



New England Secondary School Consortium

Report on Phase II Key Informant Survey

May 31, 2010



Contents

Introduction, Methods, and Respondent Backgrounds	1
Survey Findings	4
Appendix A: Detailed Survey Response Tables.....	11
Appendix B: Open-Ended Responses.....	27

Introduction, Methods, and Respondent Backgrounds

Introduction

This report summarizes findings of an online survey completed by core members of the New England Secondary School Consortium (NESSC). The objective of this survey was to gain their perspectives on the Consortium's progress on central objectives and benchmarks, the benefits of key initiatives, and the level of commitment to continued participation.

Methods

Starting with a master list of all members of the NESSC Council and Strategic Action Teams, UMDI spoke with GSP and the state liaisons to determine who had been active members of these groups. This process yielded 75 individuals who received the online survey. All survey responses were received during March of 2011.

For analytic purposes, respondents were divided into the following three categories:

- Leadership: DOE commissioners, deputy commissioners, and NESSC state leads
- Members: Other core NESSC members including state DOE representatives, K-12 educators, state legislators, state board of education members, higher education representatives, representatives from business and professional organizations, superintendents and their representatives, and other NESSC Council members.
- NESSC/GSP employees: NESSC state liaisons and GSP personnel.

After sending the survey to the third group, we belatedly decided to exclude them from the analyses. Their endorsements of NESSC efforts were notably higher than respondents from the other two groups, and we realized, given that they were in effect employees of the Consortium, that including their responses would reduce the credibility of the findings. We also excluded responses from Question 8, which asked respondents to rank several factors in their state's ongoing commitment to NESSC participation. Too many respondents were apparently confused with the item's instructions, making the data unable to be interpreted meaningfully.

Respondent Backgrounds and NESSC Involvement

Sixty-two survey responses were received. The six GSP liaisons were excluded from analyses, as explained above, leaving 56 respondents in the final sample -- 10 in the Leadership category and 46 in the Members category. Response counts in the tables in this report are generally below 56, due to a small number of respondents that left some items unanswered. In addition, questions 1 and 2 permitted multiple responses and hence have totals greater than 56.

Table 1 shows the functions served by respondents at the time of survey administration, with some respondents falling into more than one category.

Table 1	
Functions Served	
Count	Function
2	DOE Commissioner
3	Deputy DOE Commissioner
7	State Lead
2	DOE Communications Director/Head
9	LEA K-12 Educator
29	None of the above

Table 2 shows each respondents role or roles in relation to the Consortium, with the majority being state DOE representatives.

Table 2	
Role as it Relates to the NESSC	
Count	Role
29	State DOE Representative
12	LEA K-12 Educator
5	State Legislator
4	Higher Education Representative
2	Superintendent Representative
2	Education Board Member
2	Business Representative
1	Governor's Office
1	High School Principal
1	Professional Organization Representative
1	Superintendent
1	Steering Committee Member

Table 3 lists the NESSC groups that each respondent had participated in since the summer of 2010, with the largest groups being in-state implementation teams, NESSC Council, and the Policy and League of Innovative Schools strategic action teams.

Table 3	
NESSC Phase II Group Participation	
Count	Group
32	In-State Implementation Team (including former work group members)
26	NESSC Council
20	League of Innovative Schools Strategic Action Team
20	Policy Strategic Action Team
8	Messaging Strategic Action Team
4	Data Strategic Action Team
1	Offered input with various teams. No direct affiliation.
1	Some in-state implementation through our P-16 Council and some messaging
1	Attended summer policy work session and hope to present at the Spring Best Practice Workshop

Table 4 lists each respondent's length of involvement with the Consortium, with the majority having been involved for more than one year.

<i>Table 4</i>	
Length of Involvement with NESSC	
Count	Length
1	Between 0-3 months
6	Between 3-6 months
12	Between 6-12 months
37	More than one year

Survey Findings

The following tables summarize responses to questions that ask for beliefs or attitudes about the Consortium. Appendix A contains detailed findings, including all response categories, and divided into individual states' responses. The tables below provide a briefer summary, listing for each question both the percentage of respondents that fell into the top two response categories, and the mean (average) response across all response categories. In addition, these data are presented separately for two major subgroups: NESSC Leadership and Members.

Table 5 summarizes responses to questions regarding the three broad objectives that support NESSC goals -- developing high-leverage policies, creating a League of Innovative Schools, and developing broad public and political will.

Table 5				
Progress on NESSC Objectives				
Item	% Agree or Strongly Agree		Average Rating (out of 6)	
	Leadership	Members	Leadership	Members
Objective #1: High-Leverage Policies				
The Consortium has made adequate progress on this objective.	70	50	5.1	4.5
My state has made adequate progress on this objective.	60	43	4.7	4.3
The Consortium adds value beyond my own state's efforts.	78	62	5.2	4.6
Objective #2: Create League of Innovative Schools				
The Consortium has made adequate progress on this objective.	60	48	4.5	4.2
My state has made adequate progress on this objective.	50	30	4.4	3.9
The Consortium adds value beyond my own state's efforts.	88	70	5.0	4.7
Objective #3: Develop Public and Political Will				
The Consortium has made adequate progress on this objective.	40	23	4.0	3.8
My state has made adequate progress on this objective.	33	26	4.3	3.7
The Consortium adds value beyond my own state's efforts.	56	54	4.3	4.4

Major Findings

- Progress and added value were rated highest on the High-Leverage Policies, followed by the League of Innovative Schools, with progress on Public and Political Will ranked third.
- In most cases, Consortium progress was rated higher than individual state progress.
- Across all three objectives, Leadership and Members agreed more strongly that "the Consortium adds value" to their state's efforts than that their state or the Consortium "has made adequate progress".
- Responses varied substantially across states. For example, the Consortium's added value on the high-leverage policy objective was seen as highest in Connecticut (mean = 5.3 out of 6) and lowest in Maine (mean = 4.1). For the question "I think my state has made adequate progress on the LIS objective," 56% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed, compared to 17% for New Hampshire. It

should be noted that, during the time since the survey was conducted, there has been significant advancements in Maine’s legislative agenda and in the development of the LIS.

Table 6 summarizes responses to several questions on diverse issues including NESSC culture and understanding, state commitment to ongoing NESSC participation, and value that the Consortium adds to state reform efforts.

