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<td>2005</td>
<td>Title: State High School Exit Exams 2005 Annual Report: States Try Harder, But Gaps Persist</td>
<td>Patricia Sullivan, Margery Yeager, Eileen O’Brien, Nancy Kober, Keith Gayler, Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky, Jana Wooden, Jack Jennings, Diane Stark Rentner</td>
<td>Study of state exit exam results showing that despite innovations by some states and increased state funding and support to improve pass rates achievement gaps still exist.</td>
<td>STATE HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMS: States Try Harder but Gaps Persist, ACT, achievement gaps, Alabama, Alaska high school graduation exam, AIME, Minnesota, Minnesota comprehensive assessments, MCA, Mississippi, subject area testing program, national assessment of educational progress, NAP, National Center for Education Statistics, NCES, Nevada, Nevada high school proficiency exam, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, NMHSCE, No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB, North Carolina, North Carolina competency tests and tests of computer skills, NCTTCS, Ohio, Ohio graduation tests, OTG, pass rates, regents comprehensive examination, RCE, remediation, SAT, SATP, South Carolina, standard based exam, SBE, standards, standards of learning end-of-course exams, SOL, Tennessee, tests, Texas, Texas assessment of knowledge and skills, TAKS, Utah, Utah basic skills competency test, USBCT, Virginia, waivers, Washington, Washington assessment of student learning, WASL</td>
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<td>2005</td>
<td>Title: States Test Limits of Federal AYP Flexibility</td>
<td>Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky</td>
<td>This report describes states’ flexibility in determining adequate yearly progress under the No Child Left behind Act.</td>
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<td>Title: Title I Funds - Who's Gaining and Who's Losing: School Year 2005-06 Update</td>
<td>Thomas Fagan</td>
<td>The report shows the top gaining and losing school districts in Title I funding in the 2005-2006 school year.</td>
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<td>Title: A Shell Game: Federal Funds to Improve Schools</td>
<td>Thomas Fagan</td>
<td>This report describes problems with the way the funds under the No Child Left Behind Act are made available to schools identified for improvement.</td>
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<td>February 1, 2006</td>
<td>CEP Roundtable Discussions on Improving NCLB’s Highly Qualified Teacher Provisions - November 29, 2006</td>
<td>Jennifer McMurrer</td>
<td>On November 29, 2006, CEP convened 22 organizations to discuss possible changes to the NCLB definition of a highly qualified teacher. For more information on this meeting, click below on the meeting summary and the participating organizations' proposed improvements for NCLB reauthorization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 29, 2006</td>
<td>CEP Roundtable Discussions on Improving NCLB's Highly Qualified Teacher Provisions - October 17, 2006</td>
<td>Jennifer McMurrer</td>
<td>On October 17, 2006, CEP convened 22 organizations to discuss possible changes to the NCLB requirement to equitably distribute qualified, experienced teachers among high-need and lower-need schools. For more information on this meeting, click below on the meeting summary and the participating organizations' proposed improvements for NCLB reauthorization.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 17, 2006</td>
<td>Keeping Watch on Reading First</td>
<td>Caitlin Scott</td>
<td>The report highlights findings from CEP’s surveys of state and school district officials and school district case studies regarding the federal Reading First program. CEP found that state and district officials believe that Reading First is having a significant and positive impact on student achievement, and has led to many changes in curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Also significant majorities of state and districts officials surveyed by CEP credit Reading First for student achievement gains.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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**Title:** State High School Exit Exams: 2006 Annual Report: A Challenging Year  
**Author:** Nancy Kober, Dalia Zabala, Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky, Keith Gayler, and Jennifer McMurrer  
**Abstract:** This study of state high school exit exams analyzes the challenges that states faced in 2005-06 as they implemented these exams and describes the remediation services and other support that states provide to help students pass the exams.  
**Keyword:** State High School Exit Exams 2006 Annual Report: A Challenging Year, achievement gaps, ACT, Alabama, Alabama high school graduation exam, AHSGE, Alaska, Alaska high school graduation qualifying exam, alignment, Alternative Routes, Arizona, Arizona's instrument to measure standards, AIMS, assessments, Basic Skills Test, BST, California, California's high school exit exam, CAHSEE, disaggregated graduation rates, end-of-course exam, EOC, English language learners, ELL, exams, exemptions, exit exams, Florida, Florida comprehensive assessment test, FCAT, free or reduced-price lunch, FRPL, Gateway Examinations, GE, GED, Georgia, Georgia High School Graduation Test, GHSGT, Graduation Exit Exam, Graduation Qualifying Exam, GQE, graduation rates, high school proficiency assessment, HSAP, High School Proficiency Assessment, HSPA, High School Proficiency Examination, HSPE, Idaho, Idaho standards achievement tests, ISAT, Indiana, Individuals with Disabilities Act, IDEA, limited English proficient, LEP, Louisiana, Maryland, Maryland High School Assessment, Massachusetts, Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System, MCAS, Minnesota, Mississippi, Mississippi subject area testing program, national assessment of educational progress, NAEP, National Center for Education Statistics, NCES, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New Mexico High School Competency Examination, NMHSCE, New York, No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB, No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB, North Carolina, North Carolina Competency Tests, Ohio, Ohio graduation tests, OGT, pass rates, Regents Examinations, remediation, SAT, South Carolina, standards, standards of learning end-of-course exams, SOL, Tennessee, tests, Texas, Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills, TAKS, Virginia, waivers, Washington, Washington assessment of student learning, WASL  
**Publication Date:** August 1, 2006  
**Summary:** A snapshot of main or basic features of state exit exams taken from the Center on Education Policy's August 2005 report, STATE HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMS: States Try Harder but Gaps Persist.  
**Publication Availability:** PDF  
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**Title:** State High School Exit Exams: 2006 Policy Briefs  
**Author:** Dalia Zabala  
**Abstract:** Policy Brief 1: Basic Features  
A snapshot of main or basic features of state exit exams taken from the Center on Education Policy's August 2005 report, STATE HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMS: States Try Harder but Gaps Persist.  
**Published:** December 01, 2005  
**Availability:** PDF  
Policy Brief 2: Effects on Traditionally Underserved Students  
Snapshot of data on traditionally underserved students taken from the Center on Education Policy's August 2005 report, STATE HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMS: States Try Harder but Gaps Persist.  
**Published:** January 01, 2006  
Policy Brief 3: Special Problems Affecting English Language Learners  
Snapshot of results on problems with English language learners in regard to exit exams taken from the Center on Education Policy's August 2005 report, STATE HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMS: States Try Harder but Gaps Persist.  
**Published:** February 01, 2006  
Policy Brief 4: Standards Differ from the No Child Left Behind Act  
Snapshot of results on differences between states' and of the No Child Left Behind Act's requirements on graduation taken from the Center on Education Policy's August 2005 report, STATE HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMS: STATES TRY HARDER BUT GAPS PERSIST.  
**Published:** March 01, 2006  
**Keyword:** State High School Exit Exams: 2006 Policy Briefs, STATE HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMS: States Try Harder but Gaps Persist, ACT, achievement gaps, Alabama, Alabama high school graduation exam, AHSGE, Alaska, Alaska high school graduation qualifying exam, alignment, Alternative Routes, Arizona, Arizona's instrument to measure standards, AIMS, assessments, basic skills test, BST, California, California's high school exit exam, CAHSEE, Class of 2006, disaggregated graduation rates, end-of-course exam, EOC, English language arts, ELA, English language learners, ELL, exams, exemptions, exit exams, Florida, Florida comprehensive assessment test, FCAT, free or reduced-price lunch, FRPL, gateway examination, GE, GED, Georgia, Georgia exit examination for the 21st century, GEE 21, Georgia High School Graduation Test, GHSGT, graduation qualifying exam, graduation rates, high school assessment program, HAS, high school proficiency assessment, HSAP, HSGQE, HSPE, Idaho, Idaho standards achievement tests, ISAT, Indiana, individualized education program, IEP, Individuals with Disabilities Act, IDEA, limited English proficient, LEP, Louisiana, Maryland, Maryland high school
### 2006

**Title:** Ten Big Effects of the No Child Left Behind Act on Public Schools  
**Author:** Jack Jennings, Diane Stark Rentner  
**Abstract:** This article describes ten major effects of the No Child Left Behind Act based on CEP's four year study of the implementation of NCLB at the federal, state, and local levels. The article appeared in the October 2006 Phi Delta Kappan, a magazine of Phi Delta Kappa International.  
**Keyword:** Ten Big Effects of the No Child Left Behind Act on Public Schools, 2006, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, Title I, Jack Jennings, Diane Stark Rentner, major effects of the No Child Left Behind Act, Phi Delta Kappan, PDK, curriculum alignment, state tests, achievement gaps, low-performing schools, federal role  
**Publication Date:** November 1, 2006  
**Article (PDF format, 59.0 KB)**
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**Title:** Title I Funds - Who's Gaining and Who's Losing: School Year 2006-07 Update  
**Author:** Tom Fagan  
**Abstract:** School Year 2006-07 Update. This report provides information on the federal Title I, Part A funding for states and school districts for school year 2006-07.  
**Keyword:** Title I Funds - Who's Gaining and Who’s Losing: School Year 2006-07 Update, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Title I, funding, federal funding, federal demands, unfunded mandate, fund allocation, fund distribution, federal dollars, Department of Education, ED, funding equity, needy district, neediest districts, funding data, poor district, Census Bureau, allocation formula, high-need district, expenditure factor, appropriations, funding fluctuation, gaining funds, losing funds, low-poverty district, formula, targeted assistance grant, education finance incentive grant, state funds, state funding, per pupil expenditure, fully funded, full funding, recommendation, funding freeze, funding shortfall, fund reduction, school in need of improvement, school needing improvement, state reservation for school improvement activities, reservation requirement, stagnant appropriation, 4% set-aside  
**Publication Date:** August 1, 2006  
**Press Release (PDF format, 126 KB)**
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**Title:** Wrestling the Devil in the Details: An Early Look at Restructuring in California  
**Author:** CEP  
**Abstract:** This look at selected school districts in California that are restructuring under the No Child Left Behind Act may offer insights for other schools that must reevaluate their structures.  
**Keyword:** Wrestling the Devil in the Details: An Early Look at Restructuring in California, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, restructuring, restructure, sanctioned, sanction, implementation, underperforming, federal option, reform, federal, fund, governance, monitoring, support, test scores, options, assistance, support, state, district, approach, benchmark assessments, replace staff, negative consequences, strategies, federal mandate, Title I, California, California Department of Education, CDE, data, charter school, contract management, accountability, Maryland, Michigan, S4, Look Before You Leap, SCCAC  
**Publication Date:** February 1, 2006  
**Press Release (PDF format, 17.0 KB)**

### 2007

**Title:** Answering the Question That Matters Most: Has Student Achievement Increased Since No Child Left Behind?  
**Author:** CEP  
**Abstract:** Using testing data from all 50 states, this study addresses two key questions in the debate surrounding the No Child Left Behind Act: has student achievement increased and have achievement gaps narrowed since NCLB was enacted in 2002?  
**Keyword:** Answering the Question That Matters Most: Has Student Achievement Increased Since No Child Left Behind?, 2007, Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky, Nancy Koer, Jennifer McMurrer, HumRRO, Sunny Becker, Art Thacker, Hilary Campbell, Laureus Wise, Monica Gribben, Lee Koger, Emily Dickinson, Diane Stark Rentner, Jack
This report describes findings from case studies of 10 Maryland schools undergoing restructuring in accordance with the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act. The ten schools are located in four school districts in Maryland: Anne Arundel County Public Schools; Baltimore City Public Schools; Baltimore County Public Schools; and Prince George’s County Public Schools. Interviews were also conducted with state officials.

**Keyword:** Making Mid-Course Corrections: School Restructuring in Maryland, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, restructuring, restructure,

**Publication Date:** June 7, 2007

**Press Invitation (DOCX format, 12.1 KB)**

**Topic:** Federal Education Policy & Programs
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**Title:** Making Mid-Course Corrections: School Restructuring in Maryland

**Author:** Brenda Neuman-Sheldon

**Abstract:**
This report describes findings from case studies of 10 Maryland schools undergoing restructuring in accordance with the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act. The ten schools are located in four school districts in Maryland: Anne Arundel County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools, Baltimore County Public Schools, and Prince George’s County Public Schools. Interviews were also conducted with state officials.

**Keyword:** Making Mid-Course Corrections: School Restructuring in Maryland, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, restructuring, restructure,

**Publication Date:** June 7, 2007

**Meeting Summary (PDF format, 129 KB)**

**Topic:** Federal Education Policy & Programs
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**2007**

**Title:** Beyond the Mountains: An Early Look at Restructuring Results in California

**Author:** Caitlin Scott

**Abstract:**
This study examines the No Child Left Behind Act's restructuring process in California. The number of California schools in NCLB restructuring nearly doubled in the last year, increasing from 401 schools in 2005-06 to 701 in 2006-07, or roughly 8% of California schools. CEP's study found that California schools in restructuring implementing multiple reform efforts tailored to individual school needs were more likely than other schools in restructuring to meet AYP targets in English language arts.

