

# ACCOUNTABILITY AND ALIGNMENT UNDER NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND: MULTI-LEVEL PERSPECTIVES FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERS\*

Daniel Choi

This work is produced by The Connexions Project and licensed under the  
Creative Commons Attribution License †

## Abstract

Educational leaders have faced the challenges of trying to align schoolwide reforms priorities with accountability demands under the No Child Left Behind law. This article examines the barriers that complicate meaningful alignment among federal, state and local levels. This article also offers the following recommendations: Schools and districts should assess the fit between reforms and state priorities; States should actively support planning and implementation of school-level reform; States should develop a coherent organizational approach to school improvement; States should sustain leadership continuity; States should expand its database to monitor school-wide reform programs and include data on school resources/ school inputs.



NOTE: This manuscript has been peer-reviewed, accepted, and endorsed by the National Council of Professors of Educational Administration (NCPEA) as a significant contribution to the scholarship and practice of education administration. In addition to publication in the Connexions Content Commons, this module is published in the *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*,<sup>1</sup> Volume 6, Number 1 (January - March, 2011), ISSN 2155-9635. Formatted and edited in Connexions by Theodore Creighton and Brad Bizzell, Virginia Tech and Janet Tareilo, Stephen F. Austin State University.

---

\*Version 1.2: Mar 22, 2011 8:12 am GMT-5

†<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/>

<sup>1</sup><http://www.ncpeapublications.org>

## 1 Sumario en español

Los líderes educativos han encarado los desafíos de tratar de alinear prioridades de reformas de schoolwide con demandas de responsabilidad bajo el no Niño Dejaron atrás de la ley. Este artículo revisa las barreras que complican alineación significativa entre federal, el estado y niveles locales. Este artículo también ofrece las recomendaciones siguientes: Las escuelas y los distritos deben valorar el ataque entre prioridades de reformas y estado; Estados deben apoyar activamente la planificación y la implementación de reforma de escuela-nivel; Estados deben desarrollar un enfoque organizativo coherente para educar mejora; Estados deben sostener continuidad de liderazgo; Estados deben expandir su base de datos para vigilar programas escuela-ancho de reforma e incluir los datos en entradas de la escuela de recursos de escuela.

NOTE: Esta es una traducción por computadora de la página web original. Se suministra como información general y no debe considerarse completa ni exacta.

## 2 Introduction

For many schools, especially for those that struggle to meet Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) under the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, aligning schoolwide reform and state priorities means little more than complying with accountability requirements. In such situations, accountability is the basis for deciding all aspects of school reform priorities. Many of these schools argue it is difficult to do otherwise, operating under the assumption that alignment is solely a local responsibility. This narrower view of alignment may be what causes the “blindspots” when it comes to such matters as states’ roles or the overemphasis of accountability on teaching and learning. In addition to accountability considerations, a broader view of alignment emphasizes the positive impact it may have on program implementation as well as the impact it may have on curriculum and pedagogy.

How can state and local educational leaders avoid adopting the narrow view of alignment and move towards the broader view? According to the broader view, what roles do state and local levels play in this alignment process? Will the effort to meet the expectations of this broader view be worthwhile to both state and local levels?

This article explores these questions from the state and local perspective in the context of schoolwide reform. It also examines alignment among state, district and school site levels. Lastly, this article offers guidance for state and local officials in aligning schoolwide reform and state priorities and in overcoming obstacles that stand in the way of meaningful alignment.

## 3 State Perspective

In order to better understand the state’s role in alignment, it is necessary to understand its involvement in various contexts. These contexts, with respect to Title I Schoolwide Reform, include the following: the state and local relationship dynamic; the policy setting; and the states’ position on the relationship between resource adequacy and school accountability outcomes.

### 3.1 The State’s Relationship with Local Levels

Familiarity with different state and local relationships can be a “window” into precursory conditions that often influence alignment efforts affecting program implementation. Because of NCLB, the balance of power between state and local relationships has shifted to greater state influence, most notably in the area of accountability. Despite this shift the degree to which state policies influence school practices is still subject to debate. According to the “low-impact view” state policymaking has little influence over school activities. Instead district officials, school administrators, and teachers effectively change policies to fit their local contexts and preferences (Malen, 2003). This view also suggests that teachers and administrators dictate state-local relationships because they control implementation. Another position, known as the “high-impact

view,” suggests that states strongly influence local schools and districts by exerting authority over curriculum and instruction, assessment, and accountability.

