

NCLB and Scientifically-Based Research: Opportunities Lost and Found

Dan Liston, Jennie Whitcomb, and Hilda Borko¹

University of Colorado at Boulder

In fall 2006, Secretary of Education Margaret Spellings and President George W. Bush, while stumping for reauthorization of No Child Left Behind (NCLB), asserted, “It is working, and it is here to stay” (The White House, 2006). Though we find claims of its effectiveness premature, NCLB and the subsequent and less-noticed Education Sciences Reform Act (ESR) are without question changing the landscape of public education. Since their adoption in 2002, many of the laws’ provisions have been implemented. For example, high-stakes testing and reporting systems to demonstrate “adequate yearly progress” (AYP) are in place in all states. Indeed, as this editorial goes to press, headlines about schools not demonstrating AYP abound. Policies establishing criteria for “highly qualified teachers” (HQT) have been adopted, although wide variation exists across the states, particularly for veteran teachers. “Scientifically-based research” has become the stamp of approval for curriculum selection and instructional practices in many of the NCLB programs, notably Title I and Reading First grants. And, the Education Sciences Reform Act supports the newly created Institute for Educational Sciences (IES), which is a major source of funding for educational research and is overseeing contracts to overhaul the ERIC Clearinghouse into the What Works Clearinghouse. Some flexibility will undoubtedly be introduced in the reauthorization of NCLB. Regardless of changes enacted, however, we expect that the specifics of NCLB, and the broader theme of accountability to close the “achievement gap,” will continue to dominate education conversations in the years ahead.

¹ As an editorial team, we write editorials collaboratively. To reflect the nature of this joint work, we rotate order of authors with each journal issue. We acknowledge and thank Robert Reichardt and Ed Wiley for their most helpful comments on earlier drafts of this editorial.

Initial scholarly responses to NCLB offered both critical analyses and defenses of the

current conversations about a number of important and highly contested questions regarding the way NCLB and ESR are shaping k-12 classroom practice, teachers' lives, and the work of teacher education. Here, we take stock of the laws' impact on teacher education research, practice, and policy. We focus our examination on only one of several controversial aspects of the laws—the emphasis on scientifically-based research (SBR). Frederick Hess and Michael Petrilli (2006) explain,

The phrase 'scientifically based research' appears more than 100 times throughout the No Child Left Behind Act and is applied to policies addressing reading programs, teacher training, drug prevention and school safety, and a range of other topics. Scientifically based research has no title or program of its own, but it is woven into the fabric of virtually every program in the law. As a result, this emphasis has potentially far-reaching consequences for both daily classroom practice and academic research related to education. In addition, by making the federal government a more active partner in determining what specific instructional methods should be approved for classroom use, NCLB also sets a new precedent of federal involvement in curriculum and instruction (p. 94).

NCLB and ESR's bold efforts to transform educational research are both troubling and promising. We consider ways in which the pervasive emphasis on scientifically-based research narrows the conversation about teacher education research, practice, and policy, and then explore positive outcomes of these efforts.

The Narrowing Effect of Scientifically-Based Research

Narrow construal of educational research. NCLB's emphasis on scientifically-based research unduly narrows what can be construed as acceptable educational research. The law's

definition of scientifically-based research promotes experimental designs modeled after medical research. Attempting to make education an “evidence-based field” more akin to medicine, the law establishes randomized field trials as the “gold standard.” It further stipulates the following about scientifically-based research:

[SBR]is evaluated using experimental or quasi-experimental desi

program is lost. By not taking into account the level of implementation and nature of adaptation, findings about the effectiveness of a particular intervention are difficult to interpret.

Indeed, a recent RAND study, *Evaluating Comprehensive School Reforms at Scale*, found that of the four reform models studied, none was fully implemented; schools using the same model varied in their level of implementation; and there were few differences in practices between model and non-model schools (Vernez, Karam, Mariano, & DeMartini, 2006). The RAND team also found that schools were able to adopt curriculum most easily; they experienced more difficulty implementing the model's instructional practices. Changing instructional practice is hard work, and many studies of professional development have shown that teachers need significant support and time to change their practices (Putnam & Borko, 2000; Wilson & Berne, 1999). In the RAND study, teachers' commitment up front and the quality of initial support were important determinants in whether a model was implemented at higher levels. Given the study's finding that comprehensive school reforms were not fully implemented, this study illustrates the importance of understanding how teachers enact a model when making claims about its effect on achievement.

Finally, we are concerned that as the law reshapes educational research, the only acceptable research for teacher education may be those studies that attempt to build the causal chain of evidence from its starting point in teacher education programs to the final link to pupil achievement. To build an effective chain of evidence, teacher education researchers must demonstrate that a particular teacher education practice/policy shapes teacher candidate learning, which in turn shapes teacher candidates' actual classroom practice, which in turn positively influences k-12 learning that is reflected in student achievement measures (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005). To build the linkages, researchers often use a proxy for each point in the chain of

that researchers will rely upon thin proxies for complex educational processes and outcomes. In short, the legislative definitions of scientifically-based research narrow educational research. This, in turn, has implications for program design and practice in teacher education.

