Teaching recovery?

Three years in, school system leaders report that the pandemic weakened instruction

Lydia Rainey, Paul Hill, and Robin Lake

JULY 2023

Key findings

- **School system leaders reported less day-to-day chaos during the 2022-23 school year, but growing clarity around the enormity of the challenges ahead.** The diminished need to manage acute, pandemic-related crises has allowed system leaders to resume more of their normal routines and structures that offer important feedback about teaching and learning, such as observing classrooms and monitoring formative assessment results.

- **Staff shortages and challenges associated with providing additional training to teachers made Covid-19 recovery plans difficult, if not impossible, to implement.** Tutoring, extended learning time, summer school, the adoption of new curricula, and the implementation of sophisticated instructional approaches all fell victim to staffing and management hurdles.

- **Good teaching also suffered after three years of disruptions.** Leaders reported that teachers were falling back on outdated and ineffective instructional practices or using curricula that lacked grade-level content and rigor.

- **School systems are centralizing instructional support and building (or rebuilding) teachers' core skills.** However, by prioritizing strong and consistent instructional techniques system-wide, system leaders have less time to devise ways to provide specialized support for students with the largest gaps in their knowledge and skills.

- **School systems that had to refocus staff on the basics of teaching instead of academic recovery may need new solutions to support students with profound needs.** Administrators made frank assessments about the uneven day-to-day workings of their classrooms. These rare observations should spark urgent conversations in schools, communities, and policy spaces about how to provide additional help to struggling students and reverse pandemic-related learning loss.

About this project and the American School District Panel

This project is part of the American School District Panel (ASDP), a research partnership between the RAND Corporation and the Center on Reinventing Public Education at Arizona State University's Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College (CRPE). The panel also collaborates with other education organizations, including the Council of the Great City Schools and Kitamba. The ASDP is the first and only nationally representative sample of school district and charter management organization (CMO) leaders. Panel members participate in surveys and interviews to inform policy and monitor trends over time.

For almost two years, CRPE has followed five public charter and traditional school districts in a variety of urban and suburban settings to understand the academic, social, and political challenges posed by the Covid-19 pandemic. While the resulting findings are not generalizable to all U.S. school systems, they do provide detailed, on-the-ground illustrations of how school system leaders have approached and implemented pandemic recovery plans.

The participating school systems range in size from enrolling fewer than 6,000 students to more than 40,000 students; all predominantly serve students of color and high proportions of students qualifying for the federal free and reduced price lunch program. Since winter 2021, we have conducted four waves of semi-structured interviews with the systems' superintendents, chief academic officers, human resource directors, and other central office personnel. This is our fourth report, which draws from interviews conducted in the spring of 2023 with approximately 30 leaders and high-level administrators.

In the first American School District Panel report, school system leaders reported their commitment to a "learning acceleration" strategy—instructing all students at grade level and intervening immediately with individualized supports to help those who were falling behind. This was a marked departure from pre-pandemic supports that favored assigning students to separate catch-up or remedial courses. In the second and third reports, school system leaders struggled to implement aggressive academic recovery plans. They cited many factors, from emergency school closures to inconsistent student and teacher attendance to political tensions. Over the course of the 2021-22 school year, leaders were preoccupied with keeping schools fully staffed and operating, and they found that neither students nor teachers were able to put in steady work.

Introduction

In the three years since the Covid-19 pandemic fundamentally disrupted schooling across the United States, a growing body of research has consistently indicated that students' academic progress lags significantly behind even the most pessimistic predictions. The most recent administration of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) revealed that students' math performance not only declined substantially during remote learning (2020-21) but that their performance continued to decline in the year following the return to the classroom (2021-22). Some have suggested that these learning gaps are "steep but not permanent," but only if school systems respond with urgency and focus. With this in mind, we returned to the five school systems that we have been studying over the past several years with this overarching question: **after three years of learning disruptions, how are school system leaders responding?**

In general, we found that these school systems are emerging from the pandemic and subsequent health and operational crises. But, district leaders reported that their recovery plans have proven nearly impossible to successfully implement, primarily due to staffing and training challenges. During the 2022-23 school year, district leaders were able to return to regular classroom observation. What they discovered was unexpected and alarming: Years of disrupted work conditions, student behavior challenges, and high needs meant that students were not the only victims of the pandemic. Teachers and their teaching practices had suffered significantly as well.

