Meeting notes

1. Separate paper on theory only.
   1. Tanner: Not sure if it’s enough on it’s own
   2. Mike: thinking really hard about applied weights
      1. Might work if we think about implicit weights more
      2. Might be an option if we can’t identify these things in the data
2. Julian empirical front
   1. Neal chancenback? Indirect evidence that most of the improvements are in the part of the distribution that are below proficient.
   2. The data might just not be there and so thinking about a theory paper on it’s own might help us be sure we have enough of something
3. Grant ideas
   1. Spencer foundation
      1. What if it doesn’t get funded?
4. Will write letters expressing our work and involvement
5. Talk to cory codell (former student)
6. Data requirements
   1. Might want to work first on a subsample of teachers who have been around for 3+ years
7. Review paper by cory codell, mahally, economics of education review.
   1. Good rivew
8. Next Steps
   1. Fundraising
      1. Lots of Julian help here, but good to get involved and help
   2. Take a more detailed proposal to director of research at the district
      1. It’s really important to know if some teachers are better at teaching struggling students and we can reallocate students accordingly.
   3. New proposal to district
      1. Just explain the surface level differences and
9. Timeline
   1. Start with elementary students
   2. Earliest would be mid to late January review
      1. After that could get going pretty quicky
      2. February- April getting the data
   3. Really compelling email paragraph to get the sponsor to respond soon