

# Index

- academic achievement: charter schools and, 76; congestion effects and, 30; educational production and, 34–37; effects of NCLB on, 11; effects of peers on, 29–31; resource inequalities and, 29, 37
- academic achievement, measurement of: confounding factors, 13–14, 20, 26–27; cross-sectional approaches to, 13–14, 43; difficulties with, 25, 56–57, 65. *See also* growth models of achievement; status models of academic achievement; value-added models of achievement
- academic proficiency: adequate yearly progress and, 5–6; growth models of achievement in, 111–13; measurement of, under NCLB, 5–8; subjects tested, under NCLB, 6–7; treatment of, in reform proposal, 135–36, 145
- accountability, 1–4, 74, 148, 150
- “accountability on a stick,” 46
- achievement gap, 3–4, 31, 52, 107–8, 145, 150
- adequate yearly progress (AYP), 5–6; and charter schools, in Minnesota, 76–78; consequences for school districts, 10; consequences for schools, 7–10; in Minneapolis, 124–25; in Minnesota, 60–65, 76–77, 111–13; minimum subgroup size and, 5–6, 13, 57–59; minority student enrollment and, 57–65; 70; parental involvement and, 125–28, role of, in reform proposal, 145–47; students with disabilities and, 7, 61–65, 70; students with limited English proficiency and, 7, 61–65. *See also* star ratings of Minnesota schools
- adequate yearly progress, analysis of: changes in principals’ allocation of time and, 101–3; expected consequences of NCLB and, 88–90; influence of actors in education and, 94–95; principals’ allocation of time and, 65–67, 70–72; principals’ influence in schools and, 90–95
- Americans with Disabilities Act, 2
- Arnold, R. Douglas, 178n10
- AYP. *See* adequate yearly progress

- Barton, Paul E., 46  
 “breaking ranks,” 140  
 bounded rationality, 54, 78–79  
 Boy Scouts of America, 17  
*Bureaucracy* (Wilson), 25, 74  
 bureaucratic agency, 37–38, 81, 85, 89–90  
 Bush, George W., 2, 7
- charter school principals: and analysis of changes in allocation of time under NCLB, 101–3; expected consequences of NCLB, 88–90; influence of, in education, 90–93; influence of, in relation to other actors, 93–95. *See also* school principals
- charter schools: as coping organizations, 40; effects on academic achievement, 76; failure to make adequate yearly progress, 75–76, 107, 136–37; in Minnesota, 76–78, 111–13; principals’ views on NCLB, 98; student composition in, 76–77; treatment of, under NCLB, 75–80
- class size, 30–31
- cohort gain model, 110. *See also* growth models of achievement
- Coleman, James, 28–29, 31, 34
- competition, in education, 21–22
- congestion effects, 30–31, 41
- coping organizations, 39–41, 92–93
- corrective action, 9
- Crawford, Thomas, 1–2, 12
- cross-sectional models of achievement. *See* status models of academic achievement
- desegregation, 2
- Dewey, John, 40–41
- DiIulio, John J., Jr., 118–19  
 “dinged for diversity,” 57  
 “drift-net fishing,” 55–56
- Edmonds, Ronald, 31–32, 118, 128  
*Educating a Democracy* (Meier), 130
- educational production function, 33–36
- educational quality, 44
- Education Commission of the States, 169n6
- effective schools research: characteristics of effective schools, 31–32; problems with research, 32–33, 124; and production model of assessment, 118, 120; schools as social systems in, 32
- Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, 4
- endogeneity, cautions about, 87–88
- experiential organizations, 40–42, 119–20
- Finn, Chester E., Jr., 77
- five-star schools. *See* star ratings of Minnesota schools
- Florida: A+ system of accountability, 111
- free and reduced-price lunch, students eligible for, and: charter schools, 76–77; growth models of achievement, 112; school failure rates, in Minneapolis, 124; school failure rates, in Minnesota, 61–65; star ratings of Minnesota schools and, 60–61. *See also* minimum subgroup size
- Fuller, Bruce, 57
- gain models. *See* growth models of achievement
- growth models of achievement: advantages of, 109–10; analysis of, in Minnesota, 111–14; defined, 18, 109; incorporation of, into NCLB, 110–11; minority student enrollment and, 112; problems with, 109–11, 134–36
- Harvard Civil Rights Project, 130
- Harvard University, 31

