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ABSTRACT

A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF CORPORATE INFLUENCES ON EDUCATION POLICY IN THE UNITED STATES FROM 1983 TO 2010

Tiffany L. Jacobson

This dissertation investigated the degree to which economic trends in the United States, since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, have influenced subsequent education policy from 1983 to 2010. It aimed to examine the interrelatedness of economic trends within American society, as defined by employment, earning power, and the gap between the rich and poor; how corporate and private philanthropy have created the economic impetus for educational foundations; and how corporate needs, as dictated by economic trends, influence educational policy. This influence effectuated the inception of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), an educational reform movement that has resulted in the expansion of government, the advancement of a nationalized curriculum whose primary concern is developing “college and career readiness” skills, and the establishment of new industries driven by the demands of markets associated with a nationalized curriculum.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

This study attempted to examine how corporations have used their wealth and influence, through the establishment of corporate philanthropies, to drive education policy in the United States from 1983 to 2013. Over the course of these 30 years, education policy, as evidenced through the various versions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), have placed increased emphasis on accountability measures, a widely accepted practice in the corporate sector. These measures of accountability have abetted a nationalized curriculum, an objective that has been met by the adoption of the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in 2010.

The standardization of curricula, assessments, and CCSS-aligned materials also offers the opportunity for streamlining measures of accountability by way of teacher and principal evaluation systems, value-added software products, and data-driven assessment tools. Shaping policy to manipulate these emerging areas within the profession are especially lucrative to big business, as big business recognizes an opportunity to capitalize on these markets, which will be subsidized in large part by federal funds. Federal funds often serve as the catalyst for reform initiatives, as evidenced through stipulations outlined in No Child Left Behind (NCLB) and Race to the Top. As a result, it behooves corporations, through the establishment of their corporate philanthropies, to actively engage in shaping education policy.

The remainder of the chapter will provide (a) a statement of the problem, (b) the purpose of the study, (c) the theoretical framework, (d) the significance of the study, (e) the limitations, and (f) the relevant definitions.
Statement of the Problem

In a proclamation made to the American people on July 25, 1961, President John F. Kennedy stated, “Let us think of education as the means of developing our greatest abilities, because in each of us there is a private hope and dream which, fulfilled, can be translated into benefit for everyone and greater strength for our nation.” In the United States, the responsibility for “developing our greatest abilities” primarily lies within the realm of the public education system. Since the middle of the 20th century, the United States has relentlessly worked to establish itself as the most powerful, influential, and prosperous country in the world (Brooks, 2011). However, the publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983 has caused a perceived decline in the overall quality of the U.S. public education system as compared to other developed nations (A Nation Accountable, 2008). As a result, education policy of the past 30 years has been heavily influenced by corporate needs, culminating with attempts to purport a nationalized curriculum via the CCSS. This trend begs an investigation into the social ramifications of allowing education policy to be driven by the economic needs of the corporate sector. In other words, one might speculate that the current education policy by way of a nationalized curriculum is short-changing American students to better serve the interests of big business.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this historical research study was to investigate the degree to which economic trends in the United States since the publication of A Nation at Risk in 1983 have influenced subsequent education policy from 1983 to 2010. In an effort to glean insight on this issue, the researcher provides a historical context that examines the interrelatedness of (a) economic trends within American society, as defined by
employment, earning power, and the gap between the rich and poor; (b) how corporate and private philanthropy have created the economic impetus for educational foundations; and (c) how corporate needs, as dictated by economic trends, influence education policy. This influence culminated with the inception of the CCSS. This study investigated how these corporate ambitions may consequently result in the expansion of government, the advancement of a nationalized curriculum whose primary concern is with developing “college and career readiness” skills (National Governors Association [NGA] Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 2010), and the establishment of new industries driven by the demands of a markets associated with a nationalized curriculum.

**Research Questions**

1. How has big business used its influence to impact education reform policy in the United States from 1983 to 2010?
2. What stakeholder considerations were taken into account for the drafting of the Common Core State Standards?
3. In what ways was the business community involved in the drafting of the Common Core State Standards?
4. In what ways does a national curriculum influence the growth or decline of the “accountability market” in education?
5. How do education reform policies, which are impacted by economic realities, benefit big business in the United States?

**Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for this study was based on the theories of transformational leadership and monocratic bureaucracy as applied to educational
leadership. A wide body of research has found that corporations establish educational philanthropies to influence education policy (Ramdas, 2011). Since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (Gardner, 1983), educational policies, as mandated by subsequent versions of the ESEA, have purported increased measures of accountability. Experts in the field of organizational behavior have long been interested in studying how measures of accountability impact worker productivity (Katzenbach & Smith, 1993). In their 1958 work entitled, *Organizations*, March and Simon set out to explain how an organizational system serves to streamline practices that aid in the ability to absorb and process information. In turn, this information is used to simplify the decision-making process through the establishment of accepted protocols. March and Simon (1958) referred to these protocols as “programs,” or standardized routines for performing repetitive tasks. Generally, so long as incentives are deemed adequate, workers are inclined to follow established protocols. When deemed inadequate, the organization is compelled to expend time and energy to innovate its practices. In education, these innovations are commonly referred to as reforms.

In an effort to obtain the highest possible return on a philanthropic investment, corporate philanthropies frequently work in tandem to maximize their leverage. Initial investments made often purport to shift policy, which results in reforms to the current organizational framework in education. As evidenced through the various versions of ESEA, these reforms have resulted in the adoption of stricter standardization and accountability, which are both widely accepted corporate business practices (National Governors Association [NGA] Center for Best Practices, Council of Chief State School Officers [CCSSO], 2010; NCLB, 2002; Rogers, 2011; U.S. Department of Education, 2009). The nationwide adoption of the CCSS allows for the standardization of high-
stake assessments and a wide gamut of instructional materials. The use of high-stakes assessments allows for imposed accountability measures on students and the linkage of student growth outcomes to teacher and principal evaluation models. These evaluation models have also become largely standardized, as a result of having to be sanctioned by the respective state department of education. Corporations often reap hefty financial benefits from these reform movements through the creation of inroads, advancements, and innovations into unchartered educational markets. Such practices seem to mirror what Burns (1979) described as transactional leadership. Burns and others (Bass, 1985; Bennis, 2007; Kanter, 1983; Rosener, 1990; Sergiovanni, 2004) used the term “power-wielding” to describe individuals with power who are driven by personal interests. As a result, the “power-wielding” assemble their wealth (economic, military, institutional, or skill) to “influence the behavior of respondents by activating motives of respondents relevant to those resources and to those goals” (Burns, 1979, p. 18). Corporate philanthropies have used their wealth to influence education policies that have affected accountability measures for education leaders, teachers, and students. This has been done in an effort to adopt a national curriculum that has a wide variety of commercial needs.

The movement toward adopting a national curriculum, as evidenced through the CCSS, has been purported through the subsequent renewals of ESEA and NCLB, and most recently, through the passage of Race to the Top. A nationalized curriculum expands educational markets, resulting in exponential growth of consumers across the 45 states that have adopted the CCSS (NGA Center and CCSSO, 2010). Moreover, many of the organizations involved in the drafting of the CCSS have received substantial endowments from corporate philanthropies such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, and Walton Family Foundation (Ravitch,
The Race to the Top legislation heavily relies on measures of accountability for principals, teachers, and students. These accountability measures take the form of principal and teacher evaluation models and high-stakes assessments, which are both relatively recent additions to the educational market (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

Many of the widely accepted business practices being imposed on the education sector echo the ideals of German economist Max Weber and his theory of monocratic bureaucracy as the “most pervasive and credible organizational concept in the world” (Owens & Valesky, 2011, p. 207). Bolman and Deal (2008) summarized Weber’s theory as comprising the following qualities: a fixed division of labor; a hierarchy of offices; a set of rules governing performance; a separation of personal from official property and rights; the use of technical qualifications, rather than nepotism, for selecting personnel; and employment as a primary occupation and long-term career (p. 48). These tenets gained popularity within educational administration when Weber’s works were translated into English in the 1940s (Owens & Valesky, 2011).

With regard to this study, Weber’s theory of monocratic bureaucracy was examined to better understand the education reform policies that have been heavily influenced by big business through the establishment of corporate philanthropies from 1983 to 2010. Specifically, it will show how big businesses have successfully attempted to superimpose this managerial style on school districts, especially larger school districts, which have resulted with increased measures of standardization and accountability through the use of standardized assessments and teacher and principal evaluation tools. These reforms beg the question, Does this managerial style, implemented in its purest form, have the potential to alter economic realities by benefitting big business?
The theory of transformation leadership, developed by Burns (1979), questions Weber’s supposition. In the post–World War II era, bureaucracy took full flight within the realm of public education; however, Burns advocated for a leadership style that transforms the way in which bureaucracies function. Under this model, chief school officers, as heads of their respective school districts, are expected to be instructional leaders. They understand that delivering a varied and challenging curriculum in the context of research-based pedagogical practices will foster a district climate that is committed to academic excellence. They empower principals, who are building-level instructional leaders, to identify teachers’ strengths and weaknesses with precision and provide appropriate support mechanisms by way of differentiated professional development. In turn, teachers serve as agents to integrate content area literacies across a wide and varied curriculum so that students can expand their knowledge base and more fluidly apply accurate information in a variety of contexts for the purpose of drawing their own conclusions.

In an excerpt from his book, *Leadership* (1979), Burns succinctly described leadership as a quality that compels followers to mobilize on behalf of an individual to seize institutional, political, or psychological resources to better serve the followers’ interests.

In brief, leaders with motive and power bases tap followers’ motives in order to realize the purposes of both leaders and followers . . . leadership is exercised in a condition of conflict or competition in which leaders contend in appealing to the motive bases of potential followers. (Burns, 1979, p. 19)
The creation of such conditions serves to raise both leaders and followers to higher levels of motivation and morality. “The ultimate test of practical leadership is the realization of intended real change that meets people’s enduring needs” (Burns, 1979, p. 461).

Identifying these “enduring needs” becomes challenging, as these needs are often shaped by the perceptions of the business community. According to the language of the CCSS, the “enduring need” of American society is to provide students with college and career readiness skills (NGA Center and CCSSO, 2010). The assumption is that achieving this end will provide American businesses with a more competent, able-minded, and efficient workforce, thus increasing worker productivity and profit margins.

This sense of productivity speaks directly to Maslow’s theory of psychosocial development, widely referred to as Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. Within this hierarchy, human needs are identified in ascending order: (a) physical, (b) security, (c) social, (d) esteem, and (e) self-actualization.

The business sector’s emphasis on college and career readiness as the “enduring need” of American society implies that self-actualization for the average American student is inconsequential. A deeper examination of the definition of self-actualization suggests otherwise. Kiel (1999) compiled definitions of self-actualization from other experts in the field of instructional psychology. Heylighen (1999) calls it “a process or becoming . . . the process of development which does not end” (p. 41). In his original work, Maslow called it “the individual doing what he is fitted for . . . a desire to become more and more what one is” (Maslow, pp. 91–92). Mittleman (1991) referred to it as “being a mature, fully human person in whom the human potentialities have been realized and actualized” (p. 116).
Well documented as the world’s leader in entrepreneurialism, the United States has long been regarded as the epicenter for innovation and opportunity—qualities both derived from the principle of self-actualization (Brooks, 2011). In an effort to pursue private interests, big business continues to wield its influence by undermining the importance of self-actualization in educational policy. Such a practice may have the unintended consequence of weakening the overall growth of the American economy.

Figure 1: Theoretical framework on how economic realities trickle down to affect college and career readiness standards.

### Significance of the Study

This study purported to augment the body of research that addresses concerns related to why and how big business in the United States has used political capital to
shape educational reform policies of the last 30 years. The study examined how economic realities of the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s, beginning with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 and culminating with the adoption of the CCSS in 2010, have served as an impetus for educational reform policies. The overarching purpose of this contribution was to raise awareness among educational leaders, parents, and taxpayers of the strong influence that the elite business community exercises over federal and state lawmakers with regard to educational reform efforts that have resulted in the promulgation of a nationalized curriculum by way of the CCSS. Such persuasion may potentially influence the growth or decline of specific American industries and markets, thereby dictating future educational reforms in the name of economic prosperity.

**Limitations**

There were some aspects of the study that could not be controlled by the researcher. Mahoney (2004), an authority on historical comparative research from Brown University, identified power theory as a subsidiary of general theory. Power theory suggests that “collective actors,” which for the purpose of this research are corporate philanthropies, are the causal agents whose resources determine outcomes—in this case, changes in education policy such as the adoption of national standards. As stated by Mahoney, “Resources are potentially unobservable bundles of ideas and materials that provide collective actors with both the motivation to carry out certain kinds of behavior and the capacity to shape particular outcomes” (p. 463). Thus, quantifying the exact sum of resources that corporate philanthropies annually distribute to governing agencies that drive educational policy, such as the NGA Center and the CCSSO, may be unfeasible.
Mahoney (2004) also cited the black box problem. Originally coined by Hedstrom and Swedberg (1998), the black box problem refers to the complexity associated with justifying why a given causal variable, such as corporate philanthropy, exerts an effect on a given outcome variable—specifically, policy that promulgates a national curriculum by way of the CCSS. This circumstance complicates researchers’ ability to identify the connection between cause and effect, which is further complicated by the field’s lack of empirical tools for understanding how various aspects of the phenomenon attribute to the outcome. As a result, researchers may use a variety of qualitative and/or quantitative techniques in order to speculate as to why certain outcomes materialize under certain conditions.

These qualitative and quantitative techniques also have their limitations. For this study, the researcher engaged in the following methods of qualitative data collection: (a) an examination of primary source documents—specifically, mission statements of the corporate philanthropies being scrutinized—from 1983 to 2010 and the reauthorizations of the ESEA from 1983 to 2010; (b) an interview with members of various agencies responsible for drafting education policy on the state and federal levels; and (c) an examination of financial records of corporate philanthropies that have supported the NGA Center and the CCSSO, the agencies primarily responsible for the drafting of the CCSS. The last type of data collection, an examination of descriptive statistics, was completed by identifying the number of for-profit companies that market and sell products having to do with accountability systems in education for the 3 years before and 3 years after the drafting and adoption of the CCSS in 2010. This data collection was quantitative in nature.
Given the vast breadth of the primary source documents that were examined from the period of 1983 to 2010, it is possible that some nuances in the language of the legislative documents might have gone unnoticed or might have fit into multiple coding criteria, which would increase the subjectivity of the conclusions that were drawn as a result of the coding analysis. Also, ideally, interviewees would consist of the members of the various policy-making agencies involved in the drafting of the CCSS; however, given their demanding schedules, this researcher expected that these policy makers would delegate this task to a staff member. The researcher had to trust that the completeness and integrity of the responses were being offered to the best of each interviewee’s ability.

Next, in examining the financial records of the corporate philanthropies that supported the NGA and the CCSSO in the years leading up to the drafting of the CCSS, the researcher needed to remain cognizant of the possibility that these corporate philanthropies might have had reasons aside from supporting the drafting of the CCSS for endowing these agencies. Finally, when gathering and analyzing financial records from 2007 to 2013 of for-profit companies that market products to address issues of accountability in education, the researcher needed to consider factors apart from the drafting and adoption of the CCSS, such as public relations and marketing, that may have influenced the growth of one company’s product over that of another.

**Definition of Terms**

**21st-Century Skills**

The term “21st century skills” refers to the skills that students must acquire in Grades K through 12 in order to develop college and career readiness upon high school completion (NGA Center and CCCSO, 2010).
Accountability

Accountability, within the context of public education, refers to the practice of holding students, teachers, school-level administrators, and district-level administrators responsible for student performance on high-stakes assessments (Edwards, 2011).

American Legislative Exchange Council

The American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) is a national, nonprofit, bipartisan organization of elected state legislators. Its mission is to advance the fundamental principles of free-market enterprise, limited government, and federalism at the state level through a nonpartisan, public-private partnership of America’s state legislators, members of the private sector, and the general public (Walker, 2012).

Charter Management Organization

A charter management organization (CMO) is a nonprofit network of charter schools that operates under the auspices of a specific instructional ideology (Standerfer, 2006).

Common Core State Standards Initiative

The CCSS Initiative is a movement led by the NGA Center and the CCSSO to develop a single set of educational standards in the content areas of English language arts (ELA) and mathematics for Grades K through 12, for states to adopt and implement on a voluntary basis (CCSS, 2010).

Corporate Philanthropy

Corporate philanthropy is the donation of profits and/or resources, such as facilities, property, equipment, or services, to charitable causes by corporations (Blair, 1999).
Council of Chief State School Officers

The CCSSO is a bipartisan, nonprofit organization comprising each state’s education leader. The members work collectively to share best practices in education and leverage their influence to drive policies that will “produce students ready to succeed as productive members of society” (CCSSO, 2013).

Distance Learning

Distance learning is a term used to describe the delivery of instruction to students who are not physically present in the traditional classroom. This type of learning typically takes place via remotely through Internet communication providers (Mehta & American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 2012).

Elementary and Secondary Education Act

The ESEA was passed in 1965 under the administration of Lyndon B. Johnson in response to the Civil Rights Movement. This legislation sought to provide economically disadvantaged and minority students with access to better educational opportunities, including college admission and degree attainment (Ravitch, 2010).

GOALS 2000

GOALS 2000 was the national education reform model introduced by Congress in the 1990s to establish objectives for standards-based reforms that were to be met by the year 2000. Many educational experts mark this reform policy as the precursor to NCLB legislation (Paris, 1994).

Monocratic Bureaucracy

Monocratic bureaucracy is the organizational behavior theory developed by Max Weber. This theory comprises the following elements: a fixed division of labor, a hierarchy of offices, a set of rules governing performance, a separation of personal from
official property and rights, the use of technical qualifications rather than nepotism for selecting personnel, and employment as a primary occupation and long-term career. This theory has been the dominant model in the U.S. business sector since the post–World War II era (Owens & Valesky, 2011).

**A Nation at Risk**

*A Nation at Risk* is a 1983 publication produced by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, headed by David P. Gardner. It was commissioned in 1981 by secretary of education T. H. Bell to investigate and report on the overall quality of education in the United States. The commission was given an 18-month time line to focus on six particular areas of concern: (a) assessing the quality of teaching and learning in the nation's public and private schools, colleges, and universities; (b) comparing American schools and colleges with those of other industrialized countries; (c) analyzing the relationship between college admissions requirements and student achievement in high school; (d) identifying educational programs that result in notable student success in college; (e) assessing the degree to which major social and educational changes in the last quarter century have affected student achievement; and (f) defining specific issues in education which must be remedied (Gardner, 1983).

**National Governors Association**

The NGA is a bipartisan organization of governors that collectively works to share best practices on matters of state and national policy (NGA, 2013).

**No Child Left Behind Act**

NCLB is the 2001 reauthorization of the ESEA passed under the George W. Bush administration. This legislation heightened accountability measures through statutes that required states to annually assess and report demonstrated growth of students’
competency of state standards. The expectation was that all students in Grades 3–8 would be performing on grade level, as determined by each state’s assessment, by 2014 (NCLB, 2013).

**Philanthrocapitalism**

Philanthrocapitalism is a form of philanthropy that is primarily concerned with yielding measurable gains from endowments granted to selected institutions (Bishop, 2006; Kumashiro, 2012; Strickland, 2009).

**Race to the Top**

Race to the Top is a $4.35 billion contest sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education. Its purpose is to award federal grant monies to respective state departments of education for the implementation of innovative educational reform policies such as the adoption of teacher and principal evaluation models, CCSS adoption and compliance, eliminating caps on CMOs, and building systems for data collection (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

**Transformational Leadership**

Transformational leadership is a leadership model developed by Burns (1979) that emphasizes the relationship between the motivation, morale, and performance of the individual worker by valuing workers’ sense of identity, their individual contributions to the organization, and the collective contributions of all employees to the success of an organization.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Educational policies in the United States have long been driven by the economic realities of the prevailing time. Invariably, big business has used political influence to shape educational reform policies of the last 30 years, commencing with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983. The publication of this document marks the inception of venture philanthropy as a means for influencing educational reform policies. Venture philanthropy, also commonly referred to as “philanthrocapitalism,” is a form of educational philanthropy that differs from its more traditional counterpart in that it is primarily concerned with yielding gains. In contrast, traditional philanthropy, has typically sought to give back to society with no expectation of a return (Bishop, 2006; Kumashiro, 2012; Strickland, 2009).

In an essay titled “A New Generation of Philanthropists and Their Great Ambitions,” Richard Lee Colvin traced the origins of educational philanthropy back to the Reconstruction Era (Hess, 2005). Immediately following the end of the Civil War, wealthy businessmen quickly recognized the benefits of investing in the establishment of primary and vocational schools for African Americans, which later converted to normal schools that predominantly functioned as African American institutions for higher learning.

Another movement that had simultaneously begun to take shape was that of manual education, first popularized in the 1880s by Dr. Calvin M. Woodward of Washington University in Saint Louis (Floyd, 2005). In response to the urgency for workers in the rapidly growing industrial economy, Woodward proposed manual training schools replace the less efficient apprenticeship programs, which were unable to adequately fulfill workforce demands. The manual education curriculum comprised
industrial arts, whereby students’ time was split between the workshop and classroom settings, thus integrating skills of the mind and hand. The intent was to empower workers to choose their vocational path so that they might lead more fulfilling lives. This sentiment was supported by various intellectual contemporaries—specifically, Thomas Carlyle and John Ruskin, who believed that “machines dehumanized the worker,” as they emphasized speed rather than quality and craftsmanship.

Such sentiments were not shared by prominent businessmen of the time, who were consumed with the urgency to streamline worker training in an effort to boost the manufacturing of goods. As a result, these businessmen tended to support vocational education programs, which developed one specific worker skill. Kliebard (1999) documented three major organizations that promoted a marked shift from manual to vocational education during the early years of the 20th century: (a) the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM), which sought to improve the overall quality of the goods being manufactured; (b) the American Federation of Labor (AFL), which sought to provide a better quality of life for the working class; and (c) the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education (NSPIE), which sought to bridge the gap between education and life experience.

By 1912, this movement had accumulated a great deal of momentum. In an address to the National Education Association (NEA) that same year, Charles A. Presser, a well-known vocational education expert of the time, claimed that manual education had not met the pressing needs of industrial education. This claim was further substantiated by the City Club of Chicago, an organization founded in 1903, comprising prominent members of the business and civic communities. This event resulted in a movement in
which vocational education was “beginning to control the curriculum as a whole” (Kliebard, 1999, p. 54).

By and large, the purpose of philanthropies at that time varied greatly. Philanthropies “fund[ed] initiatives that both reinforced and challenged inequities in education” (Hess, 2005; Kumashiro, 2012). These ideals eventually served to drive the missions of the Carnegie, Ford, and Rockefeller Foundations, the most prominent corporate family foundations of the early 20th century. These business leaders, along with other members of the private sector, long recognized the benefits of shaping education policy.

From the rise of the Industrial Revolution to the beginning of the Cold War era, growth of diversity in cities and subsequent suburban sprawl resulted in a trend to consolidate and regionalize education. Such demographic trends led to an increase in the number of elected city positions being filled by members of the middle class. In an effort to stymy the middle class faction, the “business elite” made concerted efforts to gain control of school boards “not only by getting business leaders elected to school boards, but also by structuring the boards to reflect the centralized control and bureaucracy that characterized the large industries that were emerging at this time” (Kasper, 2005; Strickland, 2009). In an article that documents the political engagement in participatory democracy, Altschuler and Blumin (1997) examined a small sample of American towns and concluded that party leaders in these towns frequently “manipulated political events” such as “grass-roots caucuses, campaign clubs, mass rallies,” and other aspects of the democratic process, which were predominantly driven by an engaged electorate, overwhelmingly composed of the most accomplished professionals and businessmen within each respective community (p. 859).
Yarrow (2010) explained how the period from the 1920s to the 1940s was characterized by economic development and growth. The economic prosperity enjoyed by many during the 1920s had been suddenly curtailed by the extreme hardships resultant from the Stock Market Crash of 1929 and the ensuing decade of the Great Depression. This rapid loss of prosperity and perceived weakness by foreign countries caused presidents of the time to invest resources in New Deal programs and wartime and postwar initiatives that were intended to resuscitate the ailing economy.

The 1950s and 1960s was a period that ushered an acknowledgement of the vast race, class, and gender inequities present within American society. Consequently, federal and state governments responded with shifts in education policy, most notably with the Supreme Court ruling of *Brown*, the rise of the civil rights movement, and the passing of ESEA. Conservatives perceived these responses as a threat to free enterprise (Kumashiro, 2012).

By the 1970s, both big business and philanthropic foundations responded to the “liberal establishment” and began to strategically position themselves in the sphere of public policy by way of a “philanthropy roundtable” and a “business roundtable.” The catalyst for this movement can be traced back to the Powell manifesto, a Chamber of Commerce memorandum written in 1971 by Lewis Powell, who would later go on to become associate justice for the U.S. Supreme Court. Powell identified the “liberal” public policy of the proceeding two decades as an “attack on American free enterprise and American democracy,” a notion that rallied support for school choice and the privatization of public education (Atwerger et al., 2002).

In a study that explores the ever-increasing role of philanthropy in the American economy and education, Strickland (2009) provided a historical context for the
conception of the “philanthropy roundtable.” Initially, this group was composed of elite American philanthropists with the backing of their respective family fortunes. Their goal was to design a plan that would allow them to leverage their collective power to influence public policy. This group created a conservative following through the establishment of think tanks on college campuses. The intent was that these individuals would filter into positions of government service, media, and organizations for public advocacy.

Kumashiro (2012) also investigated this notion. His commentary on corporate philanthropies identified Dinesh D’Souza, Chester Finn, Newt Gingrich, and Thomas Sowell as the most prominent beneficiaries of philanthropic fellowships.

For similar reasons, the business roundtable commenced in 1972. It was composed of the 300 most successful chief executive officers in the United States. The overarching societal concerns expressed during their meetings included deficit spending from Vietnam War, the rising cost of oil, and globalization. During the latter portion of the 1980s, this group of executives exerted considerable energy on public education by calling for six national goals for the state of American education, with national education standards being among them. This idea was immediately followed by nine essential components of a successful education system, which coincided with GOALS 2000, education legislation adopted in 1994 under the Clinton administration (Riley, 1995).

GOALS 2000 initially sought to meet six major objectives. Three of the objectives were to (a) ensure all children in the United States begin school “ready to learn” (the most important); (b) reach a collective high school graduation rate of at least 90%; and (c) establish measures that would allow students in Grades 4, 8, and 12 to demonstrate proficiency in content areas of English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, the arts, history, and geography. These
outcome-based measures would be put in place to (d) “ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our nation's modern economy” (GOALS 2000 Educate America Act, 1994). That measure was thought to inevitably lead to the attainment of the next two goals: (e) ensure all Americans leave school literate and that American students lead the world in tests of mathematics and science competency. In order to realize the proceeding goals, lawmakers understood the importance of (f) striving to maintain safe and drug-free schools, which offer a “disciplined environment conducive to learning” (GOALS 2000 Educate America Act, 1994). Two additional goals that were added later spoke to the need for increasing opportunities for continued and ongoing professional growth for the nation’s teachers and the need to improve parental partnerships in an effort to promote increased levels of social, emotional, and academic achievement among American students (GOALS 2000 Educate America Act, 1994). The eight tenets of this law would eventually be used in 2002 as the cornerstones of NCLB.

The accountability measures excluded from GOALS 2000 became abundantly pervasive in NCLB. The “age of accountability,” as it came to be known under the Bush administration, mandated annual competency testing in the content areas of language arts and mathematics in Grades 3–8 and once in high school (NCLB, 2002). Under this law, schools were expected to demonstrate adequate yearly progress (AYP), or incremental progress, culminating with 100% of students demonstrating proficiency on assessments in language arts and mathematics in 2014, as dictated by individual state standards. This federal edict created a sense of urgency that trickled down from the state departments of education to their respective school districts, and extended its reach well into the private sector. By the end of the 2000s, the age of accountability had resulted in the growth and
establishment of dozens of markets within and beyond the scope of the education industry. The potential for broader growth in education markets through the standardization of curricula and assessment by way of the CCSS could be easily used to generate billions of dollars in revenue, which in large part would be federally subsidized.

Today, it is estimated that the American education system is a $500–$600 billion operation largely subsidized by public dollars (Kumashiro, 2012). However, public education in the United States has invariably sustained ties to private-sector business leaders and their philanthropies. The publication of A Nation at Risk (Gardner, 1983) marked a definitive shift in the motives of corporate philanthropies with regard to exercising influence within the realm of education policy. Although philanthropic giving has never amounted to more than 1% of total educational funding within the last 30 years, a growing number of corporate philanthropies have capitalized on the public’s perception that the overall quality of public education in the United States is quickly diminishing. These philanthropies have positioned themselves as key players in national education policy issues, promoting the creation of a nationalized curriculum, as exhibited by the CCSS (Hess, 2005; Lorenzi & Hilton, 2012; Ravitch, 2010).

**A Nation at Risk**

Prior to A Nation at Risk (Gardner, 1983), corporate interests were not pursuing any specific education agenda. The government’s “demand for highly skilled workers” (p. 4), as dictated by the space race, growth of industrialism, inception of the information age, and birth of the global market economy—all of which were characteristic of the Cold War Era—was undoubtedly shaping the K–12 curriculum. These growing demands, coupled with the economic recession of the early 1980s, provided an idyllic opportunity for the federal government to insist on immediate reform to public education.
In August of 1981, Bell, then secretary of education, established the National Commission on Excellence in Education, headed by Gardner, to investigate and report on the overall quality of education in the United States. The commission was given an 18-month time line to focus on six particular areas of concern. Members of the commission would be responsible for (a) assessing the quality of teaching and learning in the nation’s public and private schools, colleges, and universities; (b) comparing American schools and colleges with those of other industrialized countries; (c) analyzing the relationship between college admissions requirements and student achievement in high school; (d) identifying educational programs that result in notable student success in college; (e) assessing the degree to which major social and educational changes in the last quarter century have affected student achievement; and (f) defining specific issues in education that must be remedied.

The report was deliberately written with the use of harsh language in layman’s terms to generate a sense of urgency and incense the public to take action. Page 9 of the report spoke of “a widespread public perception that something [was] seriously remiss in our educational system” (Gardner, 1983). It continued by describing the current state as one of “unilateral educational disarmament” (p. 9). “For the first time in the history of our country, the educational skills of one generation will not surpass, will not equal, will not even approach, that of their parents” (p. 12). It further stated that the conflicting demands imposed on the school system have called on schools to address “personal, social, and political problems that the home and other institutions will not or cannot resolve” (p. 9).

These conclusions were drawn after having examined 41 documents and hosting a series of six public hearings across the United States. In large part, these documents
comprised summaries of papers and hearings on educational issues written by experts in education; testimonies of various stakeholders (administrators, teachers, students, representatives of professional and private groups, parents, business leaders, public officials, and scholars); analyses of prevailing problems in education; letters from concerned members of the community and educators working in various capacities; descriptions of successful programs; and approaches in education.

In 1982 the commission hosted six public hearings in various cities across the United States. The hearings were titled: Science, Math, and Technology Education; Language and Literacy: Skills for Academic Learning; Teaching and Teacher Education; College Admissions and the Transition to Postsecondary Education; Education for a Productive Role in a Productive Society; and Education for the Gifted and Talented. The information gleaned from these hearings, combined with the additional hard-copy data collected and analyzed over the preceding 18 months, were explicitly conveyed through the findings and further addressed in the recommendations portion of the report.

With regard to content, it was found that the “curricula have been homogenized, diluted, and diffused to the point that they no longer have a central purpose” (Gardner, p. 21). Expectations revealed that there had been a gradual decrease in time spent completing homework over the past two decades. Furthermore, an analysis of SAT data found that the average student achievement was incongruent with the seemingly inflated grades that were being awarded. Concerning time, the report uncovered three unsettling trends: compared to other nations, American children spent much less time on schoolwork; time spent in the classroom and on homework was often used ineffectively; and schools were not doing enough to help students develop either the study skills required to use time well or the willingness to spend more time on school (Gardner,
In matters of teaching, the report found that the profession was not luring the most academically capable college students, teacher preparation programs were severely lacking in their ability to adequately prepare teacher candidates, working conditions for many teachers were subpar compared to those of other professions, and there was a severe shortage of qualified teachers in the areas of mathematics and science.

