Using the "No Child Left Behind Act" To Improve Schools in Your State

A TOOL KIT FOR BUSINESS LEADERS

INFORMATION RESOURCES
FOR BUSINESS LEADERSHIP

TO INCREASE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT
UNDER THE "NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT OF 2001"

THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE

Dear Colleague:

In January 2002, the President and Congress finalized reforms of federal education programs. For the first time in the nation's history, federal, state, and community efforts will be aligned toward the same goals to improve academic achievement. The ***No Child Left Behind Act of 2001,*** builds on the work started in the states and provides new accountability measures and resources to help raise the achievement of students nationwide.

The business community has a vital role to play in efforts to implement the reforms. States have great flexibility in how some reforms are accomplished and business leaders should advocate for the priorities that make the most difference. Over the next year, states and local districts will be developing plans, accountability systems, and strategies for improving student achievement that will create opportunities for business involvement.

The attached tool kit is intended to help business leaders seize specific opportunities to partner with educators and political leaders in the next year to implement reforms called for by the legislation. The tool kit gives you specific action steps to help your state successfully implement the key reforms. It includes messages to deliver to public officials, additional details about the requirements of the law, and helpful contacts in each state. This tool kit is available electronically at www.brt.org/toolkit/toolkit.html, so that it can be updated regularly as the implementation progresses and new information becomes available. It is designed in a format that can be customized to your needs and compiled in a three-ring binder.

State activities over the next year or two provide an exceptional window of opportunity, and the business community must act strategically and with a common voice.

Sincerely,

Susan Traiman
Director – Education Initiative
The Business Roundtable

Christopher E. Goode
Director – Corporate Government Affairs
& Public Policy, EMC Corporation
Chairman, The Business Roundtable
Education & the Workforce Coordinating Committee

Table of Contents

Using the "No Child Left Behind Act" To Improve Schools in Your State

A TOOL KIT FOR BUSINESS

INTRODUCTION

This tool kit will help you use an important new law – the ***No Child Left Behind Act*** – to strengthen your schools. Business is in a unique leadership position to work with educators, policymakers, and civic leaders to improve student achievement as states and localities begin to make changes in elementary and secondary education called for by the Act. The fact is, when business people speak, others listen. Business leadership can make a difference in an environment of competing institutional and political interests.

The new law calls for:

- **Investing more money in education, and making sure that it's tied to results.** The law directs substantial reforms to state and local educational systems and will annually invest about $22 billion nationwide to aid implementation.

- **Testing annually to make sure that all children are competent in core subjects**. Within 4 years, all states must implement annual tests in reading and mathematics in grades 3-8 to measure student achievement. By 2007-2008, states must administer science assessments at least once in each grade span from 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12.

- **Improving the quality of teaching**. In five years, all teachers in core subjects must be highly qualified. By then, all teachers must pass a state test or a highly objective, uniform state evaluation to determine proficiency.

- **Holding schools accountable for results.** Within two years, all schools and school districts will be held accountable for all demographic groups making "adequate yearly progress" toward being "proficient" against state academic standards. The Act requires 100 percent of students to be proficient within 12 years.

- **Giving rewards to schools that improve and providing consequences for schools that do not make adequate yearly progress**. Schools that show improvement will be rewarded. Persistently low-performing schools would be required to take corrective action or face complete restructuring.

- **Empowering parents by requiring schools to regularly report student performance data.** All school districts are required to disclose, by school, annual student performance data for every major student group in formats easily understood by parents and educators.

- **Strengthening math and science education and using technology to help children learn.** Math and science partnerships can combine state and local education agencies with higher education, business, and non-profit organizations, to raise student

achievement in those subjects. Additional investments are made under the Act to integrate technology in teaching and learning.

- **Helping all children to learn to read by the third grade**. All states participate in a new $1 billion initiative for both pre-K and grades 1-3 reading programs to ensure all children can read by third grade.

Key roles for business in education reform have been to keep policy makers "focused on the prize" of raising student achievement and to use business resources—the bully pulpit, financial and in-kind investments, and influence—to highlight the priorities for educational improvements. The following pages outline actions that the business community can take as part of this planning and implementation process. They highlight the priority issues, what business can do, and what result business would want from effective policies adopted in the state. Further details about federal funding for states, implementation timelines, and web-based sources of information are provided in appendices.

POLICY UPDATE FOR 2003

Math and Science Partnerships

For the 2003-2004 school year, Congress appropriated $101 million for state and local math and science partnerships under Title II, Part B, of the No Child Left Behind Act, largely at the urging of the business community. This level of funding is significant, because it triggers a distribution of the money to all states according to a formula based on each state's share of low-income students. Prior to 2003, only $12.5 million was provided nationwide, which meant that very few partnerships were funded through competitive grants issued directly from the Secretary of Education. [A table, showing each state's share of the $101 million in 2003 is included under the *Information Resources* section of this toolkit.]

Key Provisions of the Act

This new initiative will establish partnerships to improve student achievement in mathematics and science. State Educational Agencies will award subgrants, on a competitive basis to eligible partnerships. Partnerships between high-need school districts and the science, technology, engineering, and mathematics faculty in institutions of higher education are at the core of these improvement efforts. Other partners may include state education agencies, public charter schools or other public schools, businesses, and nonprofit or for-profit organizations concerned with mathematics and science education. Priorities on the use of funds are set by a local "needs assessment," but can include improving teacher qualifications, knowledge and skills, curriculum, instructional materials, and intensive professional development activities. States are required to assess academic progress of students in mathematics annually in grades 3-8, beginning in the 2005-2006 school year. Also, by 2005-2006, states must establish science standards and begin developing assessments to measure academic progress in science, beginning in the 2006-2007 school year.

Why Math and Science Partnerships are Important

Business strongly supported the creation of math and science partnerships in the No Child Left Behind Act, and subsequently lobbied for adequate funding for them. International assessments consistently document the low achievement of American students in math and science compared to their counterparts in other countries. Business concern increases when this data is coupled with growing evidence about the lack of basic math and science skills among individuals who are entering higher education, attempting to meet demands of modern society, and facing technological challenges of the 21st century workplace. Business has an opportunity to provide leadership in partnerships by contributing expertise and advocating effective application of resources to address these issues.

The Link to Improving Teacher Quality

The partnerships can leverage how other federal funds are used for teacher quality and professional development. The largest grant for teacher quality totals $3 billion under Title II, Part A, of the No Child Left Behind Act. These funds are also for improving the content knowledge of (math and science) teachers, increasing the excellence of instructional practices, upgrading training in curricula and assessments, increasing the number of highly qualified teachers in these subjects (thus reducing the high percentage of out-of-field teachers, especially in schools with large populations of low-income students). When each state's share of the $3 billion is combined with the efforts of the partnerships, substantial new resources can be focused on this priority. This is a key opportunity for meaningful business involvement in both the partnerships and in how the Title II, Part A, money is spent in the state. [For each state's share of the $3 billion for teacher quality, see the *Information Resources* section of this toolkit.]

For more about math and science partnerships, see the appendix in this toolkit, and check out the U.S. Department of Education site at: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/AIDP/msp.html.

For further information about this tool kit, please contact:

Susan L. Traiman
Director - Education Initiative
The Business Roundtable
1615 L Street, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202-872-1260
Fax: 202-466-3509
E-mail: straiman@brt.org

Thomas A. Lindsley
Director, Washington DC Office
National Center for Educational Accountability
c/o Texas Instruments, Inc.
1455 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Suite 375
Washington, DC 20004
Phone: 202-662-2468
Fax: 202-628-2980
E-mail: Tlindsley@just4kids.org

Thom Stohler
Vice President, Technology and Workforce Policy
AeA - Advancing the Business of Technology
601 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, North Building, Suite 600
Washington, DC 20004
Phone: (202) 682-4437
Fax: (202) 216-2666
Email: Thom_Stohler@aeanet.org

Action Steps

State decisions about how to effectively implement the ***No Child Left Behind Act*** create a tremendous opportunity for the business community to work with policymakers on issues that can make the greatest difference in raising student achievement. Each state will be building on past accomplishments and reassessing its educational systems. It will be necessary to work on a state-by-state basis to influence emerging policies.

The following pages begin to chart that process, highlight the reforms likely to be of primary interest to the business community, point to problems that may be encountered, and formulate messages to use in guiding activities.

Steps to Working Successfully in Your State

1. Know the Landscape of Emerging State Policies.

States are not starting with a blank slate. Many states have been working on these issues for a decade or more. To successfully advocate the changes called for by this Act, you will need to analyze the status of the state's education reforms. Assessing the state's reforms, which includes compliance with earlier federal legislation passed in 1994, compared to the requirements in the new law, provides a context for your involvement and an understanding of the environment for where the state needs to go. Advocacy for reforms will be most convincing to policymakers when it is clearly responsive to the state's needs. By understanding your state's opportunities and challenges, you will be better equipped to make a positive difference in the reform process.

You need to monitor potential legislation in your state to implement the federal requirements, and the stance of political leadership on key education reforms. States may need to pass legislation to compliment federal requirements, or may be able to make required changes administratively. Identify the leverage points in the implementation process where influence can be applied.

You do not need to learn your state's education landscape on your own. See #2 below for suggestions about where you can get the background information you need to know.

2. Join Forces

Business coalitions working on education exist in nearly every state and many are already working on education reform. By adding your voice and influence to their efforts, you can add momentum to key reforms. Ideally, business groups in each state will convene a task force or working group to focus on the policy changes needed to successfully implement the ***No Child Left Behind Act***. *[See list of state business coalitions in Tab V.]*

Your state coalition *(see Tab V)* can help bring you up to speed on the political landscape and the educational reforms already underway, if they have been actively involved. The coalition will help to identify the key players and help you to build the relationships that are essential for

success. It is recommended that you work with an active business coalition for the implementation process.

If your state does not have a coalition, or the coalition is not actively working on the implementation of this law, there are other ways to get involved. For example, other business groups or trade associations in your state may be participating, you can initiate a program in your company, or you can contact a representative from the national business associations listed in the introduction.

3. Reach Out to Political Leadership

The key players will vary from state to state, but it is safe to assume that the following state leaders and groups will be involved:

- Governors
- Chief state school officers (state agency head or education secretary)
- State legislatures (especially education and appropriations committee leaders)
- State boards of education.

You should be prepared to succinctly make the case for the business community's positions. As a rule, you should promote the strongest outcomes envisioned in the law for implementation of successful standards and assessments, disclosure of data, accountability, alignment of system reforms, and teacher quality. The following pages provide background information and messages to deliver on each of these issues.

4. Influence the Process

Business can increase its influence in decision-making during implementation, if it demonstrates early in the process that it is committed to improving student achievement and articulates how reforms will benefit the state for improved economic prospects. It will be far more difficult for business to get involved if it does not take a seat at the table early in the implementation process.

There are a number of activities that you can undertake to influence the efforts, which include, but are not limited to, the following:

- **Write/visit key state official(s) to make them aware that you view education reform as a priority issue.** Using the information you have gathered on your state's status and the issues and messages outlined on the following pages, you can write a letter that outlines the business community's position to state decision makers.

- **Influence state planning**. Each state must submit an accountability plan to the U.S. Secretary of Education for approval demonstrating how it will implement key requirements of the law. At a minimum, plans must be available for public review and comment. Some states may establish broad-based planning groups to help compile that state's plan, which could include business representatives. The plans should be consistent with the key reforms outlined in the next section. The summary of the Act contained in the Appendix also will provide you with information you can use to compare your state's plan with the intent of the law.

(**Note:** The federal government will issue detailed planning guidance to the states. Copies of all federal guidance will be available on the Internet at: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/esea/index.html.) Copies of individual state accountability plans will be available at: http://www.ed.gov/office/OESE/CFP/csas/index.html

- **Testify before a state legislative committee**. You may request to testify on education reform at committee hearings that will be scheduled on legislation to implement the Act.