**Keyword:** Beyond the Mountains: An Early Look at Restructuring Results in California, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, restructuring, restructure, sanctioned, sanction, implementation, underperforming, federal option, reform, federal, fund, governance, monitoring, support, test scores, options, assistance, support, state, district, approach, benchmark assessments, replace staff, negative consequences, strategies, federal mandate, Title I, California, California Department of Education, CDE, data, charter schools, any other action, Michigan, Maryland, Improving America's Schools Act, IASA, Grant Joint Union, Oakland Unified, Palmdale Elementary, Tahoe-Truckee, Southern California Comprehensive Assistance Center, SCCAC, WestEd, interview, school closing, state survey, technical assistance, Advancement Via Individual Determination, AVID, Launching Education and Academic Performance, LEAP, Look Before You Leap, Building A Culture of Continuous Improvement, Reading First, internal restructuring, new school creation, bilingual education

**Publication Date:** March 1, 2007

**Press Release (PDF format, 136 KB)**

**Topic:** Federal Education Policy & Programs
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**2007**

**Title:** English Language Learners' Provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act

**Author:** Dalia Zabala

**Abstract:**
As part of its comprehensive, multiyear study of state and local implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, the Center on Education Policy hosted a roundtable discussion on March 20, 2007 with leaders from 25 organizations to address potential improvements to the English language learners’ provisions of NCLB. For more information about this meeting see the meeting summary and other supporting material below provided by Diane August and Stanley Rabinowitz, guest speakers invited to initiate our discussion.

**Keyword:** English Language Learners' Provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB, roundtable, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, English Language Learner, ELL, Limited English Proficiency, LEP, Dalia Zabala, 2007, meeting, Diane August, Stanley Rabinowitz, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, Title I, Center for Applied Linguistics, WestEd, powerpoint, language proficiency assessment, Alliance for Excellent Education, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, American Federation of Teachers, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Campaign for Educational Equity, Teachers College, Center for American Progress, Center for Applied Linguistics, Center for Law and Education, Citizens' Commission on Civil Rights, Council of Chief State School Officers, Education Trust, GW Center for Equity and Excellence in Education, Internationals Network for Public Schools, MALDEF, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Association for Bilingual Education, National Center on Immigrant Integration Policy, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Council of La Raza, National Education Association, National PTA, Phi Delta Kappa International, Second Language Testing, Inc, Senator Clinton’s (Dem. N.Y) Representative, Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages, Title III, Weighted Assessment Results, opportunity to learn, Accommodations

**Publication Date:** June 7, 2007

**Meeting Summary (PDF format, 129 KB)**
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**2007**

**Course Corrections: School Restructuring in Maryland**

**Abstract:**
Making Mid-Course Corrections: School Restructuring in Maryland, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, restructuring, restructure,
This report examines the amount of time spent during the school week on core academic subjects and how that allocation of time across subjects has changed since school year 2001-02 when NCLB was enacted. The report finds that approximately 62% of school districts increased the amount of time spent in elementary schools on English language arts and or math, while 44% of districts cut time on science, social studies, art and music, physical education, lunch or recess.

Note: Although the overall findings of this report have not changed, some of the specific numbers have been revised since its original publication to correct initial contractor data tabulation errors. To review the specific changes made, please click on "Report with Specific Revisions in Tracking".

**Keyword:** From the Capital to the Classroom: Year 5 of the No Child Left Behind Act, Choices, Changes, and Challenges: Curriculum and Instruction in the NCLB Era, 2007, Jennifer McMurrer, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, magnitude of changes in instructional time, Choices, Changes, and Challenges: Curriculum and Instruction in the NCLB Era, amount of instructional time, English language arts, ELA, reading, Mathematics, math, social studies, science, art, music, physical education, PE, recess, lunch, instructional minutes, pre-NCLB, decrease instructional time, increase instructional time, time, NCLB era, elementary school, survey, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, instructional time, curriculum, case study, interview, Bayonne City School District, New Jersey, NJ, Bloomfield School District, New Mexico, NM, Boston Public Schools, Massachusetts, MA, Calhoun County School District, Alabama, AL, Chicago Public Schools, Illinois, IL, Cleveland Municipal School District, Ohio, OH, Colorado Springs School District 11, Colorado, CO, Escandon Union School District, California, CA, Fayetteville Public Schools, Arkansas, AR, Joint School District No. 2, Meridian, Idaho, ID, Oakland Unified School District, Sheboygan Area Schools, Wisconsin, WI, Tigard-Tualatin School District, Oregon, OR, Identified school, length of school day, middle school, high school, curriculum changes, curriculum alignment, test preparation, survey, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, title I

**Publication Date:** July 24, 2007
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This report examines how states and school districts have implemented the No Child Left Behind Act's teacher quality requirements. The report finds that, according to state and district officials, the NCLB highly qualified teacher requirements have had minimal or no impact on student achievement and have not had a major impact on teacher effectiveness. The report also discusses state and district implementation of the federal requirements to equitably distribute experienced, highly qualified teachers among higher and lower poverty schools.

**Publication Date:** December 5, 2007

---

This report examines how states and school districts have implemented the federal requirements to equitably distribute experienced, district officials, the NCLB highly qualified teacher requirements have had minimal or no impact on student achievement and h

**Publication Date:** May 9, 2007
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This report examines the amount of time spent during the school week on core academic subjects and how that allocation of time across subjects has changed since school year 2001-02 when NCLB was enacted. The report finds that approximately 62% of school districts increased the amount of time spent in elementary schools on English language arts and or math, while 44% of districts cut time on science, social studies, art and music, physical education, lunch or recess.

Note: Although the overall findings of this report have not changed, some of the specific numbers have been revised since its original publication to correct initial contractor data tabulation errors. To review the specific changes made, please click on "Report with Specific Revisions in Tracking".

**Keyword:** From the Capital to the Classroom: Year 5 of the No Child Left Behind Act, Choices, Changes, and Challenges: Curriculum and Instruction in the NCLB Era, 2007, Jennifer McMurrer, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, magnitude of changes in instructional time, Choices, Changes, and Challenges: Curriculum and Instruction in the NCLB Era, amount of instructional time, English language arts, ELA, reading, Mathematics, math, social studies, science, art, music, physical education, PE, recess, lunch, instructional minutes, pre-NCLB, decrease instructional time, increase instructional time, time, NCLB era, elementary school, survey, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, instructional time, curriculum, case study, interview, Bayonne City School District, New Jersey, NJ, Bloomfield School District, New Mexico, NM, Boston Public Schools, Massachusetts, MA, Calhoun County School District, Alabama, AL, Chicago Public Schools, Illinois, IL, Cleveland Municipal School District, Ohio, OH, Colorado Springs School District 11, Colorado, CO, Escandon Union School District, California, CA, Fayetteville Public Schools, Arkansas, AR, Joint School District No. 2, Meridian, Idaho, ID, Oakland Unified School District, Sheboygan Area Schools, Wisconsin, WI, Tigard-Tualatin School District, Oregon, OR, Identified school, length of school day, middle school, high school, curriculum changes, curriculum alignment, test preparation, survey, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, title I

**Publication Date:** July 24, 2007

---

This report examines how states and school districts have implemented the No Child Left Behind Act's teacher quality requirements. The report finds that, according to state and district officials, the NCLB highly qualified teacher requirements have had minimal or no impact on student achievement and have not had a major impact on teacher effectiveness. The report also discusses state and district implementation of the federal requirements to equitably distribute experienced, highly qualified teachers among higher and lower poverty schools.

**Publication Date:** May 9, 2007
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This report examines how states and school districts have implemented the federal requirements to equitably distribute experienced, district officials, the NCLB highly qualified teacher requirements have had minimal or no impact on student achievement and h

Publication Date: August 22, 2007

Full Report (PDF format, 593 KB)
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Title: NCLB Year 5: Moving Beyond Identification: Assisting Schools in Improvement

Author: CEP

Abstract:

This report examines the kind of assistance that schools in improvement receive and how effective district and state officials believe that assistance to be. The report's findings are based on CEP's annual survey of 50 state departments of education; our nationally representative annual survey of districts; and 12 case study districts involving interviews with district and school officials.

Keyword: From the Capital to the Classroom: Year 5 of the No Child Left Behind Act, Moving Beyond Identification: Assisting Schools in Improvement, 2007, Caitlin Scott, assistance, schools in improvement, survey, case study, interviews, districts with schools in improvement, student achievement, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Title I, Bayonne City School District, Lincoln Community School, New Jersey, NJ, Bloomfield School District, New Mexico, NM, Boston Public Schools, Massachusetts, MA, Calhoun County School District, Alabama, AL, Chicago Public Schools, Carson Elementary, Pope Elementary, Illinois, IL, Cleveland Municipal School District, Ohio, OH, Colorado Springs School District 11, Colorado, CO, Escondido Union School District, California, CA, Fayetteville Public Schools, Arkansas, AR, Joint School District No. 2, Meridian, Idaho, ID, Linder Elementary, Meridian Elementary, Oakland Unified School District, Cox Elementary, New Highland Community Schools, Soprante Park Elementary, Whitmire Elementary, Tigard-Tualatin School District, Fowler Middle School, Metzger Elementary School, Tualatin High School, Oregon, OR, urban districts, Corrective action, restructuring, state strategies, Maryland, MD, Michigan, MI, state capacity, change in time, improvement strategy, achievement gap, funding school improvement

Publication Date: July 11, 2007

Full Report (PDF format, 843 KB)
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Title: NCLB Year 5: Reading First: Locally Appreciated, Nationally Troubled

Author: Caitlin Scott

Abstract:

Despite problems with the federal administration of the Reading First program, this CEP report finds that the program is widely credited by state and local officials for lifting the achievement of students who receive Reading First services. Overall, more than three-fourths of states and two-thirds of districts with Reading First grants reported that the program’s assessment and instructional programs were important causes of gains in student achievement. Further, the report finds that Reading First’s impact is felt far beyond the participating schools, with more than half of Reading First districts using elements of Reading First in non-Reading-First schools and in the upper grades. Similarly, states reported that more than 3,000 non-Reading-First districts participated in state-led Reading First professional development.


Publication Date: October 31, 2007

Full Report (PDF format, 546 KB)
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Title: NCLB Year 5: State Implementation of Supplemental Educational Services under the No Child Left Behind Act

Author: Angela Minnici and Alice P. Bartley

Abstract:

This report describes state efforts to carry out the supplemental educational services requirements. It is the first in a series of CEP publications on the NCLB implementation that will report on the results of our 2006 surveys of officials from 50 state educational agencies and a national sample of school districts, as well as case study research.
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<td>No Child Left Behind at Five: A Review of Changes to State Accountability Plans</td>
<td>Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky</td>
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<td>Title: Principles for Reauthorizing the Teacher Provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act and the Higher Education Act</td>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>As part of its comprehensive, multiyear study of state and local implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, the Center on Education Policy hosted two meetings last fall with leaders from nearly two dozen education organizations to address potential improvements to the teacher provisions of NCLB. The recommendations that received the broadest support during the two roundtable sessions are included in Principles for Reauthorizing the Teacher Provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act and the Higher Education Act, which is intended to offer policymakers a set of principles to consider as they undertake reauthorization efforts.</td>
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<td>Title: Reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965: Recommendations from the Center on Education Policy</td>
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<td>Federal Education Policy &amp; Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**2007**

**Title:** State High School Exit Exams: 2007 Policy Briefs  
**Author:** Dalia Zabala  
**Abstract:**  
Policy Brief 1: States Continue Trend Toward Higher-Level Exit Exams, More Subjects Tested  
A snapshot of main features of state exit exams taken from the Center on Education Policy's August 2006 report. STATE HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMS: A Challenging Year.  
Policy Brief 2: Growth in High School Exit Exams Levels Off But Minority Students Affected Disproportionately  
A snapshot on the number of states currently implementing or planning to implement state mandated high school exit exams, and the percentages of minority students impacted.  
Information taken from the Center on Education Policy's August 2006 report. STATE HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMS: A Challenging Year.  
Policy Brief 3: Gaps Persist in High School Exit Exams Pass Rates  
A snapshot at changes in initial pass rates for all students and each of the subgroups from 2004-05. Information taken from the Center on Education Policy's August 2006 report. STATE HIGH SCHOOL EXIT EXAMS: A Challenging Year.

**Publication Date:** January 1, 2007  
**Press Release** [PDF format, 82.6 KB]  
**Topie:** High School Exit Examinations
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**2007**

**Title:** Students with Disabilities' Provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act; Summary of a Roundtable Discussion and Guiding Principles for Reauthorization of ESEA/NCLB  
**Author:** Angela Minnici  
**Abstract:**  
As part of its comprehensive, multiyear study of state and local implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, the Center on Education Policy hosted a roundtable discussion on May 1, 2007 with leaders from 25 organizations to address potential improvements to the students with disabilities' provisions of NCLB. For more information about this meeting see the meeting summary and guiding principles for reauthorization of ESEA/NCLB and other supporting material below provided by Nancy Reder and Stanley Rabinowitz, guest speakers invited to initiate our discussion.