A series of succinct recommendations was made in the categories of content, standards, time, and teaching. Recommendations for content were as follows: “The curriculum in the crucial eight grades leading to the high school curriculum should be specifically designed to provide a sound base for study . . . [and] foster an enthusiasm for learning” (Gardner, 1983, p. 25). The commission suggested the adoption of new high school requirements, which they referred to as the “five new basics,” comprising 4 years of English, 3 years of mathematics, 3 years of science, 3 years social studies, and a half year of computer science. With regard to standards, the commission believed that K–12 schools and institutions for higher learning increased the rigor of the curriculum and raised their standards for academic performance, student conduct, and admission. It was also strongly suggested that the school day be extended to 7 hours and the school year be increased to 200–220 days, with a curriculum focused on the five new basics and far more homework assigned to students in these content areas. To better address some of the most pervasive issues with regard to the profession, the commission urged additional teaching, leadership, and fiscal support in the form of an 11-month contract. The additional 4 weeks would be designated for the purposes of training, planning, and professional collaboration (Gardner, 1983).

Various stakeholders publicly expressed their desire to eradicate these mounting concerns while improving the overall quality of education. What resulted in the
succeeding 30 years was the most concentrated education reform efforts in the history of the United States, driven primarily by economic realities and corporate needs. In short, *A Nation at Risk* blamed the current perceived failure of schools on the economic recession. Generally speaking, a period characterized by economic hardship invariably results in the slashing of public education budgets, which serves the overwhelming majority of minority students. Such was the case in the years leading up to the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (Bracey, 2008). The decreased appropriation of federal, state, and local funds to public schools stood to augment already glaring disparities among economically disadvantaged minorities and their middle class, White counterparts. These circumstances fostered conditions that were effectuating race and class inequities that have pervaded public education since the Reconstruction period (Kumashiro, 2012). Consequently, less public money had been earmarked for education, which afforded philanthropic enterprises with an occasion to supplement that loss, provided they be given an opportunity to weigh in on education policy issues.

**Corporate Philanthropy**

The business of philanthropic giving within the realm of public education has long been lucrative to some of the most successful corporations in the United States. While corporations exercise their influence over public policy, recipient school districts are afforded with an opportunity to provide additional support mechanisms for students and staff. On the surface, both parties seem to benefit from philanthropic partnerships. Despite the fact that these contributions amount to an estimated 1% of overall spending on education, corporate philanthropies continue to seek charitable opportunities that could potentially lead to widespread reforms (Green as cited by Hess, 2005). This trend originated with the vision of the Carnegie and Ford Foundations in the earlier part of the
20th century. During this time, both corporations had become highly profitable and highly influential within the sphere of American politics. Naturally, both corporations, by way of their foundations, sought to drive education policy as a means to strengthen the U.S. economy. When convenient, these corporations would forge partnerships to increase their leverage with regard to driving policy (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2004).

Bacchetti and Ehrlich (2004) investigated the measures taken by corporate philanthropies to influence education policy. In their study, Bacchetti and Ehrlich interviewed three dozen leaders who had either worked with or worked for an educational institution or a foundation. Their findings suggested that communication deficiencies existed between foundations and educational institutions. Foundation leaders’ perceptions of higher education indicated that institutions for higher education are generally unaccountable and unconcerned with social issues. Furthermore, the most prestigious schools feel little need to change. Despite advances in pedagogy, lecture is invariably the most common form of teaching, and “schools of education are neither respected, nor deserve respect or funding on some campuses” (Bacchetti & Ehrlich, 2004, p. 4).

Foundation leaders’ perceptions of K–12 education were equally dim. The general perception was that much money has been invested with little return and systemic change seems highly unlikely. If any change is to be made, then foundations must partner together for leverage. By and large, school districts do not seem interested in foundation support. The inconsequential amount of money or resources that foundations are able to offer do not seem to offset the inconveniences created by the conditions for receiving that money. Education leaders perceptions’ of foundations were also highly negative; many school leaders went on record complaining of foundations’ unrealistic
timelines for change, accusing them of being poor collaborators who are “overly focused on measurable outcomes” and chastising them for their lack of professional expertise to understand innovative practices in education and organizational behavior models in education (Doyle, 1990).

Based on their research, Bacchetti and Ehrlich offered foundations six specific recommendations. First, it was suggested that foundations focus on building educational capital. This practice refers to creating bigger bang for the buck by designing projects and innovations that add to the body of information already available. Foundations must be willing to provide models from which comparable schools and institutions can draw. In order to achieve this end, the following principles were offered: (a) ground the project design by selecting research-based strategies grounded on past lessons or studies, (b) identify the nonnegotiable aspects of a model or program, (c) incorporate a means for ensuring sustainability, (d) build in appropriate assessment at every stage of the project to provide multiple perspectives with regard to outcomes, and (e) encourage transparent communication among all stakeholders.

The second recommendation spoke to maintaining openness. Typically, institutions supply foundations with adequate information, though that favor largely goes unreturned. Foundations can eradicate this miscommunication by maintaining a website for public access to information that includes proposals for funding, written decisions along with rationales for accepted proposals, and written rationales for rejected proposals. Such measures would also serve to inform prospective grantees. This type of transparency would in turn allow for an external review of the data from a variety of stakeholders. Such communication would effectuate the gathering of multiple
perspectives on an issue or program that would augment the knowledge base of the established governing board.

This knowledge would be used to determine the nature of the professional development services needed in order for program officers to make informed decisions in a more efficient manner. It discourages the learn-as-you-go mentality that often results from navigating caveats of each grant seeker’s circumstances. Bacchetti and Ehrlich (2004) identified Grantmakers for Education as a model professional development provider. Once a knowledge base has been established, foundation officers may shift their focus on collaboration between institutions with shared needs, including schools, institutions for higher education, intermediary organizations, and coalitions that link similar groups. Following these steps creates the circumstances that allow foundation leaders to put educational capital to work. One common misconception is the need to “scale up.” The authors cautioned foundations of the divergence that exists within the educational realm; unlike in business, successful models are often nontransferable and require frequent modification for external factors (Brooks, 2011; Edwards, 2011).

The basis of these recommendations is heavily founded on the historical achievements attained by successful corporate philanthropies. The late Andrew Carnegie (1889) was fond of saying, “The man who dies rich dies disgraced” (Carnegie as cited in Lorenzi & Hilton, 2011, p. 397). After having spent the better part of his life as a steel tycoon, Carnegie vowed to devote the remainder of his life to “benevolent purposes.” Simply making more money, he wrote, “must degrade me beyond hope of permanent recovery” (Carnegie as cited in Lorenzi & Hilton, 2011, p. 397). In the 1870s, he began to make large contributions and establish hefty endowments to libraries, churches, colleges, and various nonprofit organizations. By the onset of the Cold War era, the
Carnegie Foundation of New York began to alter its giving philosophy. Given the growing perception of the decline of American education, various factions of society began to place greater emphasis on educational reform efforts. The Carnegie Foundation of New York positioned itself as a key player at the policy table.

In 1964, the Carnegie Corporation of New York identified the need for measuring the effectiveness of educational reform models. It initially allocated $112,500 to conduct an internal investigation on the plausibility and necessity of “a regular assessment of progress of education in the United States and a formation of a committee to explore possibilities of measuring educational progress” among American students (Schindler, 2007, p. 1). Within 1 year, the Committee on Assessing Progress in Education had been established, and a budget of $260,000 had been allocated for the development of education assessment methods. This exploratory committee comprised various stakeholders including chief school officers, district and school administrators, school board members, and representatives from private and public sector business interests. Their goal was “not to monitor individual student progress, but to study progress of schools and systems” in a broad context (Schindler, 2007, p.1).

By 1967, the committee had determined 10 content areas to assess student achievement. These areas were reading, writing, science, social studies, mathematics, citizenship, music, literature, fine arts, and vocational education. In addition, the committee had identified 256 subpopulations that were disaggregated by gender, age, socioeconomic status, and population density. The increased scope of the project justified a hefty raise in the endowment to $640,000, which was augmented by additional support from Ford Foundation. In 1971, the Committee on Assessing Progress in Education administered the first version of the National Assessment of Educational
Progress (NAEP), which later became widely known as the Nation’s Report Card (Schindler, 2007). In an effort to minimize the stigma associated with standardized testing, participation in the assessment was strictly voluntary and all individual student scores remained confidential. In 1988, the federal government established the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) to institute policy for the administration of the NAEP. By 1990, the NAGB was able to report state-level results, which included the coordination and transfer of responsibilities to the U.S. Commissioner of Educational Statistics.

The National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) works toward the achievement of two major goals: (a) measuring student achievement over “jurisdictional boundaries”—in other words, in various states—and (b) compiling longitudinal data by monitoring changes in achievement levels over time. NAEP continues to be the only nationally consistent and representative assessment of American student progress, which is used primarily to measure the effectiveness of American educational policies (Lorenzi & Hilton, 2011).

In 1935, Henry and Edsel Ford made a $25,000 endowment to establish the Ford Foundation. The original charter stipulated that resources be used for “scientific, educational and charitable purposes, all for the public welfare” (Ford Foundation Timeline, 2013).

Like its contemporary the Carnegie Foundation, the Ford Foundation began to shift its philanthropic giving in 1950 to a “national and international philanthropy dedicated to the advancement of human welfare” (Ford Foundation Timeline, 2013). In 1953, the Ford Foundation helped to establish the Center for Advanced Study in the
Behavioral Sciences, and by 1956, a total of 63 grants had been awarded to scholars in the field.

The 1960s ushered in a period of commitment to urban development, a topic at the forefront of many national discussions during the civil rights movement. In 1967 representatives from the Ford Foundation approached the Carnegie Foundation to support an initiative called Community Control (Ford Foundation Timeline, 2013; Ravitch, 2010). This movement embraced the idea that school reform could be achieved if it was governed by parents and members of the local community. It was in large part the resulting response to the pervasive racial inequality rampant in New York City schools during that time. Ultimately, the Ford Foundation selected three specific districts, two of which were inhabited by activists who called for Black Power (Ravitch, 2010). Quickly recognizing the mounting racial tension, the Carnegie Foundation declined.

Shortly thereafter, the Ocean Hill-Brownsville district exercised its community control by terminating 19 White teachers and supervisors without due process. This act incited the teachers union to strike a total of three times, culminating with a 2-month shutdown of schools in the fall of 1968. The New York state legislature responded to this event with the passing of a bill that would decentralize schools, institute elected boards of education, and dismantle the three school districts that initiated the conflict. Many criticized the Ford Foundation for provoking the conflict; proponents of community control had been publicly undermined by the state legislature, and those who favored centralized control of the schools accused Ford of having impelled race rioting (Ravitch, 2010). “Ford’s experience during the decentralization controversy was a stark lesson to other foundations and to Ford itself about the dangers of trying to engineer social change” (Ravitch, 2010, p. 197).
The negative outcome of the community control situation served as an indelible reminder of the risks of trying to drive social reform. As a result, the Ford Foundation sought to involve itself in other areas of educational philanthropy. In 1969 the Endowment for Children’s Television Workshop established the 26-week series *Sesame Street*. The following year, $100 million was appropriated for scholarships and fellowships to strengthen African American colleges and universities. This was followed by the Urban Community College Transfer Opportunities Program in 1982, a program geared toward helping to better prepare minority students for a transition to a 4-year institution.

The philanthropic undertakings of the last two decades indicate the Ford Foundation’s slow return to the realm of education and social policy. In 1997 the foundation allocated $1.35 million to Houston’s Project GRAD, a program committed to raising test scores, graduation rates, and college enrollment while lowering instances of teen pregnancy and juvenile delinquency. The early 2000s were a period marked by supporting research initiatives that explored affirmative action through a program called Fulfilling the Dream Fund. The Ford Foundation also launched the GrantCraft Program in 2001 in an effort to provide professional development to better guide novice philanthropists. Most recently, in 2009, the organization awarded $100 million to reform secondary education for economically disadvantaged students in seven major cities in the United States.

Although novice venture philanthropists stand to learn a great deal from studying the practices of the most successful philanthropic foundations, they may also wish to consider the benefits of studying failed efforts. The most commonly cited instance of philanthropic failure in the area of K–12 education is that of Walter Annenberg and his
1993 Annenberg Challenge (Colvin, compiled by Hess, 2005). The Annenberg Challenge consisted of a $500 million contribution that was matched by more than $600 million from local recipient communities for a total of $1.1 billion, the single largest charitable contribution made to K–12 education up to that time. The money had been allocated to nine large city school systems, a handful of rural schools, two national school reform groups, and innovations designed to bolster fine art education in a few major cities. The donations were funneled to the recipients by intermediary groups that provided services in the areas of professional development, leadership tactics, and development of academic standards. By 2001 the grant had expired and with it any bit of evidence that would indicate meaningful and sustainable reforms had occurred as a result of the endowment. Ravitch (2010) quoted Michael Casserly, executive director of the Council of Great Schools, who described the Annenberg Challenge as a “terrific bad example. The grants were poorly conceived, poorly managed, and . . . disconnected from any ability to drive any broader policy changes. The lesson is: don’t do that again” (p. 198).

Stakeholders in the arena of education policy are cognizant of the three most powerful venture philanthropy foundations: the Walton Family Foundation, the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. They have often collaborated with each other to exert leverage to influence reforms in urban education; their collective influence has been unmatched by any other organization (Ravitch, 2010).

The Walton Family Foundation is best known for its generous investments in CMOs. As stated on the foundation website,

The foundation has committed itself to specific investment sites, which are scattered throughout the continental United States. The intent is to show that parental choice can serve
as a catalyst for meaningful education reforms, which result in better academic outcomes for students. (Walton Family Foundation, 2013)

The Walton Family Foundation has concentrated its efforts on shaping public policy, creating quality schools, and improving existing schools.

In an effort to shape public policy, the foundation has awarded funds to advocacy organizations that purport public charter school choice, private school choice, and district reforms—specifically, open enrollment and intradistrict school choice. In order to encourage the establishment and expansion of new, high-quality schools of choice, the foundation invests in school startups that promise their prospective enrollers schools of choice, the replication of successful CMOs, the training of effective school administrators to lead quality schools of choice, and facilities assistance and financing to help administrators from choice schools obtain adequate facilities. To assist school choice reformers in appropriately responding and reacting to competition, the foundation invests in programs that measure teacher effectiveness, district school replacement to assist traditional districts in closing and replacing failing schools, and nondistrict school quality to address weaknesses in the organizational and behavioral management systems of public charter and private schools (Walton Family Foundation, 2013). According to Buddy Philpott, former executive director of the foundation, the emphasis on these three areas of school choice fosters a competitive nature created by the establishment of a CMO, thereby promoting self-imposed reforms within failing school districts (Colvin as cited by Hess, 2005). In 2012, these investments totaled nearly $160 million (Walton Family Foundation, 2013).

The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation is a Los Angeles based K–12 organization that has practiced “venture philanthropy” since 1999, when founder, Eli Broad, sold his
Michigan-based investment firm SunAmerica. The foundation has since invested nearly $400 million in financing subsidiary foundations in the areas of education, science/medical, art, and civics. Each of these foundations operate independently of one another. Like many of their philanthropic predecessors, the Broads felt disenchanted with the current state of public education in the United States. As stated in the mission and overview, “The state of education in America is disappointing and embarrassing . . . Education is an American issue that affects us all” (Broad Foundation, Education Mission and Overview, 2013). This mission is made in reference to the growing achievement gap, the belief that American students are unable to perform basic job functions, and the damaging effects on the U.S. economy resulting from increased rates of high school dropout, pregnancy, and incarceration among American teenagers.

In an effort to address these social dysfunctions, the Broad Foundation has identified four specific areas for targeted investments in education: federal/state policy, innovation in teaching and learning, leadership, and institutions. The area concerned with federal and state policy works toward minimizing bureaucracy, promoting school choice, providing resources and governance under which schools can succeed, and providing professional development for state departments of education. In pursuit of these ends, the Broad Foundation supports the following organizations.

AmericaWorks is an organization that works to reform the American retirement system. The Center for American Progress is a progressive think tank that produces position papers and policy briefs on topics that include expanded learning time, differential pay for principals and teachers, comparability in Title I funding, and common education standards. Education Reform Now is an advocacy organization for state and national education reform that educates policy makers on the benefits of school choice
Waiting for Super
man and The Lottery were
documentaries funded to educate the public and promote awareness of school choice
about charter school application process in some economically disadvantaged areas.

The Foundation for Excellence in Education was founded by Jeb Bush in
conjunction with the association of governors and lawmakers. This organization supports
college and career readiness standards, customized digital learning through technology,
effective teachers and leaders, ending tenure, the implementation of data-based
evaluations and compensation, alternative paths to certification/licensure, standards and
accountability support for grading schools on an A–F scale, standardized measurement of
student learning, annual comprehensive assessments in elementary and middle school,
and end-of-course exams in high school (Foundation for Excellence in Education:
Reform Agenda, 2013).)

The Harvard University Education Innovation Laboratory conducts rigorous
research to understand causes of achievement gaps and to identify “targeted high-impact
reproducible reform interventions.” It then works toward the dissemination and
replication of these initiatives. The James B. Hunt Institute for Educational Leadership
and Policy aims to improve education at the state level by educating governors to develop
state-specific strategies. The NGA raises awareness of the urgent need for education
reform, builds a greater understanding of state policy issues, and shares best practices,
including the development of the CCSS.

The National Center on Time and Learning purports to increase instructional time
by elongating the school day and school year. The Partnership for Public Service
suggests strategies that help federal agencies attract and hire the brightest, most
promising individuals. It facilitates public-private collaborations to help public servants
develop, innovate, and lead (Partnership for Public Service, 2013). Policy Innovators in Education Network provides coordination and support for a number of aggressive statewide education advocacy organizations. Their main goals are to close the achievement gap, expand parent choice, increase teacher effectiveness, improve transparency and accountability, and improve funding practices (also funded by the Gates Foundation; Pie Network, 2013).

The Broad Foundation also invests in select government education agencies. The Sacramento County Office of Education receives funds to further the California Common Core initiative. The U.S. Department of Education has received monies to partially fund federal grant programs such as Race to the Top and Investing in Innovation. Race to the Top is a competitive grant that pits states against one another to present innovative ideas for education reform. Investing in Innovation is a federal program designed to provide competitive grants to applicants implementing innovative practices to improve education, including improving student achievement, closing achievement gaps, and increasing graduation rates.

The Broad Foundation has made a number of substantial contributions to organizations interested in the area of innovation in teaching and learning. Michigan State University’s College of Education provides scholarships for its 5-year teacher preparation program. Upon completion, scholarship recipients are offered a teaching position with the Detroit public school system (Broad Center Academy Residency, 2013). The National Council on Teacher Quality (NCTQ) is an organization that develops report cards for public schools. NCTQ works toward raising public awareness of state policies concerning education, the effectiveness of teacher preparation programs, the efficiency of
school districts, and the agendas of teacher unions. This organization also receives funds from the Carnegie Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (NCTQ, 2013).

With regard to the utilization of innovative technologies in education, the Broad Foundation invests in the New York City School of One and a Santa Clara-based CMO named Rocketship Education. The School of One uses multiple modes of individualized instruction, which are provided in an open-space plan. The curriculum consists of teacher-led and software-based lessons, collaborative learning, virtual tutors, and independent practice (School of One, 2013). Rocketship Education is considered the nation’s leading example of school-level integration of technology. Its primary goals are to reduce operating costs and to eliminate the achievement gap. Rocketship Education (2013) also accepts funding from the Walton Family Foundation and the Gates Foundation.

The Broad Foundation has also established itself in the arena of K–12 leadership through the Broad Center for Management of School Systems. A number of Broad Foundation programs that cultivate educational leadership fall under this area, specifically the Broad Institute, the Broad Superintendents Academy, and the Broad Residency. The shared vision of each of these programs is to increase student achievement and to narrow the student achievement gap (Broad Center, 2013). The Broad Center for the Management of School Systems was established in 2001 and was quickly followed by Superintendents Academy in 2002. Collectively, these programs have trained dozens of individuals to be urban superintendents. These candidates are recruited from the private sector, public service, military, and education fields. Their training concentrates heavily on studying the operating practices of privately managed schools. As of 2010, these programs had produced 67 superintendents and 88 district-
level administrative positions (Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, 2010)). According to the foundation’s 2009–2010 annual report, “80% of Academy graduates who have served as superintendents for four or more years are improving student achievement faster than their peers” (Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, 2010, p. 9).

The Broad Institute for School Boards, established in 2003, has trained over 300 board members in 35 low-income districts. It has since scaled back these efforts due to frequent elections, which result in high turnover rates. Instead, the Broad Foundation identified a more successful way to support governance reforms by supporting mayors and governors in New York City, Boston, Washington, D.C., Chicago, and New Orleans—cities where the mayor has control of the school board (Broad Center, 2013).

Since 2002, the Broad Residency has recruited individuals with advanced degrees in management fields such as business, law, or public policy to impart their skills to urban school districts and charter schools. In that time, 173 Broad residents have been placed in 32 school districts, in 17 CMOs, and within the U.S. Department of Education. Of that number, 93% have remained in public education well past the initial contractual period of 2 years (Broad Center Academic Residency, 2013). As superintendent of Chicago, Arne Duncan employed the assistance of 23 Broad residents. In 2013 five served with him at the U.S. Department of Education (Broad Center Academic Residency, 2013).

The foundation’s 2009–2010 annual report also praised the Obama administration for an agenda that supports CMOs, performance pay, accountability, expanded learning time, and national standards (Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, 2010). In an effort to highlight this agenda, the Broad Foundation has provided support for the Education Week series A Nation at Risk: 25 Years Later (Robelen, 2012). It has also endowed $41
million to Teach for America, an organization that recruits the highest-performing students from the most prestigious universities to commit to at least 2 years of teaching in an underprivileged school district (Robelen, 2012).

Since 1999, the Broad Foundation has invested over $100 million in CMOs such as KIPP, Aspire, Green Dot, and Uncommon Schools. As of 2013, over 5,000 charter schools served nearly 1.5 million students, approximately 3% of American public school students (Robelen, 2012, p. 10), making the Broad Foundation the single largest investor in CMOs. In 2002 the Broad Prize for Urban Education was established to recognize school districts demonstrating significant progress. The criteria for selection were aligned with the institute’s overarching goals to increase student achievement and to narrow the achievement gap. The initial reward of $1 million was divided five ways, with $500,000 awarded to the winning district and allocated for college scholarships and $125,000 awarded to four finalist districts; this amount was increased to $2 million in 2008 (Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, 2010).

By 2000 the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation had positioned itself as the most generous K–12 educational philanthropy (Hess, 2005; Robelen, 2009). Such wealth carried a great deal of influence, which the Gates Foundation parlayed into reforming the infrastructure and management of the American high school. In February 2005, Bill Gates had a valuable opportunity as keynote speaker of the NGA Conference, which coauthored the CCSS, to present his reform ideals. These ideals concentrated on the honing of 21st-century skills as a means for advancing college and career readiness for American students. One of Gates’s most notable lines of the speech made a plea for immediate reform: “Training the workforce of tomorrow with the high schools of today is
like trying to teach kids about today’s computers on a 50 year old mainframe. It’s the wrong tool for the times” (Gates, 2005).

Gates gained widespread support among the members of the NGA. Consequently, many governors embraced his American Diploma Project Network, sponsored by Achieve, an advocacy organization that was heavily funded by the Gates Foundation and other corporate philanthropies (Hess, 2005). Described by Education Week (n.d.) as one of the most influential educational policy organizations in the United States, this organization promotes itself as an independent, bipartisan, nonprofit education reform organization whose board of directors comprises governors and business leaders.

Shortly after the NGA Conference, Achieve introduced the American Diploma Project Network as a means for pursuing Gates’s reform ideals. To date, the organization services 85% of American public school students in 35 states (Achieve, 2012) by promoting collaboration among a variety of stakeholders to advance college and career readiness. This goal is attained through the alignment of high school standards, graduation requirements, and assessment and accountability systems to meet the demands of the 21st-century workplace (Achieve, 2012). Achieve supports states as they implement the CCSS by providing (a) technical assistance to states, (b) research and development, and (c) communications tools and support.

Technical assistance is offered through conferences and seminars that assist state school officials with the unpacking of CCSS, corresponding assessments, and systems for curriculum delivery. The corresponding measures of accountability serve to bolster graduation rates and college enrollment rates. Thus, Achieve is able to offer a data collection implement called the Common Core Comparison Tool, which is used by
participating states to help them match current state standards to the CCSS. The research and development sector of the organization provides comparative studies of high school graduation requirements across state boundaries. It also offers strategies to successfully implement the CCSS from Grades K through 12 and provides state accountability models and evaluations of high school exit exams and criteria for college admissions, reporting the results to provide state support and help states change policies and practices. It also provides models for common end-of-year exams that are used by over a dozen states.

The Communication Tools and Support sector promotes awareness and need for reform and develops several tools, including the Math Work series, which provides a clear rationale for teaching higher-level mathematics, and the Future Ready Project, a Web-based resource to better guide advocacy groups that encourage different avenues for achieving college and career readiness (Achieve, 2012).

In the years ahead, Achieve will be (a) advancing the implementation of the CCSS, (b) piloting the Next Generation Science Standards, and (c) managing the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC). The CCSS implementation initiative will provide professional development services to state departments of education for unpacking and developing model curriculums for the purposes of cogent planning and effective instruction. Achieve assumes the role of project management for the administration of PARCC, an assessment used as an accountability measure as stipulated by Race to the Top Funding guidelines. PARCC “creates high-quality assessments that measure the full range of the CCSS” while simultaneously providing periodic, data-driven feedback for teachers to tailor instruction. The assessment will utilize Web-based technology to more efficiently measure principal, teacher, and student performance. Advancing the College and Career Ready Agenda
involves the expansion of the college and career-ready agenda by addressing the ever-evolving nature of the 21st-century workplace. An ongoing revision of standards and assessments to meet these needs will be conducted in an effort to closely track these changes so that policy can be altered to address these needs in a timely fashion (Achieve, 2012).

Hess (2005) described the relationship between the Gates Foundation, the NGA, and Achieve as an arrangement that purports “reform-oriented” giving, where the giving comes at a cost to policy makers, education officials, and most importantly students. In a review of more than 44 newspaper articles, Hess questioned the lack of scrutiny of Gates’s remarks in the keynote speech delivered at the NGA Conference. Not one reporter questioned his motives or speculated that Gates stood to make inroads into unchartered education markets, which could potentially generate billions in revenue. This lack of scrutiny may be attributed to the fact that the Gates Foundation funds countless education reform groups. In an article published in the *New York Times*, Dillon (2011) quoted graduate student Kenneth Libby as saying, “It’s easier to name which groups Gates doesn’t support than to list all those they do, because its just so overwhelming.” Ravitch (2010) characterized the Gates Foundation as a funding advocacy organization that embraces corporate ideals of a “market-based approach to education, typified by common standards, merit pay, data-driven decision making, and consumer choice” (p. 278).

**Corporate Grants**

Hess (2005) compiled a collection of essays that address various approaches to giving that have been spearheaded by some of the most influential education philanthropies in the United States. In fact, some philanthropic organizations have begun
to heavily invest in disseminating guidelines for maximizing philanthropic endeavors (Edwards, 2011; McKersie & Palaich, 1994). In 2001, the Ford Foundation revealed GrantCraft, a nonprofit organization that provides best practices for grant makers. As of 2010, the organization boasts of over 20,000 registered users. These users are furnished with a “virtual roundtable” that puts them in touch with seasoned grant makers from a wide variety of foundations to engage in “shoptalk” (GrantCraft, 2013).

Rangdelli (2009) of the National Committee for Responsive Philanthropy led a mixed-methods study to measure the impacts of advocacy, community organizing, and related civic engagement. A snowball sampling technique was used to select the nonprofit organization participants who met the study criteria of having been in operation for at least 5 years; executing a mission that is focused on organization or advocacy; having at least one full-time employee to compile data for the duration of the 5-year study; serving minorities, the economically disadvantaged, or other marginalized members of society; and operating on a local, statewide, or national level.

Researchers collected data via electronic questionnaires and interviews on a wide range of topics, which included the organization’s background information; fiscal information from the past 5 years; membership, leadership, and constituency information; measurable impacts of organizing and advocacy; capacity building and progress attained toward achieving unmet goals; stories of impact; and resources for maximizing advocacy and organizing. The most significant findings were documented from New Mexico, in which 14 organizations that received $16.6 million were able to leverage that investment for a return of $157 per dollar spent. In other words, key quantifiable impacts in the areas of employment wages and benefits, housing, and education were the equivalent of $2.6 billion by the conclusion of the study (Rangdelli, 2009). Such successful outcomes
draw much attention from foundation officers, who undoubtedly strive to achieve comparable results for their own foundations.

Giving USA (2013), founded in 1985 by the Giving Institute, has made it its mission to advance the research, education, and public understanding of philanthropy. Similarly, Grantmakers for Education (2012) strives to promote the wisdom, craft, and knowledge education funders need to achieve maximum results. They fervently believe that education foundations have the ability to positively alter students’ lives. In order to achieve a maximum rate of return, foundations must be knowledgeable of “educational outcomes, influencing policies and practices, engaging and empowering stakeholders and leveraging other public and private resources” (Grantmakers for Education, 2012, p. ).

To efficiently achieve these ends, Grantmakers for Education (2012) offered eight principles for effective education grant making. The first principle is discipline and focus. Grant seekers must specify a particular need with regard to an individual, school, or system improvement project. Discipline and focus are followed by knowledge. Knowledge is used to inform views that consider all perspectives. It involves the ability to accept criticism and feedback; understand the caveats of federal, state, district, and school policies; understand relationships between learning and societal conditions; maintain an awareness of preceding philanthropy in similar areas and their outcomes; and recognize best practices in leadership and teaching.

Once knowledge has been accumulated, then resources must be linked to potential grant recipients. Linking resources helps to develop a “theory of change” to identify how “specific actions will lead to desired outcomes” (Grantmakers for Education, 2012, p. 33). Questions posed may include, what types of resources are needed? to what extent will they need to operate in conjunction with one another? what are the desired outcomes
and how will they be measured? and in what ways do these outcomes contribute to the attainment of the overarching goal? Generating answers to these questions requires grant makers to identify effective grantees. In doing so, they may consider the leadership, fiscal state, and overall stability of the organization; the extent to which the organization’s vision matches that of the grant maker’s; the commitment to collaboration by both parties; and the development of a plan for sustainability after grant expires. Once these details have been addressed, the grant maker and organization become engaged partners, whereby the grant maker provides an opportunity for the recipient to “help identify the problem . . . and viable solutions” and partake in constructing the remedy (Grantmakers for Education, 2012, p. 33).

Throughout the partnership, both parties work toward achieving leverage, influence, and collaboration, which are characterized by building a following and networking with other foundations; collaborating to target a specific “need, problem, or geographic area”; and identifying if local, state, and federal policies can be used to help achieve desired outcomes or if they are they hindering the efforts of the foundation and institution. If a hindrance is detected, a discussion of current policies is conducted to determine whether or not those policies need to be altered or eliminated. Once those determinations have been reached, a plan for persistence must be implemented. Planning would involve the development of a time line for achieving incremental progress toward goal attainment and for both parties to understand that systemic change occurs over time.

Innovation and constant learning consist of the documentation of incremental measures toward achieving the goal. This includes reflecting on the effectiveness of the practices, decisions, or habits of the organization and foundation and adjusting accordingly when desired outcomes are not being met; gathering and analyzing data; and
making that data accessible to the public. In some cases, this type of transparency may also lead to shifts in public policy that occur when corporate philanthropies use their influence with state and federal lawmakers.

