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Breakfast Keynote

8:15 AM – 8:30 AM
Governor Asa Hutchinson, Arkansas
Welcome and Overview

8:30 AM – 9:15 AM

Dr. Aaliyah Samuel, Education Division Director, NGA Center
Welcome and Overview

Speakers

Dr. Aaliyah Samuel
Education Division Director, NGA Center

Sara Shelton
Director of State Relations, Education Commission of the States
Who we are

The essential, indispensable member of any team addressing education policy.
What we do

We believe in the power of learning from experience and we know informed policymakers create better education policy.
How we do it

RESEARCH  REPORT  COUNSEL  CONVENE
2018 ELECTIONS

CHANGES IN STATE EDUCATION LEADERSHIP
36 STATES PLUS D.C. will hold governors races in 2018.

There will be at least 17 NEW GOVERNORS in 2019 due to...

- 13 Term limit
- 4 Incumbent not running for re-election or lost primary
Many of these governors **APPOINT** state education leaders …
Chief State School Officers

12 STATES PLUS D.C.

6 OF THOSE STATES are guaranteed to have a new governor.

Source: CCSSO
State Higher Education Executive Officers

7 STATES PLUS D.C.

5 OF THOSE STATES are guaranteed to have a new governor.

Source: SHEEO
State Board of Education Members

25 STATES

12 OF THOSE STATES are guaranteed to have a new governor.

Source: NASBE
Other states will hold **ELECTIONS** for state education leaders ...
**CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS:** 7 STATES  
Source: CCSSO

- Arizona
- California
- Georgia
- Idaho
- Oklahoma
- South Carolina
- Wyoming

**STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION:** 8 STATES PLUS D.C.  
Source: NASBE

- Alabama
- Colorado
- Kansas
- Michigan
- Nebraska
- Ohio
- Texas
- Utah
- D.C.
87 out of 99 LEGISLATIVE CHAMBERS will hold general elections in November 2018.

Source: NCSL
Gubernatorial Analysis
Regional Analysis: Total Candidate Mentions

Map showing regions of the United States with different colors:
- New England
- Mideast
- Southeast
- Great Lakes
- Plains
- South West
- Rocky Mountains
- Far West

Legend:
- New England: Green
- Mideast: Blue
- Southeast: Yellow
- Great Lakes: Purple
- Plains: Orange
- South West: Red
- Rocky Mountains: Purple
- Far West: Green
# Strategic Priorities and Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NGA Priority</th>
<th>Categories (Top 10 in Bold)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Governance and Finance</td>
<td>All early ed issues (<em>pre-K</em>), rural ed, K-12 support materials, K-12 infrastructure, tribal education, local issues, K-12 funding issues (<em>full funding</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards, Assessments, and Accountability</td>
<td>K-12 assessments, K-12 student outcomes, school recognition, early grade reading and math support, absenteeism, graduation, literacy, academic standards, campus safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Capital</td>
<td>Early Ed Workforce, Teacher issues (<em>recruitment &amp; retention, compensation</em>), school leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole Child</td>
<td><strong>School safety</strong>, summer enrichment, family engagement, community schools, mental health, drug prevention, bullying, nutrition, homeless students, students with disabilities, ELL, gifted and talented ed, LGBTQ/bullying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personalized Education</td>
<td>Innovative learning, <strong>school choice</strong>, broadband, civics and arts education, STEM, computer science, startups, competency-based ed, early college credit programs, <strong>career and technical ed, apprenticeships</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Education</td>
<td>Research, all other higher ed issues (e.g. <em>cost of college</em>), veterans issues</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personalized Education

Territories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3+ Mentions/Candidate</th>
<th>2-3 Mentions/Candidate</th>
<th>1-2 Mentions/Candidate</th>
<th>0-1 Mentions/Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance and Finance

#2

Territories
Higher Education

#3

Territories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3+ Mentions/Candidate</th>
<th>2-3 Mentions/Candidate</th>
<th>1-2 Mentions/Candidate</th>
<th>0-1 Mentions/Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Human Capital

