

## *NCLB at Six*

Belinda S. Black  
North Carolina Department of Public Instruction

This article presents a summary of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law as it has been implemented in North Carolina. Part II describes the origin and intent of the legislation. Part III describes various measures that may be used in gauging the success of NCLB in North Carolina, including results from various student performance indicators. Part IV discusses the concept of “failing” schools under NCLB, the sequences of sanction, and the effects of these sanctions on the state’s capacity to provide assistance. Part V lists and discusses the problematic aspects of NCLB’s implementation, including the unintended consequences of the law. Part VI provides a brief summary of how students “count” under the law and whether or not some students may go uncounted, and concludes the article. Part VII includes the references cited in the article.

### Origin and Intent

In the 1830’s, the push for public education gained momentum when reformers like Horace Mann, secretary of the Massachusetts board of education, promoted the notion of the ‘common-school.’ These schools . . . would transform children into moral, literate, and productive citizens; eliminate poverty and crime; quell class conflict; and unify a population that was becoming more ethnically diverse. A public investment in education would ultimately benefit everyone, they maintained, and would make schools accountable to the American people. (Center on Education Policy, 2007)

These lofty ideals are strikingly similar to the principles articulated by proponents of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This Act, which became law in 2002, was the reauthorization of the historic Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 (ESEA), and part of President Lyndon Johnson’s War on Poverty. ESEA created the Title I program to provide funds to schools serving students in poverty. NCLB, however, adds several new twists: it aims for 100 percent of America’s students to be proficient in reading and mathematics by 2013-14, made possible by a strong accountability program, annual assessments, and the placement of highly qualified teachers in every classroom.

More than 1.3 million students attend the North Carolina’s approximately 2,300 public schools. High stakes testing and accountability are not new to this state. The ABCs of Public Education, a successful school-based management and accountability system, has held local districts and schools accountable since 1996-97.

The NCLB law, however, is a newer, heavier, and far more controversial layer of accountability for the schools and districts in the state. The state’s ABCs policies and practices were refitted in 2002-03 to incorporate federal accountability requirements. NCLB’s goal is to close achievement gaps between minority and majority subgroups of students by setting high standards with zero tolerance for failure. Student proficiency is measured against a benchmark. Schools or student subgroups either reach that benchmark or fail – as that term is defined by NCLB.

## How NCLB Works

NCLB is the first federal law to sanction public school choice and is far-reaching in its impact: it affects states, communities, school districts, schools, and families. Core provisions of NCLB seek to improve the chances for success for historically underserved student populations. The Act incorporates many of federal educational entitlement programs, such as Titles I, II, III, IV, V, and X, and awards grants to meet a wide range of educational needs, from language acquisition for English language learners to assistance for homeless students. Every state is required to implement a strong accountability system based on summative assessments in grades three through eight and grade ten. The law demands 100 percent proficiency in reading and mathematics by the end of 2013-14. Schools must meet what NCLB terms adequate yearly progress, or AYP, each school year, and close the achievement gaps between various ethnically diverse, opportunity-diverse, and ability-diverse subgroups of students. Certain schools that do not achieve AYP for two consecutive years enter “school improvement,” and face a series of escalating sanctions, ranging from public school choice to alternative governance.

Early in the implementation process, states decided whether all schools or only Title I schools (because they receive the federal funds) are subject to NCLB sanctions. North Carolina, like several other states, chose the latter. The sequence of NCLB school improvement sanctions apply only to the Title I schools in the state, which means only those schools are required to offer public school choice options if they do not meet AYP.

NCLB requires rigorous teacher credentialing to ensure highly qualified teachers in every classroom. It also requires extensive public reporting of teacher quality and AYP results and demands that schools involve parents in the improvement process. If schools are failing according to NCLB standards, the reasons why they are failing must be made public.

The nation and all states have been holding schools accountable under this system for five years. Is NCLB working? Argument abounds: the U.S. Department of Education (USED) claims success. Secretary of Education Spellings compared the law to Ivory soap: she said it is working, and is 99 percent pure. Others disagree, arguing the Act is a failed and unconstitutional intrusion into states’ rights to control education. Critics and proponents alike measure whether NCLB is working by gains or losses in student achievement. Often, in measuring the success of NCLB, any positive changes in student performance since 2002-03 (the year the law was first implemented) are offered as proof of NCLB’s success. While NCLB may have some bearing on how schools hold student subgroups accountable, there is no definitive evidence that changes in student achievement are attributable to increased accountability under NCLB.

