

GSE A114: Schooling and Society

Tuesdays, 10-1, Longfellow 319.

Instructor: Jal Mehta

E-mail: jmehta@fas.harvard.edu

Office hours: Gutman 447, Tuesday, 3-5 p.m.

Overview

This course will look across the 20th and 21st centuries to investigate the relationship between broader social, economic, and intellectual trends and the chosen vehicles for school reform. Key questions we will explore include: What are the different visions that educators, policy-makers and the broader public have had for schools? What are the underlying assumptions about the purposes of schooling and the theories of how to create good practice that serve as the basis for these visions? And how do broader social currents direct or delimit the possibilities for school reform?

The first part of the course will introduce students to the arguments among major thinkers about the purposes of education, purposes including liberal arts, democratic citizenship, social justice, student growth, critical thinking, and economic mobility and competitiveness. It will also consider the major theories of how to create good practice, including markets, states, professions, and communities. The remainder of the course will consider a series of reform efforts that have sought to bring these visions into reality. Moving chronologically across the 20th century, we will consider attempts to make schools more efficient and accountable, to desegregate the schools, to make schools more responsive to their local communities, to “deschool” society, to create standards, to empower the professionals who staff schools, to deregulate the schools, and finally a renewed effort in the present to make the schools more efficient and accountable. In the course of considering these questions we draw on major thinkers and writers in education (Rousseau, Cardinal Newman, John Dewey, Harold Bloom, Paulo Freire, Milton Friedman and A.S. Neill), leading education historians (David Tyack, Larry Cuban, Herbert Kliebard, and Richard Hofstadter), and some of the most important modern voices in the debates over school reform (Ted Sizer, Chester Finn, Deborah Meier, Jonathan Kozol, and Richard Elmore).

As much as possible, the class is intended to help students explore their own interests: paper assignments will ask students to design and defend their own school system, and to study in depth a reform strategy of their choosing. The class will also be participatory: students will give feedback to each other’s work, lead discussions, and give presentations of their final papers. Finally, in an effort to help students develop and defend their own views about school reform, students will create a group blog through which they will respond to and interact with other bloggers about ongoing issues in educational policy, and they will submit commentaries to be considered for publication in *Education Week*.

Goals for the course: The course is designed around a set of expectations about what students will be able to do when they complete the course. These include, moving from the specific to the general:

1. *Being able to examine a proposed school reform and answer the following questions:*
 - *What are its assumptions about the purposes of education?*
 - What educational, social, political, economic or cultural goals are encapsulated in its view of reform?
 - What are its broader normative assumptions about human nature?
 - *What are its views of how quality practice is created?*
 - What are its views of who should control schooling?
 - What are its normative assumptions about human nature and about what motivates students and teachers?
 - What assumptions does it make about how social organizations function and how they could be improved?
 - *What is the evidence that the practice will accomplish its objectives? What are the other likely consequences (intended and unintended) of the proposed reform?*
 - What is the quantitative evidence?
 - What is the qualitative evidence?
 - What is the historical evidence (of similar reforms in other time periods)?
 - *What do critics say about the reform? What assumptions and evidence about purposes, about how quality practice is created, and about effects of the reform do they draw upon?*
 - *Finally, what explains the reform's political success or failure? What aspects of the political system, the economic or social climate of the times, the interest group landscape, or other factors, explain why a particular reform was adopted or not?*
2. *Being able to differentiate and assess competing interpretations of the above questions.* Any given set of reforms will engender conflicting evidence and even competing meta-narratives about what the reforms are intended to accomplish (e.g. NCLB as an equity tool vs. NCLB as an attempt to scapegoat the public school system). By the end of the course, you should be able to evaluate the empirical evidence about effects of reform and to assess the evidence for each of these competing meta-narratives.
3. *Being able to assess the quality of your work—your efforts to do 1 and 2—by the standards of the discipline.* Just as master pianists can hear when even one note is slightly off, we all strive to do the same in our work as writers and thinkers about education. This is a key part of what it means to join any field: to be able to articulate the standards of the field, to be able to assess how one's efforts fall short of that standard, and to decide what would be needed for improvement.
4. *Being able to combine the aforementioned skills with your values in order to reach and defend policy positions.*
5. *Being able to apply the aforementioned skills to participate effectively in contemporary debates about school reform.*

Expectations: These are highly demanding goals that all of us in education strive to meet. Refining these skills takes considerable practice, self-reflection, and ongoing revision of both one's thinking and one's writing. All of the activities of the course are intended to contribute to helping you to reach these goals, including readings, class discussions, and written work. In line with these goals, whenever possible, there will be opportunities to choose topics that interest you, to assess and revise your work, to give and receive feedback, and to lead as well as participate in class discussion.