#4 Territories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3+ Mentions/Candidate</th>
<th>2-3 Mentions/Candidate</th>
<th>1-2 Mentions/Candidate</th>
<th>0-1 Mentions/Candidate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standards, Assessments, and Accountability

#6 Territories

- 3+ Mentions/Candidate
- 2-3 Mentions/Candidate
- 1-2 Mentions/Candidate
- 0-1 Mentions/Candidate
2018/19 Timeline of Transition Supports

- Governor Elect One-Pagers
- Governors' Response Team Site Visits
- 2019 Governors' Education Policy Advisors Institute
- Gubernatorial Transition Framework
- New Governors' Education Policy Advisors Bootcamp
Welcome and Overview

Speakers

Dr. Aaliyah Samuel
Education Division Director, NGA Center

Sara Shelton
Director of State Relations, Education Commission of the States
Good Jobs for All Americans

Speakers

Siri Smillie
Education Policy Advisor,
Governor Bullock, Montana

Karen Baumgart
Director, BillingsWorks
Pathways to Graduation

10:00 AM – 11:00 AM

Stephen Parker, Legislative Director, Education and the Workforce, NGA
Pathways to Graduation

**Moderator**

Stephen Parker  
Legislative Director  
Associate, Education and Workforce Committee, Office of Government Relations, NGA

**Panelists**

Hedy Chang  
Executive Director, Attendance Works

Kim Green  
Executive Director, Advance CTE

Dr. Carey Wright  
State Superintendent of Education, Mississippi

Carmel Martin  
Senior Advisor, State & Local Partnerships, Emerson Collective
Break

11:00 AM – 11:15 AM
Engaging Business in Education

11:15 AM – 11:45 AM

Chad Brinkley, School Innovation Specialist, Murfreesboro High School, Arkansas
Chad Brinkley
K-12 Innovation Specialist
Our Challenge
LET ME SHOW YOU THE STAIRS WE HAD INSTALLED

THIS IS HOW WE DID IT LAST YEAR, AND WE KNOW IT WORKS!
Integration ➔ Innovation
Creativity
Murfreesboro High School

Distinguished School

Recognized by Apple as a distinguished school for continuous innovation in learning, teaching, and the school environment.
Just what we do.
GEPA-only Lunch

11:45 AM – 1:00 PM
Dr. Aaliyah Samuel, Education Division Director, NGA Center
Financing Early Childhood Education with a Highly Qualified Workforce

1:00 PM – 2:15 PM

Beth Caron, Program Director, Education Division, NGA Center
Financing Early Childhood Education with a Highly Qualified Workforce

Moderator

Dr. Beth Caron
Program Director,
Education Division,
NGA Center

Panelists

Gerald M. Cutts
President and CEO
First Children’s Finance

Donald Songy
Senior Education Policy Advisor,
Governor Bel Edwards,
Louisiana
Committee Membership

LA RUE ALLEN, (Chair) New York University
CELIA C. AYALA, Los Angeles Universal Preschool (retired)
DAPHNA BASSOK, University of Virginia
RICHARD N. BRANDON, University of Washington (retired)
GERALD M. CUTTS, First Children’s Finance
KIM DANCY, New America
ELIZABETH E. DAVIS, University of Minnesota
HARRIET DICTHER, ICF, Early Education Services
KATHY GLAZER, Virginia Early Childhood Foundation
LYNN A. KAROLY, RAND Corporation
HELEN F. LADD, Duke University (emerita)
SHAYNE SPAULDING, Urban Institute
MARCY WHITEBOOK, University of California, Berkeley
The committee will study how to fund early care and education for children aged 0-5 that is accessible, affordable to families, and of high-quality, including a well-qualified and adequately supported workforce, consistent with the vision outlined in the report, *Transforming the Workforce for Children Birth Through Age 8: A Unifying Foundation*.
Principle 1: Financing a Highly Qualified Workforce

High quality ECE requires a diverse, competent, effective, well-compensated, and professionally supported workforce across the various roles of ECE professionals.