Table 6				
Agreement with NESSC-Related Statements				
How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to the NESSC?	% Agree or Strongly Agree		Average Rating (out of 6)	
	Leadership	Members	Leadership	Members
The Consortium has developed a culture that promotes communication and trust among the five states.	70	75	4.7	5.0
I feel that my contributions are valued when I participate in cross-state Consortium activities.	78	77	4.9	5.0
I feel that my contributions are valued when I participate in in-state Consortium activities.	100	80	5.6	5.0
While promoting a regional agenda, the Consortium also adequately takes into account the individual needs and circumstances of my state.	89	72	5.0	4.7
I have sufficient understanding of how the current Consortium activities and strategies are intended to lead toward the long-term 2016 NESSC goals.	89	64	5.2	4.6
I am committed to working in support of my state’s continued participation in the Consortium into the foreseeable future.	89	86	5.0	5.1
Personnel in my state’s Department of Education who aren’t active NESSC participants are kept apprised of the Consortium’s work.	38	49	4.3	4.2
My state can make more progress on transforming secondary education as part of the Consortium than it could make by itself.	89	56	5.1	4.7

Major Findings

- More than 70% of all respondents agreed or strongly agreed that the Consortium has developed a culture that promotes communication and trust among the five states and that their contributions are valued when they participate in Consortium activities.
- Eighty-nine percent of Leadership and 72% of Members agreed or strongly agreed that the Consortium takes each state's needs into account while promoting a regional agenda.
- Respondents were committed to supporting their state's continued participation in the Consortium, with a rating of agreed or strongly agreed from 89% of Leadership and 86% of Members.
- Understanding of how current Consortium activities are intended to lead toward the 2016 NESSC goals was higher among Leadership (89% agreed or strongly agreed) than Members (64%).
- Eighty-nine percent of Leadership agreed or strongly agreed that their state can make more progress on transforming secondary education as part of the Consortium than by itself, compared to 56% for Members.
- The lowest level of agreement was that DOE personnel who aren't active NESSC participants are kept apprised of the Consortium's work, with just 38% of Leadership and 49% of Members agreeing or strongly agreeing.

Table 7 summarizes responses to questions regarding the Charge of the NESSC Council, which is "to advocate for and support the transformation of secondary education in the five-state region. Members serve as the champions in each state and across the region to advocate on behalf of the NESSC. They

forge connections between the work of the NESSC and that of various other groups, organizations, and individuals with whom Council members interact."

Table 7				
Feedback on the NESSC Council				
How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements related to the NESSC Council?	% Agree or Strongly Agree		Average Rating (out of 6)	
Item	Leadership	Members	Leadership	Members
The Council has been effective in meeting this charge for the five-state region.	70	43	4.8	4.3
The Council has been effective in meeting this charge for my state.	60	38	4.6	4.1
My state has adequate representation on the Council.	40	72	4.3	4.8

Major Findings

- Slightly higher percentages agreed or strongly agreed that the Council has been effective in meeting the Charge for the five-state region than for the individual states.
- The Council's effectiveness in meeting the Charge was rated much higher by Leadership than Members, 70% vs. 43% agreed or strongly agreed for the 5-state region, and 60% for 38% for the individual states.
- This pattern reverses with regard to adequate representation on Council, with 72% of Members versus 40% of Leadership agreeing or strongly agreeing that their state has adequate representation.
- Responses varied substantially across states. For example, the Council's effectiveness in meeting the Charge for the five-state region was seen as highest by Connecticut and Rhode Island (mean = 4.8 out of 6) and lowest for Maine (mean = 4.0)

Table 8 summarizes responses to questions regarding how much value was added to their state's secondary school reform efforts by participation in the Consortium, compared to what they could have achieved on their own. (Note that the number of response categories dropped from six on the previous items to four on the remaining items, so the mean scores dropped as well.)

Table 8
NESSC Value Added to State’s Secondary School Reform Efforts

Beyond what your state could have accomplished on its own, to what extent has being part of the Consortium added value to your state's secondary school reform efforts?	% Moderate or Significant Value Added		Average Rating (out of 4)	
	Leadership	Members	Leadership	Members
Sharing of effective school practices as defined by the Global Best Practices Tool.	90	91	3.3	3.3
Leverage gained by promoting policies that have already been adopted or are being considered by other Consortium states.	78	68	3.1	2.7
Establishing momentum for transformation of secondary education.	75	75	3.0	3.0
Increasing focus within my state Department of Education on the transformation of secondary education.	80	62	3.1	2.8
Gaining interest from state legislators in the transformation of secondary education.	100	64	3.5	2.8
Increasing involvement from state legislators in the transformation of secondary education.	100	66	3.4	2.8
Gaining interest from the higher education community in the transformation of secondary education.	80	57	3.3	2.7
Increasing involvement from the higher education community in the transformation of secondary education.	67	51	3.1	2.5

Major Findings (percentages below are the percentage rated Moderate Value or Significant Value)

- Leadership felt that the highest value was added by gaining both interest and involvement from state legislators in the transformation of secondary education (100%). This was followed by sharing of effective practices as defined by the Global Best Practices Tool (GBPT; 90%) and increasing state DOE focus on transformation of secondary education (80%).
- Members rated the GBPT as adding the most value (91%).
- Across all categories, from 67% to 100% of Leadership felt that moderate or significant value was added. For members the range was from 51% to 91%.
- Leadership saw substantially more value added with regard to gaining interest and involvement from state legislators than with regard to gaining interest and involvement from the higher education community.
- Responses varied substantially across states. For example, the Consortium's contributions to establishing momentum for secondary transformation was seen as greatest by Connecticut (mean = 3.3 out of 4) and lowest by New Hampshire (mean = 2.5).

Open-Ended Responses

Respondents were also invited to choose one of the eight items from Table 8 and describe how being part of the Consortium has added value to their state's secondary reform efforts. Comments ranged across diverse themes, many of which reflected findings in the table. The 29 complete responses are listed in Appendix B. Some of the open-ended comments and themes on the Consortium's added value included:

- Greater interest, involvement, and understanding from state legislators.
- Helped state DOEs increase and sustain focus on secondary reform, as well as develop and sustain clear objectives.
- Substantial value from the Global Best Practices Tool.

- Grouping states together provides greater political cover, facilitates sharing of best practices, and brings together people with common experiences and knowledge.
- NESSC's involvement is required to sustain the focus on the common policies.
- Education reform benefits from bringing together state education agencies, institutes of higher education, and state legislators.
- Understanding the differences between states' political cultures around public education.
- Bringing greater levels of implementation to laws that existed but were underutilized.
- Higher education representatives realizing the states' seriousness about secondary reform.

Table 9 summarizes responses to questions regarding how beneficial various NESSC components were to each state's secondary school reform efforts.

Table 9 Benefit of NESSC Components to State's Secondary School Reform Efforts				
Please rate how beneficial each of the following NESSC components has been to your state's secondary school reform efforts.	% Beneficial or Very Beneficial		Average Rating (out of 4)	
	Leadership	Members	Leadership	Members
The Global Best Practices self-assessment tool.	67	68	2.9	2.8
The High Leverage Policy framework developed by the Center for Education Policy Analysis at UConn.	50	62	2.8	2.6
The three high-leverage policies developed by the Policy Strategic Action Team and endorsed by the NESSC Council.	89	68	3.4	2.7
The work of the NESSC Council.	89	71	3.1	2.8
The work of the Policy Strategic Action Team.	90	70	3.2	2.8
The work of the League of Innovative Schools Strategic Action Team.	70	74	2.9	2.8
The work of the Data Strategic Action Team.	90	66	3.1	2.7
The effectiveness of having GSP organize and facilitate NESSC gatherings.	78	87	3.2	3.1
Developing a plan to approach foundations for funding.	60	73	2.7	2.8

Major Findings (percentages below are the percentage rated Beneficial or Very Beneficial)

- Four of the components -- Policy Strategic Action Team, Data Strategic Action Team, NESSC Council, and high-leverage policies -- were rated as 89-90% beneficial or very beneficial by Leadership. The HLP framework developed by UConn received the lowest rating (50%).
- For Members, the highest-rated component was GSP's organization and facilitation of NESSC gatherings (87%).
- Responses varied substantially across states. For example, the benefit of the Policy Strategic Action Team's work was seen as greatest by Connecticut (mean = 3.3) and lowest by Vermont (mean = 2.6).