As a result, system leaders have prioritized system-wide improvement of classroom teaching or "core instruction." Pandemic recovery plans that targeted extra instruction for students who have fallen furthest behind or sophisticated instructional models that teachers were unprepared to implement are no longer priorities. Leaders are focused on centralizing instructional materials and building internal capacity to improve teaching, and while this is a rational response, it means there are few, if any, of the extra supports that research suggests will help the students who need them most.

Given the alarming number of students across the country who are not performing at grade level, some of whom are nearing graduation or have already graduated, this is a concerning reality and calls for immediate action by all K-12 education stakeholders to help school systems attend to core instruction while still ensuring that students affected by school closures and other challenges receive the immediate help they need. Federal and state policymakers, universities and other post-secondary institutions, technical assistance organizations, philanthropies, and local advocacy and parent groups can all play a role in assisting school system leaders and boards with addressing these challenges. We hope this report creates urgency around pandemic recovery for both students *and* teachers. Additionally, we hope this work inspires creative and innovative solutions that can improve teaching while also providing extra support to students who have fallen the furthest behind.

Less chaos, growing clarity

Leaders across all five systems reported that the 2022-23 school year was the first since 2019 that felt anything close to "normal." Although facing serious challenges in learning and teaching, system leaders have not had to close schools because of pandemic-related outbreaks or substitute teacher shortages. This is a return to a familiar routine. "I think the lack of crisis mode [that we've been operating in since 2020] has absolutely been something that [feels more normal]," one school system leader said.

The absence of acute crises meant that system leaders could resume some of the routines and structures that were set aside during the pandemic. Those include classroom observations by administrators, evaluating the results of students' formative assessments, and scheduling professional learning sessions for teaching staff. "This has been our first year of being able to sustain routines and structures with very minimal, if any, disruption," one leader said.

Because of the relative quiet of the past year, several leaders voiced stark realizations about the extent to which their systems suffered. As one leader said, "I think in many ways we are just starting to be able to assess the impact [of the pandemic]."

"I think in many ways we are just starting to be able to assess the impact [of the pandemic]."

All the leaders we interviewed reported that:

1. They could not implement Covid-19 recovery plans, or if they did implement them, they did not live up to their expectations.

2. They realized classroom teaching had suffered, which meant improving day-to-day instruction had to be their top priority.

These themes were a strong departure from our conversations earlier in the pandemic, when leaders were focused on ambitious recovery plans, especially learning acceleration and interventions for students with large gaps in their grade-level knowledge. In this round of interviews, the idea that students with different needs would get tailored instruction and support, such as additional learning time or tutoring to backfill their gaps, was gone.

Recovery plans difficult, if not impossible

As we reported during the 2022-23 school year, leaders cited numerous challenges to implementing their plans to help make up lost learning time from school closures. Tutoring, extended learning time, summer school, adopting new curricula, and instructional approaches all proved difficult or impossible for school system leaders to move from plan, to pilot, to scale. In this round of interviews, leaders were more frank about their inability to implement targeted supports for the students who were struggling the most.

Staffing shortages posed a key challenge to implementing recovery programs. Plans for wide-scale, high-dosage tutoring programs—which research suggests are most effective when they

are provided consistently in three or more sessions a week and closely coordinated with regular classroom lesson plans—were among the first interventions to show strain due to tight labor markets. One school system invested heavily in tutoring and found that the tutor shortage meant that the instructional quality of the tutors supplied by their tutoring vendors supplied varied tremendously.