Current failures

- Compensation of ECE practitioners is low
- Salaries are not predictable and steady
- Limited funding for higher education programs and professional development
Principle 2: Affordability and Equitable Access

High quality ECE requires all children and families have equitable access to affordable services across all ethnic, racial, socioeconomic, ability status, geographic regions.

Current failures

• Low income families pay 20 percent of income; highest income pay 6 percent

• Inadequate funding keeps many qualified families from getting assistance

• Programs are not harmonized => gaps for low income families and underutilization by middle income families
High quality ECE requires financing that is adequate, equitable, and sustainable, with incentives for quality. Moreover, it requires financing that is efficient, easy to navigate, easy to administer, and transparent.

**Current failures**

- Inadequate financial support to providers and families
- Few incentives for quality
High quality ECE requires:

4. **a variety** of high quality service delivery **options** that are financially sustainable
   - Tradeoff between provider oriented and family oriented financing mechanisms

5. adequate financing for **high quality facilities**
   - Loans, grants, tax credits, other financing mechanisms
Principle 6: Accountability, Evaluation, and Continuous Improvement

High quality ECE requires systems for ongoing accountability, including learning from feedback, evaluation, and continuous improvement.

Current limitations

- Quality rating and improvement systems (QRIS) exist in many states but have limited capacity to support and reward workforce supports
Estimating the Cost of High-Quality ECE

• **Onsite Costs**
  – Staffing levels and structures
  – Staff qualifications and compensation
  – Onsite professional responsibilities and learning
  – Operating hours and days
  – Facilities and other non-personnel costs

• **System-level Costs**
  – Workforce Development Costs
  – Quality Assurance and Improvement Costs
Key Assumptions for Illustrative Cost Estimates

• Lead educators with a BA degree
• Resources for coaching and mentoring
• Paid release time for professional development
• Specialists for children with special needs
• Paid non-child contact time
## Estimated Total Cost of High-Quality ECE

**Dynamic Estimates** of Total Cost and Share of Total Cost by ECE Provider Type and by Scenario Phase (billions of 2016 dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, dynamic estimate</strong></td>
<td>$74.5</td>
<td>$89.0</td>
<td>$114.3</td>
<td>$139.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Center-based</strong></td>
<td>$49.8</td>
<td>$62.5</td>
<td>$82.9</td>
<td>$105.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home-based</strong></td>
<td>$24.8</td>
<td>$26.4</td>
<td>$31.4</td>
<td>$34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share of total by provider type</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center-based</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home-based</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total Cost in Perspective

- Cost of ECE relative to Gross Domestic Product (GDP)
  - Phase 1: 0.4% of current U.S. GDP
  - Phase 4: 0.75% of current U.S. GDP
  
  *Compare OECD countries: 0.8% of GDP*

- Cost of ECE relative to K-12 spending
  - Phase 1: about 12% of total K-12 expenditures
  - Phase 4: about 22% of total K-12 expenditures
Sharing the Cost

• Variety of approaches to determining a reasonable share of costs for families to pay
• Assumptions for illustrative example
  – Family payments at the lowest income level reduced to $0
  – Family payments as a share of family income increase progressively as income rises
  – Burden for families with income between 2-3 times the federal poverty set at 10 percent (the current median family payment for this group).
Dynamic Estimate of the Total Cost by Transformation Phase, with Estimated Shares of Public and Family Contributions and Needed Increase above Current Public Spending (billions of 2016 constant dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
<th>Phase 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total, dynamic estimate</strong></td>
<td>$74.5</td>
<td>$89.0</td>
<td>$114.3</td>
<td>$139.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family payment</strong></td>
<td>$40.7</td>
<td>$45.1</td>
<td>$51.9</td>
<td>$58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public/private assistance</strong></td>
<td>$33.8</td>
<td>$43.9</td>
<td>$62.5</td>
<td>$81.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needed Increase Above Current Public Spending ($29 billion)</strong></td>
<td>$4.8</td>
<td>$14.9</td>
<td>$33.5</td>
<td>$52.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rec. 1. Consistent Standards

