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CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 established the federal mandate requiring schools to close the achievement gap with accountability, flexibility, and choice, so that no child is left behind (H.R., 2002). At this time, the NCLB law is past due for reauthorization. Therefore much discussion is being focused on the purpose, impact, successes, and shortcomings of this federal policy. This educational policy debate elicits numerous reactions surrounding from various constituent groups from educators, administrators, politicians, parents and community members. Even within each constituent group people possess varying perspectives on the matter of this policy. Various people view NCLB legislation as the means through which the federal government will finally have the opportunity to foster improvements in education as to allow for a quality education for all. While others argue that NCLB has fallen short of its intended goals and merely focuses on testing rather than teaching. Yet still other feel that NCLB has made some impact, but now is the time during its reauthorization to make progress with the law by determines the how-to methodology for improvement. Spellings, Cohen, Weingarten, and Rotherham share their views on the NCLB policy as it approaches reauthorization. Hence, NCLB policy will be analyzed using the framework designed by Deborah Stone in her book Policy Paradox: The Art of Decision Making (2002). Finally, there are issues surrounding the 2001 policy of NCLB. Let’s explore NCLB a policy issue as it relates to the polis and according to the essayist whether NCLB made a positive or negative impact on education.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE FRAMEWORK

I. Thesis:

“Not a calculation, but a paradoxical argument about boundaries.” (Smith, 2010).

Based upon the works of Deborah Stone and the teachings of Frank Smith it can be
determined that Policy Paradox is a framework for policy decision-making. It explores
how decisions can be impacted by external factors, which influence perspective. Stone
speaks of the polis and market society. She focuses on the polis, such as the
collective community or constructivist approach in an effort to demonstrate an
effective and favorable rationale. Stone address the market or rationalist, traditional
approach for the sake of comparison. In the book, Stone examines the idea of goals,
problems and solutions without ends. Each idea is examined to better understand
the incongruous boundaries defined or simply even explored in policy and education.

II. Policy Paradox by Deborah Stone (2002) Literature Review

A. GOALS (Benn, Bermani, Cabrera, Heyward, Toto, 2010)

This section entitled goals is based on several concepts; equity, efficiency,
liberty and security. These concepts are used to justify the actions of
decision makers, government officials, and policy holders. These terms or
values are analyzed in detail in this chapter.

1. EQUITY

There are different kinds of equality. They are based upon the recipients
of a public good, the item that is being distributed, and the process by
which the things are distributed. In an effort to express the idea of equity and to show how it is possible to have competing visions of an equitable distribution, Stone asks the reader to imagine that she has a piece of cake that needs to be distributed amongst a group of students. She argues that all would agree that the cake should be divided equally and that the obvious solution is to count the number of people, cut the cake into that number of equal pieces, and pass it out. However, Stone addresses the challenges of her “equitable solution.” Everyone has different visions of equality that would ultimately result in unequal slices, but equality of something else. What one would perceive or view as equal is unequal in the eyes of another person.

2. EFFICIENCY

Efficiency, according to Stone, is a comparative idea and method by which to judge the merits of the various ways in which to accomplish tasks. Efficiency is not a goal for something we want for our own sake, but is, rather, the ideal way in which we can achieve our goals and obtain what we value with minimum waste, duplication, and financial output. According to Stone, efficiency also looks at how to accomplish a task or reach a goal while reaching that end in the best possible way and by receiving the most from that action. When competing interpretations of efficiency and/or how to measure efficiency occur, conflicts arise. A proportional concept, efficiency answers the question, “How effectively did I get the job done?” The notion of efficiency, pointed out Stone,
dominates our capitalistic society and, when—in the positive—leads to equitable exchanges. When abused, markets can be adversely manipulated and voluntary exchange interrupted. When deeming something "efficient," one must look at the goals of the polis through output and the input and consider efficiency from the human perspective as well as from the perspective of human motivation and values. For this concept, Stone used the public library as an example, asking readers to think of a scenario in which to make the institution more efficient.

3. SECURITY

Stone describes security as another malleable notion that can change based on one's perspective. For instance, one person's needs are another person's desire. Because "material things have symbolic meanings which are more important than their material value," what is an important security concern to one person or group might not be seen in the same way by another group. Using wealth as an example, Stone asserts that "need is relative as well as absolute". Poverty can be both measured via a fixed dollar amount connected to the poverty line and against a median determination that is not concerned with a specific amount. Taking these examples back to security, the type of security a government should implement is based on what needs that government seeks to meet, pointing again to the ongoing conflict between the perspective of need and desire.
4. LIBERTY

Stone expresses liberty as people being free to act as they wish unless their activity harms another (Mill’s definition, p. 109). Stone discussed freedom and legitimate rights in this chapter. For example, do we have a right to burn the American Flag? And, when does society have a right to interfere with individual liberty? She introduces the idea of harms which may prevent the liberty of others. Stone questions if and how a society can provide both liberty and security.