NCLB has, without question, highlighted the achievement gaps between subgroup populations in the nation’s schools. In North Carolina, ten student groups are held accountable to the same high standards. NCLB-required public reporting of subgroup performance provides the state and nation with uncontroverted evidence of gaps in educational attainment among subgroups. In recognition of the importance of this measure, the North Carolina General Assembly adopted NCLB subgroup accountability as the state’s “Closing the Gap” component for the state’s accountability program (N.C. Gen. Stat. §115C-105.35).

Figure 1 illustrates subgroup performance in North Carolina for 2007. The bar furthest right indicates the reading benchmark, or goal, for performance in grades three through eight.

The goal is 76.7 percent proficiency, as measured by end-of-grade tests. Statewide, six of the ten subgroups (all, American Indian, Asian, white, multiracial, and economically disadvantaged) reached or surpassed the benchmark, while four others (black, Hispanic, limited English proficient, and students with disabilities) did not. (However, two subgroups, black and Hispanic, reached the goal of proficiency when North Carolina's growth formula approved by the U.S. Department of Education was applied.) NCLB's requirement to publicize proficiency disparities like these is important. For too long, the state and nation have been complacent about the lack of equity in academic achievement.

**Figure 1.** *Reading Proficiency in North Carolina, Grades 3 through 8, 2007.*

Has student achievement improved under NCLB in North Carolina? Some experts have suggested that the National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP), sometimes called the nation's report card, should be used in determining any such improvement under NCLB. NAEP reading and mathematics assessments are given to sample student populations in each state at grades four and eight. NCLB's success in improving student performance, the experts argue, should result in higher scores on NAEP. NAEP scores, however, show mixed results. The NAEP average scale scores for North Carolina's fourth and eighth graders in reading declined under NCLB. In 2002, the state's average NAEP reading score at grade four was 222, and in 2005, it fell to 217. In 2007, the grade 4 reading score was 218. At grade eight, in 2002, the average reading scale score was 265, and it fell to 258. In 2007, the grade eight score was 259. Mathematics scores paint a brighter picture. In 2002 the mathematics score at grade four was 230. In 2005, it rose to 241; in 2007, it rose to 242. The grade eight score in mathematics in 2002 was 276. In 2005, it rose to 282; in 2007, it rose to 284.

Do the state's test results show similar trends under NCLB? Statewide reading results for grades three through eight rose 2.9 percentage points from 2003 to 2007. The state's proficiency benchmarks increase incrementally (every three years) in order to reach 100 percent by 2013-14,

which means that even with the bar rising in 2004-05, reading performance crept upward. There was a small gain of 1.3 percentage points in the “all students” proficiency in mathematics during the same period in the elementary grades. State assessments also show some increase in the proficiency of subgroups. Statewide, the students with disabilities subgroup increased 7.6 percentage points in reading proficiency (grades three through eight) from 2003 to 2006. The limited English proficient subgroup proficiency increased by 14.4 percentage points during the same period. It is important here to understand that these two subgroups posed special concerns in the states and USED in determining AYP. Some states did not want to include these students in their state assessments, but NCLB required them to do so. Then, amid complaints, the USED loosened some of the regulations, offering greater flexibility to states in calculating AYP for these two subgroups. Thus, much of the progress shown in these data is due not to actual improvement in student performance, but rather to amending the rules surrounding subgroup accountability. Indeed, North Carolina and other states have changed their accountability rules, which are submitted to USED for approval in an accountability workbook, many times since the law was passed in 2001. North Carolina has amended its workbook 29 times since 2002, with other amendments under consideration for 2008-09.

Have achievement gaps narrowed under NCLB? Results of reading multiple choice end-of-grade tests in grades 3 through 8 indicate that some gaps narrowed from 2003 to 2007 in North Carolina. The black/white gap narrowed by 2.3 percentage points, and the achievement gap between students with disabilities and non-disabled students narrowed by an impressive 9.7 percentage points, but again, rule changes broadened accountability guidelines for the students with disabilities subgroup during this period.

