

IMPROVING THE CURRENT STATUS OF SCHOOL PERFORMANCE REPORTING

Marc A. Rubin*

ABSTRACT. The large amount of tax and tuition dollars spent on both public and private primary and secondary education in the United States is motivating an ever-increasing demand for school performance and accountability information. The information that is needed by constituents depends on the type of school accountability system in place. Although the Government Accounting Standards Board proposed a model for school performance information over a decade ago, there remains considerable variability in the type and quality of information that is provided to by schools. This article describes school performance and accountability information currently provided by both public and private primary and secondary schools. In addition, suggestions are provided on how to make improvements in the information provided by schools and districts to their constituents.

INTRODUCTION

Americans spend on average approximately \$6200 per student per year in public primary and secondary education (National Education Association, 2002). Tuition for students attending private schools averaged over \$3,000 approximately ten years ago (the last time statistics are available; Capenet, 2002) and is likely to be at least double that today. Yet, a recent survey suggests that American adults are of the opinion that the quality of education in the U.S. schools is a significant continuing concern (National Public Radio, 1999). The common belief that the resources going into the American education system can be more efficiently and effectively spent has led to an increasing amount of

* *Marc A. Rubin, Ph.D., is PricewaterhouseCoopers Professor and Chair, Department of Accountancy, Miami University. His research interest is in financial accounting, financial statement analysis, and governmental accounting.*

Copyright © 2004 by PrAcademics Press

attention paid by school stakeholders to the process of allocating educational resources and the information needed to make allocation decisions.

Although there have been many studies and proposed programs of school accountability and performance reporting, there remains a considerable amount of dissatisfaction with the current methods of holding education providers accountable. In addition, there are no uniform means of measuring and communicating the performance of school administrators, teachers, and students. School stakeholders desire information concerning the return on funds invested in education, yet this has been elusive. Currently there are a variety of programs and proposals addressing educational accountability and performance reporting. Examples of programs that are intended to increase public school performance and accountability include school or school district report cards and resource allocations based on school performance or merit.

The dissatisfaction with current methods of school accountability has also led to the design and limited implementation of school choice schemes that are intended to empower educational consumers. School choice may include a wide variety of programs such as vouchers that may be used by consumers in some defined set of schools (public or private), charter schools, magnet schools and entire privatization of schools. The assumption often made relating to choice programs is that consumers who have the option to select from different schools will have an incentive to become more informed about school performance and thus hold schools more accountable. This assumption has been questioned by a number of researchers including Ascher, Fruchter and Berne (1996). Any type of school accountability potentially requires stakeholders to use extensive amounts of information on the performance of schools, teachers and students.

Yet, as Schneider (2001, p. 73) states: "Scholars know little about the information sources parents use, the quality of that information, and how parents use it to choose schools for their children. Scholars know even less about how to intervene in the flow of school information to increase parents' information levels."

This article explores the information needs of the various school accountability programs. Subsequently, the current status of providing private and public school accountability information to external

constituents is examined. Finally, suggestions are made regarding improvements to the current provision of public and private school accountability information.

INFORMATION NEEDS OF SCHOOL ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAMS

Top Down Accountability

Legislators at all levels have designed programs, such as performance reports and merit resource allocations, in an attempt to hold educators accountable through a top-down process. These types of programs require that the higher authority collect and assess performance information and then structure rewards for service providers in order to motivate them to be more productive in working toward institutional objectives. A variation of top-down accountability processes entails the provision of information to school constituents who then lobby administrators for changes in the provision of educational services. Both private and public schools typically use some form of top down accountability.

The following is an example of top-down accountability. Performance information relating to teachers is collected and reviewed by school or school district administrators. Performance information typically includes measures of student achievement and skills. It is up to the administrator to decide how to provide merit rewards to teachers and to determine whether any actions are needed to change and improve the method for delivering educational services. In order to improve the delivery of educational services, administrators may decide to make changes to any of the following: service providers, processes for determining compensation, amounts of compensation, curriculum, development of teachers, class size, or resources available to teachers. Similar evaluative and decision processes are useful for holding building and district administrators, such as principals and superintendents, accountable. The amount of information needed by administrators using a top-down accountability process is often considerable. Administrators are usually responsible simultaneously for multiple service providers such as teachers, teacher aides, support personnel, as well as students (service recipients). The amount of information an administrator needs for assessing service providers and students for whom they are

responsible may make top-down accountability a difficult and time-consuming system to implement effectively.

Top-down accountability in schools depends on decision-makers understanding the relationship between educational inputs and performance. This relationship is the focus of a considerable number of research studies (Hanushek, 1997). In these studies, achievement test scores and graduation rates are typically used as measures of student or school performance. The selection of input measures is less consistent with numerous characteristics being studied as determinants of school or student performance. Research results have not provided conclusive evidence relating a consistent set of specific education resources to school performance. A broad examination of the research evidence suggests that student achievement is generally associated with factors related to family influences, peer groups, and the school environment. Education service providers may directly influence only school environment, and even the responsibility for school environment may be shared among a number of service providers and administrators, making it difficult to determine whose performance is impacting outcomes. The problem of determining the appropriate educational inputs and assigning responsibility for their control contributes to the overall difficulty of instituting effective top-down educational accountability.

