

Who's Saying What About NCLB Reauthorization?

ECS NCLB Reauthorization Database

September 2007

Mary Fulton, ECS Policy Analyst

No Child Left Behind – perhaps the most far-reaching version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) – has pushed states, districts and schools to improve each student's performance beyond previous expectations – at least with greater public scrutiny and stricter consequences.

Many have balked at No Child Left Behind (NCLB) accountability and testing requirements, claiming they are costly, narrow the curriculum, do not provide enough flexibility for students' different needs and undermine state sovereignty. Others argue that the law has pulled back the curtain, exposing wide achievement gaps, and forced schools to address these disparities. But few have challenged the *overall goal* of bringing all students to at least a "proficient" level of performance, even though some experts claim it is unattainable statistically and in reality.

Now, as Congress prepares to reauthorize NCLB, the debate is heating up with regard to specific requirements, provisions and details, as well as whether the law will instill the skills and knowledge necessary for students to succeed in the 21st century and compete in a global economy.

Over the past few years – and especially since 2006 – a number of national organizations have issued recommendations for improving the next round of ESEA. To better inform the national debate and policy decisions, ECS collected and synthesized these recommendations, creating a single-source database that captures "***Who's saying what about NCLB reauthorization?***"

ECS' database helps identify revisions that key stakeholders believe are necessary to achieve the law's ambitious goals, while also recognizing the challenges. The database will evolve as discussions and decisions proceed and as organizations present revised or new suggestions for renewing ESEA.

Background

The database builds on ECS *Report to the Nation: State Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act* released in July 2004 that reviewed trends within and across states; identified issues and challenges facing states; and presented a set of recommendations to improve the federal law. These recommendations were discussed and vetted by ECS Steering Committee members convened during the spring of 2004.

ECS presented the following five overarching recommendations in 2004, as well as a number of action steps for consideration by federal and state policymakers:

1. Embrace NCLB as a civil rights issue

2. Ensure performance growth of all students, not just low-performing students
3. Reassess Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) [to take into consideration student growth]
4. Strengthen highly qualified teacher requirements
5. Build state and local capacity [to assist low-performing schools].

Our initial recommendations still hold true and were bell weathers for many issues that would surface as the NCLB took root. ECS, for example, was one of the first organizations to caution that a focus on closing achievement gaps could direct attention away from higher-performing students, which some reports have found to be the case. As implementation has proceeded, several other areas – such as school leadership – have gained more attention on the national education front.

Since publishing the *Report to the Nation*, ECS has deepened its understanding of the federal law through our bird's-eye view of activity across state policymaking bodies; review of analyses, preliminary results and lessons learned; and our recent work to synthesize and analyze recommendations presented by key stakeholders as Congress prepares to reauthorize NCLB.

Overall Findings

The organizations included in the database called for greater flexibility with regard to adequate yearly progress (AYP), assessments and teaching quality, but differed on the extent and nature of the changes. In some instances, however, organizations suggested tougher requirements to reach the law's goals and to obtain more consistency across states regarding certain NCLB provisions, such as calculating AYP.

Keep in mind, some recommendations were written before the chatter about reauthorization heated up, and before particular issues – such as high school reform and school leadership – hit the front burner, analyses of the law become available, or flexibility and further guidance was offered by the U.S. Department of Education. *Check out the Summary Chart on Organizations and Recommendations for more details (pgs.5-6).*

Presumably, the changes called for by organizations reflect lessons learned from implementing NCLB requirements, analyzing data and applying knowledge from practice and research. These lessons hopefully will inform policy decisions as Congress moves forward to renew the law.

For example, on-the-ground experience and data analysis lead several organizations to suggest that AYP consequences should vary based on the reasons why and degree to which schools missed their performance goals. A school that failed to meet participation rates on exams probably requires a different intervention than one in which a majority of students are not reading on grade level.

Key Findings

ECS' database and analysis help answer the following questions:

- Where is there collective agreement across organizations?
- What new priorities and emerging issues should receive more attention?
- What are organizations *not* focusing on?