- Henig, Jeffrey, 183n34
- Hess, Frederick, M., 170n10
- inequality. *See* resource inequalities
- incentives: in NCLB, 14-15, 39-40, 79-80; use of, in reform proposal, 133, 141-44, 148-49
- informational asymmetries, 38
- Jennings, Jack, 169n6
- Johnson, Lyndon, 4
- Kennedy, Ted (U.S. Senator), 16
- King, Samuel W., 1, 23
- leadership: academic proficiency and, 5-7; in effective schools, 31-32, 43-44, 129; incentives for, in Minnesota, 142-44; measurement of, in growth models of achievement, 113-14; measurement of, in Minneapolis, 125-28; measurement of, in Minnesota Schools Survey, 65-67, 138-41; measurement of, in reform proposal, 147-48; school principals and, 28-29. *See also* school principals in Minnesota
- limited English proficiency (LEP), students with, 7, 19, 57; charter schools and, 76-77; growth models of achievement and, 112; school failure rates, in Minnesota and, 61-65; star ratings of Minnesota schools and, 60-61. *See also* minimum subgroup size
- Logan, Charles H., 119
- Loveless, Tom, 77-78, 181n4
- Malloy, Kate, 186n2
- Manna, Paul, 182n24
- Mascaro, Steve (U.S. Representative), 18
- McDonnell, Lorraine, 171-72n39
- Meier, Deborah, 12, 130, 171-72n39
- “middle-out reform,” 132-34
- Milwaukee (WI), 115
- minimum subgroup size: and adequate yearly progress, 5-6, 13, 57-59, 136; states’ efforts to increase, 57-58
- Minneapolis Public Schools (MN): analysis of student and teacher surveys in, 123-28; failure to make adequate yearly progress in, 124; production model of assessment in, 125-28; recommends flexibility for schools in hiring, 144; segregation in, 127-28, status under NCLB, 124
- Minnesota: “achievement gap” in, 52; characteristics of failing schools in, 60-65; characteristics of five-star schools in, 60-64; charter schools in, 76-78; compared to other states, 50-51; details of NCLB implementation in, 52-53, 58; growth models of achievement in, 111-14; problems with implementation of NCLB in, 53-54; school report cards in, 46-47; star ratings of schools in, 47-48, 60-61; surveys of principals in, 50; value-added models of achievement in, 116. *See also* school principals in Minnesota
- Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment, 52
- Minnesota Department of Education: implementation of NCLB, 52, 54-55; influence of, in education, 90-95; revising list of failing schools, 54-55
- Minnesota Office of Educational Accountability, 52
- Minnesota Office of the Legislative Auditor, 15, 53-55, 116, 142
- Minnesota Schools Survey, 50, 65-67, 139-41
- Minnesota State Fair, 46-47

- minority student enrollment and: adequate yearly progress, 56–58, 70; charter schools, 76–77; gain models of student achievement, 112; school failure rates, in Minneapolis, 124, 127–28; school failure rates, in Minnesota, 61–65; school failure rates, nationally, 58–60; star ratings of schools and, 60–61. *See also* minimum subgroup size
- Moe, Terry M., 37–38, 77, 181n15
- moral hazard, 38
- multitasking, 79
- Murnane, Richard, 169–70n7
- National Council of State Legislatures, 16–17
- National Education Association, 16, 110–11
- National School Boards Association, 174n77
- NCLB. *See* No Child Left Behind
- New York City Public Schools, 31
- No Child Left Behind (NCLB), 2–4; adequate yearly progress under, 5–7; calls for reform of, 17–19; consequences for failing schools, 7–10; critiques of, 12–17; implementation of, in Minnesota, 52–55; current research on, 27; grade levels tested, 6–7, 76–77; implementation of, nationally, 48–49; lack of empirical evidence about, 11; liberal promises of, 10–11, 29, 130–31, 150; one hundred percent proficiency, 14; possibility of increasing segregation, 54; promises to close achievement gap, 2–3, 10; principals' attitudes toward, in Minnesota, 81–85; principals' attitudes toward, in United States, 80; proposal for reform of, 134–50; school choice and, 77–80; state challenges to, 18, 23; state variation in implementation, 48–49, 51; subjects tested, 6–7. *See also* adequate yearly progress; school principals; school principals in Minnesota; star ratings of Minnesota schools
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. *See* No Child Left Behind.
- No Child Left Behind, analysis of: changes in principals' allocation of time under, 101–3; determinants of AYP failure, 60–65; expected consequences of, for principals, 88–90; influence of actors in education and, 94–95; principals' allocation of time and, 65–72; principals' influence in schools and, 90–95
- Novak, John R., 57
- Orfield, Gary, 130–31, 169–70n7
- outcomes, 39. *See also* coping organizations
- outputs, 39. *See also* coping organizations
- parental choice, 9, 15–16, 75
- parents: as evaluators of school quality, 129, 139; influence of, in schools, 93–94; involvement of, in schools, 125–28; role of, in educational production, 35–36
- Parsing the Achievement Gap* (Barton), 46
- Pawlenty, Tim (governor of Minnesota), 46–47, 116
- peer effects. *See* congestion effects
- peers: role of, in educational production, 29–30, 34–36, 41
- Phaedrus, The* (Plato), 1
- Pirsig, Robert, 1
- Portland Oregon Schools, 1
- principals and agents, 37
- principals of schools. *See* charter school principals; school principals; school principals in Minnesota
- private schools, 31
- “process indicators” of school performance, 118

