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Poverty and Underachievement: How Schools and Districts Lead Students to Success

When I Turn 50

“When I’m 50 I will be married and I will have two kids and I will make it a point not to be like the other men I know. I will help my wife raise my kids and I will be a good Daddy. I will get myself a good job and buy my kids everything that they need. I am going to work at a store and be the manager. I am going to be very nice to people and help people who need help. I am only going to be married once. I am going to have a nice life.”

Victor R., Grade 4

How Are We Doing?

Validate Challenge to Improve

Research on High Poverty / High Performing Schools

- 18 Studies / Reports / Data Analyses
- Representing Thousands of Schools Nationwide
- What They Did
- How They Sustain Remarkable Results

Closing the Achievement Gap

Lessons from Illinois' Golden Spike High Performing Schools

McGee, Glenn W. Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk, 2004

Source: Education Trust analysis of data from National School-Level State Assessment Score Database (www.schooldata.org). Data are from 2002.

Dayton’s Bluff Achievement Plus Elementary School

Saint Paul, MN
School Demographics

- Student Population:
  Total Student Population (PK-6th): 375 Students
  - 40% African-American
  - 25% Hispanic
  - 20% Southeast Asian
  - 13% Caucasian
  - 2% American Indian
  - 40% Mobility Index*
    (Students who relocated or left Dayton’s public schools after October 1st)
  - 91% Free and Reduced Lunch Status*
    (Eligible eligibility based upon Federal Poverty guidelines)
  - 35% English Language Learners
  - 12% Special Education Students

* Note: Statistics taken from 2008-09 School Year

Leadership

- Vision – All students can achieve at high standards
- Clear and specific building-wide mission and vision
- Accountability – High expectations for all stakeholders
- Academic Urgency – Let students know where they are and where they are headed
- Focus – Making decisions that are in the best interest of our children
- Collaboration – Team approach
- Ownership through empowerment
- Instructional Leadership – Ensuring high standards
- Decision Making – Collaborative approach
- Smile – You have the best job in the world!

School Environment

- Instructional:
  - Rituals and routines
  - Classroom set-up
  - Adequate classroom resources
- Clear and High Expectations for Student Behavior:
  - Ensuring a “teachable” environment without disruption
  - School-wide behavior model; Responsive Classroom Behavior Model
- Structural:
  - Common prep times
  - Low class size - priority
  - Inclusion model with support staff
  - Structured play
  - Meaningful committee structure

Academic Coherence

- Standards and frameworks – Implement with fidelity
- Clear understanding of academic needs
- Workshop model
  - Uninterrupted blocks (at least 60 minutes) in all core content areas (reading, writing and math)
  - Focused mini-lessons (strategy/concept), work time (practice of strategy), and sharing (linked to concept being taught)
- Support staff inclusion in the classroom (planning and team teaching)
- Research-based best practices (supplemented and aligned)
- Flexible grouping by strategy, concepts, etc.
- Curriculum mapping and alignment
- Academic continuity (K-8 Standards); Identification of Power Standards
- Concepts and strategies taught across all disciplines
- Individualized instructional plans
- Continuous monitoring of progress
  - Class plans; PGC and Student Portfolios
  - Common language across building (staff development)

Targeted Staff Development

- BELIEF: We are a networked learning community - We build our own capacity...
  - Models (backed) in small incremental steps
  - Introduction, dialogue, implementation, reflection
  - Based on building-level and individual teacher needs from accountability measures
- Continuous dialogue (Acknowledgment of input vs. benevolent dictatorship)
  - Consensus among staff
  - Open-door policy regarding observations (learning from each other)
  - Interpreting and operationalizing monthly expectations
  - Identify non-negotiables
- Opportunities for collaboration
  - Strategic mentoring; Analysis of Data; Learning Walks
  - Implementation schedule: Intergraded School/Meeting Calendar
  - Common prep, times
  - Integrated meeting schedule
  - Participation in PLCs by all staff (Full day) – reflective dialogue
  - Intervention schedule - Systematic and timely (response time)
  - District staff development
  - On-site support and coaching