Areas of Collective Agreement

1. Allow growth models for calculating Adequate Yearly Progress

All 15 organizations recommended that states and districts should receive credit for progress students make *toward* annual performance goals. This measurement would be in addition to the existing AYP calculation, which relies on a “make it or miss it” approach. The organizations, as well as experts and educators, believe a “growth model” is a more accurate and fair way to gauge improvements, especially by struggling schools that are making significant gains. One key consideration, however, is whether states have the capacity to track individual student and school progress, which is why several organizations mentioned the need for sophisticated, longitudinal state data systems in their NCLB recommendations.

2. Provide more flexibility for students with disabilities and English language learners (ELL)

Most organizations called for expanded use of alternative assessments and assistance with developing testing accommodations for students with disabilities and English language learners. Another common suggestion was to extend the amount of time these students are counted in their respective subgroups for calculating AYP. Organizations, however, differed on the extent and exact type of flexibility that should be offered.

3. Provide adequate funding to support NCLB requirements

Not surprisingly, several organizations took aim at federal funding levels and requested adequate resources to carry out NCLB requirements and goals. Despite the challenges of identifying actual costs, some organizations called upon Congress to study the fiscal responsibilities borne by states and districts under the law and make necessary budgetary adjustments. Other proposals included more flexibility to spend federal funds and eliminate financial penalties for not fully participating in No Child Left Behind.

4. Build state and local capacity to assist low-performing schools

Various reports indicate that state education departments and school districts often feel overwhelmed by their NCLB responsibilities, and lack the staff and capacity to respond effectively. It is not surprising, therefore, that more than half the organizations requested additional support for states and districts to assist low-performing schools, especially as the number of schools in need of improvement grows.

5. Offer high-quality and targeted professional development to more educators

Over half of the organizations called for more effective, ongoing teacher professional development that is tied to instruction, academic standards and student performance. And some groups recommended that these opportunities be targeted to teachers who had not achieved “highly qualified” – or “highly effective” – status. A few organizations also mentioned the need for principals and paraprofessionals to receive high-quality development opportunities.

6. Target assistance and interventions to highest need schools and students

States and districts should be able to determine the most appropriate consequences based on the degree to which and reasons why schools miss AYP targets, according to several organizations. For example, a school that falls short on testing participation rates probably does not need the same interventions as a school where a majority of students are struggling to read at grade level. States and districts also should be able to target assistance and resources to the highest-need schools and students rather than evenly spreading their limited capacity.

New National Priorities and Emerging Issues

ECS' database illustrates how education reform priorities that have come to the fore over the past few years are now entering the NCLB reauthorization conversation. The Summary Chart (on page 6) for example, shows that at least a half a dozen organizations – especially those who issued recommendations more recently – are calling for NCLB to incorporate high schools and principals to a greater extent. While ECS did not include high school reform and school leaders in our recommendations, we have since addressed these topics through comprehensive projects.

High School Reform

While high schools are subject to many NCLB requirements, including assessments, accountability and teaching quality, they seem to have received less scrutiny than elementary and middle schools. Recommendations offered by a handful of organizations, however, could bring more attention to and demands upon secondary schools under the law.

Some organizations recommended that high schools adhere to a common graduation rate definition and be held more accountable for graduating all students. And a few organizations suggested that high schools should connect more closely with and better prepare students for the demands of postsecondary education and work.

School Leadership

School leadership was not prominent in the initial Act, but the need for strong school and district leaders has gained considerable traction. Policymakers, researchers, foundations and others recognize the important role strong leadership plays in turning around low-performing schools and managing the demands of all schools. As such, several organizations called for greater inclusion of school principals in the next iteration of NCLB, especially with regard to their professional development and flexibility to recruit teachers they deem qualified and effective.

Teacher Effectiveness

Teaching quality, a key component of the initial version of NCLB, remains a focal point for most organizations, but a few suggested expanding the current definition beyond certification and subject matter knowledge to “effectiveness” based on student performance or other measures. Many experts have argued that acquiring basic credentials does not necessarily translate into an educator's ability to actually convey his/her expertise or to individualize instruction based on students' needs. Still, educators, organizations – including ECS – and researchers continue to debate and devise the most accurate and appropriate ways to evaluate teacher effectiveness.

