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A Word from the Director

Born in the 1990s, the children of Mr. and Ms. School Reform—charter schools, vouchers, and school accountability—have reached their adolescent years. Now that the gangly youth have been given an occasional chance to drive the family car, accidents are occurring. Vouchers narrowly escaped a fatal death before the U.S. Supreme Court in a 5–4 decision handed down in 2002, only to be knifed by state judges in Florida, Colorado, and elsewhere. Charters have acquired a bit of muscle, but it’s taking them longer to acquire the necessary skill set. Accountability is turning out to be an undisciplined, overweight braggart who has delivered less than the swagger promised. Meanwhile, the youngest child—teacher recruitment, compensation, and retention reform—has yet to find its voice.

Still, at least one reform babe—the new wave in education research—is doing better than expected. Ideologically based speculation about school policy has been steadily replaced by rigorous, scientific descriptions and evaluations. State testing requirements are generating vast amounts of new information about what’s happening inside the classroom. Desktop computers are analyzing tens of millions of pieces of information, allowing a precision of analysis beyond comprehension little more than a decade ago. Statisticians are inventing new ways of searching for the needle within the haystacks of data. Through web sites and Internet connections, scholars are constantly releasing into the public domain new strategies, new suggestions, and new findings.

Harvard’s Program on Education Policy and Governance (PEPG) is among the beneficiaries of the research transformation currently under way. Through its workshops, doctoral students, graduates, conferences, journal, and research enterprises, PEPS, working with scholars in the United States and abroad, is hoping to help guide those gangling adolescents spawned by Mr. and Ms. School Reform toward a mature, responsible adulthood. The following pages provide a glimpse into that process.
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What Americans Think about Their Schools

Findings from the 2007 and 2008 Education Next – PEPG Surveys

Americans both care about their schools and want them to improve. Though adults give the nation’s public schools only mediocre grades—a plurality confer a C—they give somewhat higher grades to the schools in their own communities.

The local schools may be passing, but they do not earn the same high marks as other neighborhood institutions. Americans are open to a host of education reforms, including support for Internet-based online courses for high school students. They favor funding for a number of uses, and parents overwhelmingly support it for their own children. Americans underestimate

Schools at the Bottom of the Class? (Figure 1)

Though schools are “passing” in the opinion of their communities, they are not doing so with the same “flying colors” as other local institutions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grading Public Institutions

American public schools certainly “pass” when it comes to their own communities’ opinions of them. A plurality of our respondents from both years awarded a B or above, and a majority awarded at least a C. However, when this grade disbursement is looked at in comparison to those of other local, public institutions, it is clear that the schools’ performance pales in comparison to the others (see Figure 1). Americans rate the performance of their post offices, which they may interact with more, much higher than the performance of their public schools. Even the police force, an oftentimes maligned institution and one with high performance expectations, receives significantly higher marks than schools. Public schools may be “passing” in the eyes of their communities, but they are not exhibiting the same level of quality as their fellow neighborhood cornerstones.

Supporters Leaving NCLB Behind? (Figure 2)

A smaller percentage of American adults support the renewal of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) with only minor changes in 2008 than supported it in 2007. Support for reauthorization is markedly higher when the law is described as federal legislation.

No Child Left Behind

On the most high-profile issue of the day—the debate over extending the life of NCLB—a majority of those polled in 2007 indicated that they supported the law’s reauthorization with no more than minor changes (see Figure 2). However, in the year’s time since we first asked this question, support for reauthorization has dropped. In 2008 only 50 percent of those polled supported the law’s reauthorization with no more than minor changes, down from 57 percent in 2007.

The intense debate over NCLB appears to have eroded its public support.
school spending and teacher salaries. Support for reauthorization of No Child Left Behind (NCLB) declined between 2007 and 2008.

All this—and more—is indicated by two national surveys of 2,000 and 3,000 U.S. adults conducted under the auspices of Education Next and PEPG in 2007 and 2008. William G. Howell, Martin R. West, and Paul E. Peterson, who designed the survey, published the results of the first survey in the Fall 2007 issue of Education Next and will reveal the complete findings of the second survey in the Fall 2008 issue.

