



## Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs)

### *Staying On Frame in Real Time*

The vast majority of questions and comments that communicators hear from the public and policymakers can be predicted by the research-based “**swamp**” ([link](#)) of cultural models on that issue.

*If you can predict, you can prepare.*

A strategic framer prepares by anticipating the questions that will emerge from the swamp; considering the “traps” that are lurking in a possible response; and then, choosing a well-framed response with the potential to build a more productive way of thinking about the issue.

The sample question-and-answer sequences here show this tactical thought process in action. The exemplars come from questions and issues raised by stakeholder groups, but the models aren’t intended to simply script “the right answers” to questions you might be asked. Rather, this is a teaching tool, offering illustrations of how to more effectively talk about specific sub-topics in education by applying the research-based insights of the Core Story of Education. While communicators are welcome to use the recommended responses, we encourage you to use the analysis of “false start” and “well-framed” answers to build your capacity to apply these principles fluidly throughout your communications practice.

## Q: What are the Common Core State Standards? Why do we need them?

### THE FALSE START ANSWER:

According to the Georgetown Center on Education and the Workforce, 62% of new jobs available in 2018 will require some postsecondary education. But our kids are not graduating high school with the skills they need to succeed in college and without a dramatic change of course, U.S. employers will be unable to fill 3 million of these positions. This has huge implications for our ability to remain competitive in the global market. Those jobs aren't going to stay empty. They're going to go overseas.

In order to ensure American kids are graduating college and career ready – we need to raise the bar substantially. The Common Core State Standards set higher expectations, but they also focus in on what really matters. These standards are fewer, higher, and deeper than what we had before. They spell out the foundational knowledge and skills for students in each grade, in the fundamentals: reading and math.

The fact that 45 states have adopted them means we now have the same standards across the country, for the very first time. One of the travesties of No Child Left Behind was seeing some states water down their standards so that they wouldn't look bad on the tests. With shared standards, we'll be better able to see how schools are stacking up.

### THE REFRAMED ANSWER:

Preparing our young people for the world of tomorrow means equipping them with the knowledge and skills today that they will need to succeed in the workforce. To do that, we need to update our goals for learning – and that's really all Common Core Standards are. They are a set of learning goals that work grade-by-grade, step-by-step toward what modern careers and colleges expect, so that when students graduate, they are ready for college, ready for work – ready for life.

So what does it mean to be “ready?” In our fast-changing world, readiness involves having a very flexible kind of skill set – like a rope that can be used in many contexts. We need workers who can adapt to new situations and apply what they know to unforeseen problems. By making it a priority that students are able to weave together knowledge from different content areas, and problem-solving skills, and the ability to communicate and work in teams, we're asking educators to shift their approach to teaching. We will be putting more emphasis on giving students chances to integrate what they learn in various subjects. I'm excited to see this kind of excellent teaching become more and more common – I think that this approach is going to build the next generation of American innovation.

### THE FALSE START ANALYSIS:

- The vivid critique of the existing state of affairs invokes a *Crisis* frame, which contributes to the public perception that the education system is “broken beyond repair.” This frame can sap public will for meaningful change.
- Phrases such as “raise the bar” and “higher expectations” cue the thinking that success in education is a matter of individual willpower – which makes it harder for the public to appreciate the need for systemic investments and reform.
- Talk of “foundational knowledge” and un-framed emphasis on reading and math is likely to trigger “back to basics” thinking – which leads quickly to a backwards-facing view of education reform at odds with policies that support more effective teaching and learning.
- Pointing to failures of the past feeds public skepticism that change is possible now; questioning the motivations of “the other side” cues “politics as usual” thinking, depressing public engagement.

### THE REFRAMED ANSWER ANALYSIS:

- Starts the case with an appeal to *Workforce Preparation*, which establishes the common good and builds measurable support for reform without the unproductive, us-vs.-them frame effects of *Global Competition*.
- Cues for *Progress*, such as “modern” and “updated” help to build a forward-facing perspective – warding off “back to basics” thinking.
- The definition of CCSS is clear, aspirational, and free of expert jargon, while maintaining the intent of the phrase “college and career ready.”
- Uses the Explanatory Metaphor *Weaving Skills Ropes* to describe the instructional shifts required by CCSS, rather than focusing on “reading and math.” This metaphor provides a powerful antidote to “back to basics” thinking.
- Ends on a positive note – cueing the value of *Ingenuity* to tap into a shared cultural ideal that has been tested as a reliable frame for education issues.

