

Running Head: TESTING AND ASSESSMENT

High-Stakes Testing and Assessment: For Whites Only!

Donna A. Carnduff

University of Tennessee

Abstract

With the signing of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001 by President Bush on January 8, 2002, it is clear that high-stakes testing will continue to play an important role in our education system. This paper illustrates how standardized testing and assessment historically discriminates against non-Whites because of its 'one-size-fits-all' approach. Given the increasing diversity of American school-age children, this paper will discuss why we need to use a multicultural approach to better understand students so we can create valid tests to produce valid assessments for them all. The paper will examine how students' race, ethnicity, class, and culture directly affect their approach and performance on standardized tests and how this can skew the assessment results.

High-Stakes Testing and Assessment: For Whites Only!

The No Child Left Behind Act is the most ambitious federal effort to raise achievement in public schools in more than 30 years. Taken from the Department of Education's website (U.S. Ed.gov)

“[The No Child Left Behind Act expresses] my deep belief in our public schools and their mission to build the mind and character of every child, from every background, in every part of America. - President George W. Bush, January 2001.” (Williams, 2003)

Historical Background

No Child Left Behind is the cumulative result of a standards and testing movement that began with the release of the report “A Nation at Risk” by the Reagan administration in 1983. President Lyndon Johnson passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) – the principal federal law affecting education from kindergarten through high school - as part of his Great Society initiative in 1965. (Rudalevige, 2003) This legislation in general and Title I in particular, was aimed at improving educational opportunity for underprivileged children. “Over \$185 billion was spent on Title I in 1965...with little to show for it.” (Crosby, 2002, p. 228) Over the years, Congress amended the ESEA, to provide federal funding to boost education outcome among other target population. “Federal involvement in education still remained small despite the billions of dollars flowing to states due to this signature piece of Johnson-era legislation.” (Jones, 2004)

The ESEA is reauthorized every 4 to 6 years, usually under a new ‘catchy’ name by each new administration. Congress reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1994. President Bill Clinton signed into law ‘Goals 2000’, which provided grants to help states develop academic standards.” (Rudalevige, 2003) The reauthorization required states to develop

content and performance standards, attempting to impose accountability and academic standards on the states. “States were required to make ‘continuous and substantial’ progress toward the goal of academic proficiency for all students” by 1997-1998. (Rudalevige, 2003) Despite no clear deadlines for compliance, no penalties for non-compliance, and limited participation by only 17 states, the 1994 reauthorization began the process of developing standards and tests in most states. (Rudalevige, 2003) That changed in 2002 when President George W. Bush signed into law the bill to reauthorize the ESEA dubbed the “No Child Left Behind Act of 2001.” What differentiates No Child Left Behind from the reforms of the Clinton period, are the penalties assessed on the districts and their schools for failure to meet the mandated academic standards. In the past we invested a lot of education dollars with no means to measure success or establish accountability – the result – inadequate returns on our investment. Now, schools must provide remedial measures if they fail to meet the standards.

NCLB mandates

The NCLB Act requires that all children – regardless of family income, race, gender, ethnicity, culture, disability or fluency in English – master basic reading and math skills by the 2013-14 school year. All groups must make the same progress as the whole student body. If one of these groups of students misses its academic average target for two to three straight years, schools are placed on a list of ‘under performing’ schools. For a school in an affluent neighborhood, the consequence for missing targets is an unflattering label. For a school that receives federal poverty funds through its district, it could mean the loss of those funds, making the mandates of the law much more difficult. Ironically, the law aims to make schools pay extra attention to students who typically struggle in school, purposely including minorities, poor children and those with disabilities.

“Diversifying the pool of students capable of succeeding in college is fundamentally a matter of elementary and secondary education reform. The most important recent approach to reform in this area is the NCLB Act of 2001. The vast majority of students left behind are disadvantaged or low-income.” Secretary of Education Rod Paige, Back-to-School Address, National Press Club (Sept. 24, 2003)

NCLB is still a work in progress. There have been four modifications in the past six months but the standardized testing mandate is still very much a high-stakes issue. High-stakes for elementary children could mean retention or promotion to a grade or placement in a special program. High-stakes for high school students could affect, among others, graduation status, college entrance opportunities, and scholarship availability. Therefore, it is critical that tests used to determine promotion and graduation be fair, non-discriminatory, and measure what is taught in the classroom.

