



**EQUITY,
EFFECTIVENESS
AND CONTROL:**

The Every Student Succeeds Act

**EQUITY,
EFFECTIVENESS**

2012年12月



CONCLUSIONS

- Given the disproportionate representation of students traditionally marginalized due to socioeconomic status, including race and ethnicity in schools most often subject to interventions dictated by their TSI, CSI or MRI status, we question the efficacy of the approach outlined by ESSA and implemented by the states.
- While we accept that ESSA's current school improvement parameters take a step forward in terms of flexibility, especially for states and districts to approach to the challenges of turning around schools, we posit that a better understanding of the patterns of approaches is critical to efforts to inform policy directions at federal, state, and local levels.
- The intent of ESSA was clearly to provide greater flexibility to the states and in practice it has provided maximum flexibility in principal (federal government) and agent (state agency) relationships. Duff and Wohlstetter (2019) noted that the flexibility was maximized to the extent that all plans were approved despite the wide variability in approaches taken by each of the 52 entities.
- Our analysis further suggests that the principal (state) to agent (district or school) relationship was also designed with significant variability in entrance, exit and intervention approaches.
- Local leaders, educators, and parents should be keenly aware of state roles in education and advocate at the state level for policies that influence local educational decisions.

**For more information please see:
Black, W., Rea, A., & Reck, B. (2021).
Equity, effectiveness, and control:
The Every Student Succeeds Act
and state approaches to governing
school turnaround. In C. Mullen (Ed.)
International Handbook of Social
Justice Interventions in Education.**

REFERENCES

- Aladjem, D., von Glatz, A., Hildreth, J., & McKithen, C. (2018). *State ESSA plans: A guide to the new federal requirements*. Washington, DC: Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, U.S. Department of Education. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED594698.pdf>
- American Institutes for Research. (2011). *Improving educator effectiveness: A guide to the new federal requirements*. Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. https://www.air.org/sites/default/files/downloads/report/EducatorEffectiveness_Pocket_Guide_0.pdf
- Aragon, S. (2018a). *Teacher evaluations: A guide to the new federal requirements*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. https://www.ecs.org/wp-content/uploads/Teacher_Evaluations.pdf
- Aragon, S. (2018b). *Targeted teacher recruitment: A guide to the new federal requirements*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. <https://www.ecs.org/targeted-teacher-recruitment>
- Calkins, A., Guenther, W., Belfiore, G., & Lash, D. (2007). *Turnaround schools: A guide to the new federal requirements*. Boston: Mass Insight Education & Research Institute. <https://nepc.colorado.edu/sites/default/files/McQuillan-MassInsight-Turnaround2.pdf>
- Duke, D. (2012). Tinkering and turnarounds: Understanding the contemporary campaign to improve low performing schools. *Journal of Research in Education*, 17(1), 9-24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10824669.2012.636696>
- Duke, D. (2015). *Turnaround schools: A guide to the new federal requirements*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Leithwood, K., Harris, A., & Strauss, T. (2010). *Successful school turnaround: How they do it*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.
- Liu, P., Belibas, M., & Printy, S. (2018). Understanding turnaround leadership research: Continuity and change (2009–2016). *Journal of Research in Education*, 17(3), 1-19. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143218807490>
- McGuinn, P. (2019). Assessing state ESSA plans: Innovation or retreat? *Journal of Research in Education*, 19(2), 8-13. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721719879146>
- Murphy, J. (2008). The place of leadership in turnaround schools: Insights from organizational recovery in the public and private sectors. *Journal of Research in Education*, 17(1), 74-98. DOI: 10.1108/09578230810849826
- Murphy, J., & Myers, C. (2009). Rebuilding organizational capacity in turnaround schools: Insights from the corporate, government, and non-profit sectors. *Journal of Research in Education*, 18(1), 9-27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1741143208098162>
- Rentner, D. S., Tanner, K., & Braun, M. (2019). *Number of low-performing schools, 2018-19*. Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy (pp. 1–11). <file:///C:/Users/camullen/AppData/Local/Temp/Rentner-Tanner-Braun-Number-of-Low-Performing-Schools-20190513-1.pdf>
- Reyes, A., & Garcia, A. (2014). Turnaround policy and practice: A case study of turning around a failing school with English-Language-Learners. *Journal of Research in Education*, 17(3), 349–371. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-013-0261-6>
- Rhim, L. M., & Redding, S. (Eds.). (2014). *State role in school turnaround*. San Francisco: WestEd. <https://www.wested.org/resources/state-role-in-school-turnaround>

Riley, D. L., Meredith, J., & Butler, A. N. (2019). *Statewide strategic staffing initiatives: A review of current practices and recommendations* (pp. 1-56). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

<https://ccsso.org/sites/default/files/201903/SEA%20School%20Improvement%20Under%20ESSA%20Mar%202019%20PSA%20CCSSO%20Final%203.22.19.pdf>

Rosenbach, L. J., Flowers, C., Bird, J., & Algozzine, B. (2017). An evaluation of strategic staffing initiative in a large urban school district. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 3(2), 10-25.