Equity and Excellence

Several policy experts, business leaders and educators have raised concerns that NCLB places more emphasis on closing basic skill achievement gaps and less on preparing students to compete in a global economy. Some have noted, for example, that America's strength lies in its citizens' creativity, imagination, risk-taking and problem-solving – qualities often acquired through a liberal arts education. The “equity vs. excellence” argument seems to have swung back around, but the stakes may be higher given the nation's changing demographics and the world's global market. The challenge is to ensure these goals are not mutually exclusive.

Several organizations touched on this theme by suggesting that NCLB should more strongly support a broad range of subjects and skills that will help students adapt to education, work and citizenship demands of the 21st century. Some recommended that state academic standards and assessments connect more directly to college and workplace expectations, especially as they continue to evolve. A few organizations also contended that state standards should be gauged against a national standard to ensure rigor and consistency. Finally, a couple groups touted career/technical education opportunities for students who may not attend four-year colleges, but must be prepared for an increasingly competitive and changing workplace.

Other Recommendations of Note

Several organizations commented that a reauthorized NCLB should help improve state assessments and develop more sophisticated data systems; offer greater flexibility for the types and frequency of assessments; include additional measures to gauge AYP; provide more flexibility for certain teachers to meet highly qualified requirements; expand incentives to recruit and retain qualified teachers; and use Individual Education Plans (IEPs) to more accurately determine appropriate standards and assessments for students with disabilities.

What Issues are Organizations Not Focusing On?

Early Learning

Early learning was addressed primarily through the Early Reading First program in the initial version of NCLB. Only a few groups mentioned early childhood and primarily focused on providing access to and support of high-quality, universal programs. Yet, the majority of states have realized – backed up by policies, programs and funding – that every young child needs to enter school ready to learn. Perhaps the absence of recommendations reflects a reluctance to use the primary federal education law – ESEA – as a venue for early learning.

School Safety

School safety also was not on organizations' radar screens, despite concerns that states have identified relatively few schools as "persistently dangerous" under NCLB. Education policy observers have questioned the credibility of states' definitions for these troubled schools and a recent U.S. Department of Education Inspector General's report indicate that fewer than 50 of the nation's 94,000 schools had been identified as unsafe each year since 2002-03. Yet, only a couple organizations even mentioned this issue, calling for more consistent state definitions and stronger enforcement of this provision.

About ECS' Database on NCLB Reauthorization

What Organizations are Included?

ECS included national organizations, coalitions and commissions that issued a formal and comprehensive set of recommendations. The original sources for the database – as well as reports from other organizations, the U.S. Department of Education and Congressional proposals – are listed in Appendix B. *Please see the Summary Chart below for a list of organizations included in the database.*

What Issues are Included?

The database is organized around 16 issue areas that seem to capture most of the recommendations. A "Miscellaneous and Overarching" category was created for recommendations that are broader statements about NCLB or education reform. The "Other Programs" category includes recommendations for programs such as counseling services, health and nutrition, and parental involvement. The following topics are included in ECS' database:

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)	High Schools (HS)
Assessment, Standards & Curriculum (ASC)	Other Programs (OP)
Capacity, Innovation and Research & Development (CIRD)	Safe Schools (SS)
Consequences and Interventions (CI)	School Leadership (SL)
Data Systems and Reporting (DSR)	Students with Disabilities (SWD)
Early Childhood Education (ECE)	Supplemental Education Services (SES)
English Language Learners (ELL)	Teaching Quality (TQ)
Finance Issues (FI)	Miscellaneous/Overarching (Misc.)

Summary Chart of Organizations and Issues

The following chart summarizes the number of recommendations each organization proposed for each issue. 1) Several recommendations applied to multiple issue areas (e.g. AYP and Consequences), so the total counts are higher than what organizations actually presented; 2) Some organizations did not offer recommendations for every issue, based on ECS' analysis; and 3) Organizations are listed in order of the date their recommendations were published, which helps illustrate that – in general – issues such as high school reform and school leadership have gained attention more recently.