Bottom Up Accountability

A second process for holding education service providers accountable is a bottom-up process. Instead of accountability being the sole responsibility of school administrators, the process of bottom-up accountability requires the recipients of educational services to have leverage over service providers. Service recipients can exert their leverage by having the ability to select desirable service providers or opt out of inadequate or unsuitable service providers. All private schools are subject to bottom-up accountability. Public schools potentially allow for bottom-up accountability if service recipients have some choice in selecting which teachers or schools to attend. Examples of these types of programs include choice programs (such as magnet schools), voucher programs, and charter school programs.

In programs where educational service recipients (which is intended to mean students and their parents) have at least some ability to select educational service providers, information is needed by education

recipients to make informed selections. Service recipients require information that allows for assessment of the adequacy of a service provider in meeting the educational goals of the recipient. The specific information that is required by service recipients to make choices may generally coincide with the information that is required by administrators in top-down accountability processes. For example, both decision-makers selecting from a variety of educational service providers and school administrators may desire information on school success (test scores, graduation rates, etc.) and environment (attendance rates, safety, etc.). A significant difference between top-down and bottom-up accountability is the critical nature of information that allows for comparability between service providers. Service provider comparability information, while useful for top-down accountability, is essential for the selection process by service recipients.

It is clear that both top-down and bottom-up accountability require that decision-makers, whether they are administrators or service recipients, have information available that allows them to assess the performance of providers of educational services. The information needed by decision-makers should enable them to relate educational inputs to outputs and determine a return on educational investments. Top-down and bottom-up accountability are not mutually exclusive but may be used in conjunction with one another to provide a more comprehensive accountability program. The next section of the article describes the effort by a group commissioned by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) to provide a model of school information useful to external decision-makers, such as taxpayers and the parents of school-aged children.

GASB REPORT ON ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

In 1989, the GASB published a study on the external reporting of service efforts and accomplishments (SEA) of elementary and secondary education (Hatry, Alexander and Fountain, 1989). As part of the study, the authors suggested information that would help interested parties evaluate the provision of educational services. The study contains suggestions for financial and non-financial measures of inputs, outputs, outcomes, and efficiency. The GASB report also emphasizes providing users with explanatory information as an important component for appropriate use of performance reports.

The inputs referred to in the GASB report are the resources obtained by the reporting entity to fulfill its objective. School systems are the entity on which the GASB report focuses. The GASB report suggests that school districts disclose two input measures, a monetary measure (expenditures) and a measure of labor (number of personnel). Outputs are measures of workload accomplished by the entity. In the case of schools, the suggested measures deal with the number of students served. Outcome measures provide information about program results or the objectives of the service provider. Most of the suggested school outcome measures relate to the intellectual, physical, emotional, and social progress of students. Efficiency measures attempt to relate inputs (costs) with outputs and outcomes. An example of an efficiency measure is cost per student promoted. Finally, explanatory information describes factors that may impact organizational performance, some of which may be controllable by the organization (for example, the numbers of hours students attend classes) and others that may not be controllable (for example, the number of students with English as a second language). A summary of the performance information suggested by the GASB report is found in Table 1.

The GASB report provides examples of selected state, school district, and school performance reports. The GASB report and subsequent Concept Statement Number 2 encourages schools administrators to experiment with SEA reporting (Government Accounting Standards Board, 1994). The GASB particularly emphasizes efficiency measures that relate inputs to outputs or outcomes. Although a significant amount of attention is being paid to performance reporting since the publication of the GASB report, it appears that only a limited number of these suggestions have been implemented by states and school districts. Potential reasons for the slow adoption of the GASB suggestions are discussed in a subsequent section of this manuscript. The next section reviews recent efforts toward providing educational accountability information.

CURRENT STATUS OF EDUCATION PERFORMANCE REPORTING

Few studies have been conducted analyzing the data that is available on the type, consistency, and comparability of information used by public or private school administrators for either top-down or bottom-up accountability (Schneider, 2001). Internally used information for

accountability is not readily available and will not be addressed in this study. This study addresses the characteristics of externally reported performance information since it is more accessible and can be used for