- **Lobby for necessary policy changes during the legislative process.** Use coalitions or business lobbyists to advocate specific education reform issues throughout the legislative process.

- **Leverage the business community's influence to build support for reform.** You can help elevate the issue of education reform in your state. For example, public speaking opportunities before civic groups, letters to the editor, meeting with newspaper editorial boards, company newsletters, etc., are very effective platforms from which to demonstrate the business community's concern about the implementation of education reform. You should educate your employees about, and involve them in, your efforts.

- **Look at electoral impact on education reform.** Business representatives should meet with prospective office holders to put effective implementation of the Act high on their campaign agendas.

Key Education Reforms:
Issues and Messages

This summary provides information on five key issues that were supported by the business community in federal legislation. It describes what the new law requires, why the requirements are important, what problems to anticipate, and what is the best outcome to be achieved.

I. Academic Standards and Annual Assessments

Key Provisions of the Act

Under the act, states are required to set up annual assessments in reading and mathematics for all students in grades 3-8. All states must have the tests developed, aligned to standards, and implemented for the 2005-2006 school year. The federal government provides states with funding for development and implementation of the annual tests. States can voluntarily form consortia with other states to upgrade standards and jointly develop assessments.

Why Standards and Assessments are Important

Business strongly supports annual tests in reading and math in the early grades that are aligned to challenging academic standards and that yield results measuring student achievement of the standards. This focuses education on bringing all students to the same high standards of achievement that will enable them to succeed in higher education and the 21st century workplace. Regular assessments can identify substandard achievement while it can still be fixed.

Issues to Anticipate:

- Most states will have to develop high quality annual tests in reading and math for grades 3-8. Tests may be in place for some years and not others.

- States must develop tests that can compare student achievement statewide between schools and school districts. Comparable data will be needed to determine accountability for making "adequate yearly progress," and cannot be gathered if localities are allowed to use different tests within the state.

- Some states may face a backlash to annual testing based on opposition to "high stakes" use of tests.

Messages to Promote:

- **Alignment to Standards**. Each of the state's annual tests in reading and math should be specifically developed to measure student achievement of the state's academic standards.

- **Comparability of Assessments within the State.** The annual tests should be uniform statewide and yield comparable data on student achievement from grade to grade and over time.

- **Diagnostic Use of Assessments**. Annual tests should produce results that can be used by parents, teachers, and principals to diagnose the academic needs of individual students to meet standards.

II. Public Disclosure Of Achievement Data

Key Provisions of the Act

States and local school districts are required to disclose student achievement data by school (not by individual student) and by district showing progress toward proficiency on state academic standards. Raising student achievement in each major student group is required for schools, districts, and states to make "adequate yearly progress." Annual report cards are required at the school, district, and state levels comparing student progress, by major group, toward being "proficient." Localities must identify schools that do not make adequate yearly progress. Districts must give parents options to transfer children to better performing schools or to get supplemental educational aid. Continual failure requires schools to be closed or restructured.

Why Disclosure is Important

Business supports the annual publication of student achievement data, by both school and by district, in easily understood formats that allows comparison of each local school with others in the district and state. The public disclosure of data increases individual school accountability against common state standards. This data empowers parents and educators to seek improvements and provides a management tool for accountability.

Issues to Anticipate:

- States should ensure that data from tests being made public can compare student achievement by school and compare school achievement over time.

- Raw performance data will need to be analyzed, simplified, and explained in easily understood formats when published.

- Communities may be shocked to learn that schools once considered "good" are now identified for "school improvement," because disaggregated data reveals that some student groups are not succeeding at the school.

Messages to Promote:

- The state should release annual achievement reports that display data in easily understandable formats, comparing local student groups, schools, and district performance with other students in the state.

- Public reports should disaggregate achievement data for each major demographic group of students.

- Annual reports from both the district and the state should be as uniform and similar in presentation as possible to promote public understanding of performance progress.

- Initial poor results should not be used to point fingers and bash educators but to commit to an aggressive action plan to turn around the results—no exceptions, no excuses.

- State education agencies should build adequate statewide student data-collection systems to help educators evaluate policies, identify and study best practices, and continuously improve schools. *[For key elements of statewide data systems, see "Information Resources" tab of this toolkit under National Center for Educational Accountability.]*

III. Accountability

Key Provisions of the Act

Each state is required to have an accountability system that is based on increasing student achievement. The state defines what level of achievement constitutes "proficiency" in academic standards.

Based on student achievement data from the 2002-2003 school year, the state must set an initial standard (percentage) of proficiency that all schools and all major demographic groups must meet to make "adequate yearly progress." The bar for making adequate yearly progress must be raised at least once every three years, until 100 percent of students are proficient (within 12 years). A school that does not make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years is targeted as needing improvement, and requires action plans for improvement. Continued lack of progress brings harsher corrective actions and ultimately closure or restructuring of the school.

Why Accountability is Important

The business community supports an accountability system that focuses the entire system on increasing student achievement. While each state establishes its own timeline for adequate yearly progress, the timeline must be geared toward getting 100 percent of its students to a "proficient" level within 12 years. The accountability system should hold all schools and districts to the same high standards of performance and responsibility for student achievement to ensure both consistency and fairness.

Issues to Anticipate:

- States may be inclined to define "proficiency" at a low enough level to be easily achieved rather than benchmarked to more challenging levels.

- The state must look ahead and set a timeline that is rigorous enough to achieve 100 percent proficiency in 12 years, including proficiency for all major demographic groups.

Messages to Promote:

- The state-defined levels of "proficiency" for meeting adequate yearly progress should be rigorous, but realistic.
- Accountability should be based on increasing achievement for all major student groups.
- Systems should have rewards for school and teacher performance.
- Systems should have clear, enforceable sanctions for persistently low-performing schools.
- Schools already identified as needing improvement or corrective action for not having made adequate yearly progress under the 1994 law should be dealt with immediately.
- State accountability systems should be fully implemented and operational before the 2004-2005 school year, as required by law.

IV. Alignment of Educational Improvements

Key Provisions of the Act

States are required to ensure that high-quality academic assessments, accountability systems, teacher preparation and training, curricula content, and instructional materials are aligned with challenging state academic standards so that students, teachers, parents, and administrators can measure progress against common expectations for student academic achievement.

Why Alignment is Important

Business wants to have major components and activities of the education systems aligned toward a common goal of increasing the academic achievement of all students in the state. Alignment is necessary for consistency, sound diagnosis, quality control, and accountability. Current education systems are rarely aligned.

Issues to Anticipate:

- Alignment of key educational components is difficult for the states. It will require cooperative and strategic planning between educational agency officials and staff at both the state and local levels who have not worked together before.

- The requirements of the law for alignment are not self-evident and are likely to be overlooked by state and local planners—or explained away by simply saying "their systems are already aligned."

- The federal government may not provide guidance to states on the level of alignment that is envisioned in the law, and, as a result, states may overlook it (i.e., how will states address these requirements or know when they have achieved alignment).

Messages to Promote:

- The state's planning and implementation process should result in carefully aligned high quality assessments, accountability systems, teacher preparation and training, curricula content, and instructional materials, to state academic standards.

- States should set rigorous criteria for determining when these major system components are aligned.

- States should seek the help they need to meet these requirements, including help with strategic planning, and tapping into business expertise in the planning and implementation process.

V. Teacher Quality

Key Provisions of the Act

States must ensure that all teachers in core subjects are "highly qualified" by the end of the 2005-2006 school year. A highly qualified teacher is one that (for new hires) has a BA and passes state tests in the subjects they teach, and that (for veteran teachers) has a BA and passes a high, objective state evaluation demonstrating proficiency in subjects they teach. (States may choose to test veteran teachers also).

States receive funding for professional development of teachers, with special attention to improving math and science teaching, and for teacher training in, and integration of, technology in education. States can use funds for teacher recruitment, hiring, performance pay, alternative routes to certification, knowledge development, and advanced certification.

Why Teacher Quality is Important

Study after study shows that teachers make the critical difference in whether or not a student succeeds. Business especially supports increased quality in math and science teaching. It is also vitally important to recruit and retain qualified individuals in the classroom to ensure future academic success. If students are to meet ambitious expectations, they must have superbly prepared teachers equal to the task.

Issues to Anticipate

- Many teachers are teaching subjects not in their field, and out-of-field teachers are disproportionately found in low-income schools.
- Shortages of highly qualified math and science teachers are growing.
- The urgency of teacher quality is raised by the prospective retirement of a large percentage of teachers currently in the schools.
- Providing high quality professional development for teachers has not been a standard practice in the past.

Messages to Promote:

- Teacher quality should be a top priority in state plans.
- There should be more professional development opportunities for teachers than in past practice, and should include academic content.
- The state should commit a substantial portion of professional development money to improve math and science teaching.
- The state should undertake an aggressive and innovative agenda to make the teaching profession more attractive.

WEB-BASED INFORMATION SOURCES

Check back often

MASTER COPY OF BUSINESS TOOLKIT (Check for updates)
http://www.brt.org/toolkit/toolkit.html

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION "NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND" IMPLEMENTATION SITE

No Child Left Behind Home Page	http://www.ed.gov/nclb/
Allocations of funds by state	http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/budnews.html
Text of the Law	http://www.ed.gov/legislation/ESEA02/
Text of regulations & guidance	http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister/
Guidance on Improving Teacher Quality	http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SIP/TitleIIguidance2002.doc
NCLB Desktop Reference	http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/reference.html
Individual State Accountability Plans	http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/CFP/csas/index.html
Basic information for parents	http://www.nclb.gov

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION DATA SITES

National Assessment of Educational Progress	http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard
National Center for Educational Statistics	http://nces.ed.gov

Public Site, by State, with Individual School Achievement Results (to be added)

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS

U.S. Department of Education Math & Science Partnership under No Child Left Behind Act
http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/AIDP/msp.html

National Science Foundation Math & Science Partnerships
http://www.ehr.nsf.gov/msp

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE SCHOOL OFFICERS

State Education Indicators Report with a focus on Title I
http://www.ccsso.org/projects/State_Education_Indicators/State_Education_Indicators_with_a_Focus_on_Title_I

Statewide Educational Accountability under NCLB
http://www.ccsso.org/publications/details.cfm?PublicationID=215

CCSSO Resources on No Child Left Behind Act
http://www.ccsso.org/federal_programs/NCLB/index.cfm

State-by-State Analysis of Current Reform Status
http://www.ecs.org/ecsmain.asp?page=/html/special/ESEA_main.htm

Individual State NCLB Websites and Plans
http://www.ecs.org/clearinghouse/42/65/4265.htm

EDUCATION WEEK "QUALITY COUNTS" REPORT

Survey on where each state stands on implementing reforms

http://www.educationweek.org/sreports/

THE EDUCATION TRUST

State Summaries. Individual state reports on educational performance and opportunity, including within- and cross-state achievement gap analysis.

http://www2.edtrust.org/EdTrust/states.html

The ABCs of "AYP:" Raising Achievement of All Students

http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/9C974109-4A70-4F5E-A07F-6DC90D656F0F/0/ABCAYP.pdf

ESEA: Myths vs. Realities: Answers to Common Questions about the New "No Child Left Behind Act

http://www2.edtrust.org/edtrust/ESEA

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY

School Reports, by state, with data on academic achievement and on best practices

http://www.just4kids.org/us/us_home.asp

Nine Essential Elements of Statewide Data-Collection Systems

http://www.nc4ea.org/index.cfm?pg=data_collection

Tests are Not Equal: Why States Need to Give High-Quality Assessments (with Achieve, Inc.)