Organ.	Total	AYP	ASC	CIRD	CI	DSR	ECE	ELL	FI	HS	OP	SS	SL	SWD	SES	TQ	Misc
ECS 7/2004	27	5	1	2	3	2	—	1	2	—	—	2	—	2	1	3	2
NCSL 2/2005	54	16	3	1	4	1	—	3	6	1	—	—	—	4	1	5	8
NASSP 6/2005	38	8	6	—	2	1	—	1	4	3	—	—	—	2	2	8	—
AASA 2/2006	25	6	6	—	1	4	—	1	2	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	3
NGA 3/2006	38	5	5	4	4	1	—	1	2	—	7	1	—	1	1	3	3
AFT 7/2006	33	6	7	—	7	1	1	2	2	—	—	—	—	1	1	4	1
NEA 7/2006	61	5	8	2	6	1	1	2	9	1	8	—	1	2	2	12	—
NAESP 11/2006	41	7	9	—	1	—	1	3	1	—	3	—	6	3	—	6	1
NASBE 11/2006	34	7	3	3	2	2	—	2	5	—	1	—	—	1	1	—	7
BCSA 1/2007	34	5	6	3	3	2	—	1	—	3	—	—	4	1	1	5	—
CCSSO 1/2007	39	9	7	4	3	—	—	4	2	—	—	—	—	3	1	4	2
Comm. NCLB 2/2007	97	13	16	2	9	8	1	12	3	3	1	—	6	4	6	12	1
FEA 3/2007	16	4	3	2	2	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	—	1	—
NSBA 3/2007	53	19	6	—	11	1	—	2	3	—	—	—	—	3	5	—	3
Ed Trust 4/2007	45	6	3	1	6	6	—	—	9	3	1	—	1	—	—	9	—
TOTALS	631	121	89	24	64	31	4	35	52	14	21	3	19	29	22	72	31
% of Total	N/A	19%	14%	4%	10%	5%	1%	6%	8%	2%	3%	1%	3%	5%	3%	11%	5%
Organ. w/ Recomm.	N/A	15	15	10	15	13	4	13	14	6	6	2	6	13	11	12	10

American Association of School Administrators (AASA)

American Federation of Teachers (AFT)

Business Coalition for Student Achievement (BCSA)

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)

Commission on No Child Left Behind (Comm. NCLB)

Education Commission of the States (ECS)

Education Trust (Ed Trust)

Forum on Educational Accountability (FEA)

National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)

National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)

National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE)

National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL)

National Education Association (NEA)

National Governors Association (NGA)

National School Boards Association (NSBA)

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

Assessment, Standards & Curriculum (ASC)

Capacity, Innovation and Research & Development (CIRD)

Consequences and Interventions (CI)

Data Systems and Reporting (DSR)

Early Childhood Education (ECE)

English Language Learners (ELL)

Finance Issues (FI)

High Schools (HS)

Other Programs (OP)

Safe Schools (SS)

School Leadership (SL)

Students with Disabilities (SWD)

Supplemental Education Services (SES)

Teaching Quality (TQ)

Miscellaneous/Overarching (Misc.)

Appendix A – Highlights and Comments for NCLB Database Issues

The following is a compilation of the Highlights and Comments that appear in each issue report.

Adequate Yearly Progress

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **15 of 15**

AASA; AFT; BCSEA; Comm. NCLB; CCSSO; ECS; Ed Trust; FEA; NAESP; NASBE; NASSP; NCSL; NEA; NGA; and NSBA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **None**

Comments

Not only did every organization suggest ways to improve adequate yearly progress (AYP), but this NCLB provision received more recommendations than any other issue, according to ECS' analysis.

All organizations proposed the use of "growth models" to calculate AYP, a method which would recognize and reward student and school progress toward meeting annual performance targets. Currently, schools either "hit or miss" AYP targets, and only receive credit for student gains under the somewhat confusing Safe Harbor provision.

Most organizations also called for greater flexibility for students with disabilities and English Language Learners (ELL). The recommendations focused on allowing these students to be counted in their respective subgroups for longer periods of time and tailoring achievement goals based on individual needs.