Continual Analysis and Use of Data

- BELIEF: Data drives instruction (Differential and Action Oriented)
- Deepening and strengthening of instructional practices
- Examination of data from high stakes assessments
- Minnesota Comprehensive Assessment 2nd Edition (MCA-II)
  - Test of Emerging Academic English (TEAE)
  - Naglieri Non-verbal Ability Test (NNAT)
- Authentic classroom assessments
  - Developmental reading assessments (Running Record, PALS, ORIGO MONDO)
  - Formatly – 4x/year (September, November, March, and June)
  - Informally – as needed, but with grades K-3, at least once every two weeks
  - Writing benchmarks
  - Math progress reports ( Everyday Math Secure Skills chart)
- Teacher – Student Conferences
- Class plans
- Identification of student needs and listing of strategies to meet the needs (Completed 3x/year in September, November, and March)
- Observations and analysis of student work
  - Grade level and cross-grade level
  - Teacher resource room
Dayton's Bluff Achievement Plus Elementary School

- 375 Students in Grades K-6
- 91% Low-Income
- 40% African American
- 25% Latino
- 20% Southeast Asian
- 15% White
- 2% American Indian


Dayton's Bluff Achievement Plus Elementary
St. Paul, Minnesota

2005 Dispelling the Myth Award Winner

Lapwai Elementary

2005 Dispelling the Myth Award Winner
Dayton's Bluff Elementary Improvement Over Time, Grade 5 Math

Lapwai Elementary
Lapwai, Idaho

- 312 Students K-6
- 79% Low-income
- 84% Native American
- Outperformed the state in 4th grade reading and math 2003 – 2006
- Native American students outperformed the state in 4th grade reading and math 2003 – 2006

“If it can happen at Lapwai...it can happen anywhere.”

Brenna Terry
Lapwai School Board Member
2006

Taft Elementary School

William H. Taft Elementary
Boise, ID

- 330 Students Grades k-6
- 72% Low Income
- 18% ELL/Refugee
- 9% Hispanic
Blue Ribbon Award Recipient

**William H. Taft Elementary**  
Boise, ID  
**Reading Scores, 3rd Grade**

[Reading Scores Chart]


---

2004 Dispelling the Myth Award Winner

**Osmond A. Church School**  
Queens, New York

- 1,141 students in grades PK-8
- 97% Low-Income
- 41% Asian
- 35% African American
- 21% Latino

[Bar Chart]


---

2006 Dispelling the Myth Award Winner

**Port Chester Middle School**  
Port Chester, NY

- 759 students in grades 5-8
- 65% Latino
- 12% African-American
- 64% Low-Income

[Image of students in class]
Port Chester Middle School
Port Chester, NY

Overall Test Scores Grades 5-8


Granger High School
Granger, WA

- 390 Student Grades 9-12
- 84% Hispanic
- 92% Low Income
- 100% Parent Attendance / Student Led Conferences
- 91% Graduation Rate

Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2008

Granger High School
Granger, WA

Grade 10 Reading Scores

Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction, 2008

Granger High School
Granger, WA

Improvement Over Time

2001
- Graduation Rate 30%
- 10th Grade Reading Proficiency 20%
- 10th Grade Writing Proficiency 8%
- 10th Grade Math Proficiency 6%
- Parent Conference Participation 10%

2007
- Graduation Rate 91%
- 10th Grade Reading Proficiency 80%
- 10th Grade Writing Proficiency 74%
- 10th Grade Math Proficiency 46%
- Parent Conference Participation 100%

Aldine School District

2009 Broad Prize Award Recipient for Urban Education
Aldine School District
Aldine, TX

- 62,055 students Grades k-12
- 80% Low Income
- 67% Hispanic
- 28% African American
- 3% White
- 3% Asian/Pacific Islander
- 11th largest school district in Texas

2009 Broad Prize Award Recipient for Urban Education

Aldine, TX: Raising Achievement for All While Narrowing Gaps

“How many effective schools would you have to see...
...to be persuaded of the educability of poor children? If your answer is more than one, then I submit that you have reasons of your own for preferring to believe that basic pupil performance derives from family background instead of school response to family background...
We can, whenever and wherever we choose, successfully teach all children whose schooling is of interest to us.”
Ron Edmonds... 1979

Today...in 2010...
WE KNOW WHAT WORKS IN EDUCATION. THE RESEARCH IS PROLIFIC

“Amazingly, then, the question today is not about what works, but about why we do not implement what we know works in all schools for all kids?”