"All these companies…accelerated their hiring and probably didn't have time to appropriately train people up or go in and coach people on the job. They're just placing people. And so we're probably getting some B team members [as tutors]," one system leader said, adding that they had to fire a vendor mid-year due to quality concerns. This school system planned to scale back tutoring in the coming school year because the cost was not worth the minimal impact they were seeing on student learning.

Some school systems used a portion of their federal recovery funds to ease teacher labor market pressures by offering signing and retention bonuses, but these measures often didn't work. Teachers continued to leave, school system leaders said, often in the middle of the year. "We spent a lot of money on retention bonuses and 'please stay' payments," said one system leader. "You might as well burn that money because it didn't bear out. People left anyway. People took their checks and walked. But at the time, everybody was doing it so we had to as well."

> **"All these companies… accelerated their hiring and probably didn't have time to appropriately train people up or go in and coach people on the job. They're just placing people. And so we're probably getting some B team members [as tutors]…"**

Many system leaders quickly realized a marked shift in a hot job market, where everyone—including teachers—had options. Suddenly, workers were in the drivers' seat, and school systems were clamoring for more educators than ever. "Employees are in scarce supply, and they know it," one system leader said. Labor market pressures made finding teachers and other staff to operate extended learning and summer school programs very difficult for most systems.

School systems that had planned on supporting students to recover lost learning time through learning acceleration found that this approach required significantly more teacher training than systems were able to provide or teachers were willing to adopt. Their models for learning acceleration required teachers to learn several new instructional strategies, and in the words of one leader, "doing accelerated learning where we're attending to grade-level standards and then providing scaffolds [to backfill students' learning gaps] just in time as necessary—that's going to continue to be something that we need to support. I don't see that being a short-term effort, but really just part of our ongoing practice." This leader, like others we interviewed, described the challenges they encountered trying provide professional learning to teachers starting in 2021-22 school, mostly due to a shortage of substitute teachers to cover classrooms so teachers could attend learning sessions. During

> **"We spent a lot of money on retention bonuses and 'please stay' payments… you might as well burn that money because it didn't bear out. People left anyway. People took their checks and walked. But at the time, everybody was doing it so we had to as well."**

the 2022-23 school year, when these systems offered professional learning during after-school hours, only 25% of eligible teachers participated. Leaders noted a change in teachers' capacity to take on more work—they knew their teachers were "exhausted," and they worried about asking them to do more. In the words of one administrator, "There's been a lot of protectivist [attitudes among district staff], like we can't ask teachers to do anything else."

Leaders of other systems said they struggled to find and hire high-quality professional learning providers. For districts that could find substitute coverage for classes so that teachers could attend professional training sessions during the school day, the quality of the sessions was not high enough to shift their teachers' practice. "I generally have been disappointed with outside development and developers," one leader said. Leaders recounted being frustrated by not knowing what teachers were learning, how to measure impact, or, ultimately, why they were not seeing improvement in teachers' instruction.

> **"There's been a lot of protectivist [attitudes among district staff], like we can't ask teachers to do anything else."**

As these challenges to implementing pandemic recovery plans mounted, leaders began to doubt their efficacy at scale, especially given the relatively high price of certain interventions. As one leader commented, "$500,000 for tutoring, basically. Are you kidding me? That's a lot of money. And nothing to show for it [in terms of impact on student learning]."

> **"$500,000 for tutoring, basically. Are you kidding me? That's a lot of money. And nothing to show for it [in terms of impact on student learning]."**

Good teaching (and good teachers) suffered

In 2022-23, leaders could finally resume benchmark assessments to evaluate student progress, as well as classroom observations. For the first time in three years, school system leaders had a window into the day-to-day happenings of classrooms again. But, much of what they saw concerned them.

Even after developing, communicating, and providing some training on "learning acceleration" instructional models, leaders said they saw teachers falling back on outdated and ineffective instructional practices. These included putting students to work in groups without any direct instruction (or direct instruction without any student engagement), below grade-level content, unnecessary screen usage, and classroom management skills that lacked "sophistication." As one leader described, "There are a lot of teachers [who] reverted to...traditional practices. There are a lot more teachers just delivering content and kids being very disengaged... Across that walkthrough data the biggest things we saw were really that lack of alignment to standards and lack of student engagement and lack of kids carrying the cognitive load."

