who started each of these, but a lot of it is because of whatever both seen on our experiences working as schoolteachers, working in districts, working in locals, working in states, and now working federally. I do think that there are 3 or 4 things going on. One of the things that are happening in Philly may actually help move this conversation forward. Number one, there's always a sense in America that we need a solution that you can talk about in 2 1/2 nanoseconds. Some people call it the silver bullet, but there's one solution. But these days, and Marty said it, the newest solution is just get rid of the bad teachers. It does actually remind me of Jonathan Swift's Modest Proposal, just stone a person or two, and everything else will be great. But, if we got rid of the 1 or 2 or 3 bad teachers in a school or district, then everything would be great in the school district. And what that does, is of course we have to do things to make sure that all of our teacher qualified, of course there should not be a bad teacher in a school, of course we have to do all of that. But, every time we just talk about bad teachers, we stop talking about what we need to do to change systems. the reality of life is that in our field, and everybody knows this, and when I say our field I think about educating children, educating the whole child, providing kids supports, that our field. That's all of our field, that's our collective work. The reality of life is it's more complicated than in susceptible to a one second solution. That's the reality. So, as Marty said, you do need to focus on instruction, and to focus on supports, and to create integration, like as Ira Harkavy would say, an integration between neighborhood, anchors in the neighborhood, the supports that kids need, and between that actual core instructional services in a school. And so Dennis and I can talk about it theoretically, I can give you my 5 point program for how you help all schools- good teachers, good curriculum, making sure that if kids are falling behind you get them help immediately, community schools meaning wraparound services to that school, and its collective responsibility collaboration- I can do that in 2 1/2 seconds. But the rubber hits the road in terms of how it actually looks, and how you actually can do it. And that has been what has stymied us for so long. And so we see examples around the country like Children's Aid Society has done a terrific example in NY, and when there's money to fund it, it happens. I saw a great community school in Taylor, Michigan. Jim Shelton probably talked about examples every place in this room has examples, and you know what has worked and what hasn't worked. What we need to do, and what's happening in Philly is a good example of this, is that there's been a bunch of us, the AFT innovation fund gave them a grants, there's the University of Pennsylvania though the Netter (Center) projects has been hugely instrumental in this. The other partners in Philly have been hugely instrumental. But there's 10 schools that are now engaged in this community schools project where there are wraparound services in West Philly around these tent schools and an integrated model with instruction. And an integrated model with the community including UPenn. And so what the goal is, is to see if we can make this pilot not only work and show real outcomes for children, not just in terms of you know better attendance, and better health, but also how



we ensure longer term look at student learning. But equally important show everyone else how well this works. So that they can touch it see it feel it, and they can see if you do the following 10 things, you can have a community school that integrates instruction and service. if we can make it this tangible for people, so they touch it and feel it and see it and see it is doable, Rockland county is doing the same thing. And we have these examples around the country, and then we advocate fiercely for scarce resources to do this, then I think we can reach the tipping point everybody in this room wants to reach.

Blank: So I know because we work closely with leadership, and leaders in your organizations, that sometimes when community schools get started, to be honest with you, sometimes teachers aren't at the table at the beginning. and we've heard stories, where teachers say well who are they, agencies and organizations come into the building, and conversations haven't happened, as you've suggested Dennis, but how should folks who are community school advocates in this room be reaching out to teachers, what are the hot buttons, the pain points that they're feeling now, that would bring them into this network, into this community conversation, so that we are really collectively working on these issues.

Van Roekel: Not to be repetitious but a little bit, I think when you approach, whether its teachers approaching community members of parents, or vice versa, I think if you start at an activity level, it's a hard discussion. Because if someone proposes to do a certain activity the natural thing that happens is either you agree or disagree, and you start a debate. Wrong discussion. And when that happens, I think it's far more important to get back down to purpose. I've been in several circumstances, and you'd think in any group of 35 to 45 people, adults who work in schools or parents, if you ask them the question in 2010, what do you believe is the purpose of public education- what do you want it to achieve in the community? You'd think after a good 3 hour discussion, you can just come to a consensus. I've been in those discussions I don't know how many times- they don't. It's a very hard discussion to really decide what is it that we want this system to do, and that's where that discussion has to start. Because once you decide what it is you want to accomplish for every student in your community, then it's much easier to get agreement on strategies tactics or activities. But if you don't have an agreement on purpose, how in the world do you know whether a strategy is a good one or a bad one- it depends on what it is you're trying to accomplish, what it is you want to do. So my advice to any community that wants to start a real engagement with the educators, parents community policymakers agencies, is to start that discussion with purpose; what do we want for our students? See if you start with that my guess is in some way shape or form, that purpose will always say we want it for all students. And if that happens, then we can look at many of the practices around this country, and say they are not ok, because we are not providing a good education for all students. So let's get back to our purpose, if we really do intend this to fulfill the promise of public education for every student, and were not, then what is it that we will commit to do together. So I think this is where the conversation has to begin, with the people in the room, of all those different entities, and out of that comes good ideas, good strategies, and a community school.