Lastly, about half the organizations suggested that AYP calculations should factor in "multiple measures" so as to lessen the emphasis on standardized tests.

Assessment, Standards and Curriculum

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **15 of 15**

AASA; AFT; BCSEA; Comm. NCLB; CCSSO; ECS; Ed Trust; FEA; NAESP; NASBE; NASSP; NCSL; NEA; NGA; and NSBA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **None**

Comments

Most organizations suggested expanding the use of alternative assessments for students with disabilities and English Language Learners (ELL), as well as providing more assistance to develop these exams. There also were several recommendations to improve state assessment systems, along with data collection and analysis capacity. And half the organizations would like to see greater flexibility, whether in terms of the types of exams allowed (e.g., local or computer-based), grades tested or factoring in multiple test results.

About a handful of organizations recommended that states improve and expand their standards to reflect a broader curriculum and to connect with college and work demands. A few organizations emphasized the need to bolster math, science and technology in schools.

Capacity, Innovation and Research & Development

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **10 of 15**

BCSA; Comm. NCLB; CCSSO; ECS; Ed Trust; FEA; NASBE; NCSL; NEA; and NGA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **5 of 15**

AASA; AFT; NAESP; NASSP; NSBA

Comments:

Various reports indicate that state education departments and school districts often feel overwhelmed by their NCLB responsibilities, and lack the staff and capacity to respond effectively. Therefore, it is not surprising that more than half the organizations requested additional support for states and districts to assist low-performing schools, especially as the number of schools in need of improvement grows.

Some organizations called for increased federal investment in research and development to improve schools and to identify and disseminate promising practices. And a few groups asked for greater recognition and support of state and local education innovations.

Consequences and Interventions

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **15 of 15**

AASA; AFT; BCSA; Comm. NCLB; CCSSO; ECS; FEA; NAESP; NASBE; NASSP; NCSL; NEA; NGA; and NSBA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **None**

Comments:

All organizations presented recommendations related to the consequences and interventions required under NCLB, indicating a high degree of interest and perhaps concern as well. The most common proposal was to allow states and districts to target assistance and interventions to the highest-need schools and students, rather than to all those that missed AYP goals.

Several organizations also would allow states and districts to switch the order of the first two levels of sanctions. This flexibility would permit struggling schools to first offer supplemental services (tutoring) as a way to improve student performance before turning to school choice as a possible remedy. Lastly, there was a call to give schools more time to implement reforms before moving to the next sanction level.

Data Systems and Reporting

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **13 of 15**

AASA; AFT; BCSA; Comm. NCLB; ECS; Ed Trust; FEA; NASBE; NASSP; NCSL; NEA; NGA; and NSBA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **2 of 15**

CCSSO and NAESP

Comments:

NCLB requires states to collect, analyze and report information on several topics and to disaggregate much of the data. Despite progress in developing more sophisticated information systems to meet these requirements, many states still face challenges.

While nearly every organization mentioned data systems and reporting, their recommendations were spread across several themes. Organizations suggested that a reauthorized NCLB should assist states

with developing more robust information systems, maintain and expand disaggregated data requirements (such as graduation rates), provide professional development to use data more effectively, and require more useable and easily understood reporting formats. A couple organizations would like to see additional data on report cards as well.

Early Childhood Education

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **4 of 15**
AFT; Comm. NCLB; NAESP; and NEA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **11 of 15**
AASA; BCSA; CCSSO; ECS; Ed Trust; FEA; NASSP; NASBE; NCSL; NGA; and NSBA

Comments:

Early childhood education did not play a prominent role in the initial NCLB, with the exception of Early Reading First. Only a few organizations mentioned early learning issues in their recommendations, which focused primarily on access to high-quality pre-kindergarten programs. This lack of attention, however, does not reflect the growing number of state efforts to ensure young children receive more comprehensive and higher-quality services.

English Language Learners

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **13 of 15**
AASA; AFT; BCSA; Comm. NCLB; CCSSO; ECS; NAESP; NASBE; NASSP; NCSL; NEA; NGA; and NSBA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **2 of 15**
Ed Trust and FEA

Comments:

All but one organization made suggestions regarding English Language Learners (ELL) and the overarching theme was greater flexibility. The recommendations focused on allowing more ELL students to take alternative assessments, and providing assistance to develop valid exams and accommodations. Secondly, organizations requested that ELL students be counted in this AYP subgroup until they acquire English proficiency or at least for a longer time period than currently permitted.