> **"...the biggest things we saw were really that lack of alignment to standards and lack of student engagement and lack of kids carrying the cognitive load."**

Leaders at all our sites acknowledged that instruction pre-pandemic was not always "great" and lamented its return. "How are we doing with teacher rustiness and rigor? Not good," said one leader. Another said their system was still in "survival mode in teacher practice, which is causing …reverting to old stuff." Still another leader remarked, "There's…a lot of, 'we're just getting through the day and…that's all we're doing." After visiting many schools, a leader in a fourth school system conceded, "It's difficult to point to a model classroom at this point."

> "It's difficult to point to a model classroom at this point."

Leaders had hoped they would see teaching that reflected some of the elements of the "learning acceleration" strategy that they thought would help students make up lost learning time, but instead they saw what they would have characterized as poor instruction pre-pandemic.

A lack of grade-level instruction was of particular concern, but leaders also noted that their teachers appeared to harbor lower expectations for students academically. One leader of a system led and taught predominantly by Black staff remarked, "[We have teachers who lack] expectations for kids; that kids can be excellent… Just because we are…People of Color doesn't mean we have solved that either. So I think that's some work we need to do with teachers and staff and their expectations for kids regardless of where they're from."

Leaders in all school systems also said that student behavior issues that disrupt class and the learning process remain elevated from pre-pandemic levels. One leader noted that tensions between students escalate into arguments or altercations much more quickly than in the past—and that the methods teachers and administrators used in the past to addressed these problems longer work. Because many of these systems' teachers are new to the profession, they often lack the experience to handle classroom disruptions or diffuse difficult situations, leaders said. A leader in one system where levels of community violence had increased significantly compared to before the pandemic noted that the concerns regarding safety had led some students and staff to stay home, a trend that hampered morale, and in general, derailed learning.

When asked why they thought classroom teaching had taken such a hit, leaders tended to cite two main reasons. First, routine supports for teaching such as professional development, classroom observations, and benchmark assessments to determine student progress were on hold for the pandemic. Aligning staff on everything from discipline procedures to classroom management techniques to differentiated instruction strategies was simply not at the top of the priority list over the past few years. One leader said, "Things that haven't been attended to over the last two or three years because of Covid, we're realizing that they need some love and attention." They also talked about how teachers and principals have not had enough collaboration time, which they previously used to create lesson plans, examine student data, and discuss various instructional priorities. Since schools reopened, systems had to divert all extra staff time to covering classrooms and keeping schools open. One leader remarked that this lack of time together has eroded trust between teachers and administrators. As a result, they have not been able to work on changing instructional practices.

> "Things that haven't been attended to over the last two or three years because of Covid, we're realizing that they need some love and attention."

Secondly, school system leaders said that many of their teachers were some combination of new, young, and less experienced. In three out of our five school systems, leaders reported that these problems stemmed from a tight teacher labor market—they did not have the luxury of hiring only the highest-quality teaching candidates. "The pipeline is so much smaller that we're taking risks and bets on potential teachers that are not always working out," one leader said. "I do think the first and foremost issue is 'Do we have enough high quality teachers in our schools to do this work?' And the answer is no right now for us. And that's a really hard thing to say, but I think that is the reality." To staff their classrooms, these systems had to hire more "non-traditional" or "non-credentialed" teachers, or teachers from alternate pathways that typically do not include a teaching degree. Many educators who come to full-time teaching through these routes require additional training and support from the system that hires them—support that the systems have not been able to provide.

