No Child Left Behind: A review from a Critical Race Theory Lens

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
BY

Mary L. Cameron

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Frank Guldbrandsen, Ph.D. (Advisor)
Randy Hyman, Ph.D. (Co-Advisor)

April 2011

Acknowledgments

Many people have encouraged me and provided me with support over the past five-plus years as I have worked to complete this doctorate. Special thanks to my supervisor and friend Judith Karon, who has always encouraged me to further my education. To my co-workers Audrey, Barb, Cathy, Deborah, Lita, and Tanisha, I appreciate your support as well.

To the professors who contributed to my learning, thinking, and growth, to my dissertation committee members (Helen Mongan-Rallis, Joyce Strand) and special thanks to my advisor, Frank Guldbrandsen, who guided me and kept me focused and on track, and to Randy Hyman who although arrived late on the scene has provided me with so much guidance and support, thank you also for the use of your survey model. Last but not least, I would like to express my appreciation to my classmates. I truly enjoyed learning with you and from you, and a very special thanks to my study group—Katherine, Amy, Phyllis, and Marlene. We inspired each other; now let's go and make a difference!

I would also like to thank Insoon Han and Robert Lloyd for their assistance in helping me understand statistical terms.

Dedication

This paper is dedicated to my family—first, to my loving father who passed away May 13, 2005. He was the force behind my philosophy of lifelong learning. He taught all of his children the importance of education—that once you receive that piece of paper (i.e., diploma), no one could take it away from you. Dad, I got that piece of paper and I am still learning! Thank you for all that you taught me, thank you for your love.

To my mom Edwina, who kept me on track—you constantly kept this work in the forefront by always asking me how the paper was progressing. To my big brother Will, who kept telling me I could do it, and my baby sister Sandy who was in school as well. Thank you for listening to my story and sharing your experiences. To my Aunt Lena who kept giving me encouragement all the way from Denver and assuring me that she would be here when I walked across the stage. To my other siblings—Pat, Ray, Roy, Roland, Chris, Julie, Eva, Ronald, and my deceased brother Russell—thank you all; all of you are dear to my heart. A very special thank you to my most precious children—Kenya, Chad, and Tiffani—who have always supported me during my quest for knowledge even though at times they felt it took me away from them. And my daughters-in-law Kelly and Kammie and son-in-law Karl, thank you as well. To my beautiful and talented grandchildren—Asher David, Tollie Cameron, Kaleb Joshua, Layla Rae, and Mariana LeAnn Rose, Shay, and Isaiah—Grandma is finished with school "for now" and promises to spend more time with you. And to all of my nieces and nephew (big Jessica, Justin, Deion, Angelo, and others): stay in school, live, love, be happy, and become contributing members of your communities.

Abstract

The failure to educate all children and the need to close the academic achievement gap that exists between students of color and White students continues to be a top priority of policy makers.

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which components of Critical Race Theory (CRT) influence practice in the public school setting regarding requirements of the reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) also known as the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. A quantitative research methodology was used to examine this question. Four hundred (400) Minnesota public school educators were selected to respond to a survey designed to assess the extent of their understanding of CRT and the requirement of NCLB.

Through a comprehensive review of Critical Race Theory (CRT), the study examined No Child Left Behind (NCLB) requirements through the lens of CRT. At the very core of NCLB is the goal of ensuring that all students have a fair, and equal opportunity in obtaining a high quality education and reach proficiency level on state academic achievement standards and academic assessments. CRT has sought to create equal educational opportunities for all children. According to CRT one way to ensure that all students perform at a proficiency level or higher is for schools and educators to commit to developing curriculum and programs that acknowledge the multiple strengths that each child brings into the classroom. CRT further asserts that race and culture do matter and both are important components to be considered when educating students of color.

Foreword

As I begin putting into words my understanding of scholarly research on federal legislation, the relationship between legislation, educational practice, race, and how they are connected to the achievement gap between children of color and other children, I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge that I am a woman of color who grew up in a moderately large city in the state of Minnesota, attended its schools, and continues to live there. I further acknowledge inequities existed in our public educational system then and persist. I have lived an educational experience that clearly connects with some of the literature I have reviewed-- specifically, literature from a critical race theory (CRT) perspective as it pertains to our educational system and racism. I write with the best intent of showing no bias, but feel it necessary to reveal my background, gender, and ethnicity as they contribute significantly to who I am as a person, a student, a writer, and a scholar.

The painful memory of raising my hand in response to a question from the teacher and being passed over so that a White child could respond still remains within me. The memory of feeling humiliated during history class when slavery was the topic of discussion still pains me today. Being singled out as one who was not college material and told the best I could look forward to was being a housewife or a secretary was definitely part of my school district's "hidden curriculum" and was a crushing blow to my spirit as well as to my already low self-esteem.

I felt no sense of belonging. I felt lost. I was unable to put into words the feelings that took hold in my soul. Asante (2003) offers—"the wilderness"--as a metaphor for this feeling of economic, social, political, and professional abandonment. Being "in the

wilderness" can include experiences of being denied opportunity and feeling lost, abandoned, or lacking a way out. Some wilderness dwellers find it almost impossible to escape, especially those living in the inner cities. Those who are able to escape the wilderness, recognize that at any moment, they could slip back in. I was a wilderness dweller and am doing my best to stay out of it.

This dissertation examines the extent to which components of Critical Race Theory (CRT) influence practice in the public school setting regarding requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. CRT asserts race and culture do matter and both must be taken into consideration when educating children of color.

Please note that I seriously considered examining class and poverty as part of this research, but made the decision not to consider these issues. I recognize that the socioeconomic status of families and communities contributes greatly to school financing and may also have detrimental effects on children's self-esteem and how children are treated in the classroom, particularly children of color who also live in poverty (Lichter, 1997). Studies conducted by Kozol (1991) during 1988 and 1990 in Chicago, New York, and other cities across the country revealed, through multiple conversations with White students from wealthy suburban schools, that race was more of a factor than poverty, when commenting on Black children attending their schools, whereas some students felt that race and poverty were interchangeable. Students openly acknowledged that fiscal inequalities "do matter very much" in determining what a school can offer, but also acknowledged busing Black children to their schools would "meet with strong resistance," not simply because standards would necessarily decline, but because of "out-

and-out racism" (pp. 125-126). It is for these reasons and others that the focus of this

work will be race. I further acknowledge, as does Asante (2003), that "the

implementation of justice is the most difficult of all national tasks" (p. 8).

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1

This chapter provides a brief history of racism in the United States, provides an introduction to Critical Race Theory (CRT), and presents the problem statement, purpose of the study, research question(s), and operational definition of terms, assumptions and limitations of the study.

Background

Racism. More than 200 years have passed since the founding of the United States and yet there remains deep racial discontent in this country. According to Stovall (2006), racism is an "accepted structural phenomenon centered in maintaining the status quo" (p. 250). Stovall (2006) further states that oftentimes, racism is typically viewed as something that only bigots portray, that society would rather reduce it to this as opposed to acknowledging, and discussing its origin. The social construction of racism is a direct result of systems and structures seeking a way to maintain a "racial ruling" which is also demonstrated through enforcement of policies and laws that have and do govern this country (p. 250).

Many members of minority racial/ethnic groups feel White racism, defined as a "combination of prejudice and power that allows the dominant race to institutionalize its dominance at all levels in a society" is a persistent problem in this country that is rarely confronted by the nation's White educators and political leaders. However, while many Whites grow tired of hearing about and talking about racism (Bonilla-Silva, 1997, p. 466), minority groups remain more willing to discuss racism. For example, African Americans recognize and continue to discuss the fact that this country initiated,

promoted, and profited from the enslavement of Africans (Asante, 2003; see also

Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995).

Both Blacks and Whites recognize racism is not a problem created by Black

people. Rather, it is today as it was then, "a profound White problem deeply imbedded

in what Whites consider normal thought, attitudes, and behaviors; it is in actuality, a

form of pathology" (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001, p. 134; see also Bell, 1992). Ladson-

Billings and Tate (1995) assert that, despite the attention paid to race in American

society, it remains un-theorized as a topic of scholarly inquiry in education. Race is also

politically divisive as evidenced in the Proposition 209 campaign in California in 1996

that declared official affirmative action programs to be illegal. Debates about

Confederate symbols on state flags and Bill Clinton's Initiative on Race, suggest racism

is a continuing problem in America (Henry & Sears, 2002).

Most Americans believe public education should be available to every child

irrespective of race, gender, physical ability, geographic location or socioeconomic

status. However, the reality is that discrimination in education on the basis of race

persists (Asante, 2003; also Stovall, 2006).

An attitude of cultural and racial superiority was brought to North America by

the European colonists. The "social construction" of race occurred within the economic

context of competition over land and power (Spring, 1994, 1997). The colonists began

to strip away cultures with the conquest of indigenous peoples, the enslavement of

Africans (those brought to the colonies from their native lands) and Black Americans,

(those born into slavery). These cultures were denied an education in order to allow

Whites to maintain control over their land and to sustain an inexpensive source of labor (Spring, 1994, 1997). Congress' approval of the Naturalization Act of 1790, which prevented non-Whites from gaining citizenship, illustrated the racial attitude of our Founding Fathers and legitimated the idea of one race being superior over another (Spring, 1994, 1997). Even today, Patricia Williams (1991), a lawyer, professor, and the great-great granddaughter of a slave, argues that:

> American contract law and legal institutions have exercised a deadening power over people of color by encouraging within them a sense of 'passiveness' as it is the legal document or the contract that governs them, and these individuals have been negatively affected because they have been institutionally and thereby legally designated as inferior. (p. 235)

Throughout history, racial categories have constantly changed. Two, however remain the same – Black and White. Although anthropologists have refuted race as a legitimate biological concept, "race continues to be a powerful social construct and signifier" (Parker, Deyhle, & Villenas, 1999, p. 8).

Racism has famously been called the *American dilemma* in that America is supposed to be the land of opportunity for everyone. Unfortunately, this country has managed to place people hierarchically by race and other categories which prevent some from fully realizing that dream (Abernathy, 2006). Since the 1960s, racial equality has been a *project* American society has taken on, with mixed results. Bell (1992) states "racism is an integral feature of American society" and notes that American Whites tend not to advocate on behalf of Blacks against various forms of racial discrimination

unless there is some form of "interest of importance" to them at stake such as magnet schools which were funded to attract White children into racially segregated schools (p. 5). Delgado and Stefanic (2001) discuss this advocacy in the context of "interest convergence" stating that because racism advances the interests of both White elites and working-class people, large segments of society have very little incentive to eradicate it. For example, reparations can only be politically successful if presented as providing something for Whites either as a short- or long-term benefit. If reparations are viewed as only benefiting Blacks, it has no chance of being successful. Bell (1992) hypothesized that world affairs, such as acts of violence against Blacks, riots, and domestic public relation considerations, such as the deaths of freedom fighters, and lynching's, are the real reasons for the *Brown vs. Board of Education* decision, not moral concerns for Blacks' educational opportunities.

Many recognize that the academic achievement gap is a primary source of ongoing "racial inequality" (Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003). Some recognize the racial gap in economic outcomes; the Black-White differences in academic attainment, occupation, and earning as among the most important and controversial social issues to deal with. In order for policy change in these areas to be realized efforts must be directed at public elementary and secondary schools (Hanushek & Rivkin, 2008).

For generations, the academic achievement gap between students of color and White students has been treated like a *dirty secret*, not openly discussed. Not until the Civil Rights Act of 1964, prohibiting institutions receiving federal funds from discriminating on the basis of race, color, or national origin, as well as demographic

changes and the persistent low test scores of Blacks and other students of color was this issue of achievement gap openly acknowledged (Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003; see also Viadero, 2009).

Critical theories. Critical Race Theory (CRT) views "race" as the most significant form of social oppression (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001). CRT emerged in the mid 1970s as a "progressive" and "intellectual movement" led by Derrick Bell, Alan Freeman, and other minorities in the field of law (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001).

Critical Race Theory's (CRT) primary focus is on racism, racial subordination, and discrimination. CRT supporters argue the U. S. legal system should take into account current and past discrimination imposed on Blacks and views the legal system as one that sustains white supremacy (Delgado & Stefanic, 201). CRT evolved in response to Critical Legal Studies (CLS) (Tate, 1997).

Critical Legal Studies is an American movement which was influenced by European philosophers, including nineteenth-century German social theorists such as Karl Marx and Max Weber. Proponents of CLS argue the field of law should examine how the law is applied to specific groups under specific circumstances. CLS seeks to call attention to contradictions within the law and ways in which legal doctrines help to create and maintain the status quo (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001).

Critical theory originated with several generations of German philosophers and social theorists in the Western European Marxist tradition known as the Frankfurt School. According to these theorists, a *critical* theory is distinguished from a *traditional*

in a theory is critical when it seeks human emancipation, to liberate people from those circumstances that have enslaved them (Alway, 1995).

Critical Race Theory maintains that schools should recognize culture as an important component when educating children of color, with a focus on Black children. Of equal importance is that other scholars, who may not consider themselves as proponents of Critical Race Theory but perhaps as Critical Theorists, have similar thoughts on educating other children of color. Grande (2004) questions whether schools acknowledge the relationship between education and culture and what that means when educating Native Americans. She advocates for multicultural education not only for Native American students but for all students. She also notes the importance of recognizing sociocultural behaviors such as alcohol abuse among Native American students and other factors such as the importance of family and how these play a major role in student success. Cleary and Peacock (1998) believe that in order for educators to effectively transition Native American students into an educational setting, they must first learn that "when there are strong differences between the culture of a child's home and the culture of the school, school can be confusing to a child" (p. 7). Similarly, Apple (1990) suggests "we need to examine critically not just how a student acquires more knowledge, but why and how particular aspects of the collective culture are presented in school as objective, factual knowledge" (p. 14). He notes:

> There is a growing body of curriculum scholars and sociologists of education who are beginning to take more seriously, the question of "whose culture?"

"what social group's knowledge?" and in "whose interest is certain knowledge (facts, skills, and dispositions taught in cultural institutions like schools." (p.16)

Giroux (1994) argues that neither conservative nor liberal forms of multicultural education are enough to expose white racism and promote social justice. He proposes a form of "insurgent multiculturalism" that would "strip white supremacy of its legitimacy and authority" (p. 326). Insurgent multiculturalism has a focus on studying how unequal distribution of power allows some groups to acquire and keep resources-- i.e. rituals, policies, and attitudes. Giroux suggests schools and other institutions of higher learning use insurgent multiculturalism as "a tool for critical understanding and the pluralizing of differences," and as an "ethical and political referent" which will allow teachers and students to understand how power works in the interest of dominant social relations, and how such relations can be challenged and transformed" (p. 337).

Some critical theorists (e.g., Apple, 1990; Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Spring, 1994/1997) argue the public education system was set up by those in power to maintain the status quo. Such thinkers argue many institutions and social structures dictate our lives and operate to promote those individuals who have been identified by these institutions and structures as having *talent* and *ability* as those institutions and structures define those terms (Bowles & Gintis, 1976). This type of system is commonly referred to as a meritocracy, a system that exists to reward and advance those designated as talented and gifted. In lieu of a meritocracy, critical theorists advocate for a "democratic struggle" to bring about change within structures, organizations, and state and federal

policies (Bowles & Gintis, 1976, p. 6). Instead of a conserving influence, critical theorists believe that education should be an instrument of *collective empowerment*.

Critical theorists seek to explain how schools sanction the status quo. Bowles and Gintis (1976) argue that "schools prepare students to enter the current economic system via a correspondence between school structure and the structure of production in the larger economic sphere" (p. 10). In other words, the schools help those in power maintain the status quo. Schools also "prepare these elites on presentation of self, self images and level and social class identification which are crucial for job adequacy" (p. 10). Bowles and Gintis further state schools give legitimacy to inequality when they reward and promote some students (White) and give little attention to Black children. White students of a particular social class are groomed to maintain their higher standing in society, and others are groomed to be workers who will help Whites maintain their status.

From an educational perspective, CRT recommends that scholars and activists focus their work on eliminating racism, sexism and poverty and all the influences of such in order to establish equality (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001). CRT theorists also believe that, following the Civil Rights movement, this country has been in a state of regress instead of progress due to persistent and subtle forms of racism (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001).

Critical Race Theory (CRT) draws from certain European philosophers and theorists such as Antonio Gramsci and the American radical tradition, embodied by those who sought political reform and a change to the social order, including such

figures as Sojourner Truth, Frederick Douglass, W.E.B. DuBois and the Black Power and Chicano movements of the 1960s and early 1970s. CRT embraces the idea that race is a product of a social thought and relations and not an object. CRT encourages examining the relationship between power and the construction of social roles, revisiting historic wrongs, and insisting legal and social theory have practical consequences. Critical Race Theorists believe well-intended U.S. Supreme Court rulings on race actually legitimized racism in this country (Delgado & Stefanic, 2001).

Moving forward. The 1969 National Assessment of Educational Progress identified the educational crisis as the perception that the U.S. was falling behind other information-age societies. Since then, American policymakers and educationists have devised major plans, initiatives, and partnerships to assist school systems. However, almost none of these plans involve an antiracist education (Asante, 2003, p. 249; see also Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003). The federal government has intervened through the years with legislation to encourage school districts to do a better job of ensuring a quality education for all children, such as the reauthorization of ESEA as No Child Left Behind. It leaves to the states the responsibility of developing curriculum and programs to meet the needs of all children and the responsibility to assure they offer "antiracist education" (U.S. Department of Education, 2006; also Anderson, 2005).

Statement of the Problem

Little is known about Critical Race Theory (CRT) and if components of CRT influence practice in the public school setting regarding requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to review the NCLB legislation through a Critical Race Theory lens for the purpose of determining if components of Critical Race Theory (CRT) influence practice in the public school setting regarding the requirements of NCLB. The study also sought to measure the knowledge of public school educators in the area of CRT and NCLB; specifically how they incorporate that knowledge into addressing the requirements of NCLB so classroom performance of students, particularly students of color can be improved, thereby closing the achievement gap.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of knowledge of public school educators regarding the requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001?

2. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents have similar knowledge of NCLB requirements?

3. What level of importance do public school educators perceive for the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

4. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents share similar perceptions of the importance of the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

5. What level of importance do public school educators perceive for selected professional practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in the public school setting?

6. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents do similar things with their respective knowledge of NCLB and understanding of CRT?

Operational Definition of Terms

The following are terms used throughout this study:

Critical Race Theory (CRT) is grounded in the particulars of a social reality that is defined by collective historical experiences of communities of color. The movement's intellectual agenda was forged in oppositional reaction to visions of race, racism, and law dominant in the post-civil rights period and CRT seeks to rid society of racism *(*Matsuda, Lawrence III, Delgado & Crenshaw, 1993*)*.