Knowledge of School Spending and Teacher Salaries

Americans dramatically underestimate the amount spent on public schools in their district and average teacher salaries in their state. When asked to guess per-pupil expenditures in their district, the cohort’s median response was just $2,000, or less than 20 percent of the actual amount being spent. Rounding respondents of the range of expenses school districts face improved their assessments—but not by much. The half of the sample group who saw the prompt claimed, on average, that their districts spent $5,262, about $1,000 more than the others, but still only 54 percent of the actual per-pupil spending levels in their districts (see Figure 3).

When asked about the average teacher salary in their state, members of the public again offered significantly smaller figures. Americans understate average teacher salaries in their own state by $14,370 (see Figure 3).

Of those surveyed in 2008, more than two-thirds said they would be willing to have their child take some high school courses over the Internet.

The Role of the Internet in Schools

The advent of online courses has sprung up as a potential solution to both the falling high school graduation rate and the rising cost of high school. Of those surveyed in 2008, more than two-thirds said they would be willing to have their child take some high school courses over the Internet. However, it appears that context is key when supporting online learning. One-quarter of those surveyed in 2008 were randomly assigned to one of four questions, all asking whether they would support funding for credit-bearing courses offered to high school students over the Internet. Each question involved a different group of students for which these courses would be offered, and each scenario garnered different support (see Figure 4).
Legal strategies have been used to push states to improve the level of public education across America. Adequacy lawsuits have emerged from such efforts, receiving in many cases a great deal of attention. *School Money Trials: The Legal Pursuit of Educational Adequacy* is a book that resulted from a PEPG conference that pulled together some of the most comprehensive analyses to date on these experiences.

Among the findings:

- No approach currently applied can provide scientific evidence on how much to spend to get all students to the achievement level that a state wants them to attain.
- Courts can enunciate principles to guide policymaking […] but they lack the information and institutional capacity to accomplish something as complicated as assessing the best way to achieve an adequate state education system.
- Evidence shows that increased expenditure resulting from the school finance judgments in four states has been largely offset by spending cuts at the local level, making the aggregate impact of the court order on education spending insignificant.
- Perhaps the greatest deficiency of most studies estimating the costs of an adequate education is the failure to consider that education might be improved not by increasing resources, but by improving the efficiency with which they are used.
• Other remedies, such as compensation schemes for teachers, the creation of a student accountability system, and vouchers, could be incorporated as part of a comprehensive solution.

The book edited by Martin R. West and Paul E. Peterson emanated from the conference “Adequacy Lawsuits: Their Growing Impact on American Education,” hosted by PEPG October 13–14, 2005, at the Harvard Kennedy School. The conference addressed aspects of the ongoing adequacy movement that the existing scholarly literature, for the most part, overlooked. Lawsuits challenging the adequacy of school finance have been filed in more than 35 states.

Since the publication of the conference papers, judges have shown increasing reluctance to award large settlements in adequacy lawsuits.
For-profit management of public schools is still in its infancy, and many wonder whether it can have a positive effect on student learning. In Philadelphia, that idea has been put to the test. The results, as we report in a paper issued last Friday by the Harvard Program on Education Policy and Governance, would not surprise Adam Smith. The 18th-century economist explained that those who need to make a profit have strong incentives to do well by their customers. But can Smith's theory actually work when one is talking about educating students in the most challenging of urban schools—at the very heart of a major metropolis? The answer appears to be yes.

When for-profit management of public schools was first proposed in Philadelphia six years ago, many in that city were extremely skeptical, if not aggressively hostile. So the Philadelphia School Reform Commission, the entity responsible for the innovation, gave only the 30 lowest performing schools to for-profit companies, while another 16 were given to nonprofit organizations, including two of the city's major universities (Temple and the University of Pennsylvania). Others were reorganized by the school district itself.

