

STRATEGIC EDUCATION RESEARCH PARTNERSHIP

Committee on a Strategic Education Research Partnership

M.S. Donovan, A.K. Wigdor, and C.E. Snow, editors

Division of Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education

NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL
OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES

THE NATIONAL ACADEMIES PRESS
Washington, D.C.
www.nap.edu

Acknowledgments

The committee is grateful to the many people who contributed to this phase in the development of a Strategic Education Research Partnership (SERP). The financial support of our sponsors at the Department of Education, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Carnegie Corporation of New York, and the Spencer Foundation was essential, of course, but representatives of each also participated in fruitful discussions with the committee. Our thanks to C. Kent McGuire, former assistant secretary of education research and improvement and to his successor and now director of the National Institute for Education Sciences, Grover J. Russ Whitehurst; thanks likewise are due to Valerie Reyna, Mark Conostas, and Sue Betka. We are grateful to Daniel Fallon, director of the education program at Carnegie Corporation, his predecessor Vivien Stewart, and colleague Karin Egan; Ellen Condliffe Lagemann, president of the Spencer Foundation, and Paul Goren, vice president of the Spencer Foundation and before that education officer at the MacArthur Foundation.

In the course of our work, the committee drew on the expertise of many others. James A. Kelly, president of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, served as senior adviser to the committee throughout. Kelly is one of the few people in the country to build a new research-based program, national in scope, that has made teachers and school administrators central players in education reform. David A. Goslin, former president of the American Institutes for Research, was a vital link between the first SERP committee and this one, generously providing project memory so that the Phase 2 effort could build fruitfully on what had gone before. In thinking about the conditions required for a powerful research program, the committee benefited greatly from Emerson Elliott's deep experience

and wisdom. A long-time federal career employee, Elliott occupied positions from 1957 to 2000 that placed him in the center of the federal education research enterprise, including four stints as acting director of the research function and appointment as the first commissioner of education statistics in 1992. His paper, commissioned by the committee and entitled *Three Visions for Investment in Education Research: An Insider's Recollections from Four Decades in Federal Policy and Practice* (January 2002) appears in condensed form as Appendix A.

The committee extends its appreciation to participants in a workshop on the organization of research and its relation to practice in other sectors, held in November 2000. Richard Klausner, then director of the National Cancer Institute, and Annetine C. Gelijns and Alan J. Moskowitz, codirectors of the International Center for Health Outcomes and Innovation Research, Columbia University, gave us insight into important aspects of the medical sector. Internationally known agricultural economists Vernon Ruttan of the University of Minnesota and Robert E. Evenson of Yale University shared their knowledge of the system linking research, product development, and farming through federal and state programs (the agricultural experiment stations, the extension service) and, more recently, through private-sector investment. In addition, the committee benefited from papers commissioned from Linda Argoty of Carnegie Mellon University and James Rosenbaum of Northwestern University on organizational research and educational change.

The committee's work was enhanced by the Panel on Learning and Instruction, whose chair, James Pellegrino, attended all committee meetings to ensure adequate communication and coordination between committee and panel. The panel's report, *Learning and Instruction: A SERP Research Agenda*, is being published as a companion volume to this report.

A special note of thanks is due to committee members Catherine Snow and John Reed, who agreed to take on the role of vice chair to help us accomplish a great deal of work in all-too-little time.

Our thanks go as well to Timothy Ready, who helped get things started, to administrative assistants Shirley Thatcher and Allison Shoup, and to Kirsten Sampson Snyder, who managed the review process.

This report has been reviewed in draft form by individuals

chosen for their diverse perspectives and technical expertise, in accordance with procedures approved by the Report Review Committee of the National Research Council. The purpose of this independent review is to provide candid and critical comments that will assist the institution in making its published report as sound as possible and to ensure that the report meets institutional standards for objectivity, evidence, and responsiveness to the study charge. The review comments and draft manuscript remain confidential to protect the integrity of the deliberative process.

We wish to thank the following individuals for their review of this report: Sherri Andrews, General Studies, North Carolina School of the Arts, Winston-Salem, NC; Nicholas A. Branca, Mathematical and Computer Sciences, San Diego State University; James R. Brown, Superintendent, Glendale Unified School District, CA; Anthony S. Bryk, Center for School Improvement, The University of Chicago; Williamson M. Evers, Hoover Institution, Stanford University; Richard M. Felder, Department of Chemical Engineering, North Carolina State University; Henry M. Levin, Teachers College, Columbia University; Marcia C. Linn, Graduate School of Education, University of California, Berkeley; James G. March, Graduate School of Business—Dean’s Office, Stanford University; Lorraine McDonnell, Department of Political Science, University of California, Santa Barbara; Barbara Schneider, Sociology and Human Development, The University of Chicago; and Neil J. Smelser, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley.

Although the reviewers listed above have provided many constructive comments and suggestions, they were not asked to endorse the conclusions or recommendations nor did they see the final draft of the report before its release. The review of this report was overseen by William Danforth, Washington University, St. Louis, and Richard Shavelson, School of Education, Stanford University. Appointed by the National Research Council, they were responsible for making certain that an independent examination of this report was carried out in accordance with institutional procedures and that all review comments were carefully considered. Responsibility for the final content of this report rests entirely with the authoring committee and the institution.

In addition to the NRC-led review, the committee invited external review from four others, to whom we extend our thanks:

Chester Finn, senior fellow at the Hoover Institution and president of the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation; Steven Fleischman, executive director of the Education Quality Institute; James Guthrie, director of the Peabody Center for Education Policy at Vanderbilt University; and Mary Anne Schmitt, president of the New American Schools.

Joe B. Wyatt, *Chair*
Alexandra K. Wigdor, *Director*
Committee on the Strategic
Education Research Partnership

Contents

	Foreword	xiii
	Executive Summary	1
1	The Need for a New Partnership	9
	The Challenge, 9	
	SERP Capabilities, 23	
0	Helping Hercules: Why Infrastructure Matters	29
	Boston Reading Study, 30	
	Reciprocal Teaching, 33	
	Creating the Cognitive Tutor, 36	
	The Cognitive Tutor Algebra I in an Oklahoma School District, 39	
	Linking Research and Practice with Ease, 42	
	Consortium on Chicago School Research, 45	
	Conclusion, 51	
0	The SERP Organization	52
	Developing a Program, 52	
	Attracting Stable Funding and Support, 64	
	The SERP Governance Structure, 69	
	SERP Organizational Structure, 70	
	Summary, 78	

4	SERP Networks: Who Would Come and What Would They Do? Creating Network Partnerships, 79 Who Would Come?, 79 What Would They Do?, 85 An Illustrative Agenda for a SERP Network on Learning and Instruction, 86 Would SERP Change Practice?, 105	79
5	Charting a Course of Action Getting to Launch, 110 Taking Off, 115	107
	References	117
	Appendixes	
A	Federal Investments in Education Research: A Sobering History	121
B	SERP Cost Projections: A Scenario for the Proof-of-Concept Period	127
C	Biographical Sketches of Committee Members and Staff	138