Weingarten: I think what Dennis is talking about, is that there has to be a baseline level of respect that doesn't happen because people sometimes feel so pitted against each other. So those conversations are very important to have in terms of parents and communities partners with schools, and with teachers. But I actually get a little impatient, as I'm sure many people in the room do about constant conversations that lead nowhere. And so what I've seen, we actually are taking a much more aggressive push about community schools. it is a number one priority for the American Federation of Teachers. I've told you that, you've seen that. It was something that we raised at my first speech in July 08 and it will be one of the resolutions that our executive council puts forward at our convention this year. Number two; we've actually seen a lot of our locals make this a centerpiece in their school reform proposals. And to help them, we actually put out last summer in the American Educator, a whole edition of our magazine devoted to the purpose, the use, the primacy of community schools. Part of it is, to ensure that our members know why this is important, what it means to their kids and therefore what it means to them. So the questions that Marty raised, that I'm sure many of you in the room feel frustrated about, which is, you want some services in the school, you want the school to be the hub, nobodies listening to you, they're not letting you in, what's going on? Somebody's saying it's the teachers who don't want you in your classroom, somebody's saying they don't want the schools open, all of the issues anybody in this room would probably tell me about, the way were trying to solve that is to basically talk to our local leaders and saying look, this is the way it can look. Look at the Cincinnati model- we worked all these things out! Look at what's happening in West Philly- were working all those things out. Look at what happened in NYC; look at what happened in Rockland County. Again, I go back to the conversations are important, but having concrete examples of where it works, and being able to back from those examples of the 5 or 6 things that have to happen so it's doable, what we see is within 6 months to a year of people saying wraparound services around the school, regardless of who is providing it, they become the biggest, fiercest advocate for keeping them. Because they see how it helps kids, how it keeps kids in schools, how it actually gives them more time to do instruction because a lot of the other time that they were using in instruction were really for services. How it helps in attendance, healthcare, how it helps parents feel their kids are safe, how it helps in terms of afterschool activities. They see it as soon as you get over the practicalities of making it a reality. I actually don't see this anymore as a real problem as long as we can create the examples and show people examples. And I'll say one more thing here which is this. If there's any place where there is an AFT local, where there is an issue, you know how to reach us, and we will work with you, because this is a number one priority for us.

Blank: Thank you so much. I want to ask one more quick question. I was walking by one of the workshops this morning, and they had someone talking about active learning, and engaged learning and learning for citizenship, and problem solving learning for young people. Dennis, you talked about the narrowing of the curriculum. We really do believe that engagement precedes achievement. So, I'm wondering how we can work more effectively with your members, how your member perceive strategies like more problem based learning, learning around community issues. We don't want to just tell kids it's bad to eat too much. We want kids to solve that problem for themselves, so they solve it for



their families and their communities. How does your membership see those kinds of teaching and pedagogical strategies, and what can we do in the community to help create those kinds of learning opportunities for them?

Van Roekel: We've really started putting focus on service learning. The active learning about real problems and solving them. And I think it makes all the difference in the world. I was talking with a couple of folks before lunch that have been in sessions listening to students, and if ever there is a spokesperson for the value of doing that kind of active engagement and learning, I think it's the

students. Much better than the adults. They know how powerful it is. So the whole public parent community partnership, we've been doing this for about 13 years, there have been over 200 conversations in 30 states, and I think what you just said is that they learn in all of these. If you're not engaged and active, learning doesn't take place. And the idea that the only way you can measure is with paper and pencil tests is just crazy. I always love it when they have students sing. Can you imagine trying to assess their learning on a paper and pencil test? There is evidence of student learning, but it isn't always done with a piece of paper and a pencil. I think that why the whole engagement is so important.

Weingarten: All I can say is hallelujah. (Audio missing) What reverberates in my mind is not the one about watching my own kids engaged and compete in civics and critical thinking. And then watching their own success when they were so amazingly articulate in national competitions on the bill of rights, on the 6th amendment, I don't think about that story. The story I think about is when teachers come to me and have said it just snowed and I can't spontaneously have a writing assignment about creatively thinking about the imagination of snow and what that means, or a spontaneous science lesson about snow coming out of the sky, and how that happens, because I have to teach to the test I am about to give. That's the story I think about because ultimately we have to make sure all kids are "proficient" although I certainly hate thinking about kids and proficiency. We have to make sure kids know how to read, so that they can read to learn. We have to make sure kids are agile with numbers. But if kids are not problem solvers and critical thinkers, they are not prepared for life. And that what teachers yearn to do. They yearn to make a difference in the lives of kids and prepare them to not simply dream their dreams, but achieve them.