B. PROBLEMS (Bruno, Fox, Popa-Longo, and Standard, 2010)

One of the key elements to consider when consulting Stone’s chapter on “Problems” is that strategic representation is paramount. This section of the book deals with the use of language to explicate an issue, “constructed in such a way to win the most people to one’s side and the most leverage over one’s opponents (133). Language is coupled with literary devices in the polis as a means of achieving an ephemeral goal. It is also important to note the value of fiction as a tool for representing a problem. The equivocal manner in which symbols, numbers, causes, interests, and decisions are applied in the polis is performed to convey the theme “that there is no universal, scientific, or objective method of problem definition” (134). These vehicles are intended to be used with discretion, on a moral gauge, in order to properly assess the problem at hand. “Each of these languages has room for moral conflict and may be used to convey moral values, but there is no universal technical language of problem definition that yields morally
correct answers” (134). That being said, the five tools for representing problems are to be used to achieve an accurate definition of an issue.

1. SYMBOLS

One of the most pervasive forms of problems is symbols. Symbols are comprised of four distinct types: stories, metaphors, synecdoche, and ambiguity. Narrative stories “are so useful in politics because their drama is emotionally compelling and sometimes blinding”.

Encompassing these stories we are presented with explicit examples of varies types of narratives that are used to move our decision making processes. The story of decline makes use of positive examples and then switches to warnings and a way of seeking further improvement. The story of helplessness and control expresses the notion that “the situation is bad.” We have always believed that the situation was out of our control. “Now, however, let me show you that in fact we can control things” (142).

Applying these literary devices towards defining a problem is a common tool used to evoke skewed policy and suspend critical thinking (147). Perhaps the most ubiquitous type of symbol is the metaphor. “On the surface, they simply draw a comparison between one thing and another, but in a more subtle way they usually imply a whole narrative story and a prescription for action” (148). Symbols are used to evoke assumptions,
and the metaphor is one of the primary catalysts for this, although the
line becomes blurred with symbols, as they tend to be intermixed.

2. NUMBERS

The second type of problem is numbers. Numbers collectively represent
“another form of poetry” (163). This is because the application of
numbers tends to be ambiguous, not in the sense that numbers are
misleading, but in that the method for using such numbers may be. “It
is impossible to describe counting without talking about inclusion and
exclusion (terms that in themselves suggest community, boundaries,
allies, and enemies); selection (a term that implies privilege and
discrimination); and important characteristics (a term that suggests
value judgments and hierarchy)” (164). In that respect, numbers may be
as useful as symbols in defining a problem. Numbers can be used as
metaphors as well as ambiguous statements if utilized appropriately.
Thus, the discrepancy among different forms of problems remains
minimal.

3. CAUSES

Causal theories are another form of problems that invade the social
sectors in polis. Causes as defined in policy analysis can be objective and
proved by careful review. The chart on page 191 explains that there are
two distinctions between “action and consequence and between purpose
and lack of purpose- used to create a framework for describing the
casual stories used in politics” (190). Some actions are unguided and the consequences could be either intended (mechanical) or unintended (accidental). Other actions are purposeful with intentional or inadvertent consequences. “Political actors create causal stories to describe harms and difficulties, to attribute them to actions of other individuals and organizations, and thereby to invoke government power to stop the harm” (209). Causal stories continue to meld the line of symbolic representation while also adding another dimension of interpretation to the political repertoire.

4. INTEREST

“Problems are defined in politics to accomplish political goals- to mobilize support for one side in a conflict” (231). Interest is another form of problems that can be used to sway thoughts, decisions, and actions towards a particular direction. Defining interests and alliances are the foundations of political fortitude, and precisely what set the stage for power allocations. “There is no such thing as an apolitical problem definition,” and understanding that interests are simply another form of representation is the key to properly defining a problem (231).

5. DECISIONS

Decisions are the final component of the problems chapter, most notably because they reveal a stance taken based on the demarcation of boundaries. Decisions are made according to Stone by “habit, social
custom, impulse, intuition, or procrastination; by consensus, delegation, bargaining, mediation, trial, voting, or flipping a coin” (232). The rational analytical model of decision-making refers to four distinct steps towards achieving an end: defining the goals, imagining alternate modes of attaining the goal, evaluating consequences of separate modes, and choosing the alternative to most likely attain the goal. The three main variations of decision models include: cost-benefit analysis, risk-benefit analysis, or decision analysis” (232). Although the rationalist model presents an idealistic method for achieving a goal, Stone notes that this model cannot be used independently for the ambiguity of political goals is inescapable. “As we take actions to achieve a goal, the meaning of the goal changes, the people who support and oppose it change, and the new meaning and alliances in turn change our ideas about what actions are appropriate” (245). Thus, the equivocal nature of politics requires more tools than simply rational thinking.