Narrow construal of teacher education practice. By narrowing what counts as research and by pressing for a tight alignment between scientifically-based research and teachers' classroom practice, NCLB is without question changing the k-12 landscape. For example, the Center on Education Policy (2006) reports that NCLB has led to both a narrowing of the curriculum and more direction about teaching. Specifically, they note,

...seventy-one percent of the school districts we surveyed reported that they have reduced elementary school instructional time in at least one other subject to make more time for reading and mathematics and many ... districts have become more prescriptive about what and how teachers are supposed to teach (p. 2).

These changes, combined with the pressure to connect teacher education with student achievement, may oblige teacher educators to tailor the knowledge base for teaching and the curriculum of teacher education to respond to the changing reality of k-12 classrooms.

Current conceptualizations of the knowledge base for teaching delineate three broad areas—learners and learning in social contexts, curriculum and subject matter, and teaching (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Relying on scientifically-based research is likely to focus knowledge of curriculum and teaching on those curricula and instructional practices given the stamp of approval in experimental or quasi-experimental studies. For example, the “What Works Clearinghouse” provides an “intervention rating” that characterizes the effects of educational interventions (from “positive effects” to “negative effects”), and a scale for rating the quality of studies of interventions (from “meet evidence standards” to “does not meet evidence

screens”) (<http://www.whatworks.ed.gov/>). Only studies using randomized controlled trial or quasi-experiment research designs can be rated as meeting evidence standards (either with or without reservations). At this point, very few studies in key areas such as beginning reading or elementary and middle school mathematics have received the most positive ratings. Yet, in the future, school districts that receive money through federal programs as well as schools failing to make adequate yearly progress will be expected to draw from this research base as one option when developing improvement plans. To better support NCLB, the logical inference is that candidates should learn the principles and practices of “proven” programs.

The vision of teaching implied is one of teacher as a technical-rational implementer of curriculum models rather than a reflective practitioner (Zeichner & Liston, 1996) or an “adaptive expert” (Darling-Hammond, 2006) who makes judgments and decisions in the face of uncertain and complex situations. This more restricted vision of teaching suggests that an appropriate role for teacher education is to ensure that teachers have the knowledge and skills necessary to implement only those instructional practices and curricular materials that have scientifically

matter most in defining quality teachers and whether teacher certification makes a difference. Most recently “value-added assessment” has been suggested as a way to determine quality teacher preparation.

Policymakers have found value-added assessment a helpful tool to identify whether teachers make a difference on student achievement. This statistical method has been employed in educational research to show the impact a teacher can have on student standardized test scores (Sanders, 1998). States and districts are now developing policies and data management systems that allow them to match and connect individual teachers, information about the teacher’s preparation experience (whether university-based program or other route), and the teacher’s students’ test scores. The implication appears to be that good teacher preparation will produce quality teachers who enable students to learn and show greater gains on their standardized tests. Ineffective teacher education routes will not produce teachers who enhance their students’ test scores.

Teacher educators need to be aware of this developing evaluative logic. In essence, teacher education programs will be evaluated on how well their graduates’ students do on standardized tests. Indeed, Ohio’s Teacher Quality Partnership is using “value-added assessment to estimate effects of new teachers, an effort that provides information about teacher preparation programs and practices” (Wiley, 2006, p. 34). Numerous issues and problems can be identified. For example, value-added assessment, as a tool to determine teacher education program quality, would seem to rely on too distal and too narrow a measure. Many intervening variables must be accounted for to make definitive causal claims and corresponding evaluative judgments. While some studies now account for student characteristics and include more measures of teacher preparation (e.g., number of courses or scores on PRAXIS exams), more complex models would

also consider substantive features of teacher preparation experiences and measures of actual teaching performances. Workplace factors such as teaching assignment, curricular materials, mentoring or coaching, and administrative leadership all have a bearing on a teacher's performance and ability to foster student achievement and need to be included. To make well-reasoned causal claims regarding the effectiveness of teacher education, an analysis to determine which teacher preparation routes "add value" would need to trace the entire chain of evidence. An informative value-added analysis would need to account for the impact at each point in the chain of evidence

Quantitative methodologists have identified critical concerns regarding the validity of estimates made in each of the value-added assessment (VAA) approaches currently in use (AERA, 2004; McCaffrey, Lockwood, Koretz, & Hamilton, 2003). Wiley cautions the field:

Implementers are always wise to remember that because it is generally impossible to randomly group teachers and students, and VAA estimate of teacher effects may be influenced by other factors.... While a particular approach may attempt to deal with this issue by using statistical adjustments, no set of adjustments can fully compensate for the lack of randomization. Furthermore, important questions remain about whether student achievement scores are appropriate measures of teacher effects; whether achievement tests are appropriately designed; whether and how assessment errors may affect estimates; and when assessments are best administered. Although these are crucial and complex questions, no VAA approach yet takes them into effect (p. 51).

