



ECS Database

NCLB REAUTHORIZATION

Education Commission of the States 700 Broadway, Suite 1200 Denver, CO 80203-3460 303.299.3600 Fax: 303.296.8332 www.ecs.org

ECS' No Child Left Behind Reauthorization Database

September 2007

www.ecs.org/nclbreauthorization

Who's Saying What About NCLB Reauthorization?

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.

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, the Education Commission of the States (ECS) collected and analyzed these recommendations, creating a single-source database that captures "***Who's saying what about NCLB reauthorization?***"

In July 2004, ECS released its *Report to the Nation: State Implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act*. The report reviewed trends within and across states; identified issues and challenges facing states; and presented a set of recommendations to improve the federal law. Our recommendations still hold true and forecasted many issues that would surface as NCLB took root.

Keep in mind, ECS and other organizations issued recommendations 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 became available, or flexibility and further guidance was offered by the U.S. Department of Education. See *the Summary Chart on Organizations and Recommendations* for more details.

ECS' No Child Left Behind Reauthorization Database builds on our *Report to the Nation* and identifies revisions that key stakeholders believe are necessary to achieve the laws' ambitious goals, while also recognizing the challenges.

Overall, the organizations 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.

What Did ECS Find?

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 issues are organizations *not* focusing on?

Areas of Collective Agreement

The following list identifies the top areas of agreement, even though the specific suggestions might vary. The use of growth models to track student progress and calculate adequate yearly progress (AYP) was the one revision that all 15 organizations recommended. Areas of agreement:

- Allow growth models for calculating AYP
- Provide more flexibility for students with disabilities and English language learners (ELL)
- Provide adequate funding to support NCLB requirements
- Build state and local capacity to assist low-performing schools
- Offer high-quality, targeted professional development to more educators
- Target assistance and interventions to the highest-need schools and students.

In addition, several organizations suggested that a revised NCLB should help improve state assessments and develop more sophisticated data systems; offer greater flexibility for the types and frequency of assessments; 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.

New Priorities and Emerging Issues

Several organizations called for a greater focus on high school reform and school leadership within NCLB, which reflects the increased importance that states and districts are placing on these topics. Some groups proposed measuring teacher “effectiveness” based on student performance in addition to “quality,” as defined by credentials and subject-matter knowledge. And a few organizations hinted at the need for NCLB to go beyond basic reading and math skills to ensure students can succeed in the 21st century and global economy.

What Organizations Did Not Focus On

The initial version of NCLB did not emphasize early childhood, and only a few organizations suggested that the law should help expand and fund access to high-quality, pre-kindergarten programs. The absence of recommendations, however, does not mirror the surge of state policies and funding to provide opportunities for young children.

School safety also was not on organizations’ radar screens, despite concerns that only about 50 schools nationwide have been labeled as “persistently dangerous” under NCLB. A couple organizations, however, did call for more consistent state definitions and stronger enforcement of this provision.

What Organizations Are Included?

ECS included national organizations, coalitions and commissions that issued a formal and comprehensive set of recommendations. Additional organizations will be considered for inclusion as information becomes available. *Please see the Summary Chart of Organizations and Issues below.*

What Issues Are Included?

The database is organized around 16 issue areas that seemed to capture most of the recommendations. A “Miscellaneous and Overarching” category was created for broader statements about NCLB or education reform. The “Other Programs” category includes recommendations for programs such as counseling services, health and nutrition, parental involvement and technology.

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.)

Will the Database Be Updated and Expanded?

Yes. ECS will update and expand the database as organizations release new or revised recommendations. We also plan to add additional features in the near future.

How Are the NCLB Recommendations Presented?

You can view the information through four sets of reports and the following lenses:

1. By organization – across all issues
2. By issue – across all organizations
3. Summary of each organization's recommendations – across all issues
4. Summary of recommendations for each issue – across all organizations.

Additional notes:

- Both a summary and the full text of each organization's recommendations are included.
- Several recommendations applied to multiple issues and therefore appear more than once in the reports.
- Some organizations did not offer recommendations for all issues, according to ECS' analysis.
- ECS created an issue heading and number for each recommendation to fit the database structure, but the numbers have no other significance. For example, AYP 1 – Summary of Recommendation and AYP 1 – Full Recommendation. These headings simply reflect an organization's summary and full text of their first AYP recommendation.

Whom Should I Contact About the Database?

Mary Fulton, ECS Policy Analyst, created the NCLB Reauthorization Database and welcomes your comments and questions. You can contact her via e-mail at mfulton@ecs.org or by phone at 303-299-3679.

Please see the main database page for more information and access to reports. www.ecs.org/nclbreauthorization

See the ***Summary Chart of Organizations and Issues*** on the following page for a list of organizations included in the NCLB database and the number of recommendations proposed for each issue.

© Copyright 2007 by the Education Commission of the States (ECS). All rights reserved.

The Education Commission of the States is a nonprofit, nationwide organization that helps state leaders shape education policy. It is ECS policy to take affirmative action to prevent discrimination in its policies, programs and employment practices.

To request permission to excerpt part of this publication, either in print or electronically, please fax a request to the attention of the ECS Communications Department, 303-296-8332 or e-mail ecs@ecs.org.

Summary Chart of Organizations and Issues

The following chart summarizes the number of recommendations that 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 groups 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
BSCA 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.)