In effect, a competition was run among the three types of management—for-profit, nonprofit, and government-run. Four years into the race, here are the results: Students at schools managed by for-profit firms were roughly six months ahead in math than would be expected had the schools remained in the hands of the school district. In reading, students in schools managed by for-profit firms were two months further along than they would have been if the schools had been under district control, though that difference was not large enough to give us statistical certainty. Meanwhile the nonprofits—and the school district's own reorganized schools—did no better than expected.

Our findings are based upon information gleaned from nearly 400,000 student test scores made available to us by the School District of Philadelphia. They gave us the test scores of every tested student for the years 2001 through 2006, allowing us to track student performance at for-profit, nonprofit, and low-performing district schools both before and after the management changes took place.

That data was subjected to a rigorous, quasi-experimental, "difference in differences" analysis that estimates management impacts at each type of school by making use of information on how much students were learning both before and after the management change while controlling for the students' characteristics.

Though we believe our methodology to be state of the art, our findings will nonetheless be controversial, because they contradict a prior study by the RAND Corp. in February, which found no impact of private management on student performance. The RAND study, however, failed to separate out the schools managed by the for-profit firms from those managed by the nonprofit organizations. In our study, too, management effects are nil when the two are mixed together, as the positive impacts of for-profit firms are canceled out by the negative impacts of nonprofit organizations.

Even Adam Smith would not expect that for-profit management will work anytime, and anywhere. But the Philadelphia results demonstrate that putting schools in private hands could lead to improvements in education. At the very least, the current Philadelphia for-profit schools should be allowed to continue under private management. If results from the first four years continue to hold up, they make a strong case for giving the private sector a larger role in urban education.

(The paper is available at: http://www.hks.harvard.edu/pepg/research.htm)
The commissioner of the statistical arm of the U.S. Department of Education said his office should not have initiated a recent, heavily publicized study comparing the academic performance of public and private school students because the report relied on a subjective analysis that could lead outsiders to question the research center's impartiality. Mark Schneider, the commissioner of the National Center for Education Statistics, said last week that he was not faulting the study's accuracy or methodology. But he said it was not proper for the research office to have directed a study that went so far in making judgments about how to interpret raw school data.

Mr. Schneider emphasized that he was not questioning the merits of that NCES report. “It is a very high-quality study.” But the commissioner said in the future he would not support having the NCES produce a report in which researchers made similarly subjective judgments about which student characteristics to consider.

The Public-Private School Achievement Debate

On July 14, 2006, the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) released a study that compared the performance in reading and math of 4th and 8th graders attending private and public schools. Using data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the report purported to show that public schools performed better than private schools. In a PEPG study presented to the Government Accountability Office, Paul E. Peterson and Elena Llaudet identified flaws in the NCES study. Using the same data but substituting better measures of student characteristics, they estimated three alternative models that identified a private-school advantage in nearly all comparisons. NAEP data are too fragile to permit any inference about school sector effects, one way or another, they concluded. They called for more rigorous research by the NCES. Following the release of the PEPG study, the Federal Commissioner of Education Statistics Mark S. Schneider expressed his concern about the involvement of NCES in the public and private school study:

“This is not what we should be doing,” Schneider said of the study of public and private schools, in an interview. “It’s one thing for [an academic researcher] to put our a study. That’s a totally different story than if NCES, as a statistical agency, is weighing in on that front.”

The Peterson-Llaudet study was widely debated in the media and among Washington policymakers.
Economics and Education

It’s not just going to school, but learning something while there that matters
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At the close of 2006, *Education Next* was recognized by the Editorial Projects in Education (EPE) Research Center in “Influence: A Study of the Factors Shaping Education Policy” as the most influential journal in education. The EPE’s findings were based on a survey of leading education experts from across the country.

In acknowledging the impact of *Education Next*, the study noted that the journal was “the only peer-reviewed periodical ranked among the top information sources.”