**Keyword:** Students with Disabilities' Provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act; Summary of the Roundtable Discussion and Guiding Principles for Reauthorization of
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<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Keyword</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Testimony of Jack Jennings before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education</td>
<td>Jack Jennings</td>
<td>The Center on Education Policy was asked to testify before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education on March 14, 2007. The testimony highlights CEP’s research on funding issues surrounding the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act.</td>
<td>Testimony of Jack Jennings Before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, congressional testimony, Congress, appropriations, funding, costs of NCLB, Title I ESEA, school improvement, federal role in education, state capacity</td>
<td>March 14, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Title I Funds - Who's Gaining, Who's Losing: School Year 2007-08 Update</td>
<td>Tom Fagan</td>
<td>This report discusses funding for states and schools districts under the federal Title I, Part A program for school year 2007-08. (Title I is the largest federal program assisting elementary and secondary schools, and contains the key accountability provisions under the No Child Left Behind Act.) The report highlights the impact of annual poverty count updates on the distribution of funds and discusses the mandatory state reservation of funds for school improvement activities.</td>
<td>Title I Funds - Who's Gaining, Who's Losing: School Year 2007-08 Update, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Title I, funding, federal funding, federal demands, unfunded mandate, fund allocation, fund distribution, federal dollars, Department of Education, ED, funding equity, needy district, neediest districts, funding data, poor district, Census Bureau, allocation formula, high-need district, expenditure factor, appropriations, funding fluctuation, gaining funds , losing funds, low-poverty district, formula, targeted assistance grant, education finance incentive grant, state funds, state funding, per pupil expenditure, fully funded, full funding, recommendation, funding freeze, funding shortfall, fund reduction, school in need of improvement, school needing improvement, state reservation for school improvement activities, reservation requirement, stagnant appropriation, separate appropriation, low-income children, LEA grant, funding volatility, 4% set-aside</td>
<td>August 15, 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
targets for two consecutive years, allowing them to graduate out of the school improvement designation altogether. A CEP analysis of the restructuring approaches used indicates that no single factor is most responsible for improving student achievement. Instead, schools that implemented five or more reforms over the past two years were significantly more likely to exit restructuring than were other restructuring schools.

**Keyword:** What Now? Lessons from Michigan About Restructuring Schools and Next Steps Under NCLB, No Child Left Behind, student achievement, increase achievement, raise achievement, state target, state goal, state standard, turnaround specialist, turnaround school turnaround, reform option, school reform, reform, consultant, specialist, restructuring, failing school, adequate yearly progress, AYP, school in need of assistance, in need of improvement, school improvement, gain, federal policy, state policy, policy change, consequence, transform, transformation, charter, replacement, firing, replace, staff development, curriculum, radical, fund, finances, financing, funding, reform strategy, strategies, Michigan Department of Education, Department of Education, Detroit Public Schools, Flint Community Schools, Harrison Community Schools, Willow Run Community Schools, Cerveny, Cleveland Middle School, William Beckham, Brownell, Larson, Hillside, Willow Run, 100% proficiency, 2014, Improving America’s Schools Act
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<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>A Call to Restructure Restructuring: Lessons from the No Child Left Behind Act in Five States</td>
<td>Caitlin Scott</td>
<td>This report synthesizes findings from CEP’s research on how the No Child Left Behind Act's school restructuring requirements are being implemented in Michigan, California, Maryland, Ohio, and Georgia. Document reviews and interviews with state officials were conducted in the five states, and case study research was carried out in 19 districts and 42 schools. Among the report's findings are that more schools have entered restructuring and many remain in that status for multiple years; the &quot;any other&quot; restructuring option is the most popular option in the states studied; and the five states varied greatly in the supports they offered restructuring schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Publication Date:** September 23, 2008

**Full Report (PDF format, 750 KB)**
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Building on State Reform: Maryland School Restructuring</td>
<td>Brenda Neuman-Sheldon</td>
<td>This report summarizes the State of Maryland’s strategy in dealing with 79 schools that are in NCLB’s restructuring phase because they have missed adequate yearly progress targets for five or more consecutive years. The report also highlights several schools in restructuring or planning for restructuring in Prince George’s County Public Schools, Baltimore County Public Schools, and Anne Arundel County Public Schools.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Publication Date:** September 20, 2006

**Press Release (PDF format, 101 KB)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>CEP Annual Report, 2008</td>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>The Center on Education Policy has issued a report on its activities for the calendar year 2008. This report also describes the Center's plans for 2009 and shows CEP's overall impact.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Keyword:** CEP Annual Report 2008, Building understanding of and support for public education, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, high school exit exam, exit exam, high-stakes test, diploma, dropout, drop out, role of public schools, purpose of public schools, activities, summary of year, publications, summary, policy impact, statistics, data, gather data,
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| Year | Title: CEP Testimony on NCLB School Restructuring  
| Author: Caitlin Scott  
| Abstract: On January 24, 2008, Dr. Caitlin Scott, CEP consultant, testified before California’s Little Hoover Commission about school restructuring under the No Child Left Behind Act. The Little Hoover Commission is an independent state oversight agency that investigates state government operations and aims to promote efficiency, economy, and service. The testimony is based on CEP studies of restructuring in California, Maryland, and Michigan, as well as CEP’s five-year study of NCLB, our annual reports on Title I funding, and our 2007 study of state capacity.  
| **Keyword:** CEP Testimony on NCLB School Restructuring, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, restructuring, restructure, sanctioned, sanction, implementation, underperforming, federal option, reform, federal, fund, governance, monitoring, support, test scores, options, assistance, support, state, district, approach, benchmark assessments, replace staff, negative consequences, strategies, federal mandate, California, California Department of Education, CDE, Michigan, Maryland, contract, charter school, Title I, Elementary Secondary Education Act, ESEA, Improving America’s Schools Act, IASA, Least Restrictive Environment Survey Self Assessment, English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment, Process Mentor Team, Leadership Coach, team planning, recommendation, Statewide System of Support, education agency, ESEA amendment, growth model  
| **Publication Date:** January 24, 2008

**CEP Testimony on NCLB School Restructuring, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, restructuring, restructure, sanctioned, sanction, implementation, underperforming, federal option, reform, federal, fund, governance, monitoring, support, test scores, options, assistance, support, state, district, approach, benchmark assessments, replace staff, negative consequences, strategies, federal mandate, California, California Department of Education, CDE, Michigan, Maryland, contract, charter school, Title I, Elementary Secondary Education Act, ESEA, Improving America’s Schools Act, IASA, Least Restrictive Environment Survey Self Assessment, English Learner Subgroup Self Assessment, Process Mentor Team, Leadership Coach, team planning, recommendation, Statewide System of Support, education agency, ESEA amendment, growth model**

| Year | Title: Forums: Rethinking the Federal Role in Elementary and Secondary Education  
| Author: CEP  
| Abstract: In 2008, the Center on Education Policy undertook a project to rethink the federal role in elementary and secondary education. As a first step, CEP commissioned a series of papers on key issues, requiring the authors to provide evidence of the effects of various programs and initiatives, and to provide recommendations. Each paper was peer-reviewed by individuals with diverse points of view on the issue. Also, CEP convened a series of public forums in 2008 through 2009 to discuss several of the papers. We also compiled a compendium of key studies on the No Child Left Behind Act. The result of these efforts formed a set of recommendations for the new President and Congress for shaping the federal role in elementary and secondary education.  
| FORUM 1: Oct 6, 2008 at the Dirksen Senate Office Building  
Paul Manna of the College of William and Mary presented a paper on the history of the federal role in education.  
FORUM 2: Nov 19, 2008, at the Rayburn House Office Building  
Papers were presented by Heather Weiss of the Harvard Family Research Project and Sharon Lynn Kagan of Columbia University. Dr. Weiss's paper addresses the federal role in out of school learning. Dr. Kagan's paper is on early childhood education.  
FORUM 3: Nov 20, 2008, at the Rayburn House Office Building  
Laura S. Hamilton and Brian M. Stecher of the RAND Corporation presented their paper on standards-based education reform, and W. James Popham of the University of California at Los Angeles presented his paper on the role of assessments in federal education programs.  
FORUM 4: Mar 5, 2009 at the Rayburn House Office Building (Rm 2261)  
Authors Gary Sykes and Kenne Dîbner discussed their paper on federal efforts to improve teaching.  
FORUM 5: Apr 30, 2009 at the Capitol Visitor Center in the U.S. Capitol Building (Rooms 208/209 SVC)  
CEP convened its fifth forum in this series to discuss the impact of the economic stimulus funds on the federal role in elementary and secondary education. Speakers included Jeff Simering of the Council of the Great City Schools; Mary Kuider of the American Association of School Administrators; Dane Linn of the National Governors Association; Deborah Rigsby of the National School Boards Association; and Gene Wilhoit of the Council of Chief State School Officers. Presenters addressed two questions: how are the education funds in the economic stimulus package now being spent, and will there be any effect on the future federal role in elementary and secondary education as a result of the stimulus package? View Forum Materials  
FORUM 6: Jul 1, 2009 at the Dirksen Office Building (Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions hearing room)  
Dr. Russell Rumberger of the University of California at Santa Barbara presented his paper on the federal role in improving high schools.  
View the Commissioned Papers & Research Compendium  
**Keyword:** Forums: Rethinking the Federal Role in Elementary and Secondary Education, Federal control, mandate, regulations, guidelines, accountability, No Child Left Behind

**CEP Annual Report 2008 (PDF format, 945 KB)**
Behind, NCLB, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, federal program, commission, cooperation, Title I, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, teacher quality, HQT, highly qualified teacher, Eisenhower Professional Development program, consequences, effect, initiative, incentive, resources, distribution, aid, funding, financing, fund, finance, result, standards, standards-based, reform, SBR, decentralization, monitor, evaluate, alignment, assessment, achievement, accountability, National Assessment of Educational Progress, NAEP, underserved, demographic, minority, poverty, low-income, free and reduced priced lunch, FRPL, school lunch, early childhood, Australia, Germany, Canada, Early Childhood Education, ECE, Quest for Excellence, Coherence and Equity, ECE2, history, out of school learning, after school, summer school, family, parental involvement, support, community, computer assisted instruction, Star Schools, E-Rate, PLATO, Sesame Street, technology, gap, scale, FDA, retain, attract, recruit

**Publication Date:** October 6, 2008

**Topic:** Federal Education Policy & Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>From the Capital to the Classroom: Year 5 of the No Child Left Behind Act</td>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>October 6, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abstract:** Research report on the impact of the fifth year of implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act on a geographically diverse list of schools and school districts.

**The following reports comprise the Annual Report for Year 5 (Click to View the individual reports):**

- **Some Perspectives from Rural School Districts on The No Child Left Behind Act**
  - by Ying Zhang
  - Published: 06/10/2008

- **Instructional Time in Elementary Schools: A Closer Look at Changes for Specific Subjects**
  - by Jennifer McMurrer
  - Published: 02/20/2008

- **Reading First: Locally Appreciated, Nationally Troubled**
  - by Caitlin Scott
  - Published: 10/31/2007

- **Implementing the No Child Left Behind Teacher Requirements**
  - by Jennifer McMurrer
  - Published: 08/22/2007

- **Choices, Changes, and Challenges: Curriculum and Instruction in the NCLB Era**
  - by Jennifer McMurrer
  - Published: 07/24/2007 rev 12/2007

- **Moving Beyond Identification: Assisting Schools in Improvement**
  - by CEP
  - Published: 07/11/2007

- **Educational Architects: Do State Education Agencies Have the Tools Necessary to Implement NCLB?**
  - by Angela Minnici and Deanna D. Hill
  - Published: 05/09/2007

- **State Implementation of Supplemental Educational Services under the No Child Left Behind Act**
  - by Angela Minnici and Alice P. Bartley
  - Published: 03/01/2007

### 2008

**Title:** Has Student Achievement Increased Since 2002? State Test Score Trends Through 2006–07  
**Author:** Nancy Kober, Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky  
**Abstract:**  
Using testing data from all 50 states, this study addresses two key questions: has student achievement increased and have achievement gaps narrowed since the No Child Left Behind Act was enacted in 2002. A comparison is also made between state test results and results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress.  
**Publication Date:** June 24, 2008  
**Full Report (rev July 15, 2008) [PDF format, 1792 KB]**  
*np*  
**Topic:** State Testing Data and Student Achievement