How Are We Doing?
Validate Challenge to Improve

High Performing/High Poverty Schools: Common Characteristics

Building Leadership Capacity:

Understanding First and Second Order Change

First order changes - changes in efficiency, organization, specific practices, "change without difference."

Second order changes - deep systemic changes in fundamental ethos, philosophy, beliefs driving the strategy/action

First Order Changes

- Group projects
- Cooperative learning
- School within a school
- Block Scheduling
- Recognition programs
- Interdisciplinary teaming
- Alternative assessment procedures
- Interdisciplinary curriculum
- Higher order thinking skills
- Multi-aged grouping
- Heterogeneous grouping for instruction
- Teacher teams

A Decade of Reform, Washington School Research Center

First and Second Order Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Order Change</th>
<th>Second Order Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smaller classes</td>
<td>Value relationships and improved ability to differentiate instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-based councils</td>
<td>Value collaboration and ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninety-minute teaching blocks</td>
<td>Reflect the importance of extended teaching time for more in-depth and experiential learning opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools within schools</td>
<td>Value increased interactions and relationships with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching teams with common planning</td>
<td>Reflect the importance of an aligned, focused curriculum and collaborative and learning in community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Building Leadership Capacity

- Do we have a data system that works for classroom and school leaders?
- Are we working to eliminate policies and practices that manufacture low achievement?
- Have we extended learning time for underachieving students?
- Have we reorganized time to better support professional learning?

Building Leadership Capacity

- Low Expectations
- Inequitable Funding
- Ineffective Instruction
- Tracking / Retention Pullouts
- Miss-assignment to Special Education
- Blaming Families
- Inappropriate Teacher Assignments
Are We Paying Attention?
Poor and Minority Students Get More Inexperienced* Teachers

![Bar Chart]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teachers with 3 or fewer years of experience</th>
<th>High-poverty schools</th>
<th>Low-poverty schools</th>
<th>High-minority schools</th>
<th>Low-minority schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High-poverty schools</strong></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low-poverty schools</strong></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High-minority schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low-minority schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Teachers with 3 or fewer years of experience. "High" and "low" refer to top and bottom quartiles.

Where's the time for all of this?

The Full Year Calendar

Less Summer Vacation

Less Weekends, Holidays, & Summer Vacation
Less Professional Development Days & Early Dismissal/Parent Conferences

Less Class Picnic, Class Trip, Thanksgiving Feast, Christmas, Kwanzaa, Hannukah, Awards, Assemblies, Athletics & Concerts

Less State and District Testing

Bottom Line:
Roughly 13-15 8-hr Days of Instruction Per Subject Per Year

Go Back...Find The Time
- Get creative...support professional learning that does not distract from instructional time
- Reduce scheduled / unscheduled interruptions
- Schedule testing wisely
- Extend learning...day / week / summer
- Stop releasing students early
- Conduct parent / student led conferences outside school day

Summer School...
- Every summer for underachievers
- Regular communication between parent / school
- Targeted needs based instruction
- Curriculum / aligned to school year needs
- Provide for daily nutritional needs
- Weekly field trips / recreational activities
- Minimum of 3 weeks— more is better
- Plan for transition / remaining weeks of summer

Source: Borman 2007; Barr & Parrett, 2007
Three Types of Learning


Learning in Context
“...each learning agenda acts as context for the other two...all are influenced by a larger set of contexts.”

Focus on Learning

- Do we have a common instructional framework to guide curriculum, teaching, assessment, and the learning climate?
- Do we have common assessments and embrace assessment literacy?
- Have we ensured that all students are proficient in reading?
- Do we provide targeted intervention?

Common Assessments & Assessment Literacy

- Teachers Understand Data
- Teachers Agree on Benchmarks and Common Assessments
- Teachers Use Assessment FOR Learning
- Teach—Assess—Meet Regularly to Discuss and Monitor (PLCs)
- Students Understand Goals / Targets

Student Led Conferences

- Getting clear on the philosophy and purpose
- Defining teacher, student, parent, administrator and support
- Selecting the most appropriate format
- Preparing students to lead
- Preparing parents and colleagues to participate
- Organizing the details
- Anticipating and handling unique situations
- Evaluating the conferences

Elementary Students At Risk

All kids...