Open-Ended Responses

Respondents were also invited to choose one or more of the nine items listed in Table 9 and describe how the NESSC component was beneficial to their state. The 21 complete responses are listed in Appendix B. Some of the open-ended comments and themes included:

- The Global Best Practices Tool was repeatedly mentioned as highly valuable, even "worth its

weight in gold," but with need for greater penetration into schools.

- The work of GSP was seen as essential for organization and momentum, as well as adding professionalism and productivity. Without them, "this work would be drowned in the sea of day-to-day crises and demands". They are "the glue that has kept our work moving forward".
- Benefits of the data and LIS strategic action teams were mentioned. Specifically, the LIS work will complement other state initiatives and provide a strong framework for advancing the state's reform agenda, and the data team is coordinated with the state's efforts at developing a longitudinal data system and has engaged higher education and others in regional decisions on metrics.

Table 10 summarizes responses to questions regarding respondents' beliefs about the likelihood that their state will achieve NESSC Phase II benchmarks by the end of August 2011.

Table 10				
Predicted Achievement of Phase II Benchmarks by August 2011				
How likely do you believe it is that your state will achieve the following Phase II benchmarks by the end of August 2011?	% Likely or Very Likely		Average Rating (out of 4)	
	Leadership	Members	Leadership	Members
At least one high-leverage policy will be adopted or refined in my state that aligns with the NESSC Policy Framework.	89	61	3.4	2.6
My state will secure and/or allocate funds that support participation in the League of Innovative schools (LIS).	50	17	2.5	1.8
At least six schools in my state will demonstrate their intention to be actively involved in the LIS.	67	59	3.0	2.7
My state will have created a support structure for the LIS that demonstrates a clear alignment between DOE activities with the LIS.	80	50	3.0	2.4
My state will have created a support structure for the LIS that demonstrates a clear alignment between DOE personnel with the LIS.	70	45	2.8	2.3
My state will endorse a common set of regional data metrics (that includes the NESSC data metrics) to use for public distribution.	88	45	3.1	2.5
My state will have established an in-state messaging campaign to develop broad public and political will to support new models of student-centered learning.	80	40	2.9	2.3
My state will have reached out to essential stakeholder groups regarding NESSC goals.	80	46	3.3	2.5

Major Findings (percentages below are the percentage rated Likely or Very Likely)

- Across all eight questions, ratings of likely or very likely averaged 30% higher for Leadership than for Members.
- Five of the components -- adopting or refining at least one high leverage policy, endorsing a common set of regional data metrics, creating an aligned LIS support structure, establishing an in-state messaging campaign, and reaching out essential stakeholder groups -- were rated as 89-90% likely or very likely by Leadership. The lowest rating (50%) from Leadership was for securing and/or allocating funds that support LIS participation.
- For Members, the highest-rated components were adopting or refining at least one high leverage policy (61%) and that six schools in their state will demonstrate the intention to become actively involved in the LIS (59%). As with Leadership, the lowest rating (17%) was for securing and/or allocating LIS support funds.
- Responses varied more substantially across states for this set of questions than for any other. For example, the likelihood of reaching out to essential stakeholder groups was seen as highest by

Connecticut (mean = 3.3) and lowest by Maine (mean = 2.1). The likelihood of creating a support structure for the LIS that demonstrates a clear alignment between LIS and DOE activities was seen as highest by Connecticut (mean = 3.0) and lowest by New Hampshire (mean = 2.0).

Table 11 summarizes responses to the final closed-ended question, regarding respondents' level of interest in the Consortium's continuation as a secondary education reform initiative. Eighty-nine percent of leadership and 76% of Members were interested or very interested.

Table 11				
Level of Interest in the Consortium Continuing				
Item	% Interested or Very Interested		Average Rating (out of 4)	
	Leadership	Members	Leadership	Members
How interested are you in seeing the Consortium continuing into the foreseeable future?	89	76	3.4	3.2

Finally, respondents were asked if they had any additional comments to share. The range of responses was dramatic -- from "There appears to be a gathering momentum in our state in regards to the work associated with NESSC" to "NESSC is very rapidly becoming irrelevant" -- although a substantial majority of comments were on the more positive end. The 10 complete responses are listed in Appendix B. Some of the open-ended comments and themes included:

- The need for great internal communication.
- The need for NESSC's message to be about the economic benefits of school reform.
- Needing to know more about what is working in each state and how they got there.
- The need to create a 2-year plan and vision.
- The need for more sustainable funding.
- The importance of support from higher education.

Next Steps

In addition to providing information that is valuable in the present, the findings from this survey can provide a baseline against which future NESSC developments can be compared. Toward that end, we recommend asking many of these questions annually. These findings will also be incorporated into the UMass Donahue Institute's summary evaluation report for NESSC Phase II, where they will be triangulated with other data sources that address the same topics.

The remainder of the report is two appendices that include (a) tables of survey responses that provide more detail than presented in the body of the report, and (b) the full text of responses to the survey's open-ended items.

Appendix A: Detailed Survey Response Tables

Q1: Responses related to the three broad objectives that support NESSC goals.

Responses Related to NESSC Objective 1								
Develop high-leverage policies that support school and district actions aligned with NESSC goals								
	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
<i>I think the Consortium has made adequate progress on the high-leverage policy objective.</i>								
All Respondents	54	4.6	0	2	6	39	37	17
Position								
DOE Leadership	10	5.1	0	0	10	20	20	50
NESSC Member	44	4.5	0	2	5	43	41	9
State								
Connecticut	8	4.9	0	0	0	25	62	13
Maine	9	4.3	0	0	0	78	11	11
New Hampshire	14	4.6	0	7	0	36	36	21
Rhode Island	10	4.9	0	0	10	10	60	20
Vermont	12	4.4	0	0	16	42	25	17
<i>I think my state has made adequate progress on the high-leverage policy objective.</i>								
All Respondents	54	4.4	0	6	7	41	37	9
Position								
DOE Leadership	10	4.7	0	0	10	30	40	20
NESSC Member	44	4.3	0	7	7	43	36	7
State								
Connecticut	9	4.6	0	0	0	56	33	11
Maine	9	4.3	0	11	0	33	56	0
New Hampshire	14	4.4	0	7	7	43	29	14
Rhode Island	10	4.2	0	0	20	40	40	0
Vermont	12	4.4	0	8	8	33	34	17
<i>The Consortium adds value beyond my state's own efforts toward accomplishing this policy objective.</i>								
All Respondents	53	4.7	2	7	2	25	34	30
Position								
DOE Leadership	9	5.2	0	0	0	22	33	45
NESSC Member	44	4.6	2	9	2	25	34	28
State								
Connecticut	9	5.3	0	0	0	11	44	45
Maine	9	4.1	0	11	0	56	33	0
New Hampshire	13	4.5	0	15	0	23	39	23
Rhode Island	10	5.1	0	0	0	30	30	40
Vermont	12	4.6	8	8	8	9	25	42

