УДК :37 -047.36(73)

O. Andriushyna
ORCID ID 0000 0003 4084 1771

CONSEQUENCES OF "NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT" PRESSURE: THE USA EXPERIENCE FOR UKRAINIAN EDUCATORS

The article presents desirable and unpredictable consequences of implementation No Child Left Behind Act (2001, USA) for monitoring quality of general education. NCLB Act pressure on a state, school district, school and students are investigated. The ways of using the results of monitoring quality of general education in the USA are shown. Possible consequences of monitoring realization - positive and negative, state foundation of such monitoring and its effectiveness are analyzed. The consequences of keeping the high academic standards and students educational progress are searched. The aspects of the educational monitoring that should be taken into account and analyzed for practical application in Ukraine are presented.

Key words: *academic standards; consequences of monitoring; general education; monitoring results; monitoring quality of education; quality of education; NCLB Act.*

Introduction. Ukrainian educational policy declares high quality of education and accessibility of such education for all students in the country. Having set such a priority Ukrainian educators aim at joining the European and international educational standards. One of the ways to resolve this aim is to develop and implement effective procedure of students` assessment, schools outcome evaluation and monitoring quality of education as a practical tool for educational management and predicting further development of education. Nevertheless Ukrainian educators and scientists (L. Hrynevych, I. Likarchuk, I. Babyn, A. Lytvyn, M. Myhaylichenko, I. Sovsun, H. Solodko, and V. Shynkaruk) observe a steady tendency of decreasing quality of education and lack of effective system of monitoring. Researchers draw attention to the fact that the poor quality of education in the country is based on one of the largest expenditures on education in the world. In spite of such amount of expenditures Ukrainian education still experiences lack of coordinated nationwide monitoring, that hinders to make use the results of monitoring studies effectively. Given the above, we consider investigation of international experience referring to the system of monitoring quality of education is worth studying. The ways of using the results of educational measurement for improving quality of secondary education and academic performance, their profit and drawback are extremely important for our country. The United States of America has a well developed and effective system of monitoring quality of education, based on a strict regulatory framework and on a strict accountability system. (Andriushyna O. V., 2014, pp. 867-869). The nationwide system of educational monitoring in the USA allows educators to improve quality of education for a student, school and school districts, to grand students who showed high assessment scores giving them government scholarships to study at colleges and universities, to provide supplemental educational service for those students who failed assessment or did not achieve required score, to receive administrative, educational and social support for schools that show poor results of educational achievement (Andriushyna O. V., 2013, p. 112). But American researches show that monitoring quality of general education has both desirable consequences as well as unintended negative effects. (Schneider H., Zhang N., 2013; Amrein-Beardsley Audrey, 2009, p. 4; Hickok Eugene, Ladner Mathew, 2007).

That is why we put **the aim** to search possible effects of monitoring studies, their pressure on students, teachers and schools behavior for effective implementation in Ukraine. This aim requires to put the **following tasks***:* to analyze the ways of implementation of "No Child Left Behind Act" (2001), that obliges states to put into practice continuous educational monitoring; to study the possible effects of keeping high educational standards requirements; to emphasize the aspects of educational monitoring that require further educators` analysis to prevent its negative consequences in Ukraine.

As it was mentioned above, the USA system of monitoring quality of general education is well developed and dates back to the early 30th of the previous century. For a long period of time educators, policy makers and scientists worked on the effective way to improve quality of education and make American students competitive among other developed countries. The federal law "No Child Left Behind" (2001) became a new era for reforming and improving American schools and school behavior. Under NCLB, states and school districts implement federal education policy of public school quality by requiring standardized testing. School accountability system became a federal law and demanded all students to meet proficiency standards on state curriculum-based examinations (in varied subjects, but mostly reading and math). These tests are taken by every student annually in grades 3-8 and once in high school, including Natural Sciences. However, many states meet these requirements as unattainable goal.

