

Rowan University

Rowan Digital Works

---

Theses and Dissertations

---

4-26-2004

## The effects of NCLB on Whitehall Elementary School

Cynthia T. Pritchett  
*Rowan University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd>



Part of the [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you -  
share your thoughts on our feedback form.

---

### Recommended Citation

Pritchett, Cynthia T., "The effects of NCLB on Whitehall Elementary School" (2004). *Theses and Dissertations*. 1217.

<https://rdw.rowan.edu/etd/1217>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Rowan Digital Works. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Rowan Digital Works. For more information, please contact [LibraryTheses@rowan.edu](mailto:LibraryTheses@rowan.edu).

THE EFFECTS OF NCLB ON WHITEHALL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

by  
Cynthia T. Pritchett

A Thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the  
Master of Arts Degree  
of  
The Graduate School  
at  
Rowan University  
March 1, 2004

Approved by  
Professor

Date Approved April 26, 2004

©2004 CT Pritchett

## ABSTRACT

Cynthia T. Pritchett

THE EFFECTS OF NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ON WHITEHALL ELEMENTARY  
SCHOOL  
2003/04

Dr. Ron Capasso

Master of Arts in Educational Administration

The purpose of this study is to research factual data regarding NCLB that relates to Whitehall Elementary School. The data were collected through many different resources such as internet web sites, books, newspaper articles, NCLB school district applications, and magazine articles. The purpose of the research was to avoid political opinion and concentrate on factual data. After a preliminary survey indicating various opinions of NCLB and a Corel WordPerfect presentation on NCLB fact finding, a final survey was presented to evaluate differences in opinion of a small school staff subgroup. The final survey was exactly the same as the first survey in order to control the findings. The data were analyzed and found a more positive reaction to NCLB than expected. The results of the study were insignificant because the subgroup that was surveyed represented only 20% of the staff. The data results were also skewed because the thirty minutes allotted to the presenter were not enough to complete the presentation.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my sincere thanks to Dr. Robert Kern whose knowledge guided and advised me toward the completion of my internship.

I would also like to thank my mentor, Mr. John R. Muller Jr., for all of his “words of wisdom” and many stories that encouraged me throughout my internship.

A note of thanks to the Assistant Principal at Whitehall School, Mrs. Marcia Pietroski who is a great inspiration to me as a female administrator.

I would like to thank my family who both supported me and put up with me during my long mental battle with the completion of my Master’s Degree, and acknowledge the selflessness of my husband who put my education before his own.

I would like to offer special remembrances to three of my grandparents who began this journey with me, but are not here to see the completion of it. Their wise counsel will be missed.

Finally, I would like to thank my daughter, Anastassia, who spent many long nights at school while I tried to complete the 300 internship hours required by the program.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Focus of the Study.....	1
Purpose of the Study.....	1
Definitions.....	2
Limitations of the Study.....	4
Setting of the Study.....	5
Significance of the Study.....	12
Organization of the Study.....	13
Chapter 2 Review of Literature.....	14
Conclusion.....	30
Chapter 3 Design of Study.....	34
General Description of the Research Design.....	34
Description of the Sampling and Sampling Techniques.....	35
Description of the Data Collection Approach.....	35
Description of the Data Analysis Plan.....	36

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter 4 Presentation of the Research Findings.....	37
Grand Tour Question.....	37
Conclusion.....	40
Chapter 5 Conclusions, Implications and Further Study.....	41
Implication of Study on Leadership Skills.....	42
Implications of Study on Organizational Change.....	42
Further Study.....	42
References.....	44
Appendix A.....	48
Survey 1.....	49
Survey 2.....	50
Biographical Data.....	51

## Chapter 1

### Introduction

#### Focus of the Study

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is a controversial subject at Whitehall Elementary School. It inspires anger and frustration whenever it is mentioned. There are teachers that feel it is a personal attack on their abilities, and that the expectations of both the state and federal governments are completely unrealistic. It is the intern's suspicion that there are misconceptions about how NCLB will affect our school which are creating angst and anger. The intern will research No Child Left Behind, and review its new rules and changes as they relate to Whitehall Elementary School. She will then share her findings with the staff utilizing a seminar setting.

The focus of this thesis will be to assimilate relative information about the new responsibilities and demands associated with No Child Left Behind in an effort to inform teachers of what changes to expect relating to Whitehall Elementary School. Although NCLB was adopted in its entirety, there are many amendments and clarifications to review. The intern will share her findings with the staff utilizing a seminar setting.

#### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to understand and describe the implications of No Child Left Behind for the teachers at Whitehall Elementary School using a research design that will result in a seminar for the staff to attend. The intern will discern and answer

questions from the staff using factual information based on research that she has completed. The seminar will be described as a professional development opportunity and will be offered to the staff of Whitehall Elementary School. It is the intern's goal to lessen the anxiety and anger toward No Child Left Behind through factual data and discussion of the possibilities of successful implementation of the new obligations.

### Definitions

*Achievement gap:* Title I requires schools to close achievement gaps across subgroups of students assuring that each group meets the same benchmarks as they move toward meeting the federal Title I 100% proficiency goals in language arts literacy, mathematics, and science by 2014.

*Adequate Yearly Progress:* Measured progress toward meeting the state's established academic standards.

*Category I School:* Title I schools that have been designated as "in need of improvement" under the IASA (Improving America's Schools Act).

*Core Academic Subjects:* English, Reading or Language Arts, Mathematics, Science, Foreign Languages, Civics and Government, Economics, Arts, History, and Geography.

*Highly Qualified Paraprofessional:* A paraprofessional who has not less than two years



of post-secondary education or demonstrated competence in a field or academic subject for which there is a significant shortage of qualified teachers [NCLB §2102 (4)].

*Highly Qualified Teacher:* The teacher has obtained full state certification or passed the state teacher licensing examination, and holds a license to teach in the state.

*Limited English Proficient:* Students from prekindergarten through grade 12 whose native language is other than English and who have sufficient difficulty speaking, reading, writing, or understanding the English language as measured by an English proficiency test, so as to be denied the opportunity to learn successfully in the classrooms where the language of instruction is English.

*Local Education Agency:* A public Board of Education or other public authority legally constituted with a state for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, township, school district, or other political subdivision of the state.

*Professional development:* Activities that improve and increase teachers' knowledge of the academic subjects the teachers teach, and enable teachers to become highly qualified.

*Scientifically Based Research:* Research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge.

*Title I:* A federally funded educational initiative for students that are economically and educationally disadvantaged. It is designed to provide assistance to improve the academic performance of low-performing students in the areas of language arts literacy and mathematics.

### Limitation of the Study

The methodology is unique to this study because of the site and sample size. The intern will focus only on those parts of NCLB that affect Whitehall Elementary School. There will be compounding of relevant variables and artificialities as the two surveys will be given only to those staff who are able to attend the seminar. The selection procedures and techniques for data collection contextualize the project for Whitehall Elementary School in Monroe Township and are affected by the New Jersey State plan submitted to, and approved by, the National Department of Education. There is not enough representation to generalize to a larger population. Furthermore, the relative newness of the federal and state guidelines requires continual change that may affect the study.

The seminar will be offered to a qualitative comprehensive sample of all 39 staff to be held in the Whitehall Elementary School Library during one of the scheduled bimonthly teacher's meetings. However, the intern expects a cluster sample to attend the workshop as teachers are also assigned other duties during this time.

### Setting of the Study

Monroe Township was established by the State Legislature on March 9, 1859, but actual settlement dates back to 1737, it is a “Bicentennial Community”; the first residents predate 1776. The township of Monroe was formed in March of 1859, at which time Williamstown was designated as a place for elections and town meetings. Monroe Township is located in the Northeast corner of Gloucester County. Early history refers to this as one of the “Pine Towns” because of the abundance of pine timber in the area.