...want to learn how to read!
Reading is when you know what sounds the letters make and then you say them fast. They come out words, and then you are reading.

*R. J., age 5*

You can read when you look at car and then you look at can and know you drive one and open the other one and there is only one eensy line different.

*Shelby, age 6*

It’s when you read and nobody tells you the words. But you shouldn’t do it in the bathroom. My daddy does and my mom yells at him.

*Paulette, age 5*

Words go in your eyes and come out your mouth...but it’s not like puking or anything. You say the words and that means you’re reading.

*Loren, age 4*

---

**Reading And Poverty**

- 61% of low-income families have no books in their homes
- 43% of adults with the lowest level of literacy proficiency live in poverty
- 55% of children have an increased interest in reading when given books at an early age.
- Children with a greater variety of reading material in the home are more creative, imaginative and proficient in reading. They are also on a better path toward educational growth and development.
- There is only one age-appropriate book for every 300 children in low-income neighborhoods, compared to 13 book per child in middle-income neighborhoods.

**Effective Reading Programs for Middle and High Schools: A Best-Evidence Synthesis**

Focusing on Student Learning Requires a Focus on Professional Learning!

- Develop Communities of Practice
- Support / Develop Teacher Leadership
- Engage ALL Teachers in Collaborative Analysis of Instruction and Student Work

Foster a Safe, Supportive and Healthy Learning Environment

- Have we ensured safety?
- Have we developed an accurate understanding of the influence of poverty on student learning?
- Have we fostered caring relationships and strengthened the bond between students and schools?
- Have we made an authentic effort to engage parents, families, and our community?

College Graduates by Age 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Young People From High Income Families</th>
<th>60%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young People From Low Income Families</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High Expectations and Support: A Culture of Poverty? Reality or Not?

- Oscar Lewis (1961) The Children of Sanchez

“These studies raise a variety of conclusions about poverty. But on this they agree: There is no such thing as a culture of poverty. Differences in values and behaviors among poor people are just as great as those between poor and wealthy people.” -Gorski (2008)

High Expectations and Support: Confronting Some Common Myths

- Poverty is an issue that solely effects people of color.
- People in poverty are unmotivated and have weak work ethics.
- With government assistance people can get out of poverty.
- Education, as a way out of poverty, is readily accessible to everyone.
- People living in poverty are uninvolved in their children’s learning, largely because they do not value education.
- People living in poverty are linguistically deficient.
- People living in poverty tend to abuse drugs and alcohol more than people in other socioeconomic classes.

Another Approach...

- Living in poverty does not inherently result in a shared culture.
- Poverty affect "intervening factors" that in turn affect outcomes for people (Duncan & Brooks-Gunn, 1997)

Understanding Poverty and Learning
- Forms of Capital: Human, Social, Cultural
- Health and well-being
- Language and Literacy Development
- Material Resources
- Mobility

Research on Vocabulary
- Affluent Families: 2,300 words/hour
- Blue Collar Families: 1,200 words/hour
- Poverty Families: 600 words/hour

Underachieving Children Living in Poverty
Will learn and achieve, but may arrive at school well behind their peers...from homes that may not know how to support school learning...

Underachieving Students Living in Poverty Need...
- High Expectations
- Early Intervention
- Needs-based "catchup" plans
- Intensive Reading / Math Instruction
- Extra Instructional Time
- Relevant Rigorous Well Targeted Curriculum
- Parent Education / Home Support
- Summer Programs...Nutrition / Targeted Instruction, Acceleration / Enrichment
- Plans for Mobility / Transition / Behavior
- Alternative Schools / Programs

Address Student Mobility
- Access and Maintain Accurate Data
- Be Ready
  - Departures—Counseling / Exit Interviews
  - Arrivals—Welcome packets / Diagnostics / Appropriate Placements
  - Catch up—Tutoring / Extended Day
- Build Relationships—Peers / Parents
- Frequent Communication
- Address Transportation Issues
- Engage All Staff—School-wide Support

How Are We Doing?
Validate Challenge to Improve
How is your school doing?

“Are we willing, at the very least, to tackle the classism in our own schools and classrooms?”

Sticks and Stones...

How do we talk about poverty in schools?

- The words/labels we use matter
- The danger of a deficit perspective
- Separating children’s developing sense of self form their living conditions

Initiate Student Advisories

“Take care of them like they were your own.”