TABLE 1
GASB Report Suggestions on Information for School Performance Reports

Component	Measure
Inputs	Expenditures
	Total number of personnel
Outputs	Number of student-days
	Number of students promoted
	Carnegie units as percentage requirement
	Absenteeism rate
Outcomes	Dropout rate and/or retention
	Types of tests
	Test scores by major area
	Measure of gain on achievement test
	Measure of self-esteem
	Measure of physical fitness
	Measure of post-grad employment/education
Efficiency (input to output or outcome)	Self-assessment by students of skills
	Parent assessment of student skills
	Cost per student (student, student-day)
	Cost per outcome (cost per measure of achievement)
Explanatory Data	Cost/program
	Cost/school
	<i>Controllable</i>
	Class Size or pupil/teacher ratio
	<i>Non-controllable</i>
	Attendance
	Measure of minority students
	Measure of students on reduced lunch
	Measure of need for remedial programs
	Student mobility rate measure
English as a second language	
Student enrollment	



either top-down or bottom-up accountability. Since decisions for both types of accountability require similar information, information provided for external constituents may be reflective of information internally available. Since externally provided data is more accessible, it is easier to determine the characteristics of the information that is available to school constituents that can potentially be used for either top-down or bottom-up accountability. The most common format used by states for providing public school district performance information to the general public is the "report card." In most cases, report cards are issued by the state and made available by contacting state education agencies or through agency websites. An example of a report card for school districts in Ohio can be found at <http://www.ode.state.oh.us/reportcard/archives/Default.asp>. The formats and information contained in the report cards developed by the different states are not consistent, and in a number of instances they are not comparable over time for the same state.

A recent study analyzing information included on public school report cards found a wide range of reported measures ("What Information Do States Include on Report Cards," 1999). The study indicated that most of the report cards included test scores, graduation and dropout rates, selected student characteristics, class size or pupil-teacher ratios, and a measure of student attendance. A variety of other attributes are found on report cards with less frequency. In general, current state report cards have a primary emphasis on factors related to school environment and intellectual achievement, while less attention is paid to other characteristics found to relate to student performance such as family and peer groups. Financial information (such as salary data) is provided in the report cards of 17 states but data is not available on whether any states provide school efficiency measures. Nine states provide an overall accountability measure that may in part be based on school efficiency. Findings of the report card study are summarized in Table 2.

In addition to public school report cards issued by states, both private and public schools and school districts may individually and directly provide external constituents with performance information. Schools and districts typically use newsletters, columns in newspapers or websites to communicate information on a variety of topics. The information reported by these methods is usually at the discretion of the school or district.

TABLE 2
Summary of *Education Week* Study of School Report Cards

Dimension	Attribute	Number of states that include attribute in report card (%)
Publishing and Disseminating	Does the state have an annual report card on each of its schools?	36* (100%)
	Does the state make all the school report cards available on its web site?	26 (72)
	Does the state require the school report cards to be sent home?	13 (26)
Comparing student performance	National average	17 (47)
	State average	25 (69)
	District average	20 (56)
	Previous year	25 (69)
	Scores in similar schools or districts	9 (25)
	Scores predicted by student demographics	3 (8)
	Scores in top-performing schools	1 (3)
Academics and achievement	Test scores	36 (100)
	Graduation rate	24 (67)
	Dropout rate	33 (92)
	AP courses or tests	14 (39)
	Course-taking	11 (31)
	SAT/ACT data	20 (56)
	Post secondary plans/experiences	15 (42)
Students	Student characteristics	23 (64)
	Student mobility	12 (33)
Teachers, resources and school climate	Teacher qualifications	16 (44)
	Salaries or other financial data	17 (47)
	Safety of discipline	17 (47)
	Class size/pupil-teacher ratio	20 (56)
	Student attendance	30 (83)
	Parent involvement	11 (31)
	Satisfaction/opinion data	5 (14)
Other information about school	Accountability rating	9 (25)
	Description of programs/philosophy	15 (42)

* Five additional states will have reports starting in 2000 or 2001. Six other states provide individual school test score results.

In order to obtain preliminary insights into the type of performance information made available by public and private schools and districts, the websites of public school districts and individual public and private schools were examined. The public schools and districts were selected from a list maintained by Web66. The examined websites were from schools and districts located in each of the fifty states. Districts were selected non-randomly so as to assure that sampled districts varied in location and type (urban, suburban and rural). Exhibit 1 contains a list of either the public schools or districts selected from the Web66 site (web66.coled.umn.edu). If a school district website was initially selected, then at least one school website at each level of school (high, intermediate and elementary) from that district was subsequently selected for inclusion in the analysis. If a school website was initially selected for analysis, then the district website in which the school was located and websites for schools at different levels that were located in the same district were also included in the analysis. In total, fifty district websites were analyzed and schools from each level in those 50 districts were analyzed as well.

For the purpose of describing the information contained on school and district websites, four categories of information are used. The first category is administrative information that includes items such as descriptive information, directories, event calendars, and announcements. A second category is public relations or publicity information. This category includes mission and vision statements, goals, policy statements, newsletters, and employment opportunities. The third category is performance information. This includes information such as college entrance test scores, graduation rates, awards, and accreditation information. The final category is financial information, such as budget and expenditure data. Table 3 summarizes the categories of information and the number of public school districts or schools providing the specific information on their websites.