The 2001 No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act is the reauthorization of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). NCLB holds states accountable for providing a quality of education for all children. At the core of NCLB is the ultimate goal of closing the academic achievement gap that exists between students living in poverty, students of color and other students (Thomas & Brady, 2005).

Education Reform is "a plan or movement which attempts to bring about a systemic change in educational theory or practice across a community or society" (Delisio, 2006).

Racism has been defined in many ways by various scholars, for the purpose of this research, racism is defined as a combination of prejudice and power that allows the dominant race to institutionalize its dominance at all levels in a society" (Bonilla-Silva, 1997, p. 466).

Assumptions and Limitations

The following assumptions are made for this study:

There is little research that specifically connects Critical Race Theory and federal education reform.

Summary

This chapter provided a summary of the history of racism in the United States, an introduction to Critical Race Theory, and the problem statement and purpose of the study. The literature review in Chapter Two will summarize federal legislation leading to NCLB and Critical Race Theory.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

This is a study of federal education policy—specifically, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)—and Critical Race Theory (CRT). The study will examine NCLB through the lens of CRT in order to assess whether CRT can positively affect the learning environment for students—specifically, students of color, and more specifically, Black students.

The failure to educate all children for participation in a competitive global economy has prompted calls for education reform. The United States realized that perhaps its schools were not doing as well as they could--specifically, in science and mathematics--when, on October 4, 1957, the Soviet Union successfully launched Sputnik I, the world's first artificial satellite (Friedman, 2005). The National Defense Education Act of 1958, passed by Congress under President Eisenhower, was a reaction to the Soviet Union's achievement in outer space which threatened our self-image as a technological nation. The Act called for the assurance of the Nation's technology by providing student loans for college students who studied science and mathematics. (Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003).

Many American school children are failing to achieve their potential, as evidenced by low graduation rates in the public schools (Meier, 2002; Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003). Many public schools have attempted to provide children with the best education possible, yet the inequalities of opportunity in schools persist.

The Coleman Report, also known as the *Equality of Educational Opportunity Report*, was commissioned as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Coleman, 1967). James Samuel Coleman, studied the sociology of education and public policy, and was one of the earliest users of the term *social capital*. Coleman along with several other scholars was responsible for the Coleman Report, which included over 150,000 student respondents in their study, was over 700 pages in length, and focused on educational equity (Coleman, 1976).

The 1966 Report presented that school funding had little effect on student achievement; instead, the background of the student and socioeconomic status were more important in determining educational outcomes. The Report also revealed that schools were highly segregated and noted inequalities in the schools, not only between schools but also within schools (Coleman, 1967).

In 1969, Congress created the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), often referred to as the Nation's report card, to provide evidence of what and how much students know (U.S. Department of Education, 2006). Since NAEP's creation, there has been continued interest of both federal and state government in measuring what students know. NAEP provides statistical information about student performance and other factors related to educational performance for the Nation and for specific racial/ethnic groups.

This study focused on the academic achievement of Black children in grades K-12 using the lens of CRT. CRT clearly dispels the notion that race does not matter and insists race must be taken into consideration in educating all students, specifically Black

children. This study provides a brief summary of federal legislation intended to educate all children, and through an analysis of CRT attempt to show a possible link to NCLB so as to improve the academic performance of all children, specifically Black children.

Spring (1994, 1997) highlights the Supreme Court case involving Homer Plessy (*Plessy v. Ferguson, 1896*). Homer Plessy, who was one-eighth Black and seven-eights White, was arrested for refusing to ride in the *colored* coach of a train. In *Plessy,* the Supreme Court ruled segregation did not "create a bridge of inferiority if segregated facilities were equal and the law was reasonable" (p.95). In this *separate but equal* doctrine, the Supreme Court failed to clearly define what constituted equal facilities and what was reasonable. The overturn of the separate but equal doctrine and a broader application of the Fourteenth Amendment, which defined national citizenship, came in 1954 with *Brown v. Board* (Prior to the ratification of the Fourteenth Amendment, native born Blacks were denied citizenship in their respective states, the new definition of citizenship created a new class of citizenship, a citizenship of the United States as opposed to state citizenship (Fairman, 1949; McClure, 2005).

Brown v. the Board of Education to the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act to NCLB

During the 1950s, school segregation, discrimination and racism were the reported causes of Black children not achieving at the level of their White counterparts and the struggle continued for better schooling for all children (Morris, 2001; Spring, 1994, 1997).

One of the most significant events in this country that would lead to various reforms in education was the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision *Oliver L. Brown et al. v. the Board of Education of Topeka (KS).* This event dismantled the *legal* basis for racial segregation in schools and other public institutions, clearing the way for Black and White children to attend the same schools (McClure, 2005; Morris, 2001).

However, *Brown v. Board of Education* was not simply about children and education. By declaring racial segregation violated the Fourteenth Amendment, which guarantees all citizens the equal protection of the law, this decision laid the foundation for future national and international policies regarding human rights. The laws and policies struck down by the *Brown* decision were products of the White tendency to prejudge, discriminate against, and stereotype people by their ethnic, religious, physical, or cultural characteristics. The social and ideological implication of this decision continues to be felt throughout the United States today (Brown Foundation for Educational Equity, Excellence and Research, 2004; Spring, 1994, 1997).

Federal legislation that would lead to NCLB.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (*ESEA*) of 1965 was passed by then- President Lyndon Johnson as part of his War on Poverty. Its original intent was to provide federal funding to the neediest students to promote equal educational opportunity in public elementary and secondary schools. Title I of *ESEA* established a compensatory education program to address the consequences of economic inequality by improving educational opportunities for children living in high-poverty school districts (McClure, 2005).

In 1983, the National Commission on Excellence in Education released its report, *A Nation at Risk,* which revealed very low academic achievement in most public schools. The report, commissioned by the Reagan Administration, linked the condition of American education to the nation's economic productivity (Odden, 1991). Education reform became the major policy activity of the 1980s, resulting in the states assuming more responsibility for and involvement in education and assessment (Odden, 1991). *A Nation at Risk* called for quality education for all students regardless of economic status or race and emphasized the importance of lifelong learning for the security of the country (Center for Education Reform, 1998).

The 1980s education reform movement would also introduce the Third International Measurement of Mathematics and Science (*TIMMS*), which examined American student academic performance in a global context and articulated the need for education reform in order for American students to be competitive in mathematics and science (McClure, 2005).

The first major shift in the distribution of Title I dollars occurred in the 1988 reauthorization of *ESEA*, which required improved outcomes from those states receiving the funds. However, Congress did allow Title I funds to be used for school-wide programs to support systemic improvement in schools where at least 75 percent of students were in poverty as a way to respond to the urgent call for reform in *A Nation at Risk* (Manna, 2005).

During the late 1980s, assessment in education and an increased emphasis on accountability emerged. The term assessment as used here means standardized, large-

scale testing. The large-scale testing has increased since the passage of NCLB of 2001. This increase in large-scale-testing has placed more emphasis on high-states accountability (holding adults in the school system accountable) and individual student performance. Prior to the era of assessment and an increased emphasis on accountability and individual student performance, the focus was on what students know as opposed to what students should be able to do. This shift placed accountability on the school, teacher, and curriculum (DePascale, 2009).

The Secretary's Commission on Achieving Necessary Skills (SCANS) report recommended skills that educators needed to focus on so students could be successful in a global work environment. The report was commissioned in 1990 by the U.S. Secretary of Labor. The Commission was created to encourage a high-performance economy; characterized by high-skill, high-wage employment (McClure, 2005).

In recent decades, the education policy debate has been dominated by the desire of many policymakers to see evidence that federal investments in public education programs yield tangible, measurable results in terms of student achievement and success. Three examples of this approach were reflected by the passage of the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) in 1994, President Clinton's Goals 2000, and President George W. Bush's No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2001. Clinton's Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which aimed to improve the quality of education for all students and measure the output of the nation's education system, allowing the federal government a new role in education. The IASA, a reauthorization of the ESEA of 1965, sought to improve teaching and learning for all children, enabling them to meet

challenging academic content and student performance standards (U.S. Department of Education, 1998; Plunkett, 1997; Thomas & Brady, 2005).

NCLB, the 2001 reauthorization of the ESEA of 1965, holds states accountable for providing a quality education for all children. At the core of NCLB is the ultimate goal of closing the achievement gap—specifically, between students living in poverty, students of color and other students —so that no child is *left behind* (Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003; Thomas & Brady, 2005).

To date, NCLB represents the federal government's most significant involvement in elementary and secondary public education. NCLB continues ESEA's emphasis on standards- based education reform, but NCLB has expanded ESEA's testing requirements and given the federal government unprecedented power to hold states and school districts accountable for student performance. It also seeks to eliminate the effects of racial and socioeconomic inequalities in public schools and improve the availability of quality educational opportunities for disadvantaged children. NCLB takes the commitment to improving the educational experiences of historically disadvantaged populations a step further than did the original ESEA. In addition to its accountability provisions, it includes provisions to raise academic standards. NCLB also links federal funding to student performance outcomes and imposes sanctions for low student performance (Abernathy, 2006; Manna, 2006; Thomas & Brady, 2005).

The main goals of NCLB are: to close the achievement gap between high and low performing students (specifically, between students of low socioeconomic status and other students); to create and implement an assessment program with significant

and enforceable consequences for those who fail to adhere; and to hold schools, local education agencies, and states accountable for improving the academic achievement of all students. The federal government believes it is important to keep NCLB on track and felt it necessary to employ tactics designed to assert control over state implementation while persuading the states to adopt the federal priorities as their own (Abernathy, 2006; Anderson, 2005; Manna, 2006; Thomas & Brady, 2005). The connection between education and the interest of the federal government is known, however the execution of that connection has been left undefined in the Constitution. Typically, the federal government's involvement will be in the form of targeted support for specific programs for federal purposes, such as the National Defense Education Act of 1958, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the 1983 *Nation at Risk Report* (Elmore & Fuhrman, 1990).

According to a 2006 NAEP report, achievement differences in core subjects such as mathematics, science and reading, persist between students of color and White students. From 1992-2005, differences in reading scores between White and Black students were unchanged. In math, the average score for White students in 2005 was 31 percentage points higher than for Black students and 24 points higher than for Hispanic students (U.S. Department of Education, 2006).

NCLB: Parts Broken Down

At the core of NCLB's testing and sanctions is the concept of adequate yearly progress (AYP). AYP is based on the results of standardized tests which schools administer annually. All states are required to develop a set of measurements that

schools and districts would implement to comply with NCLB. For example, in Minnesota, mathematics and reading are primary components of AYP and graduation and attendance is the secondary component. Minnesota uses the Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment-II (MCA-II) as an annual measurement to gauge learning in selected grades throughout the state. The MCA-II was first used in 2006 and is given annually to grades 3-8 and 10 for reading and grades 3-8 and 11 for mathematics. (Minnesota Department of Education, 2009).

Individual schools meet AYP by having a sufficient percentage of students meet their state's standards for academic achievement. Those percentages are determined by individual school districts (Abernathy, 2006). When individual schools and school districts fail to meet AYP for two consecutive years, they risk having school personnel replaced and/or having their buildings restructured as charter schools or turned over to private consultants (Abernathy, 2006; Minnesota Department of Education, 2009).

In AYP determinations, test scores are examined in the aggregate scores for all students in a particular grade and for eight subgroups of students: five racial and ethnic identifiers (White, Black, Hispanic, American Indian, and Asian or Pacific Islander), students who are eligible for free and reduced lunch, students with limited English proficiency, and students who qualify for special education services. Schools are evaluated by 1) the performance of all of their students, and 2) the performance of each of the eight subgroups (Abernathy, 2006; Minnesota Department of Education, 2009).

NCLB also requires states to implement statewide accountability systems covering all public schools and students. These systems must be based on challenging

State standards in both reading and mathematics. States may vary in how they approach

the development and implementation of these systems; however, it is their responsibility

to ensure state standards are rigorous and hold students to high expectations. These

systems must also identify how all schools within individual districts will be held to the

same criteria when determining if AYP has been met. School districts must also

document their capacity to implement AYP systems within their district and how they

will implement school choice and supplemental services (Abernathy, 2006; Thomas &

Brady, 2005; U.S. Department of Education, 2009).

NCLB also provides more choices for parents and students—specifically, for

children who attend underperforming schools. Parents may send their child to another

school if they feel their child is unsafe or the school needs improvement. NCLB also

allows parents to take advantage of tutoring services for their child (and take advantage

of provisions for charter, magnet, homeschooling, and private schools) (U.S.

Department of Education, 2009).

Criticism of NCLB.

Researchers from the Harvard Civil Rights Project studied the implementation

of NCLB across different educational systems. They found developing new testing and

assessment systems was a disruptive expensive process in many states. Also, allowing

states to set their own proficiency levels created serious unforeseen problems, including

the potential for greater disparities in public education since underperforming states

could use lower-stakes assessments to avoid having a high number of schools labeled as

in need of improvement. The researchers asserted these types of accountability measures

defeat the purpose of an Act aimed at providing high-quality education for all students (Sunderman & Kim, 2004).

Critics of NCLB note schools with higher numbers of students qualifying for free and reduced lunch still show lower test scores than schools with more affluent students, despite NCLB's goals of bringing about greater equality in achievement (Rothstein, 2009). Others (Rothstein, Jacobsen, & Wilder, 2009) believe test scores alone are not a sufficient way to measure whether students or schools are performing adequately and the social and economic background of the child must be taken into consideration.

Critical Race Theory, education and racism.

The following research seeks an understanding of NCLB from a Critical Race Theory perspective in hopes of capitalizing on some of its concepts so as to benefit children of color in the classroom.

The history of African American education both pre and post-civil war, is characterized by both the denial of education in order to continue the economic exploitation of Blacks and the use of segregated education to assure an inexpensive source of skilled labor (Bowles & Gintis, 1976; Spring, 1994, 1997). The persistence of racial discrimination in the United States is documented by such evidence as the differential life changes of Blacks in areas such as income, education, and occupational status. These differences are frequently attributed to the lingering effects of slavery (Cable & Mix, 2003). Some researchers acknowledge that the unsatisfactory academic performance of many Black students can be attributed to institutionalized racism. They

note problems of educational inequity are problems that arise when a dominant group seeks to oppress another and schools are basically organized in ways that promote the superiority of Whites (Spears, 1978; Hilliard, 1978; also King, Houston & Middleton, 2001).

When applied to education, CRT involves a commitment to develop schools that acknowledge the multiple strengths that each child brings into the classroom, and thereby value each child, making children more engaged in school and with learning (Yosso, 2005). As such, a CRT approach to education involves the commitment of institutions to recognize the various strengths that students and communities of color have to offer so that we move toward social and racial justice. CRT "refutes dominant ideology and White privilege while validating and focusing on the experiences of people of color" (Yosso, 2005, p. 69).

Derrick Bell, a former civil rights attorney who played a pivotal role in Supreme Court cases involving desegregation was instrumental in advancing CRT as a framework for examining the experiences of Black people in America. Specifically, Bell (1987) used story and narrative to analyze how the litigation of *Brown,* which resulted in court-ordered school desegregation, impacted the education of Black children. He argued desegregation measures ignored the fact that legalized segregation was about maintaining White control of education (Bell, 1987). Likewise, Delgado (1990) argued that a critical aim of CRT is to value the voices of people from marginalized racial groups (Delgado, 1990, 1988).

Ladson-Billings and Tate introduced CRT to the field of education with their 1995 article *Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education*. Since its inception, many scholars have viewed CRT as a way to analyze, critique educational research and practice and to make sense of the perception many have that racial inequities persist in the U.S. (Ladson-Billings, 2005).

Even the teaching of the history of this country is not neutral. It too, by the often eliminating the contributions of Africans and Black Americans, seeks to maintain the status quo. Teachers and those who write the textbooks are in the position of defining what is important and what is not. It is through this historical subjectivity that stereotypes, prejudices and biases emerge and persist. In regards to Blacks and other oppressed groups, such stereotypes can be culturally, politically and economically crippling. By promoting CRT, which seeks to reduce marginalization through the recognition and promotion of historically disenfranchised groups, American history teachers can redress stereotyping and enhance plurality in their classrooms (Lintner, 2004).

Prior to the Civil War, major differences existed between enslaved Africans in the South and freed Africans living in the North. Between 1800 and 1835, many Southern states passed laws making it a crime to educate slaves. Because of the laws that prohibited formal education, African American culture was primarily based on an oral tradition and was centered around coping with the brutal institution of slavery (Spring, 1994, 1997).

Few enslaved Blacks received a formal education. However, it is important to mention many Whites educated free Black children, and some enslaved parents educated themselves and their children within the confinements of their quarters (Parker & Stebman, 1973). These Southern laws laid the foundation for the racial condition that our country faces today (Asante, 2007).

An important event in the struggle for equality of education for Black children occurred in Boston in 1789. Boston had organized the first comprehensive urban school system after the passage of the Massachusetts Education Act of 1789, requiring towns to provide elementary schools for six months of the year and grammar schools in communities with more than 200 families. In 1790, the Black population in Boston was 766 out of a total population of 18,038. At this time, no law or tradition excluded Black children from the public schools. However, very few Black children actually attended the schools because of the poor economic conditions of the Black population and the hostile reception the children received. To protect their children from the racism and prejudice of White children and the community, in 1798 Blacks asked for and received, a separate system of schools for their children (Spring, 1994, 1997).

Morris (2001) noted Black educators were not included in political and educational debates, and were not participants in the development of educational policies in the decades immediately following *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Long before *Brown,* African Americans disagreed amongst themselves over what would constitute the most effective environment for educating Black children—separate schools or integrated schools. Most believed that education in integrated

schools would not resolve the problems associated with racism and inequitable education, and realized the push for Black children to attend integrated schools would mean that the chances of Black children having their culture represented in the curriculum and the school environment were slim (Delgado et al., 2001).

However, segregated schools had their own disadvantages, including an inferior education compared to schools serving White students. As a result, it was virtually impossible for economically exploited groups to use education as a means of economic advancement. Segregated schools conveyed negative messages about race and class to members of minority groups. Many minority students in segregated schools were taught they were inferior and many came to accept an inferior economic status, making them less likely to aspire to good jobs. Segregated education also tended to reinforce many European Americans' belief in their innate racial superiority. The Bell Curve argument that Blacks were biologically inferior to Whites also supported the argument that Blacks would be better served in different schools (Delgado et al., 2001). It would take the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) founded in 1909, over a century to win its battle against segregated education in the South. During the period of Blacks' legal struggle, segregated schooling was a major factor in condemning them to an inferior status in society (Spring, 1994, 1997).