**Lobbying**

The most effective example of lobbying is illustrated through ALEC, a national, nonprofit, bipartisan organization of elected state legislators (Walker, 2012). Its mission is to advance the fundamental principles of free-market enterprise, limited government, and federalism at the state level through a nonpartisan public-private partnership of America’s state legislators, members of the private sector and the general public. ALEC was originally founded in September 1973 by Henry Hyde, a Republican from Illinois; Paul Weyrich, a conservative activist; and Lou Barnett. The original members included a handful of elected officials, including state legislators, governors, and members of Congress. By the early 1980s, ALEC task forces had originated, and in 1981 the Task Force on Federalism convened. Task force recommendations relied heavily on testimony from other ALEC members. Under these conditions, working relationships were forged and led to the inception of other ALEC task forces. Initially called cabinet task forces, these committees worked in conjunction with the presidential “administration on policy development issues” (ALEC, 2013). As a result, more than 10,000 copies of *Reagan and the States* were disseminated to serve as guidelines for decentralizing responsibilities of the federal government to state level.

A task force on education policy was commenced in response to *A Nation at Risk* in 1983. The response consisted of a two-part report on education and blamed the perceived academic deterioration on “centralization, declining values, and an increasingly liberal social agenda” (ALEC, 2013). It offered what were considered at the time
unorthodox solutions by way of a voucher system, merit pay, and higher academic and behavioral standards. As a result of the widespread success of education policy, the task forces expanded in 1986 to explore other areas of need to “develop policy covering virtually every responsibility of state government” (ALEC, 2013). Almost a dozen additional task forces had been established within a year; 1988 marked ALEC’s evolution from a “clearinghouse of ideas submitted” by members to “freestanding think tank and model bill movers” (ALEC, 2013). For the better part of the last two decades, ALEC has actively sought to include players from private-sector corporations in accordance with its long-held ideal that “the private sector should be an ally rather than an adversary in developing sound public policy” (ALEC, 2013).

This partnership has produced hundreds of pieces of model legislation on a variety of policy issues. Arizona governor Jan Brewer, a former ALEC member, estimated that more than half of all federal legislators were ALEC members (Celock, 2012). It is also estimated that 1,000 model bills are annually introduced in some form to various state legislatures; of that number, approximately 20% are passed into law (Celock, 2012).

Although ALEC does not consider itself a lobbying organization because of its nonprofit status, many argue that its operations evoke many qualities unique to a lobbying organization, in that it provides some of the most powerful American businesses with an opportunity to covertly discuss, draft, and introduce state legislation with elected officials. ALEC’s corporate members help draft the bill. Then ALEC legislators introduce the bill in their respective state house or senate, and the members vote to pass it. This process empowers corporate members to receive public funds for rendered services, not only in education but also across a wide variety of industries (Walker,
Representative Mark Pocan of Wisconsin calls this practice “profit-driven legislation,” warning that ALEC is attempting to consolidate the federal government and “remake America, changing its laws, one state at a time” (Celock, 2012). Like Pocan, many lawmakers and advocates share these concerns (Celock, 2012).

In 2011 an ALEC informant who was able to reveal a collection of model bills drafted by ALEC, approached Lisa Graves, a former Justice Department attorney. At that time, she was provided access to more than 850 bills compiled by members of ALEC to be introduced to various state legislatures, all of which had been written to consider, and in some cases promulgate, corporate agendas. In 2011 the membership consisted of hundreds of American and foreign corporations, most notably Coca-Cola, Koch Industries, Exxon Mobil, Pfizer, Wal-Mart, scores of right-wing think tanks, nearly two dozen corporate law and lobbying firms, and approximately 1,000 state legislators (the majority of whom were Republican; Walker, 2012). Wisconsin journalist, John Nichols, in the Public Broadcasting Service documentary United States of ALEC, told Bill Moyers that when big business wants to heavily influence American politics, it does not stop at making contributions to presidential or congressional campaigns (Public Affairs Television Inc., Roy, Doctoroff O’Neill, Davidson Moyers, & Walker, 2012). “The smart players put their money in the states . . . and so the smart donors can change the whole country without ever going to Washington, without ever having to go through a Congressional hearing, without ever having to lobby on Capitol Hill, without ever having to talk to a President” (Walker, 2012).

Steve Farley, a democratic representative from Arizona, did not admonish big business for being heavily involved in the political process but was vocally critical of underhanded involvement encouraged by ALEC:
Corporations have the right to present their arguments, but they don’t have the right to do it secretly. They don’t have the right to lobby people and not register as lobbyists. They don’t have the right to take people away on trips, convince them of it, send them back here and nobody has seen what’s gone on and how that legislator had gotten that idea and where it is coming from. (Celock, 2012).

As a result of the widespread notoriety ALEC received in 2011, Farley proposed the ALEC Accountability Act, which would redefine ALEC as a lobbying organization, forcing it to disclose its sources of funding (Celock, 2012). As of January 2013, the Arizona Senate conducted its second reading of the proposed legislation. Since then, New York, New Hampshire, and Wisconsin have also introduced Farley’s model legislation. Furthermore, petitions have been made to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) in an effort to reverse ALEC’s tax-exempt status by watchdog groups including Common Cause and ALEC Exposed, and more notably by Marcus Owens, former chief of the IRS division in charge of tax exemptions (“Partisanship Disguised as Charity,” 2012).

ALEC has also amassed adversaries within the sphere of public education. Its model legislation has heavily supported privatization, school choice, and the dismantling of teachers unions. Wisconsin is among one of the states most directly affected by ALEC’s model education legislation. For example, the Special Needs Scholarship Program Act, proposed in Wisconsin by members of ALEC, was widely criticized by the Wisconsin Department of Instruction as being a bill that limits special education students’ due process rights and rights to services. Furthermore, the bill promotes the segregation of students based on disability and depletes funding in certain districts: “It will result in the largest expansion of private school regulation ever seen in Wisconsin and, at the end of the day, no one will have any data to show if it resulted in a better education” (Celock, 2012).
Other model legislation supports the voucher strategy and requires tax subsidies for private, for-profit schools. Privatization of schools at taxpayers’ expense has been a top priority of ALEC for over 20 years. It was recently expanded in Wisconsin by governor Scott Walker to eliminate a cap on participation, which increased eligibility to include those living 300% above federal poverty line (Expansion of Parental Choice Program for Eligible School Districts, 2013). The Parent Choice Scholarship Program; Act 1, 2, 3; the Great Schools Tax Credit Program Act; the Family Education Tax Credit Program Act; and the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program all provide tax credits to parents who send their children to private schools and require funds to follow students to unregulated private schools. The Charter Schools Act and Charter School Reform Bill remove charter school authorization from local school boards and award it to a state advisory committee exclusively appointed by the governor (Komer, 2007).

The Special Needs Scholarship Program Act and the Autism Scholarship Program Act are both noncompliant with portions of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Specifically, these model bills allow for homogenous groupings of students with special needs. Moreover, they allow private schools to refuse entry to students with special needs, who drive down the standardized test scores of public schools while inflating the scores of private schools (Underwood & Mead, 2012).

The Alternative Certification Act and the National Teacher Certification Fairness Act weaken the profession by allowing individuals with no professional training, background, or education to obtain a state teaching certificate. The Great Teachers and Leaders Act eliminates tenure for teachers and school administrators. The School Collective Bargaining Agreement Sunshine Act, the Public School Employee Union
Release Time Act, and the Teachers’ Rights to Know Act destabilize already existing teachers unions (Underwood & Mead, 2012).

The Bill for Establishment of Virtual Schools makes private providers eligible to receive public funds for online education. Two companies that stand to benefit from the passage of this type of legislation are the Connections Academy and K12; both were members of the ALEC Education Task Force in 2011, which helped draft the bill. In fact, a similar version of the bill passed in Tennessee in May 2011, and within weeks, the Tennessee Virtual Academy (TNVA) was awarded a no-bid contract to provide online education services to any student enrolled in Grades K–8. As of 2013, the TNVA enrolled 3,000 students (Bennett-Smith, 2013)

In an effort to counterbalance ALEC’s influence, Joel Rogers, professor of law, political science, and public affairs and director of the Center on Wisconsin Strategy (COWS) conceived the American Legislative and Issue Campaign Exchange (ALICE). The goal of ALICE is “to create a public library of model progressive laws for state and local government, including aids to their effective communication” by way of talking points, examples of circumstances under which similar law has already passed, and evidence of their long and short-term effects (ALICE, 2013).

Reauthorizations of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

The publication of A Nation at Risk (Gardner, 1983), in conjunction with the economic trends of the last three decades, has greatly impacted revisions made to the ESEA (A Blueprint for Reform, 2010). According to Ravitch (2010), in 1965, when ESEA was passed by the Johnson administration, the federal government had purported to “subsidize education of the neediest students, enforce civil rights, conduct research, gather information, and subside college costs” (A Blueprint for Reform, 2010, pp. 246–
Under the administrations of George W. Bush and Barack Obama, Congress’s passage of NCLB (2001) and Race to the Top (2010) overshadowed these objectives through accountability mandates that required drastic reforms and imposed “harsh punishments for failure to comply or to succeed” (A Blueprint for Reform, 2010, p. 247)—both widely accepted practices in the corporate sector.

Standerfer (2006) provided a succinct history of ESEA and offered suggestions that she believed would reduce the achievement gap evident between economically disadvantaged students and their more affluent counterparts. Despite ESEA’s initial efforts to remedy this issue, closing the achievement gap and preparing American students for college and career readiness remains the central focus of the proposed modifications to Obama’s ESEA reauthorization (A Blueprint for Reform, 2010). This ongoing pursuit to close the achievement gap can be attributed to two major factors: (a) the ever-increasing diversification the American student population—specifically, the increased number of English language learners and the increased frequency with which students with special needs are being identified and serviced—and (b) the growing economic stratification of the American class system as evidenced by the reduction of the middle class during the period being examined (1983 to the present day; Stiglitz, 2012; Tienken, 2010). In light of these factors, one cannot help but question (a) whether this decline in the performance of American students does in fact exist or is perceived and (b) if it does exist, whether legitimate reforms to education policy (that is, those which are in the best interest of students) stand to benefit or hurt the interests of big business.

The 1980s is identified as a decisive turning point in the educational reform movement because of the urgency created by the publication of A Nation at Risk (Gardner, 1983). Ironically, from 1980 to 1985, the NCES showed that federal funding
to elementary and secondary education was cut by 21% (Standerfer, 2006). In the mid-1980s, U.S. secretary of education William J. Bennett commissioned the Alexander-James study group to offer recommendations on how NAEP testing could be utilized to draw comparative data between states’ results, thereby increasing school accountability (Standerfer, 2006).

While the Alexander-James study group compiled their findings, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act (Public Law 105-332) was passed in 1984 in an effort to increase the quality of vocational-technical education in the United States. It was reauthorized in 1998 and again in 2006 as the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act (Public Law 109-270). It had seven primary areas of focus: (a) to develop rigorous academic and technical standards that will better prepare students for “high skill, high wage, or high demand occupations in current or emerging professions”; (b) to bridge secondary and postsecondary technical education programs; (c) to increase state and local flexibility to provide services that will improve career and technical education programs; (d) to conduct, collect, and distribute data that will identify best practices in career and technical education; (e) to provide support mechanisms that promote leadership at the state and local levels and improve the overall quality of educators in the area of career and technical education; (f) to foster frequent and ongoing communication among various stakeholders including secondary and postsecondary institutions, local businesses, and workforce investment boards; and (g) to provide opportunities for ongoing professional development in an effort to “develop . . . the knowledge and skills needed to keep the United States competitive” (§ 250, pp. 3-4).

In that same year, the Emergency Immigrant Education Program was added to the ESEA to provide services and to offset the costs for school districts with large numbers
of immigrant students. Capps et al. (2005) identified first- and second-generation immigrant students as the fastest-growing population in United States public schools, a trend that was exceedingly apparent to policymakers and school officials in the early 1980s. According to Chu (2009), this program was intended to assist local school districts in providing high-quality instruction to immigrant children who have been in the United States for less than 3 years. The services offered through this program would also provide rigorous college and career readiness skills that would serve to ease their transition to American society and eventually to the workforce (Schwartz & Stiefel, 2004; Smith-Davis, 2004). Original elements of the Emergency Immigrant Education Program were eventually included in Title III of NCLB (§3001).

In 1989 the NGA Center held an education summit. The George H. W. Bush administration publicly expressed its support for the drafting of content standards at the national level for each core subject area. This initiative was continued by the Clinton administration in the 1990s with the Goals 2000 legislation and the reauthorization of ESEA as the Improving America’s Schools Act, which required state departments of education to draft content standards in core areas that would eventually be tested.

In 2001 George W. Bush, along with Congress, reauthorized the ESEA through NCLB. NCLB heightened school accountability in that it required students to demonstrate proficiency in state academic standards through a state-mandated assessment (Title VI, §601). The legislation required each state to have a system by which student progress could be measured and disaggregated (§3123). Furthermore, schools were to demonstrate AYP toward having all students, regardless of special needs, meet proficiency on the state academic standards by the 2013–2014 school year (§1503; Ravitch, 2010). Teacher-quality standards were also added to the legislation (§1119).
Prior to the reauthorization, these standards had been controlled through state-level accreditation agencies. States were required to report the progress their schools were making toward meeting federal mandates for AYP and employing highly qualified teachers. As of 2013, each district within each respective state issued a school report card to disseminate the required data to the general public. Severe consequences resulted for schools that did not meet these standards (Title IV, §501).

In retrospect, opponents of NCLB argued that one major flaw of the legislation concerned the lack of uniformity with regard to the testing implementation. Because the responsibility for drafting content standards and corresponding assessments of those standards was left to each respective state department of education, it was virtually impossible to compare student progress across state boundaries. C. Gage Kingsbury of the Northwest Evaluation Association told the New York Times,

states that set proficiency standards prior to the passage of NCLB tended to set high standards, thinking that “we needed to be competitive with nations like Hong Kong and Singapore. But our research shows that since NCLB took effect, states have set lower standards.” (Dillon, 2005)

Furthermore, The Proficiency Illusion, a study compiled by the Fordham Institute and the Northwest Evaluation Association, found that the definition of “proficiency” widely varied from state to state (Finn & Petrilli, 2007). Researchers compiled a computerized assessment used by 26 states and found that passing scores ranged from the “6th percentile to the 77th” (Finn & Petrilli, 2007, p. 2). States with the lowest expectations for proficiency were Colorado, Wisconsin, Michigan, New Jersey, Delaware, North Dakota, Illinois, and Ohio (Finn & Petrilli, 2007). Finn and Petrilli concluded that high-stakes testing across states is highly unreliable: “It’s not just that results vary, but that
they vary almost randomly, erratically, from place . . . grade . . . and year in ways that have little . . . to do with true differences in pupil achievement” (p. 3).

During the 2008 presidential campaign, the Broad and Gates Foundations, in conjunction with other well-known philanthropies, contributed $60 million in an effort to make education reform a national issue. Auxiliary issues included the development of national standards, a longer school day, and merit pay (Herszenhorn, 2007). When Obama was elected in 2008, he quickly named Duncan secretary of education. Ravitch (2010) reported that Duncan, as superintendent of the Chicago Public Schools, had solicited substantial investments from both the Broad and Gates Foundations. As secretary of education, he appointed a high-level official from the Gates Foundation as his chief of staff and entrusted a former Gates program officer with a $650 million budget for the Invest in What Works Fund. In the wake of the 2008 economic crisis, Congress entrusted Duncan with $100 billion from the American Recovery Reinvestment Act to assist affected school districts. Over $4.3 billion was earmarked for reform efforts that came to be known as Race to the Top funds. Duncan gave control over the funds to Joanne S. Weiss, an educational entrepreneur and chief operating officer of the NewSchools Venture Fund, a venture philanthropy that works to reform public education by “supporting education entrepreneurs and connecting their work to systems change” (Ravitch, 2010, p. 218).

According to the program description issued by the U.S. Department of Education, in order to be eligible to receive funds, states must expand reforms in four specific ways: (a) adopt standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy; (b) build data systems that measure student growth and success, and inform teachers and principals about how
they can improve instruction; (c) recruit, develop, reward, and retain effective teachers and principals, especially where they are needed most; and (d) turn around the lowest-achieving schools (U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

Some critics of the Race to the Top program alleged that the nuances of the eligibility requirements had been unsubstantiated by research (Petrilli, 2009; Ravitch, 2010). In his blog, Petrilli (2009) stated, “It’s as if a bunch of do-gooders sat together at the NewSchools Venture Fund summit and brainstormed a list of popular reform ideas, and are now going to force them upon the states.” This was an event that served to highlight how venture philanthropies had successfully used their leverage to influence education policy at the national level.

**National Curriculum**

On June 1, 2009, the CCSSO (2010), in conjunction with the NGA Center, issued a press release stating that the CCSS, which are “(1) research and evidence-based, (2) aligned with college and work expectations, (3) rigorous, and (4) internationally benchmarked,” had been embraced by 49 states and territories (Tienken, 2010). That number has since declined to 45 states and territories (National Governors Association Center, 2013). To date, the CCSS only addresses the content areas of ELA and mathematics in Grades K–12, but it is expected that the CCSS will eventually be expanded to also address the content areas of social studies and science (C. Richardson & Eddy, 2011).

Developers of the CCSS maintain that consistently high standards across state boundaries will provide teachers, parents, and students with clear academic expectations that are aligned to college and career readiness. Further, the CCSS will effectuate equity by ensuring all students, regardless of geographic location, are sufficiently equipped with
the skills and knowledge needed to match the skills of foreign and domestic competitors. Unlike previous standards, which were unique to each state, the CCSS promote collaboration between states on a range of tools and policies, many of which provide inroads to new educational markets. These consist of (a) the development of textbooks, digital media, and other teaching materials aligned to the standards; (b) the development and implementation of common comprehensive assessment systems to measure student performance annually and replace existing state testing systems; and (c) changes or assistive devices needed to help support educators and schools in teaching to the new standards.

In noting the relationship that exists between organizations involved in drafting the CCSS and their funders, Dillon (2011) reported that from 2005 to 2009, the Gates Foundation increased advocacy endowments to $78 million per year and the organization had planned to increase that annual contribution to $100 million from 2010 to 2015. Ravitch (2010) concluded, “That kind of money buys lots of advocacy and support. Gates funded groups that wrote the Common Core standards, the groups that evaluated them, and the groups that advocated for them” (p. 277). Such conditions may suggest that these organizations operate with a limited willingness to provide a transparent account of their work. As a result, the accountability measures of the Race to the Top program have served to narrow the curriculum to two major content areas: ELA and mathematics. This is a practice that Lynne Munson, president and executive director of the Common Core, says is counter to that of the highest-performing nations in the world (Common Core, 2009).

Typically, nations that outperform the United States on the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) “provide their students with a comprehensive,
content-rich education in the liberal arts and sciences” (Common Core, 2009, p. iii). Although these nations take a wide variety of approaches to educating their students (e.g., some use a nationalized curriculum and tests, some do not use tests, etc.), what they have in common is a commitment to providing a meaningful course of study across a wide variety of content areas. While Munson does not deny the “curriculum narrowing” that has resulted from high-stakes testing mandated by NCLB, she does concede on behalf of the Common Core that “the content of a student’s education has a greater influence on his level of achievement than does delivery or accountability systems” (Common Core, 2009, p. v). Ironically, education reforms, as evidenced in the reauthorizations of ESEA, reflect business models that support staunch measures of accountability. These measures create circumstances by which corporate philanthropies exert their influence over policy in an effort to serve private-sector interests and potentially at the expense of students who are enrolled in American public schools.
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

Chapter 3 contains the research methodology that will be used to investigate the social ramifications of allowing education policy to be driven by the economic needs of the corporate sector. In other words, one may speculate that the current education policy promulgated by a nationalized curriculum better serves the interests of big business than those of American students. This chapter is organized into six sections: (a) an overview of the research design, (b) the participants, (c) the data collection procedures, (d) informed consent, (e) the instrumentation, and (f) the data analysis plan.

Research Design

The release of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 precipitated a perceived decline in student academic achievement when compared to that of other industrialized countries. This widely pervasive perception further resulted in the perceived decline of American dominance in the global marketplace. Consequently, corporations have been wielding their power and wealth through the establishment of corporate philanthropies to influence education policy. This practice has systemically targeted the areas of standardization and accountability, two major operating principals of the corporate sector (Ravitch, 2010). Corporate influence, by way of philanthropic enterprises, has resulted in the development of a national curriculum, or the standardization of what is taught, by way of the CCSS (Mehta & American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 2012; Petrilli, 2009; Ramdas, 2011), and accountability measures by way of teacher and principal evaluations and student growth outcomes (Samuels, 2012; Strickland, 2009). The involvement of corporate philanthropies in the shaping of education policy has presumed to ensure that college and career readiness skills are being instilled in American students while simultaneously initiating vast revenue-generating opportunities created by
standardization and accountability dictates mandated by subsequent versions of the ESEA.

The NCLB and Race to the Top legislation have embraced standardization and accountability practices that have served to expand educational markets on a national scale, affording corporations unprecedented opportunities for expansion and economic growth while simultaneously narrowing the curriculum to place emphasis on the tested content areas (Ravitch, 2010). This economic growth, in large part, is being subsidized by funds from federal legislation, which to some degree have been shaped by corporate philanthropies. The dynamics of this situation have led this researcher to investigate how the movement to adopt the CCSS has benefited the corporate sector from 1983 to 2010.

The theoretical framework of this study will aim to examine how the principles of monocratic bureaucracy, transformational leadership, and self-actualization are all affected by corporate philanthropic practices that strive to influence education policy. Monocratic bureaucracy, as developed by Weber, is the most widely accepted organizational concept practiced by corporations. Corporations, through their corporate philanthropies, have successfully sought to superimpose this concept, which heavily relies on standardization and accountability measures, on the education profession (Lorenzi & Hilton, 2011; Mehta & American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research, 2012). However, a wide body of research has shown these measures of standardization and accountability to have negative affects on student achievement and teacher effectiveness (Ohmann, 2012). Standardization and standardized accountability stymie efforts of transformational leadership in education, which results in curriculum narrowing, a practice that is in stark contrast to self-actualizing practices that serve to develop college and career readiness.
The purpose of this study was threefold: (a) to investigate changes in language of corporate philanthropic mission statements from 1983 to 2010, (b) to investigate changes in language made to reauthorization of the ESEA from 1983 to 2010, and (c) to investigate market patterns in the area of student, teacher, and principal accountability systems from 1983 to 2010.

A mixed-methods approach was used to investigate the research questions. In an effort to explore possible answers to these questions, historical and qualitative data were collected. The four generally accepted methods for the collection of historical data consist of primary sources, secondary sources, running records, and recollections. For the purpose of this study, several primary source documents—particularly, government reports, legislation, and newspaper articles—were examined. Secondary sources such as peer-reviewed publications, which offer analyses of the aforementioned primary sources, were scrutinized. Running records—specifically, the 990-PD forms for the corporate philanthropies in question and the quarterly earnings of companies offering accountability solutions in the education market—were examined. Recollections, such as autobiographies or memoirs of noteworthy individuals who participated in the drafting of legislation or the CCSS will also be examined.

According to Schutt (2011), there are four specific stages involved in conducting qualitative comparative historical data. The first step involves the identification of the purpose for the study. As previously mentioned, this study investigated how corporate ambitions consequently result in the expansion of government, the advancement of a nationalized curriculum whose primary concern is with developing “college and career readiness” skills (National Governors Association Center, 2009), and the establishment of new industries driven by the demands of a market associated with a national curriculum.
The second step requires the researcher to identify the location of the study. For this study, the location was the United States from 1983 to 2010. Third, using what Skocpol (1984) coined as “interpretive historical sociology,” the researcher attempted first to identify whether or not parallels or trends may be discerned between the language of the philanthropic mission statements or the changes in those mission statements from 1983 to 2010 and the changes in the legislative language of the reauthorizations of the ESEA from 1983 to 2010. Second, the researcher coded personal interviews conducted with members from various government agencies with regard to their involvement in the drafting of the CCSS. Third, the researcher coded data from running records to chart the corporate philanthropies that have supported the agencies involved with the drafting of the CCSS. Fourth, the researcher identified the number of for-profit companies that marketed and sold products having to do with accountability systems in education for the 3 years before and 3 years after the movement to adopt the CCSS (2007–2013). Finally, the researcher profiled the highest-grossing company, charting its quarterly growth from 2007 to 2013.

**Participants**

Individuals from various agencies were interviewed. These agencies included the NGA, CCSSO, ALEC, National Council of State Legislatures (NCSL), and the New Jersey Office of Legislative Issues. The selection of these agencies was determined by their active involvement in the development of legislative proposals related to education reform and the drafting of the CCSS. The NGA (2013) is a bipartisan organization of governors that collectively works to share best practices on matters of state and national policy. The CCSSO (2013) is a bipartisan, nonprofit organization comprising the education leaders from each state. These members work collectively to share best
practices in education and leverage their influence to drive policies that will “produce students ready to succeed as productive members of society.” ALEC is a national, nonprofit, bipartisan organization of elected state legislators. Its mission is to advance the fundamental principles of free-market enterprise, limited government, and federalism at the state level through a nonpartisan public-private partnership of America’s state legislators, members of the private sector, and the general public (Walker, 2012). The NCSL is a bipartisan agency that serves the legislators and staffs of each respective state, commonwealth, and territory in the United States. This organization affords policy makers with opportunities to share legislative ideology on a wide variety of issues affecting each state, commonwealth, or territory (NCSL, 2013). The New Jersey Office of Legislative Services is an agency established by New Jersey state law to provide confidential, professional, and nonpartisan support services to the Legislature and its staff members (New Jersey Legislature, 2013).

Data Collection Procedures

With regard to the first research question (How has big business used its influence to impact education reform policy in the United States from 1983 to 2010?), the researcher used a time line to chart and compare mission statements of two traditional philanthropies—the Carnegie Foundation and the Ford Foundation—and two new age philanthropies—specifically, the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. The researcher then used the other side of the time line to chart changes in language, specifically focusing on accountability measures, from the ESEA, NCLB, and Race to the Top laws.

Once these changes in language were charted, the researcher attempted to identify if parallels existed between (a) the language of the mission statements and changes in
mission statements from 1983 to 2010 and (b) the changes in the respective legislative language from 1983 to 2010. Stafford (2009) cited wide body of research that showed that construct variables—in this case, mission statement language and legislative language—may “capture the level of designated time allocations and responses for the purpose of understanding behavior in the context of a model” (Stafford, 2009, p. 69). For the purpose of this study, the behavior that the researcher attempted to better understand was how education reform policies, which have been heavily influenced by corporate philanthropies, have benefitted big business in the United States from 1983 to 2010.

Furthermore, Stafford (2009) suggested that time data can give rise to “synergistic models using economics and other disciplines” (p. 69) to construct a broader perspective with regard to evaluating patterns over a specific period. This method is best exemplified through the work of the American Time Use Survey, conducted by the U.S. Department of Labor, to collect representative estimates of how, where, and with whom Americans spend their time. These data have been used to inform studies published in a wide variety of peer-reviewed publications and global organizations, including the United Nations Development Programme’s Human Development Report 2010, the United Nations Gender Statistics Database, and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development’s Society at a Glance: OECD Social Indicators 2011 (Stafford, 2009).

According to Street and Ward (2011), time becomes a significant variable within a study’s design when other variables are altered with regard to the passage of time. In other words, when a study suggests that its participants have changed between two points in time, the time variable takes on different values. “Frameworks, theories, or suppositions involved in the research treat time as a variable that has a theoretical effect, as yet unproven, on something of interest in the study” (Street & Ward, 2011, p. 162). In
their review of the literature, Street and Ward detailed a 2001 study by Sabherwal et al. that suggested that time affects the degree to which normal, day-to-day operational practices can be fully resumed in the wake of a large-scale organizational change. A 2003 study conducted by Sarkar and Lee suggested that time may effect an individual’s ability to lead, facilitate transparent communication, and provide perceived equality among team members when attempting to successfully implement strategic planning models in the business sector (Street & Ward, 2011). Each of these studies treated time as an independent variable.

Another concern raised by Street and Ward (2011) with regard to the collection of time line data in a longitudinal study speaks to validity and reliability. Their study identified three forms of validity and one form of reliability: time unit validity, time boundary validity, time period validity, and longitudinal reliability. Time unit validity addresses partitioning the period in question (e.g., weeks, months, years, etc.). Time boundary validity attends to the duration of the period that will be examined. Time period validity focuses attention on a specific period or periods within that duration. Longitudinal reliability deals with establishing whether or not another researcher would have appropriated the same events according to the prescribed framework.

To address the second research question (What stakeholder considerations were taken into account for the drafting of the CCSS, the researcher conducted personal interviews with members from various agencies who were actively involved with the development of legislative proposals related to education reform and the drafting of the CCSS. These agencies include the NGA, CCSSO, ALEC, NCSL, and New Jersey Office of Legislative Services. The researcher attempted to schedule interviews to be conducted preferably in person or over the telephone.
Creswell (2012) suggested models for interviewing based on the work of other researchers such as Kvale and Brinkman, and Rubin and Rubin. First, it was recommended that the interviewer decide on research questions (see Appendix A) that are open-ended and lend themselves to elaboration. Before commencing any interview, it is necessary for the researcher to obtain informed consent. This step may be executed with a letter requesting an interview from the selected subject. Within the body of the letter, the researcher states the purpose of the study, indicates the approximate time needed to complete the interview, requests permission to audio record the interview, discusses how findings will be used, and offers a copy of the abstract or completed report. The subject’s signature of this letter serves as proof of informed consent, which must be obtained in compliance with IRB protocol. During the interview, the researcher maintains the procedure by adhering to the scripted questions, staying within the allotted time, remaining courteous and respectful regardless of the subject’s responses, maintaining objectivity, and maintaining shorthand notes and audio recording, if allowed, in the event the audio should malfunction.

An examination of records was performed in order to address the third research question (In what ways was the business community involved in this process?). The researcher sifted through the archives of the Foundation Library, located in New York City, in an effort to obtain 990-PF tax documents. The data from these documents was entered into a spreadsheet to help the researcher identify the degree to which the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation have supported the agencies involved in the drafting of the CCSS—specifically, the NGA and the CCSSO. These data were examined alongside the responses of the interview subjects from the aforementioned agencies. The researcher attempted to identify if any patterns exist
between the amount of money donated to the agency in question and their degree of involvement with respect to the drafting of the CCSS.

The fourth and fifth research questions asked, in what ways does a national curriculum influence the growth market having to do with accountability systems in education? and how do education reform policies, which are impacted by economic realities, benefit big business in the United States? In an effort to address these questions, an examination of descriptive statistics was used to identify the number of for-profit companies that market and sell products having to do with accountability systems in education for 3 years before (2007–2009) and 3 years after (2011–2013) the movement to adopt the CCSS. The researcher then followed up by profiling the highest-grossing company. An examination of that company’s quarterly growth from 2007 to 2013 was charted and examined in conjunction with timeline charting the language from the corporate philanthropies’ mission statements from 1983 to 2010 and the changes to legislative language in the reauthorizations of the ESEA from 1983 to 2010.

Informed Consent

In an effort to address the second research question of this study (What stakeholder considerations were taken into account for the drafting of the CCSS?), the researcher aimed to conduct a minimum of five interviews, at least one with a representative from each agency, with individuals who may have been directly or indirectly involved in the drafting of the CCSS. Involvement was constituted as direct if the participant was a member of a committee that drafted language for the CCSS in ELA or mathematics or indirect if the participant was working for an individual or organization that was directly involved in the drafting of the CCSS in ELA or mathematics.
The ethical considerations that were made pertained to (a) the researcher adhering to the guidelines established by the IRB and (b) maintaining the confidentiality of the participants who agree to be interviewed. To certify that the researcher fully understood the ethical nuances with regard to executing human subject research, she carefully reviewed the guidelines set forth by the IRB and passed the examination of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). To address the second ethical consideration, individuals who were asked to participate in the study received and acknowledged the terms of the Saint Peter’s University Informed Consent Form for Participation in a Research Study (see Appendix B).