http://www.nc4ea.org/files/statement%20of%20principles%20final.pdf

SELECTED FEDERAL FUNDING ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

FY 2003 Funding for 2003-2004 School Year

	Title I Grants for Disadvantaged[1]	Teacher Quality	Technology Grants	Grants to Develop State Tests	Reading Initiative	21st Century Learning Centers[2]	Math & Science Partnerships
Alabama	$177,362,455	$46,992,698	$9,690,136	$6,379,413	$18,082,502	$7,881,482	$1,760,356
Alaska	30,431,327	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,584,559	2,384,319	2,755,958	499,218
Arizona	187,860,284	45,803,961	9,655,054	7,021,172	18,034,779	9,064,566	1,755,710
Arkansas	106,001,974	28,194,595	5,465,161	5,037,148	10,532,153	4,942,086	1,025,320
California	1,649,697,459	341,185,718	89,959,919	30,621,018	142,801,723	76,288,342	13,901,945
Colorado	104,115,332	32,189,888	5,489,698	6,280,820	9,650,058	4,991,702	939,446
Connecticut	106,557,518	26,821,285	5,209,647	5,525,458	6,774,007	5,519,420	659,459
Delaware	30,637,587	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,584,273	2,384,319	2,755,958	499,218
D.C.	44,912,439	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,336,769	2,566,075	2,755,958	499,218
Florida	523,834,879	132,875,876	29,241,808	14,029,529	50,073,069	25,374,175	4,874,682
Georgia	343,346,663	76,825,005	18,645,145	9,428,919	29,362,206	16,659,140	2,858,451
Hawaii	36,094,503	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,888,745	3,016,980	2,755,958	499,218
Idaho	39,875,687	13,965,246	3,214,970	4,108,407	4,213,421	2,755,958	499,218
Illinois	478,793,210	117,358,738	25,908,318	12,675,137	35,016,846	22,814,072	3,408,938
Indiana	156,540,820	47,744,285	7,836,888	7,701,686	12,493,398	8,029,653	1,216,249
Iowa	61,057,797	22,012,532	3,214,988	5,226,824	5,210,792	3,168,461	507,278
Kansas	87,046,905	23,272,725	4,739,996	5,141,300	7,252,359	3,849,671	706,027
Kentucky	162,957,050	44,642,751	8,608,243	5,977,064	14,579,775	7,885,842	1,419,361
Louisiana	256,175,473	66,536,064	14,168,071	6,685,637	24,747,731	10,271,435	2,409,226
Maine	47,816,946	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,941,464	3,394,509	2,755,958	499,218
Maryland	152,201,505	41,535,900	8,092,948	7,095,579	10,585,926	8,197,461	1,030,554
Massachusetts	260,050,569	54,123,656	14,154,554	7,504,071	17,782,047	11,466,045	1,731,107
Michigan	420,126,320	109,667,289	20,457,029	10,857,084	26,898,636	21,775,047	2,618,619
Minnesota	117,728,364	38,871,042	6,055,412	6,909,832	9,566,710	5,909,888	931,332
Mississippi	157,215,840	42,853,605	8,315,118	5,331,372	15,684,691	5,471,889	1,526,926
Missouri	194,886,735	51,055,934	10,619,368	7,320,273	17,966,219	8,345,693	1,749,036
Montana	40,458,865	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,715,528	3,358,325	2,755,958	499,218
Nebraska	46,769,850	14,242,189	3,214,970	4,360,840	4,031,827	2,755,958	499,218
Nevada	53,216,311	14,570,528	3,214,970	4,494,754	5,327,859	2,755,958	518,674
New Hampshire	29,733,465	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,955,207	2,384,319	2,755,958	499,218
New Jersey	272,032,782	65,875,560	13,972,432	9,223,427	18,445,579	13,416,916	1,795,702
New Mexico	103,273,759	23,972,392	5,774,873	4,543,618	10,343,725	4,352,272	1,006,976
New York	1,184,751,800	235,137,051	64,948,122	17,093,407	75,616,187	54,585,531	7,361,340
North Carolina	261,980,283	64,830,985	14,721,370	8,818,139	25,668,363	11,368,449	2,498,850
North Dakota	30,329,411	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,496,025	2,384,319	2,755,958	499,218
Ohio	399,821,239	107,150,776	21,866,049	11,713,330	31,842,693	17,233,223	3,099,930
Oklahoma	128,454,510	33,891,416	6,646,069	5,679,283	12,481,635	6,355,057	1,215,104
Oregon	115,317,070	28,090,962	6,253,983	5,546,602	8,997,953	4,924,809	875,963
Pennsylvania	438,337,029	115,108,785	23,425,221	11,962,501	30,827,511	20,419,587	3,001,100
Rhode Island	43,155,247	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,751,196	3,099,656	2,755,958	499,218
South Carolina	157,877,214	37,057,604	8,651,744	6,042,595	14,370,958	7,522,110	1,399,033
South Dakota	32,000,786	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,619,087	2,384,319	2,755,958	499,218
Tennessee	185,694,729	50,085,509	10,282,694	7,180,784	18,757,124	7,425,972	1,826,032
Texas	1,018,467,898	239,845,925	55,794,699	20,407,518	93,114,584	45,457,205	9,064,833
Utah	45,809,427	18,492,824	3,214,970	5,080,179	4,834,831	2,755,958	499,218
Vermont	27,005,035	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,463,699	2,384,319	2,755,958	499,218
Virginia	182,110,558	52,138,639	9,917,162	8,212,619	15,866,958	9,288,650	1,544,670
Washington	157,166,797	46,263,752	8,312,350	7,572,445	14,132,903	7,408,275	1,375,857
West Virginia	94,167,837	24,058,246	5,106,182	4,227,670	7,308,260	4,038,437	711,469
Wisconsin	151,746,825	45,844,374	7,546,299	7,192,118	10,548,061	7,616,657	1,026,868
Wyoming	28,964,809	13,965,246	3,214,970	3,399,981	2,384,319	2,755,958	499,218
TOTALS:	**$11,684,311,000**	**$2,930,825,001**	**$695,946,750**	**$384,484,500**	**$993,500,000**	**$993,500,000**	**$100,343,500**

1 Compensatory educational assistance to districts and schools for economically disadvantaged children.

2 Expanding school use with before- and after-school and weekend services, including technology access, for youth and adults.

3 Of this total appropriation, $432,373,315 is reserved to continue existing grants in the states. These state totals reflect only new money being allocated by formula to the states.

State Business Coalition Contacts

ALABAMA

Cathy W. Gassenheimer, 334-279-1886
cathy@aplusala.org
Managing Director
Caroline Novak, 334-279-1886
caroline@aplusala.org
President
A+ Education Foundation
1 Retail Drive
Russell Building, 3rd Floor West
Montgomery, AL 36110
www.aplusala.org

ARIZONA

R. Thomas Browning, 602-221-4506
tbrowning@gplinc.org
Executive Director
Greater Phoenix Leadership
201 N. Central, 6th Floor
Mail Code AZ1-3003
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Barbara Clark, 602-438-3784
Barbara.clark@motorola.com
Motorola, Inc.
Arizona Workforce and Education
2900 South Diablo Way, MD DW205
Tempe, AZ 85284
www.motorola.com

ARKANSAS

Lee Gordon, 501-221-1558
Executive Director
Arkansas Business and Education Alliance
1415 Breckenridge Drive
Suite C
Little Rock, AR 72227

CALIFORNIA

William Hauck, 916-553-4093
bhauck@cbrt.org
President
California Business Roundtable
1215 K Street, Suite 1570
Sacramento, CA 95814
www.cbrt.org

Kirk Clark, 916-553-4093
kclark@cbrt.org
Executive Director
California Business for Education Excellence
1215 K Street, Suite 1570
Sacramento, CA 95814
www.cbrt.org

Suzanne Tacheny, Ph.D., 916-443-6411
Suzanne@cbeefoundation.org
Executive Director
California Business for Education Excellence
Foundation
1215 K Street, Suite 1510
Sacramento, CA 95814
www.cbee.net

COLORADO

Barbara Volpe, 303-861-8661
bvolpe@pebc.org
Public Education and Business Coalition
1410 Grant Street, Suite A-101
Denver, CO 80203
www.pebc.org

CONNECTICUT

Lauren Kaufman, 860-244-1938
kaufmanl@cbia.com
Vice President/Director, Education Foundation
Connecticut Business and Industry Association
350 Church Street
Hartford, CT 06103-1106
www.cbia.com

DELAWARE

Paul R. Fine, 302-984-1700
prf4306@aol.com
Executive Director
Business/Public Education Council
P.O. Box 1155
Wilmington, DE 19899

William T. Wood, Jr., 302-655-2673
woodbyrd@aol.com
Executive Director
Delaware Business Roundtable
c/o Wood, Byrd & Associates
1201 Orange Street, Suite 1010
Wilmington, DE 19801

FLORIDA

Charles Ohlinger, III, 813-229-1775
cohlinger@fc100.org
Executive Director
The Florida Council of 100
400 North Ashley Drive, Suite 1775
Tampa, FL 33602-4317
www.fc100.org

Jane McNabb, 850-521-1231
jmcnabb@flchamber.com
Executive Vice President
Florida Chamber of Commerce Foundation
136 South Bronough Street
Tallahassee, FL 32302
www.flchamber.com

GEORGIA

Dr. Steve Dolinger, 404-223-2283
sdolinger@mindspring.com
President
Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education
235 Peachtree Street, Suite 900
Atlanta, GA 30303

HAWAII

Carl Takamura, 808-532-2244
cthbr@aol.com
Executive Director
Hawaii Business Roundtable
1001 Bishop Street
Pauahi Tower, Suite 2626
Honolulu, HI 96813

IDAHO

A. Craig Olson, 208-424-2621
colson@jkaf.org
Executive Director
J.A. & Kathryn Albertson Foundation
501 Baybrook Court
Boise, ID 83706
www.jkaf.org

ILLINOIS

Jeff Mays, 312-236-7271
jmays@ilbusinessroundtable.com
President
Illinois Business Roundtable
150 North Wacker Drive, Suite 2650
Chicago, IL 60606
www.ilbusinessroundtable.com

INDIANA

Cheryl Orr, 317-464-4400 ext. 19
cherylo@che.state.in.us
Staff Liaison
Indiana's Education Roundtable
101 West Ohio Street, Suite 550

Indianapolis, IN 46204
www.edroundtable.state.in.us

Stacie Porter, 317-464-2245
sporter@indylink.com
Director of Education Policy
Indianapolis Chamber of Commerce
320 North Meridian Street, Suite 200
Indianapolis, IN 46204
www.indychamber.com

IOWA

Alexa A. Heffernan, 515-246-1700
ibc@iowabusinesscouncil.com
Executive Director
Iowa Business Council
100 East Grand Avenue, Suite 160
Des Moines, IA 50309
www.iowabusinesscouncil.com

KENTUCKY

Carolyn Witt Jones, 859-455-9595
cwjones@pfks.org
Executive Director
The Partnership for Kentucky Schools
600 Cooper Drive
Lexington, KY 40502
www.pfks.org

Robert F. Sexton, 859-233-9849
rsexton@prichardcommittee.org
Executive Director
Prichard Committee
167 W. Main Street, Suite 310
Lexington, KY 40507
www.prichardcommittee.org

LOUISIANA

Stephanie Desselle, 504-344-2225
desselle@cabl.org
Senior Vice President
Council for a Better Louisiana
Barry Erwin, 225-344-2225
Erwin@cabl.org
President and CEO
Council for a Better Louisiana
251 Florida Street, Suite 400
Baton Rouge, LA 70821-4308
www.cabl.org

MAINE

Dolly Sullivan, 207-469-3231
Mcee99@aol.com
Program Director
Maine Coalition for Excellence in Education
45 Memorial Circle
Augusta, ME 04350

MARYLAND

June E. Streckfus, 410-727-0448
june@mbrt.org
Executive Director
Maryland Business Roundtable for Education
111 South Calvert Street
Suite 1720
Baltimore, MD 21202
www.mbrt.org