(The report is available at: http://www.edweek.org/media/influence_study.pdf)
Overhauling Teacher Collective Bargaining

The Boston Globe

Taking on the teachers unions
Frederick Hess and Martin R. West  | Op-ed March 29, 2006

IT IS RARE—and risky—for a governor and national political aspirant to put the interests of children above those of a constituency that has as much electoral clout as the teachers unions. Yet Massachusetts Governor Mitt Romney has done just that, with the education reform package he proposed last September and is touring nationwide.

The governor's bill seeks to upend the status quo in teacher pay and evaluation that has been written into collective bargaining agreements across the Commonwealth. Specifically, it would offer annual bonuses for teachers with a math or science degree who pass the teacher test in their subject, forgo tenure, and receive a satisfactory year-end evaluation. It would also make teachers in all subjects eligible for a bonus upon receiving an exemplary evaluation and empower superintendents to reward teachers who work in low-performing schools. Crucially, the bill would remove teacher evaluation from the collective bargaining process and establish statewide criteria for assessing each teacher’s “contribution to student learning.”

While several states and districts nationwide are experimenting with differential pay for teachers, Romney’s proposals are noteworthy for their breadth and the size of the proposed bonuses. All told, an effective math or science teacher could receive up to $15,000 a year in three bonuses.

Catherine Boudreau, president of the Massachusetts Teachers Association, predictably criticized Romney’s proposals as “inequitable, divisive, and ineffective.” The MTA denounced the proposal as “uniquely designed to destroy collegiality in a school,” ignoring the fact that performance pay is routine in such other professions as medicine, law, and engineering, not to mention in the Commonwealth’s first-rate universities, including those that are unionized by the MTA.

The governor can expect a similarly abrupt reception nationwide—a fact he should consider as he eyes a presidential run. Teachers unions control enormous political resources, including a network of readily mobilized voters. Moreover, the public likes to think that the interests of teachers and kids are always aligned, a line tirelessly advanced by the unions. The National Education Association’s political action committee even bills itself as the “Fund for Children and Public Education.”

However, what the unions want may not always be good for students. Teacher pay is exhibit one. While unions have fought to boost salaries, they have resisted efforts to ensure that this money recruits, rewards, and retains the most essential or effective teachers. Current pay scales reward teachers only for experience and graduate credits, neither of which is a meaningful predictor of quality. The result is that districts reward long-serving veterans while failing to recognize those teachers who improve student achievement, possess high-demand skills, or take on more challenging assignments.

Proposals to revamp collective bargaining by tackling teacher pay are only a start. Teacher collective bargaining agreements extend far beyond bread and butter matters, frequently privileging the interests of employees over those of students. Across the nation, contracts include clauses that prohibit principals from factoring student achievement into teacher evaluation, that allow senior teachers to claim the most desirable school and classroom assignments, and that engage in a dazzling array of miniatuere, such as when teachers are allowed to wear an NEA membership pin. As a result, schools are organized and managed more like mid-20th-century factories than professional 21st-century centers of learning.

Romney’s proposals are noteworthy for their breadth and the size of the proposed bonuses. All told, an effective math or science teacher could receive up to $15,000 a year in three bonuses.

Catherine Boudreau, president of the Massachusetts Teachers Association, predictably criticized Romney’s proposals as “inequitable, divisive, and ineffective.” The MTA denounced the proposal as “uniquely designed to destroy collegiality in a school,” ignoring the fact that performance pay is routine in such other professions as medicine, law, and engineering, not to mention in the Commonwealth’s first-rate universities, including those that are unionized by the MTA.

The governor can expect a similarly abrupt reception nationwide—a fact he should consider as he eyes a presidential run. Teachers unions control enormous political resources, including a network of readily mobilized voters. Moreover, the public likes to think that the interests of teachers and kids are always aligned, a line tirelessly advanced by the unions. The National Education Association’s political action committee even bills itself as the “Fund for Children and Public Education.”