6. CONCLUSION OF PROBLEMS

The vehicles presented in the problems chapter are coterminous as well as mutually exclusive. They may be used independently, however, more often than not, becoming intertwined and blended in the course of defining a problem. It is through this tumultuous exchange that boundaries are made and alliances are formed, all in a dramatic effort to forge a temporary solution to a particular issue.
C. SOLUTIONS (Campos, D’Elia, McDermott, Omeis, and Sandifer, 2010)

This section is about solutions or the temporary resolutions of an argument in the polis and makes the assumption that all policies involve conscious efforts to change people’s behavior. Stone identifies the strategies of inducements, rules, facts, rights, and powers as generic mechanisms to bring about change and can be used as ongoing strategies to achieve collective purposes.

1. INDUCEMENTS

Inducements are the incentives, punishment, rewards or penalties intended to motivate people to act differently than what they might otherwise act in a given situation. Stone divides inducements into three parts: the inducement giver, the receiver of the inducement and the inducement itself. By using a utilitarian model, Stone states that in rational behavior, people have goals and all their actions are based on an economic calculus. Her theory says that by changing people’s possible options, choices, or obstacles, we can change how people move towards their goals.

2. RULES

In chapter 12, Stone states that rules are general regulations that govern. They are intended to “induce compliance” (p283) without the
threat of a consequence. For the purpose of delineating between various kinds of rules, Stone restricts the discussion of these rules to those that impose obligations and duties. These rules govern or restrict behavior in the polis based upon conscious social goals. In essence, members of society are expected to govern their own actions based on formal laws. Stone states that rules are given their power by their legitimacy which places a key role in acceptance and compliance by its members. If a rule is considered legitimate, the citizens will freely adhere to it regardless of the personal cost associated with it.

3. FACTS

The term fact can refer to, depending on context, a detail concerning circumstances past or present, a claim corresponding to objective reality, a provably true concept, or a synonym for reality. Stone focuses on how political persuasion may be interpreted differently, based on wording. Political theory may be viewed upon in two different ways, either, "revered" or "feared". Stone's discusses how the rational ideal provides a vision of society where conflict is short lived and unnecessary, where force is replaced by discussion, and where independent actions are brought together through the persuasive power of reason and verification. Many political arguments can only be comprehended as efforts of one group to preserve concealment and the other to gain access. In the polis model, all parties try to manipulate the others’ preferences.
4. RIGHTS
The main theme of this chapter is that legal rights of real political systems are energized, constrained, and constantly challenged by normative meanings of rights. Rights are yet another way of governing relationships and coordinating individual behavior to achieve collective purpose. Rights partake something of rules and sanctions, but as a policy strategy, rights are a more diffused method or articulating standards of behavior in an ongoing system of conflict resolution.

5. POWER
This chapter discusses constitutional engineering and how power is used to cultivate and control policy. The reallocation of power is the result of reconstructed authority lead by the perception of structure as a malleable entity rather than fixed. Policy-making can be viewed as a constant struggle over boundaries. The strategy of reforming the decision-making process is visible through the boundaries of membership, size, and federalism. The qualities and interests of decision-makers shape the kinds of decisions that are made. According to Stone, representation can be looked at from three different perspectives descriptive (people who will “think, feel, and reason” like one another and will vote accordingly), substantive (people who share policy beliefs and goals), and accountable (are constituents accountable to voters).
III. VISUAL MODEL (Figure 2.1.):

A. Stone’s Decision Making Model for the Polis (Fox, 2010).

This model is a visual representation of Stone’s framework. It reflects Stone’s view of how policy decisions are essentially made in the polis rather than the market otherwise viewed as the traditionalist model. Goals, problems, and solution are continuously analyzed to develop temporary solutions, and in turn creating new goals, problems, and solutions. Figure 2.1 demonstrates a model of the decision making process in the collective polis society.

Goals include the ideals of equity, efficiency, liberty, and security; all of these ideals must be examined in the decision making process. Problems are viewed through the concepts of symbols, numbers, causes, interests, and decisions; these must be look upon in an effort to build a more balanced view of the issue as it assists in the decision making process. Finally, solutions are defined as inducement, rule, fact, right, and power. In a polis society, power is not bureaucratic, but rather community-based. Each ideal once again fosters the decision making process. However, solutions do not conclude the process. It simply gives us new perceptive and provides us with a new starting point for new goals or problems.