MASSACHUSETTS

Pamela Plummer, 617-510-5666
pamela@mbae.org
Executive Director
Massachusetts Business Alliance for Education
400 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, MA 02110

William H. Guenther, 617-722-4160
wguenther@massinsight.com
President
Mass Insight Education
18 Tremont Street, Suite 930
Boston, MA 02108
www.massinsight.com

Alan MacDonald, 617-728-0881
agmmbr@aol.com
Executive Director
Massachusetts Business Roundtable
141 Temont Street, 6th Floor
Boston, MA 02111-1209

MICHIGAN

James Sandy, 517-371-2100
jsandy@michamber.com
Executive Director
Michigan Business Leaders for Education Excellence
c/o Michigan Chamber of Commerce
600 South Walnut Street
Lansing, MI 48933
www.mblee.org

MINNESOTA

Duane Benson, 612-370-0840
Executive Director
Jim Bartholomew, 612-370-0840
jbrthol@mn.uswest.net
Education Policy Director
Minnesota Business Partnership
4050 IDS Center
Minneapolis, MN 55402

MISSISSIPPI

Peggy Howard, 601-353-5488
phoward@mec.ms
Executive Director
Mississippi Public Education Forum
666 North Street, Suite 104
Jackson, MS 39225
www.msmec.com

NEBRASKA

Susan Ogborn, 402-978-7934
sogborn@omahachamber.org
Vice President, Community Development
Greater Omaha Chamber of Commerce
1301 Harney Street
Omaha, NE 68102
www.accessomaha.com

NEVADA

Ray Bacon, 775-882-6662
nma@nevadaweb.com
Executive Director
Nevada Manufacturers Association
780 Pawnee Street
Carson City, NV 89705
www.nevadaweb.com/nma

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Katherine A. Eneguess, 603-224-0740
keneguess@nhbia.org
Director
New Hampshire Business and Industry Coalition
122 North Main Street
Concord, NH 03301-4918
www.nhbia.org

Kelly Clark, 603-227-5315
nhforum@gsmr.org
Executive Director
NH Forum on Higher Education
4 Barrell Court
Concord, NH 03301
www.gsmr.org

NEW JERSEY

Dana Egreczky, 609-989-7888
dana@njchamber.com
Director, Education
New Jersey Chamber of Commerce
Jeff Osowski, 609-989-7888
jeff@njchamber.com
Vice President, Education Policy
New Jersey Chamber of Commerce
216 West State Street
Trenton, NJ 08608
www.njchamber.com

NEW MEXICO

Jacki P. Riggs, 505-242-8052
drpr@aol.com
President & CEO
The New Mexico Business Roundtable for
Educational Excellence
20 First Plaza, NW, Suite #303
Albuquerque, NM 87102

NEW YORK

Margarita Mayo, 518-465-7511 ext. 272
Margarita.mayo@bcnys.org
Director of Quality, Education and Training
The Business Council of New York State, Inc.
David F. Shaffer, 518-465-7517
David.Shaffer@bcnys.org
Corporate Secretary, President
Public Policy Institute
152 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12210
www.bcnys.org

NORTH CAROLINA

John N. Dornan, 919-781-6833
jdornan@ncforum.org
Executive Director
Public School Forum of North Carolina
Education is Everybody's Business Coalition
3739 National Drive, Suite 210
Raleigh, NC 27612
www.ncforum.org

OHIO

Richard Stoff, 614-469-1044
obrt@aol.com
President
Ohio Business Roundtable
41 South High Street, Suite 2240
Columbus, OH 43215

Jim Mahoney, 614-469-5966
jmmahoney@rrohio.com
Executive Director
Battelle for Kids
Lisa A. Gray, 614-469-5966
lisagray@rrcol.com
Director of Policy and Communications
Battelle for Kids
41 South High Street, Suite 2240
Columbus, OH 43215

OKLAHOMA

Phyllis Hudecki, 405-270-4499
pahudecki@earthlink.net
Executive Director
Oklahoma Business and Education Coalition
123 Robert S. Kerr Avenue
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

OREGON

Duncan E. Wyse, 503-220-0691
dwyse@orbusinesscouncil.org
President
Oregon Business Council
1100 SW Sixth Avenue, Suite 1608
Portland, OR 97204-1090
www.orbusinesscouncil.org

PENNSYLVANIA

Michael T. McCarthy, 717-232-8700
mccarthy@paroundtable.org
President
Pennsylvania Business Roundtable
208 North Third Street, Suite 400
Harrisburg, PA 17101
www.paroundtable.org

RHODE ISLAND

Valerie Forti, 401-331-5222
vforti@berrhodeisland.org
Executive Director
The Business Education Roundtable
345 South Main Street
Providence, RI 02903
www.berrhodeisland.org

SOUTH CAROLINA

William E. Chaiken, 803-799-4601
billc@scchamber.net
Associate Vice President for Education
South Carolina Chamber of Commerce
1202 Main Street, Suite 1810
Columbia, SC 29201-3229
www.sccc.org

TENNESSEE

Ellen Thornton, 615-255-5877
ethornton@tbroundtable.org
Executive Director
Tennessee Business Roundtable
530 Church Street, Suite 700
Nashville, TN 37219

George Yowell, 615-214-3076
gyowell@bellsouth.net
President
Tennessee Tomorrow, Inc.
333 Commerce Street
Nashville, TN 37201-3300

TEXAS

John H. Stevens, 512-480-8232
johnstbec@aol.com
Executive Director
Texas Business and Education Coalition
400 West 15th Street, Suite 809
Austin, TX 78701-2447
www.tbec.org

Sandy Dochen, 512-823-7500
dochen@us.ibm.com
President, Texans for Education
IBM
11400 Burnett Road
MC 0031N010
Austin, TX 78758

Mark Vane, 512-499-6232
mvane@akingump.com
Lobbyist, Texans for Education
Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, L.L.P.
Frost Bank Plaza
816 Congress Avenue, Suite 1900
Austin, TX 78701

UTAH

Richard E. Kendell, 801-538-8628
jurry@utah.gov
Executive Director
Utah Partners in Education
324 South State Street, Suite 500
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
www.utahpartnership.utah.org

VERMONT

Lisa Ventriss, 802-865-0410
Lisa@vtroundtable.org
President
Vermont Business Roundtable
69 Swift Street
Suite 300
South Burlington, VT 05403-7306
www.vtroundtable.org

Robin Morton, 802-223-3443
morton@vtchamber.com
Vermont Chamber of Commerce
751 Granger Road
Business Education Partnership
Barre, VT 05641

VIRGINIA

Kohann H. Whitney, 703-345-8085
Kohann.h.whitney@trw.com
Virginia Business Council
Director, Public Affairs
TRW Public Sector Solutions
12011 Sunset Hills Road
Reston, VA 20190-3285
www.trw.com

WASHINGTON

Stephen F. Mullin, 206-623-0180
smullin@waroundtable.com
Interim Executive Director
Washington Roundtable
520 Pike Street, Suite 1212
Seattle, WA 98101-4001
www.waroundtable.com

Jennifer Vranek, 206-625-9655
Jennifer@partnership4learning.org
Executive Director
Partnership for Learning
1215 Fourth Avenue
Suite 1020
Seattle, WA 98161
www.partnership4learning.org

WEST VIRGINIA

Dana E. Waldo, 304-357-0853
Dwaldo.wvroundtable@worldnet.att.net
President & CEO
West Virginia Roundtable
821 Kanawha Valley Building
Charleston, WV 25301

WISCONSIN

Jim Morgan, 608-258-3400
jimorgan@wmc.org
Vice President, Education and Programs
Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce
501 East Washington Avenue
Madison, WI 53703-2944

Executive Summary of The "No Child Left Behind Act of 2001"

In January 2001, the President and Congress began a major re-write of federal education aid and proposed significant reforms to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The Act encompassed nearly 55 programs totaling an annual investment of $19 billion. This Act traditionally covered supplemental aid for poor and disadvantaged children in K-12 education, but evolved over the years to address other education reform priorities for all children.

The business community also formed the Business Coalition for Excellence in Education, with over 70 national business organizations and U.S. corporations, to support effective principles of reform in the reauthorization of ESEA. The Coalition succeeded in having a tremendous impact on the legislation with most of its key recommendations incorporated into the new law. Some reforms that business sought would have turned out weaker or been dropped altogether without the advocacy of the Business Coalition. The final law, "No Child Left Behind Act," directs substantial reforms to state and local educational systems and will annually invest about $23 billion nationwide to aid implementation. It was signed into law January 8, 2002.

KEY REFORMS

- **Annual Assessments**. By 2005-2006 school year, all states must implement annual tests in reading and mathematics in grades 3-8. Tests must be aligned to state academic standards. All students (95%) must participate, and the assessments must be the same for all students. Assessments measure gains in student achievement, and results must be compared from year to year within the state. By 2007-2008, states must administer science assessments at least once in each grade span from 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12. The federal government covers state costs for developing and implementing annual tests. States may join in voluntary consortia to develop high quality assessments.
- **National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).** All states are required to participate in the NAEP for reading and math to verify results of state tests beginning in 2002-2003. The NAEP would be administered every two years in both reading and math to a sample of 4^{th} and 8^{th} graders. Costs for participating are covered by the federal government. No federal rewards or sanctions would be based on NAEP.
- **Accountability**. Within 2 years, all schools and school districts will be held accountable for all major student groups making "adequate yearly progress" toward being "proficient" against state academic standards. Act requires 100% of students being proficient within 12 years (by 2013-2014). All major student groups (racial and ethnic minorities, from low-income families, with limited English proficiency, or with disabilities) must make annual progress for schools and districts to succeed. Not making adequate progress in two successive years would trigger aid for improvements. Not making adequate progress over the next 3 years would require additional improvements, progressively greater corrective action, and then complete restructuring. Students in schools that are identified as needing improvement get a choice to attend other, better-performing public schools, and can receive additional services like tutoring, after school programs, and summer school. Restructured schools can open as charter schools or with new leadership, new staff, or new curriculum.

- **Data Disclosure on Results**. All school districts are required to disclose, by school, annual student performance data for every major student group in formats easily understood by parents and educators. Each state also discloses disaggregated data annually on student achievement by school district. State by state progress toward meeting proficiency levels is public. Disclosure begins with 2002-2003 school year data.
- **Teacher Quality.** By the end of 2005-2006 school year, states must have all teachers highly qualified in subjects they teach. By then, veteran teachers must have a BA, and pass a state test or a highly objective, uniform state evaluation of proficiency. Meantime, all new hires must have a BA and must demonstrate knowledge of core subjects on a state test. All states expand and deepen professional development for present teachers with $3 billion federal funds annually. Funds can be used to improve math and science teaching, deepen content knowledge, and to train teachers on the use and integration of technology in education. Other uses of funds can include teacher recruitment, hiring, testing, merit pay, alternative routes to certification, and advanced certification of exemplary teachers.
- **Math and Science Excellence**. A new initiative authorizes aid, up to $450 million annually, dedicated to math and science partnerships in the states. Congress provided $101 million in 2003. If any year's funding level is below $100 million nationally, as occurred in the first year (2002) with an appropriation of only $12.5 million, the Secretary of Education awards competitive grants to fewer partnerships, rather than sending funds to all states by formula. Partnerships combine state and local education agencies with higher education, business, and non-profit organizations, like research entities and museums, to raise student achievement in math and science. Priorities are set by local needs, but can include improving teacher qualifications, knowledge and skills, curriculum, instructional materials, and intensive professional development activities. A separate program under the National Science Foundation will target an additional $160 million to the states for a few innovative partnerships to experiment with, and widely promote, best practices. When combined with the $3 billion teacher quality program (above), which can also be used to improve math and science teaching, substantial new resources are focused on this national priority.
- **Technology**. All states participate in a $1 billion grant program to integrate technology into education. Localities will plan the use of funds based on needs, but can use funds for hardware, software, access, teacher and student training, curricula development, on-line learning, and efficient uses in administration and data management.
- **Early Reading**. All states participate in a new $1 billion initiative for both pre-K and grades 1-3 reading programs to ensure all children can read by grade 3.
- **Flexibility**. The number of programs under the Act was reduced from 55 under current law to 45. States and local school districts are given the flexibility to shift around diverse federal program funds to match local priorities and achieve results. With the exception of "Title I" money, which is targeted at economically disadvantaged students, states and localities can decide how to allocate up to 50% of all other funds distributed by formula. Additionally, 7 states and 150 school districts will be chosen to participate in demonstration projects. They will be relieved from specific rules and paperwork for individual programs, with the expectation of increased student achievement results.
- **Alignment**. All states must have challenging academic standards in core subjects and can use funds under the Act to upgrade standards. Student assessments must be aligned to

standards. Data must chart student progress in achieving standards. Teacher preparation and professional development must be aligned to the goals of student achievement. Accountability systems with rewards and sanctions must be aligned toward achieving standards. State plans must demonstrate this systemic alignment or a path toward alignment.