<p>| 2008 | Title: Has Student Achievement Increased Since 2002? State Test Score Trends Through 2006–07 | Author: Nancy Kober, Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky | Abstract: Using testing data from all 50 states, this study addresses two key questions: has student achievement increased and have achievement gaps narrowed since the No Child Left Behind Act was enacted in 2002. A comparison is also made between state test results and results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress. | Publication Date: June 24, 2008 | Full Report (rev July 15, 2008) [PDF format, 1792 KB] | Topic: State Testing Data and Student Achievement | 2008 | Title: It Takes More Than a Hero: School Restructuring in Ohio Under the No Child Left Behind Act | Author: Maureen Kelleher, Caitlin Scott | Abstract: This report describes Ohio's school restructuring efforts under the No Child Left Behind Act, including findings from interviews with state officials and case studies of nine schools in four school districts: Cincinnati Public Schools, Cleveland Metropolitan School District, Mansfield City Schools, and Mount Vernon City Schools. Key findings from the report include: (1) despite holding steady for the previous three years, the number of Ohio schools in restructuring rose from 56 schools in 2006-07 to 130 schools in 2007-08; (2) only 7 of the 177 Ohio schools ever in restructuring have successfully exited; (3) districts in Ohio that receive federal improvement funds must share data and permit state officials to visit their schools; and (4) while some Ohio schools have received attention for choosing to replace their entire staffs, most report doing so reluctantly and advise other schools to do so only as a last resort. | Keyword: It Takes More Than A Hero: School Restructuring in Ohio Under the No Child Left Behind Act, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, restructuring, restructure, sanctioned, sanction, implementation, underperforming, federal option, reform, federal, fund, governance, monitoring, support, Interview, test scores, geographic, options, assistance, support, state, district, approach, common theme, priority, accountability, leadership, administration, official, Ohio, Cincinnati Federation of Teachers, Ohio Department of Education, ODE, Cincinnati Public School District, Cleveland Metropolitan School District, Mansfield City School District, Mount Vernon City School District, letter of agreement, pilot, charter school, institutional coaching, Teacher Advancement Program, TAP, Instructional Support Teams, IST, lead principal, restaffing, Title I, Connected Mathematics, school closing, Ohio Integrated Systems Model for Academic and Behavior Supports, OISM, urban, suburban | Publication Date: August 7, 2008 | 27 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title: Lessons From The Classroom Level: Federal and State Accountability in Illinois</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><strong>Abstract:</strong> This report takes an in-depth look at how classroom practices have been influenced by No Child Left Behind and related state policies in Illinois. Drawn from classroom observations and interviews, the report sheds new light on how teachers, principals, and administrators have responded to the federal school accountability law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Keywords:</strong> Lessons From The Classroom Level: Federal and State Accountability in Illinois, federal accountability, state accountability, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, interview research, survey research, Prairie State Achievement, Exam, PSAE, Illinois Standards Achievement Test, ISAT, ACT, parental involvement, curriculum, teach to the test, state standards, alignment, funding, resources, English language arts, ELA, achievement, standardized tests, math testing, curriculum instruction, adequate yearly progress, AYP, school classification, consequences, assessments, grade level expectation, GLE, grade span expectation, GSE, curriculum narrowing, test prep, test based accountability, instructional strategy, assessment strategy, strategic targeting, data, Illinois, alternative test for English language learners, ELLs, urban, suburban, rural, classroom observation, Illinois Measure of Annual Growth in English Test, IMAGE, Standards Aligned Curriculum Initiative, curriculum mapping, commercially produced curriculum, teacher collaboration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Publication Date:</strong> December 22, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title: Lessons From The Classroom Level: Federal and State Accountability in Rhode Island</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><strong>Abstract:</strong> This report takes an in-depth look at how classroom practices have been influenced by No Child Left Behind and related state policies in Rhode Island. Drawn from classroom observations and interviews, the report sheds new light on how teachers, principals, and administrators have responded to the federal school accountability law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Keywords:</strong> Lessons From The Classroom Level: Federal and State Accountability in Rhode Island, rhode island, federal accountability, state accountability, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, interview research, survey research, New England Common Assessment Programs, NECAP, curriculum, teach to the test, state standards, alignment, funding, resources, English language arts, ELA, achievement, standardized tests, math testing, curriculum instruction, adequate yearly progress, AYP, school classification, consequences, assessments, grade level expectation, GLE, grade span expectation, GSE, curriculum narrowing, test prep, test based accountability, instructional strategy, assessment strategy, strategic targeting, data, parental involvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Publication Date:</strong> November 25, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title: Managing More Than a Thousand Remodeling Projects: School Restructuring in California</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><strong>Abstract:</strong> This report describes California’s school restructuring under the No Child Left Behind Act, and also includes findings from case studies of nine schools in four school district: Grant Joint Union, Oakland Unified, Palmdale Elementary, and Tahoe-Truckee Joint Unified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Keywords:</strong> Managing More Than a Thousand Remodeling Projects: School Restructuring in California, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, restructuring, restructure, sanctioned, sanction, implementation, underperforming, federal option, reform, federal, fund, governance, monitoring, support, Interview, test scores, options, assistance, support, state, district, approach, benchmark assessments, replace staff, negative consequences, strategies, federal mandate, On The Right Track symposium, California, California Department of Education, CDE, Grant Joint Union, Oakland Unified, Palmdale Elementary, Tahoe-Truckee Joint Unified, &quot;any other&quot;, urban, suburban, rural, achievement, Title I, technology academy, charter school, internal restructuring, Look Before You Leap, school closing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Publication Date:</strong> February 7, 2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title: Many States Have Taken a &quot;Backloaded&quot; Approach to No Child Left Behind Goal of All Students Scoring &quot;Proficient&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td><strong>Abstract:</strong> This report examines the interim objectives for student achievement established by states in their accountability plans for the No Child Left Behind Act. These objectives lay out the percentages of students that must score at or above the proficient level on state tests each year, on the way toward meeting the law's ultimate goal of 100% of students achieving proficiency by school year 2013-14. These annual objectives are used by states to determine whether schools and districts have made adequate yearly progress. CEP's analysis found that almost half of the states (23 states) have &quot;backloaded&quot; their trajectories for reaching 100% proficiency. In other words, they have called for smaller achievement gains in the earlier years of the trajectory and much steeper gains in later years, as 2014 grows nearer. Another 25 states and the District of Columbia have adopted a more incremental approach that assumes steadier progress toward the 100% goal. The two remaining states have blended trajectories that do not fit readily into the backloaded or incremental categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Keywords:</strong> Many States Have Taken a &quot;Backloaded&quot; Approach to No Child Left Behind Goal of All Students Scoring &quot;Proficient&quot;, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, restructuring, restructure, sanctioned, sanction, implementation, underperforming, federal option, reform, federal, fund, governance, monitoring, support, Interview, test scores, options, assistance, support, state, district, approach, benchmark assessments, replace staff, negative consequences, strategies, federal mandate, On The Right Track symposium, California, California Department of Education, CDE, Grant Joint Union, Oakland Unified, Palmdale Elementary, Tahoe-Truckee Joint Unified, &quot;any other&quot;, urban, suburban, rural, achievement, Title I, technology academy, charter school, internal restructuring, Look Before You Leap, school closing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Full Report (PDF format)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NCLB Year 5: Instructional Time in Elementary Schools: A Closer Look at Changes for Specific Subjects</td>
<td>Jennifer McMurrer</td>
<td>This report examines the magnitude of changes in instructional time in elementary schools in the years since NCLB took effect in 2002, and is a follow up report to Choices, Changes, and Challenges: Curriculum and Instruction in the NCLB Era that was issued by CEP in July 2007.</td>
<td>May 28, 2008</td>
<td>PDF format, 342 KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NCLB Year 5: Some Perspectives from Rural School Districts on The No Child Left Behind Act</td>
<td>Ying Zhang</td>
<td>This CEP report examines the impact of NCLB on student achievement and teacher quality in some rural districts and the changes those rural districts face in complying with the Act. The findings in this report are drawn from CEP’s 2006-07 nationally representative survey of school districts and from interviews with administrators in eight rural districts in various parts of the country.</td>
<td>May 28, 2008</td>
<td>PDF format, 412 KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Open Letter to District of Columbia Public School Officials on School Restructuring</td>
<td>Jack Jennings and Caitlin Scott</td>
<td>To assist officials of the District of Columbia Public Schools with their efforts to develop and implement school restructuring plans consistent with the No Child Left Behind Act, on May 28, 2008, the Center on Education Policy sent an open letter to Chancellor Rhee, State Superintendent Gist, and Board President Bobb outlining the key lessons we have learned from studying the NCLB school restructuring process. CEP has examined school restructuring in Michigan for four years, and restructuring in California and Maryland for three years. This summer, CEP will also issue reports on the restructuring process in Georgia and Ohio. The key lessons shared with DCPS officials are based on examining data related to restructuring in those five states as well as detailed case studies of 19 districts and 42 restructuring schools within those districts.</td>
<td>May 28, 2008</td>
<td>PDF format, 898 KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Restructuring Under the No Child Left Behind Act in Maryland: 2007-08 Follow-Up Report</td>
<td>Brenda Neuman-Sheldon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This report, CEP’s third annual review of Maryland’s efforts to restructure schools under the No Child Left Behind Act, finds that (1) although between school years 2006-07 and 2007-08 the number of schools in the restructuring implementation phase declined slightly, there was a drastic increase in the number of schools entering restructuring planning; (2) more restructuring schools are choosing to replace most or all of their staff (including principals) as a strategy; and (3) the “turnaround specialist” option for restructuring is losing favor in Maryland. The report’s findings are based on interviews with state officials, case studies of four school districts and 10 schools within those districts.

**Keyword:** Restructuring Under the No Child Left Behind Act in Maryland: 2007-08 Follow-Up Report, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, data, restructuring, restructure, improvement, differentiated accountability, consequences, corrective action, graduation rate, fund, school staff, district, interview, federal, Title I, turnaround, specialist, MSDE, Baltimore City, Anne Arundel, Prince George's County, restructuring options, Andres Alonso, guidelines, support, replace staff

**Publication Date:** September 12, 2008
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### 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title:</strong></th>
<th>State High School Exit Exams 2008 Annual Report: Moving Toward End-of-Course Exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author:</strong></td>
<td>Dalia Zabala, Dr. Angela Minnici, Jennifer McMurrer, Liza Briggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abstract:</strong></td>
<td>This report examines the new developments in the implementation of state high school exit exams in the 26 states that currently implement or plan to implement these tests. The report specifically focuses on the states’ move away from minimum-competency and comprehensive exams toward end-of-course exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publication Date:</strong></td>
<td>August 13, 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Full Report (PDF format, 636 KB)</strong></td>
<td>High School Exit Examinations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Title:</strong></th>
<th>State High School Exit Exams: 2008 Policy Briefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author:</strong></td>
<td>Dalia Zabala and Angela Minnici</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Abstract:** | Policy Brief 1: A Move Toward End-of-Course Exams  
Author(s): Dalia Zabala  
States continue to move toward end-of-course exams. The use of end-of-course exams as a graduation requirement began with one state in 2002, four states in 2007, and an expected 12 states in 2015. This brief illustrates this shift and summarizes some of the upcoming changes.  
Published: January 31, 2008  
Policy Brief 2: Patterns in Gaps in Pass Rates  
Author(s): Dalia Zabala and Angela Minnici  
States with mandated high school exit exams consistently report low pass rates for students with disabilities. These low pass rates have led educators to implement various intervention and remediation programs. Yet these gaps persist until the end of 12th grade, even though students have had multiple opportunities to retake the exam. This brief highlights some of the most common alternative paths to graduation for students with disabilities in states that require students to achieve passing scores on exit exams to receive a high school diploma. |
| **Publication Date:** | February 28, 2008  
Policy Brief 3: Students with Disabilities  
Author(s): Dalia Zabala |
This report describes Michigan's school restructuring efforts under the No Child Left Behind Act, and includes findings from case studies of nine schools in four school districts: Detroit Public Schools, Flint Community Schools, Harrison Community Schools, and Willow Run Community Schools. Key findings from the report include: (1) more Michigan schools are in restructuring due to a greater number of high schools entering restructuring; (2) the state offers additional assistance and monitoring to restructuring schools through intermediate school districts and other regional entities; (3) turnaround specialists remain the most popular restructuring option; and (4) federal Title I funds increased, but state financial difficulties hinder restructuring.

**Keyword:** The Sit Down Dinner: Formalizing Restructuring Under the No Child Left Behind Act in Michigan

**Publication Date:** March 25, 2008

**Press Release (PDF format, 103 KB)**

**Topic:** High School Exit Examinations

---

**Title:** Title I Funds - Who's Gaining, Who's Losing: School Year 2008-09 Update

**Author:** Tom Fagan

**Abstract:**

This report discusses funding for states and school districts under the federal Title I, Part A program for school year 2008-09. (Title I is the largest federal program assisting elementary and secondary schools, and contains the key accountability provisions under the No Child Left Behind Act.) The report highlights the impact of annual poverty count updates on the distribution of funds, and discusses funding for school improvement activities. The report also examines the targeting of Title I funds to the highest poverty districts.