Post-civil rights programs such as Affirmative Action and Integration policies have not really erased racism; rather, they have encouraged people to continually think about race. In the process of creating races, the categories came to be filled with meaning: Blacks were characterized one way, Whites another. Whites became

associated with normatively positive characteristics, Blacks with subordinate

characteristics (Crenshaw, 1993; Henry & Sears, 2002). It was expected the law would

eradicate these instances of race-consciousness in social decision-making, and leave

behind a race-neutral way of distributing opportunities and resources. Civil rights

advocates would use these race-consciousness concepts to condemn segregation in

schools because it imposed a racial face on education and school life (Parker et a.,

1990). Federal policies like affirmative action, which was introduced as early as 1961

by then President Kennedy, were adopted. The designation of African Americans and

others as protected classes were adopted to ensure that African Americans and other

groups would not be systematically screened out of job opportunities as a result of their

racial identity (Parker, et.al, 1999).

Parker et al. (1999) discussed the concepts of universalism, objectivism, and

race-neutrality in relationship to terms like *equal opportunity*, *merit,* and *equal*

protection. Racism according to Parker was understood to be a deviation from these

race-neutral norms. For one to be considered a racist, they would need to behave in an

irrational way—that is, assume that based on irrelevant characteristics, such as skin

color, people of color did not possess those universal characteristics of reason or merit

(Parker et al., 1999; Peller, 1990; Wallensteen, 1984). LaNoue & Sullivan, 1995)

discuss the concepts of race-neutral and race-conscious in terms of policies that

typically protect everyone (race-neutral) or those aimed at eliminating discrimination

and racism (race-conscious). The theory of policy particularism argues there is greater

popularity for race-neutral policies compared to race-specific or race-conscious, not

because the former only benefits Blacks and other minorities but because they target only a particular segment of the population. When applied to race, a policy may be particularistic or race-specific in its focus, yet universalistic or race-neutral in its justification or universalistic in both (Sniderman, Carmines, Layman, & Carter, 1996).

In 1955, the Supreme Court issued its enforcement decree for the desegregation of schools, *Brown v. Board*, as discussed above (Spring, 1994, 1997). The Courts have also intervened and reached decisions regarding charter and *controlled choice* schools, which differ from other choice schools in that *controlled choice schools* attempt to provide choice while maintaining ethnic and racial integration (Harris, 2006). However, Critical Race Theorists would argue that many government interventions, if not all, were best at serving the interests of the status quo.

Bell (1992) argues because racism **advances the interest of the White elite and the working class Blacks**, large segments of our society have little incentive to eradicate it, as it serves both Black and Whites in the manner to which each is accustomed (Whites benefiting from the physical labor of Blacks).

Tate (1997) undertook an exhaustive review of the historical and theoretical foundations of CRT in education and highlights two arguments advanced by Bell in understanding CRT: 1) the "interest convergence principle," which is built on political history as legal precedent, emphasizes that any significant progress for African Americans is achieved only when the goals of Blacks are consistent with the needs of Whites; and 2) the "price of racial remedies" asserts that Whites will not support civil rights policies that appear to threaten their superior social status. This interest-

convergence theory presented by Bell asserts that Whites, rather than Blacks, were the beneficiaries of civil rights legislation. Examples of such legislation predicated on improving the conditions of Blacks include the desegregation plans involved the disproportionate busing of Black children into predominantly White schools and the creation of well-funded magnet schools to lure White students into urban schools (p. 214-215).

Bell also hypothesized that the world and domestic situation of the time, not moral qualms over the plight of Blacks, was the moving force behind the *Brown* decision. The Korean War had ended and World War II was not long past. Black servicemen had performed gallantly in both wars and returned home after experiencing an environment where cooperation and survival took precedence over racism. They were not willing to accept the conditions that they had left behind while they were serving on active duty. It would not have been good for this country to have the international media continue to run stories of lynching and racist uprisings (Delgado et al., 2001).

Morris (1997, 2001) conducted in-depth interviews with 21 African American educators in St. Louis, Missouri as part of a research project on Black children receiving a segregated education. These interviews highlighted how elements of what is being defined today as CRT were embedded in the educator's analyses of a 1983 court settlement (*Liddell v. St. Louis Board of Education*), in which African American plaintiffs accused the St. Louis Board of Education of contributing to Black children receiving a segregated education using a 16-year desegregation plan. The interviews

were rich with the educators' detailed accounts of how the desegregation plan ultimately protected the overall interests of Whites. In the quest to remedy the educational inequities facing Black children, the desegregation of public schools drastically affected Black educators. Because of a perception that Black educators were less qualified than Whites, many were demoted, lost their jobs and were negatively stigmatized in efforts to desegregate public schools. The ending of the desegregation plan in 1999 continued to place the onus on Black people to rectify the inequitable education in the city. St. Louis Black educators and community leaders highly recommended that courts and policymakers begin to listen to the voices of Blacks when framing educational policies which intended to improve the education of Black students.

Sniderman, Carmines, Lyman, and Carter (1996) present the concepts of race-neutral policies and race-specific policies, which only benefit Blacks or other minorities. For example, a policy that calls for "increased spending for school(s) may gain less support from Whites when it is framed in a "particularistic race specific way such as increased spending for schools in Black neighborhoods" (Sniderman et al., 1996, p. 34). Further, given the constant political barriers to large-scale policies that target the most disadvantaged Blacks, it is argued that when building coalitions, and mobilizing supporters in order to sustain public policy that targets this population, it is best to present policies that will be viewed as either race-neutral or universalistic (Sniderman et al., 1996).

Harris-Lacewell (2003) state that when we assume the values of the American creed are race neutral, researchers fail to account for the implicit racism inherent in American construction of individualism and meritocracy. Researchers tend to underestimate the effects of racism by assuming American ideals are free from racial animus (p. 232).

Likewise, Sniderman and Piazza (1993) state previous policy debates were centered on whichever race the policy would benefit. They observed the focus was centered on "what the policy hopes to accomplish and how it proposes to go about accomplishing it" (p. 4). Whites will respond to the problems of race to a much greater extent than they will respond to any other issues on the public agenda (Sniderman & Piazza, 1993).

Most Americans hold strong opinions about race. Even for those who have very little interest in public affairs or find discussions of racial issues boring, the issue of race itself hits home. Sniderman and Piazza (1993) observe:

> Whites may be completely ignorant of the provenance or details of a policy such as busing and all the same, know almost instantly just where they stand on it. Race is a symbolic issue, and when they take sides on an issue like busing, it is the symbols of race—the mental picture of Black and White together—not the specific and technical details of scheduling and classroom size which they are reacting to. (p. 5)

This so-called *consensus view* of race also asserts that when it comes to supporting or opposing policy such as integration or more government assistance to improve the lives

of Blacks, most White Americans do not calculate costs and benefits, nor do they consider the appropriateness of the policy. Instead, what will drive their decision to support or oppose the policy, is their "willingness to accept Blacks as equals and the readiness to sacrifice in order to achieve racial equality" (Sniderman and Pizza, p. 6). Race is an emotional issue, and it is cumulative. While other issues come and go, race has remained on the American agenda (Sniderman & Piazza, 1993). Hurwitz and Peffley (1998) argue prejudice against Blacks is still very much alive today, but exactly where the prejudice exists and how it affects the political thinking of Whites on racial issues is not very clear. In order for us to understand public opinion on racial issues, we need to know much more about the manner in which White Americans perceive and evaluate Blacks (p. 5).

Ares and Buendia (2007) studied a large school district which was experiencing a significant increase in its population of students of color. The district adopted an *advocacy policy* and deliberately chose the term advocacy to set the direction they wanted staff to take when interacting with their students. The policy states "each student will be known as an individual and their individual needs will be easily met" (Ares & Buendia, 2007, p. 563). The intent was to treat each student as an individual and be blind to race or ethnicity. The researchers sought to determine if the district's schools were actually able to "articulate" this mission of advocacy "without lapsing into historical narratives of racial division and individualism, the results of which are continued differential achievement and unequal treatment of students based on socioeconomic, cultural, and linguistic markers" (Ares & Buendia, 2007, p. 562). They

found that discourses about advocacy eventually became racialized as the educators began to use such terms as *at risk* to identify specific students. They also found other terms within the school policy--such as *urban* and *urban centers*-- were not defined, implying they were understood without explanation. Typically, these terms are taken as code descriptors for students who are not racially classified as White. While the intent of the school policy was not to focus on race, race ultimately became the focus for advocacy. An opportunity lost in the school's Advocacy Policy was that students be recognized for their respective racial/ethnic groups since these factors and others affect them and their chances to achieve and learn differentially (Ares & Buendia, 2007).

Talking about Afrocentricity.

Asante (2007) describes the concept of Afrocentricity as being "centered on the lived experiences of a particular group"—specifically, African Americans (p. 15). He defines Afrocentricity as the "Black perspective of conceptualizing what was called Black Power in the 1960s" (Asante, 2007, p. 6). Asante (2007) believes African American people are "off-center and out of location" within their own (predominantly White) culture, and being "centered" means accepting African American values. Until African Americans gain this centeredness, they will continue to feel less than whole. Asante (2007) further states this centeredness is key to African American students' success because African Americans have been "operating from the fringes of the Eurocentric experience;" "whatever ability the African student has and whatever attempt he makes to meander through the intellectual systems which are provided, he can never fathom all the intricate ways the Europeans have devised to keep him

marginalized" (Asante, 2007, pp. 32–33). The marginalization of African American people continues to the present (Asante, 2007).

In reference to education, Afrocentricity is described as African American children being afforded the opportunity to study people of the world, their various concepts, and history from the perspective of their African heritage, thereby becoming *subjects* of the curriculum, not *objects* of the human experience. From this perspective, African American children become knowledgeable of all disciplines whether the subject is biology, literature or social studies. The student is centered in the reality of that discipline so that he/she is not seen as "having to get it" but rather is seen as being a part of it (Asante, 2007, p. 79). Asante (2003) also discusses the concept of "African agency," meaning that in this country, African Americans should not have to give up their cultural heritage in order to be considered American (p. 16). He further discusses the concept of Afrocentricity and the notion of centeredness and the acceptance of African Americans as "subjects rather than objects" (p. 71). He states when African Americans turn to "agency, action, and participation as opposed to passivity, victimization, and spectatorship, they will assume the kind of centrality that serves as a basis for national cohesion…" (p. 71). This can occur when the history and culture of African Americans are recognized and valued.

Another important argument for schools with an ethnocentric focus is they would honor *cultural perspectives*. For example, African-American culture evolved in the context of slavery and later, various forms of segregation, discrimination, and racism. As a result, African-Americans developed a distrust and suspicion of White

people. Some argue that if schools took into account this evolution, African American students may perform better (Spring, 1994, 1997).

House (1999) argues that race and policy do affect each other and measures taken to eliminate racism and close the achievement gap between students of color and White students have been limited. He asserts beliefs about race have played a significant role in the development of this country's history, literature, and education and these beliefs have led to education policies which separate, differentiate, and mandate different curricula and treatment for students of color--policies which have been passed as being fair and democratic. House (1999) believes educational policies that address how schools are financed and organized, how standardized tests are used, and how students are grouped appear to have nothing to do with race but that they actually do severely disadvantage students of color.

Vincent Snipes, a former state mathematics consultant, researched the mathematics education of African Americans in public high schools in North Carolina. His study revealed Black students received the used textbooks of White students throughout the state and Black children were consistently tracked into low-level mathematics courses across the state. Teachers consistently had low expectations regarding the ability of the Black students to perform in upper-level mathematics course and schools did not expect nor encourage Black students to enroll in mathematics courses that would eventually prepare them for college (Snipes & Waters, 2005).

A study conducted by Ogbu (2004) and analyzed by Cromeaux and Jayakumar (2007) attempts to explain why the academic achievement gap between African

American students and White students persists. Ogbu studied Black and White students in an affluent Cleveland community within a suburban school district that was comprised equally of Black and White students (Comeaux & Jayakumar, 2007). While Ogbu acknowledges structural factors such as institutional racism as a probable cause for the achievement gap, he also suggests Black students contributed to teachers' high or low expectation of their academic performance based on the economic status of their families and how involved parents were in their children's schooling. Also, the overall lower performance of Black students was due in part to the fact that as a group, they came from lower socio-economic backgrounds than White students (Comeaux & Jayakumar, 2007).

Delgado et al. (2001) remind us that we often fail to recognize racism because we do not see beyond its most blatant manifestations such as hate crimes, lynching, hate speech, and other heinous crimes. Lopez (2003) states that "racism is as powerful today as it was in the past; it has merely assumed a normality, and thus an invisibility, in our daily lives" (p. 83). From a CRT perspective, one needs to *critically* analyze how the law reproduces, reifies, and normalizes racism in society (Lopez, 2003).

Delgado et al. (2001) argue that the socio-economic background of Black children and the effect this has on performance were often presented as factual and somehow, this performance is the fault of the students as opposed to being recognized as yet another barrier resulting from racism and inequality which somehow correlates with the assumptions made by the Bell Curve, namely Blacks are biologically inferior to Whites so their low achievement is inevitable.

Some educators believe NCLB does not account for factors such as economics, home and community environment and ethnicity may contribute to a particular student's performance on a particular test, on a particular day (Abernathy, 2006).

A CRT analysis of NCLB would require research on NCLB's effect on communities of color in urban areas (most of which are low-income). Currently, NCLB puts the greatest pressure on the lowest-performing schools to increase student outcomes. What is not discussed is how the federal government plans to support the lower-performing schools to improve student outcomes. Improvement is veiled in the language of choice, in that parents whose children attend a local under-performing school have the option of transferring their child to a school that is performing at or above grade level. However, many of the parents who qualify for such transfers are unable to send their children to the higher performing school because most of those schools are already at or above capacity. While the language of NCLB continues to be neutral, its enforcement becomes racialized in urban areas, since schools that are placed on the *watch list* for poor performance predominantly serve students of color. Again, those with a critical critique of NCLB are correct in that these students of color also reside in predominantly low-income areas (Stovall, 2006).

Leadership.

Asante (2007) asserts that the American education system "has been based on White supremacist notions which endeavor to protect white advantage in education, economics, and politics by teaching that what is White is universal, even human" (p. 79). Further, he offers three overarching propositions about education: 1) it is

fundamentally a social phenomenon; it socializes children; 2) it prepares a child for being part of a social group; and 3) societies develop schools suitable to the societies; therefore, a White supremacist society develops white supremacist education (pp. 79–80).

Research on high-performing, high-minority, and high-poverty schools indicate administrators play an important role in improving the academic performance of their students (Plunkett, 1997). Most high-performing schools are led by effective school leaders who take a holistic and comprehensive approach to improving their schools. Providing adequate support for teachers and students is one way in which they do this. Administrators must ensure teachers have the resources, information, and technical assistance they need in order to teach well. They must also ensure teachers have the right mind-set and attitudes about their students. In order to accomplish this, administrators must first do their own personal and professional growth work. If a school administrator, especially the principal fundamentally believes Black students and other students of color, as well as low-income White students are inferior to middle to upper class White students, the leader will not be effective. Administrators with this type of mind-set will not set high expectations for these students because they do not believe that students from these groups are capable of academic excellence. Once an administrator has examined his or her own personal beliefs that might keep him or her from becoming an effective school leader, then he or she can help teachers. If teachers believe that certain students are lazy, dumb, culturally deprived and undeserving of an excellent education, they will never become caring and effective teachers. Principals

and other school administrators must do their best to help teachers become effective, and address mind-sets and attitudes through mandatory professional development workshops and performance evaluations (Thompson, 2007). Teachers too, hold a central position in the way schools operate and in the core functions of teaching and learning (York-Barr & Duke, 2004).

All school districts need leaders who involve all employees in developing the vision and mission of the organization. Common sense informs us if schools are successful, students within those schools are more likely to be successful as well. Marzano, Waters, and McNulty (2005) observe "whether a school operates effectively or not increases or decreases a student's chance of academic success" (p. 3). Asante (2007) states "there could be no true understanding of the role of pedagogy without some appreciation of where students and teachers are located culturally and psychologically" (p. 31).

Milner (2007), in his study of African American males, notes when teachers hold negative thoughts and beliefs about Black male students, they have lower expectations of them. Typically, these negative thoughts are a result of preconceived notions about Black males' potential and ability. These beliefs and thoughts may emerge from conversations held in the teachers' lounge, the historical perceptions that the country and the world have held about Black male students, or teachers' analysis of standardized/high stakes test data. Teachers who think this way tend to have little ideological incentive to alter their pedagogical practices (Milner, 2007).

In a Chicago housing project, a teacher inspired by Jonathan Kozol's *Savage Inequalities* provided classroom space and the opportunity for his fifth-graders to participate in curriculum development. He writes he had become frustrated by how he observed social class driving the way students were taught and what was expected of them in school (Schulz, 2005). He became aware as a teacher he must "embrace student intelligence, allowing students to leverage what they know" and what they may have already successfully accomplished (p.3). He also attests to the importance of knowing and understanding those external factors such as where a student resides based on race and socio-economic status and how this may have an impact on his/her learning.

Summary

This literature review has focused on the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) legislation of 2001 and federal reform leading to its enactment. A brief discussion of those reforms, beginning with the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was presented as well as discussion on the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* which dismantled the legal basis for racial segregation in schools and other public institutions. An honorable mention of *Plessy v. Ferguson* was also discussed as this decision challenged the separate but equal doctrine which had prevailed with segregated public schools.

The literature review also introduced Critical Race Theory. Critical Race Theory supporters such as Asante (2003), Bell (1992), Ladson-Billings (1994, 2005), and Delgado and Stefanic (2001), maintain schools should recognize culture as an important component when educating children of color, specifically Black children.

Chapter Three will discuss the methods used to explore the relationship between NCLB and CRT.

Chapter 3

Research Design and Methodology

This chapter describes the research objective, the population surveyed, and the development and administration of the survey instrument.

Research objective.

The purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which components of Critical Race Theory (CRT) influence practice in the public school setting regarding requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB).

The objective of the study was to provide answers to the following research questions:

1. What is the level of knowledge of public school educators regarding the requirements of NCLB?

2. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents have similar knowledge of NCLB requirements?

3. What level of importance do public school educators perceive for the components of NCLB to be in terms of professional practice?

4. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents have similar perceptions of the importance of the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

5. What level of importance do public school educators perceive for selected professional practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in the public school setting?

6. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents do similar things with their respective knowledge of NCLB and understanding of CRT?

Research population.