The area is drained on the east by “Four Mile Branch” and “Sqankum” branch of the Great Egg Harbor River, on the south by “Whitehall and Hospitality” branches and “Scotland Run.” Williamstown is surrounded by Cecil, Cross Keys, Downer, New Brooklyn, Robanna, and Victory lakes (History of Monroe, n.d.).

Monroe Township is an area located in Gloucester County, New Jersey, and as of the 2000 census, the township had a total population of 28,967.

According to the US Census Bureau, the township has total area of 46.9 sq. miles. 46.5 sq. miles are land and .4 sq. miles are water. Total area is .81% water.

As of the 2000 census, there are 28,967 people, 10,521 households, and 7,848 families residing in the township. The population density is 622.3 people per square mile. There are 11,069 housing units at an average density of 237.8 houses per square mile. The racial makeup of the township is 84.83% white, 11.15% African American, .25% Native American, 1.23% Asian, .03% Pacific Islanders, .99% from other races, and 1.52% from two or more races. 2.71% of the population is Hispanic or Latino of any race.

There are 10,521 households out of which 34.1% have children under the age of 18

living with them, 58.5% are married couples living together, 11.7% have a female household with no husband present, and 25.4% are non-families.

21% of all households are made up of individuals and 9.6% have someone living alone who is 65 years of age or older. The average household size is 2.73 and the average family size is 3.18.

In the township, the population is spread out with 25.6% under the age of 18, 7.4% from 18-24, 30% from 25-44, 24% from 45-64, 12.9% who are 65 years of age or older. The median age is 37 years.

For every 100 females there are 93.4 males. For every 100 females, age 18 and over, there are 89.1 males.

The median income for a household in the township is \$50,037, and the median income for a family is \$56,810. Males have a median income of \$41,062 vs. \$29,849 for females. The per capita income for the township is \$20,488. 6.2% of the population and 4.0% of families are below the poverty line. Out of the total people living in poverty, 7.5% are under the age of 18 and 7.1% are 65 or older.

The 45.6 square mile township is changing from rural/semi-rural to a suburban Delaware community. Most citizens are employed in industries and businesses outside the township. Major roadways traverse the township making it easily accessible to the Philadelphia metropolitan area, which is approximately a 20 mile distance, as well as Camden, Atlantic City and other major centers in the Delaware Valley.

Monroe Township is a comprehensive school district serving the educational needs of resident students from kindergarten through grade 12. In addition, services are provided

to preschool disabled students, as well as special needs students. The district does send students to other districts for programs not offered within the district primarily in special education. Also, secondary students may attend Gloucester County Vocational Technical School on a shared-time basis. The current organizational pattern of the school system is grades K-5 elementary, grades 6-8 middle school, and grades 9-12 high school. The district facilities include four elementary schools: Holly Glen, Radix, Whitehall, and Oak Knoll, in addition to Williamstown Middle School, and Williamstown High School. Administrative offices are housed in the Maple Grove Administration Building, except for Special Services, which is housed at Oak Knoll Elementary School.

There were schools in Monroe Township long before the township was established. It is believed that in 1750, a one-room school house was erected on Main Street. Major John Tice, a veteran of the revolutionary war, and stationed at Valley Forge with George Washington, was the first schoolmaster of record.

With the prosperity of the glass industry, Main Street School was built in 1849, followed by Maple Grove (1872) and Hall Street (1887). Hall Street still remains as a historical landmark. An enrollment of 451 students attended public schools in 1874. In 1907, the original Maple Grove School was condemned and a new one built on the same site. This facility was enlarged in 1917 and except for the Cecil School; the remaining township schools were closed (Pietroski, 1993).

Oak Knoll School was erected in 1927 and enlarged in 1954. Until 1958, high school students attended Glassboro High School. Williamstown High School, still under construction, opened its doors to students in September 1958. With a growing population,

the increasing need for elementary schools became obvious. In 1967, Whitehall School in the Cecil section was built followed by Holly Glen, north of town in 1968. Radix Elementary, in the eastern section of the township, was completed in 1980.

On January 12, 1993, a 31 million-dollar bond referendum was successfully passed allowing the district to proceed with the construction of a proposed new high school. A new high school was completed in September of 1996 located on a 40-acre parcel adjacent to the current Middle School. A second referendum was passed in 2001 which allows for the expansion of the once high school, now middle school. A new project that will expand the middle school is currently in progress. This expansion project will reorganize the current six grade middle school into a grades five to eight middle school. The middle school will be separated into two different wings, one for grades five and six, and the other for grades seven and eight.

As of school year 2001-2002, 4,917 students were enrolled in Monroe Township Schools. This included 1,406 students at the high school, 1,210 at the middle school, and 2,301 students at the four elementary schools.

The Monroe Township School District currently employs a certified staff of 402 members. At the High School, 141 teachers are on staff, the middle school has 86, 54 teachers are at Holly Glen, 61 teachers at Radix, 27 at Oak Knoll, and 39 teachers at Whitehall School. In addition there are nine Chapter I teachers at the elementary level. The district also employs four high school guidance counselors: two counselors at the middle school, two counselors to be shared by the elementary schools, four speech and language therapists, six librarians, six school nurses, and nine child study team members.

The certified faculty is supported by the following non-certified staff: 34 (full-time) six-hour aides and 76 (part-time) aides of various hourly increments.

Monroe Township is a school district that is overseen by a nine member elected Board of Education. Each member serves a three-year term. The Superintendent is the administrative and educational leader of the school district. He is supported by two assistant superintendents. The elementary assistant superintendent is responsible for curriculum and budget at the elementary level, as well as federal grant monies. The secondary assistant superintendent oversees the curriculum and budget for grades 7-12, as well as maintenance, food service, district health services, and transportation. Additionally, central administration includes a supervisor of special projects, supervisor of special services, technology supervisor, supervisor of elementary instruction and curriculum, supervisor of secondary instruction and curriculum, and pupil transportation supervisor. The district also supports three child study teams.

Each elementary school is serviced by a principal, an assistant principal, a school nurse, a reading specialist, math specialist, technology coordinator, and a speech and language therapist. Classes are self-contained and students are given instruction in the areas of art, music, technology, physical education, and Spanish, by specialized instructors.

Whitehall Elementary School, built in 1967, is located on 16 acres in the southern end of the township. The physical plant of the school consists of 26 classrooms, library, teachers' workroom, all purpose/gym/auditorium/cafeteria, administrative offices, and nurse's suite.

As of the 2001-2002 school years, the Whitehall School student population was 415 pupils. There are three half-day kindergartens, three first, second, fourth, and fifth grades and four third grades. Each class is heterogeneously grouped. Class sizes range from 13-24. In addition, there are four special education classes: two learning disabled classrooms, and two behaviorally disturbed classrooms. One resource room supports those students who are mainstreamed, classified students.

The main components of the elementary curriculum include reading, language arts literacy, and mathematics. In addition, emphasis is placed on science, social studies, computer literacy, character education, art, music, physical education, health, and library.

Students are able to participate in co-curricular activities such as: art club, library club, chorus, band, instrumental lessons, safety patrol, school store, peer mediation, student council, and math munchers. Instructional time is five hours and thirty-eight minutes (Pietroski, 1993).

The administration at Whitehall School consists of one male principal with past experience in the middle school, and one female vice principal that is in her second year of administration, after formerly being head teacher. She is shared with Oak Knoll Elementary. The vice principal is at Whitehall two days a week and at Oak Knoll three days a week.

The principal as administrator and educational leader of the school is responsible for curriculum development and implementation, evaluation, hiring of staff, scheduling, and adherence to district policy, communication with staff, liaison to central administration and the community, budget, as well as the overall management of the facilities on a daily



basis. The assistant principal is primarily responsible for student discipline, transportation, building maintenance, cafeteria procedures, public relations, and parent communications. Both administrators work closely with the child study team and the school nurse.