Once informed consent was granted, the researcher scheduled an appointment for the interview to be conducted either in person or over the phone. The anticipated duration of the interview was approximately 20 minutes. The identity of the participants remained strictly confidential, and any identifying features of their responses were removed. The researcher audio recorded participants’ responses so that they might be further analyzed after the interview was completed. All written notes and recordings were safely stored using a password-protected Web-based storage site. These notes and recordings will be promptly destroyed upon the completion of the study.

**Instrumentation**

The standardized instrument used to gather information from participants will be a qualitative interview consisting of nine retrospective items (Appendix A). An interview guide approach in which participants will be asked to provide their perspective with regard to the following specific areas: the responsibilities of their position; their professional relationship(s) with the agency(ies) and/or corporations involved in the drafting of the CCSS; and the considerations taken into account by the various
stakeholders involved in the drafting process. Participants will be provided with a list of the items to review prior to the scheduled interview. The researcher plans to ask the questions in the order in which they appear in Appendix A, using probes when necessary, in an effort to clarify or expand upon a participant’s response (University of Michigan, 1976).

In constructing the interview items, the researcher adhered to the Principals of Questionnaire Construction, which apply to the collection of qualitative data (Johnson and Christenson, 2012, p. 163-184). The questions that will be used were written to glean insight to the second research question: what stakeholder considerations were taken into account for the drafting of the CCSS? Each of the questions are clearly written, use natural and familiar language, and are versatile enough to be applied to the wide professional experiences that participants may have had while employed at various government agencies being investigated (e.g. The National Governor’s Association, The CCSSO, ALEC, NCSL, and The New Jersey Office of Legislative Services).

Data Analysis

This historical study will aim to construct a clearer understanding as to how corporations have used their influence to drive education policy in the United States from 1983 to 2010. Awareness of these practices may provide educational leaders and policy makers with a broader understanding of: the educational policies that have harmed American students; and measures that may be taken for constructing future educational policies that serve to deliver American students with the highest standard of education in the world, thus enhancing American ingenuity and competitiveness in the global market economy.
In an attempt to analyze the data collected for each of the study’s research questions, the researcher will use the Web-based, mixed-methods data collection tool, Dedoose. To address the first research question (How has big business used its influence to impact education reform policy in the United States from 1983 to 2010?), Dedoose allowed the researcher to import text of the reauthorizations of ESEA from 1983 to 2010—specifically, changes in legislative language made from ESEA to NCLB to Race to the Top. The researcher followed the same procedure to examine changes in language made to the various mission statements of the traditional philanthropies—namely, the Carnegie Foundation and the Ford Foundation—and the new age philanthropies—specifically, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation. The changes to the legislative language and mission statement language were examined along a time line continuum. The researcher carefully read through the legislative and mission statement documents to discern themes specific but not limited to the areas of funding, accountability, and standardization. She then appropriately coded the documents using themes. The coding was then examined to identify if any observable patterns could be charted as changes to the language used in the legislative documents and juxtaposed with the changes made to the mission statements of the corporate philanthropies from 1983 to 2010.

For the second research question (What stakeholder considerations were taken into account for the drafting of the CCSS?), the researcher used Dedoose to import transcribed responses and written notes from the interviews conducted with individuals from the following agencies: NGA, CCSSO, ALEC, NCSL, and the New Jersey Office of Legislative Services. These responses were carefully read. Themes including but not limited to corporate involvement, funding, accountability, and standardization were
coded in an effort to uncover patterns in the relationship that might exist between corporate interests and the drafting of the CCSS.

In an effort to address the third research question (In what ways was the business community involved in this process?), the researcher created a spreadsheet to identify the corporate philanthropies that have made significant monetary contributions to the NGA and the CCSSO in the years leading to the drafting and adoption of the CCSS. The themes of the mission statements of the corporate philanthropies, which made the most significant monetary contributions to the NGA and the CCSSO, were then examined, coded, and juxtaposed in an effort to uncover similarities in the language of their mission statements. This provided insight into what specific measures corporate philanthropies take, either separately or in conjunction with one another, in order to influence education policy.

To answer the fourth and fifth research questions (in what ways does a national curriculum influence the market growth of accountability systems in education? and how do education reform policies, which are impacted by economic realities, benefit big business in the United States?), the researcher engaged in an analysis of descriptive statistics. This quantitative data set used public record data from the Department of Commerce and the NCES to identify the amount of for-profit companies that market and sell products having to do with accountability systems in education for 3 years before and 3 years after the adoption of the CCSS in 2010. In other words, the market growth of these corporations was examined for the fiscal years of 2007 to 2013. The researcher then profiled the highest-grossing company. The researcher intended to triangulate the historical, qualitative, and quantitative data collected in an effort to offer an explanation
as to how and why corporations use their influence to advance a national curriculum policy through the implementation of the CCSS, in the United States.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

Chapter 4 presents the answers to the research questions that were used to investigate the extent to which education policy has been influenced by the economic needs of the corporate sector. As of January 2015, 43 states, the District of Columbia, four territories, and the Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) had voluntarily adopted the CCSS—an initiative promulgated by compliance with Race to the Top mandates to compete for $5 billion in federal grant monies. This widespread compliance not only has necessitated the advent of new business models in education but also has allowed for the fiscal expansion of well-established corporations within the consumer services sector of education. The complications, qualifications, and limitations of the results collected from this qualitative study are presented in accordance with the order of the research questions:

1. How has big business used its influence to impact education reform policy in the United States from 1983 to 2010?

2. What stakeholder considerations were taken into account for the drafting of the Common Core State Standards?

3. In what ways was the business community involved in the drafting of the Common Core State Standards?

4. In what ways does a national curriculum influence the growth or decline of the accountability market in education?

5. How do education reform policies, which are impacted by economic realities, benefit big business in the United States?
Impact of Big Business on Education Reform Policy

In an effort to address the first research question, “How has big business used its influence to impact education reform policy in the United States from 1983 to 2010?” the researcher set out to identify whether or not parallels or trends may be discerned between the changes in the language of the philanthropic mission statements of the selected foundations—the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Ford Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation—from 1983 to 2010 and the changes in language used in the reauthorizations of the ESEA from 1983 to 2010.

These foundations were selected based on their active involvement within the sphere of education reform for the period that this study examined, 1983 to 2010. Mission statements and annual educational agendas for each of these foundations were compiled from their respective annual reports and recorded along a time line continuum. By and large, the annual reports for each of these corporations were made available on their individual websites. The Carnegie Corporation of New York website provided portable document format (PDF) links to their annual reports beginning from 1998. All other annual reports, dating back to 1983, were accessed by visiting the rare books and manuscripts division of the Butler Library located on the campus of Columbia University in New York City. The Ford Foundation maintains its archives at the Rockefeller Archive Center located in Sleepy Hollow, New York. An assistant archivist provided the researcher with a link to the foundation’s Google Docs folder, which houses the Ford Foundation’s annual reports from 1950 to 2011. Because both the Gates Foundation and the Broad Foundation came into existence in 1998 and 1999, respectively, their annual reports were easily accessed from their websites.
Once mission statements and educational agendas for each of the corporate philanthropies were compiled, the researcher then focused on amassing the reauthorizations of landmark education policy passed from 1983 to 2010 by examining the various versions of the ESEA. It is important to note that the original intent of the ESEA of 1967 had been to combat poverty, a top priority of the Johnson administration. In subsequent years, the succeeding reauthorizations of the law proposed to continue this endeavor through the passing of NCLB in 2002 under the Bush administration and again in 2010 as A Blueprint for Reform (2010) under the Obama administration.

In each reauthorization, accountability measures commonly practiced within the corporate sector were heightened. The NCLB intensified school accountability in that it required students to demonstrate proficiency on state academic standards through a state-mandated assessment that measured student proficiency of state-developed content standards in the areas of language arts literacy and mathematics. However, it was A Blueprint for Reform that initially precipitated the adoption of CCSS by 45 states through their voluntary compliance with mandates outlined by the federally sponsored Race to the Top grant in 2010. As of January 2015, that number has since decreased to include 43 states, the District of Columbia, four territories, and the DoDEA. Traditionally, the streamlining of educational policy has fallen outside the constitutional scope of the federal government and was therefore left to the discretion of each state’s department of education. The Race to the Top grant created conditions whereby proficiency standards could be nationalized.

According to the Race to the Top program description issued by the U.S. Department of Education, in order to be eligible to receive funds, states must, in part, expand reforms to adopt standards and assessments that prepare students to succeed in
college and the workplace and to compete in the global economy (Race to the Top Fund, 2010). At the time when the program description had been released, the NGA and the CCSSO had already invested nearly 2 years developing national standards in the content areas of ELA and mathematics, which came to be known as the CCSS. Essentially, the work of developing national standards had already been done for states through the CCSS. In order to be immediately eligible to receive a portion of the $4.3 billion designated to the Race to the Top, the majority of state departments of education, led by a chief state school officer, quickly adopted and implemented the CCSS.

In order to identify the specific changes in the reauthorizations of the ESEA, the researcher used the qualitative research data analysis software program Dedoose. This program enabled the researcher to upload the mission statements and educational agendas of the four selected corporate philanthropies from 1983 to 2010, along with the reauthorized versions of the ESEA—specifically, NCLB and A Blueprint for Reform. An initial reading of these documents prompted the researcher to devise a list of broad themes that were easily apparent. Initially, all codes were “mother codes,” a term Dedoose software used to refer to broad themes within a topic. Subsequent readings of the documents precipitated the development of “child codes,” or subthemes, to further distinguish areas of focus within a common theme. Scott and Howell (2008) described this process as axial coding, a qualitative data method rooted in grounded theory. This process consists of categorizing similar data and assigning a conceptual label for like categories. Once categories have been identified, the researcher attempts to analyze relationships that may exist among and/or between each of the categories.

The axial coding, for the purposes of this study, comprised the following categories: (a) philanthropy, with child codes of advancement, advocacy, civic duty,
knowledge, philanthrocapitalism, and problem-solving; (b) assessment, with child codes of standards alignment, growth models, reliability, and validity; (c) ELA instruction; (d) early childhood education; (e) international competition, with child codes of economic success and education; (f) evaluation, with child codes of principal evaluation, teacher evaluation, and student evaluation; (g) funding, with child codes of scholarships, within the United States, and outside of the United States; (h) policy; (i) corporate involvement, with child codes of influence and leverage; (j) 21st-century skills, with child codes of STEM and college and career readiness; and (k) reform, with child codes of professional development, accountability, choice, privatization, and standardization. Child codes were later added as needed to distinguish the various aspects of each mother code.

In total, the coding of the mission statements for each of the foundations, from 1983 to 2010, yielded 56 excerpts, whereas coding of the educational agendas yielded 54 excerpts for the Carnegie Corporation, 23 excerpts for the Ford Foundation, 35 excerpts for the Gates Foundation, and seven excerpts for the Broad Foundation. The Code Application Chart, generated in Dedoose, provided a list of the frequency with which each code occurred for each media item coded (see Appendix M).

Once all pertinent foundation documents were coded—specifically, the mission statements and educational agendas of the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, the Gates Foundation, and the Broad Foundation from 1983 to 2010—the researcher continued by coding the reauthorizations of the ESEA. The researcher used the Lexis Nexis Database, a Web-based system that provides legal research services, to obtain copies of the ESEA in its entirety. Once downloaded, the legislation amounted to 837 pages of a Microsoft Word document. The sheer size of this document inhibited the efficiency with which the researcher was able to manipulate Dedoose for the purpose of
coding the document. Consequently, the researcher elected to code the ESEA table of contents, which amounted to 37 pages.

This alternative proved beneficial, as it drastically decreased the size of the document, allowing the researcher to efficiently utilize the Dedoose coding features. The first coding feature used was that of the “packed code cloud” (see Appendix G). This display presented the codes in the trademarked Wordle format, whereby the most frequently occurring codes appeared largest in the visual representation. Furthermore, during this process, the researcher was able to drag the mouse over each code to see how frequently this theme has been identified across the multiple documents being examined. The “excerpts” feature of the software allows the researcher to quickly recognize and view the frequency with which excerpts containing independent and overlapping codes had occurred across multiple documents.

Through the process of axial coding, the researcher identified substantial changes in the language of the legislation: (a) Reform is needed to make American students college and career ready and (b) college and career readiness is achievable through standardization of curriculum, high-stakes assessment, and instrumentation used to evaluate teachers and principals. The same coding method was followed to examine the mission statements and educational agendas of each of the corporate foundations that were profiled. Originally, the researcher proposed to examine only foundation mission statements. However, as she probed each foundation’s annual report, she discovered that all but the Broad Foundation documented their contributions within the field of education in great detail. This realization prompted her to use a time line to chart each foundation’s (a) annual accomplishments within education, (b) annual monetary contributions to the NGA, (c) annual monetary contributions to the CCSSO, and (d) annual monetary
contributions to Achieve, Inc., the organization charged with overseeing PARCC, a consortium responsible for the development of student assessments aligned with the CCSS (see Appendix E). Smarter Balanced is the alternate assessment consortium available to states that follow the CCSS. The collection of data associated with this consortium was not included in this study, as this state-led consortium came into existence in 2010 and had no prior dealings with the drafting of the CCSS. Although all four philanthropic foundations are widely known for their interest in improving education, differences between their individual program overviews and educational initiatives became apparent during this process. The following sections present these nuances.

The Carnegie Corporation of New York

The educational agenda of the Carnegie Corporation underwent multiple revisions from 1983 to 2012. From 1983 to 1991, its education agenda spoke of education as it pertained to the areas of science, technology, and the economy. Its three main tenets during this time were to impact (a) improvements of education in science, math, and technology; (b) improvements of access of minority-group members and girls to high-quality education in science, math, and technology; and (c) the use of science and technology in the economy and ways in which society can prepare for change especially through educational reform. In 1989 the last tenet on educational reform had been enhanced to read “educational reform, with special emphasis on improving the caliber of teachers in the nation’s elementary and secondary schools and on improving conditions under which they work” (Carnegie Corporation, 1989, p. 20). It is clear that these initiatives are very much aligned to the imperatives discussed within A Nation at Risk,
specifically with regard to infusing more rigorous instruction that would provide students with workplace readiness skills.

By 1991 less emphasis was being placed on science, math, and technology as suggested by wording used in the program overview: “The Education and Healthy Development of Children and Youth.” In order to achieve this end, the foundation concerned itself with the following three goals: (a) improving the health and development of children from the prenatal period to age 3, (b) improving the educational achievement and reducing the health problems of young adolescents, and (c) supporting selected curriculum projects and dissemination of programs that encourage the study of science and mathematics among minority members and girls (Carnegie Corporation, 1991, p. 28). In 1992, a fourth area on educational reform was added. Page 33 of the 1992 annual report stated that the corporation supported “some aspects of movement for more effective education including changes in the education profession, analysis of various forms of school restructuring, and establishment of linkages between schools and other institutions.” The wording of the program overview once again changed in 1994 to focus on the Education and Healthy Development of Children and Youth in (a) early childhood, (b) early adolescence, (c) science education, and (d) education reform. These areas of focus were condensed in 1999 to three priority areas: (a) early childhood education and care, (b) urban school reform, and (c) higher education. In 2005, “early childhood education and care” was changed to “advancing literacy” and has remained as such.

Table 1 shows the prevalence of the themes as they co-occur within the Carnegie education agendas from 1983 to 2013, the ESEA table of contents, and A Blueprint for Reform. Evaluation as a code occurred three times within the Carnegie Corporation education agenda document. An example of a coded evaluation excerpt is as follows:
Table 1: Coded theme count comparison of the educational agenda of the Carnegie Corporation of New York as compared to ESEA and A Blueprint for Reform

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A Blueprint for Reform</th>
<th>ESEA table of contents</th>
<th>Carnegie Education Agenda 1983–2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3 Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Principal evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Student evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Teacher evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21st-century skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>College and Career Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18 Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3 Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Privatization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7 Standardization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>313</td>
<td>130 121 62 Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

developing innovative teacher compensation models to increase teacher effectiveness and student outcomes; . . . effective state and district practices to improve achievement in high poverty schools; and . . . strengthening the capacity of state education agencies and districts to improve education services for English-language learners in high schools.

The overlapping of codings within the themes of evaluation, 21st-century skills, and reform are suggestive of one of two scenarios. One scenario is from 1983 to 2013, the Carnegie Corporation supported education reform policies outlined in the ESEA and A Blueprint for Reform, specifically by promoting increased awareness of infusing 21st-century skills into daily instruction by way of a standardized curriculum and ensuring this end is met by increasing measures of accountability through the use of principal and
teacher evaluation systems. An alternative scenario may be as follows: From 1983 to 2013, the Carnegie Corporation may have been successfully able to influence education reform policies, which have led to the adoption of a national curriculum in the form of the CCSS, through endowments made to the NGA Center for Best Practices, the CCSSO, and Achieve, Inc. The endowment figures presented in Table 2 may serve to support the latter scenario.

A careful examination of the annual reports of the Carnegie Corporation from 1983 to 2013 show endowments made in the amounts of $7.4 million to the NGA Center for Best Practices, $6.6 million to the CCSSO, and $3 million to Achieve, Inc. These figures are presented in Table 2. In total, endowments made to the three entities responsible for the drafting of the CCSS by the Carnegie Corporation over this 30-year time span amounted to just over $17 million.

Table 2: Endowments made by the Carnegie Corporation of New York to organizations responsible for the development of the CCSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Achieve, Inc.</th>
<th>CCSSO</th>
<th>NGA</th>
<th>Carnegie Corporation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,448,900</td>
<td>450,400</td>
<td>998,500</td>
<td>1983-1987</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,307,891</td>
<td>737,200</td>
<td>2,570,691</td>
<td>1988-1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,300,000</td>
<td>2,850,000</td>
<td>1,450,000</td>
<td>1994-1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,029,000</td>
<td>623,700</td>
<td>1,405,300</td>
<td>2000-2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,981,091</td>
<td>3,013,300</td>
<td>1,982,791</td>
<td>985,000</td>
<td>2006-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>17,066,882</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,013,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,644,091</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,409,491</strong></td>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ford Foundation

From 1983 to 1987, the Ford Foundation’s program overview comprised the following areas of giving: (a) urban poverty, (b) rural poverty and resources, (c) human rights and governance, (d) education and culture, (e) international affairs, (f) population, and (g) special program actions. Initially, the researcher intended to examine only the
areas of giving connected to education and culture. A more careful examination of the annual reports revealed that the Ford Foundation had made several contributions to the NGA and the CCSSO to affect urban poverty, rural poverty and resources, and human rights and governance from 1983 to 1999. A detailed chart of these contributions is provided in Appendix F. It is important to note that while these contributions seem to occur outside the scope of education, many of the contributions are tangibly related to issues that directly impact education. This is best illustrated through grants endowed by the urban poverty program to the NGA Center for Best Practices and CCSSO for nutrition and health studies, welfare and teen pregnancy, and youth employment between 1983 and 1999.

The Ford Foundation slightly altered the wording of these fields so that by 1991 “human rights and governance” had been changed to “governance and public policy,” population had been changed to “reproductive health and population,” and a new field titled “media projects” had been added (Ford Foundation, 1991). Endowments to the NGA Center for Best Practices for educational purposes from 1994 through 1999 were a marginal $150,000 when compared to the previous 5 years of $953,500 and the subsequent 5 years of $1,280,00. No endowments were made to the CCSSO from 1994 through 1999.

The aforementioned fields remained relatively static until 2000, when mission statement language once again changed to “asset building and community development”; “peace and social justice”; and “education, media, arts, and culture.” The latter then changed in 2002 to knowledge, creativity, and freedom. From 2000 to 2009, the Ford Foundation funded the NGA Center for Best Practices initiative on asset building and community development for the purpose of workforce development, a widely recurring
theme as the United States entered the age of accountability in public education. The age of accountability began with the signing of the NCLB, which required states to develop content standards in the areas of language arts literacy and mathematics and to annually assess students’ mastery of those standards in Grades 3 through 8 and once in high school. These measures were intended to bolster high school graduation rates and increase the competency of young adults entering college and the workplace. Examples of excerpts coded as “college and career readiness” are as follows: “urban poverty and youth employment . . . secondary school and employment . . . asset building and community development-workforce building.” Coding data pertaining to the subcode of “College and Career Readiness,” as compiled in Table 3, suggest that either the Ford Foundation has maintained an interest in supporting education policies that promote college and career readiness or, alternatively, it may have attempted to influence the policy-making process so as to make the topic of promoting college and career readiness included within the spectrum of education reform policies that have been ratified from 1983 to 2013.

Endowment figures presented in Table 4 may reinforce the latter hypothesis, revealing that the Ford Foundation funded the CCSSO with $1,111,000 from 2002 through 2011 for the dual purposes of benefiting higher education and scholarship and for transforming secondary education—both critical to developing college and career readiness.

Table 4 presents a careful examination of the annual reports of the Ford Foundation from 1983 to 2013. It shows endowments made by the Ford Foundation in the amounts of $3.2 million to the NGA Center for Best Practices and just over $2 million to the CCSSO. In total, endowments made by the Ford Foundation to the three
Table 3: Coded theme count comparison of the educational agenda of the Ford Foundation as compared to ESEA and *A Blueprint for Reform*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th><em>A Blueprint for Reform</em></th>
<th>ESEA Table of Contents</th>
<th>Ford Educational Agenda 1983-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21st Century Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>College and Career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professional Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Privatization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Standardization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>207</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Endowments made by the Ford Foundation to organizations responsible for the development of the CCSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Achieve, Inc.</th>
<th>CCSSO</th>
<th>NGA</th>
<th>Ford Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,502,500</td>
<td>549,000</td>
<td>953,500</td>
<td>1988-1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>1994-1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,610,000</td>
<td>330,000</td>
<td>1,280,000</td>
<td>2000-2005</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,441,000</td>
<td>841,000</td>
<td>600,000</td>
<td>2006-2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5,285,034</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td><strong>2,070,567</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,214,467</strong></td>
<td>Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 presents a careful examination of the annual reports of the Ford Foundation from 1983 to 2013. It shows endowments made by the Ford Foundation in the amounts of: $3.2 million to the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices; and just over $2 million to the Council of Chief State School Officers. In total, endowments made to the three entities responsible for the drafting of the CCSS over this 30-year time span amounted to just over $5 million (see Appendix E).
From 1983 to 1987, significant portions of contributions made to the NGA Center and the CCSSO was earmarked to combat urban and rural poverty. These projects included “Rural Poverty and Resources: Land and Water Management; Urban Poverty: Nutrition and Health Studies; Urban Poverty: Other; Urban Poverty: Research and Dissemination” (Ford Foundation, 1983; 1984; 1985; 1986; 1987).

In the period from 1988 to 1993, the Ford Foundation continues to fund NGA and CCSSO projects that address poverty, with a focus on welfare and teen pregnancy, and youth employment. No substantial contributions were made to the NGA Center or the CCSSO from 1994 to 1999.

From 2000 to 2005, substantial contributions were made to the NGA Center for the purposes of asset building and community development in the areas of workforce development and human development and reproductive health. During the same time span, contributions were made to the CCSSO to fund projects within the realm of education, knowledge, and religion for the purpose of education reform and higher education and scholarship-arts education partnership.

From 2006 to 2013, the Ford Foundation concentrated its contributions to the NGA Center for the purpose of asset building and community development: workforce development while concentrating its contributions to the CCSSO on the purposes of building education and scholarship and transforming secondary education.

**The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation**

Table 5 presents the co-occurrence of themes coded within the Gates Foundation education agenda, the ESEA, and *A Blueprint for Reform*. Coding data suggested that a high priority of the Gates Foundation was to support and/or aid in the implementation of education reform policies, which standardized instruction and the assessment of 21st-
century skills in an effort to promote college and career readiness; expand instruction of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM); and increase accountability measures in education by way of principal and teacher evaluation directly linked to student achievement on standardized assessments of the national standards developed by the NGA Center for Best Practices, CCSSO, and Achieve, Inc.

Table 5: Coded theme count comparison of the educational agenda of the Gates Foundation as compared to ESEA and *A Blueprint for Reform*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A Blueprint for Reform</th>
<th>ESEA Table of Contents</th>
<th>Gates Educational Agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leverage</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21st Century Skills</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College and Career Readiness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accountability</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privatization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standardization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Giving patterns discerned from the annual reports of the Gates Foundation from 1998 to 2013 suggest that the foundation has been integrally involved in funding projects directly related to the development of the CCSS. During this 15-year period, the Gates Foundation funded the NGA Center for Best Practices with $45,426,651; the CCSSO, with $84,590,012; and Achieve, Inc. with $33,208,822. This amounts to just over $163
million to organizations directly related to the drafting of the CCSS, an initiative whose adoption is directly tied to eligibility requirements for Race to the Top funds.

The most substantial contributions made to the NGA Center for Best Practices were in 2005 for high school redesigns in the amount of $19,596,965. In 2008, $2,127,420 was allocated to assist governors in increasing college and career readiness rates, thereby making American students more internationally competitive. In 2011, $1,293,904 was designated to help policymakers implement the CCSS “to ensure complete execution, as well as rethinking state policies on teacher effectiveness” (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2014).

The most substantial projects led by the CCSSO and funded by the Gates Foundation occurred in 2004 with an endowment made in the amount of $25 million and in 2007 in the amount of $21.6 million. Both were for the purpose of providing states with Web-based data instruments to “strengthen accountability and improve results through data-driven decision making.” Nearly $10 million in 2010 was to “assist with the design of the digital learning initiative, market it to the field, recruit applicants and advisors, and process applicants.” In addition, $9.4 million went to support Next Generation Learning Challenges (NGLC), a technology that strives to customize interactive learning in an effort to bolster college and career readiness, especially for economically disadvantaged students (Next Generation Learning Challenges, 2014). In 2013, $4 million went to the development of high-quality student assessments and $3.2 million in 2013 went to strengthening teacher preparation programs.

Achieve, Inc. received $1 million in startup funds from the Gates Foundation in 1999. Since then, the most notable endowments occurred in 2004 in the amount of $7.7 million to “encourage specific states to adopt high school graduation requirements that
align with college entry requirements” (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2014). Almost $13 million in 2009 went to support the foundation’s American Diploma Project, and $9.3 million in 2012 went to providing additional support mechanisms so that states could successfully implement the CCSS and “build strategic national and statewide alliances by engaging directly with key stakeholders” (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2014). Table 6 provides exact amounts for the endowments made to the NGA Center for Best Practices, the CCSSO, and Achieve from 1998 through 2013.

**Table 6: Endowments made by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to organizations responsible for the development of the CCSS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>Achieve, Inc.</th>
<th>CCSSO</th>
<th>NGA</th>
<th>Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1983-1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1988-1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76,102,539</td>
<td>9,921,771</td>
<td>25,475,312</td>
<td>40,705,456</td>
<td>2000-2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86,122,946</td>
<td>22,287,051</td>
<td>59,114,700</td>
<td>4,721,195</td>
<td>2006-2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>163,225,485</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,208,822</strong></td>
<td><strong>84,590,012</strong></td>
<td><strong>45,426,651</strong></td>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation

Whereas the former three foundations have transparently provided the public with information pertaining to their interests in educational endowments within the body of their annual reports and on their websites, the Broad Foundation has not. All information presented in this section was obtained from the organization’s website. The organization did not respond to the researcher’s attempts to establish communication via telephone or e-mail. Efforts to examine the history of the Broad Foundation for Education revealed the foundation was established in 1999 to further educational causes related to
governance, management, and leadership. By 2000, the program overview had widened its scope to include charters and leadership, and in 2001 it added unions to its list of interests. As the foundation evolved, so did its vision for impacting education. As of 2006, its vision was reworded to delineate the area of educational investments as targeting (a) transformative federal and state policy; (b) groundbreaking innovation in teaching and learning; (c) strong leadership; and (d) redesigned, high-performing institutions. A careful examination of the annual reports and Forms 990-PF of the Broad Foundation revealed no specific information related to the financial endowments that may have been made to the NGA Center for Best Practices, the CCSSO, or Achieve from 1999 to 2013, as federal tax regulation does not require foundations to disclose endowments made to political nonprofit organizations with 501(c) designations.

A careful examination of endowments made between 1983 and 2013 by the four corporate philanthropies profiled in this study—the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, the Gates Foundation, and the Broad Foundation—suggested, at the very least, that these philanthropies support the education reform policies that have been purported by the collective efforts of the NGA Center for Best Practices, the CCSSO, and Achieve, Inc. At most, the giving patterns may suggest that these philanthropies may use these endowments in an effort to impact education reform policies in a manner that will consequently benefit corporate interests, namely through the expansion of government, aided by the centralization of education policy at the federal level, through the advancement of a national curriculum whose primary concern is with developing college and career readiness skills (National Governors Association Center, 2009) and establishment of new industries driven by the demands of markets associated with (a) a nationalized curriculum and (b) the management of data associated with measuring the
progress with which a nationalized curriculum is delivered. Whereas the role of education has traditionally fallen within the scope of states’ rights, the imperative to implement national standards has federally centralized education policy and its governance while simultaneously supporting the growth of industries concerned with consumer services—specifically, data management solutions—in education.

An examination of the annual reports and Forms 990 of the four profiled philanthropies—the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, the Gates Foundation, and the Broad Foundation—suggests that the corporate sector may seek to influence education reform policy through the establishment and leveraging of corporate philanthropies as a means of maximizing corporate investments. Collectively, between 1983 and 2013, the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, and the Gates Foundation donated nearly $186 million to the three organizations responsible for the drafting of the CCSS: NGA, CCSSO, and Achieve, Inc. Endowments made by the Broad Foundation were not made publicly available. In terms of percentages, the Gates Foundation endowed 88% of this amount in its 19 years of existence, whereas the Carnegie Corporation endowed 9.2% and the Ford Foundation endowed 2.8% during the time span from 1983 to 2013. Respectively, during this time, the NGA Center for Best Practices received $56 million from these three philanthropies, the CCSSO received $93.3 million, and Achieve, Inc. received $36.2 million.

The researcher found that there is evidence to suggest that from 1983 to 2010, an increased emphasis was placed on the necessity for education reform as evidenced in the mission statements and education agendas of the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, the Gates Foundation, and the Broad Foundation. Furthermore, the reauthorizations of the ESEA from 1983 to 2010 permitted the implementation of a
nationalized curriculum and the use of accountability systems to measure the growth of students while simultaneously measuring teacher and principal effectiveness. These patterns strongly suggest that big business has used its influence by way of corporate foundations to impact educational reform policy in the United States from 1983 to 2010. The findings for the second research question will explore the considerations of stakeholders involved in the drafting of the CCSS.

**Stakeholder Consideration in Drafting Common Core State Standards**

In an effort to address the second research question, “What stakeholder considerations were taken into account for the drafting of the Common Core State Standards?” the researcher set out to conduct interviews with representatives and/or employees of various education and policy-making agencies involved with drafting, validating, and adopting the CCSS. Appendix H details the agencies contacted, including the date, mode of communication, and disclosure granted. Initially, three agencies were targeted for formal interviews: the NGA Center for Best Practices, CCSSO, and ALEC. Each agency was initially contacted through an e-mail in which the researcher offered an introduction and briefly explained the nature of the doctoral study in the following manner:

> I am a doctoral student at Saint Peter's University in New Jersey. My research is a mixed-methods design that is aiming to investigate the corporate influences on education policy in the United States from 1983–2010. Part of this investigation requires me to research the considerations of various stakeholders involved in the drafting of the Common Core State Standards. I am extremely appreciative of any assistance you may be able to provide in so far as contacting individuals within the American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC) who are willing to participate in a brief interview to further this research. (T. Jacobson, personal communication, October 1, 2013)
The researcher attempted to establish contact with a representative from the NGA Center for Best Practices Education Division on four occasions both through e-mail and telephone. The NGA Center for Best Practices did not reply to requests for an interview. Through personal networking, the researcher was able to establish contact with two individuals who were previously affiliated with the NGA Center for Best Practices. The first individual was a former employee of the NGA Center for Best Practices, and the second individual was an original member of the Common Core Validation Committee—Dr. Sandra Stotsky, professor emerita of the University of Arkansas.