The research population for this study included public school educators in the state of Minnesota including educators from districts of various sizes and educators from traditional public schools as well as non-traditional public schools (e.g., charter schools). Independent School District 709 was excluded from this study because the researcher is currently a sitting elected board member. The Superintendent of Independent School District 709 assisted the researcher by contacting some of his colleagues and encouraging them to participate in the study should they be selected.

Superintendents were included in this study because they are responsible for ensuring that each school within their respective district is following all state and federal requirements as they pertain to public education. The superintendents along with the assistant superintendent(s) are also responsible for working with other district administrators in determining how federal education legislation will be implemented within their district. Principals were included in this study because they are responsible for carrying out the directives from superintendents and assistant superintendents as to how federal legislation will be implemented. Finally, teachers were included in this study because they actually implement federal education policy.

Based on an extensive review of the literature, no studies were found which sought to capture perceived knowledge of school district personnel in regards to the NCLB and to connect classroom teaching to concepts of CRT.

Development of the survey instrument.

An extensive review of the literature on NCLB (e.g., Abernathy, 2005; Odden, 1991; Plunkett, 1997; Sunderman, 2006) and Critical Race Theory (CRT) (e.g., Asante, 2003; Tate, 1997; Thernstrom, 2003) provided the necessary knowledge to develop a comprehensive instrument that would allow for NCLB terms and components of CRT to be used to answer the research questions. The instrument developed describes the purpose of the study, identifies key terms within NCLB, and gathers information from potential respondents in regards to NCLB terms. The model for identifying perceptions of NCLB and CRT was derived from a 1983 study by Hyman (unpublished dissertation).

The first part of this instrument asked participants to provide the following demographic information:

1. Gender

2. Education role in the school

3. Grade configuration of their school

4. Average number of students per classroom of their school

5. Size of their school district

6. Number of years as a teacher

7. Number of years a principal

8. Number of years as assistant Superintendent

9. Number of years as Superintendent

In Part II of the instrument developed for this study, participants were asked to rate their knowledge of the key NCLB terms listed below. These NCLB terms are used to assess individual school performance and individual student performance. The scale had a rating of 1 to 5 with a rating of 5 indicating the highest level of understanding. The following terms were:

1. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

2. Academic Progress

3. Annual Academic Assessments

4. Highly Qualified Teachers

5. NCLB's Core Academic Subjects

6. Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO)

7. Academic Achievement Gap

8. Other Academic Indicators

9. Demographic Sub-Groups

10. Proficiency Level

Part III of the instrument developed for this study sought to determine how respondents incorporate what they know about NCLB into practice. The items were rated on a scale of 1 to 5 in terms of their importance with 5 being of high importance. Adequate Yearly Progress

a. __ Focus teaching on subjects that will be tested
b. __ Regular assessments to monitor students not making AYP
c. __ Develop an individual learning plan for students not making AYP
d. __ Technology programming that supports the standards
e. __ Planned extra time for reading, mathematics and writing for most needy students

    f. __ Focus on state standards but allow for creativity to address individual student needs

Academic Progress

    a. __ Ensure that the most successful students stay on track
    b. __ Assign the most talented teachers to successful students
    c. __ Regular assessment to determine progress of those students not making AYP
    d. __ Monitor academic performance of all students
    e. __ Reading specialists and coaches hired as needed

Academic Achievement Gap

    a. __ Acknowledge the gap's existence due to economics and ability of some students
    b. __ Assign more qualified teachers to most needy students; utilize tutors and community
    c. __ Assign lower achieving students to a special teacher to address their needs
    d. __ Develop Individual Learning Plans for each student
    e. __ Recommend to parents of failing children an off-site tutoring center

Highly Qualified Teachers

    a. __ Teachers come to the district/classroom highly qualified
    b. __ Assure that staff development funds are available
    c. __ Teachers who teach core subjects meet requirements of NCLB
    d. __ Continue to provide staff training

Demographic Sub-Groups

    a. __ Treat all students equitably regardless of ethnicity, race, etc.
    b. __ Monitor academic performance of all students, get assistance for those students who are not meeting AYP
    c. __ Ensure that all children of color meet AYP
    d. __ Ensure that at least 80% of children of color meet AYP
    e. __ Ensure that 95% of all students and 95% of all sub-groups participate in testing in order for a school or district to meet AYP

Part IV of the instrument developed for this study examined how the participants handle various classroom situations, determining the extent to which participants take race-related issues into consideration in their implementation of NCLB-related

measures. The participants were asked to identify the items listed below that they use

when responding to various situations within classroom/district. Participants were asked

to rate each component on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being of high importance. This

section included the following components:

How are equal education opportunities created for all students?

    a. __ Ensure that all students receive the same curriculum
    b. __ Modify teaching in ways that will facilitate academic achievement of our most neediest students
    c. __ Incorporate lessons and activities that will help the most needy students develop positive attitudes about self and their respective culture
    d. __ Recognize, acknowledge and value individual cultural differences
    e. __ Improve school-to-home communications
    f. __ Offer after-school programs with specific curriculum focus
    g. __ Provide support for families in need so that they can help their children

How do you facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural and social-class groups?

    a. __ Develop Individual Learning Plans for students performing below proficiency
    b. __ Use content from a variety of cultural groups to illustrate key concepts and generalizations
    c. __ Work with communities of color and others to create a school environment that is welcoming to all
    d. __ Find creative ways to engage families of color in school environment
    e. __ Recognize the relationship of education and culture (e.g., ways of communicating, values, traditions, how family is defined)
    f. __ Ensure that all students receive the same curriculum

What approaches have you/your district taken to assure that teachers have the ability to work with students who are different from them?

    a. __ Incorporate cultural competencies courses in staff development sessions that measure how individuals think and feel about cultural differences
    b. __ Ensure that teachers have staff development time
    c. __ Ensure that teachers have time to share best practices in their respective area and to talk about their experiences

d. __ Ensure that program materials reflect positive images of all people
e. __ Culturally relevant curriculum is integrated in all content areas
f. __ Invite guest speakers from various cultures and ethnic groups to talk about their lived experiences

What do you do when a racial incident occurs?

a. __ Contact the specialist hired to work with such issues
b. __ Call the parents and inform them
c. __ Use the incident as an educational opportunity to talk about racism, stereotypes, diversity, etc.
d. __ Have open and honest conversation about racism with students
e. __ Articulate a clear statement of expectation regarding racial incidents
f. __ Incorporate consequences for racial incidents in policy handbook
g. __ Respond to the incident quickly and fairly
h. __ Seek advice and support from parents and community

The survey was pilot tested by two employees of Independent School District 709. Independent School District 709 was not included in the random sampling population. The pilot test was intended to test the mechanics of *Survey Monkey;* and participants' understanding of the intent of the study. No suggestions or feedback were provided, nor were any modifications made to the survey prior to sending it to the randomly selected population of teachers and administrators.

Rationale for the study.

The fact that review of literature revealed no previous studies in this area supports the need for additional research in this area. Participants in this study as well as others will find the results of this study informative and useful as districts across the country struggle to meet the unfunded mandates of NCLB while meeting the needs of racially and culturally diverse students.

Administration of the survey.

The survey was distributed via email. The email indicated that potential participants were receiving the email because they had been randomly selected to participate in the study. The email also explained the study provided a link to the survey (in *Survey Monkey).* An attachment contained a letter of introduction which outlined the purpose of the study, introduced the person conducting the study, indicated that return of the completed survey implied consent, and stated clearly that participation in the study was voluntary (See Appendix A for Letter of Introduction and Appendix B for Survey Instrument).

Treatment of the data.

Responses obtained on each of the nine components in Part I of the instrument identified the participant's gender and, their role in education (superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal or teacher). This section also captured information as to the level each participant worked in (elementary, middle or high school), grade configuration of their particular school (K-5, 6-8, 9-12, K-6, 7-9 10-12 or other). Question 4 through 9 revealed the average number of students per classroom at their school, the size of the school district, and the number of years the respondents had worked as a teacher, principal, assistant superintendent and as a superintendent.

Responses in Part II of the instrument, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, measured the perceived knowledge of the respondents on specific terms related to NCLB.

Responses to the questions in Part III of the instrument provided a measure of the extent to which respondents incorporate what they know about NCLB into practice. Five NCLB terms related to academic performance were used in this section.

Responses in Part IV of the instrument provided a measure of the tactics derived from CRT and used by each respondent when handling various situations that occur in the classroom and rates their level of importance of each on a scale of one to five.

The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) computer program was the primary tool used in analyzing the data. This program system enabled the researcher to perform various types of data analysis relevant to the design of the study.

Procedures were selected from the SAS program which enabled the researcher to answer the study's research questions. The research questions are as follows:

1. What is the level of knowledge of public school educators regarding the requirements of NCLB?

2. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents have similar knowledge of NCLB requirements?

3. What level of importance do public school educators perceive for the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

4. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents share similar perceptions of the importance of the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

5. What level of importance do public school educators perceive for selected professional practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in the public school setting?

6. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents share similar perceptions of

    selected professional practices that reflect an integration of NCLB and CRT?

Summary

The design and methodology incorporated in the study has been outlined in this

chapter consisting of the objective of the research; research population; development of

the instrument; administration of the instrument, and treatment of the data. Chapter IV

presents a detailed review and description of the data obtained in this study.

Chapter 4

Data Presentation

The data presented in this chapter were obtained from a research instrument administered through *Survey Monkey*. Participants were randomly selected through Research Randomizer. Randomly selected superintendents, assistant superintendents, principals and teachers were sent an e-mail with an attached letter of introduction and consent form. The list of Minnesota Superintendents was obtained from a colleague who had acquired the list for her own study. The list for Assistant Superintendents in the State of Minnesota was obtained from the 2009 Minnesota Association of School Administrators (Member Directory). The list of Minnesota Principals was purchased from the State of Minnesota, Mailing List Service (www.minnesotasbookstore.com). The list of Minnesota teachers was obtained from randomly selecting ten (10) superintendents and requesting the email contact for teachers in their district, as the only information available from the State of Minnesota for teachers was their name and mailing address. Duluth's superintendent agreed to communicate to colleague superintendents across the state encouraging them to assist with teacher contact information. The research instrument was developed through an extensive review of the literature pertaining to the NCLB, and CRT.

The purpose of this study was to review the NCLB legislation through a Critical Race Theory Lens for the purpose of determining if components of CRT influence practice in the public school setting regarding the requirements of NCLB. The study also sought to measure the knowledge of public school educators in the area of CRT

and NCLB; specifically, how they incorporate that knowledge into addressing the requirements of NCLB so that classroom performance of students, particularly students of color can be improved, thereby closing the achievement gap. The study sought to provide the answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of knowledge that each participant has regarding the requirements of the NCLB Act of 2001.

2. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents have similar knowledge of NCLB requirements?

3. What level of importance do public school educators perceive for the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

4. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents share similar perceptions of the importance of the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

5. What level of importance do public school educators perceive for selected professional practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of CRT in the public school setting?

6. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents do similar things with their respective knowledge of NCLB and understanding of CRT?

Of the 400 participants that were randomly selected to participate in this study, 160 (40%) returned useable instruments. This represents 13 female superintendents; 45 male superintendents; 17 female principals, 22 male principals; 44 female teachers and 7 male teachers.

Presentation of data.

The presentation of data in this chapter begins with the employment and demographic information of the respondents; this includes gender, education role, grade configuration of their school; class size; district size and years of experience of the respondents.

Of the 160 returned instruments, 81 (50.6%) of the respondents reported their gender as female; 76 or 47.5% reported their gender as male and 3 respondents did not respond. Fifty-five (34.4%) reported their role as superintendent; 3 or 1.9% reported their role as assistant superintendents (these were merged with the superintendent role); 42 (26.3%) reported their role as school principals and 51 (31.9%) reported their role as teachers. Thirteen of the responding females reported their role as superintendents or assistant superintendents, 17 as principals and 44 as teachers, compared to 45 male respondents reporting as superintendents or assistant superintendents, 22 as principals and 7 as teachers.

The 42 responding principals reported variances in their school sites. Twenty-two reported working at the elementary level; 22 at the middle school level and 14 were employed in high schools. Of the 51 teachers, 30 were at the elementary level; 6 middle school level and 15 at the high school level (9 did not respond).

Over 20% of the respondents reported working in K-6 school sites. Seven of the public school educators were middle school employees (grades 6-8); twelve worked in schools serving grades 9-12 and five were in schools serving grades 10-12. Ninety-five of the respondents indicated "other" while 3 did not respond. Fifty-three or 33.1% of the

respondents reported their class size between 24-26 students; 44 (27.5%) reported class sizes of 27-30; 31 (19.4%) reported class sizes of 21-23; 16 (10.0%) reported class sizes over 30; 12 (7.5%) of the respondents and 4 (2.5%) of the public school educators reported class size under 20.

When looking at the district sizes for the respondents, 91 (56.9%) indicated enrollment in their district was less than 5,000 students; while 52 (32.5%) reported their district sizes of more than 10,000. Twelve (8.1%) public school educators represented districts with enrollments of 5,001-10,000 and 4 (2.5%) did not respond.

Responding teachers reported an average of 14.28 years of experience. Principals reported serving an average of 7.65 years. Superintendents who responded to the survey had served an average of 4.98 years in their current role.

Table 1

Employment and Demographic Information (N = 160)

_____

Variables	N	%
Gender		
Female	81	50.6
Male	76	47.5
No Response	3	1.9
Educational Role		
Superintendent	55	34.4
Assistant Superintendent	3	1.9
School Principal	42	26.3
Elementary	22	
Middle	6	
High	14	
Teacher	51	31.9
Elementary	30	
Middle	6	
High	15	
No Response	9	5.6
Grade		
K-5	33	20.6
6-8	7	4.4
9-12	12	7.5
K-6	5	3.1
7-9	0	
10-12	5	3.1
Other	95	59.4
No Response	3	1.9
Class Size		
Under 20	12	7.5
21-23	31	19.4
24-26	53	33.1
27-30	44	27.5
Over 30	16	10.0
No Response	4	2.5
District Size		
Less than 5000	91	56.9
5001-10,000	13	8.1
More than 10,001	52	32.5
No Response	4	2.5
Years of Experience	Mean	SD
Teacher	14.28	9.0
Principal	7.65	7.2
Assistant Superintendent	.99	2.7
Superintendent	4.98	7.7

The largest number of the population (over 50%) reported their gender as female, compared to 47.5% reporting their gender as male. Variations among the groups revealed that 13 of 74 females reported their role as either superintendent or assistant superintendent while 45 of 74 male respondents identified their role as either superintendent or assistant superintendent. There were also variations among the groups in the teacher role; 44 females as compared to 7 males in this role. There were differences among the groups with respect to grade configuration of their employing school district with kindergarten through grade 5; 33 respondents reported teaching at such sites. Variances in class size were also reported by the 3 groups. The largest class size (over 30) was reported by10.0% of the respondents. Fifty-three (33.1%) of the public school educators reported their class ranged from 24-26.

Variances in district sizes were also revealed. The largest number of the total population (56.9%) reported they worked in districts with fewer than 5,000 students, while 52 or 32.5% of the public school educators indicated their district size was more than 10,000.

The presentation of data addressing the six research questions are organized as follows: 1) data that address the level of knowledge of public school educators regarding the requirements of the NCLB Act of 2001; 3) data that addresses the level of importance public school educators perceive for the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice; and 5) data that addresses the level of importance public school educators perceive for selected professional practices that reflect an integration of

components of NCLB with aspects of CRT in the public school setting. The data for

research questions 2, 4, and 6 are addressed later in this study.

One of the primary objects of this study was to determine what public school

educators know about NCLB. This objective was stated as research question one:

What is the level of knowledge of public school educators regarding the requirements of

the NCLB Act of 2001? The instrument used in this study contained 10 items related to

NCLB. Respondents from the three groups of public school educators (superintendents,

principals and teachers) were asked to rate their knowledge of these items on a scale of

1 to 5 with 5 being the highest. Means Scores and Standard Deviation for each item

were reported for each group of educators in Table 2. Differences between groups

regarding their perceived knowledge of these items (research questions 2, 4, and 6) will

be examined later in the study.

Table 2

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Superintendents, Principals, and Teachers on Level of Perceived Knowledge of NCLB

	Superintendents		Principals		Teachers	
Level of Knowledge of NCLB						
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Adequate Yearly Progress	4.27	0.87	4.55	0.63	3.81	0.84
Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO)	3.37	1.14	3.62	1.17	3.08	1.09
Academic Progress	4.0	0.88	4.26	0.66	3.81	1.01
Academic Achievement Gap	4.13	0.93	4.17	0.79	3.75	1.04
Annual Academic Assessments	4.19	0.95	4.19	0.74	3.66	1.01
Other Academic Indicators	3.68	1.01	3.81	0.97	3.29	1.01
Highly Qualified Teachers	4.36	0.93	4.37	0.66	3.85	1.07
Demographic Sub Groups	4.27	0.95	4.46	0.74	3.81	1.04
NCLB's Core Academic Subjects	4.09	0.97	4.29	0.74	3.67	0.93
Proficiency Level	4.13	0.94	4.40	0.70	3.72	0.95

The highest mean score (4.55) was reported by principals for their perceived

knowledge of the NCLB component "Adequate Yearly Progress." All three groups of

educators reported their lowest level of perceived knowledge for "Annual Performance Objectives." Mean scores for each group were below 4.0 for this component of NCLB. Mean scores for perceived knowledge of the component "Academic Progress" were above 4.0 for superintendents and principals. Mean scores for superintendents (4.13) and principals (4.17) indicated that these two groups of educational administrators perceived a higher level of importance for the component "Academic Achievement Gap" than did teachers (3.75). Mean scores for the NCLB component "Annual Academic Assessments," indicated that superintendents (4.19) and principals (4.19) perceived a higher level of knowledge then teachers, who reported mean scores of 3.66. Means scores for NCLB component "Other Academic Indicators" indicated that principals had a higher level of perceived knowledge (3.81) than superintendents (3.68) and teachers (3.29). Superintendents (4.36) and principals (4.37) reported a higher level of perceived knowledge for the NCLB component "Highly Qualified Teachers," than teachers 3.85. Principals reported that they had a higher level of knowledge for NCLB component "Demographic Sub Groups (4.46) than superintendents (4.27) and teachers (3.81). Principals also indicated a higher level of knowledge for NCLB component "NCLB's Core Academic Subjects (4.29) than superintendents (4.09) and teachers (3.67). Superintendents (4.13) and principals (4.40) indicated a high level of knowledge for NCLB component "Proficiency Level" than teachers (3.72).

The lowest mean scores for all three groups were reported for "Annual Measurable Objectives." Superintendents reported no mean scores less than 3.3.