In addition, NCLB mandates that schools publish their scores and states to identify poorly performing schools based on students' adequate yearly progress (AYP). Many states developed harsh penalties for schools that failed to show AYP, including school audit, school reconstitution, and school closures. Schools and educators were forced to change their behaviors. For instance, Helen Schneider and Ning Zhang research shows that pressures due to school closures for poor performance, rewards for good performance, and assistance to schools that left behind lead to lower levels even of vigorous physical activity. (Helen Schneider and Ning Zhang, 2013)

These facts made American educators and scientists emphasize the imperfect mechanism of implementation "No Child Left Behind Act". Under such circumstences educators and experts distinguish two monitoring strategy of state educational policy: 1. development of new state academic standards or lowing the content of present ones so that even students with very poor academic results could meet the NCLB requirements; 2. carrying out federal penalties, losing financial support, experiencing the procedure of school closure.

American researchers point out that the federal and state educational policy is not effective. Their criticisms have focused on NCLB's use of proficiency rates as the school performance metric. This metric holds schools accountable for the performance of students that are below their state proficiency standards. Students whose performance meets their state proficiency standards have no influence on school outcomes, and NCLB does not require schools to ensure that students performing above state proficiency standards make any kind of progress at all. There are two assumptions in these trends. The first assumption is that lowering the proficiency scores negatively impacts student performance and growth. The second is that such monitoring is one-sided and doesn`t reflect real students` academic progress. (Dahlin Michael, Xiang Yan, Durant Sarah, Cronin John, 2010). Department of education, state and local educational agencies draw their attention and give support only to those schools and school districts which demonstrated low or very poor assessment scores, or even didn`t meet state standards. Such a trend prevents high performing students from further development, they lose motivation to study.

The Kingsbury Center (Northwest Evaluation Association) examined these two assumptions using growth data collected across the country. The authors examined two questions: 1. does the difficulty of a state's proficiency standards have any relationship to student academic growth? (the problem was fixing out with taking into account such differences as poverty, race, gender, amount of instruction received, out of school factors); 2. do students that are above their state's proficiency standard demonstrate less growth, relative to their peers, than do students performing below the level of their state proficiency standards? The authors found that a student's status relative to his or her state proficiency bar had an effect on growth, and that students below the proficiency bar showed greater growth than those above (Lips Dan, 2012). Such a situation is being complicated by the President Barack Abama administration measures that provide additional 1.35 billion funding. Having received additional funding states are obliged to stick to strict fedral requirements for quality of general education, which makes a significant strengthening of federal control and can have unpredictable consequences. Educators and researchers suppose that receiving additional financing, on the one hand, encourages states to meet high level academic performance and, on the other, forces stakeholders to low educational standards (Dunn Karee, Mulvenon Sean, 2009). Having defined this tendency Hickok Eugene and Ladner Mathew consider it as a threat of losing available information for students, parents, educators and community about students` academic performance, teachers, schools and school districts behavior. Under these circumstances the authers emphasize the necessity for states to choose their specific strategy of implementation NCLB (Hickok Eugene, Ladner Mathew, 2007).

Having analyzed American scientists views on a problem of using the results of monitoring it made possible to identify a set of primary issues for American educators:

– High academic standards within final examinations. This issue raises the next one – inability of scientists, educators and those who direct education policy of the state to provide teachers with the necessary educational and technical support to prepare students for such testing.

– The final exam score is imperfect. For instance, in Massachusetts state the result of final testing is determined as "is passed" and "not passed". Students with the same academic performance may have different test results, which stipulates different, as well as negative, consequences. Besides, there is the problem of psychological unpreparedness of high school students to pass final testing. Fear not pass an exam often causes rejection to take it, which automatically means being at risk student or even dropouts.

– Legal and methodological lack of proper ways of education for children who are not fluent in English (Limited English Proficiency students (LEP students)). Ignoring the fact of LEP students bilingualism leads to inequality in education, which is prohibited by the US legislation and educational policy.

– Subjective shortcomings ("training for the test" when teachers are aware of the content of the test, specifically prepare students with the necessary issues; narrowing the curriculum; exclusion students with low academic performance from school in order not to let them take a test; intentionally providing a "LEP student" status, that gives him the right to take alternative tests; paying teacher`s attention

more to the students with low academic performance rather than with high scores; teachers` prompting and cheating during the testing; administration interference in teacher`sclassroom activities (John P. Papay, Richard J. Murnane, John B. Willett, 2008).