This figure 2.1. is not linear as it is represented. Decisions can occur at various points in time, and the framework demonstrates the vary paths it could take in the process. Stone hopes that decision making in the polis does not have an end, but rather a temporary solution. These temporary solutions are often based upon cooperation, loyalty, and influence within the community. Therefore, figure 2.1. is a visual representation of decision making in the polis.
IV. POLICY PARADOX: SUMMARY

Stone’s framework for policy analysis is defined through the goal, problem, and solution approach to analysis. In turn, this process allows for well-educated and thoroughly thought-out decision making in the polis.
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

V. Rationale for Policy Analysis

Policy and decision making surrounding policy development is focused on the continuous scrutiny of the goals, problems, and solutions within the polis. In order to analyze the policy issues of No Child Left Behind, one must first investigate varying peoples’ perspectives on the matter by professionals within the educational community as well as politicians and community members alike.

A. Content Analysis

The articles by Spelling, Cohen, Weingarten, and Rotherham were examined to determine perspectives on this policy issue. Stone’s framework was used to scrutinize their opinions to shed light on the positive and/or negative impacts of the NCLB policy within the polis.

B. Unit of Analysis

The data utilized for the policy analysis was qualitative data, since this study relied primarily on the opinions of various experts in education. The qualitative method of research was used as the opinions of Spelling, Cohen, Weingarten, and Rotherham were considered in this policy analysis process. The unit of analysis used was a tally coding system. In each article, tally coding was used each time there was a new complete thought. Each new thought was evaluated using Stone’s Framework with a specific focus on goals, problems, and solutions. Similar concepts, related to Stone, were
tallied to determine the primary focal point of the authors. Stone addresses the concept of goals through the examination of equity, efficiency, liberty, and security. Stone further explores the concept of problems through symbols, numbers, causes, interests, and decisions. Stone dissects the concept of solutions through the ideals of inducements, rules, facts, rights, and power. Conclusions were drawn after all points of view had been considered for evaluation.

C. Data Study’s Reliability

The reliability of the qualitative analysis is based upon only one’s sole opinion; therefore, the results gathered and conclusions drawn are not scientifically based. Hence, the data collected should not be used as a framework for future studies, but rather be used as a collection of beliefs in an effort to enlighten other to develop their own judgments on the policy matter issue of No Child Left Behind.

D. Sample Matrix Chart (Table 3.1.)

Table 3.1. represents the chart used to code the essayists’ quotes from their works. Each paragraph was read, analyzed, and coded based upon the three categories described by Deborah Stone. Within each category of goals, problems, and solutions, quotes were once again critiqued and coded by the ideals within each category. The specific coding found in goals are described as equity, efficiency, liberty, and security. The coding relating to problems are defined as symbols, numbers, causes, interests, and decision.
Solutions’ coding are named as inducement, rule, fact, right, and power. Each quote was recorded within each category of goals, problems, or solutions with noting the ideal within each category that it most related to describing.

Table 3.1.: Sample Matrix Chart

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Problems</th>
<th>Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 1</td>
<td>Tally Coding</td>
<td>Tally Coding</td>
<td>Tally Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 2</td>
<td>Tally Coding</td>
<td>Tally Coding</td>
<td>Tally Coding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph 12</td>
<td>Tally Coding</td>
<td>Tally Coding</td>
<td>Tally Coding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS

VI. This section of the study concentrates on the four authors that all tackle the policy issues of NCLB. These authors’ are Spellings, Cohen, Weingarten, and Rotherham. Their articles were included in the January 2010 edition of U.S. News and World Report. This research project will investigate these authors’ perspectives on the NCLB policy as it relates to policy decision making and the positive or negative impact it has had in the polis. The tables included analyze the authors’ opinions using the tally coding system and Stone’s framework for policy decision making in the polis.
A. Spellings: *Measuring the value of accountability*

Spellings (Table 4.1.) feels that NCLB has been a beneficial policy as we “now have annual assessment data that are disaggregated by student group, [so] we can diagnose and correct weakness in instruction and learning” (p. 33). In Table 4.1., it is demonstrated that Spellings supports NCLB by focusing on equity and efficiency when defining her goals of NCLB and concentrates on facts, rights, and inducements when outlining her solution. She had a mixture of ideas surrounding the few problems noted, such as how accountability is making people feel uncomfortable; however, the establishment of this policy solved the matter of determining “whether students are learning enough, and when they are not, whether or not they are improving fast enough” (p. 33). Spellings did not give too much attention to problems as she does not feel that this policy causes there to be many problems, but rather it develops key goals and finds solutions through the implementation of the NCLB policy.