Another objective of this study was to determine to what extent educators incorporate what they know about NCLB into practice. This objective was stated in research question 3: What level of importance do public school educators perceive for the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice? Respondents from each of the three groups of educators were asked to rate the importance of 25 professional practices in 5 components of NCLB categories on a scale of 1-5 with 5 being the highest. Mean scores and standard deviations for each component category and practice were reported for each group of educators by category in Tables 3 through 7.

Table 3

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Superintendents, Principals and Teachers on Level of Importance for Perceived Components of NCLB in Terms of Professional Practice

Category 1: Adequate Yearly Progress	Superintendents		Principals		Teachers	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Focus on teaching on subjects that will be tested	4.19	0.82	4.24	0.70	4.09	0.92
Regular assessments to monitor students not making adequate yearly progress	4.49	0.62	4.56	0.66	3.83	1.07
Develop individual learning plans for students not making adequate yearly progress	4.10	0.68	4.06	1.07	3.60	1.31
Technology programming that supports the standards	3.81	0.80	3.76	0.89	3.46	1.24
Planned extra time for reading, mathematics and writing for most needy students	4.38	0.80	4.59	0.56	3.86	1.26
Focus on state standards but allow for creativity to address individual student needs	4.15	0.78	4.18	0.87	4.29	0.76

A series of mean scores indicated that superintendents perceived the practices "regular assessments to monitor students not making adequate yearly progress," (4.49)

to be of greatest importance. Mean scores for principals indicated a perceived level of great importance for the practice "planned extra time for reading, mathematics and writing for most needy students" (4.59). Teachers perceived greatest importance for the practice "focus on state standards but allow for creativity to address individual student needs" (4.29). All three groups, perceived the practice the "technology programming that supports the standards" to be of least importance for the component of NCLB. The mean scores for each group on that practice were 3.81 for superintendents, 3.76 for principals and 3.46 for teachers. Mean scores of less than 4.0 indicated a tendency toward a perception of less importance of components of NCLB in terms of professional practice. Teachers reported mean scores of less than 4.0 for four out of the six practices for this category.

Each group reported high mean scores for "focus teaching on subjects that will be tested." All three groups of educators reported their lowest mean scores for "technology programming that supports the standards." No mean scores less than 3.0 were reported for any groups in this category.

Mean scores and standard deviations for all respondents for their perceived level of importance for components of NCLB in terms of professional practice for items related to academic progress are reported in Table 4.

Table 4

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Superintendents, Principals and Teachers on Level of Importance for Perceived Components of NCLB in Terms of Professional Practice

Category 2: Academic Progress

	Superintendents		Principals		Teachers	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Ensure that the most successful students stay on track	4.26	0.74	4.15	0.82	4.09	0.83
Assign the most talented teachers to successful students	3.00	1.04	3.06	1.23	2.24	1.18
Regular assessment to determine progress of those students not making adequate yearly progress (AYP)	4.30	0.70	4.62	0.55	3.83	1.25
Monitor academic performance of all students	4.57	0.54	4.65	0.54	4.54	0.61
Reading specialist and coaches hired as needed	4.13	0.95	4.12	1.02	3.53	1.40

Mean scores revealed that all three groups of educators perceived the greatest level of importance for the practice "monitor academic performance of all students" (4.57). Mean scores for all respondents for "ensure that the most successful students stay on track" were above 4.0 indicating a tendency in the direction of a perceived high level of importance for this professional practice. Mean scores for this item were as follows: superintendents (4.26); principals (4.15); and teachers (4.09).

Public school administrators reported a higher level of importance for the practice "assign the most talented teachers to successful students," with superintendents reporting mean scores of 3.0 and principals reporting mean scores of 3.06. Teachers responding to this practice reported a mean score less than 3.0 (2.24) indicating a

tendency in the direction of a perceived less importance for this professional practice. All three groups reported mean scores above 4.0 for the practice "monitor academic performance of all students," indicating a high level of importance. Mean scores reported by superintendents were 4.57; and 4.65 for principals. Teachers reported mean scores of 4.54 for this item. Superintendents and principals did not report mean scores less than 3.0 in this category. Interestingly, all three groups perceived the same practice "assign the most talented teachers to successful students" as less important, mean scores of less than 4.0. Superintendents reported a mean score of 3.0, principals 3.06 and teachers reported a mean score of 2.24.

Mean scores and standard deviations for all respondents in category 3 are reported in table 5. The highest mean score for professional practice "acknowledge the gap's existence due to economics and ability of some students" was reported by teachers (4.03), while principals (3.82) and superintendents (3.96) indicated a tendency in the direction of a lower level of importance for this professional practice. Public school administrators reported a higher level of importance for the practice "assign more qualified teachers to most needy students; utilize tutors and community," with superintendents reporting mean scores of 4.0 and principals reporting mean scores of 4.15. Teachers reported mean scores for this practice less than 4.0, indicating a tendency in the direction of a perceived less level of importance for perceived components of NCLB in terms of professional practice.

Table 5

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Superintendents, Principals and Teachers on Level of Importance for Perceived Components of NCLB in Terms of Professional Practice

Category 3: Academic Achievement Gap

	Superintendents		Principals		Teachers	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Acknowledge the gap's existence due to economics and ability of students	3.96	1.02	3.82	1.10	4.03	0.98
Assign more qualified teachers to most needy students; utilize tutors and community	4.00	0.93	4.15	0.91	3.73	1.42
Assign lower achieving students to a special teacher to address their needs	3.51	1.08	3.30	1.13	3.88	1.15
Develop Individual Learning Plans for each student	4.00	0.91	3.58	1.28	3.59	1.31
Recommend to parents of failing children an off-site tutoring center	2.43	1.21	2.03	1.19	2.66	1.29

All three groups of public school educators reported means scores less than 4.0 for professional practice "assign lower achieving students to a special teacher to address their needs" indicating a tendency in the direction of perceived less important for this practice. Superintendents reported mean scores of 3.51, principals 3.30 and teachers 3.88. All three groups of public school educators reported means scores less than 3.0 for the practice "recommend to parents of failing children an off-site tutoring center" indicating a lower level of perceived level of importance; superintendents reported mean scores of 2.43, principals 2.03 and teachers 2.66. This practice was rated lowest in importance by each group for this component category. Mean scores for the practice "develop individual learning plans for each student," was reported with mean scores

above 3.0 for all 3 groups, with superintendents reporting a higher level of importance

with mean scores of 4.0, mean scores of (3.58) for principals; and teachers (3.59)

indicated that these two groups perceived a lower level of importance for this practice.

Mean scores and standard deviations for component category 4 for the three

groups of public school educators is presented in table 6 below. Mean scores for all

three groups were highest for the practice "continue to provide staff training,"

indicating a higher perceived level of importance for this professional practices.

Superintendents reported mean score of 4.49; principals, 4.7; 1 and teachers, reported

mean scores of 4.36 for this practice.

Table 6

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Superintendents, Principals and Teachers on Level of Importance for Perceived Components of NCLB in Terms of Professional Practice

Category 4: Highly Qualified Teachers						
	Superintendents		Principals		Teachers	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Teachers come to the district/ classroom highly qualified	4.36	0.82	4.29	0.84	4.35	0.95
Assure that staff development funds are available	4.36	0.85	4.50	0.75	3.97	1.22
Teachers who teach core subjects meet requirements of NCLB	4.40	0.95	4.68	0.59	4.09	0.84
Continue to provide staff training	4.49	0.75	4.71	0.58	4.36	0.93

Superintendents and principals reported mean scores above 4.0 for all items in

category 4, indicating a tendency in the direction of a high perceived level of

importance for all practices in this component category of NCLB. The highest mean

scores were reported by all three groups for the practice "continue to provide staff training" indicating a tendency in the direction of a high level of importance. Public school administrators reported mean scores above 4.0 for "assure that staff development funds are available" indicating a higher perceived level of importance with superintendents reporting mean scores of 4.36, principals 4.50. Teachers perceived this item to be less important, with reported mean scores of 3.97. All 3 groups of respondents reported mean scores above 4.0 for the item "teachers come to the district/classroom highly qualified," indicating a tendency to perceive this item as a high level of importance. Superintendents reported mean scores of 4.36, principals 4.29 and teachers 4.35.

Mean scores and standard deviations for NCLB component category 5, "Demographic Sub Groups" appear in table 7. Superintendents reported mean scores of 4.0 and higher for all practices in this category indicating a tendency in the direction of a perceived high level of importance for NCLB in terms of professional practice.

Table 7

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Superintendents, Principals and Teachers on Level of Importance for Perceived Components of NCLB in Terms of Professional Practice

Category 5: Demographic Sub Groups

	Superintendents		Principals		Teachers	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Treat all students equitably regardless of ethnicity, race, etc.	4.78	0.66	4.58	0.61	4.83	0.38
Monitor academic performance of all students, get assistance for those students who are not making AYP	4.64	0.61	4.79	0.41	4.44	0.96
Ensure that all children of color meet AYP	4.46	0.89	4.59	0.66	3.57	1.31
Ensure that at least 80% of children of color meet AYP	4.07	1.27	3.91	1.31	3.53	1.25
Ensure that 95% of all students and 95% of all sub groups participate in testing in order for a school or district to meet AYP	4.51	0.86	4.76	0.50	3.82	1.21

Each group reported their lowest mean score for the practice "ensure that at least 80% of children of color meet AYP." All three groups of public school educators reported high mean scores for practice "treat all students equitably regardless of ethnicity, race, etc.," indicating a high level of importance. Likewise, all three groups reported high means scores for "monitor academic performance of all students, get assistance for those students who are not meeting AYP," as having a high level of importance. All three groups of educators had mean scores above 4.0 for this professional practice. Superintendents reported mean scores of 4.46 and principals 4.59 for practice "ensure that all children of color meet AYP," indicated a higher perceived

level of importance while teachers with a reported mean score of 3.58 indicated a lower perceived level of importance.

Another objective of this study was to determine the level of importance public school educators perceive for selected practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of CRT. This objective was stated in research question 5: What level of importance do public school educators perceive for selected professional practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of CRT in the public school setting? Respondents from each group of educators were asked to rate the importance of 27 practices in four categories on a scale of 1-5, with 5 being the highest. Mean scores and standard deviations for each category and item were reported in Table 8 for category 1, how are equal education opportunities created for all students?

Table 8

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Superintendents, Principals and Teachers on Level of Importance for Selected Practices That Reflect an Integration of Components of NCLB with Aspects of CRT

Category 1: How are equal education opportunities created for all students?

	Superintendents		Principals		Teachers	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Ensure that all students receive the same curriculum	4.39	0.86	4.21	0.88	3.97	1.03
Modify teaching in ways that will facilities academic achievement of our most neediest students	4.50	0.62	4.54	0.64	4.65	0.61
Incorporate lessons and activities that will help the neediest students develop positive attitudes about self and their respective culture	4.35	0.67	4.46	0.64	4.39	0.88
Recognize, acknowledge and value individual cultural differences	4.37	0.83	4.57	0.63	4.58	0.67
Improve school to home communications	4.49	0.69	4.39	0.74	4.37	1.00
Offer after school programs with specific curriculum focus	4.11	0.97	4.25	0.93	4.13	1.26
Provide support for families in need so that they can help their children	4.18	0.87	4.36	1.03	4.10	1.04

Mean scores and standard deviations of the two groups of school administrators for the practice "ensure that all students receive the same curriculum," had a tendency to be on the higher level of perceived importance with superintendents reporting mean scores of 4.39, and principals 4.21. Teachers reported mean score of less than 4.0 (3.97) indicating a tendency toward a lower level of perceived importance. All three groups of educators reported mean scores above 4.0 for item "modify teaching in ways that will facilitate academic achievement of our most neediest students," superintendents

reported mean scores of 4.50, principals 4.54 and teachers 4.65. Each group also reported a mean score above 4.0 for the practice "incorporate lessons and activities that will help the neediest students develop positive attitudes about self and their respective culture" indicating a common perspective of the high level of importance with this practice. The lowest mean score reported by superintendents (4.11) was for the practice "offer after school programs with specific curriculum focus," as less important. Principals reported a mean score of 4.25, teachers reported a mean score of 4.13. All three public school educators perceived the practice "incorporate lessons and activities that will help the neediest students develop positive attitudes about self and their respective culture," to be of greater importance, with mean scores of 4.35 for superintendents, 4.46 for principals and 4.39 for teachers.

For the practice "recognize, acknowledge and value individual cultural differences," all three groups reported mean scores well in excess of 4.0. This was also the case for each group for every other question in this category except one.

Mean scores and standard deviation for the three groups of educators for category 2, how do you facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural and social-class groups, appear in table 9. The highest mean score for this category was reported by superintendents (4.45) for item "ensure that all students receive the same curriculum," while principals reported a means score of 4.26 and teachers a mean score of 4.0 indicating a somewhat lower levels of perceived importance for this question.

Table 9

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Superintendents, Principals and Teachers on Level of Importance for Selected Practices That Reflect an Integration of Components of NCLB with Aspects of CRT

Category 2: How do you facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural and social-class groups?

	Superintendents		Principals		Teachers	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Develop Individual Learning Plans for students performing below proficiency	4.16	0.93	4.85	1.13	3.77	1.19
Use content from a variety of cultural groups to illustrate key concepts and generalizations	3.96	0.90	4.04	0.90	3.97	1.12
Work with communities of color and others to create a school environment that is welcoming to all	4.16	0.95	4.19	0.92	3.71	1.27
Find creative ways to engage families of color in school environment	4.16	0.93	4.19	0.88	3.72	1.22
Recognize the relationships of education and culture (ways of communicating, values, traditions, how family is defined)	4.22	0.85	4.35	0.89	4.14	0.88
Ensure that all students receive the same curriculum	4.45	0.93	4.26	0.90	4.00	1.05

Superintendents reported a mean score of 4.0 and above for all practices in this category except practice "use content from a variety of cultural groups to illustrate key concepts and generalization," reporting a mean score of 3.96 indicating a tendency toward a less level of perceived importance. Principals reported a mean score of 4.04 for this practice, while teachers indicated a tendency toward a lower perceived level of importance with reported mean score of 3.97. Public school administrators indicated a tendency toward a high level of importance for the practice "work with communities of color and others to create a school environment that is welcoming to all."

Superintendents reported a mean score of 4.16, and principals reported mean a score of

4.19. Teachers reported a mean score of less than 4.0 indicating a tendency in the

direction of a lower level of perceived importance for this practice. Both

superintendents and principals also indicated a tendency to perceive the practice "find

creative ways to engage families of color in school environment," more important than

teachers. Superintendents reported a mean score of 4.16 and principals reported a mean

score of 4.19, while teachers reported a mean score of 3.71. All three groups of public

school educators perceived the practice "recognize the relationships of education and

culture (ways of communicating, values, traditions, how family is defined)" as

important, with mean scores of 4.22 for superintendents, 4.35 for principals and mean

scores of 4.14 for teachers.

Mean scores for each of the three groups of public school educators are listed

below in table 10 for category 3, "what approaches have you/your district taken to

assure that teachers have the ability to work with students who are different from them."

The highest mean score was reported by principals for practice "ensure that program

materials reflect positive images of all people" (4.46) indicating a high perceived level

of importance for this practice. Mean scores of superintendents and teachers also had a

tendency toward a high perceived level of importance for this item, superintendents

reported a mean score of 4.30 and teachers reported a mean score of 4.0.

Table 10

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Superintendents, Principals and Teachers on Level of Importance for Selected Practices That Reflect an Integration of Components of NCLB with Aspects of CRT

Category 3: What approaches have you/your district taken to assure that teachers have the ability to work with students who are different from them?	Superintendents		Principals		Teachers	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Incorporate cultural competencies courses in staff development sessions that measure how individuals think and feel about cultural differences	3.76	1.08	4.18	0.96	3.50	1.31
Ensure that teachers have staff development time	4.26	0.71	4.39	0.94	4.07	1.17
Ensure that teachers have time to share best practices in their respective areas and talk about their experiences	4.35	0.64	4.39	0.63	4.03	1.10
Ensure that program materials reflect positive images of all people	4.30	0.87	4.46	0.69	4.00	1.07
Culturally relevant curriculum is integrated in all content areas	4.13	0.93	4.18	0.72	3.90	1.16
Invite guest speakers from various cultures and ethnic groups to talk about their lived experiences	3.65	1.12	3.71	1.01	3.57	1.17

All three groups reported high mean scores for the practice "ensure that teachers have staff development time," indicating a tendency in the direction of a high perceived level of importance. Superintendents reported a mean score of 4.26 for this practice, principals 4.39, and teachers 4.07. Similarly, all three groups of public school educators indicated a high perceived level of importance for "ensure that teachers have time to share best practices in their respective area and to talk about their experiences," with mean scores of 4.35 for superintendents; 4.39 for principals; and 4.03 for teachers.

Public school administrators reported high mean scores for item "culturally relevant curriculum is integrated in all content areas," indicating a tendency toward a perceived high level of importance. Superintendents reported a mean score of 4.13; a mean score of 4.18 was reported by principals while teachers reported a mean score of 3.90 indicating a lower perceived level of importance for this practice. All three groups of public school educators reported mean scores of less than 4.0 for the practice "invite guest speakers from various cultures and ethnic groups to talk about their lived experiences," indicating a lower perceived level of importance of this practice. Teachers reported their lowest mean score for the practice "incorporate cultural competencies courses in staff development sessions that measure how individuals think and fell about cultural differences," with a mean score of 3.50. Superintendents (3.76) also had a tendency to perceive this practice as less important than principals who reported mean scores of 4.18 indicating a higher perceived level of importance.

Mean scores for Category 4 are reflected in table 11 below for items listed in category 4, "what do you do when a racial incident occurs." The lowest mean scores reported by all three groups of public school educators was for the practice "contact the special hired to work with such issues." All three groups reported mean scores less than 4.0 for this practice, indicating a tendency in the direction of a perceived level of less importance. Superintendents reported mean scores of 3.31, principals 2.96 and teachers reported mean scores of 3.64. All three public school educators reported high mean scores for practice "respond to the incident quickly and fairly," indicating a high

perceived level of importance. All three groups reported mean scores above 4.5;

superintendents 4.72; principals 4.86 and teachers 4.62.