## Q: Do teachers support Common Core? Do they know how to use these new standards?

### THE FALSE START ANSWER:

The teachers I know want what's best for kids. Because these standards focus on what's really important for college and career readiness, they know that the children they send across that stage will be ready for their first term paper in college, or will be able to get a job that pays enough to make ends meet. That's the kind of thing that makes the job rewarding, seeing your students go on to thrive.

Another reason teachers support this idea is that they are all hoping that these standards will let them be creative in the classroom again. They are tired of teaching to the test. That kind of teaching won't work for Common Core because these standards emphasize depth over breadth. Simply finishing a worksheet filled with variations on an equation with one variable is no longer enough. Students have to understand why their strategies for solving those equations work and how to apply them in lots of different real-world contexts. That's the kind of hands-on, minds-on teaching that passionate educators want wake up and do every day.

The only problem is time. These standards are asking for a sea change in the way teachers go about their work – these are major instructional shifts. But we're asking teachers to build this new plane while they're flying it. Our teachers are heroes and they are working hard to pull this off, but we have to do more to support them. We have teacher workshops and other PD planned for throughout the school year, and teachers are working long hours to revamp their lesson plans. You'll see that all this effort will pay off.

### THE REFRAMED ANSWER:

As with any good idea, the key to its success lies in implementation – taking a methodical, sensible approach to move it into practice and make it work. Keep in mind, though, that we're not starting from scratch here – California was one of the first states to adopt state standards in the 1990s. Our teachers are professionals who understand how to use standards in general and who can adjust to these particular standards with time and support.

If we think about these standards as a blueprint for remodeling the way we approach teaching and learning, all of us in education recognize we have to roll up our sleeves and get to work on this renovation. These standards are asking teachers, and all of us, to build better learning environments for our students.

To do any construction work effectively, we need to put in place the appropriate scaffolding for the teachers who are doing the work on the ground in our schools.

That scaffolding must wrap all around the renovation in the form of support from the administration, from the system, and from the community. Teachers need opportunities to collaborate and share ideas with their peers. They need access to teaching materials that work well with Common Core. And they need support from families and leadership - school policies and programs that educate parents about the CCSS, district leadership that advocates for sound policies that support these initiatives. One specific thing we are doing right now to provide those kinds of resources is [XYZ.] And a proposal that we really want the community to support is [XYZ].

### THE FALSE START ANALYSIS:

- By emphasizing teachers' emotional states, this answer cues the *Caring Teacher* cultural model, making teacher professionalism "hard to think."
- By focusing entirely on teachers, this answer is likely to reinforce the thinking that "*teachers are the system.*" From here, only "get tough on teachers" education reforms are visible.
- "Major change" cues are more likely to invoke fear or cynicism than they are to inspire support.
- The untested metaphor "build a plane while flying it" is probably unproductive – won't we crash?
- The last paragraph attempts to offer solutions, but the remedy feels small compared to the enormity of the problem as described.

### THE REFRAMED ANSWER ANALYSIS:

- Cues the Value *Pragmatism* right away, which has been shown to build public support for teacher professional development and support.
- Uses the *Remodeling* metaphor, which makes the prospect of accomplishing CCSS implementation feel feasible.
- Continues with the *Scaffolding* metaphor to frame the problem as one of adequate resources for implementation and the solution as a broad set of supports.

**Q: What do these major changes mean for students who are near the end of their high school careers? Are they going to be confused or shortchanged?**

**THE FALSE START ANSWER:**

The stark reality is there's a big disconnect between what kids currently graduating from high school know and can do and what's expected of them in the college and career opportunities that lie ahead. According to 2012 statistics only 45 percent of kids taking the ACT were scoring college ready in math and only 52 percent were college ready in reading. The question isn't how this change in standards will be confusing to kids near the end of their high school careers – the question is what can we do to help them before it's too late? If we don't do something to fix this huge gap between what today's jobs require and what American kids can actually do, the US is going to fall behind lose our ability to remain globally competitive.

This is true at the state level, too - this is a big problem here and one we must address immediately. The timing might be less than ideal for current juniors and seniors, but with these higher standards, they'll get a taste of the reality they'll encounter once they walk across the stage. Real learning should be rigorous – it should be challenging and push kids out of their comfort zones. I think we'll see kids rise to the occasion.