A third view takes a very different perspective, arguing that the influence of one level does not necessarily take away from that of the other in some zero-sum fashion (Fuhrman & Elmore, 1990). Instead, this view emphasizes not only the familiar issues in the foreground—state content standards, assessment, state-approved instructional curriculum—but also issues in the background at the state level—coordination with teacher licensing/preparation offices, budget/financial offices, and the relationship dynamic between state and local levels in terms of support, monitoring. Because the background issues are seldom brought to the foreground, they are left unaccounted for, and may result in costly unintended consequences. Therefore, this third view is context- and issue- specific, which means that state and local relationships can alternate as the primary influence without there being any threat to permanent change in the order of authority.

### 3.2 Policy Settings

A narrow perspective of alignment between state and local priorities has caused many unintended consequences, particularly as it relates to accountability. While accountability was not intended to so strongly influence what is taught and how it is taught, there have been reports of how accountability results have limiting the scope of what is taught (Amrein & Berliner, 2003; Wright & Choi, 2006). For example, recent studies suggest that many schools are responding to the pressure to make adequate yearly progress and help students pass high stakes tests for promotion and graduation by narrowing the curriculum and teaching to the test.

While states have been relatively silent on these matters, the question has been whether states have a responsibility to intervene. Would it be a worthwhile effort for states to meet with districts and/or schools to discuss the limits of how and how much high-stakes tests should (or should not) influence teaching and learning? Could this be an opportunity for a state-initiated effort to improve on the quality of alignment between state and local priorities?

Until there is more clarity on this matter, many local officials argue that they have no choice but to re-prioritize and treat test preparation, for example, almost as if it were its own content area comparable to the time and energy spent on other content areas.

Schools benefit when states participate in the alignment process. An evaluation of the nationally implemented CSR program showed that 72 percent of all the state officials surveyed saw CSR as a way to help schools meet state standards and succeed in the state testing program (Tushnet, Flaherty, Kim, Connolly, Gold, Goldsmith, Yin, Burt, & Warner, 2006). The other 28 percent believed that the federal NCLB guidelines drove reform and CSR in their state, highlighting preoccupation with accountability. Furthermore, the report found that states that aligned CSR to existing state policies provided more direction and support to districts and schools than states that did not align CSR with existing state policies.

### 3.3 States on the Relationship between Resource Adequacy and School Accountability

States can play the role of facilitator in school reform. Another consideration for states is how they align accountability outcomes and the resources, or inputs, that states provide to schools. Education officials in some states have suggested that, in addition to outcomes determining accountability, inputs such as the availability, accessibility, and comparability of resources across schools should carry as much weight (Oakes, 2000). In California, an expert in the state’s own resource adequacy case claimed that “...the state’s funding mechanisms are completely uncoordinated with other policy instruments, so that the attainment of educational outcomes—which generally requires that a number of different elements work in harmony—is undermined” (Oakes, 2000) The report highlights a few reasons why this coordination among policy instruments is complex, including: (1) these instruments have developed in isolation from one another, often in different agencies or in different pieces of legislation that fail to take other policies into account; and (2) many policies have the potential to be effective but only when other complementary policies are in place.

The Class Size Reduction “experiment” (CSRe) in California and the unintended consequences it had on teacher supply is a lesson in how uncoordinated policies at the state level will result in failed alignment

efforts with local levels. While it responded to research and popular opinion indicating that smaller class sizes produce better results, the policy instrument did not coordinate with various critical funding scenarios. The CSRe built staff development into the budget, but it was not nearly enough to meet the need to help new teachers. Furthermore, while CSRe did budget for new teachers, it did not budget for increasing the salaries of experienced teachers as an incentive to keep them in high-needs, teacher shortage areas (Grubb & Goe, 1999).

The result was that the high-needs schools lost many of their experienced teachers to the enticing conditions of 20:1 classrooms at affluent schools. This left the high-needs schools with having to hire more teachers with emergency credentials in order to reduce class sizes. Poor coordination speaks poorly, not of the reform policy/procedure itself, but rather the state's work in coordinating policy efforts. Not only did it complicate feasibly, it also resulted in undermining the effort itself, worsening teacher quality in the schools that CSRe was to target.