Summary of Activities and Grading: The class has four major components and the grade will be divided among them as follows: 1) class discussion, blogging, and work in teams (15%); short paper (20%); final paper (35%); and a take-home final (30%). More detail on each of these activities follows.

Given the collaborative nature of the work in the class, it will not be graded on a curve. This is consistent with the view of the teacher as a facilitator who helps each student to produce his/her best work rather than as an umpire who seeks to differentiate among students. Rather, I grade according to a fixed standard of what it means to do good work. First drafts of papers will be given a provisional grade to indicate the quality of their work, but only the grade on the final paper will count towards the final grade. All grades are final.

CLASS DISCUSSION: Please prepare not only by reading, but also by thinking about and connecting the readings, guided in part by the study questions (to be distributed each week). In the second part of the semester, I will ask you to work in teams to organize and help to lead the discussions.

Most class sessions will be divided into two blocks: roughly a two hour discussion of the readings of the week, followed by a short break, and then a discussion of a contemporary case that relates to the themes of the course. This will provide twice as many opportunities to think about reform cases than would come through the readings alone, offering more chances to bring to bear our analytic skills. While I will sometimes pick the contemporary cases to match the topic of the week, it also provides a chance for you to connect the discussions in the course to ongoing debates of interest to you.

To facilitate our study, we will all subscribe to *Education Week*, the newspaper of record for the education community. *You should read the front page, the back page commentary and the inside commentaries* (generally on the same page that the back page commentary jumps to). I will let you know on Thursday of each week exactly what we will be discussing the following week; please be in touch by then over e-mail if you have suggestions for what we should cover.

PAPERS: There are two papers for the course. The papers provide an opportunity for you to work out your thoughts through writing, and to examine your assumptions in a rigorous way. To aid in that process, the papers will go through one round of revisions, which will give you an opportunity to improve your work on the basis of feedback from me and from your classmates. This process will function as a classroom version of peer review, and it is consistent with the idea that one of the goals of the course is to help everyone produce quality work by the standards of the discipline.

SHORT PAPER: DESIGN YOUR OWN SCHOOL SYSTEM (8-10 pages) – Due March 2nd, revised version due March 16th.

Drawing on the readings from the first four weeks of the course, outline your ideal of a good school system. The paper should:

- Identify the purposes (both educational and social) the schools should accomplish (and connect the discussion of these purposes to the accompanying educational theorists);
- Identify the model(s) of how to produce good practice that the system embodies (and connect the theory of practice to the appropriate organizational theorist).
- Identify the most salient weakness(es) in your proposed model (using alternate theories of purposes and good practice), and then make an argument for why the model should be preferred even in spite of this weakness(es).

FINAL PAPER: EXPLORE A REFORM OF YOUR CHOOSING (20-25 pages) – Topic due February 20th, preliminary draft due April 20th, final paper due May 11th.

This is your chance to explore in depth a reform of your choosing. The reform can be from the past or present, from the United States or from abroad. The reform can be as broad as the “rise of vouchers” or as specific as a particular reform in a particular place at a particular time. The reform can also be a widely adopted reform or one that was only briefly proposed but never adopted (or not widely adopted). For your chosen reform, after defining the nature and scope of the reform, the paper is expected to answer the five questions spelled out in the course objectives. Specifically that means: 1) explaining the underlying assumptions about the purposes of the reform; 2) explaining its theory of how to create good practice; 3) summarizing briefly the evidence on the reform; 4) considering critics’ interpretations of each of these first three; and 5) explaining what broader political, economic or social events or political factors facilitated its rise or hindered its success. In the paper’s final section you should take a stand on whether the reform should be tried, revived, scrapped, revised, or sustained. Again, be aware of, and refute at least one—and preferably more than one—counter-argument to your preferred case.