We're working hard to get everyone up to speed and solve the problems that for too long have let too many kids slip through the cracks.

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER:**

We're all working to provide the kind of teaching and learning that allows students to fully develop their diverse interests and talents, which is all the more urgent for those students who are almost ready to move on to college or into the workforce.

Practically speaking, Common Core won't change schools overnight. The shifts in instruction are to a large extent, a matter of emphasis and focus; this is about adopting a coherent plan for making sure that the most effective ways of teaching are happening across our schools and across the curriculum. The big ideas in Common Core are not new ideas. Think about it this way. The lessons or projects that students tend to remember for years are the lessons that asked them to really engage, researching or figuring out other ways to answer truly interesting questions, or creating their own ways of representing what they know. High school students have had these kinds of lessons before, but perhaps not consistently – they may have been 'special occasion' moments in the curriculum.

If we implement Common Core well, the kinds of project-based learning that ask kids to weave together different kinds of knowledge and skills will be the rule, not the exception. It's never too late to engage students in this kind of deeper learning. Intertwined, flexible skills will be really useful in college, and this integrated thinking is what employers are looking for these days.

**THE FALSE START ANALYSIS:**

- By highlighting stark statistics and using *Rhetorical Tone* to underscore urgency, this response is likely to cue up *Crisis* thinking – which depresses, rather than builds, public support and engagement.
- This response asks the public to believe two contradictory propositions: that our kids are terribly behind, and that they can meet higher expectations if they only try.
- Uses a *Global Competition* frame - which FrameWorks' research has shown leads the public to us-versus-them thinking and reinforces 'broken beyond repair' opinions on American schools.
- Emphasizing that "real learning is hard" leads to the idea that school success is determined by individual willpower. This *Individualism* frame makes it difficult to see the large, collective, systemic issues at play.

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER ANALYSIS:**

- Begins with cues for the Values of *Human Potential* and *Workforce Preparation*, which collectivize the issue.
- Uses *Pragmatism* and a concrete explanation to frame the changes as "more of the good stuff we already know how to do" rather than a complete transformation.
- The final paragraph uses *Skills Ropes* to establish higher-order skills as essential, not nice extras. This tested metaphor is a powerful antidote to "don't change – just go back to basics" thinking.

**Q: I've heard that the Common Core is eliminating literature from English Language Arts classes and students won't be taught the classics. Is that true?**

**THE FALSE START ANSWER:**

The Common Core *does not* say to get rid of literature and only read non-fiction. It says that 50% of what elementary, 60% of what middle school and 70% of what secondary students read should be non-fiction. These are guidelines for how to think about what students *throughout the entire day*, not just in English class. So we could be adding nonfiction readings in science class, or history class, or even math class. In the end, this will come down to teachers getting together, comparing lesson plans, and figuring out how to bring more complex text into instruction across the curriculum. I think this is a good thing. In the end, the skills of close reading, textual analysis, and academic language are the sorts of things that will boost SAT scores and increase students' chances of getting into a great college.

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER:**

The big idea behind Common Core standards is to ensure that our state's graduates are ready for college, ready for careers, and ready for life. Our instruction has set students up to truly understand what they read, so that they enter college and the workforce with strong critical thinking and problem-solving skills. That's why the Common Core standards emphasize depth over breadth.

Here's what this means at a practical level. In English classes, students will still be reading many of the literary classics we first read in school – but they may read fewer of them because they will be engaging with them more deeply, taking the time to do more than just follow the storyline. They're going to be asked to show they have really thought through what it means. And more often, they will also read paired nonfiction books that help them to understand novels' historical settings, for instance. If we can teach our students to do that with one text, they will have a skill they can apply to any text. Finally, I think we can all expect to see students being asked to read in classes other than English, and not just textbooks, but interesting and challenging informational articles that have rich vocabulary and can deepen students' content knowledge. In the end, these skills will equip the next generation to take on the challenges of the 21st century.