All of these shortcomings are the reasons of public opinion on the quality of education in the USA public schools. This conclusion is based on the annual Gallup poll on issues of education (Work and Education poll), which took place in August 9-12, 2012. The survey shows that public schools received the lowest rating, despite the fact that the majority of American children (83%) is taught in public schools (Jeffrey M. Jones, 2012). Such state of community opinion on public school encourages scientists to search for new and more effective ways to improve quality of general education in the USA.

Given the above allows us to summarize the following **conclusions:**

1. The way of implementation of No Child Left Behind Act (2001), which obliges states to monitor quality of general education and students` academic progress is not perfect. The law requires that all students meet proficient academic standards in all subjects. Practice and scientific investigations show that such high requirements can not be met by all students. Such unattainable aim leads to hidden lowing of educational standards by the state. Not meeting high academic standards by all students causes penalties from the federal government and the Department of Education, loss of financial support, experiencing the procedure of students` redistribution to different school districts or complete school closure.

2. Lowing the high state academic standards leads to support only students, schools and school districts that demonstrate poor results of educational progress, while students with high score of academic performance are deprived of further educational progress and lose motivation to achieve better results. Having experienced educational measurements, educators (teachers, principals and administration) use different ways of concealing the real rate of measurement in order to avoid federal and state penalties. Expecting such evaluation and assessments teachers, principals and local education administration narrow the curriculum in favour to assessed subjects, “train to the test”, interfere in teacher`s classroom activities, exclude students with poor academic performance before assessment.

3. To prevent negative effects of monitoring quality of secondary education in Ukraine we consider the USA experience of legal (NCLB act) and financial penalties (cutting dawn state and local funding, school closure) pressure to be extremely important for our country. Ukrainian educators and policy makers should take into account the following aspects of educational measurement, evaluation and monitoring quality of education: the aim of educational monitoring – to provide the accurate and transparent information about the results of academic performance and condition of education in a particular school and school district. In accordance with the aim of monitoring the usage of its outcomes should be based on the results of educational measurements and correlated without penalties, but corrective actions must be instead. The prospective ways of using monitoring outcomes are: - social, administrative and financial support a student, school and school districts that demonstrate poor results of academic performance; the comprehensive analysis of factors affecting the results of educational achievement.

We suppose **further investigation** the factors (both positive and negative) influencing the results of education is worth studying.

References

1. ***Amrein-Beardsley Audrey.*** The Unintended, Pernicious Consequences of “Staying the Course” on the United States` No Child Left Behind Policy / Audrey Amrein-Beardsley / International Journal of Education Policy & Leadership. – 2009. – Vol. 4. - № 6. (eng.)

2. A***ndriushyna O.V.*** Legal state framework of monitoring quality of general education in the USA / O.V.Andriushyna // Molodoy uchieniy. – 2014. - № 3. – C.867-869. (eng.)

3. ***Andriushyna O.V.*** Strategiyi ispolzovaniya rezyltatov monitoringa kachestva srednego obrazovaniya na regionalnom urovne v SSA / O.V. Andriushyna // **«Nauchnaya dyskussiya: voprosy pedagogyky i psyhologiyi»:** materialy IX mezhdunarodnoy zaochnoy nauchno-practicheskoy konferentsiyi. Chast I. (24 yanvarya 2013 r.) — Moskwa: Izd. «Mezhdunarodniy tsentr nauki I obrazovaniya», 2013. — 164 c., C. 12-20; **ISBN 978-5-905945-96-0. (rus.)**

4. ***Dunn Karee, Mulvenon Sean.*** Let`s Talk Formative Assessment... and Evaluation?, 2009 / www.eric.ed.gov , ED505357. (eng.)

5. From English Language Learners to Emergent Bilinguals. Equity Matters / ***Garcia Ofelia, Kleifgen Jo Ann, Falchi Lorraine.*** Campaign for Educational Equity, Teachers College, Columbia University, 2008 // www.eric.ed.gov, ED524002. (eng.)

6. ***Helen Schneider and Ning Zhang,*** “School Accountability and Youth Obesity: Can Physical Education Mandates Make a Difference?,” Education Research International, vol. 2013, Article ID 431979, 14 pages, 2013. doi:10.1155/2013/431979. (eng.)

7. ***Jeffrey M. Jones***, In U.S., Private Schools Get Top Marks for Educating Children. August 29, 2012 // http://www.gallup.com/poll/156974/private-schools-top-marks-educating-children.aspx. (eng.)