As sources for the paper, you should draw on secondary sources as well as at least 10 primary sources. For contemporary reforms, these would most likely be interviews; for reforms in the past, this would likely mean primary documents.

Given the scope of the assignment, it will be due in pieces. In the third week of the course you will choose a topic, in the tenth week you owe a shorter draft of the entire paper (18-20 pages), including at least 6 primary sources. I will offer feedback, as will some of your classmates (see below), and then the final version of the paper (25 pages), including the 10 sources, will be due at the end of the 13th and final week of the class.

We will also hold a research workshop (date TBA) in which you will present your findings formally to your classmates and to other interested parties at the education school. More information on the presentation will be forthcoming.

TAKE HOME FINAL: This is your chance to think about and tie together the themes from the course. The questions will be cumulative and integrative, asking you to make connections across the units, and between debates from the past and the present. The final will be distributed shortly after classes end, and I will ask for it to be returned 48 hours later. In the spirit of collaborative learning, each of the teams (more details below) will submit 3-4 essay questions (meeting certain criteria) that they think should be on the final. Some of these questions will be circulated as study questions, and one will be included on the final. More information will be provided as we get closer to the date.

TEACHING AND CRITIQUING: As those of you who have taught know, the best way to know any subject is to teach it. At the same time, research on the wisdom of crowds and the success of Wikipedia suggests that groups are collectively wiser than the individuals who comprise them. We are going to apply these principles to our work. Each student will be assigned to a 3-4 person team. The teams are resources in the brainstorming stages of the paper writing—people to bounce ideas off of and get reactions. Provisional drafts of the papers will be turned into me, but also to the fellow members of the team, who will provide feedback and constructive critique. Directions on the timing and the nature of the feedback will be forthcoming. Each team will also be charged with running one of the class sessions in the second part of the semester.

GROUP BLOG: Finally, as many of you likely know, there are extended debates of almost every educational issue going on in the blogosphere. The final step to all that happens in this class is to take our learning out of classroom and become effective advocates in the real world of political and policy advocacy. *The class will sign up for an account via blogger, and each student and myself will post at least 3 posts of 400 words or more on some aspect of the contemporary debate.* We will alert other education bloggers to our contributions and respond to their posts. Each student will also write a short post with a link to his/her final paper on the blog, with the goal of stimulating wider interest in our contributions. *Each of us (me included) will also submit a commentary to Education Week,* and those that are not published will be posted on our blog.

DEADLINES: Please turn in your work on time. Late work will be penalized by 1/3 of a grade per day (i.e., A to A-). If first drafts are late, deductions will be taken from the final grade on the paper.

Books to Purchase (RT):

1. Deborah Meier et al. (2000). Will Standards Save Public Education? Boston: Beacon Press. [RT]
2. Hochschild, Jennifer and Scovronick, Nathan. (2003). The American Dream and the Public Schools. Oxford: Oxford University Press. [RT]
3. Hess, Frederick et al. (2004). A Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom? Cambridge: Harvard Education Press. [RT]

Readings List Codes:

RT = Required Text

CP = Course Pack

H = In class Handouts

On Reserve = on reserve at Gutman Library circulation desk.

E-Resources = retrieved via the Harvard Library Electronic Resources System or WWW.

Part I: What are Schools for? What is at Stake in Debates Around School Reform?

Week 1: Feb 6th -- Jumping In: A Debate About Contemporary Schools

- Deborah Meier and critics, Will Standards Save Public Education. [RT]
- James Traub, "What No School Can Do," *New York Times Magazine*, Jan 16th 2000 [E-Resource – Lexis/Nexis]
- Paul Tough, "What it Takes to Make a Student," *New York Times Magazine*, Nov. 26, 2006. [E-Resource – Lexis/Nexis]

Week 2: Feb 13th -- Background: Purposes of Schooling (I)