Responses Related to NESSC Objective 2 Create a League of Innovative Schools (LIS) program that provides models, support, political will, and momentum for school improvement aligned with NESSC goals								
	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
<i>I think the Consortium has made adequate progress on the LIS objective.</i>								
All Respondents	54	4.3	6	4	9	31	41	9
Position								
DOE Leadership	10	4.5	10	0	10	20	30	30
NESSC Member	44	4.2	4	5	9	34	43	5
State								
Connecticut	9	4.8	0	0	0	33	56	11
Maine	9	4.4	0	0	0	56	44	0
New Hampshire	13	3.9	15	8	23	8	23	23
Rhode Island	10	4.6	0	0	10	20	70	0
Vermont	12	4.2	0	8	8	50	25	9
<i>I think my state has made adequate progress on the LIS objective.</i>								
All Respondents	51	4.0	2	12	12	41	27	6
Position								
DOE Leadership	8	4.4	12	0	0	38	25	25
NESSC Member	43	3.9	0	14	14	42	28	2
State								
Connecticut	9	4.6	0	0	0	56	33	11
Maine	9	3.8	0	11	22	44	23	0
New Hampshire	12	3.3	8	33	9	33	8	9
Rhode Island	9	4.4	0	0	11	33	56	0
Vermont	12	4.1	0	8	17	42	25	8
<i>The Consortium adds value beyond my state's own efforts toward accomplishing the LIS objective.</i>								
All Respondents	51	4.8	4	4	6	13	45	28
Position								
DOE Leadership	8	5.0	12	0	0	0	38	50
NESSC Member	43	4.7	2	5	7	16	47	23
State								
Connecticut	9	4.9	0	0	0	22	67	11
Maine	9	4.9	0	0	0	22	67	11
New Hampshire	12	4.0	17	8	17	0	33	25
Rhode Island	9	5.3	0	0	0	11	44	45
Vermont	12	4.8	0	8	8	17	25	42

Responses Related to NESSC Objective 3 Develop broad public and political will to support new models of student-centered learning								
	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
<i>I think the Consortium has made adequate progress on the public/political will objective.</i>								
All Respondents	54	3.8	6	6	16	46	26	0
Position								
DOE Leadership	10	4.0	10	0	10	40	40	0
NESSC Member	44	3.8	4	7	18	48	23	0
State								
Connecticut	9	4.6	0	0	0	44	56	0
Maine	9	4.0	0	0	22	56	22	0
New Hampshire	13	3.3	23	8	8	38	23	0
Rhode Island	10	3.9	0	0	30	50	20	0
Vermont	12	3.5	0	17	25	50	8	0
<i>I think my state has made adequate progress on the public/political will objective.</i>								
All Respondents	52	3.9	0	11	14	48	23	4
Position								
DOE Leadership	9	4.3	0	0	0	67	33	0
NESSC Member	43	3.7	0	14	16	44	21	5
State								
Connecticut	9	4.1	0	0	11	78	0	11
Maine	9	3.8	0	11	22	44	23	0
New Hampshire	12	4.1	0	17	8	33	34	8
Rhode Island	10	4.0	0	10	10	50	30	0
Vermont	12	3.8	0	16	17	42	25	0
<i>The Consortium adds value beyond my state's own efforts toward accomplishing this objective.</i>								
All Respondents	52	4.4	4	4	6	40	33	13
Position								
DOE Leadership	9	4.3	11	0	0	33	44	12
NESSC Member	43	4.4	2	5	7	42	30	14
State								
Connecticut	8	4.6	0	0	0	50	37	13
Maine	9	4.8	0	0	0	44	33	23
New Hampshire	14	3.8	14	7	14	22	36	7
Rhode Island	9	4.7	0	0	0	67	0	33
Vermont	12	4.3	0	8	8	34	50	0

Q2: Responses related to several questions on diverse NESSC issues.

The Consortium has developed a culture that promotes communication and trust among the five states.								
	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
All Respondents	53	4.9	4	2	2	19	36	37
Position								
DOE Leadership	10	4.7	10	0	0	20	40	30
NESSC Member	43	5.0	2	2	2	19	35	40
State								
Connecticut	9	5.4	0	0	0	0	56	44
Maine	9	4.7	0	0	11	33	34	22
New Hampshire	12	4.5	17	0	0	17	33	33
Rhode Island	10	5.4	0	0	0	10	40	50
Vermont	12	4.8	0	8	0	33	25	34

I feel that my contributions are valued when I participate in cross-state Consortium activities.								
	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
All Respondents	52	4.9	4	2	0	17	44	33
Position								
DOE Leadership	9	4.9	11	0	0	11	33	45
NESSC Member	43	5.0	2	2	0	19	47	30
State								
Connecticut	9	5.7	0	0	0	0	33	67
Maine	9	4.9	0	0	0	22	67	11
New Hampshire	12	4.2	17	8	0	17	33	25
Rhode Island	10	5.3	0	0	0	10	50	40
Vermont	11	4.8	0	0	0	36	46	18

I feel that my contributions are valued when I participate in in-state Consortium related activities.								
	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
All Respondents	54	5.1	0	4	2	11	48	35
Position								
DOE Leadership	9	5.6	0	0	0	0	44	56
NESSC Member	45	5.0	0	5	2	13	49	31
State								
Connecticut	9	5.8	0	0	0	0	22	78
Maine	9	4.8	0	0	11	0	89	0
New Hampshire	14	4.5	0	14	0	22	50	14
Rhode Island	9	5.6	0	0	0	0	44	56
Vermont	12	5.2	0	0	0	25	33	42

While promoting a regional agenda, the Consortium also adequately takes into account the individual needs and circumstances of my state.

	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
All Respondents	53	4.8	6	0	6	13	51	24
Position								
DOE Leadership	9	5.0	11	0	0	0	44	45
NESSC Member	44	4.7	5	0	7	16	52	20
State								
Connecticut	9	5.7	0	0	0	0	33	67
Maine	9	4.4	0	0	11	33	56	0
New Hampshire	13	4.3	15	0	8	8	54	15
Rhode Island	10	5.1	0	0	0	20	50	30
Vermont	12	4.6	8	0	8	8	59	17

I have sufficient understanding of how the current Consortium activities and strategies are intended to lead toward the long-term 2016 NESSC goals.

	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
All Respondents	53	4.7	0	2	9	21	49	19
Position								
DOE Leadership	9	5.2	0	0	11	0	44	45
NESSC Member	44	4.6	0	2	9	25	50	14
State								
Connecticut	9	5.0	0	0	0	22	56	22
Maine	9	4.4	0	0	11	45	33	11
New Hampshire	13	4.7	0	0	23	8	46	23
Rhode Island	10	4.9	0	0	10	10	60	20
Vermont	12	4.7	0	8	0	25	50	17

I am committed to working in support of my state's continued participation in the Consortium into the foreseeable future.