- Faculty / Student Ratio—20: 1
- 30 Minutes / Day – 4 Days / Week
- Four-year Commitment
- Reading, Math, Portfolios, Homework, Careers
- Performance-based Graduation Requirements

“It’s now cool to do well at Granger H.S.”

It’s All About Relationships

- Engage Parents as Participating Partners
- Improve Two Way Communication
- Hold Frequent Meetings with Food
- Offer Parent Education / Support Learning at Home
- Conduct Home Visits / Caring Outreach
- Seek, Support & Coordinate Volunteers
- Provide Service Learning / Career Internships
- Access Community Assets Survey and National Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance Data
- Engage Parents & Families in Authentic Decision Making
- Initiate Student Led Conferences
- Join the National Network of Partnership Schools
  www.csos.jhu.edu

Common Characteristics, but...

“Uncommon” Sense

- Monthly Education Summits
- Full Service Schools
- Algebra for All
- Early Morning “Wake Up” Calls/Study Sessions
- Day Care in the End Zone
Compelling Conclusions

We must combat hopelessness... and instill in every child the self-confidence that they can achieve and succeed in school.

Any school can overcome the debilitating effects of poverty...
...demographics do not equal destiny!

We know how to improve any school...
Every school can become a high performing school

Teachers Make The Difference!
...They think ... we can learn this **** !!

“I am going to have a nice life.”

Victor R., Grade 4

What do we choose to do?

...our students are waiting

For PDF version of the 2010 ASCD Annual National Conference: “Poverty and Underachievement: How Schools and Districts Lead Students to Success” handout, please visit http://csi.boisestate.edu/ and click on the “Resources” link.
# FRAMEWORK FOR IMPROVEMENT

## RESEARCH ON HIGH-PERFORMING, HIGH-POVERTY SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Source</th>
<th>Effective District Leadership</th>
<th>Engage Parents, Communities, and Schools to Work as Partners</th>
<th>Understand and Hold High Expectations for Poor and Culturally Diverse Students</th>
<th>Target Low-Performing Students and Schools, Particularly in Reading</th>
<th>Align, Monitor, and Manage the Curriculum</th>
<th>Create a Culture of Assessment and Data Literacy</th>
<th>Build and Sustain Instructional Capacity</th>
<th>Reorganize Time, Space, and Transitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Louisiana School Effectiveness Study:  
"Schools Make a Difference" (Teddie & Stringfield, 1993) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Education Trust:  
"Dispelling the Myth, Revised, and Over Time" (Barth et al., 1999; Jerald, 2001; Education Trust, 2003) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Just for the Kids:  
| Mid-continent Regional Education Laboratory (McREL):  
"Raising the Achievement of Low-Performing Students" (Goodwin, 2000) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| North Central Regional Education Laboratory (NCREL):  
"Wisconsin's High-Performing/High-Poverty Schools" (Manset et al., 2000) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE):  
"The District Role in Building Capacity" (Massell, 2000) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Heritage Foundation:  
"No Excuses Lessons from 21 High-Performing, High-Poverty Schools" (Gartner, 2001) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Iowa Association of School Boards:  
"The Lighthouse Inquiry" (Iowa Association of School Boards, 2001) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| U.S. Department of Education:  
"The Longitudinal Evaluation of School Change and Performance (LESP) in Title I Schools" (U.S. Department of Education, 2001) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR):  
"Comprehensive School Reform and Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis" (Borman et al., 2002) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Northern Illinois University Center for Governmental Studies:  
"Closing the Achievement Gap: Lessons from Illinois Golden Spike High-Poverty, High-Performing Schools" (McGee, 2004) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Louisiana Staff Development Council:  
"The Secrets of Can Do Schools" (Richardson, 2003) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Learning First Alliance:  
"Beyond Islands of Excellence" (Tognini & Anderson, 2003) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Center for Performance Assessment:  
"High-Performance in High-Poverty Schools: 90/90/90 and Beyond" (Reeves, 2003) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Manhattan Institute:  
"The Achievement Index: Can Disadvantaged Students Learn?" (Greene & Fountas, 2003) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Newell-Packard:  
"High Achieving Schools Initiative Final Report" (Kitchell et al., 2004) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| Priced Committee for Academic Excellence:  
"Inside the Black Box of High-Performing/High-Poverty Schools" (Kamppel & Centrals, 2005) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |
| EdSource:  
"Similar Students, Different Results: Why Do Some Schools Do Better?" (Williams, Rist, & Haestel, 2005) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ |

