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**NICKELBEE**

In 2001, the Bush administration passed a law named No Child Left Behind (NLCB). The NLCB’s main intention was to modify the current education system with the theory of standard-based education. The theory states that by increasing the school standards and establishing goals can improve the student’s outcome (1). The schools who achieve these goals are rewarded by federal funding.

NLCB was passed because the United States of America needed to improve its education policies since many Americans were complaining of the current one. This law basically encouraged students to learn more English, Foreign Languages, Math and later, Science. Also the federal government would reward each school by providing funds to those schools that succeed in teaching students this material (1). However, since there are significant differences between schools in each state, each state is given the task to make a standardized test which students are to take to determine how each school is performing. This funding will most likely go to improving the school technology labs and giving teachers training on the best teaching methods available. Therefore it encourages teachers into taking additional effort in making sure that every student has an opportunity to learn the material given in class. NCLB also increases the accountability of the schools by requiring them to provide crucial information to parents such as the teacher’s qualifications in certain subjects and detailed report cards which specify the areas each student needs to improve. If schools turn out to be unfit for children, the school must also provide a chance for the student to transfer into a higher performing local school. Schools must also offer free tutoring for students who request it.

However, the unintentional effects or outcomes of this new law are heavily criticized. One of the unintentional effects is how teachers are dedicating themselves only into teaching what will benefit the school more rather than the children (2). It seems that teachers are now just teaching what will be in the test given by the state rather than giving a well-rounded education. Thus, students only learn narrow topics that will be on the test and never learn other subjects like arts and history (2). Another unintentional effect is how the state is so interested in this money that they decide to ease the test for the sole purpose of the kids performing better. This has turned to be a very controversial topic because these effects modify data, making it hard for experts to determine whether this law has improved kids’ education (2). Thus, people criticize that the law is useless and has caused corruption in education facilities because they are more interested in the federal funding than what the kids are actually learning.

Therefore, I believe that the government should not get involved in education since it is more of a state-oriented job. The federal government should then try to equally fund schools since one of the United States ideals is individuality – the belief that everybody has an equal opportunity to learn. I believe that the federal government had its best intentions in helping the kids’ education, but they did not consider the unintended effects of the law.

\*negatve

1. Student learn less narrow topics
2. State set the standards so they lower the standerized test

Each final paper will identify the policy (law or regulation) under

consideration, the stated goal of the policy, and analyze its effects (including at

least one secondary effect.) Especially consider how the policy changes the

incentives of individuals. A good analysis may also discuss whether the stated

both investigate the reason it was passed (legislative intent) and analyze how it

changed the incentives and actions of individuals.

cifically, you should read “The

Lesson” (p 167),
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