Findings from the website analysis suggest that school district websites generally contained more information than websites for individual schools. Additional findings indicate that high schools (likely because of the age of the students, the size of the student population and the breadth of activities) contain more information than the websites of schools for younger age children. The most common form of information reported on school and school district websites falls in either

TABLE 3
Information Reported on School and School District Websites

Type of Information Reported	Number of Public School Districts Websites (n=50)	Number of Public School Websites (n=150)	Number of Private School Websites (n=100)
Administrative (e.g., calendar, contact information, announcements, tuition)	26 (52%)	66 (44%)	100 (100%)
Public Relations (e.g., vision statement, policies, newsletters, programs)	22 (44%)	31 (21%)	100 (100%)
Performance (e.g., college entrance scores, proficiency test results, awards, etc.)	12 (24%)	18 (12%)	17 (17%)
Financial (e.g., budgets and financial statements)	4 (8%)	0	0

the administrative or public relations categories. Performance information is communicated in less than twenty percent of the district websites, and only a few districts made any type of financial information available. Although some of the school district websites directly linked to state websites containing performance information, none of the schools or school districts websites in the sample directly linked to websites containing information on school financial condition or efficiency.

The intended audience for most school websites, not surprisingly, appears to be the children and parents involved with the school. Often websites were found to contain outdated information and inactive links, suggesting that they are often not maintained on a current basis. Conclusions from the analysis of school and school district websites include that they are used minimally as a means for providing performance information and are not being utilized as a means for conveying financial and efficiency information to constituents. As technology and the use of technology change, the use of websites as a method of communication may change as well. Examples of web sites for representative school districts include Bay District Schools in Panama City, Florida (www.bay.k12.fl.us) and Calcasieu Parish Schools

in Louisiana (www.cpsb.org). From these web sites, you are able to link to the websites of the individual schools in these districts.

Private schools were selected from the Private Schools website (privateschool.miningco.com) that lists private schools by location and type. Private school websites were selected with the intention of obtaining a sample that is varied geographically and by type of school. Forty-seven private schools were selected based on the category the school was listed. Categories included all male schools, all female schools, subsidized tuition schools, military schools and sports related schools. In addition, fifty-three schools were selected from five major urban areas where private schools are prevalent. These areas included Atlanta, Boston, Washington, DC, Chicago, and New York City. The selection of schools was not intended to be random but to obtain a cross-section of areas and types of schools for an initial analysis of information contained on private school websites. Exhibit 2 includes a list of the private schools selected for website analysis.

The information contained on private school websites was assessed in a similar manner to the public school websites. The websites were reviewed to determine if they contained information on the following items; administration, publicity, performance and financial status. Results of the analysis suggest that all of the private school websites provide information on administrative matters, publicity, tuition and fee structure (if applicable), donation information, financial aid information (if applicable), and information on academic programs. Many of the senior high schools provided information on colleges attended by alumni and a few of the schools provided recent results of students on college entrance examinations (PSAT, SAT, and ACT), advanced placement, and scholarships won. No other performance information was observed on any of the private school websites. The sample of private school websites also did not contain any schools that provided information on its finances such as budgets and financial statements. Table 3 summarizes the analysis of information found on private school websites. Examples of some of the more informative private school websites include the Piney Woods School (www.pineywoods.org), The Agnes Irwin School (www.irwins.pvt.k12.pa.us), and Newark Academy (www.newarka.edu).

In addition to schools and school districts providing performance information to interested parties, independent organizations are also

becoming involved in reporting school performance information. For example, one independent organization developed a model of expected student achievement as measured by test scores using socioeconomic characteristics of a school's student population ("Outstanding High Schools," 1999). Schools are categorized based upon the amount a school exceeded its expected performance results. Additional models of rating and reporting school performance are likely to be proposed and implemented in the future. Recently, Standard & Poor's (2001), a credit rating organization, announced that they are developing a school rating system. Their rating system will compare the performance of schools within a state and assess schools' "return on investment." Michigan has already agreed to participate in the rating system, and the first set of ratings should be available in 2002.

EVALUATION OF THE CURRENT STATUS OF EDUCATIONAL PERFORMANCE REPORTING

Although most states require public schools to make performance and accountability reports available to constituents, these reports continue to have a variety of drawbacks. One problem with current education performance reports is the lack of information comparability between schools located in different states. Performance reports differ considerably in both content and format. The content variability of performance reports is caused by the lack of agreement on the key characteristics of schools to measure. The ability to determine a widely accepted educational production function that articulates the relationship between inputs (e.g., teachers, technology and materials) and outputs or outcomes (e.g., student learning) remains a challenge to educational researchers. An examination of the current research evidence suggests that student achievement is generally associated with broad dimensions such as family influences, peer groups and the school environment (Hanushek, 1997). But, education researchers continue debating specific measures that capture these dimensions, thereby creating the variability in reported information. Another content problem with school performance reports is the lack of efficiency measures provided by schools. Although the GASB report recommends that school districts offer constituents measures relating inputs to outputs, it is difficult to find schools and districts providing such measures. Efficiency measures, such as cost per program, are valuable for decision-makers to assess return on funds invested in education.