**THE FALSE START ANALYSIS:**

- Restating negative frames, even with “nots” attached, is a counterproductive communications strategy. People remember the myths and forget the “facts.”
- The use of “naked numbers” here doesn't clarify. The public is likely to wonder, “compared to what?”
- Framing the solution as simply adding nonfiction across the curriculum misses an opportunity to engage the public in the broader goal of encouraging deeper understanding of content.
- Framing the solution as one that rests entirely on the decisions of individual teachers reinforces the public's assumption that ‘teachers ARE the system,’ which makes it difficult for them to engage meaningfully in policy thinking.
- Field-specific terms such as *complex text*, *close reading*, and *textual analysis* mean little to people outside of education; they're even foreign to many people who work in education.
- Highlighting individual benefits, such as higher SAT scores, reinforces consumerist thinking about education and misses an opportunity to lift up education as a public good.

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER ANALYSIS:**

- By establishing a collective stake in the issue, this response is more likely to engage ‘bystander publics’ productively.
- This answer prioritizes accessible language over field-specific terminology – “books” and “novels” over “texts” and “literature.” “Texts” may be more accurate and specific than “books.” But are you communicating for complexity and nuance, or for understanding?
- By taking an explanatory approach and focusing on process and mechanism, this response is likely to leave the public with the satisfying sense that they grasp the issue. Filling in a complete story is one of the few ways to compete successfully with widespread myths and half-truths!

**Q:** I'm tired of hearing my child come home and say "all we did was get ready for the test," and now, with Common Core, it seems like there will be even more of this testing nonsense. I hear other parents saying they are "opting out" - why shouldn't I?

**THE FALSE START ANSWER:**

I understand your concern – I think many parents are right to be concerned that schools are too focused on test scores. All I can say is, I think we will all see that Common Core will ultimately help us get away from the world of fill-in-the-bubble and teaching to the test. Smarter Balanced is computer adaptive testing, which will give us a much more detailed picture of how well kids are mastering each standard. Online testing means we can get almost real-time data instead of having to wait weeks for paper tests to be scored.

Ultimately it's your choice whether or not you want your son or daughter to participate in the tests, but I would urge you to consider the common good in making this decision. Your child's data helps to strengthen the test. We need all the data we can get. Opting out of the tests means opting out of giving teachers a way to see what students know and can do.

And when it comes down to it, this is an equity issue. These assessments are what we use for accountability. These tests let us see where we have achievement gaps between whites and Asians versus Black or Latino students – showing us where we are failing our most vulnerable children.

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER:**

The purpose of school is to build students' potential and without ways to measure learners' progress, it's hard for any of us to know how well we're doing in developing the unique talents and abilities that our children bring.

Think about a good assessment system like a dashboard on a car. Is the gas light on? How fast are you going? What can you see through the windows and the mirrors? Having a variety of instruments tells us different things about how well students are learning.

The new assessments are much better dashboards. They have a broader range of things to look at, which gives educators more useful clues to what changes might be needed. And this approach involves looking at data and adjusting as you drive, not just when you get to the destination. Interim assessments, projects, portfolios, and assignments throughout the school year assess progress along the way. Every student benefits from that. As for the year-end assessments, by putting them online, we will get results back much more quickly, so we can use them to plan teacher professional development, improve the curriculum, and so forth for the upcoming year.

We can go farther, faster when we have access to many indicators about how things are going. The Common Core assessments are a key piece of the overall dashboard educators use to drive that process.

**THE FALSE START ANALYSIS:**

- By restating critiques of testing, this response reinforces the limited understanding that "assessment = testing."
- In focusing solely on "the test" and using expert register, this response misses the opportunity to help the public get smarter about meaningful assessment and the role it can play in improving instruction.
- "It's up to you – but consider the common good" undermines the collective action frame with an individual choice frame. Strategic framers make the affirmative case and leave the "other" point of view unstated.
- Framing equity issues in terms of the "achievement gap" can invoke zero-sum, us-versus-them thinking. Also, without careful, proactive framing of why some groups perform less well than others, the public defaults to deficit thinking.

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER ANALYSIS:**

- This response begins with the Value *Human Potential*, which builds public support for authentic approaches to assessment as well as more attention to equity in education.
- Uses the Explanatory Metaphor *Dashboard* to explain the underlying problem with over-relying on a single method of assessment, and offers a critique of the existing system without feeding into a *Crisis* frame.
- Takes advantage of the question to build public awareness of how assessment can and should work, rather than getting into the weeds of problems with implementation with a parent who is reasoning from an assumption that "all assessment is bad." There are times to push decision-makers toward better implementation, but this conversation probably isn't one of them.
- Maintains *Reasonable Tone* throughout, which establishes the communication as a message for "everyone," not just those who are already aligned with the issue.