Disclaimer

The quotes and views of many different authors and resources have been used to compose this paper. Thus, many different terms (vocabulary words) are used in describing particular groups that fall outside of the mainstream population. As much as I would prefer to qualify each term so that stereotyping does not occur, I must be true to my sources, and ask for your indulgence to use them as found. For the sake of conformity in this paper, the dominant, majority, non-minority, or mainstream population is considered to be White, Anglo Saxon, English speaking and middle-class. Other terms used, such as minority, students of color, subgroups, non-dominant, disadvantaged, low-income, poor and peers refer to those individuals that fall outside of the dominant or mainstream population. These terms, it must be noted, are used in their standard sociological construct in that they refer to individuals who have little

power in the hierarchy of power and authority. Numerically non-White's are the majority but in our society, most often, are referred to as the 'minority'. Terms like 'minority' are applied generally to children of subordinate groups in relation to the dominant group.

Harsh reality

The harsh reality is that scores on academic achievement tests, along with grades and class rankings, are directly correlated with admittance to highly selective colleges, later job performance, wages, and overall success in intellectually demanding professions. This relationship has significant consequences for ethnic, racial, language, and social class groups.

“In a commentary responding to United States and international achievement comparisons, Bracey (2002), remarks, "We [in the United States] don't have a 'public school system as we know it.' We have two. One is for poor and minority students; the other is for the rest of us." Will the NCLB Act be sufficient to address the varied gaps Bracey has characterized (urban, rural, suburban, racial, socioeconomic), or is the limited emphasis on standards and accountability that targets schools, teachers, and students a simplistic variation of the "one-size-fits-all" factory model introduced in the early 1900s?" (Williams, 2003)

Sandoval (1998) writes that minority students are becoming an increasingly large population in many school systems. Currently one-seventh of all school-age children speak a language other than English at home. Five and a half million children come to school without English-language skills. (p. 3) “About 75% of these students speak Spanish, and many of the others speak Vietnamese, Hmong, Cantonese, Cambodian, or Korean [Garcia, 1995].” (p. 3)

The number of students of color in public schools grew from 22% in 1974 to 36% in 1997. In California, Texas and New York, students of color are or soon will be the majority. This is illustrated in the table below.

Source: National Center of Education Statistics. (2004, April)

	California	New York	Texas
White	35%	54.8%	40.9%
Black	8.4%	19.9%	14.4%
Hispanic	44.5%	18.6%	41.7%
Asian/Pacific Islander	11.2%	6.2%	2.8%
American Indian/ Alaskan Native	0.9%	0.4%	0.3%

<http://nces.ed.gov.nationsreportcard/states/profile.asp>

Most urban school districts have a majority of students of color. Many of these districts are almost exclusively made up of students of color. Currently, white students make up 10% of the school population in 40% of all urban schools. Due to an influx of immigrants to the U.S., the biggest change in the composition of minority public school students will occur among Hispanics. In 20 years, the Hispanic school-age population is predicted to increase 60%. (Edelman, 2001)

The NCLB Act is intended to guarantee that all students meet standards by ensuring that they are given the chance to do so and are expected to do so. This Act assumes incorrectly, as will be verified, that the 'one-size-fits-all' standardized test is the best way to assess all children in our public schools.

Jonathan Sandoval [1998] writes

For students outside the population mainstream due to their racial-ethnic background, socioeconomic status (SES), or disability, the use of test results in high-stakes situations does not always appear equitable. For example, African American, Hispanic American,

and Native American youths seem more likely to be placed in special education classes and less likely to be placed in classes for gifted and talented students. The average of scores obtained by students from these groups, including those whose first language is not English, are generally lower than the average of scores obtained by the White English-speaking majority on tests used for high-stakes decisions. Such patterns of test results have led to charges that tests are biased against members of these groups. (p.78)

There will be increased pressure to ensure that students are allocated adequate resources to achieve the standards that No Child Left Behind is pushing for. (<http://www.ascd.org>) Equity challenges have relied on the equitable division of resources. Adequacy challenges focus on the provision of adequate resources to schools so that all students have the same opportunity to succeed (the state is responsible for providing adequate resources to schools, even if it costs more to provide subgroups with a high-quality education). (<http://www.ascd.org>) Here lies the political controversy over the NCLB Act's funding levels. With states in their current financial crunch, where will schools get the money needed to provide these resources? We must also look at providing resources with respect to cultural pluralism. All students...equal resources...same opportunity – this means for all cultures in schools, equal representation must be assured. In allocating resources proof of equal opportunities is equal results but equal results are not guaranteed by the presence of equal opportunity. Students will be penalized for their performance when their schools lack sufficient resources to help.

