


Impact Factor: **4.9**

5-Year Impact Factor:

By clicking “Accept Non-Essential Cookies”, you agree to the storing of cookies on your device to enhance site navigation, analyze site usage, and assist in our marketing efforts. [Privacy Policy](#) [Cookie Policy](#)

[Manage Cookies](#)[Accept Non-Essential Cookies](#)[Reject Non-Essential Cookies](#) Contents More

## Abstract

Forty-two states and the District of Columbia have approved school accountability requirements under the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act in the near two decades since the law's passage. Drawing on a four-page review of the literature, this article critiques the approved waiver accountability plans, comparing them to the NCLB accountability rules. We find a mixed bag—some states have made large improvements and others have not. Overall we conclude that states missed opportunities to design more effective school accountability systems that might minimize negative unintended consequences of these policies. The article concludes with suggestions for state and federal policy in light of the available literature.



## Get full access to this article

View all access and purchase options for this article.

[Get Access](#) 

## References

Acemoglu D., Kremer M., Mian A. (2008). Incentives in markets, firms, and governments. *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 24(2), 273–306.

[Crossref](#)[Google Scholar](#)

American Education Research Association, American Psychological Association, and National Council on Measurement in Education. (1999). *Standards for educational and psychological testing*. Washington,

DC: Author.

[Google Scholar](#)

Baker E. L., Linn R. L. (2004). Validity issues for accountability systems. In Fuhrman S. H., Elmore R. F. (Eds.), *Redesigning accountability* (pp. 47–72). New York: Teachers College Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Balfanz R., Legters N., West T. C., Weber L. M. (2007). Are NCLB's measures, incentives, and improvement strategies the right ones for the nation's low-performing high schools? *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(3), 559–593.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Barlevy G., Neal D. (2011). Pay for percentile. *American Economic Review*, 102(5), 1805–1831.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Betebenner D. W. (2011). *A technical overview of the student growth percentile methodology: Student growth percentiles and percentile growth trajectories/projections*. The National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment. Retrieved from [http://www.nj.gov/education/njsmart/performance/SGP\\_Technical\\_Overview.pdf](http://www.nj.gov/education/njsmart/performance/SGP_Technical_Overview.pdf)

[Google Scholar](#)

Booher-Jennings J. (2005). Below the bubble: “Educational triage” and the Texas accountability system. *American Educational Research Journal*, 42(2), 231–268.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Camilli G. (2006). Test fairness. In Brennan R. L. (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (4th ed., pp. 221–256). Westport, CT: American Council on Education/Praeger.

[Google Scholar](#)

Charbonneau É, Van Ryzin G. G. (2011). Performance measures and parental satisfaction with New York City schools. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 42(1), 54–65.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Chingos M. M. (2012). *Strength in numbers: State spending on K-12 assessment systems*. Washington, DC: Brown Center on Education Policy, Brookings Institution.

[Google Scholar](#)

Clotfelter C. T., Ladd H. F. (1996). Recognizing and rewarding success in public schools. In Ladd H. F. (Ed.), *Holding schools accountable: Performance-based reform in education* (pp. 23–64). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

[Google Scholar](#)

Crocker L., Aligna J. (2006). *Introduction to classical and modern test theory*. Independence, KY: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

[Google Scholar](#)

Cronbach L. J., Meehl P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, 52, 281–302.

[Crossref](#)

[PubMed](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Davidson E., Reback R., Rockoff J. E., Schwartz H. L. (2013). Fifty ways to leave a child behind: Idiosyncrasies and discrepancies in states' implementation of NCLB (NBER Working Paper No. 18988). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

[Google Scholar](#)

Dee T., Jacob B., Schwartz N. L. (2013). The effects of NCLB on school resources and practices. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 35(2), 252–279.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Domaleski C., Perie M. (2013). *Promoting equity in state education accountability systems*. Dover, NH: National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment.

[Google Scholar](#)

Ehlert M., Koedel C., Parsons E., Podgursky M. (2013). *Selecting growth measures for school and teacher evaluations* (Department of Economics Working Paper Series, WP 12–10). Columbia: University of Missouri.