Finance Issues

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **14 of 15**
AASA; AFT; Comm. NCLB; CCSSO; ECS; Ed Trust; FEA; NAESP; NASBE; NASSP; NCSL; NEA; NGA; and NSBA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **1 of 15**
BCSA

Comments:

By far, the most common recommendation under Finance was to adequately fund the far-reaching federal law. Despite the challenges of identifying actual costs, some organizations called upon Congress to study the fiscal responsibilities borne by states and districts to carry out NCLB's requirements and goals. Other proposals included more flexibility to spend federal funds and eliminating financial penalties for not fully participating in No Child Left Behind.

High Schools

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **6 of 15**
BCSA; Comm. NCLB; Ed Trust; NASSP; NCSL; and NEA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **9 of 15**
AASA; AFT; CCSSO; ECS; FEA; NAESP; NASBE; NGA; and NSBA

Comments:

While high schools are subject to many NCLB requirements – including assessments, accountability and teaching quality – they seem to have received less scrutiny than elementary and middle schools. Recommendations offered by a handful of organizations, however, could bring more attention to and demands upon secondary schools under the law. This shift would reflect the growing number of state and national efforts to dramatically improve all aspects of America's high schools.

Some organizations recommended that high schools adhere to a common graduation rate definition and be held more accountable for graduating all students. A few organizations suggested that high schools should connect more closely with and better prepare students for the demands of postsecondary education and work.

Other Programs

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **6 of 15**
Comm. NCLB; Ed Trust; NAESP; NASBE; NEA; and NGA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **9 of 15**
AASA; AFT; BCSA; CCSSO; ECS; FEA; NASSP; NCSL; and NSBA

Comments:

The Other Programs category includes recommendations related to after-school programs, class size reduction, health and nutrition, parental involvement, school facilities, student services and support personnel, and technology and distance-learning. Of note was the focus on meeting the multiple needs of students to help their academic performance.

Safe Schools

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **2 of 15**
ECS and NGA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **13 of 15**
AASA; AFT; BCSA; Comm. NCLB; CCSSO; Ed Trust; FEA; NAESP; NASBE; NASSP; NCSL; NEA; and NSBA

Comments:

While states are required to define and identify "persistently dangerous" schools under NCLB, few schools nationwide have received this label. Some reports and lawmakers have called for more consistent state definitions and stronger enforcement of this provision, but only two organizations mentioned safe schools in their recommendations.

School Leadership

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **6 of 15**
BCSA; Comm. NCLB; Ed Trust; FEA; NAESP; and NEA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **9 of 15**
AASA; AFT; CCSSO; ECS; NASBE; NASSP; NCSL; NGA; and NSBA

Comments:

School leadership was not prominent in the initial NCLB, but the issue has gained considerable attention in recent years. Policymakers, researchers, foundations and others have recognized the important role strong leadership plays in turning around low-performing schools and managing the demands of all schools. Perhaps it is not surprising, therefore, that several organizations called for greater inclusion of school principals in the next iteration of NCLB, especially with regard to their professional development and flexibility to recruit teachers they deem qualified and effective.

Students with Disabilities

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **13 of 15**
AASA; AFT; BCSA; Comm. NCLB; CCSSO; ECS; NAESP; NASBE; NASSP; NCSL; NEA; NGA; and NSBA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **2 of 15**
Ed Trust and FEA

Comments:

Nearly every organization recommended changes to NCLB for students with disabilities, and several common themes emerged. Organizations proposed expanded use of and improved alternative assessments, extended time for students to be included in the special education AYP subgroup, more tailored achievement goals, and greater use of students' Individual Education Plans (IEPs) to determine testing requirements

Supplemental Education Services

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **11 of 15**
AFT; BCSA; Comm. NCLB; CCSSO; ECS; NASBE; NASSP; NCSL; NEA; NGA; and NSBA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **4 of 15**
AASA; Ed Trust; FEA; and NAESP

Comments:

Recommendations related to supplemental education services (SES), or student tutoring, were equally divided among four key areas. Proposals included expanding SES and school choice options and information, targeting assistance to the lowest-performing students and schools, allowing SES before school choice and ensuring SES providers are qualified.