Table 4.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spellings # and Quote</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>FACTS</strong> - “Now that we have annual assessment data that are disaggregated by student group, we can diagnose and correct weakness in instruction“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesson No.</td>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
<td>“In reading, 9-year olds made more progress in the last nine years than in the previous 28 years combined”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><del>counting</del></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More importantly, it is a “story” –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“What gets done gets measured.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Lesson No. 2</td>
<td>Causes</td>
<td>Accountability also makes people feel uncomfortable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facts</td>
<td>We no longer are able to hide from the facts, which say that only half our minority students stand a chance of graduating from high school on time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rights</td>
<td>Politicians of parties, educators, and especially parents now rightfully expect to know the truth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. We’ve also</td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>“We did not ask schools to report on achievement gaps between low-income and minority students and their peers.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rules</td>
<td>Now, the reauthorization will be guided by these data and a better understanding of the law’s strengths and limitations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lesson No. 3</td>
<td>Inducement</td>
<td>“The law should encourage continuous improvement in our classrooms, give educators the credit they deserve for the most challenging work, and provide parents and students more customized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQUITY – “Our most effective teachers should be teaching our most disadvantages students and be rewarded with better pay and more support.”</td>
<td>INDUCEMENT – “Our most effective teachers should be teaching our most disadvantages students and be rewarded with better pay and more support.” – rewards~</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We can also</td>
<td>This is a secondary, underlying message in this paragraph.</td>
<td>This is the primary message in this paragraph.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Parents deserve</td>
<td>EQUITY – “Our most effective teachers should be teaching our most disadvantages students and be rewarded with better pay and more support.”</td>
<td>RIGHTS – “Parents deserve even more information and better options that customize schools to meet the needs of their children.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The one question</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY - “But there are some who rather go back to the days of policymaking based upon inputs rather than results.”</td>
<td>FACTS – “Talk of class size ratios, modernization of school facilities, and how much money is being spent is now overshadowed by a focus on student achievement.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>~ input / output~</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. That leads to</td>
<td>EFFICIENCY – “How to effectively use time and people in our schools.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closing the achievement gap depends upon it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>There was mostly EQUITY &amp; EFFICIENCY in this article.</td>
<td>There were not many problems in this article, but rather mostly goals and solutions.</td>
<td>There were mostly FACTS, RIGHTS, &amp; INDUCMENTS in this article.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Cohen: *States are leading the way on shared approaches*

According the Cohen (Table 4.2.), the impact of NCLB legislation is multifaceted. It has made a positive impact in that the subgroups, such as minorities, poverty, English-Language Learners, and special needs students’ poor achievement have finally been exposed. However, the policy itself does not fix the issues that surround it. This is evident because NCLB reveals that “one clear lesson is the standards, testing, and accountability are necessary but not sufficient for improving our school” (p. 34). “Substantially more attention must be paid to giving teachers and students the tools they need: a rich, rigorous, and engaging curriculum, well-designed classroom assessments, and the support they need to succeed” (p. 34). The negative impact is further explained as Cohen examines the meaning of the term proficient, and he goes onto say that it has very different meanings in different states. He concludes that proficient is not synonymous with readiness or preparedness for college and careers. Cohen concludes that the primary goals are creating equity and efficiency as it relates to NCLB, and the solutions are determined through the use of power and a focus on rules. Cohen’s opinions are reflected in Table 4.2. as it is viewed through Stone’s framework.
Table 4.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohen # and Quote</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. No Child Left  | **EQUITY** – “The law’s greatest achievement be broken down and reported by subgroups, focusing the attention of educators and policymaker.”  
_~who gets what, when, and how~_ | | |
| 2. In many schools| **CAUSES** – “But there has been too little improvement in the lowest performing schools, where challenges are most severe.”  
_“Even the law’s most ardent supporters will have to acknowledge that the pace of education improvement remains too slow, the achievement gaps among groups too large, and the distance between the academic performance of US students and those in other countries too great.”_ | | |
| 3. One clear lesson| **EFFICENCY** –  
“Substantially more attention must be paid to giving teachers and students the tools they need: a rich, rigorous, and engaging curriculum, well designed classroom assessments, and the_ | | |
| | **RULES** –  
_“Unfortunately, policy makers have made this mistake before, designing legislation on the premise that if educators are held to accountable results, they will change their practices to produce_ | | |
support they need to succeed.”

### NUMBERS
“The result is a growing number of schools identified as low performing but few state and local education systems with the ability adequately respond.”

“Measures imply a need for action, because we do not measure things except when we want to change them or change our behavior in response to them.” ~ Stone

### EQUITY
“....the law let each state set its own standard and define proficient.”

### EFFICIENCY
“And while proficient means dramatically different things from state to state, rarely does it deem proficient are academically prepared for anything, much less college and career.”