	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
All Respondents	51	5.1	2	2	0	10	51	35
Position								
DOE Leadership	9	5.0	11	0	0	0	44	45
NESSC Member	42	5.1	0	2	0	12	53	33
State								
Connecticut	9	5.3	0	0	0	0	67	33
Maine	9	4.9	0	0	0	22	67	11
New Hampshire	12	4.4	8	8	0	25	34	25
Rhode Island	10	5.6	0	0	0	0	40	60
Vermont	11	5.5	0	0	0	0	55	45

Personnel in my state's Department of Education who aren't active NESSC participants are kept apprised of the Consortium's work.								
	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
All Respondents	45	4.2	2	7	11	33	38	9
Position								
DOE Leadership	8	4.3	0	0	12	50	38	0
NESSC Member	37	4.2	2	8	11	30	38	11
State								
Connecticut	8	4.9	0	0	0	25	63	12
Maine	9	3.4	0	22	33	22	23	0
New Hampshire	12	4.1	8	8	0	42	33	9
Rhode Island	6	5.2	0	0	0	17	50	33
Vermont	10	4.1	0	0	20	50	30	0

My state can make more progress on transforming secondary education as part of the Consortium than it could make by itself.								
	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
All Respondents	53	4.7	4	4	4	26	28	34
Position								
DOE Leadership	9	5.1	11	0	0	0	33	56
NESSC Member	44	4.7	2	5	5	32	27	29
State								
Connecticut	9	5.0	0	0	11	22	22	45
Maine	9	4.9	0	0	0	22	67	11
New Hampshire	13	4.1	15	15	8	15	0	47
Rhode Island	10	5.0	0	0	0	40	20	40
Vermont	12	4.9	0	0	0	33	42	25

Q3: Responses related to the charge and membership of the NESSC council.

The Council has been effective in meeting this charge for the five-state region.								
	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
All Respondents	52	4.4	2	4	2	44	42	6
Position								
DOE Leadership	10	4.8	0	0	10	20	50	20
NESSC Member	42	4.3	2	5	0	50	41	2
State								
Connecticut	9	4.8	0	0	0	33	56	11
Maine	8	4.0	0	0	12	75	13	0
New Hampshire	13	4.3	8	0	0	46	38	8
Rhode Island	10	4.8	0	0	0	20	80	0
Vermont	11	4.0	0	18	0	55	18	9

The Council has been effective in meeting this charge for my state.								
	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
All Respondents	52	4.2	2	4	11	40	37	6
Position								
DOE Leadership	10	4.6	0	0	20	20	40	20
NESSC Member	42	4.1	2	5	10	45	36	2
State								
Connecticut	9	4.4	0	0	0	67	22	11
Maine	8	4.0	0	0	37	25	38	0
New Hampshire	14	4.1	7	0	14	43	29	7
Rhode Island	10	4.7	0	0	0	30	70	0
Vermont	11	4.0	0	18	9	37	27	9

My state has adequate representation on the Council.								
	N	Mean	Strongly Disagree (%)	Disagree (%)	Somewhat Disagree (%)	Somewhat Agree (%)	Agree (%)	Strongly Agree (%)
All Respondents	52	4.7	2	2	6	25	48	17
Position								
DOE Leadership	10	4.3	0	10	10	40	20	20
NESSC Member	42	4.8	2	0	5	21	55	17
State								
Connecticut	9	5.0	0	0	0	22	56	22
Maine	8	4.3	0	12	13	25	37	13
New Hampshire	14	4.6	7	0	7	28	29	29
Rhode Island	10	4.9	0	0	0	30	50	20
Vermont	11	4.6	0	0	9	18	73	0

Q4: Responses to questions about the value of NESSC to state’s secondary school reform efforts.

Sharing of effective school practices as defined by the Global Best Practices tool.						
	N	Mean	No Value Added (%)	Minimal Value Added (%)	Moderate Value Added (%)	Significant Value Added (%)
All Respondents	54	3.3	5	4	48	43
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	3.3	10	0	40	50
NESSC Member	44	3.3	4	5	50	41
State						
Connecticut	8	3.4	0	0	62	38
Maine	9	3.3	0	0	67	33
New Hampshire	14	3.0	14	14	29	43
Rhode Island	10	3.7	0	0	30	70
Vermont	12	3.2	8	0	58	34

Leverage gained by promoting policies that have already been adopted or are being considered by other Consortium states (i.e., “political cover”).						
	N	Mean	No Value Added (%)	Minimal Value Added (%)	Moderate Value Added (%)	Significant Value Added (%)
All Respondents	53	2.8	7	23	53	17
Position						
DOE Leadership	9	3.1	0	22	45	33
NESSC Member	44	2.7	9	23	54	14
State						
Connecticut	8	3.3	0	0	75	25
Maine	9	2.9	0	22	67	11
New Hampshire	13	2.6	8	38	39	15
Rhode Island	10	2.7	0	30	70	0
Vermont	12	2.7	25	17	25	33

Establishing momentum for the transformation of secondary education.						
	N	Mean	No Value Added (%)	Minimal Value Added (%)	Moderate Value Added (%)	Significant Value Added (%)
All Respondents	51	3.0	4	22	49	25
Position						
DOE Leadership	8	3.0	12	13	37	38
NESSC Member	43	3.0	2	23	51	24
State						
Connecticut	8	3.3	0	12	50	38
Maine	9	3.1	0	22	45	33
New Hampshire	12	2.5	17	25	50	8
Rhode Island	10	3.0	0	20	60	20
Vermont	11	3.1	0	27	36	37

Increasing focus within my state Department of Education on the transformation of secondary education.						
	N	Mean	No Value Added (%)	Minimal Value Added (%)	Moderate Value Added (%)	Significant Value Added (%)
All Respondents	52	2.9	6	29	40	25
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	3.1	10	10	40	40
NESSC Member	42	2.8	5	33	41	21
State						
Connecticut	8	3.1	0	12	63	25
Maine	9	2.8	0	45	33	22
New Hampshire	14	2.8	7	36	28	29
Rhode Island	9	2.8	11	11	67	11
Vermont	12	2.8	8	33	25	34

Gaining interest from state legislators in the transformation of secondary education.						
	N	Mean	No Value Added (%)	Minimal Value Added (%)	Moderate Value Added (%)	Significant Value Added (%)
All Respondents	54	2.9	6	24	44	26
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	3.5	0	0	50	50
NESSC Member	44	2.8	7	29	43	21
State						
Connecticut	8	3.0	0	25	50	25
Maine	9	3.0	0	11	78	11
New Hampshire	14	2.5	14	43	21	22
Rhode Island	10	3.3	0	10	50	40
Vermont	12	2.8	8	25	42	25

Increasing involvement from state legislators in the transformation of secondary education.						
	N	Mean	No Value Added (%)	Minimal Value Added (%)	Moderate Value Added (%)	Significant Value Added (%)
All Respondents	54	2.9	4	24	52	20
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	3.4	0	0	60	40
NESSC Member	44	2.8	4	30	50	16
State						
Connecticut	8	2.9	0	37	38	25
Maine	9	3.2	0	11	56	33
New Hampshire	14	2.5	7	43	43	7
Rhode Island	10	3.2	0	10	60	30
Vermont	12	2.8	8	17	67	8

Gaining interest from the higher education community in the transformation of secondary education.						
	N	Mean	No Value Added (%)	Minimal Value Added (%)	Moderate Value Added (%)	Significant Value Added (%)
All Respondents	52	2.8	6	33	38	23
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	3.3	0	20	30	50
NESSC Member	42	2.7	7	36	40	17
State						
Connecticut	8	2.5	0	50	50	0
Maine	7	2.4	0	57	43	0
New Hampshire	14	2.7	7	28	36	29
Rhode Island	10	2.9	0	30	50	20
Vermont	12	2.9	16	17	25	42

Increasing involvement from the higher education community in the transformation of secondary education.						
	N	Mean	No Value Added (%)	Minimal Value Added (%)	Moderate Value Added (%)	Significant Value Added (%)
All Respondents	52	2.6	11	35	33	21
Position						
DOE Leadership	9	3.1	0	33	22	45
NESSC Member	43	2.5	14	35	35	16
State						
Connecticut	8	2.5	0	50	50	0
Maine	8	2.1	12	63	25	0
New Hampshire	14	2.6	21	21	29	29
Rhode Island	9	2.7	0	44	45	11
Vermont	12	2.9	16	17	25	42

Q5: Responses about benefits of NESSC components to state’s secondary school reform efforts.