Achievement gaps

Most measures of academic preparedness indicate that there is an achievement gap based on a number of indicators. The NAEP report (National Assessment of Educational Progress) that on average, African-American and Hispanic students in the 12th grade score 4 years behind white

12th graders in both reading and math. The College Board, which sponsors the SAT, reported gaps of around 149 points between combined verbal and math scores of African American and white students. Gaps around 146 points exist for Hispanic and white. Asian American verbal scores are 29 points below those of white students but 32 points higher than those of white students in math. The achievement gaps in our schools are real and persistent. While 41% of white 4th graders are proficient or above in reading according to NAEP only 15% of Hispanic and 12% African American peers read at that level. In math, 34% of white 4th graders scored at or above proficiency, while just 5% of African American and 10% of Hispanic students reach that level. Statistics are similar in science and other areas of study. For low-income students, we find similar results. When measuring students' eligible for federal free and reduced-price lunch programs against those not eligible we find that while 41% of non-eligible 4th graders are proficient at or above reading compared to 14% of their low-income peers. The results for math follow the same trend - 33% to 9%. (NCES)

How do states, districts, and schools serving low-income, disadvantaged and culturally diverse students close the achievement gap to attain the standards delineated in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB Act)? The table below dramatically reveals the magnitude of this task among four groups.

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census (2000).

<i>Highest Educational Attainment for Kindergartners (at age 24)</i>	Blacks	Asians	Latinos	Whites
Graduated from high school	*87%	94%	62%	91%
Completed at least some college	54%	80%	29%	62%
Obtained at least a bachelor's degree	16%	49%	6%	30%

* Of every 100 Black kindergartners, 87 will graduate from high school. (Williams, 2003)

To magnify this task even further, “trends predict that when the above white kindergartners are 17, over 95 percent will be in high school reading at a 12th grade level while 25 percent of their black peers will have dropped out or, if still in school, will read at an 8th grade level [D'Amico, 2001]. Ample evidence shows that these disparities predict not only educational but economic prospects for America's minority populations.” (Williams, 2003)

Multicultural approach

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, specifically targeting minorities, has federally mandated standardized testing and assessment. But minorities historically do poorly on standardized tests. How do we address these two seemingly mutually exclusive issues? Before we decide to eliminate or change the standardized tests and how the results are to be evaluated, we must first look at why and how the tests are unfair and how assessment results may not be valid. We must examine the complexities in the concepts class, race, ethnicity and cultural differences; a multicultural approach. But as critical multiculturalists we must also realize the need to focus on each axis separately. (Kincheloe, 1997, p. 109)

Sandoval (1998) explains

There can be many distinct ethnicities and “cultures” represented within a “race” and many different “races represented within a given “culture”. The term culture has different meanings depending on the context within which it is used, which may or may not have relevance for test interpretation issues. (p.10)

A self-contained view of culture diverts attention away from the ways in which cross-cultural encounters that occur in the school context account for the disparities in the educational attainment of various ethnic groups. In Chapter 10 McLaren (1995) notes that by portraying

groups as self-contained, we neglect to address the groups needs to negotiate common cultural life as they try to adapt to each other's. (p. 293)

Obviously we need more research on the validity and reliability of measure for specific multicultural groups. Critical multiculturalists must ask how and why the inequalities exist. What is the role of testing? What do the results mean? Do the tests and assessment perpetuate discrimination?

