

Holding High Hopes: How High Schools Respond to State Accountability Policies

Edited by

Betheny Gross
Margaret E. Goertz

CPRE Research Report Series
RR-056

June 2005

Consortium for Policy Research in Education
University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education

© Copyright 2005 by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
List of Tables.....	iv
List of Figures.....	v
About the Authors.....	vii
Acknowledgments.....	ix
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
State Accountability Policy and Our Special Focus on High Schools.....	1
Interpreting and Implementing: A Conceptual Framework of Accountability and School Context.....	3
The Acceptance and Interpretation of the Policy.....	5
Generating a Response.....	7
Methodology.....	8
Sample.....	8
Data Collection	13
Data Analysis.....	13
Reading Across the Chapters	14
References.....	15
Chapter 2. The Press From Above, The Pull From Below: High School Responses to External Accountability	17
Introduction.....	17
Standards, Testing, and Accountability for High Schools in the Six States	18
Strength and Stability of Accountability Systems	19
Strong Systems.....	19
Weak Systems.....	20
State Assessments	20
Standards: Specificity of State Guidance.....	21
Knowledge of State Accountability and Its Perceived Value.....	21
Standards.....	22
Testing.....	23
Accountability.....	25
Salience of State Standards, Testing, and Accountability	28
Explanations for Variation in Schools’ Response to External Accountability: The Pull From Below	31
Conclusions and Research Implications	33
References.....	40
Chapter 3. Got You Under My Spell? How Accountability Policy Is Changing and Not Changing Decision Making in High Schools.....	43
Introduction.....	43
Theoretical Framework of Decision Making.....	44
Elements That Set the Scene for Decision Making	45
Decision Situations	45

Participants.....	45
Problems	46
Searching and Selecting Solutions: The Use of Information in Decision Making.....	47
Setting the Scene for Decision Making: The Context of Decisions in Schools.....	50
Problems	50
Problems Embedded Within the School	52
Issues of Curriculum and Instruction.....	52
School Organizational Issues.....	53
Issues Related to Teachers	54
Problems Embedded in the Students.....	55
Lack of Student Motivation	55
Weaknesses in Student Background	55
Deficits in Students’ Skills.....	56
Summarizing Challenges	56
Linking Solutions to Problems in Recent School Decisions	57
Decision Situations and Their Participants	59
Independent/Individual Decision Makers.....	62
Decision-Making Groups.....	62
Participants External to the School.....	64
Making the Decisions: Information and Solutions	67
The Conditions for Finding New Ideas: The Search for Information in Schools.....	67
The Selection of Strategies: A Range of Possibilities	72
Remedial Strategies	73
Curriculum Strategies	73
Instructional Practice	74
Organizational Changes	74
Conclusions.....	76
References.....	79
Chapter 4. Overview of Actions Taken by High Schools to Improve Instruction.....	81
Introduction.....	81
Purpose.....	81
Data Analysis	81
Actions as They Relate to Accountability	82
Curriculum and Instructional Strategies to Meet Standards and Content Requirements.....	82
Classroom-Based Strategies.....	82
Collaborative Efforts to Improve Curriculum and Instruction	83
Remedial Efforts	84
Modified Curriculum in Regular Classes	84
Separate Remedial Classes	85
Tutoring.....	86
Making Use of Data and Assessments.....	86
Actions Beyond Accountability	87
Magnet Programs	87
Advanced Classes	88
College Outreach	88

Career Preparation	88
Parental Outreach.....	88
Chapter 5. Stuck in the Middle With You: District Response to State Accountability	95
Introduction.....	95
District Characteristics.....	97
Research Questions.....	98
Conceptual Framework.....	101
Research Design.....	103
Findings.....	109
Type A Districts.....	110
Type B Districts.....	111
Analysis.....	112
Five C's.....	113
Consistency.....	113
Credibility.....	114
Chronology.....	114
Comprehensiveness.....	115
Comprehensibility.....	115
Discussion.....	117
Future Research	118
References.....	119
Chapter 6. Summary	123
Introduction.....	123
Accountability—A Stimulus for Action.....	123
Level of Response.....	125
Nature of Response.....	125
Searching for Solutions.....	126
External Information and Support	128
Active District Intervention	129
School Resistance	130
Conclusions.....	131
References.....	133