Teaching Quality

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **12 of 15**

AFT; BCSA; Comm. NCLB; CCSSO; ECS; Ed Trust; FEA; NAESP; NASSP; NCSL; NEA; and NGA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **3 of 15**

AASA; NASBE; and NSBA

Comments:

Teaching quality was the third most popular issue for NCLB reauthorization recommendations, behind Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), and Assessment, Standards and Curriculum (ASC). Organizations focused their proposals on high-quality professional development; flexibility for meeting highly qualified requirements for special education, middle school and multiple-subject teachers; and incentives to recruit and retain qualified teachers in hard-to-staff schools and high-need subjects.

Miscellaneous/Overarching

Highlights

Organizations that addressed this issue: **10 of 15**

AASA; AFT; Comm. NCLB; CCSSO; ECS; NAESP; NASBE; NCSL; NGA; and NSBA

Organizations that did not address this issue: **5 of 15**

BCSA; Ed Trust; FEA; NASSP; and NEA

Comments:

ECS created a Miscellaneous/Overarching category to capture recommendations that were broader statements about NCLB and education reform. We chose not to exclude these suggestions, for they contribute to a comprehensive discussion of the nation's efforts to improve schools and the education system. We did not attempt, however, to summarize this section since the proposals and comments ran the gamut and often had little in common.

APPENDIX B - Sources for ECS' NCLB Reauthorization Database

ECS reviewed the following reports for the No Child Left Behind Reauthorization database. Recommendations within the reports were analyzed, categorized and synthesized according to ECS' framework and criteria.

American Association of School Administrators (AASA)

AASA Recommendations to Improve ESEA (February 2006)

<http://aasa.files.cms-plus.com/ESEA%20Talking%20Points.pdf>

2006 Legislative Agenda (February 2006)

<http://aasa.files.cms-plus.com/Final%202006%20Legislative%20Agenda%206-06.pdf>

American Federation of Teachers (AFT)

NCLB – Let's Get It Right: AFT's Recommendations for No Child Left Behind (July 2006)

<http://www.aft.org/topics/nclb/downloads/LGIRrecommnd.pdf>

Business Coalition for Student Achievement (BCSA)

Framework for Reauthorizing the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act:

Recommendations to Improve and Strengthen the Law (January 2007)

http://www.biz4achievement.org/about_the_coalition/position_statement3.pdf

Commission on No Child Left Behind (Comm. on NCLB)

Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the Promise to Our Nation's Children (February 2007)

Full Report

http://www.aspeninstitute.org/atf/ct/%7BDEB6F227-659B-4EC8-8F84-8DF23CA704F5%7D/NCLB_Book.pdf

Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO)

ESEA Reauthorization Policy Statement (October 2006)

http://www.ccsso.org/content/PDFs/ESEA_Policy_Stmnt.pdf

Recommendations to Reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (January 2007)

http://www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/ESEA_rec_final.pdf

Education Commission of the States (ECS)

ECS Report to the Nation: State Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act (July 2004)

<http://www.ecs.org/ecsmain.asp?page=/html/special/nclb/reporttothenation/reporttothenation.htm>

Education Trust

Education Trust Recommendations for No Child Left Behind Reauthorization (April 2007)

<http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/5A150FED-85FD-4535-8DF6-737A536EB0FB/0/EdTrustNCLBRecommendations41607.pdf>

Summary of Education Trust Recommendations for No Child Left Behind Reauthorization (April 2007)

<http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/BE18FFC3-20A7-4689-8C30-1ACC1E64EDF2/0/EdTrustNCLBRecommendationsSummary41607.pdf>

Forum on Educational Accountability (FEA)

Joint Organizational Statement on No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act (March 2007)

http://www.edaccountability.org/Joint_Statement.html

National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP)