IMPLEMENTATION TIMETABLE

The Act becomes operational with the 2002-2003 school year. To allow states the maximum time for planning:

- By May 2002, the U.S. Department of Education publishes preliminary implementation rules, which can be used for planning.
- By August 2002, final rules are published.
- Prior to July 1, 2002, States would have to submit applications (interim plans) to the Secretary of Education for approval. An approved application releases federal money to the state for the 2002-2003 school year.
- By June 1, 2003, all states must have their accountability plans approved by the Secretary of Education.

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT
Implementation Time Line

The No Child Left Behind Act commits the nation's states and schools to a timetable that swiftly implements a multitude of major reforms. Most notably, the law requires states to ensure that within 12 years, all students in grades three through eight — including minority, low-income, disabled, limited-English-proficient and other traditionally low-performing student groups — meet state standards for academic proficiency in reading and math. To help school systems meet these ambitious aims, the legislation authorizes billions of dollars in new federal funds for teacher professional development, math and science initiatives, instructional technology, early childhood literacy, and other efforts.
Successful implementation will depend upon sound leadership and effective coordination at the national, state and local levels. The business community has a crucial role to play in working with education officials in their areas to make the most of the law's funding opportunities and to meet its new requirements.

2002
January. The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 was signed into law, providing $22.1 billion in K–12 public school aid annually, up from $18.7 billion under the previous Elementary and Secondary Education Act. States start planning immediately based on the legislation's text.
April-August. The U.S. Department of Education releases draft rules, reviews public comment and issues final implementation rules.
July. The secretary of education approves state applications submitted before the July 1 deadline, releasing federal funds for implementation in the 2002–03 school year. State accountability and consolidated plans will follow.

2002–03 School Year
Proficiency Benchmarks. Each state defines the initial level of "proficiency" that should be met by all schools and all major student groups.
Assessment. School systems establish baseline achievement data, based on results from current assessments wherever states have not yet begun administering annual reading and math assessments in third through eighth grades. These first-year data — detailed by school, district and student group — are the first that must be reported publicly and will establish a starting point from which to measure annual progress of all students in reading and math.
Identifying Schools. Consequences are triggered immediately for schools previously identified as needing improvement.

2003–04 School Year
Accountability. States measure "adequate yearly progress" of all schools, districts and student groups toward proficiency in reading and math on assessments aligned with state standards. All major student groups must show progress from 2002-2003 for schools to succeed.
Identifying Schools. Schools that do not show progress for all major student groups by this second year must create improvement plans within 45 days. These schools must meet progress goals for two years in a row to succeed.

2004–05 School Year
Identifying Schools.
Schools identified as needing improvement after three years of data and not meeting adequate yearly progress for all student groups must allow students to transfer to other public schools, provide transportation, and carry out school improvement plans.

2005–06 School Year
Reading and Math Assessments. States must give annual assessments in reading and math to all students in grades three through eight. The tests, which must be aligned with state standards, are required to yield data that can be compared from one year to the next and from one school to another. States can use federal funds to cover the costs of creating and implementing tests.
Science Standards and Assessments. States must adopt academic standards and create aligned assessments in science.
Identifying Schools. Schools that do not show adequate yearly progress four years in a row must provide students with supplemental services — such as tutoring and after-school and summer-school programs — as well as a choice of other public schools and transportation.
Teaching Quality. By the end of the school year, states must show that all public school teachers are highly qualified, possessing at least bachelor's degrees and demonstrating proficiency in the subjects they teach.

2006–07 School Year
Identifying Schools. Schools that have not shown adequate progress five years in a row receive corrective actions, including requirements for new improvement plans, new curricula and new policymaking structures.

2007–08 School Year
Science Assessments. States must give science assessments to students in at least one grade in each group from grades 3 through 5, grades 6 through 9, and grades 10 through 12.
Identifying Schools. Schools that do not make adequate progress for a fifth consecutive year are shut down and restructured. These schools may re-open as charter schools or regular schools with new staff and new curricula.

STANDARDS, ASSESSMENTS, AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Summary of Provisions under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Title I, Part A, of the Act contains the core requirements for improving basic programs operated by state and local educational agencies.

STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS

Challenging Academic Standards

- Each state must demonstrate that it has adopted challenging academic standards that will be used by the state, local educational agencies, and schools to gauge student achievement.
- The same academic standards must apply to all schools and children in the state.
- Academic standards must be set for all subjects determined by the state, but must include mathematics, reading or language arts, and (beginning 2005-2006) science.
- Standards must include:
    - Content standards in academic subjects that specify what children are expected to know and be able to do, contain coherent and rigorous content, and encourage the teaching of advanced skills;
    - Student achievement measures that are aligned to state academic standards and describe levels of achievement (basic, proficient, and advanced) that determine how well children are mastering the material in the content standards.

Accountability

Single Accountability System

- Each state must demonstrate that it is implementing a single, statewide accountability system that will be effective in ensuring that all local agencies and schools make "adequate yearly progress."
- Each state's accountability system must:
    - Be based on the academic standards and assessments adopted by the state, and take into account the achievement of all public school students;
    - Be the same accountability system that the state uses for all public schools and local education agencies;
    - Include sanctions and rewards that the state will use to hold local agencies and schools accountable for student achievement and for meeting adequate yearly progress.

Adequate Yearly Progress

Each state must demonstrate, based on academic assessments of student achievement, what constitutes adequate yearly progress for the state, local educational agencies and all public schools toward enabling all students to meet academic standards and narrowing the achievement gaps.

Definition. Each state must define "adequate yearly progress" in a manner that:

- Applies the same high standards of academic achievement to all student in the state;
- Is statistically valid and reliable
- Results in continuous and substantial improvement for all students
- Measures the progress of districts, schools, and the state based on academic assessments
- Includes separate, measurable, annual objectives for continuous and substantial improvement for:
    - All public school students
    - Economically disadvantaged students
    - Students from major racial and ethnic groups
    - Students with disabilities, and
    - Students with limited English proficiency
- Includes graduation rates for secondary school students, and one other academic indicator (which may include achievement on additional state or local assessments, decreases in grade-to-grade retention rates, attendance rates, and changes in the percentages of students completing gifted and talented, advanced placement, and college preparatory courses)

Starting Point. Each state, using data from the 2001-2002 school year, must establish the starting point for measuring the percentage of students meeting or exceeding the state's "proficient" level of academic achievement. At a minimum, the starting point must be based on the higher percentage of students at the "proficient" level in:

- The lowest achieving group of students in the state (as disaggregated above), or
- The school in the 20th percentile of all schools in the state (ranked by students at the proficient level).

Timeline. Each state must establish a timeline for adequate yearly progress. The timeline must ensure that within 12 years after the 2001-2002 school year all students in each major student group will meet the state's proficient level of academic achievement.

Annual Measurable Objectives. Each state must establish statewide annual measurable objectives for adequate yearly progress, which:

- Must be set separately for math and reading;
- Must be the same for all schools
- Must identify the minimum percentage of students required to meet the proficient level (applied separately for each major student group)
- Ensures that all students meet the proficiency standard in 12 years
- May be the same for more than 1 year, subject to intermediate goals (below).

Intermediate Goals for Adequate Yearly Progress. Each state must establish intermediate goals for meeting the 12-year proficiency requirement. The intermediate goals must:

- Increase in equal increments over the 12-year timeline
- Set the first increase to occur in not more than 2 years, and
- Provide for each following increase to occur at least every three years.

Annual Improvement for Schools. Each year for a school to make adequate yearly progress:

- Each group of students must meet the annual objectives set by the state and will be considered to have met the objective if the percentage of proficient students is within 10 percent of the objective, and made progress on one of the other academic indicators
- At least 95% of each group of students in the school are required to take the assessment

Uniform Averaging of Data. For the purpose of determining whether schools are making adequate yearly progress, the state may establish a uniform procedure for averaging data including the following:

- A state may average data from a school year with the one or two years immediately preceding that one;
- Until assessments are in place that provide uniform data, states may use data from assessments that were required under the 1994 ESEA law;
- A state may use data across grades in a school.

Academic Assessments

By the 2005-2006 school year, each state must have a set of high-quality, yearly academic assessments for reading and mathematics in grades 3 through 8. By the 2007-2008 school year, each state must have science assessments administered at least once during grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12. (Academic standards in science are required by the 2005-2006 school year.)

Each state may incorporate data from the assessments into a longitudinal data system that links student test scores, length of enrollment, and graduation records over time.

Requirements for Assessments

The assessments developed by states must --

- Be the same academic assessments used to measure the achievement of all children;
- Be aligned with the state's academic standards and provide coherent information about student achievement of the standards;
- Meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards;
- Involve up-to-date measures of student achievement that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding;
- Be used only for the purposes for which they are designed;

- Be used only if evidence is provided by the test publisher or other sources that the tests are of adequate technical quality to meet the purposes of the Act;
- At a minimum, for reading and math, be administered at least once during grades 3-5, 6-9, and 10-12, until annual tests are administered (at the latest by 2005-2006); *[The Secretary may provide 1 additional year if the state demonstrates that exceptional or uncontrollable circumstances, such as a natural disaster, prevented full implementation.]*
- Include students who have attended schools in a local educational agency for a full academic year;
- Produce individual student interpretive, descriptive, and diagnostic reports in uniform formats that allow parents, teachers, and principals to understand and address specific student needs;
- Enable results to be disaggregated within each state, local agency, and school by gender, by each major racial and ethnic group, by English proficiency status, by migrant status, by students with disabilities, and by economically disadvantaged students.

The assessment systems developed by the state must provide for:

- The participation of all students in the assessments;
- Accommodations for students with disabilities;
- The inclusion of limited English proficient students in the language and form most likely to yield accurate data; *[unless a student has attended a U.S. school for 3 or more consecutive years, in which case English tests are used]*

Deferral of Assessment Requirements. A state may defer the administration (but not development) of assessments for a year if the amount appropriated by Congress for the state costs of assessments is less than:

- $370 million for FY 2002; *[Congress appropriated $387 million in '02]*
- $380 million for FY 2003; *[Congress appropriated $387 million in '03]*
- $390 million for FY 2004; and
- $400 million for fiscal years 2005-2007.

Academic Assessments of English Language Proficiency. Each state must demonstrate that local educational agencies will provide for an annual assessment of English proficiency (measuring oral, reading, and writing skills) of all students with limited English proficiency beginning in the 2002-2003 school year. *[The Secretary may provide 1 additional year for exceptional circumstances.]*

Additional Requirements in State Plans. Each state plan shall describe --

- How the state will assist local agencies to provide additional educational assistance to individual students assessed as needing help to achieve academic standards;
- Steps the state will take to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers;
- An assurance that the state will help localities to develop or identify effective curricula aligned with state academic standards.

- How results of assessments will be promptly provided to local agencies, schools, and teachers in clear, easily understood, uniform formats;
- How results of assessments will be used to improve the educational achievement of individual students.