Leaders in four out of our five school systems also noted higher levels of teacher burnout and a subsequent "erosion of professional expectations" among teachers, as one leader said. For example, teachers were less committed to attending professional learning sessions or staying after school to support students or attending meetings, stipend or not. One leader elaborated that in their school system, "teacher appetite for engaging in professional learning outside of the school day [has not returned. Teachers] really just aren't attending... So what [professional learning] looks like is a lot of asynchronous learning that we're trying to create, a lot of individual [central office staff] going up to schools...during a staff meeting here and there."

> **"I do think the first and foremost issue is 'Do we have enough high quality teachers in our schools to do this work?' And the answer is no right now for us. And that's a really hard thing to say, but I think that is the reality."**

Other leaders discussed the challenges of teachers quitting mid-year as a new phenomenon, or quitting after a week. Other teachers had staged walk-outs at individual schools to protest working conditions. Most leaders said they recognized the toll the pandemic took on teachers' mental health, which they saw as a barrier to asking them to do anything extra.

Centralizing materials, rebuilding core skills

We asked leaders how they were structuring their refocus on classroom teaching. Most had two key priorities: centralizing and standardizing instructional materials and building principal and teacher capacity to support and deliver high-quality instruction. Leaders also noted other strategies, such as:

- purchasing new curricula
- creating pacing guides and formative assessments
- amassing centralized databases of high-quality lessons and benchmark assessments
- providing training to principals on identifying high quality instruction, and
- supporting student data analysis during teacher professional learning community meetings (PLCs)

One leader said, "We have done a lot of work… to get to a place where it's like, 'Okay, we're all following some of the same routines.'" Leaders noted the tension between allowing teachers autonomy to meet students' needs—which were highly varied upon returning from remote schooling—and pushing for centralized authority over what happens in each classroom. "There's so many people who are like, 'Oh, teachers need to have full autonomy or more autonomy to teach the way they think they need to teach,'" one leader said. "But that is impossible to monitor the quality of… You can literally have three months before an interim assessment to realize, 'What the heck is going on in this one school, or these couple of classrooms' before [we realize], 'oh, they're off the rails on using some [other] curriculum.' And it's not benefitting kids."

> **"You can literally have three months before an interim assessment to realize, 'What the heck is going on in this one school, or these couple of classrooms' before [we realize], 'oh, they're off the rails on using some [other] curriculum.' And it's not benefitting kids."**

Another leader said that she would be okay with teacher autonomy, particularly around curriculum, once "we can master some of the basics." She went on to elaborate how, even though their system's schooling model emphasized teacher flexibility to meet student needs, "when we've got so many new teachers and such varying student and teacher attendance, to be on the same page just in case someone else has to jump in there… Sometimes you have to rely on additional support in order to execute the curriculum with fidelity. [I want a] normed experience and [then] allow for variance where we know people are capable of going off script and being successful."

Leaders in all our school systems have also spent the past school year ramping up support for principals to improve their instructional leadership skills and other system staff to directly coach teachers (as opposed to relying on external support vendors). A leader in one system that invested heavily in developing their principals' abilities to discern between high-quality instruction and weaker strategies noted a high need for development. "We want leaders to be able to be great instructional managers and they're not right now. And it's not okay. But it is the reality of the situation." Another school system leader noted plans to bring school leaders to "model" classrooms led by teachers well-versed in the system's curriculum and with a track record of high levels of student engagement. The model classrooms would allow principals (and eventually other teachers) to see high-quality instruction in practice.

> **"We want leaders to be able to be great instructional managers and they're not right now. And it's not okay. But it is the reality of the situation."**

System leaders also said they realized that in many cases, they cannot rely on external professional learning vendors to provide enough high-quality support to teachers. In the example above, the leader's impetus for building model classrooms was to develop internal sources of instructional expertise because of the difficulty they experienced securing external coaches. In another system, a

> **"[We need to be] really clear with people, 'here's what I need you to be good at by when,' and give you time and space and resources to go do that…"**

leader explained, "[we need to] prioritize what [instructional skills] we're gonna focus on, build up our leaders to be better coaches and supporters of our teachers... [We need to be] really clear with people, 'here's what I need you to be good at by when,' and give you time and space and resources to go do that... I just think we have to be far more thoughtful and intentional about internal teacher capacity-building than we've ever been."