A brief look at how the state performed in meeting its AYP targets from 2003 to 2007 may offer further evidence related to NCLB’s effectiveness. Every school, every district, and the state as a whole are held accountable under NCLB to make AYP. To achieve this, subgroups, schools, districts, and the state are required to meet a series of performance and participation targets. The number of targets the state is required to meet has remained fairly static: in 2003, the state had 81 targets, and in 2007, it had 82. North Carolina met 65 of 81 targets, or 80.2 percent, in 2003. When the proficiency bar was raised in 2005, the state met only 61 targets (75.3 percent). In 2006, the state met 66 of 82 targets, or 80.2 percent. While the state has not made AYP under NCLB (because to do so it must meet all its targets), its performance has been consistent.

To summarize the achievement results that may address the question of whether NCLB is working to improve student achievement and close achievement gaps, NAEP scores indicate mixed results; state assessment results show mixed results with some achievement gaps narrowing. The percent of AYP targets met indicates consistent performance under the law, but there is no dramatic evidence to point to either success or failure of NCLB in raising achievement and closing the gaps.

### “Failing” Schools and Districts

Early criticism of NCLB by major education advocacy groups and educational researchers warned that the conjunctive, all or nothing aspect of making AYP under NCLB would lead to more and more schools and districts being labeled as failures. One hundred percent proficiency was unrealistic, they argued, and would set schools and districts up for failure. In North Carolina, these prophecies ring true. When NCLB was implemented, the state

was already operating under a proven accountability program. That program identified schools making progress and schools that were low-performing; it recognized schools for reaching high levels of proficiency and provided assistance to the lowest performing schools. When NCLB was incorporated into the state's model, however, the state found itself in an odd situation of having to recognize certain schools for making progress under the state accountability model, but sanctioning these same schools for failing under the NCLB rules.

In 2006-07, for example, 128 schools recognized as schools of distinction under the state's ABCs program failed to make AYP, while 476 of the state's schools of progress failed to do so. Perhaps even more surprising, six of the state's low-performing schools (identified by ABCs results) made AYP. Discord remains between the two accountability programs. For example, North Carolina's ABCs program offers incentives for ensuring that even a school's best performing students continue their academic growth. NCLB focuses only on all students reaching a minimum level of proficiency.

What do schools (or districts) who fail to make AYP do? Over half of all North Carolina's schools (55.2 percent) failed to make AYP under NCLB in 2007. Over half of the state's Title I schools failed to make AYP as well. There were 456 Title I schools that either moved into or continued in "school improvement" under NCLB. This was more than a 50 percent increase over the number of Title I schools in improvement from the previous year. By any measure, this creates a strain on the Department of Public Instruction (DPI)'s and the district's capacity to deliver technical assistance.

What are Title I schools in improvement required to do? They must notify parents by letter of the school's status, how it came to be in improvement, what school leaders intend to do to exit improvement, and how parents can assist with these efforts. They must revise their school improvement plan within three months. Non-Title I schools are required to do this as well if they fail to make AYP for two consecutive years in the same subject. If the Title I schools are in the first year of improvement, they must offer school choice, and receive technical assistance (from the DPI or the district).

Each year that the school continues in improvement, the level of sanction increases. In the second year, the school must offer choice, offer supplemental educational services for the students with the greatest economic need, and receive technical assistance. If the school fails to make AYP again in the same subject area, it enters corrective action. At this level, the district must take one of several actions prescribed in the law. At the same time that the school moves to a weightier sanction, it must offer public school choice, supplemental educational services, and receive technical assistance.

If the school still does not make AYP in the subject that placed it in improvement, the district must plan for restructuring, a phase during which the plans are developed for replacing the old, failing school with a new, and ultimately, more successful school. Finally, if the school still doesn't make AYP in the identified subject area, the school is re-opened as a fully restructured school, under new management, or with different student populations or grade configurations. This improvement process takes seven years from the original failure to make AYP. Thus far, only one school in North Carolina has been restructured.

Districts also are accountable for making AYP and are treated as one large school under NCLB. All students' scores, irrespective of their particular schools, (if they are full academic year students), roll up to the district level to count towards AYP. Only three districts in North Carolina made AYP in 2007. These districts were small with few subgroups. So not only does the state have more than half its schools "failing" schools under NCLB, it has 60 districts in Title I district improvement. (Each school district in North Carolina receives Title I funds under NCLB, so all 115 districts are considered Title I districts.)