• Fed. and state governments should establish **consistent standards**
• Funding should be linked to standards
• Funding should be sufficient to cover costs of high quality ECE
Rec. 2. Promote Access for All Children to

- Access not contingent on parental employment
- Fed. and state governments should set uniform progressive family payment standards
- Costs not covered by family payment should be covered by direct support to providers and assistance to families
Rec. 3. State Agencies Should Act as Coordinators

• Most applicable to states that have demonstrated a willingness to implement a high quality ECE system
• State agencies should act as coordinators for state and federal financing mechanisms (other than federal and state tax preferences directly to families)
Recs 4-5. Sharing the Cost

**Rec 4:** Federal and state governments should increase funding levels and revise tax preferences to ensure adequate funding.

- Ongoing significant role for the federal government
- New revenue sources should meet standard criteria for a good tax (e.g. fairness, stability, revenue-raising potential).

**Rec 5:** Family payments for families at the lowest income level should be reduced to zero, and if a family contribution is required by a program, that contribution, as a share of family income, should progressively increase as income rises.
A coalition of public and private funders should support the development and implementation of a first round of local-, state-, and national-level strategic business plans to guide transitions toward a reformed financing structure for high-quality ECE.
Rec 7. Assistance for current ECE workforce to increase their knowledge and competencies.

Recommendation 8: Grants to institutions and systems of postsecondary education to develop faculty and ECE programs. with incentives to states, colleges, and universities to ensure higher-education programs are of high quality and aligned with workforce needs.
Recs 9 and 10. Assessing Progress Toward Quality

**Rec 9:** Sustained funding for research and evaluation on early childhood education, particularly during the transition period -- both state and federal government.

**Rec 10.** Ongoing federal data collection and research
Key Messages

• High-quality ECE is critical to positive child development and has the potential to generate economic returns.
• The current financing structure is inadequate to support the recruitment and retention of a highly qualified workforce and ensure and incentivize high-quality services across settings.
• Only a small share of children currently have access to high-quality programs.
• The total cost of providing access to affordable, high-quality ECE for all children exceeds current funding amounts.
Final Thoughts

Reliable, accessible high-quality ECE, can be achieved.

- Greater harmonization and coordination among multiple financing mechanisms and revenue streams
- Greater uniformity in standards to incentivize quality
- Significant mobilization of financial and other resources shared across the public and private sector
- More equitable distribution of the share from family contributions and a commitment to major increases in public investment
Financing Early Childhood Education with a Highly Qualified Workforce

2018 GEPA Institute, Little Rock AR

Donald Songy, Senior Education Policy Advisor, Governor Bel Edwards, Louisiana
Louisiana School Readiness Tax Credits

- A Package of 5 Tax Credits, enacted in 2007:
  - 1 For Child Care Providers
  - 1 For Parents of Children under age 6
  - 1 For Directors and Teachers
  - 2 For Businesses (investing in employees’ child care, grants to CCR&Rs)

- Essential Components
  - Refundable
  - Tied to Quality
  - NOT a substitute for direct state appropriations
  - Does not create new slots—improves quality of existing slots

- Costs have averaged around $17 million/year in the last few years

- As the state has cut general revenue funding for Child Care Assistance, Louisiana has used the credits to meet the state match & maintenance of effort requirements for the Child Care and Development Block Grant
Louisiana School Readiness Tax Credits

Tax Credit vs. Tax Deduction

A tax credit reduces the taxes paid, dollar-for-dollar.
A tax deduction lowers taxable income.
A tax credit is generally more valuable to a taxpayer than a tax deduction of the same amount.

