

PUBLIC EDUCATION

A Primer on *No Child Left Behind*
and Its Impact on South Carolina



Richard D. Young
Director, Governmental Research
Institute for Public Service and Policy Research
University of South Carolina

Public Education: A Primer on *No Child Left Behind*
--And Its Impact on South Carolina--

By

Richard D. Young

June 2004

Public Education: A Primer on No Child Left Behind is published by the University of South Carolina College of Liberal Arts' Institute for Public Service and Policy Research. The institute provides training, technical assistance, and publications and conducts research designed to enhance the quality and effectiveness of state and local government leadership and management. Contact the institute at: Institute for Public Service and Policy Research; University of South Carolina; Columbia, SC 29208; (803) 777-8156; ipspr.sc.edu.

Any views construed to be presented in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily represent or express those of the Institute for Public Service and Policy Research, the College of Liberal Arts, the University of South Carolina or any other entity of the State of South Carolina.

Prologue

The Educational Research Service (ERS), a prestigious nonprofit foundation dedicated to research on public education issues confronting the United States, reported in 2001 that nearly 70% of inner city 4th graders failed to read at the “basic level” as defined by national standards. Additionally, American high school seniors were behind students in countries like Cyprus and South Africa in math tests. And finally, almost a third of college students in the U.S. were in academic remedial programs of one kind or another.¹

The ERS stated that though public education has traditionally been the domain of state and local authorities, the federal government must share the blame for the “abysmal results” like those cited above. This monograph speaks to recent federal efforts to reform public education in America.

Introduction

In early January of 2002, federal legislation was signed by the president, which according to experts and observers alike, will have profound affects on public education in the U.S. over the next few years. The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (NCLB)² significantly expands the federal role in public education and targets increased federal funding to improve designated “poor performing” school systems. NCLB further requires all 50 states to:

- 1) Become *more accountable for results* in the performance of students, teachers, and schools;
- 2) Place a greater *focus on what works* in terms of instructional approaches as based on scientific research;
- 3) Expand *parental options* with regard to accessing “performance” information and, furthermore, to permitting in some cases “school choice;” and,
- 4) Permit *more local flexibility* or control in the spending of federal monies earmarked for public education.³

The NCLB law amends previous federal legislation⁴ dealing with public education by requiring states to implement rigorous assessment methods to determine achievement in math and language arts, and eventually content standards for science. In essence, states are required to “intensify student testing, ensure high qualifications for all teachers, and guarantee that all students achieve a ‘proficient’ level of education by 2015.”⁵

In this monograph, the history of the federal role in public education will be briefly discussed, providing the backdrop for current federal initiatives under NCLB. Next, the so-called “four pillars”⁶ of NCLB will be reviewed, including accountability for results, emphasis on “what works,” expanded options for parents, and greater local flexibility in the spending of federal funds for educational purposes. Additionally, the new federal requirements for teacher qualification will be presented, and some discussion of the

federal mandates applying to “safe schools” will be given. Finally, the impact of NCLB on public education in South Carolina will be examined in brief.

The Changing Federal Role in Public Education

Until the mid-1960s, the federal role in public education was, at best, minimal. Then, starting with President Johnson’s “War on Poverty,” federal legislation entitled the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* provided an initial \$2 billion to support low-income families through various educational support mechanisms. From 1965 through 1975, federal appropriations for public education increased 200%. But mainly because of an economic downturn, federal monies for elementary and secondary education dwindled to a mere 2% annual increase by 1980.