In October 2013, the researcher was able to conduct an interview with a former employee of the NGA Center for Best Practices Division of Homeland Security and Technology from 2005 to 2007. Although the researcher was not able to glean insight as to the specific roles and responsibilities of the NGA Center for Best Practices Education Division with regard to the drafting of the CCS, she was able to gain a deeper understanding of how the Center for Best Practices operated from 2005 to 2007. As a result of this interview, the researcher learned about the organization of the NGA. Essentially, the organization functions in two distinct ways: the NGA, comprising all 50 governors, functions as an influential lobby, while the Center for Best Practices uses grant money, either from the federal government or from private entities, to research issues affecting the states so that the legislative bodies can propose viable solutions by way of policy.

When asked if the two entities ever function in a reciprocal or codependent manner, the subject replied that the nonprofit tax status enjoyed by the Center for Best Practices clearly delineated activities in which the nonprofit may or may not engage. The nonprofit
could not get into advocating for a certain position . . . [the Center for Best Practices] didn’t lobby Congress, there was a clear distinction between the two . . . but that didn’t mean [the Center for Best Practices] couldn’t share information [with its lobbying counterpart].

The participant went on to further explain that employees for the Center of Best Practices served as researchers and experts in their respective fields and as such would often find themselves charged with helping lobbyists understand an issue:

you know if a giant bill was coming down the pike, that had something to do with one of the issues that we dealt with—we were experts—we could help them, too, if they had . . . substantive non-political questions.

This response prompted the follow-up question: Were there instances where the governors or factions within the organization lobbied for a special interest? The subject explained the NGA convenes twice per year, once in the late winter, where they meet with the president in Washington, DC, and again off-site, usually in South Carolina, where “they bring in speakers and things like that, but they come together and . . . make decisions as a whole . . . the actual governors themselves, rather than just their Washington representatives.” When asked what types of speakers are typically invited to this meeting, subject replied,

There’s always purpose behind it . . . [the governors] would not be inclined, Republican or Democrat, to fund anything if it wasn’t . . . in the interest of the states . . . the Washington offices were expected to produce and the NGA meetings were expected to be substantive and worthwhile.

When asked if the various divisions of the NGA, within the lobbying portion or the Center for Best Practices portion, ever experienced any overlap in their articulation, planning, or research, the subject speculated,

I think the lobbying committees overlap quite a bit . . . you know you could cross purposes if you’re not careful . . . as to the
different jurisdictions in the Center for Best Practices, I had friends . . . in the environmental division, the education division, but they were funded through separate grants.

The researcher followed-up that question by asking if the NGA Center for Best Practices ever sought advisement or consultation from outside sources. For clarification purposes, the subject asked the researcher if she was referring to corporations. The researcher replied by asking if “generally speaking” there were times when the Center for Best Practices sought outside advisement or consultation from the entities that provide monetary grants.

The subject explained the dynamic as “a cooperative agreement.” The researchers at the Center for Best Practices and the grantees, which in this case were often federal agencies, would often discuss particular components of the research, such as the subjects or methodology, and the measures for follow-up based on the implications of the research. He illustrated this point by sharing correspondence he had had with the Centers for Disease Control:

there was a quarterly call with the CDC, and CDC . . . was buying into the topic of integrated public health and homeland security . . . they would say, “Wow, this is great. We can do a follow-up paper,” and we would sit there and we would go, “Well, actually we were thinking of doing something in the area of public health because we know the flu is getting big” . . . thinking that it was important for us to address things that were of interest to the folks we represented . . . Trying to help the states . . . that was our interest.

Although this example may serve to represent the typical interaction between the Center for Best Practices and other government agencies that grant tax dollars to fund research, it is not suggestive of how the Center for Best Practices interacts with grantees from the private sector.
The second individual contacted, Dr. Sandra Stotsky of the University of Arkansas, was affiliated with the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO in the sense that she was asked to serve as a member of the Common Core Validation Committee. According to a Common Core Report, issued June 6, 2010, the 28 member validation committee comprised “leading figures in the education standards community” (National Governors Association Center, 2010, p. 1). The validation committee was charged with (a) reviewing the process by which evidence was gathered to compose the K–12 College and Career Readiness Standards in ELA and mathematics and “provide input and feedback on that process”; (b) ensuring that the process used to compose the standards utilized “evidence of the knowledge and skills students need to be college- and career-ready; a proper level of clarity and specificity; evidence that the standards are comparable with other leading countries’ expectations; and a grounding in available evidence and research”; and (c) “validat[ing] the sufficiency of evidence supporting the CCSS (National Governors Association Center, 2010, p. 1–2). Validation committee members were appointed in September 2009 by six governors and chief state school officers involved with the CCSS initiative; these appointments were made based on the nominations submitted by national education organizations and states.

In the months preceding the certification of the CCSS, the validation committee met three times: December 2009, April 2010, and May 2010. During the May 2010 meeting, 24 of the original 28 validation committee members certified the standards as being

a) reflective of the core knowledge and skills in ELA and mathematics that students need to be college- and career-ready; b) appropriate in terms of their level of clarity and specificity; c) comparable to the expectations of other leading nations; d) informed by available research or evidence; e) the result of
processes that reflect best practices for standards development; f) a solid starting point for adoption of cross-state common core standards; and g) a sound basis for eventual development of standards-based assessments. (National Governors Association Center, 2010, p. 3)

Of the four validation committee members who did not certify the CCSS, two members publicly decried their disapproval of the CCSS: Dr. Sandra Stotsky of the University of Arkansas and Dr. James Milgram of Stanford University. Whereas Milgram’s discontent lies within the mathematics content outlined in the CCSS, Stotsky raised concerns not only with the secondary ELA content but also with the drafting process. Stotsky frequently vocalized her concerns in testimony before several state boards of education and state legislatures.

To investigate Stotsky’s point about the drafting process, a careful examination of the language used in the July 1, 2009, press release issued by the NGA Center for Best Practices, revealed the preliminary list of individuals, all of whom were described as “content-area experts from Achieve, Incorporated; ACT; and the College Board” (National Governors Association Center, 2010, p. 1). These individuals were selected to serve on the CCSS Development Work Group and the Feedback Group for ELA and Mathematics. The press release continued to explain that each list for each content area would be expanded to include additional experts in each of the content areas. The press release made no mention of how or why these individuals were selected (National Governors Association Center, 2010).

The CCSS website devoted a page to the development process. The time line data offered on this page showed that the expanded lists for the Development Work Group and the Feedback Group for ELA and Mathematics were made in the summer of 2009. Table 7 shows the number of stakeholders, by interest, involved in each of the groups:
Table 7 shows overwhelming representation from the collegiate sector. This interest comprises 30% of the ELA development committee, 50% of the ELA feedback committee, 48% of the mathematics development committee, 45% of the mathematics feedback committee, and 59% of the validation committee. Interests of state departments of education are also strongly represented, comprising 37.5% of the ELA development committee and 34% of the mathematics development committee. The distribution of these interests reinforces the CCSS mission of building college and career readiness, as the collegiate sector may offer insight with regard to the criteria used to determine college readiness. The educational testing organizations, which collectively represent

Table 7: Members of CCSS development, feedback, and validation committees for ELA and mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ELA and mathematics</th>
<th>Validation</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Development</th>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>ACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3*</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1**</td>
<td>College Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Achieve, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Student Achivement Partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>ETS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>College/university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education—for-profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Education—nonprofit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>State DOE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>District administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Retired teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teachers unions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Librarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Charter school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Total members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ William McCallum, lead writer, head, Department of Mathematics, the University of Arizona, and Senior Consultant to Achieve, Inc.
++Jason Zimba, professor of mathematics and physics, Bennington College, and Student Achievement Partners.
17.5% of the ELA development committee and 12% of the mathematics development committee, may use this criteria to develop assessment metrics to be utilized by agents from state departments of education and local school districts. These agents may in turn use information gathered from this process to inform decisions with regard to personnel, instruction, and assessment. Although this information serves to explain which interests were represented, it does not explain how these individuals were selected.

With respect to the drafting process, Stotsky (2014) repeatedly offered through testimony,

In the absence of official information from all four private organizations, it seems likely that Achieve, Incorporated and the Gates Foundation selected most of the key personnel to write Common Core’s standards. Not only were no high school mathematics teachers involved, no English professors or high school English teachers were, either. Because everyone worked without open meetings or accessible public comment, their reasons for making the decisions they did are lost to history (Ohio Rules and Reference Committee, 2014).

Lists of the CCSS Initiative K–12 standards development teams do not support the assertion that no high school mathematics teachers, English professors, or high school English teachers were involved in the development or feedback process. No information has been released to specify which members of the NGA Center for Best Practices and CCSSO served as the selection committee charged with appointing members of the development, feedback, and validation committees.

Repeated attempts to contact a representative with the CCSSO via e-mail and telephone resulted in a brief interview that took place nearly 3 months after initial contact had been made. Although the individual did not offer signed consent, the subject agreed to engage in an informal conversation that resulted in general responses pertaining to the council’s tiered system of corporate partnerships. When asked to elaborate on the
The distinction between each tier of corporate partnership, the subject asked if the response would be published, to which I responded, “No, because you did not sign a consent form. If you want to sign a consent form, allowing me to use the information supplied, then and only then will I publish the information you are sharing.” When pressed again about the distinction between the tiers of corporate partnerships, the subject declined to offer information in addition to what is already publicly supplied on the website for the CCSSO.

The researcher also sought interviews with agencies involved in education policy. She was unsuccessful in securing interviews with representatives from the following education policy organizations: the NCSL, the Education Commission of the States, and the New Jersey Office of Legislative Services. Appendix H provides a log of the researcher’s attempts to contact these organizations.

Although personal interviews often serve as an effective and efficient means for gathering information, in the case of this study, the researcher was limited by several factors. The interview with former NGA Center for Best Practices expert provided insight as to how the agency operated from 2005 to 2007 within the Division of Homeland Security, but one may question whether or not his experiences may be used to draw generalizations or conclusions as to the functioning of the Division of Education. Furthermore, in this particular interview with a sole participant, the researcher was bound by the individual experiences, knowledge base, and integrity of that participant. The unwillingness of other potential subjects to candidly speak of the procedures followed during the drafting of the CCSS left many questions unanswered.

Involvement of Business Community in Drafting CCSS
In an effort to ascertain in what ways the business community was involved in the drafting of the Common Core State Standards, IRS filings were examined for the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO. Both agencies operate as nonprofit organizations and have been assigned a 501(c) designation by the IRS. As such, both agencies are required to annually file a Form 990.

For the purposes of this study, the organizations’ Forms 990—specifically, the first two sections of Part VIII: Statement of Revenue—for fiscal years 2008 through 2011 were scrutinized. Part VIII, Line 1 identifies the total “contributions, gifts, grants, and other similar amounts.” These are further disaggregated in Lines 1a–1h (federated campaigns; membership dues; fundraising events; related organizations; government grants; all other contributions, gifts, grants, and similar amounts not included above; noncash contributions included in those lines; and total of Lines 1a-1f).

Line 2 identifies the total program service revenue, which is further disaggregated in Lines 2a–2g. These fields consist of each organization’s five largest sources of revenue. According to the IRS’s 2012 Instructions for Form 990, these may consist of monies earned from “providing a government agency with a service, facility, or product that benefited that government agency directly rather than benefiting the public as a whole” (Havian & Kelton, 2012, p. 38). Line 2g indicates the combined total of lines 2a–2f. Table 8 illustrates the data.

Table 8: IRS Form 990, Part VIII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CCSSO</th>
<th>NGA Center for Best Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Line 2g</td>
<td>Line 1h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>26,334,710</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Contributions (a)</td>
<td>Gifts (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>30,645,908</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>25,962,652</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>26,108,443</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>109,051,713</td>
<td>2,554,898</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Line 1h refers to total of all funds raised. Line 2g refers to the total of the five largest sources of revenue.

The findings in Table 8 indicate the NGA Center for Best Practices was annually able to generate between $10 million and $13 million from contributions, gifts, and grants from 2008 to 2011. The NGA Center for Best Practices recorded its highest revenues by way of contributions, gifts, and grants from its corporate partners during 2008 and 2009, the 2 years immediately preceding the nationwide implementation of the CCSS. However, it must be noted that education is just one of several areas of policy making for which the NGA Center for Best Practices maintains a committee. Consequently, individual, nonprofit, or corporate entities routinely donate to the NGA Center for Best Practices for purposes unrelated to education committee work.

Although the CCSSO did not list any revenue in the form of contributions, gifts or grants during the time in question, it did yield a substantial amount of program service revenue, as indicated by the Line 2g column, which was generated by charging for professional development services. This information suggests that the CCSSO was able to successfully promote the adoption and implementation of the CCSS to its corporate partners and participating state departments of education (see Appendix I).

Although Lines 1a-1g of Form 990 provide the sum of contributions, gifts, grants, and other similar amounts that each organization collected during the years in question, the form does not require 501(c) organizations to provide a list identifying specific information with regard to specific amounts endowed by specific contributors. This limitation is the direct result of the Supreme Court decision in the case of the *National
Association for the Advancement of Colored People v. Patterson (1958), which maintains that political organizations that hold a 501(c) designation are not required to identify the direct sources of contributions received.

Despite the privacy measures that conceal the identity of contributors and the specific sums of money endowed to 501(c) organizations, a careful examination of Part III: Statement of Program Service Accomplishment of Form 990, alongside a list of corporate partners for both the NGA and CCSSO, suggests some corporations and/or industries may have been able to successfully exercise influence over these policy-making bodies.

This hypothesis is supported by Table 9, which identifies the total amounts endowed to the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO between 2008 and 2011. During this time span, the researcher found that three of the four philanthropic foundations profiled in this study collectively endowed just over $5 million to the NGA Center for Best Practices and nearly $38 million to the CCSSO. From 2008 to 2011, these figures accounted for nearly 11% of the total funds raised by the NGA for Best Practices and 34.5% of the CCSSO sources of revenue.

Table 9: Amounts endowed to NGA Center for Best Practices and CCSSO by Foundation from 2008 to 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCSSO</th>
<th>NGA Center for Best Practices</th>
<th>Carnegie Corporation of New York</th>
<th>Ford Foundation</th>
<th>Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation</th>
<th>Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1,290,400</td>
<td>935,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>450,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35,887,767</td>
<td>3,933,521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td>Unavailable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>37,628,167</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,068,721</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examining the lists of the corporate partners to the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO further supports this hypothesis. These lists are respectively provided in Appendices I and J and provide the name of corporations that have provided both the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO with annual sponsorships. At the time when the data were being compiled, the NGA Center for Best Practices had cited 132 corporate partnerships, whereas the CCSSO had cited 33 corporate partnerships. Figures 2 and 3 show the frequency with which these corporate partnerships occur by industry. The researcher used industry names determined by MarketLine, a reputable database of business information. It is important to note that some of the companies provide goods

Figure 2: NGA Center for Best Practices corporate partnerships by industry
and/or services that cut across more than one industry; in such cases, those companies were counted for each applicable industry. The industries most frequently represented by corporate partnerships with the NGA Center for Best Practices were pharmaceuticals and health care, represented by 45 companies; technology and service, represented by 16 companies; consumer packaged goods, represented by 15 companies; and communications, financial services, and energy and utilities, each represented by 10 companies. Although a wide variety of industries are represented by the corporate partnerships of the NGA Center for Best Practices, only five industries are represented by the corporate partnerships of the CCSSO: business and consumer services, with 16 partnerships; technology and services, with 12 partnerships; media, with five partnerships; government and nonprofits, with five partnerships; and communications, with two partnerships. Although this information in no way proves that these specific corporations were directly involved in the drafting of the CCSS, it may suggest that writers of the CCSS had reason to take the concerns or interests of these corporate partners into account during the drafting process.
To further investigate ways corporations may have been involved in the drafting of the CCSS, the researcher carefully reviewed the first item in Section III: Statement of Program Accomplishments of Form 990. This section asks for the organization to briefly describe its mission. For each of the Forms 990 from 2008–2011, the NGA provided the following response: “To provide tailored technical assistance for challenges facing the states, identify and share best practices, and serve as an information clearinghouse on gubernatorial initiatives” (National Governors Association Center, 2011, p. 2). Item 4a within that same section requires a description of the exempt purpose achievements for each of the organization’s program services by expenses. Appendix H annotates the purpose achievements of the Education Division of the NGA Center for Best Practices. The primary areas of focus for the Education Division, as supported by the Dedoose’s Code Present/Absent Media Chart (see Appendix I), during this time span were concentrated on the issues of early childhood education; school reform; teacher and principal effectiveness; building college and career readiness; and science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) education. The frequency of occurrence for each of these themes was examined.

Early childhood education was coded 11 times, revealing the NGA established advisory councils entitled Learning Network: Early Childhood Advisory Councils and Creating a Comprehensive State Early Childhood Advisory Council, and published works including Early Education to 3rd Grade Access, Readiness, Talent, and Quality; Bridging the System Divides Among the Early Childhood, K–12, Postsecondary, and Workforce Systems; and Building an Early Childhood Professional Development System.

School reform was coded 15 times among the various publications, collaboration among network states, and meetings examined from 2008 to 2011. Titles included The
Quality Imperative: A State Guide to Achieving the Promise of Extended Learning Opportunities; Turning Around Low Performing Schools (a meeting held December 2–3, 2008); Low Performing Schools Meeting; and Policies to Improve Instruction and Learning in High Schools. In addition to these achievements, coding for the NGA Center for Best Practices Program Accomplishments, as listed in Section III of Form 990 from 2008 to 2011, suggests that some of their reform efforts were aimed supporting school choice, specifically through the advancement of charter schools (e.g., Achieving Excellence at Scale: State Support for High Performing Charter School Expansion, State Strategies to Improve Chronically Low-Performing Schools Initiative Improving Charter School Leadership, and State Leadership for High-Quality Charter Schools) and standardization of a national curriculum via the CCSS (e.g., Realizing the Potential: How Governors Can Lead Effective Implementation of the Common Core State Standards).

The NGA Center for Best Practices also took an interest in principal and teacher effectiveness. The subject of principal effectiveness is explicitly stated three times within the program accomplishments coded from 2008 to 2011, as evidenced by published works titled Evaluating School Principals: State Strategies to Improve Principal Preparation and State Policies to Improve the Effectiveness of School Principals. The matter of teacher effectiveness was coded nine times in the Policy Forum on Enhancing Teacher Effectiveness, which occurred December 15–16, 2008; two separate summits on preparing principals to evaluate teachers; a policy forum on evaluating teacher effectiveness; and several forums to address the topic of teacher compensation.

Program accomplishments coded for the NGA for Best Practices from 2008 to 2011 suggested the building of college and career readiness as being an important priority. College and career readiness, as a child code of 21st-century skills, was coded
28 times, whereas STEM—also a 21st-century skills child code—was identified 12 times. Accomplishments include the following summits, publications, and collaborations among states: Using Community Colleges to Build a STEM-Skilled Workforce; From Information to Action: Revamping Higher Education Accountability Systems; State Policies to Re-engage Dropouts; STEM Summit; Building a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math Education Agenda; and Industry Partnering on Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM).

From 2008 to 2011, CCSSO on its Form 990, Section III: Statement of Program Accomplishments recorded its mission as follows: “CCSSO through leadership, advocacy and service, assists chief state school officers and their organizations in achieving the vision of an American education system that enables all children to succeed in school, work, and life” (Council of Chief State School Officers, 2011, p. 2). To achieve this end, CCSSO used the same language within each of the four Forms 990 on Line 4a from 2008 to 2011 to describe its largest program services accomplishments:

CCSSO provides leadership, advocacy, and technical assistance on major educational issues. The Council seeks member consensus on major educational issues and expresses their views to civic and professional organizations, federal agencies, and the Congress. The Council serves as an informed, pragmatic voice in representing the chief state school officers’ views on education policy. Through targeted policy and effective advocacy, the Council provides a platform for chiefs to be heard. The organization also undertakes projects to help state education agencies understand, devise, and execute policy, adopt initiatives to promote educational reform efforts, and engage in collaborative exchanges to share best practices and model solutions. The Council also offers professional development to its members in a wide range of areas to build capacity at the state level. (p. 2)

Coding of Forms 990 for CCSSO from 2008 to 2011 suggested the major educational issue for the organization during this time frame was the nationwide implementation of
the CCSS (see Appendices L and M). The publications list made available on the CCSSO website indicated a strong desire for CCSSO to ensure that states were better equipped to “understand, devise, and execute” policies relating to the successful implementation of the CCSS. As evidenced in Appendix L, the publications during this period are reflective of the CCSSO commitment to advancing assessment of the CCSS.

Of the 43 excerpts coded, 14 were coded as assessment, and four were given the designated child code of alignment to standards. Five were coded as evaluation. Examples of excerpts coded as assessment include State End-of-Course Testing Programs: A Policy Brief, seven separate publications on InTASC Model Core Standards (Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium), A Guide to Computer Adaptive Testing (CAT) Systems, Performance Counts Assessment Systems That Support High Quality Learning, Implementer’s Guide to Growth Models Interim Assessment Practices and Avenues for State Involvement, Learning About Assessment: An Evaluation of a Ten-State Effort to Build Assessment Capacity in High Schools, and Learning Progressions: Supporting Instruction and Formative Assessment.

With regard to alignment with standards, the following excerpts were coded: Making Decisions: Transition from State Standards to Common Core Standards; five separate documents on How to Use Surveys of Enacted Curriculum (SEC) Charts to Compare CCSS with prior state standards; and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS), Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), and National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) assessments. Examples of excerpts for evaluation consisted of the following: Evaluating the Comparability of Scores from Achievement Test Variations, Determining Adequate Yearly Progress in a State Performance or Proficiency Index Model, and Effects of Teacher Professional
Development Gains in Student Achievement: How Meta Analysis Provides Evidence Useful to Education Leaders.

Table 10 provides a list of the most frequently occurring codes of the program accomplishments of the NGA Center for Best Practices from 2008 to 2011 versus the program accomplishments of the CCSSO from 2008 to 2011. The frequency of the codes suggests the education reform efforts of the NGA Center for Best Practices were concentrated on the development of 21st-century skills—specifically, the building of college and career readiness through the CCSS, whereas the focus of the CCSSO was the development of assessment instructions that would be used to simultaneously measure student growth along with teacher and principal effectiveness.

In an effort to investigate the extent to which corporate philanthropies—namely, the Gates Foundation and the Broad Foundation—were involved in the drafting of the Table 10: Most frequently occurring codes of the program accomplishments of the NGA Center from 2008 to 2011 versus the program accomplishments of the CCSSO from 2008 to 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>CCSSO</th>
<th>NGA Center for Best Practices</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st-Century Skills</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCSS, the researcher examined the program accomplishments of each foundation and compared those accomplishments to that of the NGA Center for Best Practices and the
CCSSO from 2008 to 2011. Insofar as the education agenda is concerned, the Gates Foundation asserted its mission as “working to help all people lead healthy, productive lives . . . In the United States, it seeks to ensure that all people—especially those with the fewest resources—have access to the opportunities they need to succeed in school and life” (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2013, p. 9). This mission is similarly relayed on the foundation’s IRS Form 990-PF, Section IX-A: Summary of Direct Charitable Activities. From 2008 to 2011, the Summary of Direct Charitable Activities, as it pertains to the foundation’s involvement in education, read as such:

Conducted and evaluated research on issues of interest to the field of education. Assisted organizations working in the area of educational improvements in assessing progress on current projects, conducting business planning, technical support and other consulting services.

It is the wording of the latter statement—namely, “working in the area of educational improvements in assessing progress”—that led the researcher to assign the codes reform, assessment, and evaluation. A careful examination of the wording of the Summary of Direct Charitable Activities and the financial figures presented in Tables 11, 12, 13, and 14 revealed combined endowments to the organizations responsible for drafting the CCSS in the amount of $107 million, or 0.99% of the total granted by the foundation from 2009 to 2011, and 66.26% of total endowments for U.S. programs from 2009 to 2011. The endowments made by the Gates Foundation since 2000 to organizations responsible for the development of the CCSS were reported in the following amounts: nearly $45.5 million to the NGA Center for Best Practices, $84.6 million to the CCSSO, and $33.2 million to Achieve, Inc., for a total of $163.2 million endowed to the three organizations responsible for the drafting of the CCSS. These financial figures are strongly suggestive of the foundation’s vested interest in (a)
advancing a national curriculum by way of the CCSS; (b) developing assessment instrumentation to measure principal, teacher, and student progress with regard to the implementation of the CCSS; and (c) and evaluating principal, teacher, and student progress through the use of data management systems.

Table 11: Total grants payable by the Gates Foundation (Line 18b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Allocated for U.S. programs Part IX-A</th>
<th>Total granted Part I, Line 25d</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>55,387,349</td>
<td>2,630,833,780</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>42,078,565</td>
<td>2,486,342,209</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>64,317,075</td>
<td>5,705,045,846</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161,782,989</td>
<td>10,822,221,835</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: $10,822,221,835

Table 12: Grants paid by the Gates Foundation to NGA Center for Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>U.S. programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30,000 Research and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>23,255,453 Global Policy and Advocacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>62,000 Pacific Northwest Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>750,000 College Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>512,197 Postsecondary Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37,674 Strategic Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>750,000 Totals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Grand Total: $26,599,661

0.25% of the total granted by Gates
16.4% of U.S. programs allocations by Gates
Table 13: Grants paid by the Gates Foundation to the CCSSO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2009 and earlier</th>
<th>US Programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7,059,993</td>
<td>2,377,648</td>
<td>10,822,522</td>
<td>64,628</td>
<td>64,628</td>
<td>10,822,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Global Policy and Advocacy Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning College Readiness Postsecondary Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$80,590,012</td>
<td>0.74% of the total granted by Gates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>49.8% of U.S. programs allocations by Gates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An examination of the mission statement and IRS Form 990-PF for the years spanning 2008 to 2011 did not reveal information to suggest the Broad Foundation was directly involved in drafting the CCSS. As indicated in Table 14, the Broad Foundation reported total grants payable in Part I, Line 25a of the IRS Form 990-PF.

Table 14: Total grants payable by the Broad Foundation (Line 18b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Allocated for education</th>
<th>Total granted</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part IXA</td>
<td>Part I, Line 25a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaggregated data</td>
<td>414,282,190</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unavailable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>146,143,257</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>266,575,362</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$827,000,809</td>
<td>Totals:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mission statement of the Broad Foundation relays urgency for reform in urban education. The foundation listed its overarching goal in education as being “to
ensure that every student in an urban public school has the opportunity to succeed” (Eli
and Edyth Broad Foundation, 2014, p. 10) It continued by building a case for immediate
reform in education:

**The American education system needs improvement.** While we
continue to spend more money each year on education, far too
many students lack adequate resources to learn, particularly
students of color and low-income students. Education is a right,
not a privilege, and no student should be left out, written off or
ignored. **Education is an issue that affects us all.** Jobs are
leaving this country and American employers say that students
today lack the skills they need to join the 21st century workforce.
If we do not create new opportunities to educate students, our
economy will continue to suffer, today’s students won’t be able to
find jobs or afford homes, our standard of living will decline, our
democracy will be at risk and we will continue to fall behind as
other countries surpass us. (Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation,
2014 Mission and Overview)

The foundation concluded its mission statement by describing its philanthropic
endeavors in terms of investment:

**Our investments.** Since 1999, The Eli and Edythe Broad
Foundation has invested more than $600 million to significantly
improve student achievement in urban areas through strong
leadership to support great teachers, school district efficiency to
push more resources to the classroom, and more options for
parents seeking high-quality public education for their children.
We focus on improving urban school districts because they serve
one of every four American children. These districts represent the
greatest opportunity to dramatically improve student achievement.
We also invest in specific areas where we believe we can provide
value to the field, based on our views that: 1) To become effective,
efficient organizations that serve students well, American school
districts and schools need strong, talented leadership; 2) Every
person and every dollar in school district central offices and
schools must be focused—efficiently and effectively—on students,
and districts must be held accountable for results; 3) All students
do better when they are supported by a great teacher; 4) Every
child should have the opportunity to attend a high-quality public
school; 5) Best practices should be shared.
The researcher identified seven excerpts from this lengthy mission statement, which address two major themes: 21st-century skills and evaluation. The mission statement of the educational division of the Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation makes explicit reference to career readiness within the context of 21st-century skills: “Students today lack the skills they need to join the 21st century workforce.” It continues by describing mechanisms that are needed in order to promote 21st-century career readiness skills: “strong leadership to support great teachers . . . districts must be held accountable for results . . . American school districts and schools need strong, talented leadership . . . All students do better when they are supported by a great teacher.”

In order to hold school districts accountable for results, those results must be measurable and subject to evaluation, hence necessitating the use of evaluation models for principals, teachers, and students. In that regard, one might surmise the Broad Foundation takes more interest in supporting policies aimed at measuring principal and teacher effectiveness through demonstrated student achievement on standardized assessments aligned to a national curriculum. In other words, although there is no evidence to suggest the Broad Foundation was affiliated with the NGA Center for Best Practices, the CCSSO, or Achieve, Inc. from 2008 to 2011, the language of the foundation’s mission statement indicates that a national curriculum, and the standardization of an assessment to measure student achievement with regard to a national curriculum does in fact address the foundation’s commitment to holding school districts accountable for promoting 21st-century career readiness skills through strong leadership that supports great teaching.

The earlier examination of mission statements and education agendas of the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, the Gates Foundation, and the Broad
Foundation (from 1983 to 2010) suggested an increased emphasis has been placed on the necessity for education reform. An examination of the reauthorizations of the ESEA from 1983 to 2010 suggested education policy makers had responded to calls for reform with the implementation of a nationalized curriculum and the use of accountability systems to measure progress growth of students while simultaneously measuring principal and teacher effectiveness. An examination of financial records, including annual reports for each foundation, IRS Forms 990 of the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO, and IRS Forms 990-PFs of the Gates Foundation and the Broad Foundation revealed endowments made by the said foundations to the NGA Center for Best Practices, the CCSSO, and Achieve, Inc. from 1983 to 2013. In total, these three organization were endowed $17 million by the Carnegie Corporation, $5.3 million by the Ford Foundation, and $163.2 million by the Gates Foundation. Specific endowment amounts that may have been made by the Broad Foundation were not attained.

Although the sample size of the subjects involved in this study—only four corporate philanthropies—posed a limitation, the careful examination of the mission statements, annual reports, and financial records of these four corporate philanthropies suggested that corporations might benefit from the establishment of philanthropies, in part, to forge partnerships with policy-making bodies. In the case of the four corporate philanthropies profiled for the purpose of this study, an analysis of the coding of each foundation’s mission statement, along with the coding of the program accomplishments outlined in the Forms 990 for the NGA and the CCSSO, suggests that these foundations might have participated in lobbying efforts with the intent of leveraging their influence to drive education policy. Involvement in such activities, for the purpose of influencing
education reform, might have served to benefit market growth of industries affected by
the creation and implementation of a national curriculum.

Other limitations were presented with this portion of the research. Originally, the
research called for the coding of running record data to chart the corporate philanthropies
that have supported the agencies involved with the drafting of the CCSS. Privacy laws
pertaining to the reporting of endowments granted to or accepted by organizations with a
501(c) designation made it impossible to identify all of the organizations that had made
contributions to the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO. Alternatively, the
researcher opted to focus on the four foundations being profiled within in this study.

The 501(c) tax designation of the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO
does not require nonexempt charitable trusts treated as private foundations—particularly,
the Gates Foundation and the Broad Foundation—to report specific amounts endowed to
nonprofit political organizations. Financial figures for endowments made by the
Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, and the Gates Foundation were publicly
reported in each foundation’s respective annual report.