The design and quality of information systems also presents a problem in education performance reporting. The variability in system design and quality may cause schools and districts to report information in a non-comparable and inconsistent manner. For example, there is no assurance in most performance reports that all school districts in a state are similarly computing a measure, such as dropout rate. Also, there is typically no assurance that the measure is computed in the same way by the same school district from one period to the next.

Another problem of educational accountability reports is the desire by providers and users of these reports to have a single aggregate measure of performance in order to reduce their information processing costs. The difficulty in providing an overall aggregate measure of school performance is the validity of the process used to aggregate the information and the possible misinterpretation of such data. Just as income is determined and interpreted a number of ways for a business, multiple interpretations of aggregate grades or scores for schools and school districts is likely to occur for users of school performance reports. For example, Ohio in 2001 used targets in 27 categories to assign a grade to school districts. Schools receive the highest grade (labeled as "effective") if they reach at least 26 of the targets. Schools reaching from 14 to 25 targets receive the next highest grade (labeled as "continuous improvement"). The targets are not weighted in assigning the grades, so all of the targets are of equal importance. The number of satisfied targets needed to receive a selected grade and the targets themselves (for example, a predetermined percentage of students passing a skills assessment) are to some degree arbitrary. The state evaluation system allows a school that misses 13 targets by a significant amount to be given the same grade as a district that barely misses two targets. This type of aggregation may mislead report users.

The integrity of the information contained in educational accountability reports presents another problem. A survey about the credibility of different sources of accountability information indicated that only nonprofit watchdog organizations were rated as highly credible by parents, taxpayers, and educators (A-Plus Communications, 1999). This suggests that users are sensitive to the source of the information. If users are to rely on the quality of the information contained in the reports for decision-making, then they require assurances that the information is accurate and unbiased.

A final problem related to educational accountability reports is one of format and implementation. Accountability reports must be user-friendly. Users then need to be made aware of the reports and how to properly analyze and act on the information contained in the reports. Information intended to hold schools accountable is only useful if the audience for the reports assesses the information and takes appropriate actions.

IMPROVING EDUCATIONAL PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

Over a decade has passed since the publication of the GASB report on educational accountability reporting. Current evidence indicates that states and public school districts and private schools have implemented few of the GASB suggestions. Although private schools are under no obligation to follow GASB suggestions or rules, their constituents should find similar performance information useful in selecting and monitoring schools. The GASB, in Concept Statement Number 2, acknowledges the general limitations of government accountability measures and how to overcome these limitations (paragraphs 67-68). Part of the implementation problem for school accountability reporting may be the lack of consensus regarding the education production function and associated difficulties with measurement. An articulated relationship between educational inputs, outputs, and outcomes is certainly a significant factor in providing educational accountability reports. Additional research and experimentation with measures of these constructs, especially efficiency measures, are also critical tasks. Although the continual research focus on the key factors in educational productivity is important for educational accountability reporting, other issues also need resolution.

Some of the problems related to educational accountability reporting are systemic. The environment in which performance information is supplied and demanded potentially needs to change. If the perceived benefits of educational accountability reports increase in relation to the cost of providing these reports, then the supply and demand for these reports should increase. If taxpayers, parents, and other interested constituents request and appropriately use performance and accountability reports in the decision-making process, then both public and private school officials will likely be motivated to provide this information. A comprehensive program to inform and educate users

about educational accountability information may help to address this issue. A similar argument should hold for top-down decision-making that takes place within schools and districts. Better accountability information should lead to better decisions and improved school outcomes.

In order for change to take place in the environment in which educational accountability is used, it is usually more effective for coalitions or groups of constituents rather than individuals to successfully motivate school officials to provide newly requested information. An appropriate environment is necessary for the groups to successfully form. This includes a method for similar constituents to identify one another and to communicate. Already established organizations (such as a parent organization or taxpayer watchdog group), websites, and the media are useful in helping to foster the growth and activity of coalitions of educational information stakeholders. These coalitions and groups can effectively request accountability information from schools by negotiating with current elected or appointed school officials, or by supporting the election of school officials willing to help with the provision of accountability information.

Another issue that needs to be addressed to improve educational performance reporting is sufficient funding for informational activities. Constituents need to request that school budgets contain an appropriate amount of funds for the development of quality information systems to gather the required data and the means to adequately disseminate school accountability reports. Sufficient funding increases the likelihood that quality performance information is available to users.

In order for accountability information to be reliable, constituents should request that audits be performed on accountability reports. Information can only help improve performance if users believe that the information is unbiased, timely, credible and accurate. Audits can be an important tool for increasing the credibility of educational accountability information.