By the beginning of President Reagan’s first term, federal education funding decreased by 21%. This decrease was due in part to strong political views held by the president. Reagan believed strongly that public education was a state and local responsibility and opposed expansion of any federal role. In fact, Reagan—as part of his election platform—had promised to abolish the U.S. Department of Education altogether.⁷

However, in 1983, concern for the role of federal government in public education began to surface with the release of the report, *A Nation at Risk*.⁸ This report found that “international comparisons of student achievement revealed that American students were ‘inferior’ to other industrialized nations, and that some 23 million American adults were functionally illiterate in reading, writing, and comprehension.”⁹

As a result, President Reagan encouraged states to establish academic standards or benchmarks. Many states did so, and this represented the beginnings of what was to become termed the “standards-based accountability movement.” Some progress was made relatively quickly. By 1990, 40% of high school graduates met the basic requirements or performance standards spelled out in the *Nation at Risk* report.¹⁰

With educational performance becoming increasingly important on the national level, in 1989, President George H. W. Bush called together a national summit meeting on education. The outcome of this summit was the formation of six far-reaching educational goals to be obtained by the year 2000. These goals included, for example, “all children will start school ready to learn,” “the high school graduation rate will be at least 90%,” and “every American adult will be literate.”¹¹

As a follow-up effort and enhancement to his predecessor, President Clinton signed into law *Goals 2000: The Educate America Act*. This Act failed to garner bipartisan support and was abandoned for more comprehensive legislation, specifically the *Improving America’s Schools Act of 1994* (IASA). This federal legislation focused on content standards and improved accountability. As such, IASA established clearly the federal role in public education as being one that sanctioned standards and assessments as vital to ensuring accountability of student performance.¹²

On January 8, 2002, President George W. Bush signed the *No Child Left Behind Act*. A comprehensive Act, NCLB substantially increased federal funding for public education totaling \$23.78 billion for the 2003-04 school year, an increase of 59.8% from 1999-2000.¹³ Moreover, NCLB instated requirements and standards that were generally lauded for their potential to impact the nation's educational system.

Accountability for Results

In order to achieve accountability for results, NCLB requires states to set high academic standards for student performance in math and reading.¹⁴ NCLB also requires states to assess or measure annually students in grades 3 through 8 as to their progress. In turn, the data collected on student progress will be used to determine school performance as well.¹⁵ Each school will receive an annual report card. Schools must meet the state's definition of "adequate yearly progress" (AYP).¹⁶ Schools not meeting AYP will be designated as "in need of improvement." Schools in need of improvement will be targeted for assistance in order to gain AYP status. Failure for two consecutive years to achieve AYP will lead to mandatory corrective action ranging from offering parents the opportunity to send their children to other schools to ultimately district or school restructuring.

All states must submit a proposed statewide accountability plan, related to the federal requirements under NCLB, to the U.S. Department of Education for review and approval. Each plan must contain the following:

- Evidence that the state has developed content and achievement standards.
- Documentation that appropriate testing and assessment systems are in place.
- Certification that school report card procedures and reporting mechanisms are established.
- Evidence that statewide systems are in position to determine and hold accountable schools and districts for student progress.¹⁷

Doing What Works: Scientifically Based Research

No Child Left Behind posits that educational programs and instructional techniques that have been "scientifically" proven to achieve positive results should be given special attention and utilized by teachers to the greatest extent possible. In other words, "doing what works" means that instructional programs which have been rigorously studied, using accepted systematic and empirical methods, and demonstrate effectiveness, should be the focus of educators. Experimentation with untested or mere "faddish" programs, lessons and teaching materials, should be discontinued. NCLB reinforces this concept and practice of "doing what works" by targeting federal funding (\$900 million in 2002-03) to provide for such programs.¹⁸

An illustration of a scientifically based educational program with proven results is the Reading First Program (RFP).¹⁹ RFP has been studied by the National Reading Panel²⁰ for several years as was requested by Congress. The stated purpose of RFP "is to prepare

young people with the necessary language, cognitive, and early reading skills to prevent reading difficulties and ensure school success.”²¹ Through precise instructional processes, RFP concentrates on five key areas, i.e., phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension.