The teaching staff currently has 39 certified full and part-time teachers. The Whitehall faculty is predominantly white and female. 20% of the staff is male and white. Two minorities are currently employed. Two staff members are disabled. The staff ranges in age from 25-56 years. 70% have earned bachelor's degrees, 30% have Master's degrees. Thirty-four staff members are tenured; the average number of years teaching is 16. (Pietroski, 1993).

Special area staff includes an art teacher, a physical education teacher, technology coordinator, a music teacher, a librarian, and a Spanish teacher. Instructional support staff includes a speech therapist, two basic skills teachers, one reading specialist, one reading/language arts coordinator, one math specialist, and one talented and gifted teacher. All but one of these positions is held by women.

Paraprofessionals include one secretary, one secretarial clerk, one library clerk, two six hour aides, one three-hour aide, and five special education aides. These positions are all held by women.

The students at Whitehall School come mainly from low to middle income families. The majority of the children live in single family homes, but a small percentage live in multiple family dwellings.

The student population numbers 415 students, which consists of 203 males and 212

females. The racial composite is 83% white, 14% black, 1.3% Hispanic, and less than .5% Asian. 17% of students are classified for special education.

Fifty-one first and second graders receive Chapter I services. Sixty-five students in grades three, four, and five qualify for compensatory education instruction.

The average class at Whitehall School contains 21 students. Students are heterogeneously grouped for all subjects. The fifth grade students change classes for math, science, social studies, and language arts.

Students take the New Jersey Assessment of Skills and Knowledge (Ask 3 and Ask 4) tests in the early spring each year. Scores are used to identify students for a wide range of programs including talented and gifted, as well as compensatory education. Most students test above the state averages in reading, math, and language. In grade three, 95% of the students scored above the state norms in reading, and 94% in language arts literacy in the spring of 2002. In mathematics, 84% of the students exceeded state mandates.

The purpose of this section has been to familiarize the reader with the internship setting. Community, school, faculty, and student body information provides the intern with an understanding of the many factors that influence the climate of the school and the learning process.

### Significance of the Study

The significance of studying NCLB and how it affects Whitehall Elementary School is for the benefit of the administration and the intern. NCLB is a law that is being debated

by educators, administrators, parents, and politicians. It greatly behooves the intern to be familiar with the law and how it affects those involved.

### Organization of the Study

The study will be organized into the four main points of No Child Left Behind which are Accountability, Assessment, School Choice, and Highly Qualified Teachers. The intern will also acknowledge effects of No Child Left Behind that relate to school parent notification.

The surveys that will be distributed to the faculty will evaluate which of the four main components faculty would like the seminar to concentrate on for information and discussion. Although the seminar will touch upon all points of NCLB, it is the intern's desire to focus on the topic that causes most of the faculty distress and enables misconception.

## Chapter 2

### Review of Literature

#### Introduction

The original enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was in 1965. It was an effort by former President Lyndon B. Johnson to settle the civil unrest that had erupted due to segregation and racism in the United States. The table of contents constituted about four printed pages of educational reforms including reforms on school choice and accountability.

The second authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed in 1994 by the One Hundred and Third Congress and former President William J. Clinton. It took the approximate four pages of educational reform divisions and turned them into approximately 21 printed pages of titles and divisions, still including school choice and accountability.

During hearings before the induction of Educational Secretary Rod Paige, Secretary Paige expressed a desire to reform the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1994, and combine the many separate, repetitive initiatives into a more concise reform that would yield results for American society. This reauthorization consists of approximately 32 pages of titles and initiatives.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary

Education Act of 1994. According to the National Association of Elementary School Principals (2003), this version also serves to define a significantly different role for the federal government in education by refocusing the law on four principles: Accountability for student achievement of academic standards, increased flexibility and local control, a greater role for parents in their children's education programs, and a greater emphasis on the use of highly scientific-based instruction.

“The very breadth and complexity of NCLB make it likely that changes will occur in response to still evolving regulations or interpretations, the use of the courts to challenge some aspects of the law, or experiences of states, districts, and schools as they work to implement it. The evolving nature of NCLB poses an additional challenge for educators.” (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2003).

No Child Left Behind is an opportunity to align federal and state initiatives in common support of higher student achievement, stronger public schools, and a better prepared teacher workforce (Illinois State Board of Education, 2003).

President Bush signed the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001 as the first major overhaul of national education in decades. Under the law, more students are expected to qualify for special services, and schools and teachers are held to a higher standard for continued federal funding (The Pioneer Press, 2003).

Much of the credit for the passage of No Child Left Behind goes to Senator Kennedy who was instrumental in bringing bipartisan agreement on the basic tenants of the new law (Driscoll & McQuillan, 2002). This law is not only a Republican initiative; both national political parties had a hand in its formation based on the 1994 law.

NCLB is only the outline constructed for each state to follow. On May 8, 2003, United States Secretary of Education, Rod Paige, approved New Jersey's state accountability plan aligned with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. New Jersey was the 17<sup>th</sup> state to gain approval (Langen&Webb, 2003). Each state sets its own standards and measures.

“As predicted, shockwaves from the No Child Left Behind legislation are spreading throughout the field of education. Schools were already feeling the confusion as last school year ended perfecting their “deer caught in the headlights” look as the legislation suddenly called into question which students, from poorly performing schools, would be attending different schools, and how the newly mandated transportation costs would be covered” (Eisenberg & Serim, 2002).

“The quality of our public schools directly affects us all as parents, as students, and as citizens. Teachers, administrators, and all school personnel have an obligation to perform their duties to the best of their ability. Yet, children are segregated by low expectations, illiteracy, and self doubt. In a constantly changing world that is demanding increasingly complex skills from its workforce, children are literally being left behind.” (The White House Forward by George W. Bush, n.d.).

Some educational institutions are not thrilled that on January 8, 2002, President Bush signed into law the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, also known as the “No Child Left Behind Act of 2001” (NCLB). According to the National Education Association (2003), No Child Left Behind represents a major directional change for the federal government: Specifying educational standards for teachers and paraeducators, and mandating that all schools (not just Title I schools) meet certain

progress measures or face sanctions. The NEA is diligent in fighting against NCLB, holding meetings and seminars to educate its members on the “evils” of the new legislation.

Not everyone agrees with the NEA: “Comprehensive school improvement reflects and fosters sound decision making. It provides a school district with the necessary focus to achieve its goals.” (The Iowa State Department of Education, 2003).

The original department of education was created in 1867. Congress declared that it should “gather statistics and facts on the condition and progress of education in the United States and Territories” (The National Center for Education Statistics, 2002, Introduction).

Section 1111 of NCLB requires each state to develop an accountability system by developing a state plan that addresses academic standards, academic assessment, and accountability. The state accountability system must be the same system for all students and must include rewards and sanctions to hold schools accountable for student achievement and for ensuring adequate yearly progress (AYP). What constitutes adequate yearly progress is defined by the state. However, the same high standards of academic achievement must apply to all public school students in the state (Babiak, 2003).

Each state is required to use data from the 2001-2002 school years to establish a starting point for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the state’s proficiency level of academic achievement on the state assessments. However, as will later be explained, this starting point is not as rigid as first thought by some. The time line is required to ensure that not later than 12 years after the end of the 2001-2002 school

year, all students in all identified groups will meet or exceed the state's proficient level of academic achievement on the state assessments.

The No Child Left Behind accountability provisions are based on four principles: Stronger accountability for results, Increased flexibility/local control, Expanded options for parents, and Emphasis on teaching methods that work (The Center for Assessment, 2002).