When identified for improvement, the district must set aside ten percent of its Title I funds for professional development and revise its district improvement plan to address its failure to make AYP. If the district fails to exit district improvement (which it can do only by meeting all targets at either one of the three grade spans in the content area that placed it in improvement) after two years, it enters a more serious stage, during which the DPI is responsible for administering corrective action. In 2007-08, the state has 26 districts under the sanction of corrective action. With limited resources at DPI, the capacity to address the needs for improvement in 456 schools and 60 districts under current NCLB provisions is sorely tested.

### Problem Areas

There are some troublesome aspects of NCLB's implementation, including areas in which the rules and common sense collide, and in which NCLB reporting requirements raise ethical considerations. Concerns include:

- non-uniformity of the law's implementation across the states;
- a lack of transparency in accountability practices;
- heavy reliance on state assessments, and expert data collection systems;
- defining troublesome NCLB components like graduation rate and teacher quality; and
- ethical concerns associated with labeling student subgroups and rights to privacy.

In addition, there are ongoing concerns about loopholes in the way that students are counted. Lastly, of course, is the issue that has taken states to court: the issue of NCLB being an unfunded mandate.

There is a surprising lack of uniformity in the implementation of NCLB accountability across all the states. The best example of this lack of uniformity is the sample, or "N" size, that states use to define subgroups. NCLB does not require a uniform sample size for calculating AYP, so states have chosen their own. North Carolina chose 40. If there are only 39 students in a school that belong to the same subgroup classification, that subgroup does not exist in the eyes of NCLB in North Carolina. Maryland chose five as its sample size to form a subgroup; in Tennessee, the "N" size is 45; in Louisiana, the "N" size is 10; and in Nevada, the "N" size is 25.

Lack of uniformity has bred non-transparency in accountability measures. For example, in the first year of NCLB, North Carolina's calculation to determine AYP was straightforward. If the school missed one or more of its targets in reading or mathematics, it failed to make AYP. If it missed AYP for two years, it moved into improvement. This straightforward approach was changed by amendment in an attempt to have fewer schools "failing" to make AYP. Today, schools must miss targets in the same subject for two years in a row in order to move into improvement.

North Carolina also added a margin of error (confidence interval) to AYP calculations. Now subgroups that miss proficiency targets by narrow margins may be deemed to meet targets through application of a confidence interval. Other amendments have made it more difficult for districts to enter improvement, and have changed the subgroup “N” size in larger districts. NCLB’s heavy reliance on testing, psychometrics, and data systems is another area of concern. The Act requires valid and reliable assessments, and test development is a labor-intensive, costly process. Even for states using off-the-shelf tests, the costs are considerable. When the curriculum changes, or when new test editions are published, a common scale for equating the older and newer test versions must be developed. This again requires extensive psychometric expertise. One criticism of NCLB has been its heavy reliance on test development and assessments, leading one think tank to quip that the law should be renamed No Psychometrician Left Unemployed.

NCLB is also reliant on states having fairly sophisticated data collection systems. When NCLB was implemented in North Carolina, for example, the state had no way to track a cohort of students moving from grade nine to graduation in four years. The state proposed using what it termed a simple graduation rate, which was the percentage of *graduates* who finished high school in four or fewer years as a placeholder until cohort data could be collected. This rate, 97 percent (in 2003), raised many eyebrows, and caused some embarrassment when it was published.

In 2006, North Carolina published its first cohort graduation rate, a far more realistic 68.1 percent. This example of reporting graduation rates points to one of the most challenging aspects of the NCLB implementation: the need for large, stable, and effective data collection systems capable of tracking students over time.

It is critical that schools and districts act as stewards of their data: they must maintain quality data at their level and closely scrutinize published results. It is imperative that districts and schools ask questions if results do not look as they should. What if a school or district believes a misidentification has been made? Under NCLB, all states must have a review period and an appeal process in place. In North Carolina, districts have two weeks to appeal their status identification. There have been only two appeals of AYP status during the past four years: one was successful in overturning a designation, the other was not.