Parental Options

NCLB ensures parents of three important things. First, NCLB provides more information to parents on their child’s progress. In this sense, each state is required to measure each child’s annual development or achievement in reading and math (and eventually science in school year 2007-08) from grades 3 through 8, and at a minimum, once during the grades 10 through 12. Parents will receive these reports at the conclusion of the school year. Second, NCLB requires states to provide parents, and the public as well, comprehensive and meticulous annual school report cards. These report cards will indicate if a school is succeeding or meets “adequate yearly progress” standards, or conversely, “is in need of improvement.” Annual reports will indicate also, for example, student achievement by race, ethnicity, gender English language proficiency, migrant status, disability status, and income level.²² Third, parents will have the option to send their child to a “high-performing” school if it is determined that their child is presently attending a school that is in need of improvement. In such cases, the school district will also be required to provide transportation to the new school. And in the case of low-income families, parents will have additionally the option of receiving tutoring services at no cost.²³

NCLB also provides assistance to parents and communities to establish charter schools, if they should choose to do so. Finally, NCLB provides parents with school choice should their child be subject to some threat or violence.

Expanded Local Control or Flexibility

NCLB allows districts and schools unprecedented flexibility on how to spend federal funds, while equally important, reducing significantly the need for paperwork with regard to separate requests and approval. Districts and schools can now target federal monies to areas of greatest need, and do so within a timeframe that is advantageous. This may include, for instance, hiring new teachers, increasing teacher pay, or offering professional development opportunities. It may also include more esoteric purposes such as the consolidation of bilingual education programs.

Specifically, NCLB permits districts and schools to transfer amongst diverse programs up to 50% of the federal formula grants received under the federal programs Improving Teacher Quality Grants, Innovative Programs, Educational Technology, and Safe Drug-Free Schools. Title I programs may also be the beneficiary of this transfer of funds. Title I is composed of several educational initiatives including Early Reading First, Advanced Placement, School Dropout Prevention, and Improving Literacy through School Libraries. NCLB additionally allows for the creation of state and local flexibility

demonstration programs for *any* legitimate educational purpose within the provisions of the revised *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*.²⁴

Highly Qualified Teachers

According to studies,²⁵ there is demonstrable evidence that “teacher quality” is crucial to both student and school success. The greater the qualifications of the teacher, the better students/schools are likely “to achieve.”

Given this, NCLB speaks directly to teacher qualifications by requiring teachers in core instructional areas (i.e., language arts, math, history, civics or government, geography, economics, and science) to be “highly qualified” by the conclusion of 2005-06. The term “highly qualified teacher” *is to be determined by each state* with minimum requirements mandated by the NCLB. Generally speaking, these NCLB minimum requirements include 1) a bachelor’s degree, 2) state teaching certification, and 3) subject area demonstrated competency.²⁶

A bachelor’s degree is a clear and obvious minimal requirement. Teacher certification, as interpreted by NCLB, is one that is to be defined specifically by state requirements, for example, typically a certification of certain instructional coursework completed and a practicum. However, with regard to subject area competency, NCLB does become more concise in its requirements, particularly distinguishing between “new teachers” and those “teachers with experience.” Below are the specific NCLB requirements pertaining to teachers and subject area competency.

- *New* elementary school teachers must demonstrate competency by passing a test on subject knowledge and teaching skills.
- *New* middle and high school teachers must demonstrate competency by passing a test on subject matter, or hold an appropriate academic major, advanced degree or other advanced credentials.
- *Experienced* elementary, middle, or high school teachers must either meet the requirements of new teachers or meet some form of experience requirements as determined by the state.²⁷

Finally, states and districts are required by NCLB to provide—in annual reports—public information as to teacher qualifications. Such information will include the professional qualifications of teachers in the state, the percentage of teachers under emergency or provisional credentials, and the percentage of classes statewide taught by teachers not meeting the credentials of highly qualified status.²⁸

Safe Schools

According to the U.S. Department of Education, violence and drugs plague many schools and affect many students. Nearly two million students, ages 12 to 18, were victims of crimes at school in 2000. Of this number, some 130,000 crimes were classified as “serious and violent,” such as rape, robbery and aggravated assault.²⁹ Moreover, illegal

drugs are problematic in many schools across the U.S. Data collected in 2001 found that 29% of students in high school reported that drugs had been offered to them on school premises.³⁰