Additionally, the Broad Foundation did not specify its four largest direct
charitable activities as per Part IX-A: Summary of Charitable Activities of IRS Form
990-PF. Instead, the foundation listed all charitable contributions granted in Part XV:
Supplementary Schedule of Grants and Contributions Paid During the Year. As
previously stated, a careful examination of the financial records for the NGA Center for
Best Practices, the CCSSO, and the corporate philanthropies selected for the purpose of
this study indicated corporate involvement in the drafting of a national curriculum in the
form of the CCSS.
The “Accountability Market” in Education

In an effort to address the fourth and fifth research questions ("In what ways does a national curriculum influence the growth or decline of the ‘accountability market’ in education?" and “How do education reform policies benefit big business in the United States?") , the researcher charted the corporate partnerships of both the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO. Documentation of these partnerships was obtained from the organizations’ respective websites.

Once the lists of corporate partnerships had been compiled for both the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO, the researcher used EDGAR, a Web-based database provided by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) that allows for transparent viewing of the financial filings of all foreign and domestic companies. For the purpose of this study, the researcher retrieved the SEC annual report Form 10-K, filed between 2008 and 2012, for each company identified as being in partnership with the NGA Center for Best Practices or the CCSSO. As the CCSS were adopted by most participating states in 2010, the time span of 2007 to 2013 was selected to chart the net growth of each company in the 2 years preceding and the 2 years following the adoption of the CCSS. During the data collection process, the researcher populated the following fields for each company: corporate partner name, location, MarketLine Industry Code, net income 2007, net income 2008, net income 2009, net income 2010, net income 2011, net income 2012, and net income 2013 (see Appendices I and J).

Market Data Analytics, a component of the suite of MarketLine products, is a Web-based database provided through the libraries of most major academic institutions. The researcher used Market Data Analytics to obtain the list of 26 industry codes and their corresponding industry code descriptions (see Appendix N). These codes were then
applied to each corporate partner so that the list of partnerships could be disaggregated and analyzed by industry. At the time the data were compiled, the NGA Center for Best Practices had 132 corporate partners from 19 different MarketLine industries. This large representation of industries with a vested interest in the NGA Center for Best Practices results from the ongoing research conducted by the center’s five divisions in the areas of economic and human services; education, the environment, energy, and transportation; health; and homeland security and public safety.

Of those 19 industries, the seven most frequently represented industries were pharmaceuticals and health care, with 42 partners; consumer packaged goods, with 13 partners; financial services, with 10 partners; technology and services, with 11 partners; energy and utilities, with 10 partners; communications, with eight partners; and media, with seven partners. These 102 corporations and/or nonprofits from seven of the 26 total industries account for nearly 77% of endowments accepted by the NGA Center for Best Practices. Of this majority, three of these industries directly influence the daily operations of public school districts: the technology and services industry, with 11 partners; the communications industry, with eight partners; and the media industry, with seven partners. These 26 partners account for nearly 20% of the NGA Center for Best Practices corporate partnerships.

The Council for Chief State School Officers has a three-tiered system of giving, which comprises 36 partnerships. The total number of partnerships for the CCSSO is considerably smaller, as it is primarily focused on policies and issues concerning public education. Four of the 26 MarketLine industries are represented by corporate partnerships, with 11 partners in the media industry, 19 partners in the technology and services industry, five partners with government and nonprofit organizations, and 18
partners with the business and consumer services industry (one stands alone, and 17 overlap with one other industry coding). Essentially, corporate partnerships constitute nearly 53% of the technology and services industry, 30.5% of the media industry, nearly 14% for government and nonprofit organizations, and 3% of the business and consumer industry. Nearly 50% of the former three industries mentioned also overlap with the business and consumer industry.

In an effort to investigate growth and/or decline of markets most heavily represented through corporate partnerships with the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO, the researcher measured the combined net income of each publicly traded corporate partner within each of the most widely represented industries. Tables 15 and 16 present these figures for the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO, respectively.

Net income is commonly referred to as a company’s “bottom line,” or the profit earned after deductions are made for operating costs. This figure is annually reported to the SEC through Form 10-K by publicly traded companies. Privately held companies are not required to publicly disclose their annual net incomes to the SEC. Consequently,

Table 15: Combined net income of corporate donors (in millions) by industry to NGA Center for Best Practices from 2008 to 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology and services industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317%</td>
<td>156.5</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>65.23</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>Apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESRI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>127.2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>Hewlett-Packard Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>IBM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42%</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>Intel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Intuit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>Microsoft Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>109%</td>
<td>211.1</td>
<td>180.9</td>
<td>161.5</td>
<td>132.9</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>NIC, Incorporated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Partner</td>
<td>Media Industry</td>
<td>Communications Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66%</td>
<td>37.1 35.6 26.8 23.3 22.4</td>
<td>2.2% 126.72 124.28 122.51 123.02 124.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Learning</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>AT&amp;T 18.38 15.35 7.04 4.97 2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS Institute</td>
<td>26% 2.9 2.7 2.4 2.3 2.3</td>
<td>607% CenturyLink 46.06 43.22 40.04 36.12 39.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td>57% 763.7 689.4 591.3 508.4 486</td>
<td>16.5% Cisco Systems 62.57 55.84 37.94 35.76 34.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplify, subsidiary of News Corp</td>
<td>25% 0.35 0.32 0.29 0.28 0.28</td>
<td>82% Comcast Corporation 2.07 2.16 1.89 1.45 1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark Cards, Incorporated, subsidiary of Crown Media Holdings</td>
<td>-37% 1.29 1.30 1.51 1.56 2.05</td>
<td>88% DeVry, Incorporated 2.76 2.89 2.51 2.01 1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company</td>
<td>27% 8.27 8.00 8.14 7.59 6.52</td>
<td>64% Education Management Corporation 6.38 4.33 3.59 3.70 4.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Education</td>
<td>.9% 2.14 1.88 1.88 1.81 2.16</td>
<td>51% Level 3 Communications, LLC 2.76 2.89 2.51 2.01 1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic</td>
<td>9% 12.05 11.50 11.82 11.24 11.01</td>
<td>25% Motorola Solutions 8.70 8.20 7.62 5.74 6.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td>24% Time Warner Cable 21.39 19.68 18.87 17.87 17.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19% Verizon Communications 115.80 110.90 106.60 107.80 97.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25% Combined 410.83 386.85 348.61 338.44 329.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16: Combined net income of corporate donors (in thousands) by industry to CCSSO from 2008 to 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-21%</td>
<td>239.4</td>
<td>279.4</td>
<td>285.3</td>
<td>299.1</td>
<td>304.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>American Institutes for Research (AIR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>1073.7</td>
<td>1037.0</td>
<td>960.0</td>
<td>905.6</td>
<td>887.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>ETS Global Scholar--Americans for Global Democracy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-93%</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>AdvanCEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 2 Contributors: Media Industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth/Decline</strong></td>
<td><strong>2012</strong></td>
<td><strong>2011</strong></td>
<td><strong>2010</strong></td>
<td><strong>2009</strong></td>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
<td><strong>Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corwin Press</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-Metrics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning, Inc.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Instruments</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Language</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Contributors: Media Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1 Contributors: Technology and Services Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Recognition Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Evaluation Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promethean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2 Contributors: Business and Consumer Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evans Newton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnering with Schools for Student Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 2 Contributors: Government and Nonprofit Organizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth/Decline</th>
<th><strong>2012</strong></th>
<th><strong>2011</strong></th>
<th><strong>2010</strong></th>
<th><strong>2009</strong></th>
<th><strong>2008</strong></th>
<th><strong>Level</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corwin Press</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-Metrics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning, Inc.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Instruments</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Language</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Growth/Decline</th>
<th><strong>2012</strong></th>
<th><strong>2011</strong></th>
<th><strong>2010</strong></th>
<th><strong>2009</strong></th>
<th><strong>2008</strong></th>
<th><strong>Level</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corwin Press</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meta-Metrics</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning, Inc.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Instruments</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Language</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Level 2 Contributors: Technology and Services Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>37491.0</td>
<td>42905.0</td>
<td>49225.0</td>
<td>65225.0</td>
<td>108249.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>317%</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intel Corporation</td>
<td>37600.0</td>
<td>35100.0</td>
<td>43600.0</td>
<td>522.4</td>
<td>156508.0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K12 Inc.</td>
<td>226.2</td>
<td>315.6</td>
<td>384.5</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>317%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>8873.0</td>
<td>9623.0</td>
<td>10373.0</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>317%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>8873.0</td>
<td>9623.0</td>
<td>10373.0</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>317%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>8873.0</td>
<td>9623.0</td>
<td>10373.0</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>317%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 3 Contributors: Government and Nonprofit Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The College Board</td>
<td>145400.0</td>
<td>134187.0</td>
<td>142358.0</td>
<td>152943.0</td>
<td>153431.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>180%</td>
<td>Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Level 3 Contributors: Media Industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Education</td>
<td>2260.0</td>
<td>2310.0</td>
<td>2430.0</td>
<td>2725.0</td>
<td>2870.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin Harcourt</td>
<td>2260.0</td>
<td>2310.0</td>
<td>2430.0</td>
<td>2725.0</td>
<td>2870.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-37%</td>
<td>Media</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Education division sold to Apollo Global Management in 2012 for $2.5 billion.  
Acquired by Providence Equity Partners in 2011 for $1.64 billion.  
Sold in 2010.

Note.  Level designation of PH indicates a privately held company.

those figures were not included when investigating (a) net income growth or decline from 2008 to 2012 of corporate contributors to the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO and (b) industry growth or decline from 2008 to 2012 of corporate contributors to the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO.

As previously mentioned, an examination of the corporate partnerships of the NGA Center for Best Practices from 2008 to 2012 revealed representation from three industries that most directly impact the day-to-day functioning of public education: the technology and services industry, the media industry, and the communications industry.  

By and large, those publicly traded corporate partners from each of these industries experienced marked growth over the 5-year period.  Based on the representation, the three industries experienced a 47% growth in their net income from 2008 to 2012.  The technology and services industry grew 57%, the media industry grew 9%, and the communications industry grew 25%.  The companies that demonstrated the most growth for each industry were Apple Corporation, which demonstrated growth by 317%; Pearson, which demonstrated growth by 27%; and CenturyLink, which demonstrated growth by 607%.  Of the five highest-grossing corporate partnerships, three are members of the technology and services industry: NIC, Inc.; Apple Corporation; and Hewlett-Packard Company.  Two are members of the communications industry: AT&T and Verizon Communications.
An examination of the corporate partnerships of the CCSSO from 2008 to 2012 revealed representation from three industries that most directly impact the day-to-day functioning of public education. Of the three industries, two were common to that of the corporate partnerships held by the NGA Center for Best Practices: the technology and services industry and the media industry. The third industry with a stake in public education policy was the government and nonprofit industry. Whereas the majority of corporate partners to the NGA Center for Best Practices within the designated industries were publicly traded companies, nearly 42%, or 15 of the 36 corporate partners to the CCSSO within the designated industries, are privately held. Privately held companies are not required to make their annual fiscal reports available for public viewing; therefore, the net income from 2008 to 2012 for companies labeled PH (privately held) is not included in Table 16.

Of the 15 publicly traded corporate partners remaining from each of these industries, 52% demonstrated increases in net income from 2008 to 2012. The researcher was not able to disaggregate growth by industry by net income from 2008 to 2012, as of the 19 total corporate partners within the technology and services industry, annual net income was found for only nine of those partners. Of the 10 total corporate partners within the media industry, annual net income was found for only four of those partners. Of the six total corporate partners from the government and nonprofit industry, annual net income for only four of corporate partners was available for public viewing.

In October of 2014, Education Week published a chart titled “Consortia Dollars for Common-Core Testing.” The chart detailed the major contracts awarded by the two federally funded consortia charged with developing CCSS-aligned assessments for participating states. To date, the two consortia have received a combined sum of $360
million in Race to the Top funds for test development. According to *Education Week*, the consortia have awarded $305 million to various companies and organizations, with the three most profitable vendors being McGraw-Hill Education CTB, awarded $72.5 million from the Smarter Balanced Consortium; Pearson, awarded a combined $63 million from both consortia; and the Educational Testing Service, awarded a combined $42.6 million from both consortia.

Table 17 presents an adapted version of the chart originally published in the October 1, 2014, issue of *Education Week*. The contracted amounts and brief service descriptions were provided by the PARCC consortia and the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortia (SBAC). Contract descriptions and amounts are subject to change over time. The chart does not include testing work being accomplished by the 24 states not currently participating in either testing consortia or the contracts awarded by individual Smarter Balanced states for test administration services.

Examination of the information provided in this chart in conjunction with information presented in Tables 15 and 16 (NGA Center and CCSSO Corporate Partners) reveals commonalities. Four of 26 corporate partnerships to the NGA Center for Best Practices, profiled in Table 15, and seven of the 37 corporate partners to the CCSSO, Table 17: Common Core testing consortia contracted vendors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate partnership</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Amount paid</th>
<th>Service description</th>
<th>Contracted vendor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSSO</td>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>$53.7 million</td>
<td>Item/task development, project management, scoring, item review, standards alignment, and other tasks</td>
<td>McGraw-Hill Education CTB $72.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>$18.5 million</td>
<td>Item, task writing, review for pilot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>$358 thousand</td>
<td>Initial achievement level descriptors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSO</td>
<td>PARCC</td>
<td>$26.3 million</td>
<td>Item development services</td>
<td>Pearson $63 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGA Center</td>
<td>PARCC</td>
<td>$26</td>
<td>PARCC assessment administration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate partnership</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Amount paid</td>
<td>Service description</td>
<td>Contracted vendor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>$9.2 million</td>
<td>Translations</td>
<td>Tri-Lin $9.2 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PARCC</td>
<td>$8 million</td>
<td>PARCC project management</td>
<td>PARCC Incorporated $8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSO</td>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>$5.4 million</td>
<td>Standard setting and communication services</td>
<td>Measurement Incorporated $5.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PARCC</td>
<td>$4.4 million</td>
<td>Facilitating meetings of educators and college faculty</td>
<td>National Math and Science Initiative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Profiled in Table 16, have also been contracted by the two consortia leading the standardized testing work of the CCSS.

In coding the service descriptions provided by each contracted vendor, the researcher found services pertaining to item development to be the most frequently occurring with six contracts, totaling $133 million. Of those contracts, four were retained by the SBAC and two were retained by the PARCC. A total of five contracts, totaling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Product/Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Measured Progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCSSO</td>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>$2 million</td>
<td>IT systems architecture</td>
<td>$4.4 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>$930,000</td>
<td>Accessibility, accommodations policy guidelines</td>
<td>$3.7 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>$739,000</td>
<td>Item authorizing, item pool</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>$2.6 million</td>
<td>Communications services provider</td>
<td>GMMB $2.6 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCSSO</td>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>Item specifications</td>
<td>Measured Progress/ ETS $1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PARCC</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>K-12 Formative assessment</td>
<td>The Center: Resources for Teaching and Learning $1.5 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PARCC</td>
<td>$1.5 million</td>
<td>Speaking and listening assessments</td>
<td>Council for Aid to Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PARCC</td>
<td>$680,000</td>
<td>K-12 Formative assessment</td>
<td>Education Development Center $680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PARCC</td>
<td>$627,000</td>
<td>Professional development modules</td>
<td>EPIC (LEO Learning) $627,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PARCC</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>Technical support for assessment development</td>
<td>National Center for Improvement of Assessment $150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>SBAC</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>Sustainability cost modeling</td>
<td>Assessment Solutions Group $80,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$21 million, were awarded for services having to do with information technology, one for SBAC and four for PARCC. Services related to the areas of test administration, project management, formative assessment, and standards setting accrued four contracts each, whereas test specification services earned a total of three contracts and data management and psychometric services yielded two contracts each.

At the very least, these figures show that nine corporate partners to the two policy-making bodies responsible for the CCSS—the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO—have profited from the creation and expansion of industries necessitated by a nationalized curriculum. With respect to curriculum, instruction, and formative assessment, the Common Core has provided publishers of curricular materials and all related professional development with a national market of state departments of education and their public school districts.

With respect to standardized assessment, a primary goal of Race to the Top was to administer common assessments to American students. NCLB had previously entrusted this task to the various state departments of education, which resulted in nearly every state administering a different assessment to measure student proficiency of different academic standards in the areas of ELA and mathematics. In an effort to provide states with a common means of assessing the CCSS, two major testing consortia—SBAC and PARCC—have been endorsed by the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO. Over 56% (9 of the 16 vendors) contracted to provide services to the two testing consortia were corporate partners to the NGA Center for Best Practices, the CCSSO, or both policy-making organizations.

With regard to data collection and management, under the provisions of Race to the Top, state departments of education, in receipt of grant funding, were required to
adopt instruments for teacher and principal evaluation. These evaluation tools are required to include multiple measures of teacher and administrator performance, including demonstrations of student growth on Common Core–aligned standardized assessments, such as the SBAC or PARCC—commonly referred to as student growth percentages (SGPs). Additionally, state departments of education are required to maintain vast databases to store individual student testing data, and individual teacher and administrator performance data. In turn, this requires individual school districts to maintain databases to store individual student data, teacher performance reports, and administrator performance reports. Like the industries providing products and services in the areas of curriculum, instruction, and formative assessment, the data collection, management, and evaluation markets in education have also experienced marked expansion over the last 30 years. The findings of this study suggest this result is due, in large part, to legislative revisions made to the ESEA since 1983.

In short, one might surmise that economic trends in the United States have served to influence reforms made to education policy between the years 1983 to 2010. The juxtaposition of updates made to ESEA and the mission statements of four highly influential corporate philanthropies during the time frame being examined (the Carnegie Corporation, Ford Foundation, Gates Foundation, and Broad Foundation) suggested corporate philanthropy has created an economic impetus for educational foundations. In turn, these foundations, along with corporate partnerships forged with the NGA Center for Best Practices, Education Division, and the CCSSO, have supported educational reform efforts that have superimposed business models of accountability on public education. Consequently, this period of educational reform has resulted in the expansion of government, the advancement of a nationalized curriculum primarily concerned with
developing college and career-readiness skills, and the establishment of new industries
driven by the demands of markets associated with a nationalized curriculum.
CHAPTER 5: FINDINGS

The purpose of this historical research study was to investigate the degree to which economic trends in the United States since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (Gardner, 1983) have influenced subsequent education reform policy from 1983 to 2010. To this end, the researcher provided the historical context needed to examine the interrelatedness of (a) economic trends within American society, as defined by employment, earning power, and the gap between the rich and the poor; (b) how corporate and private philanthropy have created the economic impetus for educational foundations; and (c) how corporate needs, as dictated by economic trends, influence education policy. Presently, this influence has culminated with the adoption and implementation of the CCSS. Throughout the course of this study, the examination of the available data from 1983 to 2010 suggested that corporate ambitions may have resulted in the expansion of government, the advancement of a nationalized curriculum primarily concerned with developing college and career-readiness skills, and the establishment of new industries driven by the demands for goods and services in the markets associated with a nationalized curriculum.

Although these government education policies, enacted by way of revisions to the ESEA from 1983 to 2010, were originally intended to decrease the achievement gap that exists between the economically disadvantaged students and their more affluent counterparts, they have been unsuccessful (Metha, 2012; J. Richardson, 2011; Rocketship Education, 2013). Nobel Prize–winning economist Joseph Stiglitz (2012) reported that many of the government policies that aided in the reduction of inequality from 1950 to 1970 had been systematically undone under the Reagan administration. During Reagan’s years in office, “The divide in market incomes increased and . . . government initiatives
designed to temper the inequalities of the marketplace were dismantled, taxes at the top were lowered and social programs were cut back” (Stiglitz, 2012, p. 24). In his review of literature available on the topic of individual income tax, Stiglitz found that in the early 1980s, income earners who comprised the top 1% received 12% of the nation’s income. According to the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) as cited by Stiglitz, average federal tax rates in 2007 were as follows:

The top one percent get in one week 40 percent more than the bottom fifth receive in a year; the top 0.1 percent received in a day and a half about what the bottom 90 percent received in a year; and the richest 20 percent of income earners earn in total after tax more than the bottom 80 percent combined. (Stiglitz, 2012, p. 23)

One might speculate that the various social policies, such as the reauthorizations of ESEA, may have served to promote the drastic stratifications in income earnings that have been experienced by the American people since 1983.

The following qualitative methods were executed in order to collect all pertinent data, which would allow the researcher to thoroughly investigate the social ramifications of allowing educational policy to be driven by the economic needs of the corporate sector. In an effort to examine the first research question, “How has big business used its influence to impact education reform policy in the United States from 1983 to 2010?” the researcher used the Web-based qualitative data collection database Dedoose to examine (a) the changes in mission statement language of the four corporate philanthropies (the Carnegie Corporation, Ford Foundation, Gates Foundation, and Broad Foundation) from 1983 to 2010, and (b) the changes in language to the reauthorizations of the ESEA. Themes were identified and coded in both sets of documents. This work was then followed up with discerning patterns between both sets of documents when juxtaposed with the period from 1983 to 2010.
The examination of endowments awarded between 1983 and 2010 by the four profiled corporate philanthropies indicated considerable support for the education reform policies—namely, a nationalized curriculum designed under the guise of bipartisanship by the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO. When collectively viewed, the giving patterns of the four profiled philanthropies are suggestive of efforts to steer education reform policies in a manner that promotes corporate interests. To date, the initiation of a nationalized curriculum has led to expansion in both government and industry. Whereas matters of curriculum and assessment had previously been left to the discretion of individual state departments of education, the recession of 2008 created unfavorable economic conditions, making state acquiescence to the conditions for Race to the Top grant money extremely lucrative. Conditions for eligibility necessitated states adopt stricter standardization and accountability measures in education—both widely accepted corporate business practices.

Compliance with these terms is illustrated through the New Jersey state legislation AchieveNJ (2012). The New Jersey Department of Education stated,

AchieveNJ supports implementation of the CCSS and PARCC assessments in several ways. Instruction and student growth are major “input” and “output” of our education system. New evaluations are intended to capture the efficacy of instruction in improving student growth—and to provide information for offering support and recognition for educations in doing this work. (Shulman, 2013, p. 6)

The New Jersey Department of Education website continues to outline the major caveats of CCSS-based instruction, which are in compliance with the terms of eligibility for Race to the Top grant money: (a) the use of teacher and administrator evaluation instruments “designed to foster and capture standards-based instruction”; (b) the observation process, including pre- and postconferences, which provides opportunities for administrators to
“view and document standards-based instruction” in classrooms; (c) measures of student achievement—specifically PARCC for the content areas of English language arts and mathematics—are aligned to the CCSS; (d) standardized assessment results provide “additional evidence” of demonstrated student achievement, aside from other accountability measures such as the teacher and administrator evaluation instruments; and (e) summative evaluation conferences, which take place at the close of the school year and provide time for teachers and administrators to “discuss observation and assessment results” (New Jersey Dept. of Education, 2013).

This example of statewide legislation, in compliance with terms for federal grant money, has allowed corporations to garner vast financial benefits through the creation of new goods and services that cater to the needs of the accountability market in public education. A nationalized curriculum has effectuated market creation and expansion in the industries of technology and services, media, communications, and government and nonprofit entities. The most pervasive needs of the accountability-in-education market include nationalized instructional curricular materials, formative and summative assessments aligned to the nationalized curriculum, Web-based technology solutions to administer formative and summative assessments aligned to the national curriculum, instruments for teacher and administrator evaluations aligned to the nationalized curriculum, and solutions for the management of data pertaining to student assessment results and teacher and administrator evaluation results. As evidenced through the growing commercial needs precipitated through the creation of a national curriculum, one might conclude big business successfully influenced education reform policies in the United States from 1983 to 2010.
To investigate the second research question, “What stakeholder considerations were taken into account for the drafting of the Common Core State Standards?” the researcher originally aimed to interview a minimum of 10 members of various education policy-making organizations involved in drafting the CCSS. A request for an interview was solicited from individuals representing the following organizations: the NGA Center for Best Practices, CCSSO, ALEC, NCSL, the Education Commission of the States (ECS), the U.S. Department of Education, the New Jersey Department of Education, and the New Jersey Office of Legislative Services.

The instrument used to gather information from participants was a qualitative interview consisting of retrospective items (see Appendix A). The researcher utilized an interview guide approach in which participants were asked to provide their perspective with regard to nine specific areas, including responsibilities of the position, their professional relationships with the agencies and/or corporations involved in the drafting of the CCSS, and the considerations taken into account by the various stakeholders involved in the drafting process. Solicited participants were provided with a list of the items, as an e-mail attachment, at the time of initial contact. The researcher asked the questions in the order in which they appear in Appendix A and used follow-up questions when necessary in an effort to clarify or expand upon the participant’s response.

Of the 20 individuals contacted for an interview, not one was able or willing to consent to the full interview. In fact, by the conclusion of the study, the researcher was only able to attain one interview with a former Homeland Security expert with the NGA Center for Best Practices from 2005 through 2007. The information yielded from the interview provided valuable insight into how experts working for the NGA Center for Best Practices researched and identified states’ issues. This research typically results
with the making of recommendations for policies that will ameliorate those issues. 
Although it was implied over the course of the interview that one might assume each of
the divisions in operation under the auspice of the NGA Center for Best Practices
operated in similar fashion, two points were made explicitly clear: (a) The subject had not
at any point in time had any firsthand experience of how the Education Division of the
NGA Center for Best Practices identified states’ issues or of how to go about
recommending feasible solutions by way of policy. (b) The tenure of service for this
subject concluded nearly 6 years prior to the interview, as a result of turnover in staff,
which is a frequent occurrence in Washington-based political agencies, operational
protocols may have changed during the years leading up to the drafting of the CCSS.

As for the other individuals who declined to participate in the study, their reasons
for declining varied. Aside from individuals who altogether neglected to respond to the
solicitation for an interview or simply declined without providing any reason (four
nonresponses), those individuals who did provide a reason stated one of the following:
too busy (one response), no knowledge of the CCSS drafting process (five responses), or
not comfortable discussing the CCSS drafting process (two responses). In one specific
instance, a subject replied, “I am uncomfortable with the attention you are trying to
draw.” In another instance, the secretary of a potential subject, who happened to be a
high-ranking official within a state department of education, responded via e-mail, “Due
to scheduling constraints, [the subject] is no longer able to participate in your study.”
One can only speculate that a source of discomfort might be the anticipated backlash
from current or prospective employers and/or colleagues and various news and/or social
media outlets. This is a seemingly ironic consequence given the transparency that
typically results from increased measures of accountability. The idea of the education
profession being built on collegiality is perhaps best summed up by Sir Ken Robinson: “Most great learning happens in groups. Collaboration is the stuff of growth” (Royal Society for the encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce, 2011). With that tenet in mind, the researcher mistakenly assumed individuals involved in the drafting of the CCSS would be willing to share their knowledge of the drafting process. The selected subjects’ reluctance to participate created a limitation so that the researcher was unable to determine with any degree of specificity what stakeholder considerations were taken into account for the drafting of the CCSS.

Efforts to investigate information available to answer the third research question, “In what ways was the business community involved in the drafting of the CCSS?” resulted in the examination of the annual reports and Forms 990 of the four profiled philanthropies—the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, the Gates Foundation, and the Broad Foundation. The information uncovered during this portion of the study suggested the corporate sector sought to influence education reform policy through the establishment and leveraging of corporate philanthropies as a means of maximizing corporate investments.

The limitations of this portion of the study posed substantial challenges. There was only one researcher coding the reauthorizations of the ESEA and up to 30 years of mission statements for each of the philanthropies. This condition eliminated the possibility for intercoding reliability. As a result, nuances in language were subject to the interpretation of the researcher, whose perceptions may have been influenced by personal experiences, which embody an 11-year career within the education profession as a middle school teacher serving an impoverished urban district and as an administrator serving an affluent district.
Additionally, some of the language within the body of the coded documents applied multiple coding criteria. Lastly, annual reports prior to 2008 for the Broad Foundation were not made publicly available. Requests for this information via telephone and e-mail to the Broad Foundation headquarters were not returned. Since federal tax regulation does not require foundations to disclose endowments made to political nonprofits with 501(c) designations, as is the case with the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO, there was virtually no way to trace the source of endowments made by the Broad Foundation.

The examination of the mission statements, annual reports, and financial records of these four corporate philanthropies suggests that corporations may benefit from the establishment of philanthropies, in part, to forge partnerships with two policy-making bodies responsible for the design and implementation of the CCSS. In the case of the four corporate philanthropies profiled for the purpose of this study, an analysis of the coding of each foundation’s mission statement, along with that of the program accomplishments outlined in the Forms 990 for the NGA and the CCSSO, suggests that these foundations may have participated in lobbying efforts with the intent of leveraging their influence to drive education policy. Involvement in such activities, for the purpose of influencing education reform, may serve to benefit the market growth of industries affected by the creation and implementation of a national curriculum.

In an effort to address the fourth and fifth research questions, “In what ways does a national curriculum influence the growth or decline of the accountability market in education?” and “How do education reform policies benefit big business in the United States?” the researcher utilized descriptive statistics to identify the number of for-profit companies that market and sell products having to do with accountability systems in
education. Originally, the researcher sought to profile the annual financial records of the largest grossing company from 2008 to 2012. This time span was selected because it allowed for the examination of the company’s net income in the preceding 2 years and the succeeding 2 years of the adoption of the CCSS. This goal proved to be especially lofty, as there are literally thousands of publicly and privately held U.S.-based companies that serve the needs of the accountability market in education. Upon deeper consideration, the researcher minimized the scope of the companies being examined to that of the corporate partnerships forged with the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO (see Appendices L and M). The findings revealed that the two national assessment consortia charged with creating instruments to measure student proficiency of the CCSS—PARCC and SBAC—had awarded contracts to companies and organizations that also maintain corporate partnerships with the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO. To date, the three vendors serving the accountability in education market that were awarded the highest-paying contracts from PARCC and SBAC were McGraw-Hill Education/CTB, Pearson, and the ETS. The combined contracted services of the three companies amount to $178.1 million, which is 49% of the $360 million appropriated to PARCC and SBAC by Race to the Top funds.

The adoption of a national curriculum, as evidenced through the CCSS, has been perpetuated by subsequent renewals of the ESEA, the NCLB, and most recently Race to the Top. Figure 3 provides a visual representation of how economic realities serve to fuel corporate interests in reforming educational policies to reflect the implementation of accountability measures for educational leaders, teachers, and students—a common business practice. These reforms have resulted in a national curriculum, which has benefitted big business in the United States through the manipulated growth of
accountability markets in education. Although the NGA Center for Best Practices and the CCSSO both maintain the primary purpose of these reform efforts is to build college and career readiness, that remains to be seen through the work of future studies.

**Recommendations for Future Studies**

Individuals interested in adding to this body of research may find it worthwhile to correlate future PARCC and SBAC indicators of college and career readiness to college entrance rates, college graduation rates, employment rates by industry, or market growth within a particular industry. Data from such studies may be further disaggregated to examine trends by demographic features such as gender, race, ethnicity, region, or other indicators of socioeconomic status. Such studies may be used as an attempt to quantify to what degree the implementation of the CCSS has served to develop widespread college and career readiness.

Future studies may also attempt to survey representatives from various philanthropies, collective bargaining agencies (e.g., NEA, American Federation of Teachers), and high-stakes testing opt-out groups (e.g., United Opt Out, National Center for Fair and Open Testing, etc.), which are involved in promoting educational reform through public policy. An expanded sample size of such philanthropies, collective bargaining agencies, and/or opt-out organizations may allow researchers to conduct qualitative studies that will investigate general trends in policy aimed at reforming (a) K–12 public education and (b) teacher and school leader preparation programs offered at institutions for higher education. Such studies may elect to conduct statistical analyses of data (e.g., financial contributions, corporate partnerships, union membership, parental involvement, student achievement, etc.).
At this point in time, the examination of data for the purpose of this study has evidenced the gradual evolution of corporate philanthropies and the partnerships forged with policy-making bodies has allowed the corporate sector to successfully influence education reform policies from 1983 to 2010 (see Figure 1).