Finally, users need the ability to compare educational accountability information over time for the same school or district, as well as among schools and districts. User groups need to establish databases of benchmarking information to improve the decision-making capability of users.

Although most of the discussion on improving educational accountability reporting relate to external users, it is likely that the development of accountability information for internal users parallels the development of accountability information for use by external parties. Additional investigation of the information needs of administrators using top-down accountability and the information used by recipients for bottom-up accountability is likely to be beneficial.

CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Governments are increasing their efforts in educational performance reporting. This is especially apparent for schools, as demonstrated by the significant increase in the school report cards developed and disseminated by states. Although during the last decade the Government Accounting Standards Board has devoted considerable attention and resources to performance reporting, there remains considerable room for improvement. While educational accountability can be either top-down or bottom-up, both processes require similar information regarding the inputs, outputs, outcomes, and efficiency of the educational process. Both forms of accountability can benefit from improved accountability information. Increasing the constituent demand for information, as well as allocating additional resources to the development of this information, enhance the likelihood for better educational accountability information. The creation and enhancement of existing coalitions of education constituents also increases the possibility of improved accountability.

REFERENCES

- Ascher, C., Fruchter, N., & Berne, R. (1996), *Hard Lessons: Public Schools and Privatization*, New York: The Twentieth Century Press.
- A-Plus Communication (1999), *Reporting Results: What the Public Wants to Know, A Companion Report to Education Week's Quality Counts '99*. Arlington, VA: Author, 12.
- Capenet (2002), *Private School Facts* [On-line]. Available at www.capenet.org/facts.html.
- "What Information Do States Include on Report Cards," (1999, January 11), *Education Week*, 28 (17): 88-89.

- Government Accounting Standards Board (1994), *Concept Statement Number 2 Service Efforts and Accomplishments Reporting*, Norwalk, CT: Author.
- Hatry, H.P., Alexander, M., & Fountain, Jr., J.R. (1989), *Service Efforts and Accomplishments Reporting: Its Time has Come: Elementary and Secondary Education*, Norwalk, CT: Government Accounting Standards Board.
- Hanushek, E.A. (1997, Summer), "Assessing the Effects of School Resources on Student Performance: An Update," *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 19 (2): 141-164.
- Schneider, M. (2001), "Information and Choice in Educational Privatization," in H. Levin (Ed.), *Privatizing Education: Can the Marketplace Deliver Choice Efficiency, Equity and Social Cohesion?* (pp. 72 -102). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Standard & Poor's (2001), *School Evaluation Services (SES)*. [On-line]. Available at www.standardpoor.com/ProductsAndServices/CreditMarketServices/SchoolEvaluationServices/School.html.
- "Outstanding High Schools: Lessons from Six Metro Areas," (1999, January 18), *US News*. [On-line]. Available at <http://www.usnews.com/usnews.issue/990118/18intr.htm>.

EXHIBIT 1
Public School Web Pages Examined

Name	Location	Website
Logan Avenue School	Emporia, Kansas	www.usd253.kansas.net
Emmetsburg Community School District	Emmetsburg, Iowa	emmetsburg.k12.ia.us
Cherry Valley Elementary School	Polson, Montana	www.digisys.net/cherry
Eisenhower High School	Houston, Texas	www.crpc.rice.edu/CRPC/GT/bchristo/ike
Caravel Middle School	Carmel, Maine	www.sad23.k12.me.us/2338_Web/Caravel/cmshome.html#top
Mayfield City School District	Mayfield, Ohio	www.lnoca.ohio.gov/~mayfield
Reed High School	Sparks, Nevada	www.reedhigh.com/index2.htm

EXHIBIT 1 (continued)

Name	Location	Website
Albany High School	Albany, New York	www.global2000.net/albanyk12/AHS.Home.html
Bay District Schools	Panama City, Florida	www.bay.k12.fl.us
Cullman High School	Cullman, Alabama	www.cneti.com/%7Echs
Holbrook Unified School District	Holbrook, Arizona	www.holbrook.k12.az.us
Upper St. Clair School District	Upper St. Clair, Pennsylvania	www.uscsd.k12.pa.us
Morgan School District	Morgan, Utah	www.morgan.k12.ut.us
Giles County Public Schools	Giles County, Virginia	admin.sbo.giles.k12.va.us
Aspen School District	Aspen, Colorado	mogul.ahs.aspen.k12.co.us
Zuni Public School District	Zuni, New Mexico	www.zuni.k12.nm.us
Little Rock School District	Little Rock, Arkansas	www.lrsd.k12.ar.us/home.htm
Seminole County Schools	Donalsonville, Georgia	www.seminole.k12.ga.us
Dearborn Public Schools	Dearborn, Michigan	www.dearbornschools.org
Greenfield Public Schools	Greenfield, Massachusetts	www.greenfield.k12.mass.edu
Cambridge School District	Cambridge, Illinois	www.cam.henry.k12.il.us
Newburg Public Schools	Newburg, Missouri	www.rollanet.org/~wolf
Covington Public Schools	Covington, Tennessee	www.covington.k12.tn.us
Beverly Hills Unified School District	Beverly Hills, California	www.beverlyhills.k12.ca.us
Bruce-Exeland Public Schools	Bruce, Wisconsin	www.bruce.k12.wi.us
North Slope Borough School District	North Slope, Alaska	www.nsbds.k12.ak.us
Griswold Middle School	Rocky Hill, Connecticut	w3.nai.net/~griswms
Woodbridge Elementary	Greenwood, Delaware	wes.wdbrdge.de.lightspan.net/servlet/UserView