Financially speaking, the districts hardest hit had no choice but to reallocate resources to make up the difference in their actual spending and the CSRe funds provided by the state, which also resulted in having to take from funding that was originally slated for facilities management and instructional materials (Grubb & Goe, 1999). This was an avoidable mistake, which exacerbated rather than alleviating teacher inequalities among districts throughout the state.

The state's role in alignment, therefore, cannot be underestimated. States have on-going opportunities to help facilitate successful alignment of school reform with state priorities. How it will materialize will depend upon how it fits in the grander scheme of the states' priorities now and in the years to come. This could potentially have a great effect on how districts and schools will align their priorities with the states'.

## 4 The District and School Perspectives

As a complement to the state's perspective on aligning schoolwide reform priorities with state priorities, the district's and school's perspectives provide insight into areas that include: the district's and school's relationship with the state; the planning of schoolwide reform through the Comprehensive School Improvement Plan (CSIP); and the effect of accountability policies on teaching and learning.

### 4.1 The Districts and Schools' Relationship with the State

Just as states differ in how they influence local levels, local levels differ in how they respond to state authority. The relationship dynamic from a district perspective can fall into the low- or high- impact categories; however, the shared control may be the more appropriate. In the shared control view, authority can shift from one level to the other without de-stabilizing the existing relationship.

Because states have created accountability systems under the direction of NCLB, many local officials equate alignment with compliance, and concede alignment as a unilateral effort—states set policies while schools and districts comply. Although schools and districts make the ultimate decisions with respect to the needs and goals of its local populations, alignment requires state and local effort. Further, districts and schools may have to decide whether a more positive incentive for aligning their priorities to the states' exists.

The recent CSR evaluation results show positive trends for schools that integrated more school reform components in their CSIP. Regarding the relationship between alignment and the extent of implementation, the Year 2 CSR evaluation reported that the “possibility that schools with better alignment also had a greater strength of implementation still exists” (Tushnet et al., 2006). In fact, 52 percent of the districts in the evaluation indicated that CSR helped schools meet state standards and testing requirements. Furthermore, the report revealed that schools including a larger number of program components for CSR—components are nearly identical to Schoolwide Title I components—were more aligned with state priorities than schools that included fewer program components in their school improvement plans.

Reasons for not noticing these benefits vary considerably. Some surmise that districts and schools have been of two minds: one of compliance and one of matters directly related to actual teaching and learning.

While accountability goals and expectations have become increasingly explicit, guidelines for instructional delivery and curriculum planning have not, even among practitioners and the research community.

## 4.2 Comprehensive School Improvement Plans

For schools receiving Title I Schoolwide funding, the comprehensive school improvement plan (CSIP) is the document instantiating the extent to which a school has aligned its priorities to state priorities. As the primary agents of implementation, schools face the daunting task of planning for a reform program that not only includes all the required components of Title I Schoolwide, but to do so under volatile circumstances (policy climates) originating from within the district and/or at the state level.

Though accountability is a prominent part of any reform agenda, the components of Title I Schoolwide force schools and districts also to allocate time and effort to plan programs around components not directly related to achievement outcomes, such as *parental/community involvement* and *support for staff*. While this does not keep schools from the preoccupation with achievement outcomes, it may remind schools about the holistic nature of school reform. Thus, planning schoolwide reform with respect to aligning specific components is particularly challenging at the local level, because schools are both the last line of implementation and the ones who are directly rewarded or sanctioned based on the decisions they make. Schools that are below, or near below, making AYP may struggle with associating alignment with anything other than accountability.

For many of the traditionally low-performing and high-poverty schools, they are expected to meet their goals in the midst of budget fluctuations, sometimes-conflicting state and local level policies, and a short time period in which to turn achievement scores around. Therefore, for many schools, alignment with state priorities is often as confusing as it is demanding. Still it is not clear what demands this puts on districts and schools as the last line of implementation—for instance, teachers delivering instruction to students.

Preoccupation with accountability could prevent schools and districts from appreciating the broader scope of alignment, its original intent, and proven benefits. These benefits may not always clearly show direct effects on student achievement, but as the CSR evaluation found, there are clearer associations between alignment of priorities and the quality of program implementation.