Under No Child Left Behind's accountability provisions, states must describe how they will close the achievement gap and make sure all students achieve academic proficiency. They must produce annual state and school district report cards that inform parents and communities about state and school progress. Schools that do not make progress must provide supplemental services and, if still not making adequate yearly progress after five years, must make dramatic changes to the way the school is run according to Langen & Webb (2003).

No Child Left Behind has major implications in the areas of assessment and technology. It permits greater flexibility in delivery of instruction, but mandates extensive accountability and evaluation of the effectiveness of program interventions (International Society for Technology in Education, 2003).

A school district may delay, for up to one year, the implementation requirements under the second year of school improvement, correction plan, or restructuring if either of the following applies: 1) If the school makes Annual Yearly Progress for one year, or 2) The school's failure to make Annual Yearly Progress is due to exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances such as natural disaster or unforeseen decline in financial



resources. If the school makes Annual Yearly Progress for two consecutive years, the school cannot be subject to school improvement, corrective action, or restructuring; nor can it be identified as needing improvement (Haughwout, n.d.).

All of the provisions provide states with greater flexibility in applying Annual Yearly Progress and potentially limit the number of schools that will be identified as needing improvement. First, the 10% safe harbor provision will work to prevent subgroups that are making progress, but not at the proficiency rate set for them, from causing a school to fail to meet its Annual Yearly Progress goals. Second, the determination of statistically reliable subgroups will prevent a small number of students from causing a school to fail, but will still yield valuable assessment results to help address their achievement. Third, by enabling the school to average data from the previous one or two school years, an unusually bad year won't necessarily cause a school to fail, but at the same time does not back off the requirement for increasing proficiency levels in future years. Fourth, by enabling a school to combine data across grade levels, then failures for example, of the third grade to meet Annual Yearly Progress in math can, where other grades are meeting Annual Yearly Progress, prevent a school from being designated as a failure. Fifth, by excluding students who transfer during the school year from being included in determining the receiving school's Annual Yearly Progress, that school will not be designated as failing as the result of students who are not enrolled for the "full academic year," based on how the state defines that term (Haughwout n.d.).

Research indicates that what occurs in classrooms, the training and the ability of the teaching force, and the overall culture of the school all affect student learning (The

National Center for Education Statistics, 2002, Summary).

The new law focuses on holding schools accountable for student achievement. States must devise and offer tests in reading and mathematics for every child each year in grades three through eight starting in the fall of 2005. Under current law, states are required to test students three times during K-12 years (Pioneer Press, 2003).

Instructional interventions funded by No Child Left Behind must show research-based evidence of effectiveness (this is mentioned 111 times in the authorizing legislation, House Resolution 1). Educators must compare student performance with standards-based benchmarks, and report results using a comprehensive student information system.

Most states and school districts do not have a system in place for measuring, reporting, and using student data to inform decision making (International Society for Technology in Education, 2003).

The federal government provides about 7% of the total monies spent on education in the United States. These funds provided by the federal government to pay for its mandates fall far below the amount needed to implement its requirements. In fiscal year 2002 (October 1, 2001-September 30, 2002), the US paid 31 billion to help support its Elementary and Secondary Education Act initiatives, which amounts to about 1.5 % of the federal budget (The Monroe County School Boards Association, 2003).

Section 1116 of NCLB requires each local educational agency receiving Title I funds to use the state academic assessments and other indicators described in the state plan to annually review the progress of each school under Title I, to determine whether the school is making adequate yearly progress. The local education agency is required to

publicize and disseminate the results of the local annual review.

Schools with stagnant scores get more money, but must offer students the option of transferring to better performing public schools (Pioneer Press, 2003).

Consequences for schools that do not meet Annual Yearly Progress provisions: Year 1 -No action, Year 2 -School identified as failing Annual Yearly Progress, Year 3- Identified as “needing improvement” and State sanctions including: Technical assistance from a district not identified as “needing improvement,” Creation of a school improvement plan, Public school choice to parents with transportation provided by the district, Year 4 -State assistance to district and monitoring, Year 5- Same as Year 4 plus implementation of either: Replace staff, New curriculum, Outside expert, Extended school year or day, Year 6- School plans for restructuring, Year 7- Implementation of restructuring (The Center for Assessment, 2002).

Section 1116(b) of NCLB requires the local educational agency to identify for improvement any school served under Title I that fails for two consecutive years to make adequate yearly progress as defined in the state’s plan. The local educational agency (LEA) is required to identify failing schools before the beginning of the school year following the failure to make adequate yearly progress. In the case of schools identified for school improvement, the LEA must provide all students enrolled in the school with the option to transfer to another public school served by the local education agency that has not been identified for school improvement subject to space availability (Babiak, 2003).

The LEA is required to develop a school plan for each failing school. The plan must

be developed in consultation with parents, staff, and outside experts for approval by the local education agency. The school is required to implement the school plan not later than the beginning of the next full school year following its identification as a failing school. The LEA is required to establish a peer review process to assist with the review of the school plan and work with the school as necessary to meet the requirements of the act.

Section 1116(b)(4) of NCLB requires the LEA serving the school identified for school improvement to provide technical assistance as the school develops and implements the school plan. Technical assistance is required to be based on scientifically based research.

Section 1116(b) (5) of NCLB requires a LEA serving a school that fails to make adequate yearly progress by the end of the first school year, after identification as a failing school to: Continue to provide all students enrolled in the school with an option to transfer to another public school served by the local education agency; Make supplemental educational services available, and Continue to provide technical assistance (Babiak 2003).

By the end of the second full year, a LEA must do all of the previous reforms, identify the failing school for corrective action, and either institute and fully implement a new curriculum, extend the school year or school day, restructure the internal organizational structure of the school, decrease management authority at the school level, appoint an outside expert to advise the school, or reorganize/replace the school staff.

If after one full year of the corrective action plan, the school still does not meet Annual Yearly Progress, the school must continue with the previous corrections and prepare a plan to carry out an alternative governance not later than the beginning of the

school year following the year in which the LEA implements the corrective plan and continues to not make Annual Yearly Progress. Alternative governance could be creating a public charter school, replacing all or most of the school staff, entering into a contract with a private management company, turning the operation of the school over to the state, or any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement that makes fundamental reforms to improve student academic achievement in the school (Babiak, 2003).

On July 1, 2002, US Secretary of Education Rod Paige announced that an estimated 8,600 schools nationwide have failed to meet state standards for two consecutive years. In some districts, more than half of the schools have been designated low-performing. In Montgomery County, Maryland, only 102 of the 6,000 students eligible to transfer have opted to do so. Officials are also noticing that the students choosing to transfer are not the low-achieving, low-income students that the law was intended to benefit (Elementary and Secondary Education Act/No Child Left Behind, 2002).

Data for 1999 suggest that more students attend "chosen" public schools when more choice is available. In 1999, a greater percentage of school districts in the West offered public school choice programs than districts in the Northeast, Midwest, or South. In the same year, students living in the West were more likely to attend "chosen" public schools than students living in any other region (The National Center for Education Statistics 2002, School Choice). However, if schools in other areas offered school choice, it is reasonable to assume that given the opportunity, most students would rather choose the school they attend.

Section 1116(b)(9) of NCLB requires an LEA to provide and pay for the provision of transportation for students in schools that fail to make Annual Yearly Progress to the public school the student transfers to and attends. If all the public schools served by the LEA to which a child may transfer are identified for school improvement, corrective action or restructuring the agency will establish a cooperative agreement with other LEA's in the area for a transfer (Babiak, 2003). There are also grant provisions in NCLB to supplement transportation costs relating to school choice.