- Critical thinking:
 - Hofstadter, Richard. (1963). Anti-Intellectualism in American Life. New York: Vintage Books. (pp. 24-51). [CP]
 - Freire, Paulo. (1970). The Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Continuum. (pp. 57-74). [CP]
- Liberal education:
 - Cardinal Newman, J H. (1923). The Idea of the University. Discourses V,VI, VII. London: Longmans, Green and Co. (pp.99-178). [CP]
- Growth:
 - Rousseau, Jean Jacques. (1971). The Emile of Jean Jacques Rousseau. W. Boyd (Ed.). New York: Teachers College Press. (pp. 11-25, 33-52, 70-94). [CP]

Week 3: Feb 20th -- **Background: Purposes of Schooling (II)**

- Economic purposes:
 - Grubb, W. Norton and Lazerson, Marvin. (2004). The Economic Gospel. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (pp. 1-28, 245-269). [CP]
- Citizenship and social purposes
 - Kaestle, Carl F. (1983). Pillars of the Republic. New York: Hill and Wang. (pp. 75-103). [CP]
- Social Justice
 - Counts, George S. (1969). Dare the School Build a New Social Order? New York: Arno Press. (pp. 1-13, 27-56). [CP]
- Background:
 - Lakoff, George. (2002). Moral Politics. Chicago: University of Chicago. (pp. 24-37, 65-140, 162-176). [CP]

Week 4: Feb 27th --**Background: How to Create Good Practice**

- Markets
 - Friedman, Milton. (2002). Capitalism and Freedom. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (pp. 22-36, 85-107). [CP]
- States
 - Hochschild, Jennifer. and Scovronick, Nathan. (2003) The American Dream and the Public Schools. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (pp.1-27). [RT]
- Professions
 - Freidson, Eliot. (2001). Professionalism: The Third Logic. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (pp. 1-14, 17-35, 197-222). [CP]
- Accountability
 - Finn, Jr., Chester (1991). We Must Take Charge. New York: Free Press. (pp. 144-158, 235-237). [CP]
- Communities
 - Fung, Archon. (2004). Empowered Participation. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (pp. 1-30). [CP]
- Hybrids
 - Finn, Jr., Chester. “Real Accountability in K-12 Education: The Marriage of Ted and Alice.”
[E-Resource: http://media.hoover.org/documents/0817938826_23.pdf/]
- Why change of any kind is so difficult:
 - Tyack, David and Cuban, Lawrence. (1995). Tinkering Toward Utopia. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (pp. 60-109). [CP]

Part II – Early Approaches to Reform: A Product of the Times or A Precursor to the Present?

Week 5: March 6th -- An Early Efficiency Movement

- Callahan, Raymond. (1962). Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (pp. 19-41, 65-125, 179-220). [On Reserve.]
- Lagemann, Ellen. (2000). The Elusive Science. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (pp. 19-22, 56-70). [CP]
- Kliebard, Herbert. (1995). The Struggle for the American Curriculum. New York: Routledge. (pp. 77-105). [CP]
- Gladwell, Malcolm. (2003, Sept. 15). Making the Grade. *The New Yorker*. p.31. [E-Resource – Lexis/Nexis]
http://www.newyorker.com/talk/content/articles/030915ta_talk_gladwell?030915ta_talk_gladwell

Recommended

- Berman, Barbara. (1983). Business Efficiency, American Schooling and the Public School Superintendency. *History of Education Quarterly*, 23, 297-321 [E-Resource – JSTOR]

Part III – Challenge and Backlash

Week 6: March 13th -- Desegregation (then and now)

- Hochschild, J. and Scovronick, N. (2003). The American Dream and the Public Schools. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (pp. 28-51). [RT]
- Rieder, Jonathan. (1985). Canarsie. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. (pp. 203-263). [CP]
- Kozol, Jonathan. (2005). The Shame of a Nation. New York: Crown Publishers. (pp. 13-37, 237-263). [CP]
- Orfield, Gary. and Eaton, Susan (1996). Dismantling Desegregation. New York: The New Press. (pp. 53-71). [CP]
- Kahlenberg, Richard. (2001). All Together Now. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. (pp. 12-46). [CP]