[Google Scholar](#)

Figlio D. N., Ladd H. F. (2007). School accountability and student achievement. In Ladd H. F., Fiske E. (Eds.), *Handbook of research in education finance and policy* (pp. 166–182). New York: Routledge.

[Google Scholar](#)

Figlio D. N., Loeb S. (2011). School accountability. In Hanushek E. A., Machin S. J., Woessmann L. (Eds.), *Handbooks in economics: Economics of education* (Vol. 3, pp. 383–421). North-Holland, the Netherlands:

Elsevier.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Goldhaber D., Hansen M. (2012). Is it just a bad class? Assessing the long-term stability of estimated teacher performance. *Economica*, 80(319), 589–612.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Hanushek E. A., Raymond M. A. (2005). Does school accountability lead to improved student performance? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 24(2), 297–327.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Heck R. H. (2006). Assessing school achievement progress: Comparing alternative approaches. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(5), 667–699.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Hernández R. A. (2013). *Maintaining a focus on subgroups in an era of Elementary and Secondary Education Act waivers*. Washington, DC: Campaign for High School Equity.

[Google Scholar](#)

Ho A. D. (2008). The problem with “proficiency”: Limitations of statistics and policy Under No Child Left Behind. *Educational Researcher*, 37(6), 351–360.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Holmstrom B., Costa J. R. (1986). Managerial incentives and capital management. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 101(4), 835–860.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Jacobsen R., Snyder J. W., Saultz A. (2012). When accountability strategies collide: Do policy changes that raise accountability standards also erode public satisfaction. *Educational Policy*, 27(2), 360–389.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Kane T. J., Staiger D. O. (2002). The promise and pitfalls of using imprecise school accountability measures. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 16(4), 91–114.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Kremer M., Sarychev A. (2000). *Why do governments operate schools* (Harvard Working Paper). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

[Google Scholar](#)

Krieg J. M., Storer P. (2006). How much do students matter? Applying the Oaxaca Decomposition to explain determinants of Adequate Yearly Progress. *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 24(4), 563–581.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Linn R. L. (2000). Assessments and accountability. *Educational Researcher*, 29(2), 4–16.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Linn R. L. (2004). Accountability models. In Fuhrman S. H., Elmore R. F. (Eds.), *Redesigning accountability systems for education* (pp. 245–273). New York: Teachers College Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Linn R. L., Haug C. (2002). Stability of school-building accountability scores and gains. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 24(1), 29–36.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

McCaffrey D. F., Sass T., Lockwood J. R., Mihaly K. (2009). The intertemporal variability of teacher effect estimates. *Education Finance and Policy*, 4(4), 572–606.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

McEachin A., Polikoff M. S. (2012). We are the 5%: Which schools would be held accountable under a proposed revision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act? *Educational Researcher*, 41(7), 243–251.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

McNeil M. (August 29, 2012). *Virginia and U.S. Ed. Dept. agree to NCLB waiver do over* [blog post]. Retrieved from [http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2012/08/this\\_is\\_not\\_what.html](http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/campaign-k-12/2012/08/this_is_not_what.html)

[Google Scholar](#)

Milgrom P. (1988). Employment contracts, influence activities, and efficient organization design. *Journal of Political Economy*, 96(1), 42–60.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Milgrom P., Roberts J. (1988). An economic approach to influence activities in organizations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, S154-S179.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

National Center for Education Statistics. (2007). *Mapping 2005 state proficiency standards onto the NAEP scales*. Washington, DC: Author.

[Google Scholar](#)

Neal D., Schanzenbach D. W. (2010). Left behind by design: Proficiency counts and test-based accountability. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 92, 263–283.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Polikoff M. S., Wrabel S. L. (2013). When is 100% not 100%? The use of safe harbor to made Adequate Yearly Progress. *Education Finance and Policy*, 8(2), 251–270.

[Crossref](#)  
[Google Scholar](#)

Porter A. C., Linn R. L., Trimble C. S. (2005). The effects of state decisions about NCLB adequate yearly progress targets. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 24(4), 32–39.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Prendergast C. (1999). The provision of incentives in firms. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37(1), 7–63.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Reardon S. F., Raudenbush S. (2009). Assumptions of value-added models for estimating school effects. *Education Finance and Policy*, 4(4), 492–519.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Riddle W., Kober N. (2011). *State policy differences greatly impact AYP numbers*. Wasington, DC: Center on Education Policy.