~input / output~

### DECISIONS
“States have been working together to fix this problem.”

“States have been working together to fix this problem.”

~maximum total welfare~

“The decision maker should choose the alternative that maximizes overall welfare.”

~accountable~

“Power is the central...
| 7. This work has sparked a broader movement led by the nation’s governor’s and state school chiefs, to develop standards that focus clearly on the most essential knowledge and skills students must acquire through their K-12 education in order to be prepared for life after high school. |
| 8. Though this is “States that adopt the common standards and tests will get a leg up in the competition for the $4 billion Race to the Top fund.” “And......set aside $350 million.....help states work together to develop common assessment aligned to the standards.” |
| 9. These common efforts by the states aren’t a panacea, but they will provide an important foundation |
Conclusions | **EQUITY and EFFICIENCY** dominate this article in relation to its goals. | In regards to the problem, this article focuses on a mixture of **CAUSES, NUMBERS, and DECISIONS** | **POWER and RULES** govern this article when we analyze the solution.

C. Weingarten: *Good objectives weighed down by fatal flaws*

Weingarten (Table 4.3.) feels that NCLB as a policy issue has made little or no impact on improving or enhancing the educational system for students.

Weingarten’s ideals are exemplified in Table 4.3. Weingarten sites numerous problems with this policy, which primarily focus on the causes of the problem. Weingarten exclaims, “unfortunately, most of what we have learned shows that while the law’s mission of creating high stakes (the faulty emphasis on tests) and sticks (punishing schools in need of help) hasn’t strengthened public education” (p. 36). This is her foundation of the policy problem, otherwise known as causal reasoning in the polis. As Stone would illustrate that “to identify a cause in the polis is to place burdens on one set of people instead of another” (p. 189). In this case, Stone might assign the blame on the policy makers of NCLB legislation or perhaps it’s the State Education Departments as they were the ones to interpret and implement the policy within each individual state. Whoever is to blame, it can
be concluded that the initial development of the NCLB policy falls short of reaching success. Weingarten further defines the goals through the need for equity, efficiency, and security for our students in an effort to provide the best education for all regardless of race, socio-economic level, or nationality. She explains the solution through the implementation of power and facts. She also points out that “in making accountability for some, but not all, its hallmark, the law has diminished the importance of shared responsibility” (p. 36). Power is utilized in the solution by redefining membership as Stone describes. Furthermore, Stone affirms, officeholders are accountable to constituents if constituents have the ability to influence representatives and to remove them from office (p. 360). Therefore, all constituent groups must join forces in order to work together to provide an equitable, efficient, and secure educational environment in hopes that all children will be able and can learn and succeed to the best of their abilities.

Table 4.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weingarten # and Quote</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 What have we</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CAUSES</strong> - “Unfortunately, most of what we have learned shows that while the law’s mission of creating high stakes (the faulty emphasis on tests) and sticks (punishing schools in need of help) hasn’t strengthened public education.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>EQUITY</strong> - “In particular, those of us</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I had high hopes</td>
<td>committed to seeing all students succeed, no matter their ZIP code, applauded the focused attention on eradicating the achievement gap.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. But hope, no</td>
<td><strong>CAUSES</strong> – “After years of living with and working under the law, the simple truth is that it has not achieved its stated objectives, its flaws outweigh its goals, and funding for it never approached promised levels.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. As the administration EQUITY - “As the administration and lawmakers look towards reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act – named No Child Left Behind in its last iteration – they must build upon its original intent, which was to level the playing field for disadvantaged students and be a core part of the war on poverty.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SECURITY – “But now that education must be different, more rigorous and richer in content, if we are to give our students what they need to succeed in a 21st-century, knowledge-based economy.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Instead, it has</td>
<td><strong>CAUSES</strong> – “Too often tests are not aligned to the curriculum that students are taught all year, and as a consequence, test results may not accurately indicate what a student has learned.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INTEREST</strong> – “And teachers caution that the excessive number of tests and high stakes attached to them consume inordinate amounts of one thing they and their students have too of: time.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Make no mistake</td>
<td><strong>NUMBERS</strong> – “Like an X-ray, however, tests can diagnosis, but they cannot cure.”</td>
<td><strong>RULES</strong>–“Good tests can help teachers determine how their students are performing and identifying the areas in which their students need assistance.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><del>numbers measure &amp; demonstrate a need for action based upon the story told</del></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> The No Child law</td>
<td><strong>EFFICIENCY</strong>-“Students need well-prepared and engaged teachers; teachers need cooperative and supportive school leadership; and administrators need the latitude and resources to offer rich and rigorous curricular, free of pressures to dumb down their standards in order to look good.</td>
<td><strong>INDUCEMENTS</strong> – “No Child law imposes grave sanctions for failure to meet arbitrary target, even for schools that made significant progress. The result has been unproductive punishments for some schools and inadequate support for others.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>~motivation to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|   | And they all need parents and communities to reinforce outside the classroom | avoid punishment~POWER~ “And in making accountability for some, but not all, its hallmark, the law has diminished the importance of shared responsibility.”