Another set of issues concerns the definition of and practices associated with a "professional" education. Are there bodies of knowledge and understandings that teachers should master that are not aimed directly at raising students' test scores? Should teachers be acquainted

with the history of US public education? Should educators explore their ethical obligations to students, parents and their profession? Should teachers be prepared to be curriculum developers or deliverers? Should some joy and satisfaction be expected in the learning and teaching process?

Certainly additional issues could be outlined. For our purposes here we want to underscore the currently developing value added means of appraising teacher education efforts. Unfortunately it appears that the early 1900's logic of and concern for social efficiency has reappeared in the logic of value added appraisals. Raymond Callahan's (1962) delineation of the public school's "cult of efficiency" has become the "cult of VAA."

Promising Possibilities of Scientifically-Based Research.

Thus far we have depicted several ways in which NCLB and the Education Science Reform Act's emphasis on scientifically-based research narrows teacher education research, practice, and policy. We also see, however, possibilities for this legislation to focus the teacher education community on the quality and rigor of our research, to examine critically the practices and knowledge conveyed in teacher education programs, and to argue more strenuously for a broadened policy agenda that will improve linkages between teacher education, induction, and teachers' ongoing development.

Improving research. Legislative definitions of scientifically-based research press educators to debate what constitutes quality and rigor in educational research and more specifically research on teacher education. Such discussions open the door for much-needed studies that build the complex evidentiary chain illustrating how powerful teacher education practices contribute to candidates' teaching performance, which in turn foster student learning, and ultimately their performance on achievement tests. The field of teacher education stands to benefit from research of this type, especially if these studies demonstrate impact on the

achievement of diverse learners. This is particularly true if the research is not limited by a narrow construal of acceptable research designs, but rather incorporates multiple methods in a single project. Two promising examples of such research are the *Teacher Pathways Project*

become more skeptical consumers. Less snake oil will be sold and more real medicine” (2005, p. 17). In this issue, Walsh considers this position in her book review. Currently, knowledge of research design is not heavily emphasized in many discussions of the knowledge base for

full sense of what it means to be humane and human in our schools, both as learners and as teachers.

References

Carlson, J.S. & Levin, J.R. (2005). *The No Child Left Behind legislation: Educational research and federal funding*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Center on Education Policy (2006). From the capitol to the classroom: Year 4 of the No Child Behind Act, Summary and Recommendations. Retrieved 11/23/06 from <http://www.cep-dc.org/nclb/Year4/NCLB-Year4Summary.pdf>

Cochran-Smith, M. & Fries, K. (2005). Researching teacher education in changing times: Politics and paradigms. In M. Cochran-Smith & K. Zeichner (Eds.). *Studying teacher education: The report of the AERA panel on research and teacher education* (pp. 69-109). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Deleted: Cochran-Smith, M. (2005). No child left behind: 3 years and counting. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56 (2), 99-103.¶

Commission on No Child Left Behind (2006). National Education Organizations and Policy Experts Testify at Final Commission Hearing. Press release downloaded 11/23/06 from http://www.aspeninstitute.org/site/c.huLWJeMRKpH/b.1200931/k.6F95/Press_ReleasesAdvisories.htm

Darling-Hammond, L. (2006). *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J. (2005). *Preparing teachers for a changing world: What teachers should learn and be able to do*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Darling-Hammond, L. & Youngs, P. (2002). Defining “Highly Qualified Teachers”: What Does “Scientifically-Based Research” Actually Tell Us?. *Educational Researcher*, 31(9), 13-25.

Deleted: xx (xx)

Deleted:)

Dillon, S. (2006). As 2 Bushes Try to Fix schools, the Tools Differ. *New York Times*. September, 28, 2006.

Deleted: Dillon, S. (2006a). Reports says education officials violated rules. Retrieved September 23, 2006 from <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/23/education/23education.html?ei=5070&en=49ac85d0aaf523...> ¶

Elmore, R.F. (2002). Testing trap. *Harvard Magazine*, 105(1), 35.

Deleted: b

Formatted: Font: Italic

Fuller, B. (2006). *Is the No Child Left Behind Act Working?*. Berkeley: Policy Analysis for California Education.

Goldhaber, D. & Brewer, D. (2000). Does teacher certification matter? High school teacher certification status and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 22(2), 129-145.

Henig, S. (2006). Back to School for Teachers: The No Child Left Behind Act has Changed how

Sanders, W.L. (1998). Value-added assessment. *School Administrator*, 11(55), pp. 24-27.

Teacher Quality Partnership (2006). <http://www.teacherqualitypartnership.org/>

The White House, Fact Sheet: The No Child Left Behind Act: Challenging Students through

High Expectations. (2006). Retrieved on 10/10/2006 from

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2006/10/print/20061005-2.html>

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

York: Simon and Schuster.

Vernez, G., Karam, R., Mariano, L.T., DeMartini, C. (2006). *Evaluating Comprehensive School*

Reform Models at Scale: Focus on Implementation. Retrieved on November 18, 2006

from <http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/MG546/>

Wiley, E.W. (2006). A practioner's guide to value added assessment. (Educational Policy

Studies Laboratory Research Monograph). Tempe, AZ: Arizona State University.