NCLB contains provisions that respond to violence and drugs in schools. The main emphasis here is prevention. Federal funds are granted to states, which then award monies to districts and schools that are in most need of safety and drug prevention programs. NCLB requires that these federal funds must be directed to districts and schools that are determined to be unsafe or at risk as based on “objective, scientific data.” NCLB also requires that districts and schools receiving federal funding to foster safety and drug-free surroundings must measure and report the progress of its prevention programs.³¹

Of importance, it should be noted that the *Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994*,³² as amended, mandates that any state receiving federal funds under NCLB, for purposes of school safety, must have passed state legislation requiring school districts to expel students for one year for bringing a firearm to school. Furthermore, NCLB requires states to have a policy intact that refers students to a criminal justice program if they are found guilty of possessing a firearm on school premises. The intent here is to remove dangerous students immediately from the school environment and to provide deterrents to similar illegal weapons possession among students.

NCLB additionally requires states receiving federal funds for school safety to provide what is known as the “unsafe school choice option.” This is a statewide policy that permits parents or students the option to choose a designated “safe” school if 1) their school is designated as being “persistently dangerous,” or 2) a student has been the victim of school violence.

Impact on South Carolina Public Education

NCLB’s initial impact on public education in South Carolina may be described or understood in two ways. First, on a positive note, South Carolina has had the benefit of setting high standards and rigorous assessments of academic performance at an early stage. The *South Carolina Education Accountability Act of 1998* (EAA) put in place an accountability mechanism of statewide academic standards and testing that far exceeded other state efforts at the time and, in many cases, continues “to set the bar high” comparatively speaking. This was an advantage to South Carolina and its public education system in the sense that when the federal *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* was enacted, the Palmetto State was already making progress in compliance to several NCLB aims and requirements. Second, however, on a somewhat problematic note, South Carolina has set standards of such high academic performance that using NCLB measurement (accelerated) timetables and guidelines, the state finds it difficult to demonstrate annual achievement under the NCLB, particularly with regard to NCLB’s “adequate yearly performance” (AYP) standards. South Carolina could of course lower its high standards, as compared to other states, and substantially improve its AYP performance status. But, the state’s leadership believes that this “lowering the bar” in

public education to simply score higher on NCLB's annual performance measures would be counterproductive, a setback, and would ultimately undermine efforts of the state's EAA to make world-class strides in overall educational achievement.

Thus, this is one significant dilemma South Carolina faces in the implementation of NCLB. Nevertheless, the state is progressing in several respects. South Carolina was one of the first states to receive approval of its accountability plan for NCLB by the U.S. Department of Education and was praised by the U.S. Secretary of Education for the EAA and its aims. Further, the Educational Testing Service (ETS) has recently released findings indicating that South Carolina's progress in public education is one of the best in the nation.

In the narrative which follows, the problems confronting the state's public education system will be touched upon. From this point, South Carolina's NCLB plan will be examined as will the importance of Title I schools in the state. Next, the results of the first NCLB evaluation of the state will be reviewed. Finally, the ETS research results of the state's education system will be discussed.

Systemic Problems Confronting Public Education in the State

According to the U.S. Census and South Carolina's *Kids Count Project*,³³ in 2000, there were some 1,009,641 children under age 18 in the state, which at the time had a total resident population of roughly 4,447,000.³⁴ Interestingly, the number of children under age 18 has decreased percentage-wise over the past few decades. For example, children under 18 in the year 2000 represented 25.2% of the state's total population; in 1960 they were 41.7%, 36.9% in 1970, and 30.2% in 1980.