The Global Best Practices self-assessment tool.						
	N	Mean	No Benefit (%)	Somewhat Beneficial (%)	Beneficial (%)	Very Beneficial (%)
All Respondents	46	2.9	6	26	44	24
Position						
DOE Leadership	9	2.9	11	22	33	34
NESSC Member	37	2.8	5	27	46	22
State						
Connecticut	8	3.1	0	25	37	38
Maine	7	2.7	0	43	43	14
New Hampshire	12	2.5	17	33	33	17
Rhode Island	8	3.4	0	0	62	38
Vermont	11	2.7	9	27	46	18

The High Leverage Policy framework developed by the Center for Education Policy Analysis at UConn.						
	N	Mean	No Benefit (%)	Somewhat Beneficial (%)	Beneficial (%)	Very Beneficial (%)
All Respondents	42	2.6	12	29	45	14
Position						
DOE Leadership	8	2.8	0	50	25	25
NESSC Member	34	2.6	15	23	50	12
State						
Connecticut	8	3.0	0	25	50	25
Maine	7	2.1	14	57	29	0
New Hampshire	10	2.9	10	10	60	20
Rhode Island	6	2.8	0	33	50	17
Vermont	11	2.3	27	27	37	9

The three high-leverage policies developed by the Policy Strategic Action Team endorsed by the NESSC Council.						
	N	Mean	No Benefit (%)	Somewhat Beneficial (%)	Beneficial (%)	Very Beneficial (%)
All Respondents	46	2.8	9	19	52	20
Position						
DOE Leadership	9	3.4	0	11	33	56
NESSC Member	37	2.7	11	21	57	11
State						
Connecticut	8	3.1	0	0	87	13
Maine	8	2.9	0	25	62	13
New Hampshire	12	2.8	8	33	34	25
Rhode Island	7	2.9	0	29	57	14
Vermont	11	2.6	27	9	37	27

The work of the NESSC Council.						
	N	Mean	No Benefit (%)	Somewhat Beneficial (%)	Beneficial (%)	Very Beneficial (%)
All Respondents	47	2.9	6	19	58	17
Position						
DOE Leadership	9	3.1	0	11	67	22
NESSC Member	38	2.8	8	21	55	16
State						
Connecticut	7	3.1	0	0	86	14
Maine	7	2.7	0	29	71	0
New Hampshire	12	2.8	8	33	34	25
Rhode Island	8	3.3	0	25	25	50
Vermont	12	2.6	17	8	75	0

The work of the Policy Strategic Action Team.						
	N	Mean	No Benefit (%)	Somewhat Beneficial (%)	Beneficial (%)	Very Beneficial (%)
All Respondents	46	2.9	6	20	52	22
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	3.2	0	10	60	30
NESSC Member	36	2.8	8	22	50	20
State						
Connecticut	8	3.3	0	0	75	25
Maine	7	3.1	0	14	57	29
New Hampshire	12	2.9	8	25	33	34
Rhode Island	7	2.7	0	29	71	0
Vermont	11	2.6	18	27	37	18

The work of the League of Innovative Schools Strategic Action Team.						
	N	Mean	No Benefit (%)	Somewhat Beneficial (%)	Beneficial (%)	Very Beneficial (%)
All Respondents	49	2.8	8	18	55	19
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	2.9	10	20	40	30
NESSC Member	39	2.8	8	18	59	15
State						
Connecticut	8	3.1	0	12	63	25
Maine	7	3.0	0	28	43	29
New Hampshire	13	2.6	23	15	39	23
Rhode Island	8	3.0	0	12	75	13
Vermont	12	2.7	8	25	58	9

The work of the Data Strategic Action Team.						
	N	Mean	No Benefit (%)	Somewhat Beneficial (%)	Beneficial (%)	Very Beneficial (%)
All Respondents	48	2.8	4	25	60	11
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	3.1	0	10	70	20
NESSC Member	38	2.7	5	29	58	8
State						
Connecticut	7	2.9	0	29	57	14
Maine	7	2.4	0	57	43	0
New Hampshire	13	2.9	8	23	46	23
Rhode Island	8	3.0	0	12	75	13
Vermont	12	2.7	8	17	75	0

The effectiveness of having GSP organize and facilitate NESSC gatherings.						
	N	Mean	No Benefit (%)	Somewhat Beneficial (%)	Beneficial (%)	Very Beneficial (%)
All Respondents	48	3.2	10	4	46	40
Position						
DOE Leadership	9	3.2	11	11	22	56
NESSC Member	39	3.1	10	3	51	36
State						
Connecticut	8	3.5	0	0	50	50
Maine	8	3.3	0	0	75	25
New Hampshire	12	2.6	33	0	42	25
Rhode Island	8	3.6	0	12	13	75
Vermont	11	3.0	9	9	55	27

Developing a plan to approach foundations for funding.						
	N	Mean	No Benefit (%)	Somewhat Beneficial (%)	Beneficial (%)	Very Beneficial (%)
All Respondents	43	2.7	12	19	53	16
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	2.7	10	30	40	20
NESSC Member	33	2.8	12	15	58	15
State						
Connecticut	6	2.8	0	17	83	0
Maine	6	2.5	16	17	67	0
New Hampshire	12	2.7	25	8	42	25
Rhode Island	8	3.3	0	12	50	38
Vermont	11	2.6	9	36	46	9

Q6: Respondents' beliefs about the likelihood of achieving Phase II benchmarks by August 2011.