8. ***Lips Dan.*** A Smaller Path to a "Race to the Top" in Educational Reform, 2012 // www.eric.ed.gov , ED509500. (eng.)

9. ***Hickok Eugene, Ladner Mathew***. Reauthorization of No Child Left Behind: Federal Management or Citizen Ownership of K-12 Education? / Hickok Eugene, Ladner Mathew, 2007, www.eric.ed.gov . ED498010. (eng.)

10. State Standards and Student Growth: Why State Standards Don`t Matter as Much as We Thought / ***Dahlin Michael, Xiang Yan, Durant Sarah, Cronin John.*** – Northwest Evaluation Association, 2010, www.eric.ed.gov. ED521964. (eng.)

11. The Consequences of MCAS Exit Examinations for Struggling Low-Income Urban Students / ***John P. Papay, Richard J. Murnane, John B. Willett.*** – Harvard Graduate School of Education, July 2008 // http://www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/0708papay-murnane-willett.doc

Е. В. Андрюшина. ПОСЛЕДСТВИЯ ВНЕДРЕНИЯ ЗАКОНА «НИ ОДНОГО НЕУСПЕВАЮЩЕГО РЕБЕНКА»: ОПЫТ США ДЛЯ ПЕДАГОГОВ УКРАИНЫ

В статье исследовано влияние закона «Ни одного неуспевающего ребенка» на формирование образовательной политики штата, школьного округа и школы. Рассмотрены пути использования результатов мониторинга качества среднего образования в США на уровне штата, школьного округа и школы. Проанализирована эффективность и возможные последствия осуществления мониторинга под воздействием закона «Ни одного неуспевающего ребенка» – позитивные и негативные. Исследованы последствия соблюдения высоких требований образовательных стандартов и образовательного прогресса учеников, охарактеризовано их влияние на образовательную деятельность учеников, учителей, руководителей школ и школьных округов. Выделены аспекты образовательного мониторинга, которые необходимо учитывать и анализировать в педагогической практике Украине.

Ключевые слова: *закон «Ни одного неуспевающего ребенка»; качество образования; мониторинг качества среднего образования; последствия мониторинга; результаты мониторинга; среднее образование; учебные стандарты.*

О. В. Андрюшина. НАСЛІДКИ ВПРОВАДЖЕННЯ ЗАКОНУ «ЖОДНОЇ НЕВСТИГАЮЧОЇ ДИТИНИ»: ДОСВІД США ДЛЯ ОСВІТЯН УКРАЇНИ

Інтеграція українського суспільства в європейське та світове співтовариство зумовлює нові вимоги до якості освіти. Процес підвищення якості освіти, уніфікація критеріїв оцінки освітніх результатів пов'язані з розробкою системи моніторингу, враховуючи досвід країн, в яких моніторингові дослідження ефективно функціонують та мають вплив на результати навчання, сприяють прогнозуванню розвитку освіти. В статті досліджено вплив закону «Жодної невстигаючої дитини» на формування освітньої політики штату, шкільного округу та школи. Розглянуто шляхи використання результатів моніторингу якості загальної освіти в США на рівні штату, шкільного округу та школи. Проаналізовано ефективність та можливі наслідки здійснення моніторингу під впливом закону «Жодної невстигаючої дитини» – позитивні і негативні. Досліджено наслідки дотримання високих вимог освітніх стандартів та освітнього поступу учнів, окреслено їх вплив на освітню діяльність учнів, вчителів, керівників шкіл та шкільних округів. Виокремлено аспекти освітнього моніторингу, що потребують урахування та аналізу для практичного застосування в Україні. Особистий внесок автора полягає у розкритті небажаних наслідків у впровадженні жорстких штрафних санкцій при використанні результатів моніторингу якості загальної освіти та у запропонованих шляхах їх реалізації.

Ключові слова: *закон «Жодної невстигаючої дитини; моніторинг якості середньої освіти; навчальні стандарти; наслідки моніторингу; результати моніторингу; середня освіта; якість освіти.*

Рецензенти

Желанова В. В. – д. п. н., доц.

Зубченко О. С. – канд. п. н.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 20.04.15

Прийнято до друку 23.04.15