EXHIBIT 1 (Continued)

Name	Location	Website
Kimberly School District	Kimberly, Idaho	www.kimberly.edu/admin/index.shtm
Kalani High	Honolulu, Hawaii	www.hern.hawaii.edu/hern95/pt032/khs.html
Northwest High	Indianapolis, Indiana	ideanet.doe.state.in.us/~christof
Glenwood Middle School	Glenwood, Maryland	www.howard.k12.md.us/glenwood
South Washington County Schools	Woodbury, Minnesota	www.sowashco.k12.mn.us
Petal School District	Petal, Mississippi	www.petalschools.com
Plainview High	Plainview, Nebraska	pluggers.esu8.k12.ne.us/~plv/home.html
S.P. Arnett Middle School	Westlake, Louisiana	hal.calc.k12.la.us/~arnett/Arnett.html
Gilford Elementary	Gilford, New Hampshire	ges.gilford.k12.nh.us
Scott County Schools	Scott County, Kentucky	www.scott.k12.ky.us/sch
Cherry Hill West	Cherry Hill, New Jersey	www.wwwcomm.com/guidance
Myrtle Grove Middle School	Wilmington, North Carolina	www.nhcs.k12.nc.us/mgms
Bismarck Public School District	Bismarck, North Dakota	www.bismarck.k12.nd.us/bps
Oregon City School District #62	Oregon City, Oregon	www.orecity.k12.or.us/default.html
Middletown Public Schools	Middletown, Rhode Island	www.middletownri.com/msdmain.html
Cowpens Middle School	Cowpens, South Carolina	www.spa3.k12.sc.us/cms/Index.html
Philip High	Phillip, South Dakota	www.geocities.com/Athens/Acropolis/2740
Fisher Elementary	Arlington, Vermont	www.state.vt.us/schools/fis
Kennewick School District	Kennewick, Washington	www.ksd.org/ksd.org/htmls/index2.htm

EXHIBIT 1 (Continued)

Name	Location	Website
George Washington High	Charleston, West Virginia	gwhs.kana.k12.wv.us
Riverton Middle School	Riverton, Wyoming	www.fremont25.k12.wy.us/RMS/rms.htm
Northwest Heights Elementary	Durant, Oklahoma	www.durantisd.org/nwh

EXHIBIT 2
Private School Web Pages Examined

School Name	Location	Website
Boys' Schools		
Allen Academy	Bryan, TX	www.allenacademy.org
The American Boychoir School	Princeton, NJ	www.princetonol.com
Archbishop Riordan High School	San Francisco, CA	www.riordan.pvt.k12.ca.us
Army and Navy Academy	Carlsbad, CA	www.army-navyacademy.com
Avon Old Farms School	Avon, CT	www.avonoldfarms.com
Bellarmino College Preparatory	San Jose, CA	www.bcp.org
Belmont Hill School	Belmont, MA	www.belmont-hill.org
Benedictine High School	Cleveland, OH	mail-now.com/Benedictine
Benedictine High School	Richmond, VA	www.benedictinehighschool.com
Bishop Hendricken High School	Warwick, RI	www.hendricken.com
Boston College High School	Boston, MA	www.bchigh.edu
Brophy College Preparatory	Phoenix, AZ	www.brophyprep.org
Cardigan Mountain School	Caanan, NH	www.cardigan.org
Cathedral Preparatory School	Erie, PA	www.cathedral-prep.com
Catholic Memorial	West Roxbury, MA	www.cath-mem.org

EXHIBIT 2 (Continued)