## 5 Extraneous Factors/Obstacles

Though research shows that alignment has positive effects on implementation extraneous factors often get in the way. For example, change in leadership, competing reform efforts, or uncoordinated district initiatives can determine the extent to which a program like Title I Schoolwide can be implemented fully and contribute to gains in student achievement.

While devising a comprehensive school improvement plan is a vital component of schoolwide reform, the broader accountability context presents challenges that may be out of a district's or school's control. One such challenge is local responsiveness to state laws, judicial mandates, and district level policies that are not directly related to school reform, but may affect schoolwide reform efforts or teacher quality. Examples include: policies that prescribe how to instruct English Language Learners and Special Education students or limit the type of instructional settings. Another potential challenge includes conflicts between district and school level policies like the provision of highly qualified teachers for students.

Though NCLB and Title I program components emphasize the need for highly qualified teachers, many districts are simply unable to provide them. For example, in one large urban district in California, a consent decree mandated an equitable distribution of the highest qualified teachers among all its schools (Choi, 2010). Principals could not always hire the best-qualified teachers so that fewer schools would have too many of the least or highest qualified teachers. Such policies, while well-intentioned, sometimes put schools in a predicament where the result is hiring less qualified teachers and turning away some of the more qualified ones.

While the performance requirements and the time in which schools have to achieve them are quite clear, what is not so clear is when the clock starts and stops. Not all schools are at the same stage in their

school reform efforts. Some may be in the middle or beginning of their implementation or work with an external, technical assistance provider. How much time schools actually have to show improvements, given the differences in school-to-school circumstances is still unknown.

## 6 Recommendations

For schools seeking to implement schoolwide reform programs, aligning priorities with states and districts is a worthwhile effort not only for compliance sake, but for increasing the likelihood that school-level reform efforts will be successfully implemented. As referred to earlier, the CSR evaluation concluded that, coordinating and integrating schoolwide reform efforts with state-level systemic reforms was a major contributor to the efficiency and effectiveness of the reforms (Friedman, 1999). Another study found that the schools that made the most progress in their whole-school improvement efforts were the ones that were able to connect ongoing state-, district-, and school-level reform efforts with the new programs they were pursuing (Wasley, Hampel, & Clark, 1997).

Coordinating school-level reform efforts with district and state efforts, however, can be difficult and complex. Many reform programs have their own set of curricular and instructional guidelines, as well as particular assessment instruments designed to measure students' achievement of program-specific learning objectives. This program-specific, instructional guidance can be inconsistent with the instructional guidance provided by local school districts or by state assessments associated with accountability systems. In one study, for example, state- and district-level policies regarding instructional practices for ESL students made it difficult to include these students in whole-school reform efforts (Datnow, Borman, Stringfield, Overman, & Castellano, 2003). Requirements posed by states and districts frequently conflicted with the requirements of reform program developers. In the case of the New American Schools (NAS) initiative, many principals reported that the instructional practices that were part of school restructuring did not align with state tests. Moreover, the content of the tests did not address the changes in behavior and learning targeted by the schools' reform programs (Mitchell, 1996).

How can schools, districts, and states overcome the challenges of aligning school improvement efforts with state priorities? Based on research, we offer the following recommendations:

### 6.1 Recommendation 1: Schools and districts should take the time to assess the fit between reform programs and state priorities.

Due to the pressure to improve student achievement scores, school and district officials may feel the need to rush the planning and selection process for schoolwide reforms. Hurried planning, however, can negatively affect the implementation of reform programs (Berends, Bodilly, & Kirby, 2002). Schools and districts seeking to better align reform programs with state priorities should take a slower and more deliberate approach to planning. Such an approach allows school officials to more carefully consider the match between prospective reform programs and a school's current programs and organizational culture. In terms of alignment, it enables school and district officials to better assess the fit between the reform programs and state initiatives.

Careful planning can also help schools respond to emerging state demands. In a study of schools implementing schoolwide reforms in the face of changing state and district contexts, schools that made careful efforts to align reform programs with state priorities had the highest rates of implementation success (Datnow, 2005). In one of the most successful schools, for example, teachers responded to the state's new curriculum standards by assessing the overlaps between the new curriculum and the curriculum of the reform program they were already implementing. The teachers then developed detailed scope and sequences at each grade-level to show that they were in compliance with both (Datnow, 2005).