At least one high-leverage policy will be adopted or refined in my state that aligns with the NESSC Policy Framework.						
	N	Mean	Not Likely (%)	Somewhat Likely (%)	Likely (%)	Very Likely (%)
All Respondents	45	2.8	9	24	47	20
Position						
DOE Leadership	9	3.4	0	11	33	56
NESSC Member	36	2.6	11	28	50	11
State						
Connecticut	6	3.2	0	17	50	33
Maine	9	2.6	11	33	45	11
New Hampshire	11	2.7	9	18	64	9
Rhode Island	8	2.6	0	50	37	13
Vermont	11	2.9	18	9	36	37

My state will secure and/or allocate funds that support participation in the League of Innovative Schools (LIS)						
	N	Mean	Not Likely (%)	Somewhat Likely (%)	Likely (%)	Very Likely (%)
All Respondents	46	2.0	33	44	17	6
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	2.5	30	20	20	30
NESSC Member	36	1.8	33	50	17	0
State						
Connecticut	6	2.3	17	33	50	0
Maine	8	2.0	25	50	25	0
New Hampshire	13	1.4	61	39	0	0
Rhode Island	8	2.4	12	50	25	13
Vermont	11	2.2	27	46	9	18

At least six schools in my state will demonstrate their intention to be actively involved in the LIS.						
	N	Mean	Not Likely (%)	Somewhat Likely (%)	Likely (%)	Very Likely (%)
All Respondents	45	2.7	9	31	38	22
Position						
DOE Leadership	9	3.0	11	22	22	45
NESSC Member	36	2.7	8	33	42	17
State						
Connecticut	7	3.3	0	14	43	43
Maine	8	2.9	0	37	38	25
New Hampshire	12	2.2	33	25	34	8
Rhode Island	8	3.0	0	25	50	25
Vermont	10	2.7	0	50	30	20

My state will have created a support structure for the LIS that demonstrates a clear alignment between DOE activities with the LIS.						
	N	Mean	Not Likely (%)	Somewhat Likely (%)	Likely (%)	Very Likely (%)
All Respondents	46	2.5	17	26	44	13
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	3.0	20	0	40	40
NESSC Member	36	2.4	17	33	45	5
State						
Connecticut	7	3.0	0	14	72	14
Maine	7	2.3	14	57	14	15
New Hampshire	13	2.0	38	23	39	0
Rhode Island	8	2.9	12	13	50	25
Vermont	11	2.7	17	26	44	13

My state will have created a support structure for the LIS that demonstrates a clear alignment between DOE personnel with the LIS.						
	N	Mean	Not Likely (%)	Somewhat Likely (%)	Likely (%)	Very Likely (%)
All Respondents	46	2.4	15	35	41	9
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	2.8	20	10	40	30
NESSC Member	36	2.3	14	41	42	3
State						
Connecticut	7	2.7	0	29	71	0
Maine	7	2.1	14	72	0	14
New Hampshire	13	2.1	31	31	38	0
Rhode Island	8	2.8	12	13	62	13
Vermont	11	2.6	9	36	37	18

My state will endorse a common set of regional data metrics (that includes the NESSC data metrics) to use for public distribution.						
	N	Mean	Not Likely (%)	Somewhat Likely (%)	Likely (%)	Very Likely (%)
All Respondents	46	2.6	4	44	41	11
Position						
DOE Leadership	8	3.1	0	12	63	25
NESSC Member	38	2.5	5	50	37	8
State						
Connecticut	8	3.0	0	37	25	38
Maine	8	2.3	0	75	25	0
New Hampshire	12	2.4	8	50	33	9
Rhode Island	9	3.0	0	0	100	0
Vermont	9	2.3	11	56	22	11

My state will have established an in-state messaging campaign to develop broad public and political will to support new models of student-centered learning.						
	N	Mean	Not Likely (%)	Somewhat Likely (%)	Likely (%)	Very Likely (%)
All Respondents	48	2.5	12	40	38	10
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	2.9	10	10	60	20
NESSC Member	38	2.3	13	47	32	8
State						
Connecticut	7	2.6	0	57	29	14
Maine	8	2.1	12	63	25	0
New Hampshire	14	2.5	21	29	29	21
Rhode Island	8	2.6	12	13	75	0
Vermont	11	2.5	9	46	36	9

My state will have reached out to essential stakeholder groups regarding NESSC goals.						
	N	Mean	Not Likely (%)	Somewhat Likely (%)	Likely (%)	Very Likely (%)
All Respondents	51	2.7	14	33	25	28
Position						
DOE Leadership	10	3.3	0	20	30	50
NESSC Member	41	2.5	17	37	24	22
State						
Connecticut	8	3.3	0	25	25	50
Maine	8	2.1	25	50	12	13
New Hampshire	14	2.6	21	29	21	29
Rhode Island	9	3.1	0	22	45	33
Vermont	12	2.4	16	42	25	17

Q7: Respondents' level of interest in the Consortium continuing.

Level of interest in the Consortium continuing into the future.						
	N	Mean	Not Interested (%)	Somewhat Interested (%)	Interested (%)	Very Interested (%)
All Respondents	51	3.3	6	16	23	55
Position						
DOE Leadership	9	3.4	11	0	22	67
NESSC Member	42	3.2	5	19	24	52
State						
Connecticut	8	3.3	0	25	25	50
Maine	9	3.3	0	22	22	56
New Hampshire	12	2.8	17	25	16	42
Rhode Island	9	3.6	0	11	22	67
Vermont	12	3.4	8	0	33	59

Appendix B: Open-Ended Responses

Beyond what your state could have accomplished on its own, please describe how being part of the Consortium has added value to your state's secondary reform efforts.
Being part of NESSC has greatly increased communication regarding the efforts for secondary school reform with legislators and other stakeholders. Additionally we have been able to keep the focus on these issues and continue to consolidate our efforts so that they are most effective.
Secondary educators see that surrounding states are working toward the same motives, and the annual conference allows them to meet each other and share.
Since the last election there has been a real interest in strengthening secondary education both for post-secondary and career ready students.
Gaining interest from state legislators in the transformation of secondary education. The state legislators involved have a better view of what is meant by high school transformation and why it is needed. Our legislators have been involved to some extent but I would like to see more involvement on their part. How we accomplish that I am not sure.
I have recommended the Global Best Practices Tool to many in the field. The Consortium has helped our state DOE focus on clear objectives for secondary reform.
I think that by grouping together states there is more political cover and more opportunity to promote best practices and findings
The Consortium brings together committed individuals who have common experiences and backgrounds but who charge ahead in the change process in significantly different ways. I would like to participate more in activities and especially learn more about LIS.
Value added with folks talking to each other. In my state, meetings are in isolation as they happen then there is no communication/movement until the next meeting. NESSC is treated like a special interest group...not a fault of theirs but a fault of the state. I do, however, find meetings cumbersome with policies/processes being repeated and debated to a point of not wanting to attend. The policies set by the consortium seem to stay in the forefront which is good but without these policies being promoted by NESSC I think the work would fade away.
Work of the Council and our state's promotion of that work to/through our P-16 Council have been very helpful with the higher education community. Regional goals relating to higher education have been particularly persuasive and a good tool for thinking about smoothing the transition from high school to higher ed.
As a small state, NH benefits from joining with others to approach federal and private grant programs.
I think the Consortium as provided valuable support and the tools are terrific. I think the problem is on our state end. The information isn't getting out to the right people (high school principals, superintendents, legislators, school boards - and higher ed. Communication is, and has been, an issue.
The tools developed And implemented have helped me frame discussions, clarify evaluative processes, and focus strategies for school improvement.
The Global Best Practices Toolkit has been used over the past year and a half to guide the development of the School Improvement Plan. The SIT has used the document to self assess in four important areas of the school and develop plans to make improvements. It has been a very valuable tool.
Two of our state legislative leaders play an active role on the state advisory council
The sharing of effective school practices as defined by the Global Best practices tool is exceptional on its own merit and is being widely disseminated to schools. This tool, if used with fidelity by schools for self-study, will greatly enhance practices and strategies toward improving culture, student achievement, and the overall spirit of learning and teaching. In a state where reform is needed greatly, this tool is invaluable.
The capacity to bring leaders from higher Ed, state government and LEAs to a single table and work together on substantive and systemic policies and strategies to affect change and improve student and adult performance continues to add value with every meeting.
We will be promoting the use of GBP as a self-evaluation tool and will facilitate its appropriate use.
Learning and sharing experiences, policies and practices with other States gives the ability to promote more effectively. However, communication with council members outside of DOE is minimal therefore the ability to promote to the business community, public and secondary education is insufficient to date.