Unfortunately, many children in South Carolina today are at considerable risk. According to a 2003 report,³⁵ 500,000 children are considered "at risk" in the state. Several indicators or problem areas are used by experts to determine at-risk children. These include family status (e.g., birth to teen mothers, divorce rates, family violence, abuse and neglect), economic status, health, readiness and early school performance, student achievement, and adolescent risk behaviors.³⁶ Consider, for example, the following South Carolina statistics:

- Family status—In 2001, 5% of all births were to teen mothers, 91% of whom were unmarried; 14,657 divorce decrees were granted affecting some 11,712 children; 19,250 cases of abuse or neglect were investigated.
- Economic status—In 1999, 187,275 children (18.8% of all persons under the age 18) were in households with incomes below the poverty level; 29,547 households received Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF).³⁷
- Health—In 2001, 11,480 or 20.6% of pregnant women received no prenatal care; 5,349 or 9.6% of all live births were classified "low birth-weight;" 20% of 9 to 17 year-olds met the medical definition of some mental (emotional or behavioral) disorder; 128,764 children were not covered by health insurance; Medicaid expenditures for children under 18 were \$991 million in 2002.

- Readiness and early school performance—In 2001, 13.6% of children were “not ready” for 1st grade; 13% repeated one of the first three grades; 16.1% of eight and nine year-olds were in special education.
- School achievement—In school year 2001-02, 15% of all children were in special education; 25.4% of 4th grade students were below basic (PACT)³⁸ reading and math standards; 36.7% of 8th graders were below reading and math standards; the dropout rate (8th graders no longer enrolled in grade 12, average of students for three years ending 2000-02) was 31.9%.
- Adolescent risk behaviors—In 2001-02, 21% of 7th and 8th graders and 37.1% of those attending high school reported that they had used alcohol within the past month; 9.5% of 7th and 8th grade students and 20.1% of high school students reported that they had used drugs within the past month; 20,158 juvenile offenders were remanded to solicitors for various offences related to delinquency.³⁹

Thus, the data above on South Carolina’s children and youth are distressing. Too many children are obviously at risk. But South Carolina and its leadership, particularly those involved or concerned with educational matters, are working diligently to aid and improve the education of the state’s children. Further, state and local governments are cognizant of the problems associated with children and are organizing and committing considerable resources to remedy them. The state’s *Education Accountability Act* and the federal *No Child Left Behind Act* are two important educational initiatives that are making in-roads to improve upon the education, and ultimately, the well-being of South Carolina’s children.

South Carolina’s Accountability Plan for NCLB

NCLB requires each state to submit a comprehensive planning document—a statewide school accountability plan—to indicate how the state will comply with the federal mandates of the *No Child Left Behind Act*. On January 1, 2003, the S.C. Department of Education submitted its accountability plan⁴⁰ to the U.S. Department of Education for review and approval. The submitted accountability plan not only made provisions to meet the requirements of the NCLB, but also addressed fully the requirements of the *S.C. Education Accountability Act*.

Schools receiving federal Title I funds⁴¹ (Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged) must achieve the status of adequate yearly progress (AYP) or suffer penalties. South Carolina’s accountability plan addressed this important NCLB requirement, since nearly three-quarters of its schools receive Title I funds. But the S.C. Department of Education recognized and continues to acknowledge that achieving AYP will be difficult, mainly, as stated earlier, because the state’s EAA proficiency standards⁴² in reading and math are so much more rigorous than that of other states.⁴³

For the record, the state superintendent for education has stated that “NCLB will penalize South Carolina and a handful of other states which have set high proficiency standards.” According to the superintendent, “there needs to be a level playing field.”⁴⁴

Approval of South Carolina's NCLB Plan

All states were required by NCLB to submit accountability plans to the U.S. Department of Education (USDOE) by the end of January 2003. The USDOE review process consisted basically of three steps. An initial overall review was conducted by USDOE with technical feedback, as appropriate. Next, a separate and independent peer review team conducted an analysis of each state's accountability plan and offered, as necessary, any suggestions. Finally, with the incorporation of suggested changes, the USDOE approved the accountability plans of those states successfully completing both the initial review and the peer review processes.