Audience Questioner: My name is Steven Bingler, and I'm an urban planner and an architect, so I want to ask you a very concrete question. I realize that there are so many different ways of solving or achieving the goal of education for all children, but many people have different opinions on how to do that. So, the choice model, advocates would say lets bus kids across town and that has significant urban



planning implications. Because if we're busing the kids, maybe we need to bus the parents. If it's a community school, do community schools include parents, or is a community school just a place where we do wraparound services with 3rd party providers vs. the question of neighborhood schools. That brings up the issue of neighborhood schools- and some people would say going back to pre Brown vs. Board of Education and were forcing through neighborhood schools, were forcing our neighborhoods to stay segregated, or to stay wherever they are. So from an urban planning point-of-view, you can understand this dilemma. In which way are we going to go? Or are we going to go both ways at once? Should we focus on more efficient transportation systems, or should we focus on more livable neighborhoods? And I'm not asking you to answer that question, but I'm interested in how we're going to get to that answer. (36:10-37:52)

Weingarten: I grew up in a suburb and spent most of my time in a city. And it's different than in a rural area. Dennis grew up in a rural area and there's a different answer sometimes in terms of choice issues in a rural area than in a suburban area or a city. But, if one has multiple schools in a geographic area, I think you do both. I think we have to have an obligation to parents, that there neighborhood school is not simply a community school, but is a great school, and I think a community school and a great school should be synonymous, but remember what we said before in terms of the issue about services and instructions. We have to be about, in my judgment, making sure that the school within the geographic area in which parents and kids live, are great schools. And then have hopefully, a good choice program as well. But ultimately, that should be our obligation to parents. Probably doesn't solve your urban planning issue, but that should be our obligation.

Van Roekel: Randi did a beautiful job in venturing that, in that it really does vary where you are. One of the other questions I would follow that up with is who do you think ought to have that discussion. Who should the decision maker be? Now to me, as an urban planner, if a group had the discussion, whatever answer they came up with, then you would know what you want to do in the future, in terms of your planning. But I think we have to think about who should be the decision maker about that in the community, and engage those people in that conversation. I don't think the answer is nearly as important as who you involve in deciding what they want for their community, and once that answer is made, I think the planning becomes easier.

Audience Questioner: I'm Margret Broad, community for Learning in San Francisco. I want to talk about competition for resources, because that's where things- when we're talking about teacher salaries, services, who should be in the afterschool program, the employee of the YMCA, or a credentialed teacher, that's when things get tense. My question is do you have some solutions to that, and can the



teachers unions become advocates for resources for our community school vision, rather than competitors for the community school vision.

Weingarten: I watched those questions be worked out in every jurisdiction in which we've been engaged in, in a real way. I think that the first question you asked about the competition for resources, that's the hardest issue right now. And that's part of even though I vehemently disagree with the nature and the demagogic nature of the debate, when somebody is forced because of a lack of resources to decide what are they going to do- are they going to focus on teacher quality, or additional services to students, that to me is a false choice. But, it is a choice that is going on in community after community because of the effects of the great recession. In terms of San Francisco, and California, you know this better than I, the fight for resources right now is dreadful. So what we, and a few of us have been taking about this, one of the reasons were pushing for some federal dollars here, is to create at least a bridge loan, and bridge programs to stop or stem some of those fights for resources. If you can get over that

question, and that is very much a stiflingly hard question these days, but once you get over that question, many of our teacher units throughout the county, once they see the effectiveness of outside program providers, they actually want them. A lot of the issue has become, is this going to be a program that is going to be aligned with us - like an afterschool program- so they know what we're doing in school, and we can actually do a value add for kids, as opposed to it not being aligned. So, once you get through those questions, making sure the school stays open for 10 hours a day, that my classroom is still clean in the morning so I don't have to clean it up, you get through those pragmatic issues. I have watched teachers really want these programs.