Section 111(b)(3) of NCLB and Section 200.6 of IDEA require a state's academic system to provide for the participation of all students in the grades assessed. With respect to special education students found eligible under the IDEA, Section 200.6 requires that appropriate accommodations that each student's Individual Education Plan team determines are necessary to measure the academic achievement of the student be provided. For disabled students under Section 504, Section 200.6 requires that appropriate accommodations that each student's placement team determines are necessary to measure the academic achievement of the student must be provided. In addition, Section 200.6 requires that each state assessment system provides for one or more alternate assessment systems for a student with disabilities who the student's Individual Education Plan determines cannot participate in all or part of the state assessment, even with appropriate accommodations. The alternate assessment must yield results in at least reading, mathematics, and beginning with the 2007-2008 school year, science.

**Annual Yearly Progress:** Applies the same high academic standard to all public

academic and secondary students in the state, is statistically valid and reliable, results in continuous and substantial academic improvement for all students, measures progress primarily on the academic assessments developed by the state, includes separate measurable annual progress objectives for continuous improvement for economically disadvantaged students, from major ethnic and racial groups, students with disabilities, and English Language Proficient students, includes graduation rates for secondary students, and at least one other academic indicator as determined by the state for all public elementary schools, and may include other academic indicators such as: Other state or locally administered tests; Decreases in grade to grade retention rates; Attendance rates; and Changes in the percentages of students completing gifted and talented, advance placement, and college prep courses (Babiak, 2003).

Section 1111(h)(6) of the Act requires the LEA to notify parents of each student attending any school receiving Title I funds that the parent may request information regarding the professional qualifications of the student's classroom teacher, including: Whether or not the teacher has met state qualifications and licensing criteria for the grade levels and subject areas in which the teacher provides instruction; Whether the teacher is teaching under emergency or other provisional status through which state licensing criteria have been waived; the Baccalaureate Degree major of the teacher and any other graduate certification or degree held by the teacher, and the field of discipline of the certification or degree; Whether the child is provided services by paraprofessionals, and if so, their qualifications.

Section 1119(c) requires that each school district receiving Title I funds ensure that all

paraprofessionals hired after January 8, 2002, and working in a program supported by Title I funds, have completed at least two years of study at an institution of higher education, obtained an Associate or higher degree, or met a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate, through a formal state or local assessment, knowledge of, and the ability to assist in instructing reading, writing, and mathematics, or knowledge of, and the ability to assist in instructing reading readiness and mathematics readiness as appropriate. Paraprofessionals must have a secondary school diploma or equivalent (f) section (e) contains exceptions for those paras who are proficient in a language other than English, act as a translator, whose duties consist solely of conducting parental involvement activities (Babiak, 2003).

Teachers are considered highly qualified if they have a Bachelor's degree, have full state certification, or have demonstrated subject matter competence in the area(s) taught (The Illinois State Board of Education, 2003, June 17).

Section 1116(d) states that nothing in Section 1116 will be construed to alter or otherwise affect the rights, remedies, and procedures afforded school or school district employees under federal, state, or local laws, collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or other agreements between such employees and their employers (Babiak, 2003).

A study by A&M University found that nearly 25% of newly hired teachers in the state were not certified in the subjects they taught (Elementary and Secondary Education Act/No Child Left Behind, electronic version, 2002).

Teachers can meet the definition of a highly qualified teacher through federal



specifications or through a High Objective Uniform Standard of Evaluation developed by the State. This alternate means is the *New Jersey House Standard: The Content Knowledge Matrix*. There are to be no consequences to individuals in terms of job loss. Districts have the ongoing responsibility to support and monitor teacher progress toward meeting the goal of satisfying the federal definition of a highly qualified teacher by or before the end of 2005-2006 school year. Special education teachers who provide direct instruction in one or more core academic subjects in elementary K-5 settings, as well as those providing instruction in self-contained classes, must satisfy the federal definition of a highly qualified teacher at the elementary level. The requirements for special education teachers who provide in-class or pull-out support services or who team teach are not yet final because of the reauthorization of IDEA. The federal legislation requires that schools and programs funded under Title I inform parents of their right to inquire about the qualifications of the teachers in the school. It also requires that Title I funded schools and programs notify parents when a child has been taught for four or more consecutive weeks by a teacher who has not yet satisfied the federal definition of highly qualified. The New Jersey House Standard offers veteran teachers in Title I schools and programs and all teachers in non-Title I schools an alternate means of demonstrating that they are highly qualified. Elementary teachers who can document ten points on a content knowledge matrix will satisfy the definition of a highly qualified teacher. This will be spread out across five categories that include college course work, professional development activities, team teaching with a content specialist, and national board certification for elementary generalists and years of successful teaching experience (Librera, 2003).

One of the problems that rural communities face involves the ability to hire highly qualified teachers. It is not easy for rural towns to attract young teachers. Officials in Helena, Montana, and several other state capitals, feel that the federal law seems intended to shake up big city schools (Becker, J. 2003).

Each year, rural school districts forgo federal funding because there are too many strings attached that don't take into account the unique needs of students in rural America. Moreover, rural schools often lack the enrollment, financial resources, and other data needed to compete effectively against larger school districts for competitive federal education grants. Rural schools also frequently receive formula grant allocations in amounts too small to be effective. These schools do the best they can with the tools they have, but it is often done with considerably fewer resources than needed. No Child Left Behind provides rural school districts with increased flexibility and funding to enhance academic achievement. It addresses the unique needs of those districts that cannot compete for federal education grants because they do not have adequate resources (Boehner & Gregg, 2003).

Section 1118 of NCLB requires an LEA that receives Title I funds to implement programs, activities and procedures for the involvement of parents. The programs, activities and procedures must be planned and implemented following consultation with the parents of the participating children. The LEA is required to develop a policy or plan for establishing parent participation programs (Babiak, 2003).

No Child Left Behind's testing requirements represent the industries biggest changes. Though the requirements do not go into effect until 2005, last year \$387 million in

federal money was appropriated to help many states come into compliance. If a state already is in compliance, however, it can take its \$3 million and use it for other purposes, including implementation of an online assessment system (The Association of Educational Publishers, 2003).

Title II, Part D of No Child Left Behind, Enhancing Education through Technology (EETT), provides grants to states. Half of the funds are allocated to districts following Title I formulas, and half are for competitive grants. Twenty-five percent of the funds must support professional development that emphasizes the integration of technology into curriculum and instruction (International Society for Technology in Education, 2003).

Scientifically based research has been gathering for 30 years concerning how the brain works, and how people learn. However, the research was written for other researchers and not presented in a way that can guide our daily work in classrooms (Eisenberg & Serim, 2002). One of the challenges that teachers will now face is how to effectively use research in teaching.

President Bush's No Child Left Behind reforms are linked to the largest single-year increase in history for federal elementary and secondary education funding, a 27% increase (4.8 billion). This act made possible the largest increase in history of the federal Title I program, 1.5 billion. This funding will have increased more under the first two years of his administration than in the previous seven years combined. Funds will flow to local school districts with significantly fewer strings attached. The number of federal programs has been streamlined from 55 to 45. Never before has the federal government invested so much in our schools (Boehner & Gregg, 2003).

## Conclusion

Even though this bill is 1100 pages long, it really is very simple. The model of improvement it presupposes is this: You assess student performance using measures that you think are sufficient to summarize what kids have learned over a long period of time; You set very ambitious targets for improvements in scores on those tests; You require continual improvement, and then you reward and punish. This is precedent setting at the federal level, but it is nothing new. It's the culmination of a 30- year trend in assessment policy. Much of what's in the bill reflects developments at the state level over the past 10-12 years; there is virtually nothing in the bill's assessment provisions that has not been tried before by at least one state (Koretz, 2002).

Many exaggerations and partial truths have been printed such as: "The new school law requires that all schools deemed to be low performing must offer public school choice-beginning this year; ...the law hampers local school districts' ability to provide tutoring programs that are coordinated with the school; ...in future years school districts must convert schools to charter schools or hand the administration of schools over to private management; ...it requires that all teachers be highly qualified in a single year; ...it exempts charter school teachers;.." (Cahill, n.d. ). It is false statements such as these that are counterproductive to the ideals and results that No Child Left Behind was created to attain.