Week 7: March 20th -- **Community Control (then and now)**

- Eliot, Thomas. (1959) Toward an Understanding of Public School Politics. *American Political Science Review*, 53(4), 1032-1051. [E-Resource – JSTOR]
- Rogers, David. (1970). The New York City School System: A Classic Case of Bureaucratic Pathology. In A. Rubinstein (Ed.), *Schools Against Children: The Case for Community Control* (pp. 127-142). New York: Monthly Review Press. [CP]
- Wilkerson, Doxey. (1970). The Failure of Schools Serving the Black and Puerto Rican Poor. In A. Rubinstein (Ed.), *Schools Against Children: The Case for Community Control* (pp. 93-126). New York: Monthly Review Press. [CP]
- Kozol, Jonathan. (1967). Death at an Early Age. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. (pp. 1-27, 97-107, 193-202). [CP]
- Fung, Archon. (2004). Empowered Participation. Princeton: Princeton University Press. (pp. 69-98). [CP]
- Hochschild, Jennifer. (2005). What School Boards Can and Cannot (or Will Not) Accomplish. In W. Howell (Ed.), *Besieged: Schools Boards and the Future of American Politics* (pp 324-338). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. [CP]
- Howell, William. (2005). Introduction. In W. Howell (Ed.), *Besieged: Schools Boards and the Future of American Politics* (pp 1-23). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. [CP]

Week 8: April 3rd – **Unschooling and Open Schooling (then and now)**

- Illich, Ivan. (1971). Deschooling Society. New York: Harper and Row. (pp. 1-24). [CP]
- Neill, A. S. (1960). Summerhill. New York: Hart Publishing. (pp. 3-28, 95-132, 155-171). [CP]
- Dewey, John. (1997). Experience and Education. New York: Touchstone. (pp. 33-60, 67-72). [**On Reserve.**]
- Steven, Mitchell. (2001). Kingdom of Children. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (pp. 30-71). [CP]
- Saulny, Susan. Home Schoolers Content to Take Children's Lead. (2006, November 26) *New York Times*, Section 1; Column 2; National Desk; Pg. 1. [E-Resource – Lexis/Nexis]

Skim

- Cuban, Larry. (1993). How Teachers Taught. New York: Teachers College Press. (pp. 149-204). [CP]

Part IV – Reform, Retrenchment or Rationalization? The 1980s to the Present

Week 9: April 10th -- Markets – Arguments from the Right and Left

- Chubb, John and Moe, Terry. (1990). Politics, Markets and Schools. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution. (pp. 1-68, 185-229). [**On Reserve.**]
- Jencks, Christopher. (1966) Is the Public School Obsolete? *The Public Interest*, 2, 18-27. [CP]
- Reich, Robert.(2000, September 6). The Case for Progressive Vouchers. *The American Prospect Online*. [E-Resource – accessed at the following URL
<http://www.prospect.org/webfeatures/2000/09/reich-r-09-06.html>]
- Sizer, Theodore. (2004). The Red Pencil. New Have, CT: Yale University Press. (pp. 1-29). [CP]
- Cuban, Larry. (2004). The Blackboard and the Bottom Line. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. (pp. 140-157). [CP]
- Hochschild, J. and Scovronick, N. (2003) The American Dream and the Public Schools. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (pp.107-132). [RT]

Week 10: April 17th – Standards

- Early impetus for standards (1980s):
 - National Commission on Educational Excellence. (1983). A Nation at Risk. A Report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education. [E-Resource: accessed online at]: <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/index.html>
 - Stedman, L. and Smith, M. (1983). Recent Reform Proposals for American Education. *Contemporary Education Review*, 2, 85-104. [CP]
 - Murphy, Joseph. (1990). The Educational Reform Movement of the 1980s: A Comprehensive Analysis. In J. Murphy (Ed.), *The Educational Reform Movement of the 1980s* (pp. 3-55). Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing. [CP]
- Standards-Based Reform (early 1990s):
 - Smith, Marshall and O’Day, Jennifer. Systemic School Reform. In S. Fuhrman and B. Malen (Eds.), *The Politics of Curriculum and Testing* (pp. 233-267). London: Falmer Press. [CP]
 - Finn, Jr., Chester (1991). We Must Take Charge. New York: Free Press. (pp. 128-143, 235-273). [CP]
 - Bloom, Allan. (1987). The Closing of the American Mind. New York: Simon and Shuster. (pp. 336-382). [CP]