~ redefining membership~

ex. officeholders are accountable to constituents if constituents have the ability to influence representatives and to remove them from office. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. This law has</td>
<td>SECURITY – “The greater accomplishment, however, will be in not simply highlighting their needs but addressing those needs” <del>needs</del></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9. Struggling schools | SECURITY – “Struggling schools need real help – not punishment or unproven approaches, as currently prescribed in the law. ~needs~ | POWER~“The American Federation of Teachers has a long track record of working with administrators, parents, and communities to provide real help to struggling students and low-performing
| 10. Positive interventions | **FACT** – “Positive interventions include the wrap around services kids need to address out-of-classroom issues, like health and nutrition, that have a direct effect on how well a student does inside the classroom.”

**FACT** – We are heartened by the “tremendous successes of the burgeoning community-schools movement, particularly in communities with large number of disadvantaged students.” |

| 11. Ensuring that we | **EQUITY** – “Ensuring that we help prepare all kids for life, college, and work in our knowledge-based economy will require a collaborative, sustained effort from all stakeholders – from the president and the secretary of education on down to states, school districts, principals, teachers, parents, and community members.”

**RIGHT & POWER** – “Ensuring that we help prepare all kids for life, college, and work in our knowledge-based economy will require a collaborative, sustained effort from all stakeholders – from the president and the secretary of education on down to states, school districts, principals, teachers, parents, and community members.” |
12. As we move past NCLB and towards this law’s next iteration, it must reflect the complexity and urgency of educating and supporting all students in the ever changing and increasingly demanding world in which they live.”

### Conclusion

This article mostly reflects **EQUITY, EFFICEINCY, & SECURITY** in establishing the GOALS.  
This article mostly reflects **CAUSES** of the PROBLEM.  
This article mostly reflects **POWER** and **FACTS** of the SOLUTION.

D. Rotherham: *Moving from ‘what’ to ‘how’ in educational policy*

Rotherham (Table 4.4.) looks to redefine the NCLB policy as it is approaching reauthorization.  Rotherham does not feel strongly either way about the positive or negative impact of NCLB; however, his approach centers more on moving from the “what” to the “how” in educational policy.  We have already defined what the policy is, but we have not defined how it is delivered as a power instructional program as Rotherham describes (p. 37).  Table 4.4 demonstrates the huge emphasis on problems with the current policy and determining solutions.  While Rotherham dissects causes of the problem, he also strongly focuses on the interests affecting the problem.  “It was assumed that the rules of special-interest politics somehow
stopped at the schoolhouse door” (Rotherman, 2010). Special interest groups were impacting decisions as described by Rotherham. Hence, once this assumption was eliminated from the decision making process, there was a redefining of the problem and in turn helping to better find a new solution. Special interest groups were not the only voices heard and applied in consideration of policy decisions making. Solutions should rely heavily on facts, rules, and power as we wait for the authorization plan to be determined under President Obama. Constituent groups need to put children first, and further develop the how portion of the policy. It’s the how of the policy that is lacking and the solution needs to address this matter. One of Rotherham’s solutions pinpoints Stone’s facts. For example, since 2001 school district “investments in state data systems make much better measures possible now.” Here it is facts that are used to demonstrate the positive impact of this policy. However, more still needs to be done to solve this policy problem, such as improve teacher effectiveness, provide better school for low-income students, empower and engage parents for assistance, and just as important, “national leaders must change the politics around the education issue” to eradicate special interests (Rotherham, 2010). When leaders join forces to change politics power is utilized to make a greater change for the youth of America to ensure that they receive the best education possible.