Participation in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). Each state plan shall provide assurances that the state will participate in biennial academic assessments of 4th and 8th grade reading and mathematics under NAEP beginning in school year 2002-2003, if the Secretary pays the cost of administering it. *[Congress appropriated $108 million in FY'03 compared to $36 million in FY'01, intending to cover such costs.]*

Penalties. If a state fails to meet deadlines established by the 1994 ESEA reauthorization for adopting challenging academic standards and a system for measuring adequate yearly progress, the Secretary shall withhold 25% of state administrative funds under this Act each year until the state meets the requirements.

Voluntary Partnerships. A state may enter into a voluntary partnership with another state to develop and implement the academic assessments and standards required under the Act.

Annual State Report Card

Beginning with the 2002-2003 school year, each state shall prepare and distribute an annual state report card.

The report card shall be concise and presented in an understandable and uniform format.

Required Information. Each state shall include in its report card --

- Information on aggregate student achievement at each proficiency level disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged;
- A comparison of actual achievement levels for each group with the annual objectives for each group;
- The percentage of students not tested (disaggregated by the same categories);
- The most recent 2-year trend in student achievement in each subject area and for each grade level (only for the subjects assessed under this Act);
- Aggregate information on other indicators used to determine adequate yearly progress;
- Graduation rates;
- Performance of local school districts regarding making adequate yearly progress, including names of schools identified as needing improvement;
- Professional qualifications of teachers, percentage of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers, disaggregated by high poverty and low poverty schools (top quartile and bottom quartile).

Optional Information. A state may include additional information to best provide parents and the public with information on the progress of public schools, such as --

- School attendance rates;
- Average class size in each grade;
- Gains in English proficiency for LEP students;
- Incidence of violence, substance abuse, suspensions, and expulsions;
- Extent and type of parental involvement;
- Percentage of students completing advanced placement courses and passing advanced tests;
- Clear and concise description of the state's accountability system.

Annual Local Report Card

Each local educational agency receiving assistance under the Act must prepare and distribute an annual report card beginning with the 2002-2003 school year.

Required Information. In addition to the data in the state report card that is appropriate to and aggregated from local assessment data and is required in the local report card, the state must ensure that the local agency report card include:

For the Local Educational Agency --

- The number and percentage of schools identified as needing improvement;
- How students of the local agency achieved on the statewide academic assessments compared to the state as a whole;

For the School --

- Whether the school has been identified for school improvement;
- How the school's students achieved on statewide assessments compared to students in the local education agency and the state as a whole.

Accountability

All students, including all major student groups, must become "proficient" in state academic standards for reading and math in grades 3-8. (Disaggregated student groups include minorities, low-income, disabled, and limited English proficient).

- States define and set initial level of "proficiency" that all schools and student groups must meet to succeed. (Based on the higher level of either the lowest performing schools or student groups.)
- States measure "adequate yearly progress" toward proficiency of all districts, schools, and student groups based on achievement data from assessments. To make adequate yearly progress, all students (95%) in the school, including all major student groups must meet proficiency standard. If a school does not make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years, corrective actions must be taken.
- Proficiency standard for yearly progress must be raised at least once every 3 years.

Setting the Bar

State sets initial proficiency level in 2002-2003 that must be met by all schools and major student groups.

Assessment Data for Accountability

Baseline year for collecting student achievement data by school for accountability purposes is 2002-2003. (For states without annual tests in reading and math in grades 3-8, data from current assessments are used until annual assessments are developed.)

Confirmation year to validate student achievement data by school is 2003-2004. If a school does not show adequate yearly progress by this second year, an improvement plan must be developed in 45 days.

- Public disclosure of data begins with 2002-2003 school year.
- After two years of data, schools not previously known to be needing improvement are identified. Likewise, a school identified as needing improvement must meet adequate yearly progress goals two consecutive years to succeed and change its status. (If a school is already identified as needing improvement before 2002-2003 with data and assessments from the 1994 law, they are aided immediately according to their status.)

School Status and Timetable

- Schools still identified as needing "improvement" (after 3rd year) must provide students an option to transfer to another better performing public school, provide transportation, and implement an improvement plan, including professional development for teachers. The local educational agency must provide technical assistance.
- Schools identified a second year as needing improvement (after 4th year of data showing lack of adequate progress) must provide "supplemental services" to students (like tutoring, after school programs, summer school - parents get a list of providers), choice of another public school, transportation, and continue to carry out an improvement plan.
- Schools still not making adequate yearly progress (after 5th year) move into "corrective action" requiring a new plan, new curricula, and altered governance. Local districts can replace school staff relevant to the problems, fully implement new curricula along with appropriate professional development, decrease local management authority, appoint outside experts to help, extend the school year or day, or restructure internal organization of the school. Students continue to get supplemental services and the right to transfer to a better performing public school.
- Schools identified again as not making adequate progress (after a 6th year) are closed and restructured. A school can re-open as a charter school, or regular school with new staff, with new curricula.

State Review of Local Educational Agency Improvement

A process similar to that outlined above, of having local school districts review and identify the performance of individual schools, is required by the state for the annual review and identification of school districts that need improvement based on student achievement data.

A state must help those local school districts that are identified by providing technical assistance, professional development, and administrative restructuring. Continuing to miss standards for adequate yearly progress brings increasingly aggressive aid and penalties from the state until a district is taken over by a receiver or trustee in lieu of the local school board and superintendent until adequate yearly progress is made.

Schools and Local Educational Agencies Previously Identified

Schools and local agencies previously identified as needing improvement or requiring corrective action prior to enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, shall maintain that identification and status for purposes of immediate actions to correct and improve student achievement to make adequate yearly progress.

School Support Teams

Each state must establish school support teams composed of persons knowledgeable about scientifically based data and practice on teaching and learning and about successful schoolwide projects, school reform, and improving educational opportunities for low-achieving students. Teams can include:

- distinguished teachers and principals;
- pupil services personnel;
- parents;
- representatives of institutions of higher education;
- representatives of regional educational laboratories or technical assistance centers; or
- outside consultant groups.

Support Team Functions. Teams assigned to a school shall:

- analyze the school's operations including the instructional program and make recommendations for improvement;
- collaborate in the design, implementation, and monitoring of an improvement plan;
- evaluate the effectiveness of school personnel every six months;
- make additional recommendations as plans are implemented.

Teams may help a school for up to 2 years.

State Recognition of Academic Achievement

Each state must establish a program for making awards to schools and teachers that significantly close the achievement gap between the major groups of students, or exceed their adequate yearly progress for 2 or more consecutive years.

Qualifications for Teachers and Paraprofessionals

Beginning the first day of school year 2002-2003, all teachers hired after that date, who teach in a program receiving funds under this Act, must be "highly qualified."

The state must develop a plan to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified no later than the end of the 2006-2007 school year. Schools, school districts, states, and the Secretary of Education must all make annual reports on progress toward this goal.

Definitions of "Highly Qualified"

Highly qualified teachers must be state certified and --

- For newly hired elementary school teachers, have a BA degree and have demonstrated subject knowledge and teaching skills (by passing a rigorous state test) in reading, writing, mathematics, and other areas of elementary curriculum;
- For newly hired middle or secondary school teachers, have a BA degree and demonstrate high level competency in each subject area taught (by passing a rigorous state academic subject test), or completion of an academic major, graduate degree, or advanced certification in the subject area(s) taught;
- For existing elementary and secondary school teachers, hold a BA degree and have passed a rigorous state test, or demonstrated competency based on a high, objective, and uniform standard of evaluation developed by the state.

Qualifications of Paraprofessionals

New Paraprofessionals. Paraprofessionals hired after the date of enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act (January 8, 2002), are required to have:

- Completed at least 2 years of higher education;
- Obtained an associate's degree (or higher);
- Met a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate through formal academic assessment knowledge of, and the ability to assist in instructing, reading, writing, and mathematics.

A high school diploma will no longer be sufficient by itself.

Existing Paraprofessionals. All existing paraprofessionals must meet the new paraprofessional requirements (above) within 4 years of enactment.

Exceptions. Exceptions are made for paraprofessionals who provide services primarily to act as a translator for non-English speaking students or who conduct parental involvement activities.

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL QUALITY

Summary of Provisions under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL TRAINING AND RECRUITMENT

Title II, Part A, of the No Child Left Behind Act consolidates prior federal funding for class size reduction and teacher professional development into a single state grant for teacher quality authorized at $3.2 billion. The actual appropriation from Congress totaled $2.9 billion for FY 2003, a substantial increase from the $2 billion investment in 2001.

Purpose

This grant program provides funds to state agencies, local school districts, state higher education agencies, and certain partnerships in order to increase teacher and principal quality and increase the number of highly qualified teachers and principals in the schools.

Qualifications for Teachers and Paraprofessionals

(Title I of the Act contains requirements for qualified teachers and paraprofessionals that relate to programs and professional development under this Title II, and, therefore, are repeated here for convenience of the reader.)

Beginning the first day of school year 2002-2003, all teachers hired after that date, who teach in a program receiving funds under this Act, must be "highly qualified."

The state must develop a plan to ensure that all teachers are highly qualified no later than the end of the 2006-2007 school year. Schools, school districts, states, and the Secretary of Education must all make annual reports on progress toward this goal.

Definitions of "Highly Qualified"

Highly qualified teachers must be state certified and --

- For newly hired elementary school teachers, have a BA degree and have demonstrated subject knowledge and teaching skills (by passing a rigorous state test) in reading, writing, mathematics, and other areas of elementary curriculum;
- For newly hired middle or secondary school teachers, have a BA degree and demonstrate high level competency in each subject area taught (by passing a rigorous state academic subject test), or completion of an academic major, graduate degree, or advanced certification in the subject area(s) taught;
- For existing elementary and secondary school teachers, hold a BA degree and have passed a rigorous state test, or demonstrated competency based on a high, objective, and uniform standard of evaluation developed by the state.

Qualifications of Paraprofessionals

New Paraprofessionals. Paraprofessionals hired after the date of enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act (January 8, 2002), are required to have:

- Completed at least 2 years of higher education;
- Obtained an associate's degree (or higher);
- Met a rigorous standard of quality and can demonstrate through formal academic assessment knowledge of, and the ability to assist in instructing, reading, writing, and mathematics.

A high school diploma will no longer be sufficient by itself.

Existing Paraprofessionals. All existing paraprofessionals must meet the new paraprofessional requirements (above) within 4 years of enactment.

Exceptions. Exceptions are made for paraprofessionals who provide services primarily to act as a translator for non-English speaking students or who conduct parental involvement activities.

State Application for Funds (Title II)

The state educational agency must submit an application to the Secretary for funding. The content of the application must include:

- A description of how activities are aligned with state academic standards, state assessments, and state and local curricula;
- How funds will be used to improve the quality of teachers and principals;
- A description of the strategy to ensure that teachers are trained in the use of technology;
- How the state will deliver intensive professional development using proven strategies like peer networks, technology, and distance learning;
- A description of how teacher professional development needs will be met (including teacher mentoring);
- A description of annual measurable objectives to improve teacher quality.

Allotment of Funds to States

The Secretary of Education must allot to each state an amount equal to what the state received for fiscal year 2001 (prior to enactment of this Act) under former "Class Size Reduction" and "Eisenhower Professional Development" programs, now combined.

Of the remaining funds appropriated, each state receives its relative share based on the following formula:

- 35% based on the state's share of eligible school age population (ages 5-17);
- 65% based on the state's share of youth from families living below the poverty line.

State Use of Funds

Distribution. Once the state receives the grant, it must:

- Distribute 95% of the funds to local educational agencies through subgrants;
- Use 2.5% for state activities (below);
- Use 2.5% for local partnerships with higher education institutions.