The Business Roundtable poll reveals that 56 % of parents and 59 % of voters agree that a school should be labeled "needs improvement" if even one group of students is falling behind. eighty to 90 % of parents say that they would be concerned to learn that,

while the majority of students in their communities were meeting requirements in reading and math, specific groups - such as African Americans, English Language learners, low income or special needs students - were not (Colgan, 2003).

Evaluation is often what's missing in education reform or change efforts. We pay lots of attention to teacher actions and behavior (the inputs: lesson plans, text books, etc.) but not so much to outputs (evidence of student learning) (Eisenberg & Serim, 2002).

Section 1117 of the Act requires each state to establish a statewide system of intensive and sustained support and improvement for LEA's and schools receiving Title I funds (Babiak 2003).

Section 1117 (b) requires each state to establish a system for state recognition, including academic achievement award programs, distinguished schools and awards to teachers. The purpose of these programs would be to recognize schools that meet or exceed their adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years and to financially reward these schools (Babiak, 2003).

Annual Yearly Progress depends on the performance of the school, and it changes over time. Understanding change in student learning is critical to improving public schooling. Annual Yearly Progress must take into account where you start and where you should end up between the present time and the mandated time. Thus, Annual Yearly Progress may be defined as the growth rate that will place you on the target given where you are presently (Thum, 2003).

Districts have much greater flexibility in the use of funds if they are not restricted to class size reduction or professional development. Examples of allowable uses include:

Hiring highly qualified teachers; Reducing class size (not restricted to early grades); Providing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals (not restricted to only mathematics or science); Developing and implementing means to recruit and retain highly qualified teachers, principals, and pupil services personnel; Reforming tenure systems, providing merit pay, testing teachers in their subject areas, establishing partnerships with institutions of higher education; Providing professional development on improving classroom behavior; Developing teacher advancement plans to emphasize multiple career paths and pay differentiation; and establishing programs for exemplary teachers (New York Council for Superintendents, Bulletin 4, n.d.).

All districts are protected from severe loss of Title I funding through hold-harmless provisions of the legislation which mandates eligible districts receive no less than 85% of the amount received the previous year (New Jersey Department of Education, 2003).

No Child Left Behind is the first, large scale, overt manifestation of a true education paradigm shift in 150 years; and taken seriously, it is mind-boggling in its implications. Its underlying premise is that what schools do makes a difference. Historically, what schools offered and what students did made the difference. To hold schools accountable for student learning is a shift of massive proportions - if it works (Doyle, 2003).

Finally, although much of the content focuses on the detailed requirements of the law, it is important that none of us lose sight of the overriding purpose of the legislation - ensuring educational success for all children (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2003).

Embrace the educational policy, it's the law, and a negative attitude can help to foster

resistance and resentment by school staff, thus making efforts to comply even more difficult (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2003).

Clearly, principal leadership will be a defining element in efforts across the nation as schools work to improve educational opportunities for all children (National Association of Elementary School Principals, 2003).

## Chapter 3

### Design of the Study

#### Introduction

It was important to the intern to evaluate the overall perception of NCLB within the staff at Whitehall Elementary School. It was the intern's observation that the Whitehall Elementary staff was reluctant to accept NCLB as legislation created for the benefit of education, and not as an overall scheme to eliminate the public education system and turn it into a private industry. It became the hypothesis of the intern that misconception was a key factor in the staff's reluctance. The intern tried to alleviate the staff's reluctance by providing accurate information in a way that explained the background of ESEA and the theory behind the changes within NCLB. This was done through a Corel slide show presentation accompanied by the intern's explanation of the slides. It was evaluated through a survey approved through IRB.

#### General Description of the Research Design

The intern designed the research to be based on the most recently available information. Amendments and interpretations to NCLB were posted on educational databases and websites on an almost daily basis. There was also confusion that existed between the federal and state legislation. It was imperative to the design that accurate,



up-to-date information was given to the Whitehall staff at the time of presentation. It was also important to the intern that federal legislation was not confused with state mandates. A Corel slide show presentation was utilized to present this information to the staff in a clear and precise manner. Using technology in this way allowed the intern to change, eliminate, and add information to the presentation as the information changed according to research findings.

#### Description of the Sampling and Sampling Techniques

Whitehall Elementary School offered all staff the opportunity to present professional development workshops and seminars during regularly scheduled faculty meetings. The seminars were open to all staff. There were two presentations scheduled simultaneously. The staff chose which presentation they wanted to attend. The intern presented during a regularly scheduled seminar. Although the seminar was offered to the entire population, it was an unknown and uncontrolled variable in the research sampling as to how many staff out of 37 would actually participate.

#### Description of the Data Collection Approach

The intern gave a survey to the participating teachers (a possibility of 37) before the workshop with indicators of how well informed the teachers felt, if they felt that NCLB was generally harmful to education or beneficial, who they thought would benefit from NCLB legislation, and who would be affected. After the workshop, the intern repeated the same survey to indicate whether or not a change of any indicator had taken place.

### Description of the Data Analysis Plan

The data analysis was structured as a comparison between two surveys. The analysis was completed after the seminar. It was a case study involving the teachers who attended the workshop that contrasted the perceptual findings of No Child Left Behind before the seminar and after. The first group of surveys that was distributed before the seminar was collected and reviewed to determine whether the intern's perception and hypothesis of the overall negative outlook toward NCLB were correct. The results of each separate indicator from this group of surveys were determined to discern between positive and negative viewpoints.

The second group of surveys that was given after the seminar was collected and evaluated in the same manner as the first. The results of the two surveys were compared and contrasted with each other as a whole, and by each separate indicator.

The indicators were developed before the actual presentation. The intern was not able to complete the seminar; and therefore, not all of the indicators represented accurate data.

## Chapter 4

### Presentation of Research Findings

#### Grand Tour Question

The research that the intern conducted was on the effects of NCLB on Whitehall Elementary School. It took place at a low-middle socioeconomic elementary school in southern New Jersey. The school includes grades K-5 and various special needs, self-contained/mainstreamed classrooms. The research was meant only for this school and should not be used as a generalization of other elementary schools.

The population the intern chose was the grade level, special area, basic skills, and special needs teachers of Whitehall Elementary School. The intern chose this group as representatives of the entire faculty, those who would be most affected by the requirements of NCLB.

The entire teaching staff was not used for the research as the presentation was attended on a voluntary basis. Six of the 29 teaching staff attended the presentation and completed the two distributed surveys. The teachers attended an after - school faculty meeting presentation that lasted 30 minutes on January 16, 2004 from 4:05 pm until 4:35 pm. The presentation was not completed due to time restrictions.

The faculty members arrived in the Whitehall Elementary library beginning at 4:00 pm. The first survey was distributed by the intern, completed by the staff, and collected by the intern. A Corel WordPerfect presentation was given.

Many questions and discussions were brought up by the staff attending which resulted in the incompleteness of the presentation. The second survey was distributed by the intern, completed by the staff, and collected by the intern at the end of the presentation; two staff members returned the second survey during the following school day.

The surveys were read by the intern and analyzed using Microsoft Excel Charts and Graphs. The answers to the surveys were calculated and compared with each other. They were analyzed in an effort to see if the presentation had positively or negatively influenced the opinions of the staff regarding NCLB.

In question one of both surveys, teachers were asked, "How well informed are you regarding NCLB?" In the preliminary survey (Survey 1), one out of six teachers felt that they were well informed, while four out of six felt that they were not. After the presentation (Survey 2), all six teachers felt that they were well informed. If a teacher was well informed, this was considered by the intern as a positive response. If a teacher felt that they were not well informed, this was considered a negative response. The option of "Don't know" was also given, but not utilized in question 1 of either survey.