Whether through matching new programs with state standards or assessing the fit between existing programs and emerging state initiatives, schools and districts that take the time to coordinate improvement efforts with state-level priorities can positively affect implementation at later stages.

## **6.2 Recommendation 2: States should play an active role in supporting planning and implementation of the reform.**

The responsibility for aligning school improvement efforts with state priorities does not fall solely on district and school officials. Rather, states also play an important role, particularly when it comes to planning and implementation support. Research on the CSR program shows that state support for schoolwide reform and alignment of the reform with state goals and standards go hand in hand (Tushnet et al., 2005). In fact, when states used CSR to advance their overall reform priorities, they typically provided CSR schools with high levels of support. Not surprisingly, these schools had closer alignment with state priorities and higher rates of reform implementation than schools from states that did not embrace CSR as a state-policy measure.

To ensure its alignment with state priorities, states should treat schoolwide reform as a tool for achieving state educational goals. Inherent in this notion is the need to support school in the planning and implementation of whole-school reform programs. Given the importance of a match between a school's needs, a program's characteristics, and state priorities, states should provide schools and districts with reasonable time to assess different programs and make an unforced and appropriate choice as to which reform program(s) they are going to use. To facilitate the selection and planning process, states should also provide information about reform programs that complement or expand upon state and district initiatives. This might include a list of "compatible" programs or information—via workshops, publications, or on-site assistance—on what to look for in a program. Taking information dissemination one step further, states can even provide facilitators or on-site coordinators to help schools: (1) understand state policies; (2) select a program that addresses school as well as state priorities; and (3) create comprehensive school improvement plans that target both local needs and state demands. Providing such individualized support is crucial in helping schools achieve improvement in the era of standards-based reform (Lane & Garcia, 2004).

## **6.3 Recommendation 3: States should develop a coherent organizational approach to school improvement.**

The best states can do to promote reform within schools is to send clear, consistent, and coherent messages regarding educational programs and outcomes. Helping schools in the planning process is one way achieving this. An equally important step is developing a policy framework that guides the funding and implementation of all programs and services that are intended to support student learning.

Many states have a large roster of policy instruments that target increased student achievement in low-performing schools. Examples these instruments include class-size reduction, teacher quality provisions, program improvement grants, and Title I programs. Such policies, however, may be uncoordinated or fragmented, a condition that undermines their ability to attain educational outcomes (Grubb & Goe, 1999).

As mentioned earlier, California's "experiment" with class size reduction (also a provision under the Title I Schoolwide program) was one example where as one of its top priorities it failed to consider what effect its other policies would have on the new policy.

To avoid similar problems, states should develop coherent and overarching education policy that can guide reform efforts and reduce the fragmentation of policy messages and programs that bombard schools and districts (Massell, 1998). This begins with the creation and promulgation of a vision for education—one that puts teaching and learning at the forefront. Rather than being the end goals in themselves, measures like accountability and state standards should be used as strategic and tactical means of achieving the vision (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2001). Other policy initiatives—like class size reduction, teacher quality provisions, and Title I Schoolwide programs—should also be used as tools for achieving the vision, and states should ensure that these policies are aligned, coordinated, and complementary. Perhaps most important, state officials must communicate not only with districts and schools, but with each other as well. Too often, different policies are developed in isolation from each other, and funding deliberations occur in a separate room from those involving policy initiatives. The sooner all sides—state, district, and school officials included—are on the same page, the sooner districts and schools can begin the process of aligning school improvement efforts with state priorities.

#### 6.4 Recommendation 4: States should sustain leadership continuity.

To assist schools and districts in planning and make sure reform efforts work towards the larger state policy goals, states need to develop and sustain their leadership capacity for the reform. In the context of schoolwide reform, leadership capacity at the state level involves the ability state officials to fully understand the reform's context, the dynamics and barriers that schools undergo when selecting and implementing a whole-school change process, and how whole-school change relates to other state initiatives. State officials need to adapt their ways of working with schools to promote a more individualized and supportive working relationship and identify new and different strategies to support whole-school reform efforts (Hamman & Lane, 2002).