Culture influences how we behave, what we believe, what we value how we socialize and how we make sense of our experiences. Ignoring the importance of cultural differences will lead to unfair testing practices. "For example, the wording, illustrations, layout and contextual information in a test item may reflect the language, ways of thinking and experience of a particular cultural group." (Solano-Flores, 2000) It privileges students from that same cultural group and penalizes students from other cultural groups. These consequences are extremely important in the U.S. where cultural diversity is considerable and decisions that affect students' lives and the funding received by schools are based on standardized test scores. Tests that are developed without properly taking into account cultural differences will be reinforcing social inequalities. (Solano-Flores, 2000)

Obviously, the "one-size-fits-all" strategy governing the current structures of schools ignores the complexity of the dynamics influencing the gaps among groups. The myopic theories we currently use to explain how individuals learn, limit progress and produce narrow, simplistic strategies for closing the gaps among groups. (Williams, 2003) Historically these theories assumed the problem was due to a lack in the culture, in abilities, in motivation, or in coping skills of minority children and their families.

Williams (2003) writes

These assumptions ignore abundant and mounting evidence about the complexity of existing achievement gaps between black and white, Asian and white, white and Hispanic, and high- and low-income students. In addition, gaps once assumed to be limited to urban or rural schools and schools serving disadvantaged students are now being identified in suburban communities and schools [D'Amico, 2001]. Continued failure to formulate reform strategies supported by a thorough analysis and synthesis of *all* available evidence leaves to chance the possibility of closing the gaps among groups.

Researchers, educators, and scholars have argued that assessment tools normed on majority group populations, specifically Euro-centric populations, cannot be arbitrarily used with individuals who differ from that normative population. (Suzuki, 2001, p. 5)

The reliability and validity of a test used with individuals of different cultural or linguistic groups who were not included in the standardization group are questionable. Thus, it is important to recognize that diversity may exist between test examiners and examinees even if the differences are not readily apparent. An example is a Latino adolescent who appears acculturated to the test examiner but who nonetheless is more adept in Spanish than English [Padilla, 1992]. Such an adolescent may have more difficulty on a timed test if it is administered in English. Also, the experiential background of culturally diverse individuals may differ from that of the group, on whom the tests were standardized, resulting in questions about the validity of the test instrument [Sue, 1998].

(Suzuki, 2001, p. 6)

Tests can be biased by the content or construction of test items that they give unfair advantage to only one group over another. The content of a test can be manipulated easily to

favor one cultural or social group. The formatting of the test, mode of test administration, or personality and bias of the examiner may also bias a test. (Suzuki, 2001, p. 7)

Increasing evidence suggests that children from diverse cultural backgrounds interpret test items differently. They bring different expectations and knowledge to the test. As such, they generally do not score as high as children of the mainstream culture on standardized tests. To accommodate these scores, we must look critically at the structure of the test and how the results were assessed.

In a way, multicultural assessment and cultural identity assessment are synonymous. One cannot conduct a full assessment without accounting for issues of cultural identity, including racial, ethnic, spiritual, sexual orientation, and gender components of that identity. (Suzuki, 2001, p. 336) “The underlying assumption here is that universal sets of the ‘best’ ability tests can work anywhere, as long as they are adequately translated and administered by a ‘native’ tester.” (Suzuki, 2001, p. 336)

Some research has focused on highlighting the issues of socioeconomic status (SES), health factors, education, residential and regional issues, language, and acculturation on test scores. All of these variables continue to affect test performance. The higher the SES, the higher the IQ scores. Children with health impairments tend to score lower on tests. Children living in isolated communities, such as Indian reservations, lack the familiarity of the test stimuli and score lower than their peers. The degree of acculturation to the dominant culture also has a direct correlation to test scores.

Kohn (1999) suggests that the traditional approach to education consists of a heavy diet of standardized testing, but for other people’s children, particularly students of color.

“Standardized tests are more likely to be used and emphasized in schools with higher percentages of minority students.” (p.92)

Kohn (1999) acknowledges that

One place where traditional teaching rules with a vengeance is in “urban” or “inner-city” schools which are generally euphemisms for those attended by children of color from low-income families. Minority children are more likely than their peers to spend time taking multiple-choice standardized test and to be taught a low-level curriculum designed around those tests. (p. 9)

Educator and researcher advocates for black children have long argued that standardized testing is not geared toward improving learning. Suzuki has noted that standardized testing contributes to perpetuating social, economic, and political barriers confronting minorities.

