

Report Title and Link

State and Local Implementation of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act, Vol. IX—Accountability under NCLB: Final Report

Program/Policy

- *NCLB* requires states to hold schools and districts accountable for making adequate yearly progress (AYP) toward the goal of every child achieving proficiency in reading and mathematics by the year 2014. In schools that repeatedly fail to make AYP toward meeting state proficiency standards, *NCLB* provides for a progressive series of increasingly intensive interventions.
- *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*, Title I, Part A
- The Title I, Part A, program budget was \$13.9 billion in FY 2008, \$12.8 billion in FY 2007, and \$12.7 billion in FY 2006.

Main Study Questions

- How have states implemented the standards, assessments, and accountability provisions of Title I and Title III?
- How are schools and districts performing with respect to AYP and what are the reasons for not making AYP?
- What efforts are being made to improve district and school performance, including technical assistance, mandated interventions, and local initiatives?

Findings and Implications

- Three-quarters of the nation's schools made AYP in 2005–06, a nearly identical proportion as in 2003–04 and 2004–05. Among the one-quarter of schools that did not make AYP, more than half (55 percent) missed targets for either the school as a whole or for multiple student subgroups.
- Twenty percent of Title I schools (10,781 schools) were identified for improvement for 2006–07. Over half (53 percent) of these schools were located in 1 percent of the nation's Title I districts (177 districts).
- States reported performance results for 2005–06 testing more quickly than for 2003–04 testing, but roughly one-third of states were still finalizing calculations and processing appeals well into the school year.
- Both identified and nonidentified schools reported needing technical assistance in many areas in 2005–06 or 2006–07, but the need was greater among identified schools.
- All states reported having a system of support for schools identified for improvement, and most states reported providing some level of support to all identified schools.
- In 2006–07, required interventions occurred in most, but not all, Title I schools in improvement or corrective action. However, most Title I schools in restructuring status did not experience any of the specific interventions named in the law.

Study Rationale:

Legislative Mandate (National Assessment of Title I)

Study Design

- Descriptive
- Interviews in all states and surveys in a nationally representative sample of 300 school districts and 1,483 schools.

Data Sources

- Interviews with state education officials in all states; surveys of nationally representative samples of districts, principals, and teachers; surveys of parents in eight large urban school districts. Surveys were conducted in 2004–05 and 2006–07.

Study Limitations

- None reported.

Study Budget

- \$15.4 million for two studies that produced a series of 10 reports on *NCLB* implementation.

Contractor: RAND and American Institutes for Research

Report Date: January 2010.

Revised January 7, 2010