Table 11

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Superintendents, Principals and Teachers on Level of Importance for Selected Practices That Reflect an Integration of Components of NCLB with Aspects of CRT

Category 4: What do you do when a racial incident occurs?						
	Superintendents		Principals		Teachers	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Contact the special hired to work with such issues	3.31	1.46	2.96	1.48	3.64	1.31
Call the parents and inform them	4.45	0.82	4.79	0.42	3.93	1.16
Use the incident as an educational opportunity to talk about racism, stereotypes, diversity	4.18	1.04	4.29	1.05	3.90	1.23
Have open and honest conversation about racism with students	4.36	0.84	4.54	0.79	4.17	1.04
Articulate a clear statement of expectations regarding racial incidents	4.48	0.90	4.82	0.39	4.34	1.08
Incorporate consequences for racial incidents in policy handbook	4.48	0.85	4.71	0.53	4.00	1.20
Respond to the incident quickly and fairly	4.72	0.73	4.86	0.36	4.62	0.82
Seek advice and support from parents and community	4.02	1.15	4.11	1.20	3.93	0.16

Public school administrators reported a higher level of importance for the

practice "call the parents and inform them," than did classroom teachers.

Superintendents reported mean scores of 4.45; principals 4.79, while teachers reported

mean scores of 3.93 indicting a tendency toward a lower level of perceived importance

for this item. Each group of public school educators reported mean scores above 4.0 for the practice "have open and honest conversation about racism with students," indicating a high perceived level of importance, with superintendents reporting mean scores of 4.36, principals 4.54 and teachers 4.17. Public school administrators also perceived a higher level of importance for the practice "use the incident as an educational opportunity to talk about racism, stereotypes, and diversity," with mean scores of 4.18 for superintendents; 4.29 for principals, while teachers reported mean scores of 3.90 indicating a lower level of importance. All three groups reported high mean scores for "articulate a clear statement of expectations regarding racial incidents," indicating a tendency in the direction of a higher level of importance. Superintendents reported mean scores of 4.48; principals 4.82; and teachers 4.34. All three groups reported mean scores of 4.0 and above for practice "incorporate consequences for racial incidents in policy handbooks," indicating a high level of importance. Superintendents and principals reported mean scores of 4.0 and above for the practice "seek advice and support from parents and community," indicating a tendency toward a higher level of importance, while teachers reported mean scores of 3.93 indicating a lower level of importance for this item.

Statistical comparison between groups.

This study also examined differences between groups on reported levels of knowledge of NCLB, reported levels of importance for professional practices, and reported levels of importance of professional practices that reflect on integration of NCLB and CRT. These objectives were stated as research questions 2, 4, and 6.

1. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents have similar knowledge of NCLB requirements?

4. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents share similar perceptions of the importance of the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

6. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents do similar things with their respective knowledge of NCLB and understanding of CRT?

A total of 160 respondents from all three groups of public school educators provided the data to determine if significant differences existed among the three groups by each of the 10 categories and 62 items of the research instrument. The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) currently Predictive Analytics Software (PASW) for Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used. Significance was determined in this study at alpha = .05. Of the 160 useable instruments in this study, 9 had at least one missing value, meaning that they left a blank for a response. The 9 missing values were in the demographic category where the respondents left blank their educational role. These 9 were excluded from this comparison because their educational role was not identified.

The data in this section of the study is presented in order to satisfy the requirements of these research questions in determining 1) whether differences exist among the three groups regarding their level of knowledge of NCLB; 2) levels of importance for professional practices and 3) level of importance of professional practices that reflect an integration of NCLB and CRT.

Comparisons were made where significant differences were indicated. Duncan's multiple range test was used to determine between which groups significant differences were indicated for all three categories. The Bonferroni-Sidak correction was used for post-hoc comparisons to address the problem of multiple comparisons.

The mean scores, ANOVA, p-value and Bonferroni-Sidak are identified below in table 12 for perceived knowledge of NCLB for all groups.

Table 12

Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparison between Groups for Perceived Knowledge of NCLB for All Three Educators

Category 1: Knowledge of NCLB

	Superintendents Mean	Principals Mean	Teachers Mean	F	p-value	Comparison
Adequate Yearly Progress	4.27	4.55	3.81	9.85	.00	1≥3, 2≥3
Annual Academic Assessment	4.19	4.19	3.66	5.28	.01	1≥3, 2≥3
Other Academic Indicators	3.68	3.81	3.29	3.36	.04	2≥3
Highly Qualified Teachers	4.36	4.37	3.85	4.97	.01	1≥3, 2≥3
Demographic Sub Groups	4.27	4.46	3.81	5.90	.99	1≥3, 2≥3
NCLB Core Academic Subj.	4.09	4.29	3.67	5.75		1≥3, 2≥3
Proficiency Level	4.13	4.40	3.72	5.75		2≥3

Significant differences among the three groups are indicated in the table above. These terms appear under Knowledge of NCLB. Superintendents report a significantly higher level of knowledge of NCLB than teachers in all items but two. Principals report a significantly higher level of knowledge of NCLB than teachers on all items. Principals

and superintendents do not differ significantly in their reported knowledge for any of

the areas of knowledge of NCLB.

Analysis of variance and post hoc comparisons between groups on the

perceptions of the importance of components of NCLB in terms of professional practice

are listed in table 13 below category 1, adequate yearly progress.

Table 13

Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparisons between Groups on Perceptions of the
Importance of Components of NCLB in Terms of Professional Practice

Adequate Yearly Progress

	Superintendents Mean	Principals Mean	Teachers Mean	F	p-value	Comparison
Regular assessments to monitor students not making adequate yearly progress	4.49	4.56	3.83	9.32	.03	1≥3, 2≥3
Develop an Individual Learning Plan for students not making yearly adequate progress	4.19	4.06	3.60	3.54	.03	1≥3
Planned extra time for reading, mathematics, and writing for most needy students	4.38	4.59	3.86	6.03	.00	1≥3, 2≥3

A significant difference was reported among the three groups on their

perceptions of the importance of the practice "regular assessments to monitor students

not making adequate yearly progress." Both superintendents and principals differed

significantly with teachers on their perception of the importance of this practice.

Similarly, a significant difference between groups was reported for "planned extra time

for reading, mathematics and writing for most needy students," the difference was noted

between superintendents and teachers and between principals and teachers.

Superintendents reported a significantly higher perception of importance than teachers

for "develop an individual learning plan for students not making adequate yearly

progress."

Analysis of Variance and comparisons between groups for Category 2, academic

progress is listed in table 14.

Table 14

Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparisons between Groups on Perceptions of the Importance of Components of NCLB in Terms of Professional Practice

Category 2: Academic Progress	S (1) Mean	P (2) Mean	T (3) Mean	F	P value	Comparisons
Assign the most talented teachers to successful students	3.00	3.06	2.24	5.75	.00	1≥3, 2≥3
Regular assessment to determine progress of those students not making AYP	4.30	4.62	3.83	7.23	.00	1≥3, 2≥3

Superintendents differed significantly from teachers for "assign the most

talented teachers to successful students." Principals also differed significantly from

teachers for this practice. Both groups of administrators also reported significantly

higher perceived level of importance than teachers for the practice "regular assessment

to determine progress of those not making AYP."

For category 3, no significant differences were reported between the 3 public

school educators regarding particularly their level of importance for the five practices

listed under "Academic Achievement Gap." The practices were as follows:

acknowledge the gap's existence due to economics and ability of some students; assign

more qualified teachers to most needy students; utilize tutors and community; assign

lower achieving students to a special teacher to address their needs; develop individual

learning plans for each student; and recommend to parents of failing children an off-site

tutoring center.

 Analysis of variance and post hoc comparisons between groups for category 4,

"Highly Qualified Teachers" is listed below in table 15.

Table 15

Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparisons between Groups on Perceptions of the
Importance of Components of NCLB in Terms of Professional Practice

Category 4: Highly Qualified Teachers						
	S(1) Mean	P (2) Mean	T (3) Mean	F	P value	Comparisons
Teachers who teach core subjects meet requirements of NCLB	4.40	4.68	4.09	4.23	.02	2≥3
Principals differ significantly from teachers in this category						

 Principals differ significantly from teachers in this category. As indicated in

Table 15, principals differed significantly from teachers for the practice "teachers who

teach core subjects meet requirements of NCLB."

 Table 16 reports the analysis of variance and post hoc comparisons between

groups on perceptions of the importance of components of NCLB in terms of

professional practice for category 5, "Demographic Sub Groups."

Table 16

Analysis of Variance and Post Hoc Comparisons between Groups on Perceptions of the Importance of Components of NCLB in Terms of Professional Practice

Category 5: Demographic Sub Groups

	S (1) Mean	P (2) Mean	T (3) Mean	F	P value	Comparisons
Ensure that all children of color meet AYP	4.46	4.59	3.58	10.53	.00	1≥3, 2≥3
Ensure that 95% of all students and 95% of all sub groups participate in testing in order for school or district to meet AYP	4.51	4.76	3.82	10.16	.00	1≥3, 2≥3

Superintendents and principals reported significantly higher perception than teachers of the importance for the practice "ensure that all children of color meet AYP." Likewise, both groups of public school administrators also reported significantly higher perceptions than teachers of the importance of the practice "ensure that 95% of all students and 95% of all sub groups participate in testing in order for school or district to meet AYP.

The next section of the survey asked respondents to provide their perceptions of selected professional practices that reflect an integration of NCLB and understanding of CRT. The first category under this section "how are equal education opportunities created for all students?" contained seven professional practices. No significant differences were reported between and among groups for any practice in this category. This category included the following practices: ensure that all students receive the same curriculum, modify teaching in ways that will facilitate academic achievement of our most neediest students, incorporate lessons and activities that will help the most needy students develop positive attitudes about self and their respective culture, recognize,

acknowledge and value individual cultural differences, improve school to home communications, offer after school programs with specific curriculum focus and provide support for families in need so that they can help their children.

Respondents reported no significant differences in their responses on the importance of any of the six practices in category 2, "how do you facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural and social-class groups." The items in this category included develop individual learning plans for students performing below proficiency, use content from a variety of cultural groups to illustrate key concepts and generalizations, work with communities of color and others to create a school environment that is welcoming to all, find creative ways to engage families of color in school environment, recognize the relationship of education and culture (ways of communicating, values, traditions how family is defined), and ensure that all students receive the same curriculum.

There were no significant differences among the three groups for practices in category 3, "what approaches have you/your district taken to assure that teachers have the ability to work with students who are different from them?" The practices in this category included the following: incorporate cultural competencies courses in staff development sessions that measure how individuals think and feel about cultural differences, ensure that teachers have staff development time, ensure that teachers have time to share best practices in their respective area and to talk about their experiences, ensure that program materials reflect positive images of all people, culturally relevant

curriculum is integrated in all content areas, and invite guest speakers from various

cultures and ethnic groups to talk about their lived experiences.

Table 17 reports significant differences among the three groups of public school

educators for category 4, "what do you do when a racial incident occurs?"

Table 17

Perceptions of Selected Professional Practices that Reflect an Integration of NCLB and CRT – Comparisons among Groups

What do you do when a racial incident occurs?	S (1) Mean	P (2) Mean	T (3) Mean	F	P value	Comparisons
Call the parents and inform them	4.45	4.79	3.93	7.32	.00	1≥3, 2≥3
Incorporate consequences for racial incidents in policy handbook	4.48	4.71	4.00	4.77	.01	2≥3

Superintendents were also significantly more likely than teachers to "incorporate

consequences for racial incidents in policy handbook."

Summary

The research findings for this study have been presented in this chapter. The

extent to which superintendents, principals and teachers differ in their perceived

knowledge related to NCLB has been examined and presented. The data that examined

the extent to which differences between superintendents, principals and teachers exist

on how they incorporate what they know about NCLB into practice and how they

incorporate what they know about NCLB with components of CRT has also been

examined and presented.

A summary of the development of this study, methodology, finding and

recommendations for future considerations are presented in Chapter 5.

Chapter 5

Summary and Development of the Study, Methodology, Findings and

Conclusion and Recommendations for future

Chapter 5 is comprised of the following sections: a) a summary b) development

of the study, c) methodology, d) findings, e) conclusions, and f) recommendations for

future considerations.

Summary and development of the study.

The primary purpose of the study was to determine if components of CRT

influence practice in the public school setting regarding the requirements of the NCLB

Act. The study also sought to measure the knowledge of public school educators in the

area of CRT and NCLB and how they incorporate that knowledge into addressing the

requirements of NCLB so that classroom performance of students, specifically students

of color can be improved thereby closing the achievement gap. Three groups of public

school educators were compared to determine if superintendents, principals and

teachers have similar knowledge of NCLB requirements. The perceptions of the three

groups were also compared to determine if differences existed in the level of

importance they perceived for components of NCLB in terms of professional practice.

The three groups of public school educators were also compared to determine if

differences existed in their perceptions of selected professional practices that reflect an

integration of NCLB and CRT. The specific research questions were:

1. What is the level of knowledge of public school educators regarding the

   requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001?

2. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents have similar knowledge of NCLB's requirements?

3. What level of importance do public school educators perceive for the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

4. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents share similar perceptions of the importance of the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

5. What level of importance do public school educators perceive for selected professional practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in the public school setting?

6. Do teachers, principals, and superintendents do similar things with their respective knowledge of NCLB and understanding of CRT?

The data presented in this chapter were collected from a research instrument administered to four groups of Minnesota Public School educators. The instrument was developed from an extensive review of NCLB and CRT. The format of the instrument was developed from the model in a previous study (Hyman, 1989). The instrument included four parts which included: Part I: Employment and demographic information; Part II: data with responses of the 3 groups of educators as to their perceived knowledge of NCLB; Part III: data that incorporates the responders perception as to how they incorporate what they know about NCLB into practice; and Part IV: data that addresses the respondents perceived knowledge of NCLB and how they deal with specific classroom situations.

Methodology.

The research population for this study included public school educators in the state of Minnesota. The public school educators were from school districts of various sizes and from traditional public schools, as well as non-traditional public schools (e.g., charter schools). Independent School District 709 was excluded from this study because the researcher is currently a sitting elected board member. The Superintendent of Independent School District 709 assisted the researcher by contacting some his colleagues and encouraging them to participate in the study should they be selected.

One-hundred (100) superintendents, 100 assistant superintendents, 100 principals, and 100 teachers were randomly selected to participate in the study.

A four-part research instrument was designed and developed for distribution to the 400 public school educators. Part I of the instrument sought employment and demographic information to 9 questions from superintendents, principals, and teachers.

Part II of the instrument sought responses from the public school educators to perceived knowledge of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB). Respondents were asked to rate their level of perceived knowledge on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest to 10 NCLB terms. The NCLB terms included the following:

1. Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)

2. Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO)

3. Academic Progress

4. Academic Achievement Gap

5. Annual Academic Assessments

6. Other Academic Indicators

7. Highly Qualified Teachers

8. Demographic Sub Groups

9. NCLB's Core Academic Subjects

10. Proficiency Level

Part III of the instrument asked respondents how they incorporate what they know about NCLB using the 10 terms from Part 1I, into practice. The public school educators were asked to rate the level of importance for incorporating these terms into practice on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest. The categories in this part of the instrument included the following:

Adequate Yearly Progress

g. __ Focus teaching on subjects that will be tested
h. __ Regular assessments to monitor students not making Adequate Yearly Progress
i. __ Develop an individual learning plan for students not making Adequate Yearly Progress
j. __ Technology programming that supports the standards
k. __ Planned extra time for reading, mathematics and writing for most needy students
l. __ Focus on state standards but allow for creativity to address individual student needs

Academic Progress

f. __Ensure that the most successful students stay on track
g. __ Assign the most talented teachers to successful students
h. __ Regular assessment to determine progress of those students not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)
i. __ Monitor academic performance of all students
j. __ Reading specialists and coaches hired as needed

Academic Achievement Gap

    f. __ Acknowledge the gap's existence due to economics and ability of some
        students
    g. __ Assign more qualified teachers to most needy students; utilize tutors and
        community
    h. __ Assign lower achieving students to a special teacher to address their needs
    i. __ Develop Individual Learning Plans for each student
    j. __ Recommend to parents of failing children an off-site tutoring center

Highly Qualified Teachers

    e. __ Teachers come to the district/classroom highly qualified
    f. __ Assure that staff development funds are available
    g. __ Teachers who teach core subjects meet requirements of NCLB
    h. __ Continue to provide staff training

Demographic Sub-Groups

    f. __ Treat all students equitably regardless of ethnicity, race, etc.
    g. __ Monitor academic performance of all students, get assistance for those
        students who are not meeting AYP
    h. __ Ensure that all children of color meet AYP
    i. __ Ensure that at least 80% of children of color meet AYP
    j. __ Ensure that 95% of all students and 95% of all sub-groups participate in
        testing in order for a school or district to meet AYP

        Part IV of the instrument sought to determine how the public school educators

handle various situations given the requirements of NCLB. The categories for this part

of the instrument included the following:

How are equal education opportunities created for all students?

    h. __ Ensure that all students receive the same curriculum
    i. __ Modify teaching in ways that will facilitate academic achievement of our
        most neediest students
    j. __ Incorporate lessons and activities that will help the most needy students
        develop positive attitudes about self and their respective culture
    k. __ Recognize, acknowledge and value individual cultural differences
    l. __ Improve school-to-home communications

m. __ Offer after-school programs with specific curriculum focus

n. __ Provide support for families in need so that they can help their children

How do you facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural and social-class groups?

g. __ Develop Individual Learning Plans for students performing below proficiency

h. __ Use content from a variety of cultural groups to illustrate key concepts and generalizations

i. __ Work with communities of color and others to create a school environment that is welcoming to all

j. __ Find creative ways to engage families of color in school environment

k. __ Recognize the relationship of education and culture (e.g., ways of communicating, values, traditions, how family is defined)

l. __ Ensure that all students receive the same curriculum

What approaches have you/your district taken to assure that teachers have the ability to work with students who are different from them?

g. __ Incorporate cultural competencies courses in staff development sessions that measure how individuals think and feel about cultural differences

h. __ Ensure that teachers have staff development time

i. __ Ensure that teachers have time to share best practices in their respective area and to talk about their experiences

j. __ Ensure that program materials reflect positive images of all people

k. __ Culturally relevant curriculum is integrated in all content areas

l. __ Invite guest speakers from various cultures and ethnic groups to talk about their lived experiences

What do you do when a racial incident occurs?

i. __ Contact the specialist hired to work with such issues

j. __ Call the parents and inform them

k. __ Use the incident as an educational opportunity to talk about racism, stereotypes, diversity, etc.

l. __ Have open and honest conversation about racism with students

m. __ Articulate a clear statement of expectation regarding racial incidents

n. __ Incorporate consequences for racial incidents in policy handbook

o. __ Respond to the incident quickly and fairly

p. __ Seek advice and support from parents and community

The survey was pilot tested by two employees of a Minnesota Independent School District.

Findings.

The findings in this study are presented in response to each of the 6 research questions. The Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) currently Predictive Analytics Software (PASW) for Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used. Significance was determined in this study at alpha = .05.