However, what the unions want may not always be good for students. Teacher pay is exhibit one. While unions have fought to boost salaries, they have resisted efforts to ensure that this money recruits, rewards, and retains the most essential or effective teachers. Current pay scales reward teachers only for experience and graduate credits, neither of which is a meaningful predictor of quality. The result is that districts reward long-serving veterans while failing to recognize those teachers who improve student achievement, possess high-demand skills, or take on more challenging assignments.

Proposals to revamp collective bargaining by tackling teacher pay are only a start. Teacher collective bargaining agreements extend far beyond bread and butter matters, frequently privileging the interests of employees over those of students. Across the nation, contracts include clauses that prohibit principals from factoring student achievement into teacher evaluation, that allow senior teachers to

"Teacher collective bargaining agreements [...] frequently privilege the interests of employees over those of students."
At a time when disappointing student performance, stark achievement gaps, and an ever-“flattening” world call for retooling American schools for the 21st century, the most daunting impediments to doing so are the teacher collective-bargaining agreements that regulate virtually all aspects of school district operations. These agreements are a critical part of the problem, and the solution, to the educational challenges we now face.

In a report by Frederick Hess and Martin R. West, *A Better Bargain: Overhauling Teacher Collective Bargaining for the 21st Century*, the authors argue that collective bargaining agreements should be modified on five key fronts:

- Teacher pay should reflect the scarcity and value of teachers’ skills, the difficulty of their assignments, the extent of their responsibilities, and the caliber of their work.
- Pension and health benefits should resemble those offered by other organizations competing for college-educated professionals, which will entail shifting from industrial-era defined-benefit plans to defined-contribution plans better suited to the new economy and a professional workforce.
- Tenure should be eliminated from K–12 schooling or, at a minimum, contracts and state laws should be modified to enable management to more readily remove ineffective educators.
- Personnel should be assigned to schools on the basis of educational need rather than seniority.
- Work rules should be weeded out of contracts, and contracts should explicitly define managerial prerogatives.

The report was presented on March 29, 2006, at an event organized by the American Enterprise Institute, with a special address on education reform by former Massachusetts governor Mitt Romney.
To explore the use of economic incentives in education, CESifo Munich and PEPG of Harvard University hosted a conference in Munich, Germany, May 16–17, 2008. The organizers, Paul E. Peterson (Harvard) and Ludger Woessmann (University of Munich), brought together scholarly perspectives from both sides of the Atlantic.

The conference explored the implications of arguments as old as those voiced by Jean-Jacques Rousseau, who once claimed that the best education was one that the child discerned for himself. The tutor was to “do nothing and let nothing be done” so that the child would be free to learn whatever he needed to know without external pressure. When it came to learning, incentives—whether cash or compliments—had perverse consequences. Was Rousseau correct? Do incentives operate differently in education than they do in other sectors of society? What kinds of incentives prompt learning? Which ones deter it? Do students respond to economic rewards? Do teachers respond to material rewards for meritorious accomplishments, or do they regard them as demeaning? Are extrinsic incentives preferable to intrinsic ones, monetary incentives to nonmonetary ones? If schools face competition for students, do they become more efficient?
The voucher debate has been both intense and ideologically polarizing, in good part because so little is known about how voucher programs operate in practice. In the revised edition of The Education Gap, William G. Howell and Paul E. Peterson report new findings drawn from the most comprehensive study on vouchers conducted to date. Added to the paperback edition of this groundbreaking volume are the authors’ insights into the latest school choice developments in American education, including new voucher initiatives, charter school expansion, and public-school choice under No Child Left Behind. The authors review the significance of state and federal court decisions as well as recent scholarly debates over choice impacts on student performance. In addition, the authors present new findings on which parents choose private schools and the consequences the decision has for their children’s education. Updated and expanded, The Education Gap remains an indispensable source of original research on school vouchers.