[Google Scholar](#)

Rothstein R., Jacobsen R., Wilder T. (2008). *Grading education: Getting accountability right*. Washington, DC and New York: Economic Policy Institute and Teachers College Press.

[Google Scholar](#)

Shapiro C. (1983). Premiums for high quality products as returns to reputations. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 98(4), 659–679.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Sims D. P. (2013). Can failure succeed? Using racial subgroup rules to analyze the effect of school accountability failure on student performance. *Economics of Education Review*, 32, 262–274.

[Crossref](#)

[Web of Science](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Smith M. S., O'Day J. A. (1990). Systemic school reform. In Fuhrman S. H., Malen B. (Eds.), *The politics of curriculum and testing* (pp. 233–268). New York: Falmer Press.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

Stein J. C. (1988). Takeover threats and managerial myopia. *Journal of Political Economy*, 96(1), 61–80.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

U.S. Department of Education. (2010). *Interim report on the Evaluation of the Growth Model Pilot Project*.

Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/disadv/growth-model-pilot/gmpp.pdf>

[Google Scholar](#)

U.S. Department of Education. (2011). *Letter from the Education Secretary, September 23, 2011*. Retrieved

from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/secletter/110923.html>

[Google Scholar](#)

Weiss M. J., May H. (2012). A policy analysis of the federal growth model pilot program's measures of school performance: The Florida case. *Education Finance and Policy*, 7(1), 44–73.

[Crossref](#)

[Google Scholar](#)

## Biographies

**MORGAN S. POLIKOFF**, PhD, is an assistant professor at the University of Southern California Rossier School of Education, 3470 Trousdale Parkway, WPH 904A, Los Angeles, CA 90089; [polikoff@usc.edu](mailto:polikoff@usc.edu). His research focuses on the design and effects of standards, assessment, and accountability policies.

**ANDREW J. MCEACHIN**, PhD, is an assistant professor of Education Policy and Program Evaluation at North Carolina State University, College of Education, 608E Poe Hall, Campus Box 7801, Raleigh, NC 27695-7801; [gjmceach@ncsu.edu](mailto:gjmceach@ncsu.edu). His research focuses on the design and impact of accountability systems, math education policy, and the economics of education.

**STEPHANI L. WRABEL** is a dean's fellow at the University of Southern California, Rossier School of Education, 3470 Trousdale Parkway, 901D Waite Phillips Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90089; [swrabel@usc.edu](mailto:swrabel@usc.edu). Her research focuses on accountability policy, nonpromotional school transitions, and military-connected students and schools.

**MATTHEW DUQUE** is a PhD candidate at the University of Southern California, Rossier School of Education, 3470 Trousdale Parkway, 500 Waite Phillips Hall, Los Angeles, CA 90089. His research focuses on the distribution of teacher quality within and across schools.



## Similar articles:

---



Restricted access

[We Are the 5%: Which Schools Would Be Held Accountable Under a Proposed Revision of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act?](#)

Show Details ▾

---



Restricted access

[The Politics of Elementary and Secondary Education Act Waivers](#)

Show Details ▾

---



Restricted access

[Accountability Under Constraint: The Relationship Between Collective Bargaining Agreements and California Schools' and Districts' Performance Under No Child Left Behind](#)

Show Details ▾

---

[View More](#)

## Sage recommends:

---

### CQ Researcher

Report

[No Child Left Behind](#)

Show Details ▾

---

### SAGE Knowledge

Book chapter

[No Child Left Behind: Is the Law Improving Student Performance?](#)

Show Details ▾

---

### SAGE Knowledge

Book chapter

[Achievement Gaps: Causes, False Promises, and Bogus Reforms](#)

Show Details ▾

---

[View More](#)

You currently have no access to this content. Visit the [access options](#) page to authenticate.

[View full text](#) | [Download PDF](#)

## Also from Sage

### CQ Library

Elevating debate

### Sage Data

Uncovering insight

### Sage Business Cases

Shaping futures

### Sage Campus

Unleashing potential

### Sage Knowledge

Multimedia learning resources

### Sage Research Methods

Supercharging research

### Sage Video

Streaming knowledge

### Technology from Sage

Library digital services