Question 1: What is the level of knowledge of public school educators regarding the requirements of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001?

This question was answered by examining the mean scores generated by respondents in each of the three public school education roles as they indicated their perceived level of knowledge of NCLB on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest. Mean scores obtained for superintendents were above 3.0 for all 10 items listed (Adequate Yearly Progress, Annual Measurable Objectives, Academic Progress, Academic Achievement Gap, Annual Academic Assessments, Other Academic Indicators, Highly Qualified Teachers, demographic Sub Groups, NCLB's Core Academic Subjects and Proficiency Level) which indicated a tendency toward a high level of perceived knowledge. Only two items (Annual Measurable Objectives and Other Academic Indicators) were below 4.0.

Mean scores for superintendents and principals for 8 out of the 10 components of NCLB were above 4.0; two components of NCLB (Annual Measurable Objectives and Other Academic Indicators) were below 4.0. Means scores for teachers for all 10

items were above 3.0 and none exceeded 3.85. The lowest means scores for teachers were for the same two items as for the superintendents and principals (Annual Measurable Objectives and Other Academic Indicators) indicating a lower level of knowledge for these two component categories of NCLB.

Question 2: Do teachers, principals, and superintendents have similar knowledge of NCLB's requirements?

This question was answered by determining if statistically significant differences existed among the mean scores of the three public education roles. Statistical significance difference was set at alpha = .05.

Statistically significant differences were found among the groups for seven out of the ten component categories of NCLB. For five of the seven categories where a statistically significant difference was found, superintendents reported a higher level of perceived knowledge than teachers and principals reporting a higher level of knowledge than teachers. For two of the seven components, the significant difference was between principals and teachers where principals reported a higher level of knowledge than teachers.

Question 3: What level of importance do public school educators perceive for the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

This question was answered by examining the mean scores generated by the three groups of public school educators for five component categories of NCLB, and a total of 25 professional practices.

Mean scores for superintendents were above 3.0 for all practices listed under component category 1, "Adequate Yearly Progress" and only one practice (technology programming that supports the standards) was below 3.9 indicating that superintendents perceived a high level of importance for practice in this components category of NCLB.

Mean scores of principals for practices in category 1 ranged from 4.59 to 3.76. Mean scores for teachers on importance of these practices ranged from 4.29 to 3.60.

Mean scores for superintendents and principals for the importance of practice in component category 2, "Academic Progress," were above 4.0 for every practice except "assign the most talented teacher to successful students." Mean scores were reported as follows: superintendents (3.0), principals 3.06 and teachers 2.24. All shared a common perception that this practice was of less importance.

Mean scores for each group of educators were above 3.0 for each professional practice in component category three, "Academic Achievement Gap" except for the practice "recommend to parents of failing children an off-site tutoring center." Responses from superintendents (2.43), principals (2.03), and teachers (2.66) on this item indicated clear agreement among all three groups of educators that this practice was far less important than other practices in this category.

Mean scores for superintendents and principals on the practices in Category 4, "Highly Qualified Teachers," were all above 4.0 indicating a high level of perceived importance for these practices. Mean scores for teachers on practices in this category were above 4.0 except for the practice "assure that staff development funds are available," indicating a tendency toward a lower level of importance for this item.

Mean scores for superintendents for category 4, "Demographic Sub Groups," were all above 4.0 indicating a high level of importance for the components of NCLB in terms of professional practices. Mean scores for principals for category 4 were all above 4.1 reporting a high level of importance for the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice. Mean scores for teachers in this category were all above 3.0 indicating a high level of importance.

Mean scores for superintendents for category 5, "Demographic Sub Groups," were above 4.0 indicating a high level of importance for the components of NCLB in terms of professional practices for this category. Mean scores for principals were above 4.0 except for one practice "ensure that at least 80% of children of color meet AYP," which reported a mean score of 3.91. Mean scores for teachers for this category were all above 3.0.

Question 4: Do teachers, principals, and superintendents share similar perceptions of the importance of the components of NCLB in terms of professional practice?

Statistically significant differences were found among the three groups of public school educators for 4 of the 6 professional practices in category 1, "Adequate Yearly Progress." Superintendents reported a significantly higher level of perceived importance for these three practices (regular assessments to monitor students not making adequate progress, develop an individual learning plan for students not making adequate yearly progress and planned extra time for reading, mathematics and writing for most needy

students) than teachers. Principals reported a significantly higher level of perceived importance for three practices than teachers.

Statistically significant differences in category 2, "Academic Progress." were found on two of the five practices in this category, "assign the most talented teachers to successful students," and "monitor academic performance for all students," with superintendents and principals reporting a significantly higher level of perceived importance than teachers.

No statistically significant differences were found among the three groups of public school educators in category 3, "Academic Achievement Gap."

Statistically significant differences for category 4, "Highly Qualified Teachers," were found among the groups for the practice "teachers who teach core subjects meet requirements of NCLB," with principals reporting a higher level of perceived importance than teachers.

Statistically significant differences were found among the three groups of public school educators in category 5, "Demographic Sub Groups," in two of the five practices in this category. Statistically significant differences were reported among the three groups for professional practices "ensure that at least 80% of the children of color meet AYP," and "ensure that 95% of all students and 95% of all sub groups participate in testing in order for a school or district to meet AYP," with superintendents and principals reporting a higher level of importance than teachers for both of these practices.

Question 5: What level of importance do public school educators perceive for selected professional practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of CRT in the public school setting?

This question was answered by examining the mean scores from the responses reported by the three public school educators with four categories and a total of 27 items within the four categories.

Mean scores for superintendents for category 1, "How are equal education opportunities created for all students?" were all above 4.0 indicating a high level of importance for selected professional practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of CRT.

Mean scores for principals in this category were also above 4.0 indicating a high level of importance. Mean scores for teachers for this category were also above 4.0 except for one professional practice "ensure that all students receive the same curriculum," which reported a mean score of 3.97.

Mean scores for both groups of administrators for five of the six practices in category 2, "How do you facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural and social-class groups?" were all above 3.0 indicating a high level of perceived importance for these professional practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of CRT in the public school setting.

All 3 groups of public school educators reported mean scores of 3.5 or above for all practices identified listed in category 3, "what approaches have you/your district

taken to assure that teachers have the ability to work with students who are different from them."

Category four asked the public school educators what they would do when a racial incident occurred. Superintendents and principals reported mean scores above 4.0 for professional practice "call the parents and inform them, while teachers reported a mean score of 3.93 indicated a lower level of perceived importance. Principals indicated a higher level of importance than teachers for "incorporate consequences for racial incidents in policy handbook." Principals reported a mean score of 4.71 and teachers reported a mean score of 4.0.

Question 6: Do teachers, principals, and superintendents share similar perceptions of selected professional practices that reflect an integration of NCLB and CRT?

This question was answered by determining if statistically significant differences existed among the mean scores of all three groups for four categories with a total of 27 items.

No statistically significant differences were reported among the three groups of public school educators for any of the practices in category 1, "how are equal education opportunities created for all students?"

No statistically significant differences were reported among the three groups of public school educators for any of the practices in category 2, "how do you facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural and social-class

groups?" No significant differences existed between the groups for any of the practices identified with category three.

Statistical significant differences were reported in category 4, "what do you do when a racial incident occurs." Both groups of administrators indicated they were significantly more likely than teachers to "call the parents and inform them." Principals also reported a significantly greater likelihood than teachers to "incorporate consequences for racial incidents in policy handbook."

Discussion.

Careful reflection on the results of this study has prompted several additional important questions. A critical need exists to further examine this issue from other perspectives. Acknowledging the perspectives and understanding that public school educators hold for key components of NCLB, it is not clear how or if they would integrate professional practice, incorporating elements of CRT in the public school setting so as to close the academic achievement gap. This section of the study will address some of those unanswered questions and the rationale for future study.

The survey instrument did not provide respondent educators the opportunity to identify location of schools,(i.e., urban or rural); enrollment percentage of students of color; the number and percentage of students on free and/or reduced lunch; or ethnicity/race of the public school educators who responded to the survey. This raises the question as to whether responses based on knowledge or perception of knowledge would be different if coming from an African-American, Native American or another ethnic group. One must also take into consideration the location of the district, the

ethnic make-up of the student population and the number of students on free and/or reduced lunch. Do public school educators who are African-Americans or identify themselves as Native American or Latino have a different perception of their understanding of NCLB than public school educators who are White? Does location of the school influence knowledge or perception of knowledge and what is done with that knowledge? Are African-American or other public school educators more inclined to incorporate culture into the curriculum, and would members from these ethnic groups handle racial situations in the classrooms differently from their White colleagues. Would a public school teacher from an African-American or other ethnic background feel comfortable contacting a parent if a racial incident occurred, bypassing an internal policy that suggest that a principal or superintendent make the call?

Asking the three groups of public school educators to rank their perceived knowledge on ten components of NCLB, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being of the highest level of knowledge, begs the question what is 'real' knowledge compared to 'perceived' knowledge. It is often said that one's perception is their reality. Given this, how was this knowledge obtained, and what exactly are these public school educators doing with that knowledge to help educate all children and close the academic achievement gap? Does a White public school educator feel more comfortable rating their perceived knowledge high because they are part of the culture that identifies what knowledge is?

Significant differences between superintendents and teachers on seven out of the 10 key components of NCLB were identified. A significant difference was also reported

between principals and teachers on the same components of NCLB. Since teachers are responsible for implementing federal legislation into practice, why would teachers report their perceived knowledge lower than the public school administrators. Should teachers perceive their level of understanding at a level comparable to superintendents and principals and what does this say in terms of their ability to teach? Do superintendents and principals perceive their knowledge as higher because they are responsible for NCLB in terms of administration and consequences for the failure of a school to achieve adequate yearly progress?

When asked how professional practices associated with CRT are incorporated with components of NCLB to improve academic performance, or the professional practice "develop an individual learning plan for students not making adequate yearly progress," teachers reported a mean score of less than 3.60, indicating a lower level of importance. Superintendents and principals reported mean scores of 4.19 and 4.06 respectively. Why would teachers not perceive this to be of a higher level of importance since they are the ones who are interacting with the students on a day-to-day basis and should be aware of those students who demonstrate a need for an alternative form of education? Likewise, superintendents and principals perceived the professional practice "regular assessments to monitor students not making adequate yearly progress" at a high level of importance with mean scores above 4.0 while teachers again, reported a mean score of less than 4.0 indicating a lower level of perceived importance. These data suggest that a study allowing for a rich discussion with superintendents, principals and

teachers regarding responses to the importance of these professional practices is warranted.

When asked to rate the level of importance on other professional practices, superintendents and principals reported mean scores of 4.0 and above for most practices. If they are rating these professional practices as important, why does the achievement gap still exist? Are superintendents and principals requiring these professional practices be implemented in their schools, and if not, why? If they are requiring these professional practices that they perceive to be of high importance to be implemented in their schools, why do teachers perceive their level of importance to be on a significantly lower?

Why do the three groups of public school educators perceive the professional practice of "ensuring that all students receive the same curriculum" to be highly important? Consistent and equal treatment of all students does not insure that children are treated equitably, that a child's individual educational needs are taken into account What remedies have been put in place to redress historic injustices that have prevented or diminished access to many? Why do all three groups of public school educators perceive the professional practice "offer off-site tutoring centers for students not making adequate yearly progress to be of lower importance? Superintendents reported mean scores of 2.43, principals, 2.03 and teachers 2.66. Providing this option to students enrolled in schools that are not making adequate yearly progress is a requirement under NCLB. Does the fact that funds to provide these services come directly from the district's general fund impact how the educators view this professional

practice? How do funding limitations affect educational priorities in response to unfunded federal mandates?

When asked "what approaches have you/your district taken to assure that teachers have the ability to work with students who are different from you," superintendents reported a mean score of 4.13 for the professional practice "culturally relevant curriculum is integrated in all content areas, and principals reported a mean score of 4.18. Teachers who are in contact with the students every day, reported a significantly lower mean score (3.71) indicating a lower level of perceived importance for this professional practice. Why is the gap between administrators and teachers on this practice so great?

When asked "what do you do when a racial incident occurs?" superintendents and principals reported mean scores above 4.0 for the professional practice "call the parents and inform them while teachers reported a mean score less than 4.0 indicating a lower level of importance for this practice. Does district policy dictate who contacts the parent(s) in such situations? Is such policy consistent across districts in the state of Minnesota? Why do superintendents and principals perceive the practice "use the incident as an educational opportunity to talk about racism, stereotypes, diversity, etc. when a racial incident occurs as having a high level of importance, each group reported mean scores above 4.4, while teachers reported a mean score of 3.93 indicating a lower level of importance? CRT informs us that if children exhibit racist behavior it should immediately be addressed in the school setting.

Finally, potential differences between perceptions of importance for professional practice for all groups of educators and their actual utilization of these practices were not determined and should be examined.

Based on this discussion, the following section provides recommendations for future study.

Conclusion and recommendations for future consideration.

This study examined the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act through a comprehensive review of Critical Race Theory (CRT). The ultimate goal of NCLB is closing the achievement gap (Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003; Thomas & Brady, 2005).

CRT has sought to create equal educational opportunities for all children. According to CRT one way to ensure that all students perform at a proficiency level or higher is for school and educators to commit to developing curriculum and programs that acknowledge the multiple strengths that each child brings into the classroom. CRT further asserts that race and culture do matter and both are important components to be considered when educating students of color (Thernstrom & Thernstrom, 2003).

The three groups of public school educators identified knowledge of NCLB as well as components of CRT in responding to the questions on the survey instrument. The three groups of educators also identified the level of importance for components of NCLB in terms of professional practice and the level of importance they perceived for professional practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of CRT. The following represent conclusions of this study:

1. The results of the study support conclusions that all three groups of public school educators possess a reasonably strong knowledge of components of NCLB.

2. The results of the study support the conclusion that school administrators have a significantly higher level of knowledge for seven of the 10 component categories of NCLB.

3. The results of the study support the conclusion that all three groups of educators perceive a high level of importance for professional practices in components of NCLB.

4. The results of the study support conclusions that superintendents and principals shared similar perception of the level of importance for the professional practice associated with components of NCLB.

5. The results of the study support the conclusion that both groups of administrators perceived significantly greater importance for nine of the 25 professional practices associated with the five component categories of NCLB examined in the study.

6. The results of the study support conclusions that little variation exists among the three groups of public school educators in their perceived level of importance for selected professional practices that reflect an integration of components of NCLB with aspects of CRT in the public school setting.

7. The results of the study support the conclusion that both groups of administrators were significantly more likely to call parents and inform them

about a racial incident occurrence and principals were more likely than teachers to incorporate consequences for racial incidents in a policy handbook.

The results of this study raised a number of issues and questions which merit additional consideration and further study. The researcher supports further study in the following areas.

1. A mixed method study should be conducted to obtain additional information about individual ratings for perceived knowledge of NCLB, i.e., why do superintendents perceive they have more knowledge of NCLB than principals and teachers?

2. How do the three groups of public educators measure their perceived knowledge of NCLB?

3. How much knowledge and or understanding do the three groups of educators have of CRT?

4. Has academic performance among students of color, specifically African-American/Black students increased in schools where educators have a level of knowledge of NCLB and integrate components of CRT into practice at their respective sites?

5. What do students say about level of understanding of their teachers, principals and superintendents in terms of their knowledge of NCLB and integration of CRT in the public school settings?

References

Abernathy, S. F. (2006, Spring). Evaluating the impact of No Child Left Behind in Minnesota. *CURA Reporter, 36*(1), 17–24.

Alway, J. (1995). *Critical theory and political possibilities: Conceptions of emancipator politics in the works of Horkheimer, Adorno, Marcuse, and Habermas.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press. Retrieved from: Questia Media America, Inc., http://www.questia.com/PM.qst?a=o&d=15073188#.

Anderson, L. W. (2005). The No Child Left Behind Act and the legacy of federal aid to education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, *13*(24). Retrieved from: http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/129.

Apple, M. W. (1990). *Ideology and curriculum* (2nd ed.)*.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Ares, N., & Buendia, E. (2007). Opportunities lost: Local translations of advocacy policy conversations. *Teachers College Record, 109*(3), 561–589.

Asante, M. K. (2003). *Erasing racism: The survival of the American nation*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.

Asante, M. K. (2007). *An Afrocentric manifesto: Toward an African renaissance*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.

Banks, J. A. (1994). Transforming the mainstream curriculum. *Educational Leadership*, *51*(8), 4-8. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/may94/vol51/num08/Transforming-the-Mainstream-Curriculum.aspx.

Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural education: Historical development, dimensions, and practice. In J.A. Banks (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (pp. 3-24). New York: MacMillan.

Banks, J. A. (1995). Multicultural Education: Its Effects on Students' Racial and Gender Role Attitudes. In J. A. Banks & C. A. M. Banks (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (pp. 617-627). New York: Macmillan.

Bell, D. (1987). *And we are not saved: The exclusive quest for racial justice*. New York: Basic Books.

Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York, NY: Perseus Books Group.

Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bonilla-Silva, E. (1997). Rethinking racism: Toward a structural interpretation. *American Sociological Review, 62*(3), 465-480. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2657316

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J. C. (1977). *Reproduction in education, society and culture*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

Bowles, S. & Gintis, H. (1976). *Schooling in capitalist America: Educational reform and the contradictions of economic life*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Brown v. Board of Education. (2004). Brown Foundation for Educational Equity, Excellence and Research. Retrieved from http://brownvboard.org/Summary/index.php.

Center for Education Reform. (1998). *Fifteen years after A Nation at Risk Summit*.

   Retrieved from http://www.edreform.com/_upload/still-at-risk.pdf

Cleary, L. M., & Peacock, T. D. (1998). *Collected wisdom: American Indian education*.

   Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Coleman, J. S. (1967). The concept of equality of educational opportunity. *Equality of

   Educational Opportunity*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Coleman, J. S. (1976). Coleman on Jackson on Coleman. *Educational Researcher*, *5*(2),

   3-4. American Educational Research Association. Retrieved from

    http://www.jstor.org/stable/1174276.

Comeaux, E., & Jayakumar, U. M. (2007). Education in the United States: Is it a Black

   problem? *The Urban Review, 39*(1), 93-104.

Crenshaw, K. (1993). Beyond racism and misogyny: Black feminism and 2 Live Crew.

   In Matsuda et al. (Eds.), Words that wound (pp.111-132). Boulder: Westview.

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods

   approaches* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five

   traditions*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Delgado, R. (1988). Critical legal studies and the realities of race-Does the fundamental

   contradiction have a corollary? *Harvard Civil Right: Civil Liberties Law

   Review*, 23, 407-413.