List of Tables (by chapter)

Chapter 1

Table 1. Sample of Six State Accountability Systems.....	9
Table 2. Achievement/Context Matrix	10

Chapter 2

Table 1. Key Characteristics of State Accountability Policies for High Schools, 2002–2003: Six Study States	36
Table 2. Characteristics of State Assessment Systems for High Schools, 2002–2003: Six Study States.....	38

Chapter 3

Table 1. Number of Schools in the Sample That Incorporated State Standard and/or Assessment Targets in Their Local Goals	51
Table 2. Schools Reporting Curriculum and Instruction Problems	53
Table 3. Summary of Challenges.....	57
Table 4. The Challenges Identified and the Challenges Addressed.....	58

Chapter 4

Table 1. Curriculum and Instructional Strategies to Meet Standards and Content Requirements	89
Table 2. Remedial Efforts	91
Table 3. Data and Assessment Actions.....	92
Table 4. Actions Beyond Accountability.....	93

Chapter 5

Table 1. Contrasting State Accountability Systems.....	104
Table 2. Sampling Choices	105
Table 3. District Types and Descriptors	108
Table 4. Qualities of District Response	109
Table 5. Review of Distinguishing Policy Features.....	116

List of Figures (by chapter)

Chapter 1

Figure 1. Accountability Strategy for School Improvement.....	2
Figure 2. Conceptual Framework of School Response to Accountability Policy.....	4
Figure 3. Geographic Locale of Visited Schools	11
Figure 4. Enrollment Numbers in Visited Schools	11
Figure 5. Percentage of Students Receiving Free or Reduced Lunch in Sample Schools.....	12
Figure 6. Ethnic Composition of Visited Schools	12

Chapter 3

Figure 1. Model of Information, Search, and Solutions	49
Figure 2. A Continuum of Change.....	76

Chapter 5

Figure 1. Conceptual Framework Map	102
--	-----

About the Authors

Amy Bach is a doctoral student in the Reading/Writing/Literacy program in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. Currently, Bach is working with CPRE at Harvard on a study that focuses on how high school students define “good work,” what motivate students to produce good work, and how adults and peers contribute to students’ conceptions of good work.

Gayle Christensen completed her Ph.D. at Stanford University in 2004. She is spending the 2004–2005 academic year as a German Chancellor Scholar under the auspices of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. While in Germany, Gayle is working as a research fellow at the Center for Educational Research at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development, where she continues to examine the situation of immigrant students cross-nationally.

Margaret Goertz is co-director of CPRE and a Professor of Education Policy in the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania. She is a past president of the American Education Finance Association and has been Executive Director of the Education Policy Research Division at the Educational Testing Service. Goertz has published widely on standards-based accountability. Her current research interests include education finance, education policy, and intergovernmental relations, with particular attention to fiscal and programmatic equity.

Matthew Goldwasser is an independent consultant who specializes in research on high schools and youth. He conducts program evaluations, qualitative and action research studies for school districts, schools, organizations, and community groups. His work is especially concerned with the role of youth as researchers and activists in their own schools and communities.

Betheny Gross is a researcher at the Center on Reinventing Public Education at the University of Washington, where she is currently involved in a study on the implementation and impact of comprehensive school reform programs. Her research interests include examining strategies for organizational improvement and the impact of district and state policy on local improvement efforts.

Donna M. Harris is a Mellon Postdoctoral Fellow at Wellesley College. Previously, Harris was a researcher for CPRE at the University of Pennsylvania. She received a master’s degree from Teachers College, Columbia University, and a Ph.D. in Educational Policy Studies from the University of Wisconsin-Madison. She received a dissertation grant from the American Education Research Association and the National Center on Educational Statistics to support her analysis of data from the National Education Longitudinal Study of 1988. Harris has also held a postdoctoral fellowship at the RAND Corporation. Her research interests include educational policy, race, tracking, and inequality in American public schools.

