

Changing The Status Of The Status

And so, arguing the undoubted need to engineer a brand-new public school reality; maintaining the obligation to *step up*, to *stand for*, and in the name of a modern-day social responsibility, *put students first* – well, in the deeply concerned name of children?

Governmentally manufactured NCLB test-score reformations were insistently, aggressively and continually mandated. Across the nation, in state after state, city after city, district after district: one by one, the inflexibly detached innovations assaulted, ransacked and destabilized unsuspecting low-income neighborhoods: blowing up the weakest schools; closing, restructuring and redesigning. Removing experienced teachers; eliminating long-term principals; re-assigning students; separating, segregating and dividing.

Creating, as year after year of reform passed?

A mercilessly ongoing havoc.

In a belated shell-shocked rejoinder, apprehensive citizens began to react. Voices rose as constituents labored to describe the ruinous fallout tied to an overwhelming, and even blatantly discriminatory, agenda. At first uneasily, and then more frantically, frightened participants demanded what they believed to be their right: an old-fashioned, old-school-traditional, neighborhood-protective, opinion-inclusive democratic forum.

Refusing responsibility for implementing an old-school-style, multi-voiced inclusion, however, in strategic response the gurus of reform turned away. Electing to extend a more promising tactic, they began to make publicly negative references to *pre-testing*, *pre-NCLB* traditions – those old-school collaborative traditions where a building management had depended upon intentionally inclusive practices – as the now outdated “broken system’s” *old-days status quo*.

And, from there?

Ah, well, from there it was simply a funky little razzle-dazzle two-step.

Those vocally frustrated detractors; that growing mass of dissatisfied anti-reform critics; those so many loudly opinionated, but clearly misguided parents, students, and community members; those uncooperative, outspoken teachers and, in fact, anyone at all who continued to demand any of those old-days’ expectations for an *intentionally democratic collaboration*?

Well, in the fast pace of truly modern days, critics like these (and, oh; surely this was obvious) were nothing more than self-interested disbelievers who, due to their impossible-to-understand loyalty for the tediously slow practices tied to an indefensible old-school status quo – well scandalously, people like these?

Clearly did not hold a high value for children.

That old-fashioned expectation for an interactively democratic inclusion – oh, make no bones about it, this message was repeatedly and assertively insinuated: Tolerance for any of those sluggishly outdated voice-inclusive, tediously-collaborative practices *would force the nation backwards*. Backwards into that shameful, no longer palatable pre-testing world where poor and/or culturally-different communities had been left to muddle along on their own.

Citing the intentions of an original NCLB, modern-day arguments calling for the uninterrupted production of a relentlessly collected testing data immovably maintained that – well, due to the statistically proven deficit of a data-supported underachievement?

Poor and often culturally-different children simply could not, as had been the case in days of an unapardonably slow, multi-voiced, old-school-inclusive status quo, *be left to themselves*.

Oh my, no.

Blowing up their schools.

Silencing their teachers.

Removing their career-committed principals.

All of this?

Was unmistakably and unquestionably necessary.

Because, as everyone (well, everyone who mattered in truly contemporary days) knew,
and subsequently never questioned:

Test scores?

Never lied.