Van Roekel: I'll just add one thing. The competition for resources is an awful one, and Randi pointed out why it's a false choice, which makes it so horrible. But there's another part that they don't connect all the dots. In every single state the policymakers have to look at first of all, their tax policies, their economic growth policies, which absolutely are tied to the whole funding issue for public education. You can't do one of those three. There are many states that have absolutely built in structural deficits. What they say they want to provide for the citizens of their state- both adults and children- cannot be provided based on the tax structures they have, or the lack of taxes for certain individual groups, so until they take that whole system on, it's impossible then to force one entity- the education- to fight over resources that aren't sufficient to do what they asked us to do. So that's one part of the competition that I think is so unfair, that they won't deal with the underlying system that provides the resources, and instead make these false choices. One other thing I have to say about the competition. Maybe it's because I'm a high school math teacher, but I am tired of listening to the debate about competition framed in the world of norm referenced tests, and they don't understand what they're talking about. I've started to say it over and over do you understand that half of all doctors in America graduated in the



bottom half of their class- and they always will. Except for Lake Wobegone where everyone is above average. And the reason it frustrates me so is because in the educational arena, they make it sound like we're doing something wrong, when all of our teachers didn't graduate from the upper quartile. Even if you only hire college graduates, who graduated in the top quartile, and you put them all in teaching, there will be a bottom quartile. So in this whole competition, whether it's the false dichotomy about resources, or the competition of what defines doing a good job or a bad job, if you put it in the wrong frame, we can't win, and that frustrates the heck out of me. So maybe we as math teachers didn't do an adequate job of teaching mathematics to these policymakers- they don't understand mean median and mode, and we need to work on that.

Audience Questioner: My name is Jane Hodgedon-Young, and I work for the US Department of Education. My question is around, we've heard a lot about extended learning, and often that is referring to extending the school day, sometimes some kind of summer camp, something like that. I know there are a lot of arguments on both sides about extending the school year, or changing the school year

schedule, so that the long summer break becomes intermittent breaks, and I would just like to hear what you have to say around that concept. (46:42-47:36)

Van Roekel: As you look around the country I think there are a lot of things that are going on, both in extending the school day as well as extending the school year, changing it so that sometimes they don't change the number of days, but structure of the school year. I'll come back to the question, who do you think ought to decide that? I think that whenever someone outside the community informs a community that this is what you need to do and all things will be better, they respond negatively. But when it's done within a community and they decide this is the best way, one example, in Evansville IN, when they, through negotiations with management, the school board and the employees, let us take a look at our lowest performing schools, what do we need to do differently? They can add up to 20 days to the length of the school year, they're adding 5 days just for data analysis. What a great idea. Everyone wants to measure something, but nobody wants to take the time to analyze what does it mean? What is it that you ought to do in response? In my math classes I used to try to teach the difference between high correlation, and cause and effect. I would say if I made a study of all the people injured in a car accident in the last year, my guess is that over 90% have a cavity or a filling in their mouth. That's a very high correlation. Do you really believe that a cavity caused any of those accidents? So, as we look at the research about what is the impact of extending the day or the year, first of all, who should make it? Secondly, we have to analyze the data to make sure that what we're doing is making a difference, and ill add one other thing. The answer is not only should there be more time, but more importantly, what do you want to do with that time? I was in one community discussion, and they were saying, if we added 20 days to the school year, what would we do with those days? It was a very rich discussion, and all of



these ideas started flowing, and all of a sudden this one person says wait a minute. Why would we only change the 20 extra days? We can change all the days that are already there, what do we want to do differently? It's a wonderful discussion, and it ought to be based on number 1, who decides that, what is your purpose and what do you want to accomplish, and then analyzing what's happening to make sure that its impacting students in the way we intended and wanted.

Weingarten: We've always been open to extending learning time and to opening schools for a much longer period during the day and the year. The research about summer learning loss is chilling, and that gives a lot of credence to trying to have different learning opportunities over the summer. We've also seen lots of school districts because of overcrowding and other things like that actually do some of this, and then the first moment that they can change it back, they change it back, which goes to Dennis' point about needing to hear from community. The times that it has worked the best, and this is speaking from someone who actually negotiated a system wide extension of the school day in 2002, and had to renegotiate it about 6 times, because the system did a really terrible job in using the extra time that was available in the way in which we envisioned it. In 2002, I negotiated in NYC another 100 minutes of time, speaking of the industrial model. But we said let each school decide how to use it. Then the new

chancellor said this was giving too much flexibility to the schools, try to micromanage it in a different way, and every which way they tried to micromanage it, there were winners and losers, and people hated it. The parent's didn't like the way in which it was micromanaged, because parents in Staten Island wanted different things from parents who were in the Bronx or Queens. So in my personal experience of negation, obviously teachers bought in and were willing to do it, but only when the time is meaningful for them in embedded job development, or kids in additional tutoring to ensure that they are keeping up. What I've gotten to is let people have choices in terms of how to do this. and if they're willing to, we have a school called Brooklyn generations high school in Brooklyn, which actually has a staggered year, but they made the choice to do that and the kids who go there made that choice, the teachers who teach at that school made that choice, and the school is doing amazingly well. Extended time has to have a school by school decision over whether and how to do that, and if you do that, then it works.