On March 22, 2003, South Carolina's accountability plan for implementation of NCLB requirements was approved by the U.S. Department of Education. The USDOE stated that "South Carolina was a leader in setting high standards."⁴⁵

In kind, the state superintendent for education in South Carolina responded that the state has made positive achievement in education over the past few years. The state superintendent pointed out additionally that the Princeton Review had recently, in fact, determined that South Carolina's accountability system for public education was the 11th best in the United States.⁴⁶

Title I Schools in South Carolina

A few words on Title I schools are appropriate at this juncture since 1) NCLB provides for them in statute, and 2) they impact roughly 75% of all South Carolina's schools. Thus, the relevant question here is, "What is a Title I school and what is its importance to the NCLB law?"

Once the principal provision of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964*, Title I is, as amended, the first major provision of the NCLB act.⁴⁷ It is entitled "Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged" and consists of 12 specific provisions and a general provisions section. These provisions are as follows:

- 1) Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies (I-A)
- 2) Reading First (I-B-1)
- 3) Early Reading First (I-B-2)
- 4) William F. Goodling Even Start Family Literacy Program (I-B-3)
- 5) Improving Literacy through School Libraries (I-B-4)
- 6) Education of Migratory Children (I-C)
- 7) Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk (I-D)
- 8) National Assessment of Title I, Title 1 Evaluation and Demonstrations (I-E-1501-1503)
- 9) Close-Up Fellowship (I-E-1504)
- 10) Comprehensive School Reform (I-F)

- 11) Advanced Placement (I-G)
- 12) School Dropout Prevention (I-H)
- 13) General Provisions (I-I)

Title I and its provisions comprise the single largest federal appropriation for public education in the United States. Schools receive Title I monies as based on a percentage of their students in households with incomes at or below the poverty level. In South Carolina, all districts qualify for Title I monies, as do most schools. In school year 2001-02, \$122 million in Title I funds went to public education statewide, and this amount increased to \$142 million in 2002-03.

The logic for Title I assistance is straightforward. According to the S.C. Department of Education, “recognizing that children in poverty are academically challenged more than others, federal funding is earmarked to public schools with higher percentages of students from low-income families.”⁴⁸

First NCLB Results for South Carolina

In mid-December of 2003, the S.C. Department of Education reported its first accountability outcomes under NCLB. As was suspected by many, the results were disappointing.

Only nine high schools met all of their adequate yearly progress goals. Those not meeting fully AYP totaled 188. In some cases, AYP requirements consisted of some 29 pre-set goals making full compliance extremely difficult. For example, of the 188 high schools not meeting AYP, 44 fell short of compliance by missing as few as one to five goals.⁴⁹

Much of the problem here resulted from the fact that the state Department of Education was initiating its first field test for 10th graders called the “High School Assessment Program,” or HSAP. This new exam replaced the Basic Skills Assessment Program (BSAP), which had served as the state’s exit test since the 1980s. The HSAP is considered more rigorous and challenging than the BSAP. As with the BSAP exam, the HSAP allows 10th graders to be given their first opportunity to pass the high school exit exam, and if failure occurs, students can retake the HSAP in the 11th grade, and if need be, the 12th.⁵⁰

Given these circumstances, the state Department of Education requested that the U.S. Department of Education for a one-year delay on AYP measurements. The USDOE denied the state’s request.

Further, as discussed earlier, two other problems contributed to the dismal first NCLB results for South Carolina. First, South Carolina’s tough proficiency standards, which exceed those of most other states, made it difficult to reach overall better AYP ratings, particularly given the stringent milestones and timetables dictated by NCLB. Second, NCLB requires districts and schools to disaggregate their performance data by subcategories such as ethnicity, poverty, etc. Failure in any subcategory means failure for

the entire school or district. Given the state's demographic profile, these conditions contributed additionally to the state's poor showings under NCLB.