The most effective means for state officials to do this is by spending time working with schools undergoing schoolwide reform and gaining an in-depth knowledge of what schoolwide reform means at the state and district levels (Lane & Garcia, 2004). State-level politics and changes in state-budgeting make sustaining leadership continuity difficult, but the experience of CSR shows that when state coordinators are able to stay in their positions and gain expertise and knowledge of whole-school reform, they enhance their credibility with districts and schools and their ability to make informed decisions about how to appropriately support schools (Lane & Garcia, 2004).

#### 6.5 Recommendation 5: States should expand its database to monitor schoolwide reform programs and include data on school resources/ school inputs.

For alignment to mean more than just accountability requirements, the most practical way to do so may be to ensure that each and every one of the Title I Schoolwide Components are included and not overshadowed—by one, the evaluation component (student achievement outcomes). While easier said than done, the lessons learned above will have hopefully provided some evidence that alignment efforts directly and non-directly related to accountability considerations, is a worthwhile expenditure of resources. After all, higher achievement scores do not comprise the whole of school reform. Rather, all of the other schoolwide reform components are purposeful and are mutually supportive in that their successful implementation were designed to produce positive outcomes, student achievement outcomes being one of many. Therefore, alignment has too many benefits for it to be reduced to only accountability and compliance.

## 7 References

- Amrein, A.L., & Berliner, D.C. (2002). High-stakes testing, uncertainty, and student learning. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 10 (18). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n18/>.
- Berends, M., Bodilly, S.J., & Kirby, S.N. (2002). *Facing the challenges of whole-school reform: New American schools after a decade*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Choi, D. (2010). The Impact of Competing Definitions of Quality on the Geographical Distribution of Teachers *Education Policy*, 24 (2).
- Comprehensive School Reform in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts: Implementation and outcomes from a four-year study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25, 143-170.
- Datnow, A. (2005). The sustainability of Comprehensive School Reform models in changing district and state contexts. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 41(1), 121-153.
- Datnow, A., Borman, G., Stringfield, S., Overman, L., & Castellano, M. (2003). Comprehensive School Reform in culturally and linguistically diverse contexts: Implementation and outcomes from a four-year study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25, 143-170.
- Friedman, L.B. (1999). *Launching the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Act in six Midwest states: Implications for schools, districts, and model providers implementing the program*. Oak Brook, IL: North Central Regional Education Laboratory.
- Fuhrman, S., & Elmore, R. (1990). Understanding local control in the wake of state education reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 12 (1), 82-96.



Grubb, N., & Goe, L. (1999). Expert testimony report, *Williams v. California*. Retrieved from <http://decentschools.org><sup>2</sup>.

Hamman, E., & Lane, B. (2002). *We're from the state and we're here to help: State-level innovations in support of high school improvement*. Providence, RI: Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory at Brown University. Retrieved on from <http://www.alliance.brown.edu/pubs/csr/index.shtml><sup>3</sup>.

Institute for Educational Leadership. (2001). *Leadership for student learning: Recognizing the state's role in public education*. Washington, DC.

Lane, B., & Garcia, S. (2004). State-level support for comprehensive school reform: Implications for policy and practices. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 10(1), 85-112.

Malen, B. (2003). Tightening the grip? The impact of state activism on local school systems. *Educational Policy*, 17(2), 195-216.

Massell, D. (1998). *State strategies for building local capacity: Addressing the needs of standards-based reform* (CPRE Research Report). Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Mitchell, K. J. (1996). *Reform and resistance in schools and classrooms: An ethnographic view of the Coalition of Essential Schools*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Oakes, J. (2000). Expert testimony report, *Williams v. California*. Retrieved from <http://decentschools.org><sup>4</sup>

Tushnet, N. C., Flaherty, J. F., Kim, J-O., Connolly, B., Gold, N., Goldsmith, S., N., Yin, R., Burt, J., & Warner, E. (2006). *Longitudinal assessment of comprehensive school reform implementation and outcomes: Third-year report*. WestEd.

Wasley, P. A, Hampel, R. L., & Clark, R. N. (1997). The puzzle of whole-school change. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 78(9), 690-697.

Wright, W. E., & Choi, D. (2006). The impact of language and high-stakes testing policies on elementary school English language learners in Arizona. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 14(13). Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v14n13/><sup>5</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup><http://decentschools.org/>

<sup>3</sup><http://www.alliance.brown.edu/pubs/csr/index.shtml>

<sup>4</sup><http://decentschools.org/>

<sup>5</sup><http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v14n13/>