State Activities. The state agency shall use funds (2.5% of the state's allotment) for one or more of the following activities:

- Reform teacher and principal certification or licensing requirements to ensure that
  - Teachers have the subject matter knowledge and teaching skills in the subjects they teach,
  - Principals have the instructional leadership skills to help teachers teach and students learn,
  - Certification and licensing requirements are aligned with state academic standards,
  - Teachers and principals have the knowledge and skills, including technology literacy, to help students meet academic standards.
- Support teachers and principals, including those new to their profession, with programs that
  - Provide mentoring, team coaching, reduced class schedules, and intensive professional development,
  - Use standards or assessments with beginning teachers that are consistent with state academic standards;
- Establish or expand alternative routes for state certification of teachers, especially in areas of mathematics and science;
- Help local agencies recruit and train highly qualified teachers;
- Reform tenure systems, and implement teacher testing systems for subject matter knowledge;
- Develop systems to measure the effectiveness of specific professional development programs;
- Fund projects promoting reciprocity between states for teacher and principal certification or licensing;
- Help localities deliver intensive professional development through technology, peer networks, and distance learning;
- Support training for teachers to effectively integrate technology into curricula and instruction, and to collect, manage, and analyze data;
- Develop merit-based performance systems and strategies that provide differential pay for teachers in high-need subjects and in high-poverty schools;
- Support leadership academies for principals and superintendents to become management and educational leaders;
- Help localities develop initiatives for professional growth and multiple career paths (such as career teacher, mentor teacher, or exemplary teacher) with pay differential.

Allocation of Funds to Local Agencies

The state must allocate to each local educational agency an amount equal to what the locality received for fiscal year 2001 (prior to enactment of this Act) under former "Class Size Reduction" and "Eisenhower Professional Development" programs, now combined.

Of the additional funds that may remain available, each locality receives its relative share based on the following formula:

- 20% based on the locality's share of eligible school age population (ages 5-17);
- 80% based on the locality's share of youth (ages 5-17) from families living below the poverty line.

Local Application and Needs Assessment

The local education agency must submit to the state an application that is based on a local assessment of professional development and hiring needs. The assessment must take into account what teachers will require in order to have the subject matter knowledge and teaching skills to help students meet academic standards.

Contents of Local Applications. Local applications shall include:

- A description of how these activities will be aligned with state academic standards and the curricula tied to standards;
- How activities will be used to eliminate the achievement gap separating low-income and minority students from others;
- An assurance that funds will go to schools that
  - Have the lowest proportion of highly qualified teachers,
  - Have the largest average class size, or
  - Are identified for "school improvement" having not made adequate yearly progress;
- How funds are used to train teachers to integrate technology into curricula and instruction to improve teaching and learning;
- How funds will be used to improve teaching in schools identified as not meeting standards.

Local Use of Funds

The local educational agency can use funds to carry out one or more of the following activities:

- Recruit and retain highly qualified teachers, including specialists in core academic subjects, and use additional incentives, such as scholarships, signing bonuses, or differential pay, for highly qualified teachers in schools where there are shortages;
- Provide professional development that improves the knowledge of teachers in core academic subjects they teach, effective instructional methods, and the use of standards and assessments to improve student achievement;
- Develop initiatives to retain skilled teachers and principals that provide
  - Mentoring from exemplary colleagues,
  - Induction and support during the first 3 years,

    - Financial rewards for individuals successful in helping low-achieving students to reach standards,
- Carry out professional development programs to improve the quality of the teaching force, that may include
    - Partnerships with higher education institutions,
    - Cost-effective technology and distance learning,
    - Tenure reform,
    - Merit pay,
    - Testing of teachers in the subjects they teach;
- Carry out professional development designed to improve the quality of principals and superintendents;
- Hire highly qualified teachers through alternative certification routes;
- Provide teacher advancement opportunities that promote professional growth and emphasize multiple career paths (becoming a career teacher, mentor, or exemplary teacher);
- Carry out programs related to exemplary or master teachers.

State Funds Reserved for Partnerships with Higher Education

The state agency for higher education receives 2.5% of the state's allotment of teacher quality grant funds. The agency issues grants on a competitive basis to eligible partnerships.

Eligible Partnerships. Partnerships are entities that

Must include --

- An institution of Higher Education and the division that prepares teachers and principals,
- A school of arts and sciences,
- A high-need local educational agency, and

May include --

- Another local educational agency,
- Charter school,
- An elementary or secondary school,
- An educational service agency,
- A non-profit organization,
- A teacher or principal organization,
- A business.

Partnership Use of Funds. The partnerships must use the funds for --

- Professional development activities in core academic subjects to ensure that,
    - Teachers and paraprofessionals have subject matter knowledge in the academic subjects they teach,
    - Principals have instructional leadership skills to help teachers and students master core academic subjects;
- Assistance to local educational agencies for sustained, high quality professional development activities that,
    - Ensure individuals are able to use academic standards and assessments to improve instructional practices and student achievement,
    - Prepares skilled individuals to teach other peers schoolwide,
    - Improve teaching at low-performing schools.

Accountability

Improvement Plans. If any local educational agency does not make adequate yearly progress goals for two consecutive years, it must develop an improvement plan for meeting the goals, including activities for training and professional development.

Technical Assistance. During development of the local agency plan, the State agency must provide technical assistance to the locality and, if applicable, to specific schools that need assistance with professional development.

State Authority. If any local educational agency does not make adequate yearly progress for three consecutive years, the state must step in and reach agreement with the locality on how funds under this Title are to be used to achieve performance goals, including strategies and activities for professional development that are coordinated with reforms at the schools.

National Activities

Teacher Recruitment Campaign. The Secretary may carry out activities to help high need educational agencies in recruiting teachers (including retaining new teachers). The activities may include a national service campaign about the resources for, and the routes to, the field of teaching. The Secretary can link activities to information and referrals available through the National Teacher Recruitment Clearinghouse.

School Leadership. The Secretary can carry out a national principal recruitment program through both financial incentives for entering the profession, mentoring new principals, or conducting leadership and management programs, and competitive grants to high need local educational agencies, consortia, or partnerships with such agencies.

Advanced Certification and Credentialing. The Secretary may encourage and support teachers seeking advanced certification or credentialing. In doing this, the Secretary is required to make grants to:

- Develop standards for teachers including measures for increased student achievement;
- Promote outreach, recruitment, subsidy, or support for certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, the National Council on Teacher Quality, or other nationally recognized organizations.

Early Childhood Teacher Training. The Secretary may award competitive grants for up to 4 years to partnerships that can train early childhood educators. Partnerships may consist of higher education institutions, professional development entities, human service and Head Start agencies, or other entities of demonstrated effectiveness for improving the skills of early childhood educators who work in communities that have high concentrations of children in poverty.

Teacher Mobility. The Secretary is authorized to appoint a 12-member National Panel on Teacher Mobility to study ways of increasing mobility and employment opportunities for teachers, especially for states with teacher shortages or for areas that are difficult to staff. The panel will study teacher supply and demand, recruitment and hiring strategies, and

reciprocity of certification and licensing across states. A report is due within 1 year of the panel's appointment.

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS

This new grant program, under Title II, Part B, authorizes up to $450 million annually for state and local math and science partnerships. Funds would be allotted to states based on each state's relative share of the number of students in poverty. Each state would allocate funds by competitive grant application to eligible local partnerships for a period of 3 years. If any year's funding is below $100 million nationally, as occurred in the first year (2002) with an appropriation of only $12.5 million, the Secretary of Education awards competitive grants to fewer partnerships rather than sending funds to all states by formula. *[A detailed summary of this program is provided separately.]*

INNOVATIONS FOR TEACHER QUALITY

Title II, Part C, reauthorizes several existing programs for recruitment and training of teachers and adds new innovations.

Transitions to Teaching

$150 million is authorized in the first year (2002) for supporting effective transitions to teaching for mid-career, military, and other professionals with subject matter expertise to enter the teaching profession.

Troops to Teachers Program. Up to $30 million of the funds authorized are reserved to fund the administration of the troops to teachers program. This program helps members of the Armed Forces to obtain certification or licensing as elementary, secondary, or vocational and technical school teachers and facilitates their employment in high poverty areas or areas experiencing teacher shortages.

Transition to Teaching Program. The purpose of this program is to:

- Recruit and retain mid-career professionals (including paraprofessionals) and recent graduates from higher education as teachers in high-need schools; and
- Encourage the development of alternative routes to certification that recognize the experience, expertise, and academic qualifications of individuals in lieu of traditional courses and reduce the period of time.

The Secretary can make competitive 5-year grants for this program. Eligible entities for the grants include regional consortium of state educational agencies.

National Writing Project

The Act authorizes a grant to the nonprofit organization of the National Writing Project to support the expansion of network of sites and promote distribution of effective practices and research about the teaching of writing. The national nonprofit entity contracts with institutions of higher education or nonprofit educational providers to train teachers (grades kindergarten-college) and develop teachers to instruct other teachers in writing.

Civic Education

This program is intended to improve the quality of civics and government education by educating students about the history and principles of the U.S. Constitution and Bill of Rights, fostering civic competence and responsibility, and using cooperative civic and economic education exchange programs with emerging democracies. Most activities are carried out through the nonprofit Center for Civic Education or the National Council on Economic Education. $30 million is authorized.

Teaching of Traditional American History

This new program authorizes the Secretary to make competitive grants to local educational agencies to promote teaching of American history as a separate subject (not just part of social studies), strengthening curricula, improving the quality of instruction, and provide professional development in the subject. Local agencies must partner with a higher education institution, nonprofit history organization, or a library or museum.

Teacher Liability Protection

This part clarifies the limits and protections for teacher liability to give teachers, principals, and other school professionals the tools they need to maintain order, discipline, and an appropriate educational environment.

ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY

Title II, Part D, of the Act consolidates various programs to integrate technology and skills in education. Congress authorizes $1 billion for state and local grants in fiscal year 2002. (For school year 2003-2004, Congress actually appropriated $696 million.)

The programs goals are to: 1) improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools; 2) ensure that every student is technologically literate by 8th grade; and 3) integrate technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development.
[A detailed summary of this grant program is provided separately.]

NEW FEDERAL MATH AND SCIENCE EDUCATION INITIATIVES

Summarizing Provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

Congress proposed new federal initiatives in math and science education in 2001, particularly for improving math and science teaching. Key provisions for nationwide partnerships were enacted with the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, in Title II, Part B. Separate legislation was approved for the National Science Foundation to fund fewer, but larger, partnerships in selected parts of the country, led by higher education institutions.

SOURCES OF NEW INITIATIVES

No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

This rewrite of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) included a major new investment for recruitment, professional development, and training of teachers, including math and science teachers, under a separate Title focused on "Teacher Quality." The Title also creates a new grant program for Math and Science Partnerships in every state.

A) Teacher Quality, Training, and Recruiting Fund --Title II, Part A. This fund consolidates $3 billion in grants to states that is allocated by formula based on a state's relative share of poverty and student population. Within 5 years, states must ensure that all teachers are highly qualified in the subjects they teach. Funds can be used to improve math and science teaching.

B) Mathematics and Science Partnerships -- Title II, Part B. This new grant program, also under the No Child Left Behind Act, authorizes up to $450 million annually to be allocated to states based on each state's relative share of the number of students in poverty. Each state then allocates funds by competitive grant application to eligible local partnerships for periods of up to 3 years. If any year's funding is below $100 million nationally, as occurred in the first year (2002) with an appropriation of only $12.5 million, the Secretary of Education awards competitive grants to fewer partnerships rather than sending funds to all states by formula. Congress appropriated $101 million in 2003, and all states receive funds by formula.

Purpose: To improve student achievement in mathematics and science by:

- Encouraging higher education institutions to take greater responsibility for improving math and science teacher education;
- Ensuring that math and science teacher education is a career-long process;
- Bringing teachers together with scientists, mathematicians, and engineers to improve their skills;
- Developing more rigorous curricula aligned to academic standards expected for postsecondary study in engineering, math, and science.