- production function. *See* educational production function
- production model of assessment, 118; characteristics of 120, 123; criminal justice policy and, 118–19; in Minneapolis (MN), 125–28; proposal for incorporation into NCLB, 137–38
- Public Agenda, 80–81
- public goods, 30
- “public policy pluralism,” 77
- public school choice, 21–22, 75, 119, 145
- Putnam, Robert, 51
- racial and ethnic minorities. *See* minority student enrollment
- Report on Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Coleman et al.), 28–29, 31, 34
- resource inequalities, 19, 29; and failure to make adequate yearly progress, 57, 72; in Minneapolis (MN), 127–28. *See also* free and reduced-price lunch, students eligible for
- restructuring, 9
- Rotherham, Andrew, 183n34
- safe harbor, 5, 13. *See also* adequate yearly progress
- safety, 125–28
- “school in need of improvement,” 8
- school choice. *See* charter schools; public school choice; vouchers
- school principals: assessing student achievement, 25–26; attitudes toward NCLB, 80; demonstrating leadership, 28, 43–44, 120–23; as focus of study, 27–28; as targets of NCLB, 27–28; treatment of, in reform proposal, 146–48; trade-offs in time and attention of, 33, 65–66
- school principals, analysis of: allocation of time and adequate yearly progress, 65–67, 70–72; allocation of time and star ratings, 67–70; attitudes toward NCLB in Minnesota, 81–85; changes in principals’ allocation of time under NCLB, 101–3; expected consequences of NCLB, 88–90; influence of other actors in education, 94–95; influence of, in schools, 90–95
- school principals in Minnesota: attitudes toward NCLB, 81–85; attitudes toward value-added models of assessment, 116–17; dangers of shirking, 78–79; effects of NCLB on other actors, 98–101; leadership of 125–28, 138–41; perceived benefits of NCLB, 95–97; reallocation of time under NCLB, 101–3; suggestions to improve law, 120–23; trade-offs in allocation of time under NCLB, 97–99; views of rewards for leadership, 141–44
- school report cards, 7, 46–47
- “schools of promise,” 146–48
- segregation, 29–30, 127–28
- social capital, 51, 125–28
- social context of education, 29–30, 118–19, 121, 141
- South St. Paul (MN), 46–47
- Spellings, Margaret (U.S. Secretary of Education), 16, 110
- standardized tests: history of, 1; use of, in NCLB, 5–6, 12–13
- star ratings of Minnesota schools: implementation of, 47–48; principals’ allocation of time and, 67–70; relationship to student characteristics, 60–65. *See also* adequate yearly progress
- status models of academic achievement, 6; problems with, 13–14, 43, 108–9, 129, 135
- students: as evaluators of school quality, 139–41; role of, in educational production, 34–36
- students with disabilities and: charter schools, 76–77; growth models of

- students with disabilities and  
*(continued)*  
 achievement, 112; school failure rates in Minneapolis, 124; school failure rates in Minnesota, 61–65; star ratings of Minnesota schools, 60–61. *See also* minimum subgroup size
- supplemental services, 9
- surveys: in Minneapolis, 123–25; Minnesota Schools Survey, 50; principals' attitudes toward, in Minnesota, 120–21; use of, in reform proposal, 137–38
- teachers: assessing student achievement, 25; influence of, in education, 90–95; principals' views of, in Minnesota, 99–101; role of, in educational production, 36; salaries of, 68; treatment of, in reform proposal, 139, 146–48
- Tennessee: use of value-added measures of assessment, 115–16
- test participation requirements, 6
- Title I, 5, 8–10, 146
- top-down and bottom-up reforms in education, 75, 78–80, 119, 132
- unfunded mandates, 16
- U.S. Constitution, 4
- U.S. Department of Education, 6, 17, 48, 110–11
- U.S. General Accounting Office, 15, 16
- Utah State Legislature, 18
- value-added models of achievement: advantages of, 114–15; defined, 18, 114; problems with, 115–17, 134–36; use of, in Minnesota, 116
- vouchers, 21–22, 75
- War on Poverty, 4
- Wilson, James Q.: 25, 74, 95; and coping organizations, 39–41, 142; and criminal justice policy, 118–20
- Wood, George, 179–80, 30