**Keyword:** Title I Funds - Who's Gaining, Who's Losing: School Year 2008-09 Update, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Title I, funding, federal funding, federal demands, unfunded mandate, fund allocation, fund distribution, federal dollars, Department of Education, ED, funding equity, needy district, neediest districts, funding data, poor district, Census Bureau, allocation formula, high-need district, expenditure factor, appropriations, funding fluctuation, gaining funds, losing funds, high-poverty district, low-poverty district, formula, targeted assistance grant, education finance incentive grant, state funds, state funding, per pupil expenditure, fully funded, full funding, recommendation, funding freeze, funding shortfall, fund reduction, school in need of improvement, school needing improvement, state reservation for school improvement activities, reservation requirement, stagnant appropriation, separate appropriation, low-income children, 4% set aside, Hurricane Katrina, Mississippi, Louisiana, New Orleans, Basic Grant formula, Concentration Grant formula, Title I-A, funding volatility, Katrina fund, Education Finance Incentive Grant, EFIG

**Publication Date:** September 9, 2008

**Full Report (PDF format, 87.7 KB)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Audio transcript of this meeting

Keywords: CEP Forum 5 on Rethinking the Federal Role: Economic Stimulus Package, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, federal, funding, stimulus package, economic stimulus, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, federal role, federal impact, federal money, state money, governors, stimulus effects, National Governors Association, NGA, Chief State School Officers, Great City Schools, School Administrators, School Boards, fiscal environment, fiscal climate, Diane Linn, National Association of State Budget Offices, FY 09, FY 10, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, ARRA, Missouri, Alabama, Texas, Massachusetts, Congressional Budget Office, CBO, General Accounting Office, GAO, State Accountability Official, accountability, OMB, Gene Wilhoit, assessment system, standards, data, data system, federal requirement, Illinois, Arkansas, high quality teacher, HQT, reform, reauthorization, IES, IDEA, Deborah Rigsby, Mississippi, National League of Cities, Title I, North Carolina, California, AFT, Rebuild America’s Schools Coalition, graduation rate. Mary Kusler, create jobs, job creation, fiscal stabilization fund, Virginia, shortfall, Secretary of Education, early childhood, special education, funding cliff, inverted funding. Jeff Simering, equity, FMAT, class size, state aid, Wyoming, Joel Packer, Secretary Duncan, Secretary Spellings. Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, Stephanie Sullich, early intervention, RTI, professional development, Mississippi, private sector, US Department of Education, ED, English Language Learner, ELL, Commissioned Papers, federal role, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, public forum, recommendation, federal program, funding, federal, President Obama, Congress, Paul Manna, Title I, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, IDEA, Eisenhower Professional, Development Program, high quality teacher, HQT, professional development, program effect, policy initiative, policy effect, Laura S Hamilton, Brian Stecher, Kun Yuan, standards, standards-based reform, SBR, assessments, accountability, accountability indices, National Assessment of Educational Progress, NAEP, evaluation, incentives, W. James Popham, accountability test, state-level testing, federal role, Australia, Germany, federal system, student tracking, teacher recruitment, Sharon L. Kagan, Jeanne L. Reid, ECE2 policy, Early Childhood Education, ECE, Excellence, Coherence and Equity, ECE, data, data gap, historical context, early education, infrastructure, education system, Heather B. Weiss, Priscilla Little, Suzanne Bouffard, Sarah Deschenes, Helen Janc Malone, out of school learning, after school program, summer program, summer learning, family involvement, learning support, complementary learning, pathway, Matthew Cheria, education technology, Sesame Street, PLATO, computer-assisted instruction, CAI, Star Schools, E-Rate, achievement gap, rural, Geoffrey Borman, high-poverty school, scaled reform, Comprehensive School Reform, Federal Drug Administration, FDA, Gary Sykes, Kennes Dibner, federal teacher policy, teacher retention, evaluation procedure, teacher evaluation, Russell Rumberger, high school performance, school restructuring, non-academic outcome, capacity, data systems

2009

Title: CEP on Pennsylvania Test Results
Author: CEP
Abstract:
On August 19, 2009, Jack Jennings, President of CEP, participated in an event at the state capitol in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania to discuss the gains made in the state’s test scores since 2002. The press release appears below with links to the first 2009 CEP state test scores report, and the Pennsylvania profile used for that report.

View “State Test Score Trends Through 2007-08: Part 1 of Report

Publication Date: August 19, 2009
Pennsylvania State Data Testing Profile (PDF format, 286 KB)

Topic: State Testing Data and Student Achievement

2009

Title: Commissioned Papers for CEP’s Project to Rethink the Federal Role in Elementary and Secondary Education
Author: CEP
Abstract:
In 2008 and 2009, the Center on Education Policy (CEP) commissioned a series of major papers to assist in rethinking the federal role in elementary and secondary education. Authors were asked to review areas of activity in which the federal government has been involved over the past half century, determine the purposes of the federal programs, examine the evidence of their effect on education, and make recommendations for the future role of the federal government in public education. Each paper was peer-reviewed by individuals with diverse points of view on the issue. CEP also convened a series of public forums to discuss several of the papers and compiled a compendium of key studies on the No Child Left Behind Act.

In February 2010, CEP issued its recommendations for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act). In developing these recommendations, CEP drew upon these papers, forums, research compendium, as well as CEP’s comprehensive studies of NCLB and our long-term experience with federal policies. The document, Better Federal Policies Leading to Better Schools, provides guidance for President Obama and the Congress in shaping the federal role in elementary and secondary education.

View the Compendium of Key Studies
Presented Papers:
“Federal Aid to Elementary and Secondary Education: Premises, Effects, and Major Lessons Learned” by Paul Manna, College of William and Mary

“Standards-Based Reform in the United States: History, Research, and Future Directions” by Laura S. Hamilton, Brian M. Stecher, and Run Yuan, RAND Corp.

“The Role of Assessment in Federal Education Programs” by W. James Popham, University of California, Los Angeles

“Demographic Trends and the Federal Role in Education” by Harold Hodgkinson, Hodgkinson Associates, Ltd.

“The Federal Role in Education: Lessons from Australia, Germany, and Canada” by Chad R. Lykins and Stephen P. Heyneman, Vanderbilt University

“Advancing ECE2 Policy: Early Childhood Education (ECE) and its Quest for Excellence, Coherence, and Equity (ECE)” by Sharon L. Kagan and Jeanne L. Reid, Teachers College, Columbia University


“From PLATO to Podcasts: Fifty Years of Federal Involvement in Educational Technology” by Mathew Cherian, Graduate Student, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

“National Efforts to Bring Reform to Scale in America’s High-Poverty Elementary and Secondary Schools: Outcomes and Implications” by Geoffrey D. Borman, University of Wisconsin-Madison

“Fifty Years of Federal Teacher Policy: An Appraisal” by Gary Sykes and Kenne Dibner, Michigan State University

“What the Federal Government Can Do to Improve High School Performance” by Russell W. Rumberger, University of California, Santa Barbara

Related Papers:
Two other papers that are informing this project to rethink the federal role in elementary and secondary education were developed in 2004 for a CEP forum on the No Child Left Behind Act.

“Ruminations Regarding NCLB’S Most Malignant Provision: Adequate Yearly Progress” by W. James Popham, University of California, Los Angeles

“Rethinking the No Child Left Behind Accountability System” by Robert L. Linn, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, University of Colorado at Boulder

Keyword: Differentiating and Simplifying: Transforming School Restructuring under No Child Left Behind in New York

Title: Differentiating and Simplifying: Transforming School Restructuring under No Child Left Behind in New York

Author: Caitlin Scott, Elizabeth Duffrin, Maureen Kelleher

Abstract: This report describes New York’s efforts to assist schools in restructuring during school year 2008-09 and reports on the state’s participation in the NCLB differentiated accountability pilot program.

Keyword: Differentiating and Simplifying: Transforming School Restructuring under No Child Left Behind in New York, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, New York, New York City, NYC, Regional School Support Center, David Bryant, restructuring, structure, improvement, differentiated accountability, coordination, sub-groups, English Language Learner, ELL, consequences, corrective action, graduation rate, urban, suburban, rural, fund, grant, class size, time on task, kindergarten, full-day, charter school, school staff, district, interview, federal, Title I, intervention, evaluation, strategies, focus, Central Islip Union Free, Syracuse City School District, data

Publication Date: September 3, 2009

Full Report (PDF format, 588 KB)

Topic: Federal Education Policy & Programs

2009

Title: Education Week Commentary: Rethinking ‘Restructuring’

Author: Jack Jennings, Caitlin Scott, and Nancy Kober

Abstract: On May 13, 2009, Education Week featured an article by CEP drawing conclusions from its five years of work reviewing the restructuring of schools required by NCLB. The piece was written by Jack Jennings, Caitlin Scott, and Nancy Kober.

Keyword: Education Week Commentary: Rethinking ‘Restructuring’, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, data, restructuring, restructure, improvement, differentiated accountability, consequences, corrective action graduation rate, urban, suburban, rural, fund, grant, school staff, district, interview, federal, Title I,
2009

**Title**: Expanded Learning Time: A Summary of Findings from Case Studies in Four States  
**Author**: Jennifer McMurrer, Matthew Frizzell, Nanami Yoshioka, Caitlin Scott, and Nora Ostler  
**Abstract**: This summary report describes the strategies being used by case study sites to meet federal requirements and encouragements for increased or expanded learning time, and the challenges, successes, and impacts associated with this implementation process. The report is based on the findings of a series of case studies of 17 low-performing schools within 11 school districts in four geographically dispersed states—Connecticut, Colorado, Oregon, and Virginia.  
**Publication Date**: January 13, 2015  
**Full Report (PDF format, 694 KB)**  
**Topic**: More and Better Learning Time

2009

**Title**: Expanding Restructuring and Taking on High Schools: An NCLB Follow-up Report in Michigan  
**Author**: Caitlin Scott  
**Abstract**: This report describes Michigan's efforts to assist schools in restructuring during school year 2008-09 and reports on the state's implementation of a growth model to measure student performance for purposes of accountability.  
**Publication Date**: April 2, 2009  
**Full Report (PDF format, 694 KB)**  
**Topic**: Federal Education Policy & Programs

2009

**Title**: How State and Federal Accountability Policies Have Influenced Curriculum and Instruction in Three States: Common Findings from Rhode Island, Illinois, and Washington  
**Author**: Deepa Srikantaiah  
**Abstract**: This report takes an in-depth look at how classroom practices in Rhode Island, Illinois, and Washington State have been influenced by state accountability policies and the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The report, How State and Federal Accountability Policies Have Influenced Curriculum and Instruction in Three States, examines how teachers and administrators have responded to increased accountability and pressure to meet state standards. Drawing from case studies of 18 schools in the three states, CEP highlights the national implications for how accountability is impacting curriculum and instruction and provides recommendations to help mitigate some of the harmful effects of standards-based accountability systems.  
**Publication Date**: October 6, 2009  
**Press Release (PDF format, 11.6 KB)**
2009  
**Title:** Intensified Support: Changes in School Restructuring in Georgia under the No Child Left Behind Act  
**Author:** Elizabeth Duffrin  
**Abstract:**  
This report describes Georgia's efforts to assist schools in restructuring during school year 2008-09 and reports on the state's participation in the NCLB differentiated accountability pilot program.  
**Keyword:** Intensified Support: Changes in School Restructuring in Georgia under the No Child Left Behind Act, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, Georgia, data, restructuring, restructure, improvement, differentiated accountability, consequences, corrective action, graduation rate, urban, suburban, rural, fund, grant, school staff, district, interview, federal, Title I, intervention, evaluation, strategies, instructional strategy, student achievement, focus, academic growth, proficiency target, safe harbor, state test, National Assessment of Educational Progress, NAEP, scoring scale, Kathy Augustine, Atlanta, Beverly Hall, Middle School Transformation Initiative, Grady County, Diane Bradford, instructional strategies, Muscogee School District, GDOE, school response, ineffective teacher, school management, special education  
**Publication Date:** September 3, 2009  
**Full Report (PDF format, 1,910 KB)**

2009  
**Title:** Lessons From The Classroom Level: Federal and State Accountability in Washington State  
**Author:** Deepa Srikanthaia, Carolyn Moilanen, and Lisa Swayhoover  
**Abstract:**  
This report takes an in-depth look at how classroom practices have been influenced by No Child Left Behind and related state policies in Washington. Drawn from classroom observations and interviews, the report sheds new light on how teachers, principals, and administrators have responded to the federal school accountability law.  
**Keyword:** Lessons From The Classroom Level: Federal and State Accountability in Washington State, federal accountability, state accountability, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, interview research, survey research, curriculum, state standards, alignment, funding, resources, achievement, standardized tests, math testing, curriculum instruction, adequate yearly progress, AYP, school classification, consequences, assessments, test prep, test based accountability, instructional strategy, assessment strategy, data, parental involvement, Washington assessment of student learning, WASL, state standards, instructional style, failing student intervention, graduation requirement, classroom observation, standards based accountability, curriculum alignment, Starbucks, Microsoft, struggling student services, curriculum narrowing, teaching to the test, inquiry-based instruction, additional form of assessment, teacher motivation  
**Publication Date:** July 28, 2009  
**Full Report (PDF format, 1,923 KB)**