In question 2 of both surveys, teachers were asked, "Do you feel that NCLB is harmful to public education?" In Survey 1, five out of six teachers felt that NCLB was harmful to public education; one out of six felt that it was not. In Survey 2, three out of six teachers felt that NCLB was harmful to public education, two felt that it was not and one did not know. If a teacher answered that NCLB was harmful to education, this was considered a negative response by the intern. If a teacher answered that NCLB was not harmful to public education, this was considered a positive response.

Question 3 of the surveys read, “Do you feel that NCLB will help public education?” In Survey 1, two out of six teachers felt that NCLB would help public education, while four out of six felt that it would not. In Survey 2, it became evenly split with three teachers answering negatively that NCLB would not help public education and three teachers answering positively, that NCLB would help public education.

Question 3 asked the teachers, “Who do you feel NCLB benefits?” The options were: Students, Parents, Teachers, Administration, Other (with an option to write in an answer), Nobody, or Don’t Know. In Survey 1, two teachers felt that the students benefit from NCLB, three felt that parents benefit, one felt that teachers benefit, no one felt that administration benefits, two selected “Other” and wrote in “politicians,” no one selected “Nobody,” and one teacher selected “Don’t Know.” After the presentation, only one teacher felt that students benefit from NCLB, two felt that parents benefit, one felt that teachers benefit, still no one felt that administration benefits, three wrote in politicians benefit in the “Other” category, one teacher wrote “nobody benefits,” and one teacher marked “Don’t Know.” If students, parents, teachers, or administration was marked, the intern considered this a positive response. If “politicians” was written in, the teacher marked “Nobody,” or “Don’t Know,” this was considered a negative response.

Question 5 asked, “How much will NCLB affect you as a teacher?” In Survey 1, four teachers selected “A lot,” one teacher marked “A little,” no one marked “Not at all,” and one teacher marked “Don’t Know.” In Survey 2, all six teachers marked that NCLB would affect them “A lot” as a teacher. “A lot” and “A little” were considered positive responses while “Not at all” and “Don’t Know” were considered negative responses.

The last question, question 6 asked, "How much will NCLB affect Whitehall Elementary School?" In Survey 1, three teachers wrote "A lot," 1 teacher wrote "A little," no one marked "Not at all," and two teachers wrote, "Don't Know." In Survey 2, four teachers wrote that NCLB would affect Whitehall elementary school "A lot," one wrote "A little," no one wrote "Not at all," and one teacher wrote "Don't Know." If a teacher chose "A lot" or "A little," these were considered positive responses. If a teacher wrote "Not at all" or "Don't Know," these were considered negative responses.

An analysis of all positive and negative responses was gathered by the intern resulting in 26 positive responses and 14 negative responses in Survey 1. In Survey 2, there were 27 positive responses and 13 negative responses in Survey 2.

### Conclusion

The question of how the No Child Left Behind legislation affects Whitehall Elementary School continued to be ever changing as was the implementation of the legislation. With each new set of guidelines came a new set of feelings and fear of unknown consequences regarding highly qualified teacher status, annual yearly progress, and school choice. The legislation was polarizing with study results before the intern's presentation and after.

## Chapter 5

### Conclusions, Implications and Further Study

#### Introduction

Although only six teachers attended the intern's presentation on NCLB, it was interesting to the intern to see who the participants were: the local union president, a teacher who was also on town council, a basic skills teacher who was also the school test score coordinator, a resource room teacher and basic skills teacher (both minorities - the only minority teachers in the school) and the school librarian (because it was her room) - all female. It was not the regular classroom teacher who was interested in NCLB. It was those who were politically or socially motivated.

At first, the intern was disappointed that the presentation to the staff members was not complete. However, this was an important piece of study in and of itself. The reason that the presentation was incomplete was because the teachers kept raising questions, making comments, sharing information that they had gathered. Some of it, as was expected, was political misinformation; however, it was brought out into the open and discussed.

In the intern's opinion, the most important parcel of misinformation discussed was the recognition that there was a difference between the federal piece of legislation entitled NCLB and the implementation of NCLB which was mandated by the State of New Jersey. It was also noted that not all knew that NCLB was not a Federal Education Law, but a Federal Civil Rights Law. Further, the staff was not willing to

accept statistics taken from the National Institute of Educational Statistics because of their belief that statistics regarding NCLB were manipulated for political purposes.

#### Implications of Study on Leadership Skills

The intern feels that in the area of school leadership, it will be those who through research - based methods can improve curriculum and bolster test scores who will attain success. It will require administration and staff to stay alert to sudden policy changes and legislative amendments to lead a school successfully under NCLB.

#### Implications of Study on Organizational Change

The implications of NCLB on organizational change are numerous. LEA's will have to focus on testing in New Jersey as this is the form of student assessment that has been chosen by the State. The gap between student subgroups will be scrutinized in an effort to avoid falling under AYP expectations. Some districts may be affected by student choice initiatives losing student enrollment, gaining student enrollment, or shifting student enrollment within the district. The hiring of new teachers will be limited to those who fulfill the highly qualified teacher status, while those who are already teaching will work to attain such status.

#### Further Study

The study of how NCLB affects Whitehall Elementary School is not nearly complete. If NCLB was one piece of legislation with firm unbending guidelines and strict consequences of adherence, it would be easier to judge the affects it might have on a



school, but NCLB is not that strict piece of legislation. It's design based on ESEA is an effort to improve civil rights for those who are in no position to fight for them. It gives options and guidelines for states to choose the best formula that will work for them to close the achievement gap for minorities and low - income students.

Whitehall Elementary School, being in New Jersey, is subject to the almost weekly changes in implementation of NCLB that the state hands down to each LEA. It is nearly impossible to measure the effects of legislation that is incomplete in implementation, even as it forces consequences to those who have not met its always changing standards. It is difficult to not feel fear and concern about a policy that seeks to improve school districts through sanctions where the rules change without notice or apparent reason. However, NCLB is not to blame for the lack of organization offered by the state of New Jersey, or for the state's choice of testing as its sole form of student assessment. NCLB is not to blame for the implementation of school choice which has been included throughout all ESEA legislation, or for the state's definition of how to become a "highly qualified teacher." NCLB is to be credited, in the intern's opinion, for raising the level of awareness to student and parental rights to a good education in a safe school by a highly qualified teacher no matter what race or social status. How does NCLB affect Whitehall Elementary School? It has raised the collective awareness of what constitutes an education in the United States of America. There should never be a time when a framework for the betterment of our youth is not studied, and a better plan formulated and implemented.

## References

- The Association of Educational Publishers. (2003, January 2). Legislation and advocacy: No Child Left Behind, A policy backgrounder from The Association of Educational Publishers. Retrieved from [www.edpress.org](http://www.edpress.org)
- Babiak, A., *A guide to the No Child Left Behind act of 2001 in New Jersey*, Lorman Education services, Eau Clair, WI, 2003.
- Becker, J. (2003, June 23). No Child Left Behind: law may leave many rural teachers behind, *New York Times*. Retrieved from [www.nytimes.com](http://www.nytimes.com)
- Boehner, J., & Gregg, J. (2003, July 9). A congressional analysis of the impact of President Bush's *No Child Left Behind* reforms, Available from News from the committee on education and the workforce web site, <http://edworkforce.house.gov>
- Cahill, D. (n.d.). No Child Left Behind act. Retrieved from <http://www.nea.org>
- Eisenberg, M., & Serim, F. (2002, September). No Child Left Behind-the implications for educators, *Information Today Inc*. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from [www.infotoday.com](http://www.infotoday.com)
- The Center for Assessment. (2002, June 26). No Child Left Behind accountability provisions. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://nciea.org>
- Doyle, D. (2003, July 22). The tidal wave builds, editor's cyberchair Archive. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from [www.thedoylereport.com](http://www.thedoylereport.com)
- Driscoll, D., & McQuillan, M. (2002, February 22). No Child Left Behind, Available from The Massachusetts department of education web site, <http://www.doe.mass.edu>
- Elementary and secondary education act/No Child Left Behind analysis [Electronic version]. (2002, July). *Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development*, Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.ascd.org>
- Haughwout, K. Adequate yearly progress reporting in New Jersey under NCLB, Resource Information, Cherry Hill Public Schools, n.d.
- The Illinois State Board of Education. (2003, June 17). Illinois criteria for meeting the No Child Left Behind requirements for highly qualified teachers, Available from <http://www.isbe.state.il.us>