Schools and the Equal Opportunity Problem, Ludger Woessmann and Paul E. Peterson, eds. (MIT Press, 2007)
This edited volume contains a selection of works presented at a 2004 conference cosponsored by PEPG that brought together leading scholars from the United States and Europe to examine the evidence on how education can address the equal opportunity problem. The aim of the conference was “to explore the consequences of [...] school reforms for equal educational opportunity in advanced industrial societies, focusing mainly on countries in Europe and North America.” The evidence shows some routes for advancement but also raises doubts about whether some policies are effective in altering the opportunity structure. Findings reveal that even major differential spending will not produce an equality of results. In other words, “if something could be done to improve the overall performance of the system, policies that also improved its equity would be easier to accomplish” (Hanushek, p.175).

Rajashri Chakrabarti
Postdoctoral Fellow at PEPG during 2004–06. She is currently working at the Federal Reserve Bank of New York as an economist. She received her Ph.D. in economics from Cornell University. In spring 2009 MIT Press will publish the volume she coedited with Paul E. Peterson titled School Choice International.

Brad Smith
Undergraduate Research Fellow 2004–05, B.A. in government 2005, won a 2007 Rhodes Scholarship. His thesis, titled “The Effects on Student Achievement of Charter Schools in Milwaukee,” prepared under the direction of Paul E. Peterson, was awarded Harvard’s Thomas Temple Hoopes Prize as well as the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences Undergraduate Research Award.

Erica Suares
Undergraduate Research Assistant at PEPG for spring 2007. She received her M.Ed. in the Education Policy and Management Program at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and is now working at the White House in the Political Affairs Office.

Martina Viarengo
Currently PEPG Postdoctoral Fellow. She received her Ph.D. from the London School of Economics (LSE) and was a recipient of the Ambassadorial Fellowship of the Rotary Foundation during her graduate studies at LSE. She is on leave from the Centre for Economic Performance of LSE, where she works as a research economist within the Education and Skills Program.
PEPG school voucher research has been identified as 1 of the 13 most influential studies shaping education policy over the past 10 years, according to the recent Editorial Projects in Education (EPE) Research Center report, “Influence: A Study of the Factors Shaping Education Policy.”

The core of the research, conducted by William G. Howell and Paul E. Peterson, together with Patrick Wolf and David Campbell, was published in 2002 by the Brookings Institution Press under the title *The Education Gap*. That work, along with Peterson’s other work on school choice, was cited by EPE as among the 13 “blockbuster” studies of the past decade.

Of the top 13 studies included, only 4 were the result of academic research. The remaining studies were sponsored by the government or independent think tanks. EPE identified the U.S. Department of Education’s National Assessment of Educational Progress as the single most influential study.

EPE surveyed education policy experts and performed citation review in three independent databases, LexisNexis, Elton B. Stephens Company (EBSCO) Academic Search Premier, and Education Resources Information Center (ERIC). The analyses were aimed at determining the frequency with which research was cited.

Using this process, EPE concluded that “Peterson is widely recognized for a large body of research on school choice and voucher programs.” According to EPE, his voucher studies were the 5th most cited in the LexisNexis database and the 8th most cited in the EBSCO database. (The report is available at: http://www.edweek.org/media/influence_study.pdf)

Influencing Education Policy: Blockbuster Research

Ph.D. student in the Department of Government, is currently working on various projects in the following areas: judicial participation in education politics, regulation in the teaching profession, and comparative international education reform.

Matthew M. Chingos
Ph.D. student in the Department of Government, is a research associate at the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation. He has recently conducted empirical research jointly with Martin R. West on teacher quality and mobility in Florida.

Michael Henderson
Ph.D. student in the Department of Government and Social Policy, graduated with honors in 2001 from Louisiana State University, where he earned a B.A. in political science. His current research interest is school reform that expands educational opportunity.

Elena Llaudet
Ph.D. student in the Department of Government, received her B.S. from the University of Barcelona in 2000. She has done research on the effects of school sector on students’ performance at different levels of education.

Daniel Nadler
Ph.D. student in the Department of Government, is currently working on various projects in the following areas: judicial participation in education politics, regulation in the teaching profession, and comparative international education reform.
The United States currently faces the daunting challenge of hiring large numbers of new teachers while simultaneously improving the quality of its teaching workforce. The difficulty of predicting the effectiveness of teachers based on what is known about them before they enter the profession means that retaining those teachers who have demonstrated their effectiveness in the classroom is essential to accomplishing the task.