Skim

- National Center on Education and the Economy. (1990). America’s Choice: High Skills or Low Wages, (pp. v-ix, 1-9, 19-48) Rochester, NY: Author. [**On Reserve.**]

Week 11: April 24th -- Professionalism

- Higher Education
 - Jencks, C. and Riesman, D. (2002). The Academic Revolution. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction. (pp 1-27). [CP]
 - Study Group on the Conditions of Excellence in Higher Education (1984). Involvement in Learning: Realizing the Potential of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education. (pp. 23-61, skim entire report). [On Reserve.]
- K-12 Education
 - Theoretical background:
 - Etzioni, A. (1969). Preface. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization* (pp. v-xvii). New York: Free Press. [CP]
 - Overviews:
 - Toch, Thomas. (1991). In the Name of Excellence. New York: Oxford University Press. (pp 134-204). [CP] (Read quickly for overview)
 - Kerchner, Charles and Cauffman, Krista (1995). Lurching Towards Professionalism: The Saga of Teacher Unionism. *Elementary School Journal*, 96(1), 107-122. [E-Resource – JSTOR]
 - Primary sources:
 - Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Author. (pp. 11-15, 20-21, 25-26, 35-41, 55-78, 87-103, 117-118). [On Reserve.]
 - Chase, Bob. (1997-1998). The New NEA: Reinventing Teacher Unions for a New ERA. *American Educator*, 21(4), 12-16. [CP]
 - Archer, Jeff. (2002). President Leaves Mixed Record on Pledge to Reinvent the NEA. *Education Week*, 21(41). [E-Resource – EBSCO]
 - A critical view:
 - Finn, Jr., Chester. (2003). Teacher Reform Gone Astray. [E-Resource - Accessible at URL]:
http://media.hoover.org/documents/0817939210_211.pdf

Recommended

- Lortie, D. (1969). The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School. In A. Etzioni (Ed.), *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization* (pp. 1-53). New York: Free Press. [CP]

Week 12 May 1st – **Deregulation**

- Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. (1999). The Teachers We Need and How to Get More of Them. [E-Resource - accessible online at URL]: <http://www.fordhamfoundation.org/institute/publication/publication.cfm?id=15&pubsubid=41&doc=pdf>
- Hess, Frederick et al. (2004). A Qualified Teacher in Every Classroom? Cambridge: Harvard Education Press. (pp. 11-47, 177-278). [RT]
- Osborne, David and Gabler, Ted. (1992). Reinventing Government Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. (pp. 1-48, 250-279). [CP]
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. New York: Author. (look again at A Nation Prepared, particularly 35-41). [On Reserve.]
- Stern, Jane. Making Schools Succeed. *Baltimore Sun*, May 5, 1993, p.19A. [CP]

Week 13 May 8th – **Accountability and Federal Control**

- Adams, Jr., Jacob and Kirst, Michael. (1999). New Demands and Concepts for Educational Accountability. In J. Murphy and K. Louis (Eds.), *Handbook on Research on Educational Administration* (pp. 463-489). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. [CP]
- Elmore, Richard. (2004). School Reform from the Inside Out. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press. [pp. 201-211, 227-258]. [CP]
- Hess, Frederick and Petrilli, Michael. (2006, June 5). Whither the Washington Consensus? *American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research*. [E-Resource - available at]: http://www.aei.org/include/pub_print.asp?pubID=24487 .
- Traub, James. (2002, April 7). The Test Mess. *New York Times Magazine*, Section 6; Column 1; Magazine Desk; p. 46 [E-Resource – Lexis/Nexis]
- Thernstrom, Abigail and Thernstrom, Stephan. (2003). No Excuses. New York: Simon and Schuster. (pp. 11-40). [CP]
- Center on Education Policy. (2006). From the Capitol to the Classroom, year 4, executive summary: [E-Resource, permanent URL]: <http://www.cep-dc.org/nclb/Year4/NCLB-Year4Summary.pdf>
- Meier, Deborah. (2002). In Schools We Trust. Boston: Beacon. (pp 1-6). [CP]