**Implications for Public Policy**

The researcher aimed to augment the body of research that addresses concerns related to why and how big business in the United States has used political capital to shape educational reform policies of the last 30 years. The economic conditions present within American society during the 1980s, 1990s, and 2000s have caused a perceived decline in the overall quality of the American public education system when compared to other industrialized countries. This perception, whose beginning is marked with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983 and continues nearly 30 years later with the adoption of the CCSS in 2010, has served as an impetus for educational reform policies. The overarching purpose of this contribution was to raise awareness among educational leaders, parents, and taxpayers of the strong influence the elite business community exercises over federal and state lawmakers with regard to educational reform efforts that have resulted in the promulgation of a nationalized curriculum—the CCSS. Such persuasion may potentially influence the growth or decline of specific American industries and markets, thereby dictating future educational reforms in the name of economic prosperity.

**Implications for Educational Leadership**

The education reforms adopted within the age of accountability have resulted in the standardization of curriculum, high-stakes assessment, and instrumentation for teacher and principal evaluation. As stated in Chapter 1, such reforms are reflective of
Weber’s theory of monocratic bureaucracy (Owens & Valesky, 2011). The first three tenets speak to (a) a fixed division of labor, (b) a hierarchy of offices, and (c) a set of rules governing performance. The top of this hierarchal model consists of each state’s respective governor and chief state school officer, who are charged with ensuring successful statewide implementation of the CCSS. Regional efforts at implementation are overseen by respective county superintendents of education, who manage the district superintendents. On the district level, superintendents are charged with evaluating school-based principals on their ability to adequately evaluate each member of their teaching staff.

Although several instruments for evaluation are available for purchase, each instrument must be in compliance with the following guidelines outlined by the National Center for Education Evaluation (NCEE) and Regional Assistance: (a) establish clear approaches to measuring student achievement growth for individual students; (b) design and implement rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation systems for teachers; (c) differentiate effectiveness using multiple rating categories that take student achievement growth into account as a significant factor and are designed with teacher involvement; (d) conduct annual evaluations that include timely and constructive feedback and provide teachers with data on student achievement growth for their students, classes, and schools; (e) use evaluations to inform decisions about staff development, compensation, promotion, tenure, certification, and removal of ineffective teachers (Hallegren, 2014). Essentially, all five of these requirements are satisfied once states adopt the CCSS (1); implement a teacher evaluation model, which is in part, contingent upon demonstrated student performance on high-stakes, CCSS aligned-assessments (2, 3, 4); and use results yielded from the evaluation instrument to make personnel decisions (5).
In theory, when applied to the management of static and consumable objects and/or services that bear profit, this model is touted as “the most pervasive and credible organizational concept in the world” (Owens & Valesky, 2011, p. 207). In the case of public education, the end users are students and teachers, and the objective is to compel end users to demonstrate performance at predetermined levels of effectiveness (for teachers) or proficiency (for students). When this expectation is mandated without taking into account a wide spectrum of uncontrollable challenges with which a school, district, or state must contend (many of which are directly linked to the socioeconomic status of the community) it is shortsighted to expect standardized reform models to successfully ameliorate all challenges in all public school settings.

Conversely, transformational leadership asserts that excellence, in both teaching and learning, is achieved by leaders who successfully appeal to the motive bases of their teachers and students (Burns, 1979). These leaders promote shared ownership of district- and school-wide goals, consider the voices of all stakeholders when developing policies and procedures, encourage professional growth and risk taking rooted in research-based best practices, and create conditions whereby collaboration and successes are celebrated. The presence of these qualities serves as “the ultimate test of practical leadership [in which] the realization of intended real change . . . meets people’s enduring needs” (Burns, 1979, p. 461). Leaders of American public schools must be allowed to meet the enduring and unique needs of the American people, free of interference from corporate interests.
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APPENDIX A

Subject Questionnaire

The following questions comprise the questionnaire used for individuals serving the government agencies (the National Governors Association, the Council of Chief State School Officers, the American Legislative Exchange Council, the National Council of State Legislatures, and the New Jersey Office of Legislative Services) involved in the drafting of the Common Core State Standards:

1. What is your position within [said organization]? What are your responsibilities within that position?
2. How have you been involved in the drafting of the CCSS?
3. Did you coordinate with other agencies? If so, how did you coordinate with other agencies?
4. What was the nature of the relationship your organization had with other agencies?
5. Who were the major stakeholders involved in the drafting of the CCSS?
6. What organization or groups provided input during the drafting process?
7. Did your organization have any corporate partners? If so, who? What were their priorities?

8. Did their priorities impact your organization’s final recommendation with regard to the drafting of the CCSS? If so, in what way?

9. For CCSSO, what is the difference between a Level 1, 2, or 3 corporate partner?
APPENDIX B

Informed Consent

Title: A Historical Overview of Corporate Influences on Education Policy in the United States from 1983 to 2010

Researcher: Tiffany L. Jacobson

Institution: Saint Peter’s University, Jersey City, New Jersey

Department: Education

Contact Information: (T) 201.320.2119, (F) 201. 330. 8940, tjacobson@saintpeters.edu

You are invited to participate in a research study investigating corporate influences on education policy in the United States from 1983-2010.

The research will involve your participation in an interview. The interview will be comprised of nine items from a standard questionnaire. These questions will ask of the nature of your involvement, or that of the institution for which you work, in the writing and adoption of the Common Core State Standards.

The interview will take approximately 20 minutes, and it will be recorded so that responses may be later analyzed.

You may not gain any benefit from participating in the study, but your responses will help the researcher to better understand the degree to which the Common Core State Standards initiative has been influenced by corporate needs.

If you volunteer to participate in this study, please remember that you may withdraw your participation at any time during the interview, free of consequence.

There are no risks from participating in the study.

Your identity will not be kept confidential, unless requested. The recording of your interview will be erased at the conclusion of the study. The findings of this study may be presented at professional conferences, or published in professional journals, but your name and all other identifying information will remain confidential.

If you have any questions about this study, or if you have any questions regarding your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at Saint Peter’s University at (201) 761-6085.
Informed Consent Form for Participation in a Research Project

(Note: All blanks on this form must be completed. If any category of information is not applicable, it should be so indicated. If the subject is a Saint Peter’s University student, an additional form must also be executed.)

Name of Participant________________________________________

Project Title__________________________________________

1. I have been asked to participate in the above project. I understand that this project involves research.

   a. The purpose of this research is:

   b. The expected duration of my participation is:

   c. The procedures which will be followed in connection with the research are:

   d. Some of these procedures are experimental, specifically:

2. The reasonably foreseeable risks or discomforts to me in connection with this research are:

3. The benefits which I or others may reasonably be expected to receive from this research are:

4. If applicable, I have been informed of any alternative procedures or courses of treatment, if any, which might be advantageous to me. These are as follows:

5. I have been informed that the extent, if any, to which the confidentiality of any records in connection with the research in question identifying me will be maintained is as follows:
6. If the research in question involves more than minimum risk, I have had explained to me whether any compensation is available and whether any medical treatment is available in the event I should be injured, and if so what these consist of, or where further information may be obtained.

Specifically, I have been informed that:

7. I have been informed who to contact for answers to pertinent questions about the research and about my rights in connection with the research. I have also been informed who to contact in the event I receive any research related injury. Specifically, I have been informed that I should contact:

8. I have been informed that my participation in the research is voluntary, that refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled, and that I may discontinue my participation in the research at any time without any penalty or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled.

(Note: The following are to be stricken out where not appropriate)

9. Some or all of the treatments or procedures involved in the research may involve risks to me which are currently unforeseeable.

10. The presently anticipated circumstances under which my participation in the research may be terminated by the researcher(s) without my consent are as follows:

11. Additional costs which may result to me by reason of my participation in the research in question are as follows:

12. The possible consequences to me if I elect to withdraw from the research are as follows:

13. In order to insure the orderly termination of my participation in the research the following procedures will be adopted:

14. I have been informed that any significant new findings developed
during the course of the research which may relate to my willingness to continue participation will be provided to me.

15. The number of subjects participating in the research is ________________.

16. I have requested and received the following information concerning the research: OR

I have been afforded an opportunity to obtain any additional information which I may wish to receive concerning the research. I do not desire any such additional information.

17. The name(s) of the person(s) who have provided me with the information contained in this form is/are:

By signing this form I certify that I have read and understand its contents and I voluntarily agree to participate in the research in question.

Signature: ___________________________________________

Dated: ______________

Witness: ____________________________________________

Dated: ______________
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National Institute of Health (NIH) Certificate

Certificate of Completion

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) Office of Extramural Research certifies that Tiffany Jacobson successfully completed the NIH Web-based training course "Protecting Human Research Participants".

Date of completion: 03/02/2011

Certification Number: 648101
## APPENDIX D

### Methodology Map

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. How has big business used its influence to impact education reform policy in the United States from 1983 to 2012?</td>
<td>a. Use a time line to examine mission statements of traditional and new age philanthropies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Chart change in language from ESEA to NCLB to Race to the Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Can parallels be drawn between language of the mission statements/changes in mission statements over time to changes in legislative language?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tool: timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mission Statement Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>←---------------------------------------------------------------→</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Legislation Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can funding patterns be discerned?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What stakeholder considerations were taken into account for the drafting of the Common Core State Standards?</td>
<td>Interview: interview member of the NGA and CCSSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tool: personal interviews, NGA and CCSSO websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In what ways was the business community involved in this process?</td>
<td>Examination of records: Identify venture philanthropists that have supported NGA and CCSSO since the beginning of the CCSS movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tool: spreadsheet identifying main contributors of NGA and CCSSO in the years leading up to the drafting of the CCSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In what ways does a national curriculum influence the growth market having to do with accountability systems in education?</td>
<td>Examination of Statistics: descriptive statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Data sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify the number of for-profit companies that market and sell products having to do with accountability systems in education for 3 years before (2007) CCSS and 3 years after (2013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Profile the highest grossing company; examine quarterly growth from 2007 to 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. How do education reform policies, which are impacted by economic realities, benefit big business in the United States?</td>
<td>Department of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>National Center of Educational Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## APPENDIX E
Time Line of Philanthropic Mission Statements

Carnegie Corporation of New York

1998: The Carnegie Corporation of New York is a philanthropic foundation created by Andrew Carnegie in 1911 to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States. Its charter was later amended to permit the use of funds for the same purposes for some countries that are or were members of the British overseas Commonwealth. The corporation’s basic endowment was $135 million; the market value of its assets was approximately $1.4 billion as of September 30, 1998.

1999: The Carnegie Corporation of New York is a philanthropic foundation created by Andrew Carnegie in 1911 to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding among the people of the United States. Its charter was later amended to permit the use of funds for the same purposes for some countries that are or were members of the British overseas Commonwealth. The corporation’s basic endowment was $135 million; the market value of its assets was approximately $1.7 billion as of September 30, 1999.

2000-2008: Carnegie Corporation of New York was created by Andrew Carnegie in 1911, to promote “the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding.” Under Carnegie’s will, grants must benefit the people of the United States, although up to 7.4 percent of the funds may be used for the same purpose in countries that are or have been members of the British Commonwealth, with a current emphasis on sub-Saharan Africa. As a grant-making foundation, the Corporation seeks to carry out Carnegie’s vision of philanthropy, which he said should aim “to do real and permanent good in this world.

2009-2012: "To do real and permanent good in this world” (Gospel of Wealth, 1900).

Ford Foundation

1983: The Ford Foundation is a private, nonprofit institution dedicated to the public well-being. It seeks to identify and contribute to the solution of problems of national or international importance. The Foundation works mainly by granting funds to institutions and organizations for experimental, demonstration, and developmental efforts that give promise of producing significant advances in various fields. As an additional means of accomplishing program objectives, the Foundation in some instances makes grants to individuals whose professional talent or experience corresponds with its programs and activities. The Foundation also makes loans to or otherwise invests in enterprises that advance philanthropic purposes in its fields of interest.
The Foundation was established in 1936 by Henry Ford and Edsel Ford and made grants largely to Michigan charitable and educational institutions until 1950, when it became a national organization. It has had no ties to the Ford family or company for many years.

Including the fiscal year 1983, the Foundation has made commitments totaling $5.9 billion. The recipients have been located in all fifty states, the District of Columbia, and various foreign countries, especially in less-developed areas.

A Board of Trustees from a variety of fields determines Foundation policy. A professional staff evaluates grant applications, explores means and opportunities to stimulate advances in fields with which the Foundation is concerned, works with prospective grantees, and recommends proposals for approval by the president and trustees.

Applications for grants should set forth objectives and details of methods for carrying them out, the qualifications of the persons and institutions involved, the institution's affirmative-action policy and record, and an estimated budget. The Foundation does not use grant-application forms. Domestic applications and inquiries about how nominations or applications for grants to individuals may be made should be sent to the secretary of the Foundation; applicants in foreign countries should direct their proposals to the resident representative.

Activities supported by Foundation grants must be charitable, educational, or scientific under the appropriate provisions of the Internal Revenue Code and Regulations. Because its funds are limited in relation to the great number of worthwhile proposals it receives, the Foundation limits its grants to efforts likely to have wide effect. It does not grant funds for purely personal or local needs, the routine operating costs of institutions, or programs for which government support is readily available, or the construction or maintenance of buildings.

1984: Including the fiscal year 1984, the Foundation has made commitments totaling $6 billion. The recipients have been located in all fifty states, the District of Columbia, and various foreign countries, especially in less-developed areas.

1985: Including the fiscal year 1985, the Foundation has made commitments totaling $6.2 billion. The recipients have been located in all fifty states, the District of Columbia, and various foreign countries, especially in less-developed areas.

1988: Including the fiscal year 1988, the Foundation has made commitments totaling $6.8 billion. The recipients have been located in all fifty states, the District of Columbia, and various foreign countries, especially in less-developed areas.

1990: Including the fiscal year 1990, the Foundation has made commitments totaling $7 billion. The recipients have been located in all fifty states, the District of Columbia, and various foreign countries, especially in less-developed areas.
1992: **Including the fiscal year 1992, the Foundation has made commitments totaling more than $7 billion. The recipients have been located in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and various foreign countries, especially in less-developed areas.

A Board of Trustees from a variety of fields determines Foundation policy. A professional staff evaluates grant applications, explores means and opportunities to stimulate advances in fields with which the Foundation is concerned, works with prospective grantees, and recommends proposals for approval by the president and by senior staff.

1993: A resource for innovative people and institutions worldwide

The Ford Foundation is a private, nonprofit institution. Established in 1936, it made grants largely to Michigan charitable and educational institutions until 1950, when it moved to a national and international program of giving. Including the fiscal year 1993, the Foundation has made commitments totaling more than $7 billion. The recipients have been located in all 50 states, the District of Columbia, and various foreign countries, especially in less-developed areas.

A Board of Trustees from a variety of fields determines Foundation policy. A professional staff evaluates grant applications, explores means and opportunities to stimulate advances in fields with which the Foundation is concerned, works with prospective grantees, and recommends proposals for approval.

1994-2004: The Ford Foundation is a resource for innovative people and institutions worldwide. Our goals are to: Strengthen democratic values, reduce poverty and injustice, promote international cooperation and advance human achievement.

2005: Strengthen democratic values, reduce poverty and injustice, promote international cooperation and advance human achievement.

2006: Delivering on a promise to advance human welfare with a diversity of approaches and continuity of purpose: finding leaders, supporting social movements, building institutions, creating opportunities.

2007: Strengthen democratic values; reduce poverty and injustice; promote international cooperation; and advance human achievement

2008: We believe in the inherent dignity of all people. But too many are excluded from social, political, economic, and cultural institutions that affect their well-being, denying them a voice in decisions that affect their lives and the opportunity to achieve their full potential. And while the scale of the problems facing humankind has grown, so has our ability to make positive change.

We work to ensure that social systems and institutions include everyone, so that all people have a voice in decisions that affect their lives. Our approach to today’s problems
is informed by decades of experience working with visionaries on the frontlines of social change around the world.

We strive to be strategic and focused in our efforts, so our resources are put to their best use in working with our grantees to create lasting change that transforms people’s lives.

2009-2010: The Ford Foundation works with visionary leaders and organizations worldwide to change social structures and institutions so that all people have the opportunity to reach their full potential, contribute to society, have a voice in the decisions that affect them, and live and work in dignity. This commitment to social justice is carried out through programs that strengthen democratic values, reduce poverty and injustice, promote international cooperation, and advance human knowledge, creativity and achievement.

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation


1998, Gates Library Foundation: The Gates Library Foundation is dedicated to partnering with public libraries to bring access to computers, the Internet, and digital information to patrons in low income communities in the United States and Canada.

1999: 1) Close the Digital Divide: Innovations in information technologies are changing the way we learn, communicate and live our daily lives. However, poor communities, that arguably have the most to gain from access to computers, technology training and digital networks, are the least likely to have them. As part of its commitment to bring the promise of technology to neighborhoods in need, the Foundation is equipping every eligible library in the U.S. and Canada with high-powered computers, Internet access and technology training and support for librarians; 2) Open the doors to higher education: The Foundation has a 20-year commitment to support 20,000 students from ethnic and racial communities currently underrepresented in higher education today. Scholar-leaders showing academic promise, unmet financial need and demonstrated leadership are eligible for scholarships for college and graduate studies; 3) Equip learning leaders to integrate technology in schools: Using our home turf of Washington State as a laboratory, the Foundation sponsors the Teacher Leadership Program, a model for supporting teachers in their effort to infuse technology into the learning environment. A parallel effort, the Smart Tools Academy, aims to equip school principals and administrators for their leadership role in technology integration.

2000, Education Mission: The education programs of the foundation were launched in March 2000, with a $350 commitment to support education improvements in three priority areas: model schools and districts; professional development opportunities for teachers, principals and superintendents; and scholarships to broaden access to higher education. 2001, Education: The foundation's Education Program seeks to address the
current inequalities in the preparation for and access to college for all students by supporting the creation of small, rigorous high schools, and reducing financial barriers to college.

2002: Education: The need for reform is critical. The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is committed to helping reduce the inequities in our education system, assuring every student in the United States the opportunity for success, regardless of race, location, or income level. To better serve our students, the foundation is helping create new small high schools and transform existing high schools into smaller, more effective learning environments that provide that rigorous curriculum and support students need to graduate ready for college, work, and citizenship. Through partnerships with other foundations and local school districts, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation has supported hundreds of such high schools around the country. The foundation is reducing financial barriers to higher education through several scholarship programs.

2003: Education: As a nation, we have yet to create a high school system that ensures that all of our young people reach their full potential. Today, nearly one-third of eighth graders will not graduate from high school. Of those who do graduate, fewer than half will be prepared for a four-year college. Low-income and minority students are at particular risk. Nearly half of all African-American and Hispanic students won’t make it to graduation day.

Educating America’s children is critical to the future of our society, economy, and democracy. High school dropouts are far more likely to face unemployment and much less likely to vote than those who finish high school. And too often those who do graduate are not prepared for college and work in an economy where virtually all jobs that yield a family wage demand an education beyond high school.

The foundation’s Education program is working to help communities create high school systems that prepare all students for college, work, and citizenship. In the fall of 2003, more than 150 new or redesigned high-quality small schools opened their doors in 22 states across the country. These small schools are helping foster the three R’s — rigor, relationships, and relevance — that contribute to all students succeeding. Half of the nation’s largest urban school districts now are engaged in high school reform, many of which receive support from the foundation.

In 2003, the foundation also continued to forge partnerships with education and civic leaders, school districts, and other foundations to raise awareness of the need for all students to graduate college-ready, and to make real changes in the nation’s education landscape.

2004-2005: Education: Ensuring that all students graduate from high school ready for college, work, and citizenship by supporting great high schools.

2006: Education: We established the United States Program to reduce inequities and to increase access to opportunity so those with the greatest need and the fewest resources could have the same chance as everybody else to succeed. We work to accomplish these goals through the following portfolios of giving: a) Early Learning in Washington State: Helping make sure that all children in Washington state start learning before they begin school and begin kindergarten ready to succeed; b) Increasing High School Graduation
and College Readiness Rates: Significantly increasing the number of students—particularly low-income, Hispanic, and African-American students—who graduate from high school with the skills and knowledge necessary for college and work; c) Scholarships and College Access: Removing financial barriers to college for promising students who can’t afford it.

2007, Education: We are committed to the goal of extending greater opportunity to everyone in the United States, with a particular focus on improving secondary and postsecondary education in America.

2008, Education: In the United States, we work towards one overarching goal—more opportunity for everyone in this country. Bill and Melinda Gates believe an excellent education is the most direct path to opportunity, especially for low-income young people, so that is the focus of our efforts.

2009-2012: Guided by the belief that every life has equal value, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation works to help all people lead healthy, productive lives. In developing countries, it focuses on improving people’s health and giving them the chance to lift themselves out of hunger and extreme poverty. In the United States, it seeks to ensure that all people—especially those with the fewest resources—have access to the opportunities they need to succeed in school and life. Based in Seattle, Washington, the foundation is led by CEO Jeff Raikes and Co-chair William H. Gates Sr., under the direction of Bill and Melinda Gates and Warren Buffett.

Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation

2008-2010: Transforming K-12 urban public education through better governance, management, labor relations and competition

2011-2012: Investing in the bold and innovative transformation of K-12 urban public education in America so that students of all backgrounds are academically prepared for college.
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Educational Agendas From Philanthropic Annual Reports and Contributions Made to the NGA Center for Best Practices and CCSSO by Foundation, 1983–2013

*Carnegie Corporation of New York*

1983–1987

Education: science, technology, and the economy

- Improvements of education in science, math, and technology
- Improvements of access of minority-group members and girls to high-quality education in science, math, and technology
- Examination of the impact of science and technology on the economy and ways in which society can prepare for change especially through educational reform

Total endowed to NGA: $998,500

1983: Social policy with respect to children and their families $20,000

1984: Adolescent pregnancy $98,500

1985: N/A

1986: N/A

1987: Implementation of findings from *A Nation Prepared*: $890,000

Teachers for the 21st Century

Total endowed to CCSSO: $450,400

1983: Resource Center on Educational Equity $157,000

1984: N/A

1985: Resource Center on Educational Equity $293,400

1986: N/A

1987: N/A

1988-1993
Education: science, technology, and the economy

• Improvements of education in science, math, and technology

• Improvements of access of minority-group members and girls to high-quality education in science, math, and technology

• Examination of the impact of science and technology on the economy and ways in which society can prepare for change especially through educational reform changed in 1989 to . . . educational reform, with special emphasis on improving the caliber of teachers in the nation’s elementary and secondary schools and on improving conditions under which they work (1989 Annual Report, p. 20).

Changed in 1991 to the Education and Healthy Development of Children and Youth (1991 Annual Report, p. 28)

• Concerned with health and development of children from prenatal period to age 3

• Improving the educational achievement and reducing the health problems of young adolescents

• Supporting selected curriculum projects and dissemination of programs that encourage the study of science and mathematics among minority members and girls

Added fourth area in 1992

• On education reform, the Corporation supports some aspects of movement for more effective education, including changes in the education profession, analysis of various forms of school restructuring, and establishment of linkages between schools and other institutions (1992 Annual Report, p. 33).

Total endowed to NGA: $2,570,691

1988: Implementation of findings from A Nation Prepared:

Teachers for the 21st Century and Time for Results: The Governors’ 1991 Report on Education $691,000

1989: Implementation of findings from A Nation Prepared:

Teachers for the 21st Century and Time for Results: The
Governors’ 1991 Report on Education $504,000

1990: N/A

1991: Implement restructuring of elementary and secondary systems, resulting from Education Summit–1989 $500,000

1992: Implementing national goals for education in the 1990s $400,000

1993: Implementing national goals for education in the 1990s $475,000

Total endowed to CCSSO: $737,200

1988: N/A

1989: N/A

1990: N/A

1991: Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium $300,200

1992: N/A

1993: Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium $437,000

1994–1999

The Education and Healthy Development of Children and Youth

• Early childhood

• Early adolescence

• Science Education

• Education Reform

General grants added in 1996 to “explore broad social and economic forces that affect family functioning and link new knowledge about children and youth to media and policy audiences” (1996 Annual Report, p. 39).
Wording changed in 1999:

Education

• Early Childhood Education and Care

• Urban School Reform

• Higher Education

Total endowed to NGA: $1,450,000

1994: Implementing national goals for education in the 1990s $600,000

1995: Implementing policies that promote school readiness $250,000

1996: N/A

1997: Implementing national goals for education in the 1990s $400,000

1998: N/A

1999: Implementing policies that promote young children’s healthy development and school readiness $200,000

Total endowed to CCSSO: 2,850,000

1994: Technical assistance meeting on school-based community service programs $25,000

1995: Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium $450,000

1996: N/A

1997: Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium $450,000

1998: Implementation of the Comprehensive School Reform Program $25,000

1999: Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium $450,000
2000–2005

Education

• Early Childhood and Education Care (changed to Advancing Literacy in 2005)
• Higher Education
• Urban School Reform
• Discretionary Grants

Total endowed to NGA: 1,405,300

2000: Strengthening teacher education $600,000

2001: Implementing policies that promote young children’s healthy development and school readiness $299,900

Strengthening teacher education $505,400

2002–2003: N/A

2004–2005: N/A

Total endowed to CCSSO: $623,700

2000: Effective state and district practices to improve achievement in high poverty schools $225,000

2001: N/A

2002–2003: Strengthening the capacity of state education agencies and districts to improve education services for English-language learners in high schools $398,700

2004–2005: N/A

2006–2013

Education

• Advancing Literacy
• Higher Education
• Urban School Reform
• Discretionary Grants

Changed in 2008 to
• Democracy and Urban Education
• Urban Education/Higher Education
• Higher Education/Teacher Education

Changed in 2009 to
• New Designs for Education Systems
• Urban Education and Higher Education

Total endowed to NGA: $985,000

2006: Developing state policies to promote adolescent literacy $50,000

2007: N/A

2008: Developing innovative teacher compensation models to increase teacher effectiveness and student outcomes $300,000

2009: N/A

2010: Towards an action agenda to improve STEM education in collaboration with National Academy of Science and Achieve, Inc. $635,200

2011: N/A

2012: N/A

2013: unavailable

Total endowed to CCSSO: $1,982,791

2006: N/A
2007: N/A

2008: N/A

2009: Research and technical assistance to states in the adoption and implementation of clearer, higher standards in English Language Arts and Mathematics (CCSS) $1,240,400

2010: N/A

2011: SBAC ELL Advisory Committee $50,000

2012: Implementation of CCSS $691,700

2013: unavailable

Total endowed to Achieve, Incorporated: $3,013,300

2010: Developing of Next Generation of Science Standards $2,163,300

2011: ELL subcommittee for the PARCC $50,000

2012: Completion of Next Generation Science Standards $800,000

2013: unavailable

Ford Foundation

1983–1987

Program Overview

Urban Poverty

Rural Poverty and Resources

Human Rights and Governance

Education and Culture

International Affairs

Population

Special Program Actions
Total endowed to NGA:

1983: Rural Poverty and Resources-
   Land and water management

1984: Urban Poverty-Nutrition and Health Studies
   Rural Poverty and Resources
   Land and water management
   Governance and public policy
   Governmental structures and functions

1985: Rural Poverty and Resources
   Land and water management (returned)
   Governance and public policy
   Governmental structures and functions (returned)

1986: Rural Poverty and Resources
   Land and water management (returned)

1987: Rural Poverty and Resources
   Public Policy (returned)

Total endowed to CCSSO:

1983: Equal Opportunity for Women

1984: Urban Poverty–Other

1985: Urban Poverty–Research and Dissemination
   Urban Poverty–Other (returned)

1986: N/A
1987: Secondary School and Youth Employment

School Improvement for the Disadvantaged (returned)

1988–1993

Program Overview

Urban Poverty

Rural Poverty and Resources (added 1991)

Human Rights and Social Justice

Governance and Public Policy (changed to Human Rights and Governance in 1990, changed back to Governance and Public Policy in 1991)

Education and Culture

International Affairs

Reproductive Health and Population (added 1990)

Other Actions (removed 1991)

Media Projects (added 1991)

Total endowed to NGA

1988: Urban poverty–welfare and teen pregnancy

Rural poverty and resources–policy development

Governance and public policy

Governmental structures and functions


1990: Governance and public policy

Governmental structures and functions

1991: Rural poverty and resources–policy development
1992: N/A

1993: N/A

Total endowed to CCSSO

1988: N/A


1990: N/A

1991: Urban poverty–youth employment

1992: Education and culture–access and equity

1993: N/A

1994–1999

Program Overview 1994–1995

Urban Poverty

Rural Poverty and Resources

Rights and Social Justice

Governance and Public Policy

Education and Culture

International Affairs

Reproductive Health and Population

Media Projects

Program Overview (1996–1999)

Asset Building and Community Development

Peace and Social Justice
Education, Media, Arts, and Culture

Total endowed to NGA:

1994: Governance and public policy–public policy analysis

1995: N/A

1996: N/A

1997: N/A

1998: N/A

1999: Asset building–economic development–policy research

Total endowed to CCSSO:

1994: N/A

1995: N/A

1996: N/A

1997: N/A

1998: N/A

1999: N/A

2000–2005

Program Overview

Asset Building and Community Development

Peace and Social Justice

Education, Media, Arts, and Culture (changed in 2002 to Knowledge, Creativity, and Freedom)

Total endowed to NGA:
2000: N/A

2001: Asset building and community development–workforce development

Asset building and community development–human development and reproductive health

Education, knowledge, and religion–education reform

2002: N/A

2003: Asset building and community development–workforce development

2004: Asset building and community development–workforce development

2005: N/A

Total endowed to CCSSO:

2000: N/A

2001: N/A

2002: Knowledge, creativity, and freedom: education, knowledge, and religion:

Higher education and scholarship–arts education partnership

2003: N/A

2004: N/A

2005: Knowledge, creativity, and freedom: education, knowledge, and religion:

Higher education and scholarship–arts education partnership

2006–2013

Program Overview

Asset Building and Community Development

Peace and Social Justice

Knowledge, Creativity, and Freedom
Program Overview 2007

Closing the Economic Opportunity Gap

Strengthening Democratic Values

Increasing Access to Higher Education

Global Reach and Impact

Governance and Accountability

Total endowed to NGA:

2006: Asset building and community development–workforce development

2007: N/A

2008: N/A

2009: Asset building and community development–workforce development

2010: N/A

2011: N/A

2012: N/A

2013: N/A

Total endowed to CCSSO:

2006: Knowledge, creativity, and freedom–education and scholarship

2007: N/A

2008: N/A

2009: Knowledge, creativity, and freedom–transforming secondary education

2010: N/A

2011: Knowledge, creativity, and freedom–transforming secondary education

2012: N/A
2013: N/A

Total endowed to Achieve, Incorporated:
2006–2013: N/A

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation
1983–1987
1988–1993
1994–1998 Grants
World Health and Population
Education
Community Giving in the Pacific Northwest
Annual Gifts and Special Projects
Libraries and Access to Information

1999 Grants
Global Health
Libraries and Public Access to Information
Education
Pacific Northwest
Special Projects

Total endowed to NGA: $0.00

1998: N/A
1999: N/A
Total endowed to CCSSO: $0.00

1998: N/A

1999: N/A

Total endowed to Achieve, Incorporated: $1,000,000

1998: 00:00

1999: “Operating Support” Washington, D.C. $1,000,000

2000–2005 Grants

Global Health

Libraries and Public Access to Information

Education

Pacific Northwest

Special Projects

Total endowed to NGA: $40,705,456

2000: N/A

2001: N/A

2002: To support changes needed to transform high school education in the United States $275,515

To support a one-day meeting to prepare a publication focusing on turning around low-performing high schools to be presented at the NGA's Winter Meeting $30,000

2003: To support creation of a coherent system of education pathways that lead students through at least the second year of college $382,918
2004: To support “Redesigning the American High School” $511,658
   To support “Redesigning the American High School” $187,435

2005: To support the State Early Childhood Policy Leadership Forum $62,000
   To provide states with grants and assistance to develop
   and implement comprehensive plans for high school
   redesign and increase college-ready high school
   graduation rates $19,596,965