How are our schools faring in this regard? In Florida, schools with high-performing students are able to retain a majority of their most effective teachers while dismissing all but a handful of their worst performers. When we look at the state public school system as a whole, however, the pattern is less encouraging, as there is little difference in the effectiveness of those who remain in the profession and those who leave.

The paper was presented at the conference “Performance Incentives: Their Growing Impact on American K–12 Education,” hosted by the National Center on Performance Incentives at Vanderbilt University on February 28–29, 2008.
“The Efficacy of Choice Threats within School Accountability Systems: Results from Legislatively Induced Experiments,” Paul E. Peterson and Martin R. West

“Growing Pains: The School Consolidation Movement and Student Outcomes,” Christopher Berry and Martin R. West

“The Role of School Improvement in Economic Development,” Eric A. Hanushek and Ludger Woessmann

“Fundamental Determinants of School Efficiency and Equity: German States as a Microcosm for OECD Countries,” Ludger Woessmann


“Civics Exam: Schools of Choice Boost Civic Values,” Patrick Wolf

“Fueling Educational Entrepreneurship: Addressing the Human Capital Challenge,” Frederick Hess and Bryan Hassel

“Heterogeneity in School Sector Effects on Elementary Student Performance,” Paul E. Peterson and Elena Llaudet


“The Third Way of Education Reform: Principal and Parental Assessments of Teacher Quality,” Brian Jacob


“Should We Care about Cognitive Skills? The Role of Education Quality in Economic Growth,” Ludger Woessmann

“School Choice Impacts: Initial Results from the Latest Voucher Experiment,” Patrick Wolf

“The Non-Cognitive Returns to Class Size,” Martin R. West

Papers from the conference “Economic Incentives: Do They Work in Education? Insights and Findings from Behavioral Research” (May 16–17, 2008)

“The Long-Term Effect of Monetary Incentives to High School Teachers and Students,” Victor Lavy

“Economics Incentives in Education: The Morning After,” Eric Bettinger

“Long-Term Consequences of School Choice in Sweden,” Anders Böhlmark and Mikael Lindahl

“Every Catholic Child in a Catholic School: Early Resistance to State Schooling, Contemporary School Competition, and Student Achievement across Countries,” Martin R. West and Ludger Woessmann

“Psychology of Incentives,” Armin Falk

“The Effect of Financial Rewards on Students’ Achievement: Evidence from a Randomized Experiment,” Edwin Leuven, Hessel Oosterbeek, and Bas van der Klaauw


“Student Incentives in Education: Evidence from Charter Schools,” Margaret Raymond

“Impact of For-Profit and Nonprofit Management on Student Achievement: The Philadelphia Experiment,” Paul E. Peterson and Matthew M. Chingos


“Teacher Characteristics and Student Performance in India: A Pupil Fixed-Effects Approach,” Geeta Kingdon

“Teacher Advancement Program: Findings from an Independent Appraisal,” Matthew Springer and Dale Ballou


(Papers from the conference Economic Incentives: Do They Work in Education? Insights and Findings from Behavioral Research are available at http://www.hks.harvard.edu/pepg/)
PEPG Activities

Colloquia Series  The PEPG Education Policy Colloquia Series was initiated to foster an interest in education research within the Harvard community by inviting top scholars from across the country to present their recent research findings in an open discussion with colloquia attendees.

Doctoral Fellowships  PEPG offers graduate students the possibility of becoming involved in the research activities of the program as doctoral fellows.

Postdoctoral Fellowships  PEPG offers a one-year resident postdoctoral fellowship. Fellows work at Harvard University and are expected to engage in independent projects that are related to the program’s focus.

Conferences  In recent years PEPG has hosted a number of major conferences on topics that are central to the nation’s education agenda.

For additional information, please visit: http://www.hks.harvard.edu/pepg/