Table 4.4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotherham # and Quote</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. It is hard to find</td>
<td></td>
<td>CAUSES –</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The contentiousness, obfuscation, and sometimes blatant misrepresentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The No Child Law</td>
<td>leave parents, teachers, and policymakers baffled about what it requires or what its effects are.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EQUITY</strong> - “Barely more than half of minority students earn a traditional four-year degree, and substantial gaps in achievement separate students by race and income.”</td>
<td><strong>NUMBERS</strong> - “Barely more than half of minority students earn a traditional four-year degree, and substantial gaps in achievement separate students by race and income.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. The law is also | **CAUSES** - “The law is also exposing how few schools can deliver a powerful instructional program.”  
**SYMBOLS** – “When schools become test-preparation factories, it illustrates broader problems in K-12 education.” |
| 4. The nation has | **INTERESTS** - “The nation has pursued a standards-based reform policy since the first George Bush was president.”  
**RULES** – “But data from various measures raise questions about whether standards-based reform is powerful enough to transform US Education from our 20th century model to the level of performance we need now.” |
| 5. Because it had | **CAUSES** – “For a long time, it was assumed that the rules of special-interest politics somehow stopped at schoolhouse door.” |
| 6. A decade later | **INTERESTS** – “With teachers unions prioritizing jobs over reform and attacking President Obama’s educational plans, the |
delineations on the issue are obvious.”

| 7. What all this | **INDUCEMENTS** – “NCLB was an important ‘what’ law. It forced states to specify performance goals, report data, and increase pressure for better performances.”

**CAUSES** – What it was a weak ‘how’ law, too anchored in past approaches to federal education policy.”

**FACTS** – “What all this points to is the need for ambitious policy and political ideas in the next version of the law.” |

| 8. The way forward | **EFFICENCY** - “Large investments must be made to improve teacher effectiveness, open good news public schools through charter schooling and other strategies, and ensure that better supports are in place for low-income students.”

**CAUSES** – “In 2001, states could only measure school performance in simply ways.”

**RULES** – “The laws accountability rules should be updated.”

**FACTS** - “Investments in state data systems make much better measures possible now.” |

| 9. As important | **INTERESTS** – “As long as the debate comes down to stakeholders interest verses the general interests, the prospects for durable reforms are not good.”

**POWER** – “As important, national leaders must change the politics around the educational issue.” |

| 10. Finally, the bill | **CAUSES** - “We lack ideas and information about strategies for teaching and learning that could make schools more effective.”

**POWER** - “We cannot ‘standards’ and ‘choice’ our way to dramatically better schools. Rather, we need a more robust education research and innovative agenda.” |

| 11. We’ve learned | **FACTS** – “We’ve learned a lot from NCLB. Whether that learning can pierce the political
VII. Final Summary

In conclusion Spellings feels that NCLB policy overall has positively impacted education as we have more data to drive instruction and educational practices are improving as a result. While Weingarten claims that the initial intentions of this policy were good, but as she exclaims there are “fatal flaws” in the policy. Weingarten further explains that “the results [have] been unproductive punishments for some schools and inadequate support for other” (p. 36) to make real progress and see results. Cohen and Rotherham both address positive and negative impacts of the law. While they both have somewhat mixed reactions, they differ from each very distinctly. Cohen sites states initiatives verses federal legislation as the key component to the issue. States would benefit from combined efforts of working together to create commonalities in standards and achievement. Rather Rotherham is content with the basis of the NCLB policy as it’s is defined; however, he strives to see more how to explained in the new policy as it will soon be reauthorized.
In conclusion, NCLB as a policy issue in the polis must consider all children’s best interest in order to provide superiority in educational practices within the learning environment, so that all students regardless of race, socio-economic status, language spoken or special needs, will be offered an opportunity to achieve excellence through distinction in pursuit of a strong background in academics and the skills required to be a success in the world. The goal of the NCLB policy is to strive for equality in services rendered, efficiency in the how to deliver improved education to students, and security that they can learn in a safe setting where students can feel free to take risk and solve problems. NCLB has noted positive affects, such as increased data and facts about each individual student, which will be able to provide educators with the proper area of concentration needed to improve while still emphasizing strengths to play upon for self-esteem building and establishing academic foundations. This method has proven beneficial on more than one occasion, and the use of data can still be incorporated into best practices. As NCLB is approaching reauthorization, it must also be considered that we need to foster learning that will prepare students to be ready for college or a career. Consequently, educators need to be provided with better training and tools to be able to implement improved instruction. In policy decision making, we must eliminate the negative influence of special interest groups shortsighted visions based upon personal agendas as it does not improve education for all. Various other causes need to be reviewed to extinguish obstacles for improvement. In our solution, students need to be ultimately provided with the skills
needed as they graduate from the K-12 system of education and transition into the real world or higher educational systems throughout America and the world. The incorporation of facts, power, rights and rules will all be essential as the state and federal government work cooperatively with educators, administrators, community members, parents, and even students to better improve education for all students alike through meaningful policy development and well-planned, thoughtful decision making. This approach is the start of a new plan relating to policy improvement. Hence, the goals are established to address the problems and find temporary solution, because once a problem is solved a new goals in established. NCLB is not immune from this process, and shared decisions making will be the best method of addressing policy issues within the polis.
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