2009  
**Title:** Looking For New Ways to Make Progress: School Restructuring in Maryland, 2008-09 Follow-Up Report  
**Author:** Brenda Neuman-Sheldon  
**Abstract:**  
This report describes Maryland's efforts to assist schools in restructuring during school year 2008-09 and reports on the state's participation in the NCLB differentiated accountability pilot program.  
**Keyword:** Looking For New Ways to Make Progress: School Restructuring in Maryland, 2008-09 Follow-Up Report, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, data, restructuring, restructure, improvement, differentiated accountability, consequences, corrective action, graduation rate, urban, suburban, rural, fund, grant, school staff, district, interview, federal, Title I, school audit, growth model, assistance, Maryland, Anne Arundel County Public Schools, Baltimore City Public Schools System, Prince George's County Public Schools, test score data, state report card, staff replacement, Maryland DAP, support, capacity building, monitoring process, implementation, technical assistance, special education, district response  
**Publication Date:** April 2, 2009  
**Full Report (PDF format, 4,007 KB)**

2009  
**Title:** Mining the Opportunities in Differentiated Accountability: Lessons Learned from the No Child Left Behind Pilots in Four States  
**Author:** Caitlin Scott  
**Abstract:**  
This report examines how four states—Georgia, Maryland, New York, and Ohio—have taken advantage of the flexibility under the Differentiated Accountability Pilot program to help low-performing schools under the No Child Left Behind Act. Launched by the U.S. Department of Education in 2008, the program allows nine states to vary the intensity and type of intervention they use with struggling schools and focus their resources on those with the greatest needs.  
**Keyword:** Mining the Opportunities in Differentiated Accountability: Lessons Learned from the No Child Left Behind Pilots in Four States, accountability, adequate yearly progress, AYP, data, Differentiated Accountability Pilot, federal assistance, Georgia, low performing schools, Maryland, monitoring, New York, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Ohio, Ohio Improvement Process, restructuring, school choice, school climate, school districts, school improvement, school reform, school turnaround, Title I, turnaround, tutoring, U.S. Department of Education  
**Publication Date:** September 3, 2009  
**Press Release (PDF format, 23.3 KB)**  
**Topic:** Federal Education Policy & Programs
2009

**Title:** State High School Exit Exams 2009 Annual Report: Trends in Test Programs, Alternate Pathways, and Pass Rates

**Author:** Ying Zhang

**Abstract:**
The report draws from CEP's eight-year study of high school exit exams to identify long-term trends in state policies and student performance. It highlights a growing trend among states to establish alternate pathways to graduation for students who are struggling to pass exit exams. The report also analyzes exit exam pass rates and finds that 11 of the 16 states showed an average annual growth in the proportion of students passing the test in reading and 13 states showed average annual growth in mathematics. Although many states narrowed the gaps in initial pass rates between the various student subgroups over the years, the gaps remain large in both subjects.

**Keyword:** State High School Exit Exams 2009 Annual Report: Trends in Test Programs, Alternate Pathways, and Pass Rates, achievement gaps, ACT, Alabama, Alabama high school graduation exam, AHSGE, Alaska, Alaska high school graduation qualifying exam, alignment, Alternative Routes, Arizona, Arizona's instrument to measure standards, AIMS, Arkansas, Arkansas Comprehensive Assessment Program, assessments, Basic Skills Test, BST, California, California's high school exit exam, CAHSEE, disaggregated graduation rates, end-of-course exam, EOC, English language learners, ELL, exams, exemptions, exit exams, Florida, Florida comprehensive assessment test, FCAT, free or reduced-price lunch, FRPL, Gateway Examinations, GE, GED, Georgia, Georgia High School Graduation Test, GHSGT, Graduation Exit Exam, Graduation Qualifying Exam, GQE, graduation rates, Graduation Required Assessments for Diploma, GRAD, high school proficiency assessment, HSAP, High School Proficiency Assessment, HSPA, High School Proficiency Examination, HSPE, Idaho, Idaho standards achievement tests, ISAT, Indiana, Individuals with Disabilities Act, IDEA, limited English proficient, LEP, Louisiana, Maryland, Maryland High School Assessment, Massachusetts, Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System, MCAS, Minnesota, Mississippi, Mississippi subject area testing program, national assessment of educational progress, NAEP, National Center for Education Statistics, NCES, Nevada, New Jersey, New Mexico, New Mexico High School Competency Examination, NMHSCE, New York, No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB, No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB, North Carolina, North Carolina Competency Tests, Ohio, Ohio graduation tests, OGT, Oklahoma, Oklahoma End-of-Instruction Exams, EOI, pass rates, Regents Examinations, remediation, SAT, South Carolina, standards, standards of learning end-of-course exams, SOL, Tennessee, tests, Texas, Texas Assessment of Knowledge and Skills, TAKS, Virginia, waivers, Washington, Washington assessment of student learning, WASL

**Publication Date:** November 5, 2009

**Full Report, updated 1/13/2010 (PDF format, 811 KB)**

**Topic:** High School Exit Examinations

---

2009

**Title:** State Student Achievement Testing Data

**Author:** CEP

**Abstract:**
This brochure invites research and analysis of the unique stockpile of data found on CEP’s Web site regarding K-12 testing results from all 50 states. The brochure describes the wealth of available test data and explains how to access that information.

**Keyword:** State Student Achievement Testing Data, 2009, brochure, stockpile of data, wealth of state test data, 50 states, student subgroup, achievement levels, student achievement, percentages proficient, basic, proficient, advanced, mean scale scores, standard deviation, effect size, numbers of test takers, statistics, comparable test data, test characteristics, data limitations, profiles, worksheets, tables in overall achievement, achievement gap, reading, math, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, number of test-takers, white, African American, Latino, Asian, Native American, free or reduced-price lunch, low income, non low income, students with disabilities, SWD, Special Education, SPED, English language learners, ELL, limited English proficiency, LEP, English as a second language, ESL, males, boys, females, girls, Title I students, migrant students, HumRRO

**Publication Date:** October 1, 2009

**Brochure (PDF format, 297 KB)**

**Topic:** State Testing Data and Student Achievement
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2009

**Title:** State Test Score Trends Through 2007-08, Part 1: Is the Emphasis on Proficiency Shortchanging Higher- and Lower-Achieving Students

**Author:** Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky, and Nancy Kober

**Abstract:**
This report is the first in a series of reports describing results from CEP's third annual analysis of state testing data. The report provides an update on student performance at the proficient level of achievement, and for the first time, includes data about student performance at the advanced and basic levels. Also included are profiles for each state, which show trends in reading and math for basic, proficient, and advanced levels in elementary, middle, and high school. The study provides an in-depth look at the full range of student performance in order to better understand whether the No Child Left Behind Act's focus on proficiency has caused teachers to shortchange students at either end of the academic spectrum.

**Updated July 15, 2009**

[Errata outlining the specific changes from the June 17th version of the report are available upon request. Please call or e-mail us at 202-822-8065 or cep-dc@cep-dc.org.]

**View 2007-08 State Profiles and Worksheets**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Full Report (PDF format, KB)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>View 2007 State Profiles and Worksheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>State Test Score Trends Through 2007-08, Part 2: Is There a Plateau Effect in Test Scores?</td>
<td>Naomi Chudowsky and Victor Chudowsky</td>
<td>Many in the research and policy worlds have taken for granted the existence of a phenomenon known as the “plateau effect,” wherein test scores rise in the early years of a test-based accountability system and then level off. Drawing from our database of reading and math test results from all 50 states going back as far as 1999, we looked for evidence of a plateau effect in 55 trend lines from 16 states with six to ten years of consistent test data. This report outlines those findings.</td>
<td>June 17, 2009</td>
<td>358 KB</td>
<td>State Testing Data and Student Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>State Test Score Trends Through 2007-08, Part 3: Are Achievement Gaps Closing and Is Achievement Rising for All?</td>
<td>Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky, and Nancy Kober</td>
<td>This report examines testing data from all 50 states to determine if achievement gaps between subgroups of students are narrowing. The report also looks at the achievement trends of subgroups of students at the elementary school level.</td>
<td>October 1, 2009</td>
<td>346 KB</td>
<td>State Testing Data and Student Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>State Test Score Trends Through 2007-08, Part 4: Has Progress Been Made in Raising Achievement for Students with Disabilities?</td>
<td>Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky, Nancy Kober</td>
<td>Using data from state reading and mathematics tests, this report takes an in-depth look at the performance of students with disabilities and highlights the problems with the testing data for these students.</td>
<td>November 16, 2009</td>
<td>256 KB</td>
<td>State Testing Data and Student Achievement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reduced-price lunch, FRPL, Gender, Male, Female, boy, girl, National Assessment of Educational Progress, NAEP, achievement gap, student achievement, percent proficient, mean scale scores, subgroup, reading, mathematics, math, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, trends, state profiles, 2007-08 state profiles, supplemental tables, accountability, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, basic, proficient, advanced, state testing data**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Publication Date</th>
<th>Publication Format</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Summary: Lessons from the Classroom Level about Federal and State Accountability in Rhode Island and Illinois</td>
<td>CEP</td>
<td>In the winter of 2008, the Center on Education Policy released reports examining the impact of national and state accountability systems on curriculum, instruction, and student achievement in Rhode Island and Illinois. Using classroom observations and interviews with school administrators, instructional specialists, teachers, parents, and students, CEP developed case studies of 12 schools in the two states. This report summarizes the common findings across the two states and discusses findings that were unique to each state.</td>
<td>February 6, 2009</td>
<td>Summary Report (PDF format, 116 KB)</td>
<td>State Testing Data and Student Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Top Down, Bottom Up: California Districts in Corrective Action and Schools in Restructuring under NCLB</td>
<td>Caitlin Scott</td>
<td>This report describes California's efforts to assist schools in restructuring during school year 2008-09 and reports on the state's expanded approach to technical assistance, which includes public as well as private providers. The reports examine trends since 2002 in the percentages of students in each of the ethnic/racial group studied that reached the proficient level on state tests, the achievement gaps between each of the three subgroups and white students, and the performance of these students on 2008 state tests. The reports also explore possible policy implications for the achievement trends.</td>
<td>April 2, 2009</td>
<td>Full Report (PDF format, 1757 KB)</td>
<td>State Testing Data and Student Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>A Call to Action to Raise Achievement for African American Students</td>
<td>Nancy Kober, Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky, and Shelby Dietz</td>
<td>These three reports, &quot;A Call to Action to Raise Achievement for African American Students&quot;, &quot;Improving Achievement for the Growing Latino Population Is Critical to the Nation’s Future&quot;, and &quot;Policy Implications of Trends for Asian American Students&quot; examine the performance of these students on state reading and math tests used for accountability under NCLB. The reports examine trends since 2002 in the percentages of students in each of the ethnic/racial group studied that reached the proficient level on state tests, the achievement gaps between each of the three subgroups and white students, and the performance of these students on 2008 state tests. The reports also explore possible policy implications for the achievement trends.</td>
<td>June 30, 2010</td>
<td>Full Report (PDF format, 350 KB)</td>
<td>State Testing Data and Student Achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Better Federal Policies Leading to Better Schools</td>
<td>Nancy Kober, Jack Jennings, and Jody Peltason</td>
<td>In February 2010, CEP issued its recommendations for reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act). This document contains CEP's recommendations for reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act. These recommendations are based on a two-year review of current and past federal policies and a wide range of research, including CEP's own comprehensive studies of NCLB and student achievement in all 50 states. In developing the recommendations, we also brought to bear our long-term experience with federal policies and consulted with numerous experts of varying backgrounds, including commissioning 11 papers on key issues. The document provides guidance for President Obama and the Congress in shaping the federal role in elementary and secondary education. In developing these recommendations, CEP drew upon a series of commissioned papers, public forums and research compendium associated with their project Rethinking the Federal Role, as well as CEP's comprehensive studies of NCLB and our long-term experience with federal policies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>How Many Schools and Districts Have Not Made Adequate Yearly Progress? Four-Year Trends</td>
<td>Alexandra Usher</td>
<td>This report analyzes trends over four years in the number of schools and school districts that did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) in raising student achievement under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). Using data from the Consolidated State Performance Reports submitted to the U.S. Department of Education by all 50 states and the District of Columbia, we calculated the percentage of schools and districts in the nation and in each state that did not make AYP based on testing in school years 2005-06 through 2008-09. An update to this report will be released early in 2011 and will include data from school year 2009-10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>How Many Schools and Districts Have Not Made Adequate Yearly Progress? Four-Year Trends, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, Consolidated State Performance Report, US Department of Education, ED, not making AYP, state comparison, district not making adequate yearly progress, state not making adequate yearly progress, backloaded trajectory, backloaded approach, state goal, scoring proficient, percentage proficient, English language learners, ELLs, students with disabilities, subgroups, graduation rate target, state objective, state-determined, student achievement, accountability, accountability measure, achievement measure, safe harbor, below proficient, intervention, school in need of improvement, SINI, district in need of improvement, DINI, annual objective, 100% proficient, 2014, federal mandate, federal requirement, standard test, AYP results, AYP data, reporting AYP, AYP determination, state exemption, AYP exempt, Texas, variation between states, education quality, cut scores, state differences, AYP requirement, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, Obama Administration, President Obama, reform, reauthorization, blueprint, A Blueprint for Reform, recommendation, flawed system, common core state standards, CCSS, common standards, common assessment</td>
<td>Shelby Dietz, Malini Roy</td>
<td>Drawing on data from state departments of education and other public sources, this report estimates the number and percentage of public schools that did not make adequate yearly progress. The report finds that approximately one-third of the nation’s public schools did not make AYP in school year 2008-09, although the number varied greatly by state. A table outlining the percentage of schools not making AYP by state is also included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Improving Achievement for the Growing Latino Population Is Critical to the Nation’s Future</td>
<td>Nancy Kober, Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky, and Shelby Dietz</td>
<td>These three reports, &quot;A Call to Action to Raise Achievement for African American Students&quot;, &quot;Improving Achievement for the Growing Latino Population Is Critical to the Nation’s Future&quot;, and &quot;Policy Implications of Trends for Asian American Students&quot;, examine the performance of these students on state reading and math tests used for accountability under NCLB. The reports examine trends since 2002 in the percentages of students in each of the ethnic/racial group studied that reached the proficient level on state tests, the achievement gaps between each of the three subgroups and white students, and the performance of these students on 2008 state tests. The reports also explore possible...</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Improving Low-Performing Schools: Lessons from Five Years of Studying School Restructuring under No Child Left Behind</td>
<td>Caitlin Scott, Nancy Kober</td>
<td>On Dec 7, 2009, CEP held a forum in Washington, D.C. to discuss CEP's five-year study of schools in restructuring under NCLB. The event included a discussion of CEP's research on schools in restructuring under NCLB in six states — California, Georgia, Maryland, Michigan, New York and Ohio — and in 23 districts and 48 schools within those states. Panelist included an official from the U.S. Department of Education, as well as education leaders from states and school districts, and principals of successfully restructured schools. This report summarizes the presentations and discussion at that meeting.</td>
<td>High School Exit Exams, Exit Exams and Other Assessments, Arizona's instrument to measure standards, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, trends, state profiles, appendix tables, accountability, ethnic isolation, state testing data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Policy Implications of Trends for Asian American Students</td>
<td>Nancy Kober, Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky, Shelby Dietz</td>
<td>&quot;Improving Achievement for the Growing Latino Population Is Critical to the Nation’s Future, Student Achievement Policy Brief #3: Latino Students, 2010, Nancy Kober, Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky, Shelby Dietz, HumRRO, Sunny Becker, Hilary Campbell, Emily Dickinson, Rebecca Dvorak, Monica Gribben, Diane Stark Rentner, Jennifer McMurrer, tests, assessment, African American, Asian, Latino, Native American, white, low-income, Free lunch, Reduced-price lunch, FRPL, Gender, Male, Female, boy, girl, achievement gap, student achievement, percent proficient, mean scale scores, subgroup, reading, mathematics, math, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, trends, state profiles, appendix tables, accountability, ethnic isolation, state testing data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>State High School Tests: Exit Exams and Other Assessments</td>
<td>Shelby Dietz</td>
<td>CEP’s 9th annual report on high school exit exams discusses new developments in state high school exit exam policies and how students enrolled in school in states with these policies are affected. This year’s report finds that 28 states required high school exit exams in the 2009-10 school year (up from 26 in 2009), and public schools in those states enroll 83 percent of the nation’s students of color and more than three-quarters of the country’s low-income pupils. For the first time, this year’s report also includes information about graduation requirements in states that do not require exit exams.</td>
<td>State High School Tests: Exit Exams and Other Assessments, achievement gaps, ACT, Alabama, Alabama high school graduation exam, AHSGE, Alaska, Alaska high school graduation qualifying exam, alignment, Alternative Routes, Arizona, Arizona’s instrument to measure standards, AIMS, Arkansas, Arkansas Comprehensive Assessment Program, assessments, California, California's high school exit exam, CAHSEE, Common Core State Standards, disaggregated graduation rates, end-of-course exam,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract: Using data from state reading and mathematics tests, this report takes an in-depth look at the performance of male and female students. The study includes a national snapshot of 2008 achievement differences in both subjects at grades 4, 8, and in high school.

