
Vague planning continues re. addressing educational problems

Did you see the August 6th *Washington Post* article that begins:

“Two years after Congress scrapped federal formulas for fixing troubled schools, states for the most part are producing only the vaguest of plans to address persistent educational failure.”

The article reports that: “Of the 17 accountability plans submitted to the U.S. Department of Education, an independent review found only two — from Tennessee and New Mexico — adequately addressed how to help low-performing schools. The review was conducted by Bellwether Education Partners, a Washington consulting group, and the Collaborative for Student Success, an advocacy group that has championed high standards and strong accountability.”

Essentially, what Tennessee and New Mexico have mapped out are detailed plans for supporting district efforts. That’s a step in the right direction.

Clearly, the specifics of state inputs (e.g., ideas, resources, accountability levers) will be important.

Unfortunately, what continues to be missing is an understanding that states, districts, and schools are continuing to box themselves in with a two-component school improvement framework. This means they are failing to adopt a third component that *prioritizes* improving how schools address barriers to learning and teaching and re-engage disconnected students along with instructional and management improvements. Without a three component framework for school improvement policy and practice, it is unlikely that schools will effectively develop a unified, comprehensive, and equitable system of student/learning supports.

To appreciate the significance of this planning deficit, see the brief (4 page) discussion entitled: “*Preparing for ESSA? Start by Reviewing Analyses of What’s been Wrong with School Improvement Efforts*” – <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/pdfdocs/markrev.pdf>

For even more, see <http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/newinitiative.html>

Think about sharing this information with state, district, and school planners.

From the Center at UCLA that is co-directed by Howard Adelman & Linda Taylor (<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/>).

Send comments to adelman@psych.ucla.edu or Ltaylor@ucla.edu