Total endowed to CCSSO: $25,475,312

2000: N/A

2001: N/A

2002: To support a working conference on using the No Child
   Left Behind Act to improve achievement of students in
   the middle grades $25,000

2003: To support activities of CCSSO around educational
   issues, particularly related to secondary school reform $249,000

2004: To provide states with sophisticated, Web-based data
   tools that will strengthen accountability and improve
   results through data-driven decision making $25,000,000

2005: To support technical assistance and research-based
   information to NGA Honor States pursuing high school
   redesign efforts $201,312

Total endowed to Achieve, Incorporated: $9,921,771

2000: N/A
2001: Supporting National Education Summit, Palisades, NY $25,000

2002: N/A

2003: N/A

2004: To assist and encourage specific states to adopt high school graduation requirements that align with college entry requirements

2005: To help states align secondary school math expectations with the demands of postsecondary education and work

$7,747,861

$2,148,910

2006–2013 Grants

Global Health

Libraries and Public Access to Information

Education

Pacific Northwest

Special Projects

Total endowed to NGA: $4,721,195

2006: N/A

2007: N/A

2008: To help governors improve college and career-ready rates and make state education systems internationally competitive $2,127,420

2009: To build capacity and awareness among governors around post-secondary goals $512,197

2010: N/A
2011: To work with state policymakers on the implementation of the Common Core State Standards, with special attention to effective resource reallocation to ensure complete execution, as well as rethinking state policies on teacher effectiveness $1,293,904

2012: To support effective implementation of the Common Core State Standards through the development and dissemination of an official set of identifiers and metadata $37,674

2013: To support governors in implementing the CCSS and improving teacher and principal preparation $750,000

Total endowed to CCSSO:

2006: N/A $59,114,700

2007: To support Phase II of the National Education Data Partnership seeking to promote transparency and accessibility of education data and improve public education through data-driven decision making $21,642,317

2008: To partner with federal, state, public, and private interests

To develop common, open, longitudinal data standards $3,185,750 to increase the leadership capacity of chiefs by focusing on standards and assessments, data systems, educator...
development and determining a new system of supports
for student learning

2010: To assist with the design of the digital learning $9,961,842
initiative, market it to the field, recruit applicants and
advisors, and process applications

2011: To assist with the design of Wave 2 of the Next $64,628
Generation Learning Challenges (NGLC), marketing it
to the field, recruit applicants and advisors, and process applications

To support capacity building at SMARTER Balanced
Assessment Consortium (SBAC) regarding framework $289,899
Development and higher education engagement

To support Common Core State Standards Work

To support NGLC Impact Strategies $743,331

2012: To support strategic planning for the sustainability of the $9,388,911
CCSS and the two assessment consortia tasked with $400,381
Designing assessments aligned with those standards

To support CCSSO in helping States to build their data $1,100,000

Inoperability capability and IT leadership capacity

2013: To support a multi-state pilot on education preparation $1,277,648

To support CCSSO partnership to support high quality $703,737
Implementation of the CCSS

To support the development of high quality assessments $799,825
to measure the CCSS

To support improved access to high speed broadband $4,000,000
connectivity for schools, libraries, museums, and public institutions that support teaching and learning

To support the CCSSO to work with several states to $400,000 strengthen teacher preparation in order to improve academic outcomes for students $3,197,931

To support a 20-month project of the Council of Chief State School Officers to help 7–10 member states and a subset of their school districts to integrate implementation of the Common Core State Standards with their reform efforts in teacher effectiveness in ways that produce measurable impact at the school and district level $1,958,500

Total endowed to Achieve, Incorporated: $22,287,051

2006: N/A

2007: N/A

2008: N/A

2009: To support Achieve’s American Diploma Project $12,614,352

2010: N/A

2011: To bolster efforts to support national and state strategies to adopt, implement and sustain college and career-ready policies $375,000

2012: To strengthen and expand the ADP Network, provide more support to states for CCSS implementation, and build strategic national and statewide alliances by engaging directly with key stakeholders $9,297,699

Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation

1983–1987 N/A

1988–1993 N/A

Program Overview:

Governance

Management

Leadership

2000–2005 Program Overview:

Charters

Leadership

2001 Program Overview:

Leadership

Unions

2006–2010 Program Overview:

Educational Investments

Transformative Federal and State Policy

Groundbreaking Innovation in Teaching and Learning

Strong Leadership

Redesigned, High-Performing Institutions

National Governors Association—no specific “investment” information provided in annual reports but listed on Broad website.
APPENDIX G

Packed Code Cloud
APPENDIX H

Subject Log

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Agency</th>
<th>Contact Made</th>
<th>Interview Made</th>
<th>Interview Response</th>
<th>Mode of Communication</th>
<th>Interviewee Disclosure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Governor's Association (NGA)</td>
<td>9/26/13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail, E-mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers</td>
<td>9/26/13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail, E-mail, Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(CCSSO)</td>
<td>10/14/13</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Legislative Exchange Council</td>
<td>9/26/13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>No position</td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ALEC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Council of State Legislatures</td>
<td>9/26/13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Commission of the States</td>
<td>9/26/13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Office of Legislative Services</td>
<td>9/27/13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States Department of Education</td>
<td>9/27/13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey Department of Education</td>
<td>10/14/13</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail, Telephone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX I

Corporate Partners of the Council of Chief State School Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AdvancED</td>
<td>Alpharetta, GA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21.478</td>
<td>22.028</td>
<td>22.9163</td>
<td>22.028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackboard</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>239.480</td>
<td>312.134</td>
<td>377.000</td>
<td>447.318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Recognition Corporation</td>
<td>Maple Grove, MN</td>
<td>4 (privately held)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETS</td>
<td>Lawrence Township, NJ</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.8797</td>
<td>0.8872</td>
<td>0.9056</td>
<td>0.9600</td>
<td>1.0370</td>
<td>1.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Scholar--Americans for Global Democracy</td>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>324716.000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iqity</td>
<td>Columbus, OH</td>
<td>4 (23rd held, email sent 12/29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mc-Graw-Hill Education</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>4, 17</td>
<td>4450m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft</td>
<td>Redmond, WA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.122</td>
<td>60.420</td>
<td>58.437</td>
<td>62.484</td>
<td>73.7230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest Evaluation Association</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>41.6900</td>
<td>54.6100</td>
<td>64.6900</td>
<td>73.7100</td>
<td>83.9800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promethean (Blackburn, Eng)</td>
<td>Alpharetta, GA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>Iowa City, IO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>238.06452741129293400302585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Cupertino, CA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.49</td>
<td>42.91</td>
<td>65.23</td>
<td>108.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corwin Press</td>
<td>Thousand Oaks, CA</td>
<td>17 (traded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evans Newton Incorporated-Partnering with Schools for Student Success</td>
<td>Scottsdale, AZ</td>
<td>4 (privately held)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K12 Inc.</td>
<td>Herndon, VA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140.556</td>
<td>226.235</td>
<td>315.573</td>
<td>384.47</td>
<td>522.43</td>
<td>708.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measured Progress Measurement Incorporated</td>
<td>Durham, NC</td>
<td>4 (privately held)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance Learning acquired by Premier 2011 (London, Eng) School Improvement Network</td>
<td>Wisconsin Rapids, WI</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.1079</td>
<td>0.1152</td>
<td>0.1215</td>
<td>0.1301</td>
<td>0.1463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaskStream</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>4, 23 (sent 12/29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas Instruments</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.501</td>
<td>10.427</td>
<td>13.966</td>
<td>13.735</td>
<td>12.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson Language Training Wireless Generation/Amplify owned by News Corp</td>
<td>Oxford, MA</td>
<td>4 (traded)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wireless Generation/Amplify owned by News Corp</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>6, 23</td>
<td>8.338</td>
<td>8.752</td>
<td>9.095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III Contributors</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco</td>
<td>San Jose, CA, New York, NY Reston, VA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34.9200</td>
<td>39.5400</td>
<td>36.1200</td>
<td>40.0400</td>
<td>43.2200</td>
<td>46.0600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College Board</td>
<td>Silver Springs, MD</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5740</td>
<td>0.6080</td>
<td>0.6230</td>
<td>0.7210</td>
<td>0.7050</td>
<td>0.7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>4, 17</td>
<td>0.0076</td>
<td>3.307</td>
<td>3.387</td>
<td>3.706</td>
<td>4.168</td>
<td>4.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subsidiary of Discovery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquired</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Harcourt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haughton-Mifflin Harcourt Company</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7/16/07</td>
<td>2.0490</td>
<td>1.5624</td>
<td>1.5070</td>
<td>1.2953</td>
<td>1.2856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machines Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IBM)</td>
<td>Armonk, NY</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>98.7900</td>
<td>103.6000</td>
<td>95.7600</td>
<td>99.8700</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questar Assessment, Inc.</td>
<td>Brewster, NY</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43.3filing 2008</td>
<td>18.4m</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS Institute Inc.</td>
<td>Cary, NC</td>
<td>23, 4</td>
<td>2.1000</td>
<td>2.2600</td>
<td>2.3100</td>
<td>2.4300</td>
<td>2.7250</td>
<td>2.8700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truenorthlogic</td>
<td>Sandy, UT</td>
<td>23, 4</td>
<td>4mail 12/30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX J

Corporate Partners of the National Governors Association
Center for Best Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corporate Partner</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT (non-profit)</td>
<td>Iowa City, IO</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>238.0645</td>
<td>274.1129</td>
<td>293.4003</td>
<td>302.585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aetna</td>
<td>Hartford, CT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>30.95</td>
<td>34.76</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>33.78</td>
<td>36.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altria Client Services, Inc. subsidiary of Altria Group (previously Phillip Morris)</td>
<td>Richmond, VA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.664</td>
<td>19.356</td>
<td>23.556</td>
<td>24.363</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amazon.com</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14.8350</td>
<td>19.166</td>
<td>24.509</td>
<td>34.204</td>
<td>48.077</td>
<td>61.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Specialty Health</td>
<td>San Diego, CA Virginia Beach, VA Thousand Oaks, CA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.9088</td>
<td>4.438</td>
<td>5.1881</td>
<td>5.8063</td>
<td>2.2284</td>
<td>2.8013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amplify owned by News Corp</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>6, 23</td>
<td>8.338</td>
<td>8.752</td>
<td>9.095</td>
<td>8.654</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple</td>
<td>Cupertino, CA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24.581</td>
<td>37.49</td>
<td>42.911</td>
<td>65.23</td>
<td>108.25</td>
<td>156.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astellas Pharma Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>Japan-exclude</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>London, Eng</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29.5591</td>
<td>31.601</td>
<td>32.804</td>
<td>33.300</td>
<td>33.591</td>
<td>27.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT&amp;T</td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>118.935</td>
<td>124.03</td>
<td>123.02</td>
<td>122.51</td>
<td>124.28</td>
<td>126.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atria Senior Living (privately held)</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank of America</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>66.83</td>
<td>72.78</td>
<td>119.64</td>
<td>110.22</td>
<td>93.45</td>
<td>83.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Buy Co., Inc.</td>
<td>Richfield, MN</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35.9300</td>
<td>39.8920</td>
<td>44.7370</td>
<td>49.2430</td>
<td>49.7470</td>
<td>50.7050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best Doctors (privately owned)</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biogen Idec</td>
<td>Weston, MA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.1716</td>
<td>4.0975</td>
<td>4.3773</td>
<td>4.7164</td>
<td>5.0486</td>
<td>5.5165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Cross Blue Shield</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP America</td>
<td>London, Eng</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>291.4400</td>
<td>367.0500</td>
<td>246.1400</td>
<td>297.1100</td>
<td>375.1200</td>
<td>388.2900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgepoint Education</td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0857</td>
<td>0.2183</td>
<td>0.4543</td>
<td>0.7132</td>
<td>0.9333</td>
<td>0.9682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CenturyLink</td>
<td>Monroe, LA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6560</td>
<td>2.6000</td>
<td>4.9740</td>
<td>7.0420</td>
<td>15.3510</td>
<td>18.3760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catamaran</td>
<td>Schaumburg, IL</td>
<td>20,23</td>
<td>0.0932</td>
<td>0.8629</td>
<td>1.4386</td>
<td>1.9484</td>
<td>4.9755</td>
<td>9.9401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerner Corporation</td>
<td>Kansas City, MO</td>
<td>20,23</td>
<td>1.5199</td>
<td>1.6760</td>
<td>1.6719</td>
<td>1.8502</td>
<td>2.2032</td>
<td>2.6700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chrysler</td>
<td>Auburn Hills, MI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61.1170</td>
<td>48.4770</td>
<td>28.7920</td>
<td>41.9460</td>
<td>54.9810</td>
<td>65.7840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisco Systems</td>
<td>San Jose, CA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>34.9200</td>
<td>39.5400</td>
<td>36.1200</td>
<td>40.0400</td>
<td>43.2200</td>
<td>46.0600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citi</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45.3000</td>
<td>53.3660</td>
<td>48.4960</td>
<td>54.1860</td>
<td>48.4470</td>
<td>47.6030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Coca-Cola Company</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.2500</td>
<td>6.6190</td>
<td>6.5170</td>
<td>6.7140</td>
<td>8.2840</td>
<td>8.0620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Unix</td>
<td>Linux</td>
<td>Mac</td>
<td>Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The College Board</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.5740</td>
<td>0.6080</td>
<td>0.6230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comcast Corporation</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>6, 17</td>
<td>31.0600</td>
<td>34.4200</td>
<td>35.7600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCA</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
<td>1.5300</td>
<td>1.6100</td>
<td>1.6600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVS Caremark</td>
<td>Woonsocket, RI</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76.0700</td>
<td>87.0100</td>
<td>98.2600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daiichi Sankyo</td>
<td>Tokyo, Jap</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>78.7700</td>
<td>88.0100</td>
<td>85.9300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daimler</td>
<td>Stuttgart, Ger</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>137.6500</td>
<td>133.4500</td>
<td>106.9600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darden Restaurants</td>
<td>Orlando, FL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.5671</td>
<td>6.6265</td>
<td>7.2175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deloitte</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.4400</td>
<td>2.7200</td>
<td>2.6700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeVry, Inc.</td>
<td>Downers Grove, IL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.9335</td>
<td>1.0983</td>
<td>1.4452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Dow Chemical Company</td>
<td>Midland, MI</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53.3750</td>
<td>57.3610</td>
<td>44.8750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTE Energy</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.4750</td>
<td>9.2810</td>
<td>7.9830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Management Corporation</td>
<td>Pittsburg, PA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.3637</td>
<td>1.6842</td>
<td>2.0115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Testing Service</td>
<td>Lawrence Township, NJ</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.8797</td>
<td>0.8872</td>
<td>0.9056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMD Serono affiliate of Merck KGaA</td>
<td>Rockland, MA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endo Health Solutions</td>
<td>Malvern, PA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.0856</td>
<td>1.2604</td>
<td>1.4608</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESRI-Environmental Systems Research Institute</td>
<td>Redlands, CA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExxonMobil Corporation</td>
<td>Irving, TX</td>
<td>9390.328</td>
<td>459.579</td>
<td>301.500</td>
<td>370.125</td>
<td>467.029</td>
<td>453.123</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMC Corporation</td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.6320</td>
<td>3.1153</td>
<td>2.8262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Motor Company</td>
<td>Dearborn, MI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>168.8840</td>
<td>143.5840</td>
<td>116.2830</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genentech- acquired by Roche Group 2009</td>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.8600</td>
<td>14.7200</td>
<td>53.8100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Electric Company</td>
<td>Fairfield, CT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Motors</td>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>179.9840</td>
<td>148.9790</td>
<td>104.5890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilead Sciences, Inc.</td>
<td>Foster City, CA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.2300</td>
<td>5.3358</td>
<td>7.0114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GlaxoSmithKline</td>
<td>Brentford, Eng</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.5700</td>
<td>24.3000</td>
<td>28.4300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Living</td>
<td>Plano, TX</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Thornton</td>
<td>Chicago, IL</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.4000</td>
<td>3.3600</td>
<td>4.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTECH-Lottomatica Group</td>
<td>Providence, RI</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.2500</td>
<td>2.7900</td>
<td>2.9500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hallmark Cards, Inc. owned by Crown Media Holdings</td>
<td>Studio City, CA</td>
<td>16, 17</td>
<td>0.2343</td>
<td>0.2818</td>
<td>0.2796</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harley-Davidson Motor Company</td>
<td>Milwaukee, WI</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1430</td>
<td>5.9554</td>
<td>4.7819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDR, Inc. (privately held)</td>
<td>Omaha, NE</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1444</td>
<td>1.3628</td>
<td>1.4862</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewlett-Packard Company</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>104.286</td>
<td>118.3640</td>
<td>114.5520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Corporation of America</td>
<td>Nashville, TN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26.8580</td>
<td>28.3740</td>
<td>30.0520</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Publishing Company</td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7/16/07</td>
<td>2.0490</td>
<td>1.5624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humana</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25.153</td>
<td>28.753</td>
<td>30.7430</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBM Corporation</td>
<td>Armonk, NY</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>98.7900</td>
<td>103.6000</td>
<td>95.7600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ExxonMobil Corporation: 104.5890
Dow Chemical Company: 107.1000
Roche Group: 150.2760
Hewlett-Packard Company: 152.2560
GTECH-Lottomatica Group: 203
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Revenue 1</th>
<th>Revenue 2</th>
<th>Revenue 3</th>
<th>Revenue 4</th>
<th>Revenue 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intel</td>
<td>Santa Clara, CA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38.334</td>
<td>37.586</td>
<td>35.127</td>
<td>43.623</td>
<td>53.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intuit</td>
<td>Mountainview, CA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.606</td>
<td>2.978</td>
<td>3.073</td>
<td>3.403</td>
<td>3.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson &amp; Johnson</td>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.444</td>
<td>32.309</td>
<td>30.889</td>
<td>29.450</td>
<td>28.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPMorgan Chase &amp; Co.</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>71.372</td>
<td>67.2520</td>
<td>100.4340</td>
<td>102.6940</td>
<td>97.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente (non-profit)</td>
<td>Oakland, CA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Universe (privately held)</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 Communications, LLC</td>
<td>Broomfield, CO</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2690</td>
<td>4.2260</td>
<td>3.6950</td>
<td>3.5910</td>
<td>4.3330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Berger Group (privately held)</td>
<td>Morristown, NJ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUS</td>
<td>Reston, VA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.5846</td>
<td>0.6996</td>
<td>0.7201</td>
<td>0.8317</td>
<td>0.9296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinsey &amp; Company (privately held)</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Corporation</td>
<td>Redmond, WA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51.122</td>
<td>58.437</td>
<td>62.484</td>
<td>69.9430</td>
<td>73.7230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Molina Healthcare, Inc.</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.4624</td>
<td>3.0912</td>
<td>3.6602</td>
<td>3.9899</td>
<td>4.6034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorola Solutions</td>
<td>Libertyville, IL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.8310</td>
<td>6.9380</td>
<td>7.410</td>
<td>7.6170</td>
<td>8.2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mylan Inc.</td>
<td>Canonsburg, PA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.1788</td>
<td>5.1376</td>
<td>5.0928</td>
<td>5.4505</td>
<td>6.1298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestle Waters North America</td>
<td>Stamford, CT</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.9000</td>
<td>10.7600</td>
<td>10.9700</td>
<td>83.6000</td>
<td>92.2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIC, Inc.</td>
<td>Olathe, KS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>857.5500</td>
<td>100.5750</td>
<td>132.8860</td>
<td>161.5340</td>
<td>180.8990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nike</td>
<td>Beaverton, OR</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10.6270</td>
<td>18.5280</td>
<td>18.3240</td>
<td>20.1170</td>
<td>23.3310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Southern</td>
<td>Norfolk, VA</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.5850</td>
<td>3.0840</td>
<td>1.9620</td>
<td>2.6760</td>
<td>3.2130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northrop Grumman Novartis Pharma</td>
<td>Fall Church, VA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24.6440</td>
<td>26.2510</td>
<td>27.6500</td>
<td>28.1430</td>
<td>26.1120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.0720</td>
<td>41.4590</td>
<td>44.2670</td>
<td>50.6240</td>
<td>58.5660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novo Nordisk Inc.</td>
<td>Plainsboro, NJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41.8310</td>
<td>45.5350</td>
<td>51.0780</td>
<td>60.7760</td>
<td>66.3460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oracle USA Inc.</td>
<td>Redwood City, CA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.9960</td>
<td>22.4300</td>
<td>23.2520</td>
<td>26.8200</td>
<td>35.6220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier</td>
<td>Charlotte, NC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.8800</td>
<td>3.5300</td>
<td>3.4300</td>
<td>3.3100</td>
<td>2.7100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Pharma</td>
<td>Stamford, CT</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.4180</td>
<td>48.2960</td>
<td>49.2690</td>
<td>67.0570</td>
<td>67.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfizer</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48.4180</td>
<td>48.2960</td>
<td>49.2690</td>
<td>67.0570</td>
<td>67.4250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Procter &amp; Gamble Company</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>71.0950</td>
<td>77.7140</td>
<td>75.2950</td>
<td>77.5670</td>
<td>81.1040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prudential Financial</td>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>33.7930</td>
<td>28.7210</td>
<td>32.3350</td>
<td>38.2170</td>
<td>49.0300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acquired by Premier 2011 (London, Eng)</td>
<td>Wisconsin Rapids, WI</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.1079</td>
<td>0.1152</td>
<td>0.1215</td>
<td>0.1301</td>
<td>0.1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ResCare</td>
<td>Louisville, KY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.4000</td>
<td>1.5167</td>
<td>1.5586</td>
<td>1.5626</td>
<td>1.5793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanofi</td>
<td>Bridgewater, NJ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38.0000</td>
<td>37.3400</td>
<td>40.3500</td>
<td>43.8400</td>
<td>45.2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Companies</td>
<td>2022 Sales</td>
<td>2021 Sales</td>
<td>2020 Sales</td>
<td>2019 Sales</td>
<td>2018 Sales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAS Institute Inc.</td>
<td>Cary, NC</td>
<td>23, 4</td>
<td>2.1000</td>
<td>2.2600</td>
<td>2.3100</td>
<td>2.4300</td>
<td>2.7200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAN Health Plan (non-profit)</td>
<td>Long Beach, CA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.4890</td>
<td>1.6138</td>
<td>1.6630</td>
<td>1.6640</td>
<td>1.8776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholastic</td>
<td>Danbury, CT</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.8706</td>
<td>2.1591</td>
<td>1.8128</td>
<td>1.8820</td>
<td>1.8776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodexo USA</td>
<td>Gaithersburg, MD</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.6940</td>
<td>20.4490</td>
<td>19.8460</td>
<td>20.7940</td>
<td>22.2990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Alabama Gas District</td>
<td>Evergreen, AL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Company</td>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15.3530</td>
<td>17.1270</td>
<td>15.7430</td>
<td>17.4560</td>
<td>17.6570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Farm Insurance</td>
<td>Bloomington, IL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.6640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>63.3670</td>
<td>64.9480</td>
<td>65.3570</td>
<td>67.3900</td>
<td>69.8650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIAA-CREF</td>
<td>New York, PA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toyota Motornull</td>
<td>Tokyo, Jap</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>210.0264</td>
<td>231.5702</td>
<td>177.8129</td>
<td>164.7170</td>
<td>166.0569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TransCanada</td>
<td>Calgary, AB</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.2230</td>
<td>1.4400</td>
<td>1.3740</td>
<td>1.2330</td>
<td>1.5260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truven Health Analytics</td>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilever United States</td>
<td>Englewood Cliffs, NJ</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54.45</td>
<td>54.9000</td>
<td>53.9500</td>
<td>59.97</td>
<td>62.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnitedHealth Group</td>
<td>Minnetonka, MN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>75.4310</td>
<td>81.1860</td>
<td>87.1380</td>
<td>94.1550</td>
<td>101.8620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verizon Communications</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>93.5000</td>
<td>97.4000</td>
<td>107.8000</td>
<td>106.6000</td>
<td>110.9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMware</td>
<td>Palo Alto, CA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.9054</td>
<td>1.1781</td>
<td>1.0294</td>
<td>1.4014</td>
<td>1.8412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walgreens Co.</td>
<td>Deerfield, IL</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>53.7620</td>
<td>59.0340</td>
<td>63.3350</td>
<td>67.4200</td>
<td>72.1840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wal-Mart Stores Inc. Weight Watchers International</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.4672</td>
<td>1.5358</td>
<td>1.3989</td>
<td>1.4520</td>
<td>1.8192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WellCare Health Plans, Inc.</td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.3908</td>
<td>6.5219</td>
<td>6.8782</td>
<td>5.4402</td>
<td>6.1069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WellPoint, Inc. Western Governors</td>
<td>Indianapolis, IN</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>60.1556</td>
<td>61.5792</td>
<td>60.8286</td>
<td>57.7405</td>
<td>59.8652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX K

National Governors Association Center for Best Practices, Form 990 Education Division Achievements (2009–2012)

2008—Education Division During 2009

Projects in States:

Afterschool Technical Assistance

Collaborative Network States:

Career Technical Education

Learning Network: Early Childhood Advisory Councils

State Leadership for High Quality Charter Schools

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) Grant Program

Publications:

Creating a Comprehensive State Early Childhood Advisory Council

Building a High Quality Education Workforce: A Governor’s Guide to Human Capital Development

The Quality Imperative: A State Guide to Achieving the Promise of Extended Learning Opportunities

Achieving Excellence at Scale: State Support for High Performing Charter School Expansion

Supporting Adolescent Literacy Achievement

The Pathways to Advancement Project: How States Can Expand Postsecondary Educational Opportunities for Working Adults

Accelerating the Agenda: Actions to Improve America’s High Schools

Policy Forum on State Strategies for Enhancing Teacher Effectiveness Benchmarking for Success: Ensuring US Students Receive a World Class Education

State Strategies to Improve Chronically Low-Performing Schools Initiative Improving Charter School Leadership
Meeting Academic and Economic Need Through Career Technical Education

Policies to Improve Instruction and Learning in High Schools

Implementing Graduation Counts: State Progress to Date

2008 Meetings in 2008–2009:

December 2–3, 2008: Turing Around Low Performing Schools

December 15–16, 2008: Policy Forum on Enhancing Teacher Effectiveness

January 13, 2009: Accelerating the Agenda: Actions to Improve America’s High Schools

January 25–27, 2009: STEM Grantee State Meeting

March 23–24, 2009 Career Technical Education Policy Academy

June 7–9, 2009 GEPA Institute

(Statement 11, Form: Schedule O, p. 12)

2009—Education Division During 2010

Projects in States:

Afterschool Technical Assistance

Collaborative Network States:

Learning Network State Early Childhood Advisory Councils

State Strategies to Achieve Graduation for All

State Strategies for Turning Around Low-Performing Schools

State Leadership for High-Quality Charter Schools

Supporting Student Success

NGA Center STEM Network

Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM) Grant Program

Publications:

Policy Academy on Creating New Models of Teacher Compensation
2010 Governors' Education Policy Advisors Institute

Achieving Graduation for All Policy Academy

Building an Early Childhood Professional Development System

Increasing College Success: A Road Map for Governors

Measuring Student Achievement at Postsecondary Institutions

Reducing Dropout Rates through Expanded Learning Opportunities

Achieving Graduation for All A Governor's Guide to Dropout Prevention and Recovery

State Policies to Improve Teacher Professional Development

2009 Governors Education Symposium Issue Briefs

Building Brighter Futures for Our Children A National Summit for State Policymakers

Raising Rigor, Getting Results Lessons Learned from AP Expansion

Implementing Graduation Counts State Progress to Date

2009 Meetings in 2010:

Policy Academy on Teacher Pay

Low Performing Schools Meeting

Post-Secondary Credentials

State Strategies to Achieve Graduation for All

Governor's Education Policy Advisor Meeting

Teacher Compensation Meeting

Industry Partnering on Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM)

(Statement 11, Form: Schedule O, p. 12)

2010—Education Division During 2011

Collaborative Network States:
Effective Teachers and School Leaders in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math (STEM) Achievement

Education Time and Learning Reform

Turing Around Low Performing Schools

High School Redesign

Common Core State Standards

Postsecondary Education Access and Completion

2010 Publications in 2011:

New Models of Teacher Compensation: Lessons Learned from Six States

Building a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math Education Agenda

State Early Childhood Advisory Councils: An Overview of Implementation Across the States

Preparing Principals to Evaluate Teachers

Realizing the Potential: How Governors can Lead Effective Implementation of the Common Core State Standards

Using Community Colleges to Build a Stem-Skilled Workforce

From Information to Action: Revamping Higher Education Accountability

State Policies to Reengage Dropouts

2011 Governors Education Symposium Issue Briefs

State Policies to Improve the Effectiveness of School Principals

State Strategies For Fixing Failing Schools and Districts

Maximizing the Impact of State Early Childhood Home Visitation Programs

Improving Postsecondary Attainment Among Adults

2010 Meetings in 2011:

STEM Summit
Policy Academy on State Strategies to Evaluate Teacher Effectiveness

Policy Academy: Strengthening Postsecondary Accountability Systems

Policy Forum on Early Dropout Prevention

Evaluating School Principals

Policy Forum on Evaluating Teacher Effectiveness

2011 Joint Policy Advisors Institute

State Strategies to Improve Principal Preparation

2010 Publications in 2011:

2011 Governors Education Symposium Issue Briefs

State Policies to Reengage Dropouts

From Information to Action: Revamping Higher Education Accountability Systems

Using Community Colleges to Build a STEM-Skilled Workforce

Realizing the Potential: How Governors Can Lead Effective Implementation of the Common Core State Standards

Preparing Principals to Evaluate Teachers

State Early Childhood Advisory Councils: An Overview of Implementation across the States

(Form 990, Schedule O, p. 25)

2011—Education Division During 2012

Collaborative Network States:

Early Childhood, K-12, and Postsecondary Education

Early Education to 3rd Grade Access, Readiness, Talent, and Quality

Teacher/Leader Effectiveness and Distribution

Common Core State Standards and Related Assessments

Flexibility and Competency-based Learning (Including redesigning time)
Charter Schools

Postsecondary (Higher Education and Workforce Training) Productivity

Accountability, Access, Success, and Affordability

Finance, Data, and Accountability (Including Efficiency, Effectiveness, and Underfunded Liabilities)

Bridging the System Divides Among the Early Childhood, K-12, Postsecondary, and Workforce Systems

2011 Publications in 2012:

Creating a College and Career Readiness Accountability Model for High Schools

State Strategies for Awarding Credit to Support Student Learning

Using Data to Guide State Education Policy and Practice

The Role of Informal Science in the State Education Agenda

Governor’s Role in Aligning Early Education and K-12 Reforms: Challenges, Opportunities, and Benefits for Children

Trends in State Implementation of the Common Core State Standards: Educator Effectiveness
## Code Present/Absent Media Chart for Accomplishments of the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers (1 indicates present)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>NGA Center for Best Practices, Themes from line 4a of 990</th>
<th>Accomplishments of NGA 2008-2011</th>
<th>Accomplishments of CCSSO 2008-2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>philanthropy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advancement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advocacy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civic duty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internationally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within the United States</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philanthro-capitalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem-solving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alignment with standards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth models</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>validity</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internationally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scholarships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporate involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corporate influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leverage</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Readiness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>choice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>privatization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standardization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX M

### Code Application Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>philanthropy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advancement</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advocacy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civic duty</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internationally</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within the United States</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philanthro-capitalism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problem-solving</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alignment with standards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth models</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELA instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principal evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationally</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarships</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the United States</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leverage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21st Century Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College and Career Readiness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privatization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX N

### MarketLine Industry Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MarketLine Industries</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace and Defense</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Forestry</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Consumer Services</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and Real Estate</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Packaged Goods</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy and Utilities</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental and Waste Management</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Business</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Non-Profit Organizations</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Goods and Machinery</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingredients</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Arts</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals and Mining</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper and Packaging</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmaceuticals and Healthcare</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retailing</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sourcing</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and Services</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and Logistics</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>