Refundable Tax Credit

A ‘refundable’ tax credit is one that is available to a taxpayer even if they do not owe taxes.
The School Readiness Tax Credits are REFUNDABLE.
Initial Impetus

- 2007 - Implementation of a voluntary Quality Rating and Improvement System
- Need for funding to support and incentivize both:
  - Higher quality
  - Participation in the QRIS
- Concern about cuts in future general fund appropriations
  - Tax credits are **not** part of the annual budgeting process.
  - Once passed, tax credits are open-ended, unless they are capped, and Louisiana’s are **not** capped.
# Louisiana School Readiness Tax Credits
A Package of 5 Credits

## Tax Credit to Child Care Providers
- For profit and not-for-profit centers can participate
- Based on the number of children they serve in the Child Care Assistance Program (or in foster care)
- Ranges from $750/child to $1500/child
- Increases with the number of stars of the center

## Tax Credit to Parents
- Builds on the existing state child care tax credit
- Based on the quality rating of the center
- The amount of the credit decreases with the income of the family
- Refundable for families with incomes less than $25,000
2 Tax Credits to Businesses

- Employers receive a credit for “eligible child care expenses” based on the quality rating of the center
  - Includes things like construction, renovation, expansion, or major repair of an eligible child care facility, purchase of child care slots at eligible child care facilities actually provided or reserved for children of employees, not to exceed $50,000 in expenses per tax year.
  - However, they can only claim a % of the eligible expenses, from 5-20% based on the center’s rating.
- In addition, businesses may claim a tax credit for grants to child care resource and referral agencies
  - Dollar for dollar credit
  - Maximum is $5,000 per business
Louisiana School Readiness Tax Credits
A Package of 5 Credits

Tax Credit to Child Care Teachers and Directors (as originally passed in 2007)

- 4 levels based on the education of the teacher/director
  - Provided directly to child care teachers and directors based on their level on the Staff Career Ladder or Director Career Ladder
  - Level 1 is a CDA level
- Must be working at a center participating in the rating system
  - The star rating does not impact the credit
  - Must work at the center at least 6 months
- Amount is adjusted annually based on the Consumer Price Index
  - In 2016 the amount of this credit ranged from $1,658 to $3,315
# Louisiana School Readiness Tax Credits

*Successful Support for the Child Care Industry and Early Childhood Education*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Credit</th>
<th>Child Care Expenses (Family)</th>
<th>Provider</th>
<th>Directors &amp; Staff</th>
<th>Business Support</th>
<th>Resource &amp; Referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 Amount</td>
<td>$2.3 M</td>
<td>$4.8 M</td>
<td>$8.7 M</td>
<td>$371 K</td>
<td>$947 K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Recipients</td>
<td>13,338 Families</td>
<td>454 Providers</td>
<td>4044 Directors &amp; Staff</td>
<td>49 Businesses</td>
<td>229 Businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Per Recipient</td>
<td>$173</td>
<td>$10,655</td>
<td>$2154</td>
<td>$7573</td>
<td>$4133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How Determined**
- Families are eligible for tax credit based upon the quality rating of the center
- Providers receive a tax credit based on center rating and the number of children they serve in CCAP or foster care
- Based on education level (4 levels – CDA (national certification with a high school degree) through a Masters Degree)
- Must work at a center in rating system (at least 6 months)
- Star rating does NOT impact this credit
- Employers receive a credit for a percentage of “eligible child care expenses” based on the quality rating of the center (e.g. construction, slots for employees)
- Employers may claim a tax credit for up to $5,000 in grants to child care resource and referral agencies

**Features**
- Refundable up to $25,000 in income
- Builds on existing state child care tax credit, from 50 – 200% based on rating and income
- Refundable
- From $750 – 1500 per CCAP child based on star rating
- For-profits and non-profits are eligible
- Refundable
- From $1658-3315 based on education level
- Adjusted annually based on CPI
- Refundable
- Percentage ranges from 5 – 20% based on star rating
- Maximum expense is $50,000 (w/credit as percentage)
- Refundable
- Credit is dollar for dollar
- Maximum is $5,000