Eligible Partnerships: An eligible partnership must include:

- A high-need local educational agency;
- An engineering, math, or science department of a higher education institution;

And, may include:

- A business;
- A non-profit or for-profit institution of demonstrated effectiveness. (The intent of Congress is that such an institution may include a museum, research institution, or a public coalition composed of leaders from business, elementary education, postsecondary education, public policy organizations, or other civic leadership.)

Activities: The application for funds from the partnership to the State must include results from a comprehensive assessment of teacher quality and needs in math and science for the relevant schools and districts covered by the partnership. The assessment must include information such as:

- participation of students in advanced courses in math and science;
- percentage of secondary level classes taught by teachers with academic majors in math or science;
- number of teachers participating in content-based professional development;
- extent to which elementary level teachers have the content knowledge to teach math and science.

Funds can be used for many activities, based on local needs, such as:

- Developing rigorous math and science curricula;
- Improving subject matter knowledge and strong teaching skills of math and science teachers;
- Establishing summer professional development institutes;
- Recruiting math, science, or engineering majors into teaching through scholarships, stipends, and signing incentives;
- Identifying and developing exemplary teachers;
- Establishing distance learning programs;
- Creating programs that bring teachers into contact with working scientists, mathematicians, and engineers; and
- Encouraging young women and other underrepresented individuals to pursue degrees leading to math and science careers.

Each partnership receiving funds must develop an evaluation and accountability plan that includes rigorous objectives to measure the impact of activities funded under the partnership.

The accountability plan must include measurable objectives for:

- Increasing the number of teachers who participate in content-based professional development;
- Improving student performance on math and science assessments, including TIMSS.

The accountability plan may also include measures for:

- Increased numbers of students in advanced courses;
- Increased percentages of elementary level teachers with majors or minors in math, science, or engineering;
- Increased percentages of secondary level math and science teachers with academic majors in math and science.

National Science Foundation.

Additional congressional appropriations for a supplemental math and science partnership initiative, combined with new leadership under NSF for Education and Human Resources, point to several other options.

Math and Science Partnership Program. Congress appropriated $160 million for NSF Math and Science Partnership programs. In using the funds, the NSF director is required to ensure close cooperation with, and non-duplication of, programs authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (above).

The director awards competitive grants to institutions of higher education, or nonprofit institutions, for partnerships with local educational agencies. Partnerships may also include businesses and state educational agencies. Grants draw upon the expertise of the partners to improve education in math and science. Some partnerships will be statewide, others will be based in school districts. NSF grants will be fewer, but larger (up to $5 million each), than the local partnership grants under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Grants will be both "comprehensive" and "targeted." Funds can be used for:

- Recruiting students for careers in math or science education at the elementary or secondary school level;
- Instructing teachers on using technology more effectively to teach math and science;
- Creating certification programs for math and science professionals who wish to being a new career in teaching;
- Developing assessments to measure student mastery of content and cognitive skills;
- Developing undergraduate math and science courses for education majors;
- Developing a cadre of master teachers who will promote reform and improvement in schools;
- Providing research opportunities in business or academia for teachers and students;
- Bringing mathematicians, scientists, and engineers from business into school classrooms.

The NSF director sets a minimum level of matching funds required from the partnership, which may include in kind contributions. *[See www.her.nsf.gov/msp/]*

Technology in Education

Summary of Technology Grant Provisions under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001

ENHANCING EDUCATION THROUGH TECHNOLOGY (Title II-D)

Under Title II, Part D, of the recently enacted No Child Left Behind Act, Congress authorizes $1 billion in grants for a variety of activities to improve student achievement in K-12 schools. For school year 2003-2004, Congress actually appropriated $696 million. This is a brief summary of the law's requirements.

Purposes

- To help states and localities implement a comprehensive system that uses technology effectively in schools;
- To encourage initiatives that will increase access to technology, including those involving public-private partnerships;
- To support an educational technology infrastructure with acquisition, development, interconnection, implementation, improvement, and maintenance;
- To help teachers, principals, and administrators with the capacity to integrate technology into curricula and instruction, including professional development;
- To provide constant access to training and updated research in teaching and learning through electronic means;
- To support electronic networks, such as distance learning, of rigorous academic courses and curricula for isolated areas;
- To rigorously evaluate the impact of these grant activities on student achievement; and
- To use technology to promote parental involvement in education and communication with school officials.

Goals

Primary: Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools.

Secondary:

- Ensure that every student is technologically literate by 8th grade;
- Integrate technology resources and systems with teacher training and curriculum development.

State and Local Technology Grants

The Secretary distributes 98 percent of the funds to state educational agencies according to each state's relative share of Title I funds for education of the disadvantaged. The state then distributes funds to local educational agencies:

- 50% by formula according to the locality's relative share of Title I funds;
- 50% by a State-determined competitive process.

The state agency retains 5% of the state's allotment for certain activities, but must identify and offer technical assistance to local districts with the highest percentages of children from poverty families.

Local Applications. To receive funds from the state, a local educational agency must submit a new or updated long-range strategic educational technology plan that is consistent with the state plan. Local applications must describe how funds will be used to achieve the purposes and goals of this program.

> *Consortia Applications*. Localities can join other local agencies, institutions of higher education, or other educational entities to provide local programs. The State can help form local consortia for this purpose.

Allowable Uses of Funds

State Activities:

- Develop strategies for delivery of rigorous academic courses and curricula through distance learning or other innovations;
- Establish public-private initiatives for the acquisition of education technology in high-need areas;
- Provide professional development in the use of technology to --
  - access data and resources to develop curricula and instructional materials,
  - enable teachers to use the Internet to communicate with parents, other teachers, and administrators, and to retrieve Internet-based learning resources;
- Provide all students with access to educational technology;
- Develop performance criteria to determine how effective technology is integrated into curricula and instruction, increasing the ability of teachers to teach and enabling students to meet state academic standards;
- Collaborate with other states on distance learning or making available specialized courses.

Local Activities:

Professional development. At lease 25% of the local grant must be used for ongoing, sustained, and intensive, high-quality professional development.

Other Activities.

- Conduct initiatives, particularly in public-private partnerships, to expand access to technology for students and teachers in high-need schools;
- Acquire proven courses and curricula that integrate technology and help students meet challenging State academic standards;
- Utilize technology to connect schools and teachers with parents to promote meaningful parental involvement and to foster communication about curricula, assignments, and assessments;
- Prepare one or more teachers in a school to be technology leaders, and provide bonus payments;
- Acquire linkages, resources, services, hardware, software, or other learning materials to improve student achievement;
- Use technology to collect, manage, and analyze data to inform teaching and improvement efforts;
- Implement performance measurement systems to determine the effectiveness of education technology programs;
- Implement information technology courses.

No local educational agency or school can use funds for computers used to access the Internet without having in place and enforcing a policy of Internet safety and protection for minors that protects against pornography during use of computers. Failure to have policies and protections in place by the second year disqualifies schools for access to federal funds under this program.

National Activities:

An Independent Study. The Secretary must conduct a long-term study on the practices under which educational technology is effective in increasing student achievement and on the practices that increase the ability of teachers to integrate technology effectively in to curricula and instruction. The Secretary must establish an independent review panel for the study, make interim reports to Congress, and submit a final report by April 1, 2006.

National Education Technology Plan. The Secretary must update and publish a national long-range technology plan within 12 months of enactment of the No Child Left Behind Act (by January 8, 2003). The plan must describe how the Secretary will promote:

- Higher student achievement by integrating advanced technologies into curricula and instruction;
- Increased access to technology for teaching and learning in high poverty schools;
- Use of technology to help with State systemic reform strategies.

Ready-To-Learn Television.

The Secretary awards grants to public telecommunications entities to:

- Develop and distribute educational video programming for preschool and elementary school children to facilitate student achievement;
- Develop education materials, including interactive programs and distance learning, that promote school readiness and effective use of materials by teachers, Head Start, Even Start, family literacy, and child care providers caring for preschool and elementary school children.

Telecommunication entities receiving grants must:

- Coordinate the development and dissemination of programming with the Secretaries of Education and Health and Human Services to ensure enhancement of parent and child care provider skills among relevant federal programs.
- Report annually to the Secretary describing
  - The programming that has been developed and the target population of the programs;
  - The training materials to accompany the programming and how they are distributed to users;
  - How the programming has been distributed and the geographic distribution;
  - Initiatives undertaken to develop public-private partnerships for non-federal support of the programming.
- Limit administrative costs to 5% of the grant.

In FY 2003, Congress appropriated $22 million for this program.

OTHER COMPONENTS OF THE ACT RELATED TO TECHNOLOGY

21st Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)

This initiative provides grants for communities to expand before and after school programs (and during summer and recess periods) for academic enrichment, tutoring, counseling, and a broad array of other activities.

Authorized activities include telecommunications and technology education programs.

The Act authorized $1.250 billion, and the actual appropriation was $1 billion.

Community Technology Centers (Title V, Part D, Subpart 11)

This program enables grantees to create community technology centers that provide disadvantaged residents of economically distressed communities with access to information technology and related training.

Eligible grantees can be a foundation, museum, library, for-profit business, nonprofit organization, State or local educational agency, or a consortium of these entities. The federal share of the cost of any project is 50% and must be matched in cash or in kind. Grants are 3 years in duration. Grantees must describe how the project will continue when federal support ends.

Allowable Use of Funds

- Expand centers and access to information technology and related training for disadvantaged residents of distressed areas;
- Evaluate effectiveness of the project;
- Support staff, supervise instruction, build community partnerships;
- Acquire equipment, networking capabilities, and infrastructure;
- Serve residents with access to computers, information technology, and use of technology in support of preschool preparation, academic achievement, educational development, and workforce development, such as
    - For Children, after school activities using software that provides academic enrichment and help with homework, develops technical skills, explores the Internet, participates in multimedia activities, including web page design and creation;
    - For Adults, GED, language instruction, and adult basic education programs, introduction to computers, intergenerational activities, and educational development;
    - For Career Development, job preparation activities, training in basic and advanced computer skills, resume writing workshops, access to databases of employment opportunities, career information, and online materials;
    - For Small Business, computer-based training for basic entrepreneurial skills and electronic commerce, access to information on business start-up programs that is available online;
    - For the Home, assistance in the acquisition, installation, and use of information technology in the home through low-cost solutions such as networked computers, web-based television devices, and other technology.

Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers For Technology (Title X, Part E)

The No Child Left Behind Act amends Title II of the Higher Education Act by adding a Part B for this grant program "Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers for Technology."

This program helps consortia of public and private entities to conduct programs that prepare teacher candidates to use advanced technology in ways that prepare students to meet challenging academic standards.

Consortia must include an institution of higher education (that prepares teachers for initial entry into teaching), a state or local educational agency, and at least one of the following: another higher education institution, a school of education at such an institution, a school of arts and sciences, a professional association, for-profit business, nonprofit organization, or other entity capable of contributing to technology-related reform of teacher preparation programs.

Grants are 5 years in duration. Grantees must describe how the project will continue when federal funding ends. The federal contribution must not exceed 50%. The non-federal share may be in cash or in kind.

Allowable Use of Funds

- Create programs that prepare prospective teachers to use advanced technology to prepare all students, including groups of students who are underrepresented in technology-related fields and groups of students who are economically disadvantaged to meet state academic standards. Evaluate the effectiveness of the program.
- Implement high-quality programs that enable educators to integrate technologies into curricula and instruction, evaluate technologies for use in instruction, help students develop technical skills, use technology to manage and analyze data to improve teaching and decision making.
- Develop alternative teacher training paths for technology-proficient educators.
- Develop and distribute resources and information on effective use of technology in the classroom, and provide technical assistance.
- Measure the capacity of prospective teachers to use technology effectively in the classroom.

Congress appropriated $62.5 million for this program in FY 2003.