**Q:** We've heard all sorts of worrisome things about these new CCSS assessments. They're computer-based, which is sure to lead to glitches. And they're supposed to be really hard. Why are we suddenly changing the way our kids are assessed?

**THE FALSE START ANSWER:**

A new set of standards calls for a new set of assessments, and it's time for this change because the old tests were very problematic.

The standardized tests we've been using for years give us a limited amount of information about what kids know and are able to do. The tests themselves did not assess higher order thinking and set a much lower bar regarding our expectations for all students.

These new tests raise that bar, just as the CCSS have done. They push teachers to do the hard work of building critical thinkers in their classrooms and not just kids who do well on a multiple choice test. Rather than applying their knowledge solely to English and math concepts, these tests challenge students to read, write, and do math across disciplines. They are doing things like reading historical passages and writing about scientific data.

These tests also represent a more fair way of assessing our students. They utilize computer adaptive testing, which means that they have built in technological capabilities to adapt the level of difficulty of questions to the responses students are giving. So if a child answers a higher-level question incorrectly the next question is downgraded and this kind of leveling of the test gives educators a more complete data-driven analysis of how well students have or have not mastered particular standards.

**THE FALSE START ANALYSIS:**

- By repeating the phrase *standardized tests* several times, the communicator only invokes and strengthens public thinking that 'Assessment = Testing.' This makes it harder for the public to appreciate the important role that formative assessment and direct assessment plays in instruction.
- The phrase "raise the bar" here triggers "willpower" thinking: if kids work hard enough they can do it, therefore this is a matter of teachers and students not working hard enough.
- The concluding paragraph is filled with education jargon that conveys little meaning to the public.

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER:**

In order to grow a strong workforce of tomorrow we must have an accurate way of evaluating how we're building students' potential today. Today the key issue for employers is not whether workers know certain content but rather how they go about finding, verifying, and applying information.

The CCSS were designed to address the reality of a changing world, and so the assessments that go along with them must do the same. The Smarter Balanced assessments adopted by California are a thoughtful remodel of the way we assess learning.

Like any good remodeling project they reflect an upgrade in quality and content. They ask students to show deeper learning and to solve real world problems across disciplines. Students must provide written reflections that explain their reasoning. They solve multi-step problems that require application of knowledge of how an equation works in one context to how it might work in another. This is precisely the kind of thinking we have to do in our lives outside of school – it makes sense to evaluate whether they're learning how to do it in school.

Again, like a good remodeling job these tests are designed to increase ease of use, and provide flexibility depending on the needs of the user. Using the latest technology the tests offer all students access to tools like scratch pads and calculators. But they can also help students with particular needs with features like foreign language glossaries, text size modifications, and different physical formats like Braille. It's a remodel that makes it possible to meet the different needs that different children bring.

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER ANALYSIS:**

- Opens with *Human Potential* value, which combats back to basics thinking and pairs well with the *Remodeling* metaphor.
- Smarter Balanced assessments described in *Pragmatic* terms.
- Uses the *Remodeling* metaphor to explain and contextualize the important but easily jargon-laden adaptive features of the tests.

**Q:** What about all the criticism I am hearing – that this is a policy cooked up by bureaucrats in Washington and that this is just more standardization that will take away all creativity in the classroom?

**THE FALSE START ANSWER:**

CCSS is NOT a federal takeover of education. And for that matter, they're not some sort of corporate plot to make millions of dollars on new textbooks, either. The tests are not going to invade your child's privacy. We are not all going to become serfs in a scary new world order. All of these myths that are being perpetuated are really troubling.

For the record, states voluntarily adopted these standards. It was an idea that came out of CCSSO and NGA. And really, it was originally a conservative idea – so I find it ironic that the red states are now the ones rolling back the standards that they couldn't wait to adopt just a few years ago.

Standards tell us what students should know and be able to do – they set the bar, but they don't tell us how to jump over it. We have to figure that out for ourselves. As for creativity and autonomy, many California districts are leaving it up to school sites to decide how to implement CCSS. So, I think that the fears about standardizing our kids' learning are unfounded.