Source: LA Department of Revenue
Strategies to Pass the Tax Credits

- The tax credits were framed as economic development
  - Louisiana has many tax credits to support other industries
  - Promoted child care as an industry
- Lead legislator was a banker
- Widespread support
  - Advocacy community
  - Meetings with key legislators
  - Work with state agencies - Department of Revenue, Legislative Fiscal Office
- Media support
- Business support
- Pressure to reduce the fiscal impact
  - Revised the fiscal note without cutting back on the bill by revising predictions of uptake
As legislated by Act 639, the Commission membership is comprised of voting and non-voting members that represent needed perspectives to guide this work.

**Providers**
- Family Child Care
- Type I or II centers
- Type III centers
- Head Start and Head Start Collaboration
- Nonpublic school program participating in publicly funded early childhood initiatives
- School superintendents
- Public post-secondary educators

**Advocates**
- Community Networks
- Early Steps
- Maternal Infant Health home visitation
- Child advocacy and special education organizations
- American Academy of Pediatrics
- Early education and intervention researchers

**Government Officials**
- Governor’s Office
- House of Representatives
- Senators
- La. Dept. of Ed., special education and early education
- Board of Regents
- Louisiana Workforce Commission
- Department of Economic Development
- Department of Child and Family Services

**Community**
- Parents of children in a publicly funded early childhood program
- Business representatives
- Municipality receiving Head Start funding
The 38 member Early Childhood Care and Education Commission shall study and make recommendations relative to establishing a vision for the future of early childhood care and education in Louisiana, building on the work of Act 3 in 2012.

When conducting analysis and making recommendations relative to a vision and framework, the commission shall do all of the following:

1. Gather and analyze data and develop a plan focused on family access, affordability, and quality.
2. Determine best practices for the purpose of informing the continued development of local governing entities.
3. Determine a sustainable infrastructure to ensure quality programs including workforce and professional development, monitoring and assessment, coordinated enrollment, and data-informed decision making.
4. Identify opportunities for collaboration and coordination.
5. Define a timeframe for achieving the vision and determine benchmarks for the intervening years.
6. Determine the amount of funding needed to achieve affordable access to quality care and education for all children from birth through age four and recommend policies that prioritize the allocation of future funding.
The 38 member Early Childhood Care and Education Commission shall study and make recommendations relative to establishing a vision for the future of early childhood care and education in Louisiana, building on the work of Act 3 in 2012.

By the end of the Commission’s work together, the goal is to produce a coherent set of recommendations related to:

• Access and Quality: What should be Louisiana’s aim as it relates to serving children in high quality settings?
• Governance: How can local governance support enhanced funding and improvement statewide?
• Funding: What will these improvements cost Louisiana?
Financing Early Childhood Education with a Highly Qualified Workforce

Moderator

Dr. Beth Caron
Program Director, Education Division, NGA Center

Panelists

Gerald M. Cutts
President and CEO, First Children’s Finance

Donald Songy
Senior Education Policy Advisor, Governor Bel Edwards, Louisiana
Break

2:15 PM – 2:30 PM
Spotlight on the States: Supporting Teachers and Leaders

2:30 PM – 3:45 PM

Seth Gerson, Program Director, Education Division, NGA Center
Spotlight on the States: Supporting Teachers and Leaders

Moderator

Seth Gerson
Program Director, Education Division, NGA Center

Panelists

LaTanya Patillo
Teacher Advisor to Governor Cooper, North Carolina

Dr. Wayne Lewis
Kentucky Interim Commissioner of Education, Kentucky

Linda Fandel
Special Advisor to Governor Kim Reynolds, Iowa
Review and Next Steps

3:45 PM – 4:00 PM

Dr. Aaliyah Samuel, Education Division Director, NGA Center
Seated Dinner: Cybersecurity and Coding in Schools

7:00 PM – 8:00 PM

Anthony Owen, STEM Coordinator, Arkansas Department of Education