The Educational Testing Research Assessment

While the AYP report cards are discouraging, other recent research on South Carolina's educational progress indicates substantial improvement over the past few years. The Educational Testing Service (ETS),⁵¹ the world's largest private educational research organization, reported in March 2004 that "South Carolina had the 4th best improvement in reading, after the District of Columbia, California, and Louisiana."⁵²

The ETS study analyzed each state's progress on the National Assessment of Educational Progress⁵³ (NAEP), sometimes referred to as the "nation's education report card." The NAEP compares scores of 4th to 8th graders over a four-year period in math and reading. This research permits the examination of trends of the same group of students as they progress over a given period of time in core subject areas.

Many experts and observers believe that this research methodology is more meaningful than that of NCLB's yearly annual assessment or the AYP assessment.

Conclusion

In this monograph, an overview of the federal *No Child Left Behind* legislation has been presented with a brief discussion of its impact on public education in South Carolina. NCLB is considered by many to be the most comprehensive educational initiative ever enacted by congress and the president. Its goals of accountability for results, focus on what works, provision for parental choice, and increased local control and flexibility are unprecedented in scope and detail.

South Carolina faces many challenges in the coming years in improving its public educational system. Many problems confront the state and educational progress, including those associated with family and economic status, health, school readiness and achievement, and at risk behaviors. But South Carolina has shown both forethought and commitment to educational improvement on all fronts. NCLB is but one more initiative, albeit one that is most exigent, that the state includes in its many strategies to improve the education of South Carolina's children.

References

Education Research Service (2001). *No child left behind: A special reprint of George W. Bush's education plan, with relevant discussion education leaders should ask*. Arlington, VA: Education Research Service.

Devoe, J. et al (2003). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Departments of Education and Justice.

Ingersoll, R. (2002, January). *Out of field teaching, educational inequality, and the organization of schools: An exploratory analysis*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Center for Study of Teaching and Policy.

Sanders, W. and Rivers, J. (1996, November). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and Assessment Center.

U.S. Department of Education (2003). *No child left behind: A toolkit for teachers*. Washington, DC: USDOE, Office of the Under Secretary.

Whitehurst, G. (2002). *Research on teacher preparation and professional development*. Washington, DC: White House Conference on Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers.

Endnotes

¹ Education Research Service (2001). *No child left behind: A special reprint of George W. Bush's education plan, with relevant discussion education leaders should ask*. Arlington, VA: Education Research Service, p. 3.

² See *No Child Left Behind Act* at <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/index.html>.

³ Retrieved March 23, 2004 from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml?src=ln>.

⁴ Principally the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965* and the *Improving America's Schools Act of 1994*.

⁵ Op. Cit., <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/landing.jhtml?src=ln>.

⁶ U.S. Department of Education (2003). *No child left behind: A toolkit for teachers*. Washington, DC: USDOE, Office of the Under Secretary, p. 3.

⁷ Retrieved March 23, 2004 from <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/educ/NCLBHistory.htm>.

⁸ See *A Nation at Risk* at <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html>.

⁹ Retrieved March 23, 2004 from <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/risk.html>.

¹⁰ Op. Cit., <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/educ/NCLBHistory.htm>.

¹¹ See <http://www.skepticfiles.org/conspire/b34.htm>.

¹² Op. Cit., <http://www.ncsl.org/programs/educ/NCLBHistory.htm>.

¹³ Retrieved March 23, 2004 from <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/into/index.html>.

¹⁴ By school year 2007-08 standards for science must additionally be in place.

¹⁵ Data will be disaggregated for students (per school) by income, race, disabilities and limited English proficiencies. Schools not meeting AYP as based on any disaggregated data will be designated in need of improvement.

¹⁶ "Adequate yearly progress" or AYP is defined in the following way: "Each state is required to define the level of proficiency students must achieve in mathematics, reading or language arts (and eventually science). Within the next 12 years, all students must attain this requisite level of proficiency, and each school is required to demonstrate that it is make 'adequate yearly progress' toward achieving that goal."