Leaders across all sites prioritized shoring up "core instruction" by centralizing instructional materials and building the capacity of their staff. This is their main approach to helping students make up learning gaps. As a superintendent told us, "I think that if we are following the blueprint that I have made, where we...have made the gains in the preparation of the adults that are in front of the children... that ultimately is what closes the gaps, right?"

Optimism and caution for centralization

One of our sites appeared to be farther along than the others when it came to improving classroom teaching, which its leaders attributed to increases in student test scores that surpassed pre-pandemic performance in algebra. "Instructional routines and the infrastructure for a guaranteed high-quality teacher, teaching high-quality instruction, every day has been our absolute focus," the school system's leader said of the 2022-23 school year. This system's top staff had spent a significant amount of time narrowing their curricula by identifying so-called "power standards," or key grade-level standards that all teachers should be teaching. The system's leaders then arrayed those into a pacing guide for each grade level, so everyone could stay on track. These staff also developed instructional materials for these standards and built them into an internal searchable database. Leaders also held school-level staff accountable for student progress: At one point, they communicated that teachers must take responsibility for keeping kids on track, a relatively unheard of directive given the labor market pressures we discussed earlier.

While we heard from school-level staff about the benefits of this support and focus, we also witnessed some early limitations of relying heavily on centralized instructional materials. One school leader reported that her teachers were struggling to keep up with the district's curriculum pacing guides. "We are still experiencing some challenges

> **"We are still experiencing some challenges with just staying on pace. Even though the pace has been revised and revised and revised."**

with just staying on pace. Even though the pace has been revised and revised and revised," she said. For some teachers, at least part of the pacing challenge stemmed from students' very large gaps in skills and knowledge. In the words of a secondary teacher, "Kids are struggling with the basic skills... I see a lot of the sixth graders coming in not even just knowing just the basics...and it's starting to tell in their work." Practically speaking, this means the delayed pace of learning for students who lost ground during school closures is increasingly in conflict with the timetable of the pacing guides teachers are expected to follow. "If you get stuck on one unit and [the students] don't get it, you can't really move to the next unit because they kind of follow each other." The teacher added, "we do need extra hands. All hands on deck." Efforts to shore up instruction are undoubtedly necessary, but they also demonstrate the dichotomous

thinking we observed during our interviews: Either focus on Covid-19 recovery plans *or* improve classroom instruction. As these early results suggest, focusing on improving instruction is important but also likely insufficient on its own to address widespread learning gaps, just as would be focusing solely on interventions and failing to improve classroom instruction.

> "If you get stuck on one unit and [the students] don't get it, you can't really move to the next unit because they kind of follow each other... We do need extra hands. All hands on deck."

All hands on deck: Conclusion and implications

Returning to these school systems for the fourth time, three years after the start of the pandemic, revealed that leaders were reckoning with the full impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on not just their students, but also their teachers. Many have reported on learning loss and the pandemic's other negative consequences for students, but we have seen relatively little discussion of how teachers' instructional practice has fared over the past three years. These school system leaders believe that basic instructional practices suffered significantly, and they have come to realize that they need to pour an unexpected amount of time and attention into helping teachers regain and strengthen core skills. The "learning acceleration" models that many district leaders expected would catch students up required advanced teaching strategies, and were thus difficult to achieve when many teachers needed help reviewing the basics. Further, pandemic recovery programs—specifically tutoring, extended learning time, and bonuses to retain staff—were nearly impossible to implement at scale.

Improving classroom instruction undoubtedly needs to be a priority for these school systems, and the reality is that each of these school systems will continue to see many students who are not "keeping pace," who are dropping out, or who are graduating without the skills and competencies they need. This begs the question: How do we best help these students while teachers are re-engaging with core instructional techniques?