“Gregory and Lee [1986] note that standardized tests are used primarily for selecting and screening; consequently, if tests or their users are discriminatory toward particular groups, such groups may be unfairly denied access to educational and career opportunities.” (2001, p. 5)

Research shows that approximately five million students are inappropriately tested each year, due to their diverse cultural backgrounds, by standardized assessment tools including standardized achievement tests (Suzuki, 2001, p. 8) Suzuki implies that test performance of an individual who comes from a non-dominant culture or is in a lower in socioeconomic class, may be affected in ways not intended or expected by the test maker. (2001, p. 8)

Factors such as family background, parenting styles, parental educational levels, and parental socioeconomic levels have been found as contributing variables influencing children’s scores on IQ tests.

Suzuki (2001) cites Thorndike [1997] who describes issue of test bias in this way: One of the most prevalent themes in popular discussions of testing is that tests are unfair to certain groups. The term used is *bias*. It is often asserted that standardized tests are used to deprive certain groups of access to educational and employment opportunities. To the extent that tests are used mechanically as selection and placement devices, and to the extent that some groups in our society have historically performed less well on tests, tests *do* become instruments through which access to education and employment is disproportionately barred to members of these groups. The question that must be addressed is whether individuals are unjustly barred and, more generally, what constitutes fair and equitable use of tests for the selection, placement, and classification of individuals (p. 369).

In this context, test bias refers to measures that either overestimate or underestimate the true scores of any specific group. (Suzuki, 2001, p. 369)

Although adequately translated tests can greatly enhance the accuracy of test results, examiners should not ignore the important influence of the examinee's cultural experience and history on the assessment process: "The specific individual experience of nonmajority culture individuals will greatly influence their educational, emotional and language development" [Bracken and Barona, 1991, p. 129]. Thus, it is important to consider the test taker's cultural and individual differences, in addition to language, in the assessment process. Also, when trying to fully understand minority test takers, it is important to consider information related to their immigration and educational status [Bracken and Barona, 1991]. This information is important because it provides critical data about the linguistic and cultural proficiency of the person about to be assessed. For

instance, from this information the examiner has a better idea of whether the assessment instrument is appropriate for the individual to be tested. (Suzuki, 2001, p. 14)

A test may be biased through inappropriate application resulting in identifying one group over others. Tests are often used to select children for grade promotion or inclusion to a special class. (Suzuki, 2001, p. 7)

Tests are composed for White, Anglo Saxon, English-speaking, middle-class standards, values, attitudes, beliefs, experience, and knowledge. This gives legitimacy and power to this dominant group. It 'denies' the non-dominant groups forcing them to compete on unequal terms. It is easy to see why scores on tests are consistently lower for those from the non-dominant population. If a test designed for one cultural group is administered to another cultural group, the test automatically favors the group for whom the test was designed. Ability tests are not transportable from one culture to another. Cultural expectations do inform our ways of being, knowing and understanding.

Suzuki (2001, p. 24) recommends

To increase the cross-cultural assessment competency of test examiners, such individuals must be knowledgeable and comfortable with the traditional customs and communicative styles of many individuals who do not represent the prototypical middle-class person on whom most assessment instruments are based. We recommend that test users involve minority community members in selecting instruments to be used in a school, employment venue, placement center, and so forth. This practice increases the minority community's trust and rapport regarding testing practices and results in more appropriate assessment measures, practices, and decision-making.

Many millions of children throughout the U.S. are unfairly disadvantaged when they are assessed with dominant culture-loaded achievement tests.

Let's look specifically at how language barriers can affect testing and assessment. High stakes proficiency tests are challenging enough but for thousands who don't speak English as their first language, they can be daunting. Half of students with limited English abilities nationwide are already U.S. citizens whose parents come from foreign countries. (Matzelle, 2004)

The past few years have seen increased concern over the testing of intelligence of minority children and particularly of the assessment of mental abilities of non-English speaking or bilingual children...The unfair practice of administration of invalid intelligence tests to bilingual and bicultural populations has been noted...Testing the intelligence of a Spanish-speaking youngster through a sampling of English words penalizes the testee. [They] may not have had the opportunity to hear the word in English...The assumption that the testee has been exposed to experiences basic to test activities similarly leads to invalidity. For the most part, experiences utilized in intelligence test items are taken from typical White, Anglo Saxon, English-speaking, middle-class situations... Culturally different children experience the same failure due to not having the experiences assumed by the test items rather than to lack of intelligence. [The problem with English tests translated into Spanish are that Mexican American children fluent in Spanish have never heard the Spanish equivalent of some English words.] For instance, the English word 'hot dog' has been translated to 'un perro caliente' which at best means 'a dog which is warm' and at worst means 'a dog in heat'...Past efforts to measure with a high degree of validity the intelligence or mental abilities of

children who speak two languages by the use of a test in a second language has led to over-inclusion of minority children in classes for the mentally retarded. Low levels of expectancy for children assumed to be mentally retarded has led to a self-fulfilling prophecy much to the life-long detriment of minority children. Cárdenas (1995)