Retrieved March 24, 2004 from <http://www.nsba.org/site/docs/5300/5211.pdf>.

¹⁷ Op. Cit., U.S. Department of Education (2003), p. 10.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁹ See <http://www.ed.gov/programs/readingfirst/index.html>.

²⁰ See <http://www.nationalreadingpanel.org/>.

²¹ Retrieved March 25, 2004 from <http://www.ed.gov/programs/earlyreading/index.html>.

²² Op. Cit., U.S. Department of Education (2003), p. 5.

²³ Ibid.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 10.

²⁵ See Sanders, W. and Rivers, J. (1996, November). *Cumulative and residual effects of teachers on future student academic achievement*. Knoxville, TN: University of Tennessee Value-Added Research and

-
- Assessment Center. See Whitehurst, G. (2002). *Research on teacher preparation and professional development*. Washington, DC: White House Conference on Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers. See Ingersoll, R. (2002, January). *Out of field teaching, educational inequality, and the organization of schools: An exploratory analysis*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Center for Study of Teaching and Policy.
- ²⁶ Op. Cit., U.S. Department of Education (2003), p. 12.
- ²⁷ Ibid.
- ²⁸ Ibid., p. 14.
- ²⁹ Ibid., p. 30.
- ³⁰ Devoe, J. et al (2003). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2002*. Washington, DC: U.S. Departments of Education and Justice.
- ³¹ Op. Cit., U.S. Department of Education (2003), p. 30.
- ³² See <http://www.morgan.k12.il.us/4rivers/Gun.htm>.
- ³³ See <http://www.sckidscount.org/>.
- ³⁴ Retrieved March 31, 2004 from <http://www.sckidscount.org/kc03.asp?COUNTYID=47>.
- ³⁵ See *2003 South Carolina Kids Count Report* at <http://www.sckidscount.org/kc03.asp?COUNTYID=47>.
- ³⁶ Retrieved March 31, 2004 from http://www.sckidscount.org/kc_intro01.html.
- ³⁷ See <http://www.state.sc.us/dss/fi/plan.htm>.
- ³⁸ Palmetto Achievement Challenge Test. See <http://www.scfuture.clemson.edu/today&tomorrow/education/pact/>.
- ³⁹ Retrieved April 1, 2004 from <http://www.sckidscount.org/kc03.asp?COUNTYID=47>.
- ⁴⁰ See <http://www.myscschools.com/nclb/>.
- ⁴¹ See <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg1.html>.
- ⁴² The American Institutes for Research identifies South Carolina as one of six states with the “toughest” proficiency standards in the nation. See <http://www.myscschools.com/news/more.cfm?articleID=288>.
- ⁴³ More specifically, this is problematic since NCLB has set aggressive timetables and standards for measuring yearly progress, and as such, the State Department believes that this puts South Carolina at disadvantage to meet AYP goals. Further, because of the demographic diversity of the state's schools, and the requirements of NCLB to measure by disaggregated categories, South Carolina educators believe it will be hard to reach sufficient levels of yearly achievement.
- ⁴⁴ Retrieved April 1, 2004 from <http://www.myscschools.com/news/more.cfm?articleID=288>.
- ⁴⁵ Retrieved April 1, 2004 from <http://www.myscschools.com/news/more.cfm?articleID=333>.
- ⁴⁶ Ibid.
- ⁴⁷ See <http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg1.html>.
- ⁴⁸ Retrieved April 1, 2004 from <http://www.myscschools.com/nclb/EducatorsFAQAYP.htm>.
- ⁴⁹ Retrieved April 2, 2004 from <http://www.myscschools.com/news/more.cfm?articleID=388>.
- ⁵⁰ Ibid.
- ⁵¹ See <http://ets.org/>.
- ⁵² Retrieved April 2, 2004 from <http://www.myscschools.com/news/more.cfm?articleID=420>.
- ⁵³ See <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>.