- The International Society for Technology in Education. (2003). No Child Left Behind poses challenges, learning and leading with technology, Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://iste.org>
- The Iowa State Department of Education. (2003, February 24). Winter institute comprehensive school improvement: teaching and learning connections, Retrieved July 26, 2003 from [www.state.ia.us](http://www.state.ia.us)
- Koretz, D. (2002, October 1). No Child Left Behind? A faculty response to President Bush's education bill, *HGSE News: The news source for the Harvard graduate School of Education*, Retrieved July 26, 2003 from [www.gse.harvard.edu](http://www.gse.harvard.edu)
- Langen, D., & Webb, J. (2003, May 8). Secretary Paige approves New Jersey state accountability plan under No Child Left Behind. Retrieved July 26 from <http://NoChildLeftBehind.org>
- Librera, W. (2003, July 11). The New Jersey model for identifying highly qualified teachers, Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.state.NewJersey.us>
- Manzo, K. (2003, June 20). National assessment of educational proficiency reading scores: progress mixed with decline [Electronic version], *Education Week*. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.edweek.org>
- Mathis, W. (2002, October 22). The federal No Child Left Behind law: should Vermont take the money?, Vermont Society for the Study of Education: policy discussion paper. Retrieved July 26, from <http://www.state.vt.us/educ>
- The Monroe County School Boards Association. (2003). Expensive unfunded federal mandates, Retrieved July 26, 2003 from [www.mcsba.org](http://www.mcsba.org)
- The Monroe Township Historical Society. (2003). The history of Monroe Township, Available from the Official Website of Monroe Township, Gloucester County, [www.monroetownshipnewjersey.org](http://www.monroetownshipnewjersey.org)
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. *K-12 principals guide to no child left behind*, Educational Elementary and Secondary Education Outreach Service, Arlington, Va, 2003
- The National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). The condition of education: commissioner's statement. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.ed.gov>
- The National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). The condition of education: school choice. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.ed.gov>
- The National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). The condition of education:

- summary. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.ed.gov>
- The National Center for Education Statistics. (2002). Reading, Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.ed.gov>
- The National Science Teachers Association. (2003). Key definitions from no child left behind, *Legislative handbook*. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.nsta.org>
- The National Education Association. (2003, July 2). Pre-RA symposium no child left behind act: implications for the National Education Association Members and Locals. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from [www.nea.org](http://www.nea.org)
- The New Jersey Department of Education. (2003). District financial data. Available from the New Jersey Department of Education web site <http://NewJersey.evalsoft.com>
- The New Jersey Department of Education. (2003). Facts about our school. Available from the New Jersey School Report Card web site <http://NewJersey.evalsoft.com>
- The New Jersey Department of Education. (2003). New Jersey school report card 2002: Welcome to the New Jersey school report card web site. Available from the New Jersey Department of Education Web Site <http://NewJersey.evalsoft.com>
- The New Jersey Department of Education. (2003). Statewide assessment results. Available from the New Jersey State school report card web site <http://NewJersey.evalsoft.com>
- The New York State Council of School Superintendents. (n.d.). No Child Left Behind act: critical issues for school district leaders, Bulletin 1: Accountability for failure to make progress in raising student achievement. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from [www.nyscoss.org](http://www.nyscoss.org)
- The New York State Council for School Superintendents. (n.d.). No Child Left Behind act: critical issues for school district leaders, Bulletin 3: Higher qualifications for teachers and paraprofessionals. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from [www.nyscoss.org](http://www.nyscoss.org)
- The New York State Council for School Superintendents. (n.d.). No Child Left Behind act: critical issues for school district leaders, Bulletin 4: New funding for teacher and principal training and recruitment. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from [www.nyscoss.org](http://www.nyscoss.org)
- The No Child Left Behind newsletter. (2002, April 22). What to know. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.NoChildLeftBehind.gov/index.html>
- Pietroski, M. *An internship in elementary school administration at Whitehall*

*Elementary School Williamstown, New Jersey 1993-1994*, Unpublished master's thesis, Rowan University, Glassboro, New Jersey.

The Pioneer Press. (2003, January 31). No Child Left Behind act: Wisconsin gets high marks for federal law, *Associated Press*. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.pioneerlocal.com>

Poll shows majority support No Child Left Behind reporting requirements [Electronic version]. (2003). *American School Board Journal*, Retrieved July 26, from <http://www.asbj.com>

Thum, Y. (2003). Making annual yearly progress-No Child Left Behind: A sample analysis, Department of Education UCLA, American educational elementary and secondary education act association. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.gseis.ucla.edu>

United States Today. (2003, March 11). Census United States: debt, spending up for school districts, Washington (AP). Retrieved July 26, 2003 from: <http://www.UnitedStatesatoday.com>

The United States Department of Education, No Child Left Behind: A desktop reference, 2002 available from [www.ed.gov/pubs/edpubs.html](http://www.ed.gov/pubs/edpubs.html)

The United States Department of Education. (2003, April 30). State of New Jersey consolidated state application accountability workbook, Available from the New Jersey Department of Education web site: <http://www.state.NewJersey.UnitedStates/education>

The White House United States forward by President George W. Bush. (n.d.). No child left behind. Retrieved July 26, 2003 from <http://www.NoChildLeftBehind.gov>

Wilkopedia, The free encyclopedia. (n.d.). Monroe Township, Gloucester County, New Jersey. Retrieved July 26, 2002 from [www.wikipedia.org](http://www.wikipedia.org)

**Appendix A**  
**Presentation Surveys**

**Survey On NCLB Presentation (1)**

1. Do you feel well-informed regarding NCLB?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

2. Do you feel that NCLB is harmful to public education?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

3. Do you feel that NCLB will help public education?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

4. Who do you feel NCLB benefits?

- Students
- Parents
- Teachers
- Administration
- Other \_\_\_\_\_
- Nobody
- Don't Know

5. How much will NCLB affect you as a teacher?

- A lot
- A little
- Not at all
- Don't Know

6. How much will NCLB affect Whitehall Elementary School?

- A lot
- A little
- Not at all
- Don't Know

Survey On NCLB Presentation (2)

1. Do you feel well-informed regarding NCLB?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

2. Do you feel that NCLB is harmful to public education?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

3. Do you feel that NCLB will help public education?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know

4. Who do you feel NCLB benefits?

- Students
- Parents
- Teachers
- Administration
- Other \_\_\_\_\_
- Nobody
- Don't Know

5. How much will NCLB affect you as a teacher?

- A lot
- A little
- Not at all
- Don't Know

6. How much will NCLB affect Whitehall Elementary School?

- A lot
- A little
- Not at all
- Don't Know



## Biographical Data

<b>Name</b>	Cynthia Pritchett
<b>High School</b>	Clayton High School Clayton, NJ
<b>Undergraduate</b>	Bachelor of Science Music Education West Chester University West Chester, PA
<b>Graduate</b>	Master of Arts School Administration Rowan University Glassboro, NJ
<b>Present Occupation</b>	Music Teacher Whitehall Elementary School Williamstown, NJ