School Name	Location	Website
Subsidized Tuition Schools		
Girard College	Philadelphia, PA	www.girardcollege.com
The Hadley School for the Blind	Winetka, IL	www.hadley-school.org
The Piney Woods School	Piney Woods, MS	www.pineywoods.org
Regis High School	New York, NY	www.regis-nyc.org
South Dakota School for the Deaf	Sioux City, SD	www.ris.sdbor.org
Academy of the Holy Angels	Demarest, NJ	www.holyangels.org
Academy of the Holy Cross	Kensington, MD	www.academyoftheholycross.com
Academy of the Holy Names	Tampa, FL	www.holynames.tpa.org
Academy of Mount St. Ursula	Bronx, NY	www.amsu.org
Academy of Our Lady Good Counse	White Plains, NY	www.goodcouncil.pvt.k12.ny.us
Academy of Saint Joesph	Brentwood, Long Island, NY	www.asjli.org
The Agnes Irwin School	Rosemont, PA	www.irwins.pvt.k12.pa.us
Albany Academy for Girls	Albany, NY	www.albanyacademyforgirls.org
Annie Wright School	Tacoma, WA	www.aw.org
Archbishop Prendergast Catholic High School	Drexell Hill, PA	www.prendie.com
The Archer School for Girls	Brentwood, CA	www.archer.org
Ashley Hall	Charleston, SC	www.ashleyhall.org
The Baldwin School	Bryn Mawr, PA	www.baldwinschool.org
Bryn Mawr School	Baltimore, MD	www.brynmawr.pvt.k12.md.us
Castilleja School	Palo Alto, CA	castilleja.org
Military Schools		
Admiral Farragut Academy	St. Petersburg, FL	www.farragut.org
Chamberlain Hunt Academy	Port Gibon, MS	www.chamberlainhunt.org
Florida Air Academy	Melbourne, FL	www.flair.org

EXHIBIT 2 (Continued)

School Name	Location	Website
Fork Union Military Academy	Fork Union, VA	www.fuma.org
Hargrave Military Academy	Chatham, VA	www.hargrave.edu
Sports Related Schools		
Green Mountain Valley School	Waitsfield, VT	www.gmvs.k12.vt.us
International Junior Golf Academy	Hilton Head, SC	www.IJGA.com
Mount Hood Academy	Government Camp, OR	www.mthoodacademy.com
Northwood School	Lake Placid, NY	www.northwoodschoo.com
The Palmer Academy	Tampa, FL	www.palmertennis.com
Squaw Valley Academy	Olympic Valley, CA	www.sva.org
The White Mountain School	Bethlehem, NH	www.whitemountain.org
Atlanta, GA		
The Alfred and Adele Davis Academy		www.davisacademy.org
Atlanta International School		www.aisschool.org
The Ben Franklin Academy		www.benfranklinacademy.org
Cathedral Academy		www.mindsrping.com/~cathedra
The Cottage School		www.cottageschool.org
Dominion Christian High School		www.dominionchristian.org
The Galloway School		www.gallowayschool.org
George Walton Academy		www.gwalton.org
Holy Innocents Episcopal School		www.hies.org
The Lovett School		www.lovet.org
Marist School		www.marist.com
Boston, MA		
Archbishop Williams High School		www.awhs.org
Arlington Catholic High School		www.achs.net
The Brimmer and May School		www.brimmer.org
The Brooks School		www.brooks.pvt.k12.ma.us
Buckingham Brown and Nichols School		www.bbns.org
The Cambridge School of Weston		www.csw.org
The Concord Academy		www.concordacademy.org
The Cushing Academy		www.cushing.org
The Dana Hall School		www.danahall.org

EXHIBIT 2 (Continued)

School Name	Website
Fontbonne Academy	www.mec.edu/fontbonn
Lawrence Academy	www.lacademy.org
Washington, DC Schools	
Alexandria Country Day School	www.acdsnet.org
Archbishop Carroll High School	www.archbishopcarroll.org
Conelley School of the Holy Child	www.holychild.org
Edmund Burke School	www.eburke.org
The Elizabeth Seton High School	www.setonhs.org
Episcopal High School	www.episcopalhighschool.org
Flint Hill Academy	www.flinthill.org
Georgetown Day School	www.gds.org
Gonzaga College High School	gonzaga.pvt.k12.dc.us
The Islamic Saudi Academy	www.saudiacademy.net
The Maderia School	www.maderia.org
Chicago, IL Schools	
Brother Rice High School	brrice.chi.il.us
Benet Academy	www.benet.org
Carmel High School	carmel.k12.il.us
The Cove School	interaccess.homepage.com/~cove
De La Salle School	www.dls.org
Gordon Tech High School	www.gordontech.org
Holy Cross High School	www.holycross-hs.org
Immaculate Heart of Mary High School	www.ihmhs.net
Loyola Academy	www.goramblers.org
New York City Schools	
Newark Academy	www.newarka.edu
New York Military Academy	www.nyma.org
The Nightingale-Bamford School	www.nightingale.org
Notre Dame Catholic High School	www.nortredame.org
Our Lady of Mercy High School	www.olma.org
The Packer Collegiate Institute	www.packer.edu
The Pingry School	www.pingry.k12.nj.us
The Portledge School	www.potrledge.org
The Purnell School	www.purnell.org
Queen of Peace High School	www.qphs.org
The Ranney School	www.ranneyschool.com