Julian Vasquez Heilig is a Ph.D. candidate in Education Administration and Policy Analysis at Stanford University. His research focuses on accountability policy and urban education.

Dana Holland holds an M.A. in applied anthropology and is currently a doctoral candidate in education and sociology at the University of Pennsylvania. Dana was awarded an International Dissertation Field Research Fellowship by the Social Science Research Council to pursue her doctoral research, which examines the interrelations between academic social science and the activities of international development agencies in the Southern African country of Malawi.

Karen Hussar is a second year doctoral student in Human Development and Psychology at the Harvard Graduate School of Education. She is a research assistant for CPRE at Harvard with 6 years of qualitative research experience. She holds a master's degree in Human Development and Psychology from Teachers College, Columbia University.

Michael Kirst is a Professor of Education and Business Administration at Stanford University. He received a Ph.D. in political economy and government from Harvard University. Kirst has held several positions with the federal government, including Director of Program Planning and Evaluation for the Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education in the U.S. Office of Education. Kirst was president of the California State Board of Education from 1977 to 1981. Kirst has published books and articles on school finance politics, curriculum politics, intergovernmental relations, and education reform policies. His recent work concerns improving student preparation for success in postsecondary education.

Tom Luschei is a Ph.D. candidate in International Comparative Education at Stanford University. Prior to his graduate studies, he taught elementary and high school in Los Angeles. In 2004, he contributed a book chapter to *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending*, published by Teachers College Press.

Diane Massell is a Senior Research Associate for CPRE at the University of Michigan's School of Education. Massell received her master's degree and Ph.D. in Administration and Policy Analysis from Stanford University. Her career has centered broadly on the influence of government education policies on schooling practices, including work on standards-based reform and most recently the interactions between comprehensive school designs and external policies.

Melissa Prosky is a researcher at the Consortium for Policy Research in Education at the University of Pennsylvania, where she manages the Study of High School Strategies for Instructional Improvement. In addition to this work, she has also assisted in the data collection for the federal Evaluation of Title I Accountability Systems and School Improvement Efforts (TASSIE).

Jonathan A. Supovitz is an associate professor at the Graduate School of Education at the University of Pennsylvania and a senior researcher at CPRE. His research focuses on the ways that educational organizations of various forms (e.g., districts, schools, external providers) systematically support the improvement of teaching, learning, and classrooms and foster their own organizational learning.

Elliot Weinbaum is a researcher for CPRE at the University of Pennsylvania. Weinbaum holds a B.A. from Yale and a Ph.D. from Penn. His research interests include intergovernmental relationships, performance-based accountability, and other effects of policy on school improvement. Recent research has examined the impacts of statewide accountability systems on district improvement efforts aimed at high schools. He is currently taking part in a national study of high schools, their internal communication networks, and the roles that outside organizations play in high schools' strategies to improve instruction. He can be reached at elliottw@gse.upenn.edu.

Acknowledgments

This report is based on research conducted by the Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) and funded by the Institute of Education Sciences, United States Department of Education, under Grant No. R308A960003. Opinions expressed in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Institute of Education Sciences, the United States Department of Education, CPRE, or its institutional members.

The work in this volume required the goodwill and patience of countless people to whom the contributors would like to extend a sincere thank you. First, the editors, the authors, and the greater research community owe a deep debt of gratitude to the hundreds of teachers, school administrators, and district administrators whose openness in sharing their experiences provided invaluable insights into the context of high schools and the impact of accountability policies. We hope this compilation provides them with an analysis that is even half as valuable as the insights they shared with us. The authors would also like to thank Robert Floden, Charles Thompson and Mark Rohland for their thorough and thoughtful reviews as well as Kelly Stanton for her efforts in producing the final product. Finally, this work was a collaborative effort of many researchers including those not represented among authors. This work would not have been possible without the efforts of Martin Carnoy, Richard Elmore, and Susan Fuhrman, all of whom provided guidance in the research design and analytic discussions.