Perhaps no part of NCLB has gained greater enmity among educators than the highly qualified teacher provisions. Highly qualified was defined as content mastery in core subject areas, evidenced by credentialing, college major, or performance on a rigorous state teacher’s exam. The law requires every core content class to be taught by a highly qualified teacher and set a deadline for that to happen. States submitted plans to USED to account for failure to reach the 100 percent highly qualified target, and the deadline was been extended to the end of the 2006-07 school year. Some teachers with years of experience and proven records were not deemed highly qualified because they did not hold degrees in the many subjects they were responsible for teaching. Data collected by the DPI indicated that in 2006-07, 97.2% of the core academic classes in North Carolina were taught by highly qualified teachers. However, the data also point out what many already knew to be true: the neediest classrooms have fewer highly qualified teachers. Sadly, the law does not address this. In a state already beset with a teacher shortage, the highly qualified teacher requirements add confusion, frustrations, and headaches for schools, districts, and state administrators.

In addition, many believe rigid testing demands have narrowed curricula and have resulted in less creative and more test-focused teaching. A recent study was critical of U.S. education policy because it “focuses too much on teacher qualifications and not enough on teachers being engaging and supportive” (Toppo, 2007).

Any discussion of inherent problems with the NCLB legislation must include mention of a lawsuit filed in August 2005 by the State of Connecticut against the USED alleging that NCLB imposes millions of dollars in unfunded federal mandates in violation of the Unfunded Mandates Provision of the Act itself. (State of Connecticut, 2007). On March 19, 2007, Connecticut filed a motion asking the Court to require Secretary Spellings to submit records for the State's appeal of the denial of its amendments regarding special education and English language learner student testing. As yet there is no resolution in this case.

One of the earliest criticisms of NCLB dealt with the burdensome and costly nature of compliance, and state and local capacities to fulfill its requirements. Some states' districts have chosen to refuse federal Title I dollars rather than comply with the law. On February 5, 2008, the federal government requested expedited rehearing and rehearing en banc of the January 7 decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit in *School District of the City of Pontiac, et al. v. Secretary of the United States Department of Education* (No. 05-2708). A divided panel ruled that states may choose to accept federal funds yet refuse to comply with the Act's requirements. Based on a perceived ambiguity in one provision, 20 U.S.C. § 7907(a), the panel declared that states and their school districts “need not comply with the Act's requirements where federal funds do not cover the increased cost of compliance.”

#### Who Counts?

No issue regarding problems with NCLB has received more attention than how students are counted in determining AYP. In North Carolina, only full academic year students are included in AYP calculations. A full academic year is defined by the State Board of Education as 140 days. Transient students, not counted at a school level, may count at the district level if they move to another school within the district and remain in the district for 140 days. Otherwise, their performance does not count toward making AYP.

A subgroup cannot exist in a school or district if there are fewer than 40 students in that group. An additional caveat is that these 40 students must be full academic year students. Again, if there are only 39 full academic year students with disabilities in a school, that school does not have a student with disabilities subgroup. In this case, these 39 students' test results are counted in the all students subgroup and may be counted in their respective racial, economic and language subgroups.

The number of students uncounted by NCLB is relatively small. Table 1 shows the numbers of students statewide that were not counted in AYP in reading in grades three through eight in 2007. There were slightly more than 4,500 students, or .7 percent of the total students tested in North Carolina (in reading in elementary and middle grades), that were uncounted at the state level.

Table 1

*Number of Students Tested and Full Academic Year (FAY) Students in North Carolina, Reading Grades 3-8, 2007*

NC Students	All	American Indian	Asian	Black	Hispanic	Multi-racial	White	Row Totals
# Tested	657,603	9,575	14,808	186,172	61,879	21,098	364,116	1,297,410
# FAY	655,367	9,572	14,331	186,012	60,353	21,077	364,012	1,292,324
<b>Difference</b>	<b>2,296</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>477</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>1,526</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>4,587</b>

Source: 2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Results by Subgroup, NCDPI

Are some students over-counted in computing adequate yearly progress? Some say “yes.” Take for example a poor Hispanic student who is disabled and has limited English proficiency. This student’s scores, if he is a full academic year student, and if the school and district “N” sizes are adequate, may contribute five times in the school’s AYP calculations. His scores count in the school as a whole (all students) subgroup, the Hispanic subgroup, the economically disadvantaged subgroup, the limited English proficient subgroup, and the students with disabilities subgroup. The National School Boards Association has protested this kind of overrepresentation of certain students. Others have suggested that these students are very important students, and since they wield considerable impact on AYP, the school should make efforts to ensure their optimum performance.