The uncharacteristically frank assessments leaders offered about teaching in their systems even after years of confronting challenge after challenge suggest that district strategies alone cannot reverse pandemic learning loss in the near term. In the words of one teacher, this is an "all hands on deck" moment. School systems need support to simultaneously improve classroom teaching and catch up students. Below, we've compiled some of the ways that key players across the education system can support school systems and ensure students and recent graduates are well-prepared for their futures.

- **Federal policymakers:** The school system leaders we interviewed were preparing for the expiration of federal Covid-19 recovery funds, in particular by winding down expensive and difficult-to-implement tutoring programs. Going forward, federal policymakers should support recovery within current budgets by providing greater flexibility on Title I and promoting its use for out-of-school private tutoring or extra coursework. As many students will likely be entering postsecondary education with significant learning gaps, federal funding should support long-term programs to close older students' skill gaps or cover the cost of post-high school remediation.

- **State policymakers:** Many leaders are still hopeful that high-dosage tutoring will be the solution to catching students up, but school systems struggle to find enough high-quality tutors. States can help by subsidizing the development of quality independent tutoring and supplementary learning providers, or by recruiting and providing training to staff for tutoring, summer, and out-of-school learning programs. There is also potential for states and charter authorizers to provide oversight and transparent information about vendor performance. In terms of policy, states should ensure that school systems have maximum flexibility to increase student learning time as necessary, as well as the ability to provide adequate professional development to teachers.

- **Postsecondary institutions:** Students continue to graduate from high school without much support to address pandemic-related learning gaps. Postsecondary institutions, including universities, community colleges, and vocational programs, will need to anticipate that these graduates will have additional needs, whether they are entering the workforce or going to college. Teacher prep programs should support teacher candidates to identify student learning gaps, develop and deliver differentiated instruction, and use high quality curricula and teaching techniques to meet students' needs. Teacher prep programs should also treat training and working with tutors as a core skill for certified teachers.

- **Technical assistance and support providers:** Overall, system leaders were quite disappointed in the quality of support they received from vendors. Listening to school system leaders and addressing their various implementation challenges should be vendors' first orders of business. Before entering into contracts, support providers should provide evidence of the ability to staff their programs and the functionality of their tech tools in particular. Districts entering into contracts with vendors should be prepared to hold vendors accountable for their performance throughout the contract, with the knowledge that some contracts may need to be amended or terminated.

- **Philanthropies:** Local and national philanthropies can help identify "bright spot" methods that have been shown to both improve classroom teaching and help the students furthest behind to catch up. They can also support the research and development of programs and strategies to support student recovery, such as innovative delivery models for wrap-around services or extra learning time, including AI-enabled tutoring and teacher coaching.

- **Local advocates and parent groups:** Parents and families can be an untapped resource for tutors. Advocacy groups like The Oakland REACH recruit and train family and community members to tutor students, creating an alternative pathway into tutoring and other educator roles. Other advocacy and parent groups could follow suit and recruit, train, and deploy parent tutors to support student learning.

- **School system leaders and school boards:** School system leaders should consider these leaders' candid reflections and assessments as a model and carefully examine the instruction in their own systems; early feedback on our findings suggest that these patterns are not isolated to these five districts. For leaders who find similar patterns to those in this report, consider recruiting stakeholders from the above groups. These stakeholders should support teachers in building their instructional capacity and providing key instructional materials, and provide additional resources for students who are furthest behind.

Acknowledgments

About the Center on Reinventing Public Education

CRPE is a nonpartisan research and policy analysis center affiliated with Arizona State University's Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College. We develop, test, and support bold, evidence-based, system-wide solutions to address the most urgent problems in K–12 public education across the United States. Our mission is to reinvent the education delivery model to prepare all American students to solve tomorrow's challenges. We conduct this work in partnership with other leading organizations in our field and funders who support our mission. Since 1993, our research, analysis, and insights have informed public debates and innovative policies that enable schools to thrive. Questions about CRPE and its research can be sent to crpe@asu.edu.