Having a team from our DOE has increased not only the level of involvement but also the knowledge about and focus on transformation. NESSC work strongly supports the current DOE/SBE strategic plan and is embraced by DOE leadership.
I'm not sure that it has, yet.
The Global Best Practices tool is wonderful. Our regional principals' group is seriously considering using it as a regional assessment/accountability tool. The high-leverage policy focus, however, is lost on Vermont principals. I, for one, am fiercely proud of Vermont education, and the one thing I've learned through participation in the NESSC is the gulf between the state's educational cultures.
My view is from the entire NE region so my thoughts reflect the five states involved. I think the contributions of the state legislative reps have added an invaluable level of dialogue to the discussion and potential changes resulting from the work of the Consortium. I have benefited from their input and contributions. Additionally, I continue to benefit from the small cohort discussions during which all individuals participate and share ideas.
The Consortium has helped with bringing momentum for transformation. While Maine had many of the necessary laws on the books, we were not making progress in an organized way in putting those policies into practice. By requiring each state to form a Logic Model and Policy Implementation Plan, the Consortium has helped clarify how the NESSC work fits into, and promotes, other fledgling efforts of the Department. Seeing the comprehensive policy statements and efforts of other states in the Consortium has also provided a push.
Raising awareness as an external organization, opening opportunities for stakeholders to talk with a focus.
Nothing stands out
We clearly have work to do in NH--but not for lack of work from the NESSC--they help to keep the ball moving down the court
State legislators introduced legislation regarding school age requirement (16-18) and are actively seeking ways to strengthen secondary education particularly the academic and career readiness connection. Global best practices toolkit is going to form the foundation for our next generation of secondary school accountability in our Commissioner's Review process.
We have engaged higher education in the council and in the LIS team...this has brought a great ripple effect back to the state. Higher education reps have realized that we are actually working to improve high schools not just talking about it. Creates stronger partnerships.
1. Our Chancellor of Higher Ed has been closely working with us from the beginning and his efforts to support our transformation of secondary education has been instrumental in our slow but steady success to improve outcomes and opportunities for HS students. 2. Having State Board of Education and political representation has been very positive in helping support our NESSC work and move some of it to the state policy area and to statute.

Briefly describe how one or more of the NESSC components has been beneficial to your state.
Without the work of GSP to organize and facilitate gatherings, the gatherings would not have taken place at all, they would have taken place less frequently, and/or they would not have been as productive. This work is impossible without an outside facilitator.
The Global Best Practices self-assessment tool is worth its weight in gold. It contains specifics to help educators start the transformative process, and is an easy-to-use and inviting resource.
The League of Innovative will support other state initiatives including a Dept of Education Partnership for High School, College and Workforce Alignment
The Policy Action team can be an asset to Maine
I have been impressed with the organization of all NESSC activities that I have participated in.
I don't see, in my state, direct results of any of the work expect to focus on decreasing the drop out rate. I believe the policies are ""on the minds"" of some administrators but do not see a department wide commitment to the work.
NH is developing data systems consistent with those used in the region and nationally. The face-to-face and video-conference meetings have all been very professionally facilitated by GSP.
The Global Best practices Tool is wonderful. It just hasn't gotten to the field yet. None of what HAS been accomplished would not have happened without the guidance and support of the GSP.
We have used the Global Best Practices Toolkit extensively.
The Global Best Practices self-assessment tool has been gaining ground in our state as more schools are sharing its practicality in developing and implementing improvement plans for their schools
The work of the NESSC is exceptional in that all voices matter, the conversation is focused, the results are shared

widely and the impact is immediate at the school and district levels. The communication is clear and frequent enough to keep the conversation current.
The glue that has kept our work moving forward is the presence of GSP. Their calm, organized, detailed, respectful and committed approach to the members of our organization is invaluable.
I left many blank because I don't have enough background with the group to know.
I do not know the current extent to which each of these components has been beneficial but they have certainly been helpful keeping us focused as we move forward. I believe the most immediate impact has come from identifying and discussing the specific policies. It has allowed us to begin to visualize and hopefully implement the steps we need to take as a state.
The Global Best Practices tool has great potential if we can get schools to use it. Work with NEASC around this is essential, in my opinion.
GSP's organization and staffing assistance are essential to our work. The enthusiasm and attention of the GSP staff keep us on task; without their efforts, I'm afraid this work would be drowned in the sea of day-to-day crises and demands.
organizing group meetings and high level discussions.
I am not in favor of GSP/NESSC being given carte blanche to market our in-state foundations for a project of marginal value
See above for the benefit of Global Best practices tool. The data strategic action team is coordinated with the state's efforts at developing a longitudinal data system and has engaged higher education and others in regional decisions on metrics. The League of Innovative schools coincides with our next iteration of secondary school reform and provides us with a strong framework for moving the state reform agenda forward.
The GBP fits significantly into our school improvement mission at the DOE and specifically addresses high schools....which are different and sometimes get lost in the PK-8 work of a department.

Please Add Any Additional Comments You Would Like To Share
Thank you for orchestrating this important work across states.
This is a tall challenge, especially with the changing political landscape. The key is to get the new commissioner invested. Otherwise nothing will happen
We probably need to do more to communicate internally. I am aware of the broad goals of NESSC, but within Maine, I have not had much conversation with colleagues about our commitment to it or the various components. The strongest aspect, it seems to me, is the LIS. It is also the one I can "sell" most easily as a clear component and benefit to Maine's involvement. Working with other states to develop and pass similar policies and legislation has minimal impact in Maine, I believe.
Our state's economic crisis and recent Republican majority has presented a huge challenge in communicating the value of the work of NESSC. It is not due to the efforts of the consortium, but to the stubborn refusal to listen to anything that many of the Republicans do not understand. It is discouraging, but I believe that the value of NESSC during times like this is mutual support and encouragement. Our messaging HAS to be about the long term economic benefits of innovation to the students and the communities.
More direct interaction between legislators More specific, perhaps visits, to recognized programs Less process, more action.....each state is doing something. I'd like to know better what is working and how they got there.
NESSC is very rapidly becoming irrelevant--Would not recommend continued funding
There appears to be a gathering momentum in our state in regards to the work associated with NESSC as there is a closer connection with NESSC policy, practical work (LIS), and the state's priority areas.
We need to create a 2 year plan and vision, requires more sustainable funding and commitment of possibly State funds to provide this stability. Higher education support will be critical moving forward and could possibly yield financial support as well.
I am very supportive of the work being done by the NESSC and have appreciated the support/colleagueship/ideas provided by this group. It can often be a challenge to keep everything going especially since so many staffing reductions have occurred in our DOE.
Our new Governor has adopted an early education priority and will most likely focus efforts in PK-3. It seems hard to for us to focus on more than one area at a time but we are trying to cover all three of our state's priorities in our state comprehensive plan.