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER:**

Contrary to the misinformation that's out there, Common Core was actually an idea that state governors came up with, and educators from every state worked on developing the standards. The standards are a set of updated learning goals that states agreed were the "core" of what was needed for a strong workforce in this day and age. To that shared core, states can and should add local priorities. And because standards are essentially an organized list of goals, not a full curriculum, states and districts still need to make a lot of decisions about what books, learning activities, etc. that will work best in their local contexts.

It seems to me to be a good idea to unify some key learning goals across the country. In many areas of life, we standardize some things to make them more workable. Think about what a mess it would be if electric outlets varied in size and shape across your community, your state, and between states. Families who must change schools, such as military families, have this kind of problem with school learning goals now. Adopting a consistent set of learning standards nationwide will have many long-term benefits – it's more in keeping with today's mobile society, and it makes it easier for states to share ideas about what's working well.

**THE FALSE START ANALYSIS:**

- Restating negative/opposition frames, even with "nots" attached, is a counterproductive communications strategy. People remember the myths and forget the "facts."
- An argumentative tone, political and partisan language, and acronym soup all work to create the sense that this message is for "insiders" and people who already agree with the perspective expressed, rather than civic discourse that's for everyone.

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER ANALYSIS:**

- This response uses a strategic formula for mythbusting: it signals that myths exist, but only makes the affirmative case. It elaborates and explains, rather than argues.
- Pulling from the domain of the tested Explanatory Metaphor *Remodeling* via the analogy to electric outlets, this response channels attention to beneficial aspects of standardization across geographies.
- An explanatory stance signals that this message is for everyone, and that this interaction is about learning and civic problem-solving – essential for public engagement.



**Q: Who is responsible for CCSS implementation in the state and how on earth will we pay for this overhaul of our education system?**

**THE FALSE START ANSWER:**

While the Common Core State Standards have been adopted by 45 states in the US, each state has a lot of freedom to implement them in their own way. In California, implementation of specific academic content standards is a local decision and not mandated by the *Education Code*. That said, the state strongly recommends that districts choose to use the Common Core because per *EC* Section 52060, one of the state priorities that must be addressed in each Local Education Agency's Local Control and Accountability Plan is the implementation of the academic content and performance standards adopted by the State Board of Education. All this is to say: the state has adopted the standards, but they are not a curriculum, and local school districts still have a great deal of autonomy over how to reach the standards.

This is not an unfunded mandate. We have the *Common Core State Standards Systems Implementation Plan for California* in place that utilizes funding already available to our schools to get them up to speed. And we have a one-time set-aside of \$1.25 billion of Common Core State Standards Implementation funds that we have already distributed to help local districts implement the standards.

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER:**

That's a great question with an easy answer: we are all responsible. In order to move California forward on a successful path to CCSS implementation, we need the collective efforts of many parties committed to and working collaboratively towards that goal. School boards, the state office, district administrators, educators, and the public all have roles to play here.

The CCSS present a real opportunity to remodel the way we do education in our state. Like a building code that contractors must adhere to in upgrading a kitchen, all our schools are now working toward a consistent set of goals for student learning. Sharing what works, borrowing good ideas from elsewhere, and collaborating on solutions to long-standing challenges will become both essential and easier.

From the beginning, California's educational organizations and agencies have embraced this idea, harmonizing their efforts, seeking feedback from teachers and principals throughout the state and unanimously approving their recommendations when adopting the CCSS. And we have made some sensible steps in terms of setting aside funds to support this renovation. The state has already dedicated a major one-time pool of funds to support implementation – in fact, California was the only state to do so. I think this shows how California has been leading the country in this ambitious change.

**THE FALSE START ANALYSIS:**

- Though this response attempts to come off as non-threatening, with its emphasis on local control, the onslaught of technical and policy vocabulary undermines that effect and makes this feel just as unmanageable as the public already thinks it is.
- The use of *Numbers* in the discussion of funding in the end is counterproductive because the numbers feel isolated – how much is 1.25 billion in the context of the rest of the state's education budget? Who gets that money and how?

**THE REFRAMED ANSWER ANALYSIS:**

- Uses the "bridge and pivot" technique to shift the discourse away from the unproductive frame embedded in the question, and back toward the Core Story.
- Avoids education policy jargon, and repurposes the reclaimed communications real estate to build a productive understanding of what collaborative reform can and should look like.
- Uses the *Remodeling* frame to help explain how the system works and the collective involvement at play in the fix.
- Provides solid examples of solutions that have worked which helps to make this feel less like an insurmountable challenge.