**State Test Score Trends Through 2007-08, Part 5: Are There Differences in Achievement Between Boys and Girls?**

**Author:** Naomi Chudowsky and Victor Chudowsky

**Abstract:** This report examines the performance of English language learners on state reading and mathematics tests, and discusses the issues surrounding the classification and testing of these students.

**State Test Score Trends Through 2008-09, Part 1: Rising Scores on State Tests and NAEP**

**Author:** Naomi Chudowsky and Victor Chudowsky

**Abstract:** This report compares state math and reading proficiency scores in grades 4 and 8 to National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) basic scores for the period of 2005 to 2009. The study found that scores on state tests and NAEP have increased in most states with sufficient data. Also included with the report are profiles for the 23 states that are included in the research because they did not have breaks in their testing data for the years studied.
achievement gap, student achievement, percent proficient, mean scale scores, subgroup, reading, mathematics, math, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, trends, state profiles, 2008-09 state profiles, basic, advanced, accountability, state testing data

Publication Date: September 15, 2010
Press Release (PDF format, 20.2 KB)
Topic: State Testing Data and Student Achievement

2010
Title: State Test Score Trends through 2008-09, Part 2: Slow and Uneven Progress in Narrowing Gaps
Author: Nancy Kober, Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky
Abstract: This report provides a detailed look at student performance on state tests and examines whether state-level results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) confirm the trends found on state tests. The report tracks data for all states and the District of Columbia in math and reading for grades 4, 8, and high school by student race, ethnicity, income, and gender from as early as 2002 through 2009, where three or more years of comparable data are available. Also available are 50 state profiles with detailed student achievement data and tables showing the performance of various student groups on 2009 state tests. Finally, also posted here are short video clips of CEP’s President and CEO Jack Jennings explaining the main findings of this study.

The Appendix Tables provides state-by-state tables showing the 2009 percentages proficient, mean test scores, and achievement gaps in reading and math for all major subgroups in the states with sufficient data.

View 2008-09 State Profiles

2010
Title: The Achievement Gap: Slow and Uneven Progress for Students
Author: CEP
Abstract: Center on Education Policy’s New Findings
After eight years of implementing the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and other school reforms, how much progress have states and school districts made in raising achievement for students from all backgrounds and closing achievement gaps based on race, ethnicity, income, and gender?

In its new report, the Center on Education Policy analyzed trends in reading and mathematics performance and achievement gaps for several groups of students: African American, Asian American, Latino, Native American, and white students, as well as low-income, male, and female students.

View the comments by CEP President Jack Jennings, as he shares his viewpoints on the report and what it means for education reform here. Preview: Jennings, Achievement Gap 1 from Spotlight on Vimeo.

What are the key findings of the report on the achievement gap in schools?

Jack Jennings, President, Center on Education Policy
What are the messages the report communicates?

Jack Jennings, President, Center on Education Policy
What is the impact on low-income children?

Jack Jennings, President, Center on Education Policy
What needs to change in schools in order to close the achievement gaps for poor children and children of color?

Jack Jennings, President, Center on Education Policy
What are the highlights of the report concerning Hispanic and Native American students?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Title: The Policy and Politics of Rewriting the Nation's Main Education Law</th>
<th>Author: Jack Jennings</th>
<th>Abstract: This article, written by CEP President and CEO Jack Jennings, looks at the prospects for reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education in the 112th Congress given the outcomes of the 2010 elections and the resulting divided government. The article appeared in the December 2010 <em>Kappan</em> magazine.</th>
<th>Publication Date: December 12, 2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Title: The Window is Closing on Sensible School Reform</td>
<td>Author: Jack Jennings</td>
<td>Abstract: This article, written by CEP President Jack Jennings, appeared in The Hill on March 2, 2010, and discusses the critical last chance that effective ESEA reauthorization now faces.</td>
<td>Publication Date: March 2, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Title: A Serious Step Backward</td>
<td>Author: Jack Jennings</td>
<td>Abstract: On October 24, the Huffington Post carried a blog written by Jack Jennings, CEP’s president and CEO, on the views of the Republican presidential aspirants on the role of the federal government in education.</td>
<td>Publication Date: October 24, 2011</td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Title: AYP Results for 2010-11</td>
<td>Alexandra Usher</td>
<td>This report updates previous CEP research with data from the 2010-11 school year on the number of schools not making adequate yearly progress (AYP) under the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB). The estimated percentage of all U.S. schools not making AYP was 48% in 2011, an all-time high and an increase from 39% in 2010. The report also provides six years of trends in the percentage of schools in all 50 states, D.C., and the nation not making AYP, using official numbers from the State Consolidated Performance Reports submitted to the U.S. Department of Education. AYP results for 2010-11, AYP, adequate yearly progress, NCLB, No Child Left Behind, Duncan, Department of Education, proficiency, 100%, 2014, 48%, ESEA, elementary and secondary education act, reauthorization, waiver, flexibility, backload, cut score, consolidated state performance report, Alabama, Arkansas, Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Connecticut, D.C., Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, north Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication Date: December 15, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report (PDF format, 240 KB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic: Federal Education Policy &amp; Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Title: Discussion of CEP Report State Test Score Trends Through 2008-09</td>
<td>Jack Jennings</td>
<td>On April 5, 2011, CEP released a report that provides a detailed look at student performance on 8th grade state reading and math tests, tracks testing data by student race, ethnicity, income, and gender from as early as 2002 through 2009. The report finds that contrary to popular wisdom, there have generally been upward trends in state reading and math test scores at 8th grade. The progress is more noteworthy in math, where every state with sufficient data made gains in the percentage of 8th grade students reaching the advanced level and all but one of these states showed gains at the proficient level. In most of the states, however, gaps have widened between lower- and higher-achieving subgroups of 8th graders at the advanced level in math. Watch the video below to hear CEP President and CEO Jack Jennings, and Deborah Kasak, Executive Director of the National Forum to Accelerate Middle-Grades Reform, discuss the report’s findings. Spotlight: CEP Middle School Report from Spotlight on Vimeo. Click here to view videos by topic.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication Date: April 8, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(format, Invalid size argument)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Title: Discussion of CEP Report State Test Score Trends Through 2008-09</td>
<td>Jack Jennings</td>
<td>On October 5th, 2011, Progress Lags in High School, Especially for Advanced Achievers, CEP’s latest report on student achievement, was the topic of a taped discussion sponsored by Spotlight on Poverty and Opportunity. Jack Jennings, CEP’s president and CEO was one of the discussants. Poverty Single Most Important Factor in High School Achievement from Spotlight on Vimeo. CEP Report Findings on High School Achievement from Spotlight on Vimeo. Common Standards Impact on Future from Spotlight on Vimeo. State Test Score Trends Through 2008-09, Part 5: Progress Lags in High School, Especially for Advanced Achievers, high school, student achievement, achievement trends, tests, math, English language arts, reading, achievement gap, proficient, proficiency, advanced, state tests, mean scores, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, accountability, state tests</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication Date: October 5, 2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(format, Invalid size argument)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Title: Federal Aid to the Schools - Wasteful or Helpful?</td>
<td>Jack Jennings</td>
<td>This blog posted on April 21, 2011, in the Huffington Post, by Jack Jennings counters the criticisms of conservative critics of federal aid to education by describing the equity purpose of this aid and then highlighting the major educational achievements of the groups principally targeted for this assistance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Get the Federal Government Out of Education? That Wasn’t the Founding Fathers’ Vision</td>
<td>Jack Jennings</td>
<td>February 7, 2011</td>
<td>In this article, written by Jack Jennings, CEP’s president and appearing in the February 7, 2011 Huffington Post, discusses the history of the federal role in education, and gives reasons why the federal government should continue to be involved in education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Get The Federal Government Out Of Education? That Wasn’t The Founding Fathers’ Vision</td>
<td>Jack Jennings</td>
<td>February 7, 2011</td>
<td>This article, written by Jack Jennings, CEP’s president and appearing in the February 7, 2011 Huffington Post, discusses the history of the federal role in education, and gives reasons why the federal government should continue to be involved in education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Keywords:** African American Students, Elementary And Secondary Education Act, Federal Aid To The Schools—Wasteful Or Helpful?, Individuals With Disabilities Education Act, Latino Students, National Assessment Of Educational Progress, Title IX, Academic Achievement, Equality Of Educational Opportunity, Equity, Esca, Federal Aid To Education, Idea, Mathematics, Naep, Nclb, No Child Left Behind, Reading, Students Of Color, Students With Disabilities, Education News,
2011
Title: Have We Gotten It Wrong on School Reform?
Author: Jack Jennings
Abstract: This November 23, 2011 Huffington Post blog written by CEP’s president Jack Jennings highlights a recent study of the education systems in Shanghai (China), Finland, Japan, Singapore, and Ontario (Canada), and discusses what lessons can be learned from these countries to help improve public education in the United States.
Keyword: benchmarking, common state standards, international studies, education funding, teacher pay, teacher preparation, student testing, the No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB, Obama, Have We Gotten It Wrong on School Reform?
Publication Date: November 23, 2011
Blog Post (PDF format, 337 KB)
Topic: Public School Facts & History