Such subgroup categorization of students is positive in highlighting gaps in achievement, but there is a down side to this kind of data slicing. NCLB data requirements are heavy on labeling (some labels may be construed as pejorative). Imagine how it would feel to be a member of one of these subgroups: “limited proficient,” “disadvantaged,” or having “disabilities.” Labeling students and groups within the schools raises ethical concerns. Each time educators use terms like “limited English proficient” or “students with disabilities” they are making assumptions and inferences about human potential.

A particular concern, for example, has arisen with the labeling of what was originally supposed to be called the economically disadvantaged subgroup. As data managers and programmers developed processes for identifying the students who compose this subgroup, they began using a far more sensitive label: the Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) subgroup. Check out the state’s AYP web site, or web sites from other states, and see how often terms like “Free and Reduced Lunch,” a designation that the U.S. Department of Agriculture considers highly confidential, is used in public reporting. Schools, districts, and states must be careful in protecting student privacy and family rights. In North Carolina, in order to protect anonymity, results for fewer than five students in a subgroup are not published. Labeling practices and categorization, however, have unintended consequences.

Despite its promise, NCLB has not proven to solve or even perfectly define inequities and areas for improvement in public education. To fulfill its mission, NCLB must evolve into a

program that is more transparent, uniform, and sensitive to issues like reliance on high stakes testing, teacher quality, and methods of determining adequate yearly progress.

When the No Child Left Behind Act became law, advocates cheered and opponents decided to wait it out for five years. The law was scheduled for reauthorization in 2007, and the debate is raging on Capitol Hill. Political pundits pose different theories about when the law may actually be reauthorized, but most agree that it is likely to be at least 2009.

Reauthorization did not happen according to the law's original timeline. Now, with the 2008 election year in full swing, Secretary Spellings is visiting a number of states to participate in roundtable meetings and discuss progress toward No Child Left Behind goals. With the leading presidential candidates curiously silent on the law's reauthorization, the outcome is uncertain. What is certain is that no federal education law has ever had the far-reaching impact or consequences of No Child Left Behind during the past six years.

### References

- 2006 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Results by Subgroup [Data table]. Available from North Carolina Public Schools Web site, <http://ayp.ncpublicschools.org/nclb2006/AypDetail.cgi>.
- Aspen Institute. (2007). *Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the Promise to Our Nation's Children*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Black, B. (2007, March 13). *Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization: Improving NCLB to Close the Achievement Gap*. Notes from the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions and the House Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, D.C: Unpublished.
- Center of Educational Policy. (2007). *Why We Still Need Public Schools: Public Education for the Common Good*. Washington, D.C: Author.
- Deshryver, D. (2007, April 6). *Federal Update*. Washington, D.C.: Brustein and Manasevit.
- No Retreat on School Reform. (2007, March 26). *The Washington Post*, p. A15.
- NCLB at 5 in NC. (2007, February). *North Carolina NCLB News*. 1-3. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina Department of Public Instruction.
- NCLB QueryMaster news alerts.
- Spillan, S. (2007, February 22). *Federal Update*. Washington, D.C.: Brustein and Manasevit.
- State of Connecticut Attorney General's Office. (2007). Attorney General's legal action in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act. Hot Topics. Available from <http://www.ct.gov/AG/cwp/view.asp?a=2129&q=310548>

Toppo, G. (2007, March 29). Study gives teachers barely passing grade in classroom. *USA Today*. Retrieved April 2, 2007, from [http://www.usatoday.com/news/education/2007-03-29-teacher-study\\_N.htm](http://www.usatoday.com/news/education/2007-03-29-teacher-study_N.htm)

U.S. Department of Education. (2006, July 12). State Board of Education of North Carolina Consolidated State Application Accountability Workbook. Washington, D.C.: Author.

U.S. Department of Education web site at <http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/reauth/index.html>.