Conclusion

Critical multiculturalism calls for a reexamination of the American educational system that perpetuates diversity differences through the use of standardized testing for high-stakes assessment. With the signing of NCLB, it appears that testing will probably be part of the American education system for a while so how do we go about reconstructing the tests and evaluating the results across subgroups. Given the increasing diversity of our school children being tested, a number of strategies have been developed that enables us to use traditional ability measure. These practices include use of translators, interpreters, and translated measures; the biocultural model; and cross-battery assessment. (Suzuki, 2001, p. 371) The discussion of each practice is beyond the scope of this paper but certainly we must have a change of attitude, a ‘new vision’ towards low-performing students. See William’s (2003) table below.

<i>Toward a New Vision of Low-Performing Learners</i> Current View	A New Vision
Deprived	Culturally different
Failing/low achieving	Unrecognized abilities/ underdeveloped potential
Unmotivated	Engaged/self- motivated/effortful
At risk	Resilient

Source: Williams and Newcombe (1994).

Suzuki (2001) summarizes best when she states that

Assessing the aptitude of diverse populations has been problematic because of limitations in test development and research. In addition, the lack of sensitivity to cultural context in test selection, test administration, and test interpretation is noted. It is critical that test developers, clinicians, educators, and researchers continue to reexamine current instruments and develop new practices in assessing cognitive abilities. Aptitude measures play a major role in determining future educational and occupational opportunity. It is imperative that these tests be used in ways that truly tap the intelligence and aptitude of all members of racial and ethnic groups (pp. 379-380)

References

- Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development (ASCD). (2003, October).
<http://www.ascd.org/cms/index.cfm?TheViewID=2224>
- Crosby, B. (2002). *The \$100,000 teacher*. Sterling, VA: Capital Books, Inc.
- Cárdenas, J.A. (1995, January). *Bilingual intelligence testing*. IDRA Newsletter.
<http://www.idra.org/Newsltr/1995/Jan/JAC.htm>
- Edelman, M.W. (2001). *The State of America's Children*. Boston: Beacon Press p.64-65
- Kincheloe, J. L. & Steinberg, S. R. (1997). *Changing multiculturalism*. Buckingham, England: Open University Press.
- Kohn, A. (1999). *The schools our children deserve*. Boston, NY: Houghton Mifflin Company
- Matzelle, C. (2004, April 15). *Bridging the language gap in education*. Plain Dealer Reporter.
<http://www.cleveland.com/printer/printer.ssf?/base/lorain/1082026559219441.xml>
- McLaren, P. L. & Sleeter, C. E. (1995). *Multicultural education, critical pedagogy, and the politics of difference*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- National Center for Education Statistics (NCES). <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/>
- Rudalevige, A. (Fall 2003). *The politics of no child left behind*. Education Next. California: Hoover Institution. Retrieved April 2004, from <http://www.educationnext.org/20034/62.html>
- Sandoval, F. (1998). *Test Interpretation and Diversity*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Solano-Flores, G. (Summer 2000). *Chrysalis: Newsletter of the cultural validity in assessment project*. (Vol. 1, No. 1-b). Retrieved April 2004 from, <http://www.edgateway.net/cs/cvap/print/docs/cvap/news.htm>

Suzuki, L. A. & Ponterotto, J. G. & Meller, P. J. (2001) *Handbook of Multicultural Assessment : Clinical, Psychological, and Educational Applications (2nd Ed.)*. San Francisco Jossey Bass, 2001

U.S. Department of Education. *No child left behind*. Retrieved April 2004 from,
<http://www.ed.gov/nclb/overview/intro/index.html>

Williams, B. (2003). *Closing the achievement gap: A vision for changing beliefs and practices* (2nd Ed. Chap. 1). Alexandria VA: ASCD. Retrieved April 2004 from,
<http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/2003williams/2003williamstoc.html>