Recommendations for the Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (November 2006)

http://www.naesp.org/client_files/ESEA-8-06.pdf

National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP)

NASSP No Child Left Behind Legislative Recommendations (June 2005)

http://www.principals.org/s_nassp/bin.asp?CID=969&DID=52898&DOC=FILE.PDF

National Association of State Boards of Education (NASBE)

NASBE's Guiding Principles for NCLB Reauthorization (November 2006)

http://www.nasbe.org/new_resources_section/leg_briefs/LegB_NASBE_NCLB_Reauthorization_11.06.pdf

National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL)

Delivering the Promise: State Recommendations for Improving No Child Left Behind (February 2005)
Executive Summary (Full report available through NCSL)

http://www.ncsl.org/programs/press/2005/NCLB_exec_summary.htm

National Education Association (NEA)

ESEA: It's Time for a Change! NEA's Positive Agenda for the ESEA Reauthorization (July 2006)

<http://www.nea.org/lac/esea/images/posagenda.pdf>

National Governors Association (NGA)

ECW-02. Education Reform Policy (Revised March 2006)

Formerly Policy HR-4

<http://www.nga.org/portal/site/nga/menuitem.8358ec82f5b198d18a278110501010a0/?vgnnextoid=20ca9e2f1b091010VgnVCM1000001a01010aRCRD>

National School Boards Association (NSBA)

NSBA Resource Guide for NCLB Improvements (March 2007)

<http://www.nsba.org/site/page.asp?TRACKID=&VID=1&CID=895&DID=11192>

Additional References

ECS would like to recognize the following organization and agencies' recommendations related to NCLB reauthorization and will consider their inclusion in the database at a future date.

Center on Education Policy

Reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: Recommendations from the Center on Education Policy (August 2007)

<http://www.cep-dc.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=document.showDocumentByID&nodeID=1&DocumentID=223>

National Alliance for Public Charter Schools

Creating the Schools Our Nation Needs: NCLB Reauthorization and the Promise of Public Charter Schools (March 2007)

http://www.publiccharters.org/files/1914_file_NAPCS_NCLB_Statement_Singles_for_Web_1_.pdf

National Center for Mental Health in Schools

University of California – Los Angeles (UCLA)

For Consideration in Reauthorizing the No Child Left Behind Act: Promoting a Systematic Focus on Learning Supports to Address Barriers to Learning and Teaching (July 2006)

<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/PromotingaSystematicFocus.pdf>

Pathways to College Network

Policy Recommendations for Reauthorization of NCLB and HEA (Summer 2007)

http://www.pathwaystocollege.net/pdf/HEA_NCLB_brief.pdf

U.S. Congress

Members of Congress have introduced several bills related to NCLB reauthorization, which can be tracked on The Library of Congress' Web site. Here are examples of comprehensive legislation.

<http://thomas.loc.gov/>

S.B. 1775 – No Child Left Behind Act of 2007

Sponsor: Sen. Richard Burr; Cosponsor: Sen. Judd Gregg

Introduced: July 12, 2007

<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/query/z?c110:S.1775:>

H.R. 1539 – Academic Partnerships Lead Us to Success Act or the A PLUS Act

Sponsor: Rep. Hoekstra

Introduced: March 15, 2007

<http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/D?d110:4:./temp/~bdFgBN:./bss/d110query.html>

S.B. 2001 – All Students Can Achieve Act

Sponsor: Sen. Joe Lieberman; Co-sponsors: Sen. Coleman and Sen. Landrieu

Introduced: August 3, 2007

<http://lieberman.senate.gov/documents/asca.pdf>

Discussion Draft Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

Presented by: Rep. George Miller and Rep. Howard "Buck" McKeon

Released: August 27, 2008

Summary

<http://edlabor.house.gov/bills/MillerMcKeonNCLBDiscussionDraftSummary.pdf>

Full Text

<http://edlabor.house.gov/bills/MillerMcKeonNCLBDiscussionDraft.pdf>

U.S. Department of Education

Building on Results: A Blueprint for Strengthening the No Child Left Behind Act (January 2007)

<http://www.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/nclb/buildingonresults.pdf>