2011
Title: Public Radio Podcast on the Future of the No Child Left Behind Act
Author: CEP
Abstract: On April 29, American RadioWorks, the producer of documentaries for public radio, released its podcast on the future of the No Child Left Behind Act. The program was an interview with Jack Jennings, CEP’s president and CEO.
Listen to the podcast here.
Keyword: The Future of the No Child Left Behind Act, the No Child Left Behind Act, NCLB.
Publication Date: April 29, 2011
( format, Invalid size argument)
Topic: Federal Education Policy & Programs

2011
Title: State Test Score Trends Through 2008-09, Part 3: Student Achievement at 8th Grade
Author: Naomi Chudowsky, Victor Chudowsky
Abstract: This report, which provides a detailed look at student performance on 8th grade state reading and math tests, tracks testing data by student race, ethnicity, income, and gender from as early as 2002 through 2009. State test results are analyzed when three or more years of comparable data are available, and student performance at the basic, proficient, and advanced achievement levels are included in the analysis. The main finding is that, contrary to popular wisdom, there have generally been upward trends in state reading and math test scores at 8th grade. The progress is more noteworthy in math, where every state with sufficient data made gains in the percentage of 8th grade students reaching the advanced level and all but one of these states showed gains at the proficient level. In most of the states, however, gaps have widened between lower- and higher-achieving subgroups of 8th graders at the advanced level in math.
Also available are 50 state profiles with detailed student achievement data and tables showing the performance of various student groups on state tests.
View 2008-09 State Profiles
Keyword: State Test Score Trends through 2008-09, Part 3: Student Achievement at 8th Grade, achievement, tests, assessment, 8th grade, middle school, African American, Asian-American, Latino, Native American, white, low-income, free lunch, reduced-price lunch, FRPL, gender, male, female, boy, girl, achievement gap, basic, proficient, advanced, mean scale scores, subgroup, reading, language arts, mathematics, math, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, trends, state profiles, accountability, state testing data
Publication Date: April 5, 2011
Press Release (PDF format, 18.8 KB)
Topic: State Testing Data and Student Achievement

2011
Title: State Test Score Trends Through 2008-09, Part 4: Is Achievement Improving and Are Gaps Narrowing for Title I Students?
Author: Nancy Kober, Jennifer McMurrer, Malini R. Silva
Abstract: This report compares achievement trends since 2002 (or a more recent year in some states) on state reading and math tests for Title I students and students not participating in Title I. The largest of the federal aid programs for K-12 schools, Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 supports extra instructional services for low-performing students in low-income schools and for all students in the highest-poverty schools. Generally, achievement on state reading and math tests has improved in recent years for students participating in the Title I program in most of the 19 states with comparable data. Further, gaps between Title I participants and non-participants have also narrowed more often than they have widened since 2002, although trends were more positive at grades 8 and high school than at grade 4.
A one-page profile of state-specific performance trends for Title I and non-Title I students is available for each of the 19 states included in the study.

View 2008-09 State Profiles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>State Test Score Trends Through 2008-09, Part 5: Progress Lags in High School, Especially for Advanced Achievers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Jennifer McMurrer and Nancy Kober</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>This report examines testing data from 40 states and the District of Columbia from 2002 through 2009 and finds that while high school scores on state English language arts and math tests rose in most states, smaller proportions of states made gains in high school compared with 4th and 8th grades. State testing data also show a lack of progress and widening gaps between various groups of high school students at the advanced level in many states. A supplemental appendix with listings of where states fall within the various analyses for this study is available as well as one-page profiles of state-specific performance trends at the advanced achievement levels for nine states.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Date</td>
<td>October 5, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>State Testing Data and Student Achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Turning Around the Lowest Performing Schools: A Noble Goal and a Daunting Challenge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Jack Jennings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>In this blog posted on April 7, 2011 in the Huffington Post, Jack Jennings describes the intent and weighs the prospects for success of President Obama’s initiative to make improvements in the nation’s lowest performing schools. The blog draws on the research conducted by CEP on schools needing restructuring under NCLB in assessing the chances for major improvement in these lowest performing schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Date</td>
<td>April 7, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Federal Education Policy &amp; Programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>AYP Results for 2010-11 — May 2012 Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Alexandra Usher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>This report updates the December, 2011 report “AYP Results for 2010-11” to include AYP data from school year 2010-11 for New York State. Several numbers throughout the report have changed as a result of the new data from New York. Most notably, the estimated percentage of all public schools in the nation that did not make AYP for 2011 has been revised from 48% to 49%, an all-time high and an increase from 39% in 2010. The report also provides six years of trends in the percentage of schools in all 50 states, D.C., and the nation not making AYP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication Date</td>
<td>May 8, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Federal Education Policy &amp; Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Title: AYP Results for 2010-11 — November 2012 Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Author: Alexandra Usher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abstract: This report updates the May, 2012 report AYP Results for 2010-11 to include AYP data from the Consolidated State Performance Reports from the U.S. Department of Education. Several numbers have changed as a result of the new data. The estimated percentage of all public schools in the nation that did not make AYP for 2011 was 48%, an all-time high and an increase from 39% in 2010. The report also provides six years of trends in the percentage of schools in all 50 states, D.C., and the nation not making AYP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication Date: November 1, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Report (PDF format, 119 KB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Topic: Federal Education Policy &amp; Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Title: Major Accountability Themes of Second-Round State Applications for NCLB Waivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Wayne Riddle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abstract: This report analyzes the NCLB waiver applications submitted in the second round by 26 states and Washington, D.C. to the U.S. Department of Education in February 2012. Among the findings in the report is that, like the first round of applications, these states are proposing new accountability systems that will lead to greater complexity both within states and between states, but at the same time will be more integrated with states' own existing accountability systems. Also, nearly all the state applications propose annual achievement targets and performance levels that are more nuanced than what is currently in place under NCLB. At the same time, 19 of the 27 applications analyzed will use a combined subgroup for accountability decisions, rather than all of the student subgroups mandated under NCLB. None of the states analyzed will continue to require school choice and SES in schools identified for improvement, as is currently mandated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keyword: waivers, no child left behind, accountability, common core state standards, adequate yearly progress, subgroups, NCLB, flexibility, No Child Left Behind, Duncan, ESEA, elementary and secondary education act</td>
</tr>
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<td>Publication Date: May 8, 2012</td>
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<td>Report (PDF format, 274 KB)</td>
</tr>
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<td>Topic: Federal Education Policy &amp; Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Title: Makeovers, Facelifts, or Reconstructive Surgery: An Early Look At NCLB School Restructuring In Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Author: Caitlin Scott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abstract: Examination of the restructuring phase mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act in three Michigan school districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Keyword: Makeovers, Facelifts, or Reconstructive Surgery: An Early Look At NCLB School Restructuring In Michigan, No Child Left Behind, NCLB, Adequate Yearly Progress, AYP, restructuring, restructure, sanctioned, sanction, implementation, underperforming, federal option, reform, federal, fund, governance, monitoring, support, test scores, options, assistance, support, state, district, approach, benchmark assessments, replace staff, negative consequences, strategies, federal mandate, Title I, Michigan, coach, interview, contract management, charter school, Improving America's Schools Act, IASA, Idaho, Nevada, accountability, Lansing, Detroit, external reform, Willow Run, Flint, Harrison, governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Publication Date: November 1, 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Full Report (PDF format, 188 KB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Title: NCLB Waivers and Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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This report describes states’ early experiences in applying for flexibility from key requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), also known as NCLB waivers, and their plans for implementing the new systems outlined in their applications. Findings from the 38 survey states indicate states believe that the waivers address several of the problems they see with the NCLB accountability requirements, however, many state officials are concerned about what will happen to the programs and policies in their waiver plans if ESEA is reauthorized. These and other key findings that emerged from the survey results are presented in this report.
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Abstract:
This report, based on a winter/spring 2013 survey of 40 Common Core State Standards-adopting states, examines state education agency (SEA) officials’ views on the federal role in implementing the standards. The report finds that, although a direct federal role in implementing the Common Core State Standards has been controversial, a majority of states in the survey support legislative and/or regulatory changes to the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act to help them with their implementation efforts. The report also addresses the issue of within-state opposition to standards and finds that the vast majority of survey states do not anticipate their state’s decision to adopt the standards will be reversed, limited or changed in 2013-14.
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Abstract:
What, if anything, can the federal government do to improve persistently low-performing schools and ensure that all students attend effective schools? Congressional efforts to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reveal deep differences on this central question. Many Congressional Republicans say the answer is to substantially reduce the federal role and increase state and local control of education, a philosophy embodied in the Student Success Act reported by the House education committee. Key Congressional Democrats disagree, as do civil rights organizations, the Secretary of Education, and some business leaders; these groups emphasize the importance of maintaining federal protections and tracking achievement for disadvantaged students and providing targeted funding to high-poverty schools. Senate education committee leaders have introduced a bipartisan bill that would retain some federal requirements but give states more latitude in how they hold schools accountable. The bill would also pass responsibility to states and school districts to determine how to improve low-performing schools.

To inform this debate, policymakers of diverse viewpoints can look to a body of research conducted over the past 13 years by the Center on Education Policy. Since 2002, CEP has studied implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act, particularly federal policies to improve low-performing schools and raise student achievement. This research includes state and local surveys, case studies, and analyses of test score trends. Summarized below are the main lessons learned from this body of work about the federal role in school improvement. These are by no means the only lessons from this research; all of the study reports on NCLB and school improvement are available for free at www.cep-dc.org.

1. **Allow some flexibility in the use of school improvement funds.** School improvement is often a complex, iterative, and evolving process in which school and community context influences choices and implementation. Until very recently, the Obama Administration’s rules for federal School Improvement Grants (SIGs) required recipients to use funds to implement one of four specific reform models. But the one-size fits all approach did not work for many grantees participating in CEP’s research, especially schools in rural areas. It will be important to build some flexibility into any federal role in assisting states and districts with improving schools.

2. **Recognize that even with a more flexible approach, some structure can be helpful in planning and implementing reforms.** The federal school reform models, though flawed, did provide a process and a structure that encouraged many low-performing schools to analyze data, consider how they were doing things, and determine how they might improve. For example, by virtue of having to respond to federal requirements to expand learning time, schools often ended up making better use of instructional time in the school day and finding more time for teacher development, planning, and collaboration.

3. **Provide dedicated funding for school and district reform.** Federal SIGs were often a welcome source of extra funding because they allowed district and school leaders to try new approaches for improving student learning. Typically, other funding streams received by district and schools were not realistic sources of support for school reform because they were already obligated for salaries and other expenses.
4. **Target a portion of federal dollars on improving the capacity of states and districts to help low-achieving schools.** Often state education agencies lack sufficient staff to provide technical assistance on school improvement, while districts lack staff to fashion reform plans and to identify academic, curricular, staffing, or other issues that affect school performance. Although money for improvement is needed at the school level, it’s just as important that federal funds are available to build state and local staffing capacity and expertise to help struggling schools.

5. **Recognize that real change may take longer than a three- or five-year grant cycle.** There is a tendency among policymakers to declare a program or a policy a failure if it does not show immediate positive results. It takes time, however, to bring about systemic change and increase student achievement in schools that educate large proportions of low-income and disadvantaged students. For example, many schools that received federal SIGs funds focused the first year or more of their grant on improving school safety, attendance, parent involvement, and other aspects of school climate, which they viewed as a necessary precondition to improving achievement.

6. **Sustain funding for improvement activities.** SIGs are provided for a limited number of years on the theory that local or state funds will gradually replace the federal dollars to sustain activities. CEP’s research shows, however, that more often than not when the federal money goes away, so does the reform effort, no matter how promising.

7. **Study and report on school improvement efforts.** Although the U.S. Department of Education has released some data on the impact of SIGs, there is much more to be learned about the state, district, and school roles in planning and implementing school improvement. For example, which approaches worked and did not work for states and schools to improve student achievement? And what were the conditions that contributed to the successes and obstacles of these approaches? What is needed is a sustained, multi-tiered federal approach to study school improvement efforts that are underway; this should include funds for localized, timely, and actionable research as well as larger federal data collection and analysis across multiple sites.

CEP’s research points to the need for a balanced federal role in school improvement that reduces some requirements but still provides a degree of structure; that provides dedicated funding for schools, districts, and states to carry out their respective responsibilities; and that allows for sustained support over a sufficient period of time.

Thoughtful policymaking requires attention to lessons from the past, continued attention to emerging information in the present, and a candid discussion of how the past and present can inform the future. We hope that the House and Senate education committee members will take into consideration the valuable research done by CEP and other groups when crafting an ESEA policy on the federal role in improving low-performing schools.