Delgado, R. (1990). When a story is just a story: Does voice really matter? *Virginia

   Law Review*, 76, 95-111.

Delgado, R., & Stefanic, J. (2001). *Critical race theory: An introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.

Deliso, E. R. (2006). Educational Reform. *Education World.* Retrieved from www.education-world.com.

DePascle, C. A. (2009). Formative reform: Purposeful planning for the next generation of assessment and accountability system. *Center for Assessment* (NCIEA). Retrieved from http://www.nciea.org/publications/RILS_FormativeReform_CD09.pdf.

Elmore, R. F., & Fuhrman, S. (1990). The national interest and the federal role in education. *Publius*, *20*(3), 149-162. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3330220.

Fairman, C. (1949). Does the Fourteenth Amendment incorporate the Bill of Rights? The original understanding. *Stanford Law Review*, *2*(1), 5-139. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1226431.

Field, P. A., & Morse, J. M. (1992). Nursing research. The application of qualitative approaches. London: Chapman & Hall.

Friedman, T. L. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

Gibson, M. A. (1984). Approaches to multicultural education in the United States: Some concepts and assumptions. *Anthropology & Education Quarterly*, *15*(1), 94-120. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3216446.

Giroux, H. A. (1994). Insurgent multiculturalism and the promise of pedagogy. In

Multiculturalism: A critical reader (pp. 325–343). Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Grande, S. (2004). *Red pedagogy: Native American social and political thought*.

Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Hanushek, E. A., & Rivkin, S. G. (2008). Harming the best: How schools affect the

Black-white achievement gap. *National Bureau of Economic Research*.

Retrieved from http://www.nber.org/papers/w14211.

Harris, D. N. (2006). Lost learning, forgotten promises: A national analysis of school

racial segregation, student achievement, and controlled choice plans. *Center for

American Progress.* Retrieved from

http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2006/11/pdf/lostlearning.pdf.

Henry, P. J., & Sears, D. O., (2002). The symbolic racism 2000 scale. *Political

Psychology*, *23*(2), 253-283. Retrieved from

http://www.jstor.org/stable/3792290.

Holton, G. (1984). A Nation at Risk revisited. *Daedalus*, *113*(4), 1-27. Values,

Resources, and Politics in America's schools (Fall, 1984), pp. 1-27. Retrieved

from http://www.jstor.org/stable/20024940.

House, E. R. (1999). Race and policy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives, 7*(16), 76–

97. Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/551/674.

Hurwitz, J., & Peffley, M. (1998). *Perceptions and prejudice: Race and politics in the

United States*. Grand Rapids, MI: Yale University Press.

Hyman, R. E. (1983). An assessment of student affairs preparation programs in relation to professional competencies. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation).

Jennings, M. E., & Lynn, M. (2005). The house that race built: Critical pedagogy, African-American education, and the re-conceptualization of critical race pedagogy. *Educational Foundations, 19*(3-4), 15-32.

King, K. L., Houston, I. S., & Middleton, R. A. (2001). An explanation for school failure: Moving beyond Black inferiority and alienation as a policy-making agenda. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 49*(4), 428-445. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3122363.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York, NY: Crown.

Lacewell, M. V. Harris (2003). The heart of the politics of race: Centering Black people in the study of White racial attitudes. *Journal of Black Studies, 34*(2), 222-249. doi:10.1177/0021934703255596.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). The evolving role of critical race theory in educational scholarship. *Race Ethnicity and Education, 8*(1), 115-119. doi: 10.1080/136133205200034102.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate IV, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record, 97*(1), 47-68. Retrieved from

http://www.hs.iastate.edu/wp-

content/uploads/2011/01/Toward_a_Critical_Race_Theory_of_Education.pdf.

LaNoue, G. R., & Sullivan, J. C. (1995). Race neutral programs in public contracting.

Public Administrative Review, *55*(4), 348-356. Retrieved from

http://www.jstor.org/stable/977126.

Lichter, D. T. (1997). Poverty and inequality among children. *Annual Review of*

Sociology, *23*, 121-145. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/2952546.

Lintner, T. (2004). The savage and the slave: Critical Race Theory, racial stereotyping,

and the teaching of American History. *Journal of Social Studies Research*,

Retrieved from

http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa3823/is_200404/ai_n9406043/.

Lopez, G. R. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory

perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 39*(1), 68–94.

Manna, P. (2006). Control, persuasion, and educational accountability: Implementing

the No Child Left Behind Act. *Educational Policy*, *20*(3), 471-494.

doi:10.1177/0895904805284055.

Margano, R. J., Waters, T., & McNulty, B. A. (2005). *School leadership that works:*

From research to results. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Educational

and Learning (McREL).

Matsuda, M. J., Lawrence III, C. R., Delgado, R., & Crenshaw, K.W. (1993). *Words*

that wound: Critical Race Theory, assaultive speech, and the first amendment.

Boulder: Westview Press.

McAllister, J. & Irvine, J. (2000). Cross cultural competency and multicultural teacher education. *Review of Educational Research, 70*(1), 3-24. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1170592.

McCarthy, C. (1991). Multicultural approaches to racial inequality in the United States. *Oxford Review of Education, 17*(3), 301-316. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/4618595.

McClure, P. (2005). Where standards come from. *Theory into Practice, 44*(1), 4-10.

Meier, D. (2002). *In schools we trust: Creating communities of learning in an era of testing and standardization.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Milner, H. R., IV. (2007). African American males in urban schools: No excuses – Teach and empower. *Theory into Practice, 46*(3), 239-246.

Minnesota Department of Education. (2009). Functional requirements for the 2009 No Child Left Behind Adequate Yearly Progress Calculations. Roseville, MN: Author.

Monette, D. R., Sullivan, T. J., & DeJong, R. (2008/2005). *Applied social research: A tool for the human services* (7th ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson Books/Cole.

Morris, J. E. (1997). Voluntary desegregation in St. Louis, Missouri: Impact on partnerships among schools, African American families and community. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.

Morris, J. E. (2001). Forgotten voices of Black educators: Critical race perspectives on the implementation of a desegregation plan. *Educational Policy, 15*, 575-600. doi:10.1177/0895904801015004004.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Odden, A. R. (1991). *Education policy implementation*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Olsen, L., Bhattacharya, J., & Scharf, A. (2006). *Cultural competency: What it is and why it matters.* Oakland, CA: California Tomorrow.

Orb, A., Eisenhauer, L., & Wynaden D. (2000). Ethics in qualitative research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship, 33*(1), 93-96. doi:10.1111/j.1547-5069.2001.00093.x.

Parker, L., Deyhle, D., & Villenas, S. (1999). *Race is…race isn't: Critical race theory and qualitative studies in education.* Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Parker, K. E., & Stebman, B. J. (1973). Legal education for Blacks. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 407*, 144-155. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1038760.

Plunkett, V. R. (1997). Focus on children's learning: The central purpose of improving America's Schools Act. *Journal of Education For Students Placed At Risk, 2*(3)*, 209-211.

Rothstein, R. (2009, Spring). What's wrong with accountability by the numbers?

    American Educator, 20-23. Retrieved from

    http://www.aft.org/pdfs/americaneducator/spring2009/ROTHSTEIN(2).pdf

Rothstein, R., Jacobsen, R., & Wilder, T. (2009, Spring). Grading education: Test-based

    accountability can't work, but testing plus careful school inspections can.

    American Educator, 24-32. Retrieved from

    http://www.aft.org/pdfs/americaneducator/spring2009/ROTHSTEIN(2).pdf

Schulz, B. D. (2005). Living savage inequalities: Room 405's fight for equity in

    schooling. *Journal of Educational Controversy, 2*(1). Retrieved from

    http://www.wce.wwu.edu/Resources/CEP/eJournal/v002n001/a001.shtml

Seidman, I. (1998). *Interviewing as qualitative research: A guide for researchers in*

    education and the social sciences. (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College

    Press.

Sniderman, P. M., Carmines, E. G., Layman, G. C., & Carter, M. (1996). Beyond race:

    Social justice as a race neutral idea. *American Journal of Political Science, 40*,

    33–55.

Sniderman, P. M., & Piazza, T. L. (1993). *The scar of race.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard

    University Press.

Snipes, V., & Waters, R. (2005). The mathematics education of African Americans in

    North Carolina from the Brown decision to No Child Left Behind. *The Negro*

    Educational Review, 56, 2(&3), 107-126

Spears, A. K. (1978). Institutionalized racism and the education of Blacks. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, *9*(2), 127-136. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3216194.

Spring, J. (1994/1997). Deculturalization and the struggle for equality: A brief history of the education of dominated cultures in the United States. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Stovall, D. (2006). Forging community in race and class: Critical race theory and the quest for social justice in education. *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 9*(3), 243–259.

Sunderman, G. L. (2006). *The unraveling of No Child Left Behind: How negotiated changes transform the law*. Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University. Retrieved from http://dwot.org/nclb_unravel.pdf

Sunderman, G. L., & Kim, J. (2004). *Increasing bureaucracy or increasing opportunities? School district experiences with supplemental education services.* Cambridge, MA: The Civil Rights Project at Harvard University. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED489173.pdf.

Tate, IV, W. F. (1997). Critical race theory and education: History, theory and implications. *Review of Research in Education*, *22*, 195-247. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/1167376.

Thernstrom, A., & Thernstrom, S. (2003). *No excuses: Closing the racial gap in learning*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Thomas, J. Y., & Brady, K.P. (2005). Elementary and Secondary Education Act at 40: Equity, accountability, and the evolving federal role in public education. *Review of Research in Education, 29,* pp 51-67. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3568119.

Thompson, G. L. (2007). *Up where we belong: Helping African American and Latino students rise in school and life*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

U.S. Department of Education. (1998). Goals 2000: Reforming education to improve student achievement. Retrieved from http://www2.ed.gov/PDFDocs/g2kfinal.pdf.

U.S. Department of Education. (2006). High school students show no progress in reading, according to the Nation's Report Card. Retrieved from http://www.nagb.org/newsroom/PressReleasePDFs/Math%20and%20Reading%2012th%20Grade%202005-News%20Release.pdf

U.S. Department of Education (2008). NCLB and other Elementary/Secondary Education Policy Documents.

Viadero, D. (2009). Book probes scoring gaps tied to race. *Education Week, 28*(20), 10–11.

Williams, B. T. (2004). Ethical leadership in schools servicing African American children and youth. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 24,* 38–47.

Williams, P. J. (1991). *Being the object of property (a gift of intelligent rage): The alchemy of race and rights*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

York-Barr, J., & Duke, K. (2004). What do we know about teacher leadership? Findings

    from two decades of scholarship. *Review of Educational Research*, *74*(3), 255-

    316. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/3516026

Yosso, T. J. (2005). Whose culture has capital: A critical race theory discussion of

    community and cultural wealth? *Race, Ethnicity and Education, 8*(1), 69–91.

Appendix A

E-Mail Introduction to Participants Regarding the Study

No Child Left Behind: A Review from a Critical Race Theory Lens

You are invited to be in a research study of the No Child Left Behind
Act of 2001, a review from a Critical Race Theory Lens. You were
selected as a possible participant because you have been identified as
a Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent, Principal or Teacher
in a public school within the state of Minnesota.

This study is being conducted by Mary L. Cameron, a doctoral candidate
at the University of Minnesota.

If you agree to participate in this study, I ask that you complete the
survey located at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/BBVQVMB

The return of the completed survey implies your consent.

The study has minimal risk, if any.

There is no compensation for participation in this research.

The records of this study will be kept private. In any sort of report we
might publish, we will not include any information that will make it
possible to identify a subject. Research records will be stored securely
and only the researcher will have access to the records.

Participation is voluntary. If you decide to participate, your are free
to not answer any question or withdraw.

The researcher conducting this study is Mary L. Cameron, you may contact
me at mcameron@d.umn.edu or at 218-341-8893.

Thank you for your interest and participation in this study.
--
Mary L. Cameron

Appendix B

Research Instrument

Mary Cameron August 2010

1. Default Section

The purpose of this study is to examine the extent to which components of Critical Race Theory (CRT) guide practice in the public school setting regarding requirements of No Child Left Behind (NLCB) Act of 2001.

For the purpose of this study the following terms have been defined:

No Child Left Behind - is the 2002 legislative update of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, specifically designed to hold schools and teachers accountable for student performance.

Adequate Yearly Progress - as defined by the federal No Child Left Behind Act obligates the United States Department of Education to determine how every public school and school district in the country is performing academically according to results on standardized tests.

Components of Critical Race Theory - proponents of CRT argue that the work we do in education must move toward eliminating the influence of racism, sexism, and poverty to bring about equality. Multicultural education seeks to create equal educational opportunities for all students. Cultural competency requires teachers to demonstrate their ability to work effectively across cultures.

Racial Incidents - any incident that is perceived to be racist by the victim or any other person. These include unwanted actions by a person or group of people directed at people of different ethnic origin which cause humiliation, offence or distress or interfere with their performance or creates an unpleasant learning environment.

| Next |

Mary Cameron August 2010

2. Part I: EMPLOYMENT AND DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Answer items 1 through 5 by CIRCLING THE LETTER(S) of the most appropriate response.
For items 6 through 9, please respond accordingly.

1. Your Gender

   Female

   Male

2. Your educational role in the school

	Superintendent	Assistant Superintendent	School Principal	Teacher
Select from the drop-down menu				

3. Grade configuration of your school

   K-5   K-6   Other

   6-8   7-9

   9-12   10-12

4. Average number of students per classroom for your school(s)

   Under 20   24-26   over 30

   21-23   27-30

5. What is your school district size?

   Less than 5,000

   5,001-10,000

   More than 10,000

6. How many years have you worked as a Teacher?

[   ]

7. How many years have you worked as a Principal?

[   ]

8. How many years have you worked as an Assistant Superintendent?

[   ]

9. How many years have you worked as a Superintendent?

[   ]

Prev   Next

Powered by **SurveyMonkey**
Create your own free online survey now!

Mary Cameron August 2010

3. Part II

Your responses to this part of the study will be based on your knowledge of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001, (the 2002 legislative update of The Elementary and Secondary Education Act), specifically designed to hold schools and teachers accountable for student performance.

1. On a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being the highest, rate your perceived knowledge level for each of the items below that specifically relate to NCLB.

	1	2	3	4	5
Adequate Yearly Progress					
Annual Measuarble Objectives (AMO)					
Academic Progress					
Academic Achievement Gap					
Annual Academic Assessments					
Other Academic Indicators					
Highly Qualified Teachers					
Demographic Sub Groups					
NCLB's Core Academic Subjects					
Proficiency Level					

Prev   Next

125

Mary Cameron August 2010

4. Part III

Your responses to this section will be based on how you incorporate what you know about NCLB into practice. Please rate each of the items below in terms of importance using a scale of 1 being of no importance to 5 being of high importance.

1. Adequate Yearly Progress

	1	2	3	4	5
Focus teaching on subjects that will be tested					
Regular assessments to monitor students not making adequate yearly progress					
Develop an individual learning plan for students not making adequate yearly progress					
Technology programming that supports the standards					
Planned extra time for reading, mathematics and writing for most needy students					
Focus on state standards but allow for creativity to address individual student needs					

2. Academic Progress

	1	2	3	4	5
Ensure that the most successful students stay on track					
Assign the most talented teachers to successful students					
Regular assessment to determine progress of those students not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP)					
Monitor academic performance of all students					
Reading specialists and coaches hired as needed					

3. Academic Achievement Gap

	1	2	3	4	5
Acknowledge the gap's existence due to economics and ability of some students					
Assign more qualified teachers to most needy students; utilize tutors and community					
Assign lower achieving students to a special teacher to address their needs					
Develop Individual Learning Plans for each student					
Recommend to parents of failing children an off-site tutoring center					

4. Highly Qualified Teachers

	1	2	3	4	5
Teachers come to the district/classroom highly qualified					
Assure that staff development funds are available					
Teachers who teach core subjects meet requirements of NCLB					
Continue to provide staff training					

5. Demographic Sub Groups

	1	2	3	4	5
Treat all students equitably regardless of ethnicity, race, etc.					
Monitor academic performance of all students, get assistance for those students who are not meeting AYP					
Ensure that all children of color meet AYP					
Ensure that at least 80% of children of color meet AYP					
Ensure that 95% of all students and 95% of all sub groups participate in testing in order for a school or district to meet AYP					

[Prev]   [Next]

Mary Cameron August 2010

5. Part IV

Given the requirements of NCLB, this section seeks to determine how you handle various situations. Please identify the items below that you apply and rate each using a scale of 1 being of no importance to 5 being of high importance.

1. How are equal education opportunities created for all students?
1 being of no importance to 5 being of high importance.

	1	2	3	4	5
Ensure that all students receive the same curriculum					
Modify teaching in ways that will facilitate academic achievement of our most neediest students					
Incorporate lessons and activities that will help the most needy students develop positive attitudes about self and their respective culture					
Recognize, acknowledge and value individual cultural differences					
Improve school to home communications					
Offer after school programs with specific curriculum focus					
Provide support for families in need so that they can help their children					

2. How do you facilitate the academic achievement of students from diverse racial, cultural and social-class groups?
1 being of no importance to 5 being of high importance.

	1	2	3	4	5
Develop Individual Learning Plans for students performing below proficiency					
Use content from a variety of cultural groups to illustrate key concepts and generalizations					
Work with communities of color and others to create a school environment that is welcoming to all					
Find creative ways to engage families of color in school environment					
Recognize the relationship of education and culture (ways of communicating, values, traditions, how family is defined)					
Ensure that all students receive the same curriculum					

3. What approaches have you/your district taken to assure that teachers have the ability to work with students who are different from them?

1 being of no importance to 5 being of high importance

	1	2	3	4	5
Incorporate cultural competencies courses in staff development sessions that measure how individuals think and feel about cultural differences					
Ensure that teachers have staff development time					
Ensure that teachers have time to share best practices in their respective area and to talk about their experiences					
Ensure that program materials reflect positive images of all people					
Culturally relevant curriculum is integrated in all content areas					
Invite guest speakers from various cultures and ethnic groups to talk about their lived experiences					

4. What do you do when a racial incident occurs?

1 being of no importance to 5 being of high importance

	1	2	3	4	5
Contact the specialist hired to work with such issues					
Call the parents and inform them					
Use the incident as an educational opportunity to talk about racism, stereotypes, diversity					
Have open and honest conversation about racism with students					
Articulate a clear statement of expectation regarding racial incidents					
Incorporate consequences for racial incidents in policy handbook					
Respond to the incident quickly and fairly					
Seek advice and support from parents and community					

[Prev]   [Done]

Powered by **SurveyMonkey**
Create your own free online survey now!