* Primary recommendation or conclusion from the study  
* Noted strategy or practice from the participating school(s) or district(s)

Framework of Research on High-Performing, High-Poverty Schools (Barr & Parrett, 2007)
## Eliminate Practices that Manufacture Low Achievement

What is my school’s or district’s progress toward eliminating:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>BEGINNING</th>
<th>EMBEDDING</th>
<th>SUSTAINING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Action Has Been Taken</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts Are Limited</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Results Are Being Gained</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efforts and Results Are Spreading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practices Are Widespread, Policies Are in Place, and Results Are Increasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Unequal funding
2. Low expectations
3. Ineffective teachers
4. Retention, tracking, and overuse of pullouts
5. Misassignment to special education
6. Blaming students and families
7. “Bell Curve” mentality
8. Fees for extra-curricular activities

*The Kids Left Behind © 2007 Solution Tree • www.solution-tree.com*
William H. Parrett is the Director of the Center for School Improvement & Policy Studies and Professor of Education at Boise State University. He has received international recognition for his work in school improvement, small schools, alternative education, and for his efforts to help youth at-risk. His professional experiences include public school and university teaching, curriculum design, principalships and college leadership, media production, research and publication.

Parrett holds a Ph.D. in Secondary Education from Indiana University. Parrett has served on the faculties of Indiana University, the University of Alaska and Boise State University. As Director of the Boise State University Center for School Improvement & Policy Studies (1996 to present), Parrett coordinates funded projects and school improvement initiatives which currently exceed $7.9 million. His research on reducing achievement gaps and effective schooling practices for youth at risk and low performing schools has gained widespread national recognition.

Parrett is the co-author of, Saving Our Students, Saving Our Schools, 2nd edition, (Corwin Press, 2008, Honorable Mention, National Education Book of the Year 2009), The Kids Left Behind: Catching Up the Underachieving Children of Poverty (Solution Tree, 2007), Saving Our Students, Saving Our Schools (2003), Hope Fulfilled for At-Risk & Violent Youth (2001), How to Create Alternative, Magnet, and Charter Schools that Work (1997), Hope at Last for At-Risk Youth (1995), Inventive Teaching: Heart of the Small School (1993), The Inventive Mind: Portraits of Effective Teaching (1991), and numerous contributions to national journals and international and national conferences.

Parrett’s media production, Heart of the Country (1998), is a documentary of an extraordinary principal of a village elementary school in Hokkaido, Japan, and the collective passion of the community to educate the heart as well as the mind. Since its release, the production was nominated for the Pare Lorentz Award at the 1999 International Documentary Awards (Los Angeles, CA); has won the Award of Commendation from the American Anthropological Association, a Gold Apple Award for best of category at the National Education Media Network Festival (Oakland, CA), a National CINE Golden Eagle Award (Washington, D.C.), and a Judges’ Award at the 24th Northwest Film Festival (Portland, OR). In addition, Heart of the Country was an invited feature and screened at the Cinema du Reel festival in Paris (1998) and the Margaret Mead Film Festival (1998) in New York City. This work has received critical acclaim for its cinematography and insight into the universal correlates of effective teaching and learning and the power of community participation in public schools.

Parrett has also served as visiting faculty at Indiana University, the University of Manitoba, Oregon State University, Hokkaido University of Education (Japan), Nagoya Gakui (Japan), Gifu University (Japan) and Heilongjiang University (People’s Republic of China). His consultancies include state departments, boards of education, state and regional service providers and school districts in 41 states and 10 nations.

Throughout his career, Parrett has worked to improve the educational achievement of all children and youth, particularly those less advantaged. Toward this goal, as director of the CSI&PS, he has overseen the acquisition of over twenty million dollars in external funding to create programs and interventions designed to help educators, schools, communities, and universities benefit from research and best practice. These efforts have positively impacted the lives of thousands of young people.
Kathleen Budge

Kathleen Budge is the coordinator of the Leadership Development Program at Boise State University. She has led the development of this innovative, non-traditional preparation program, the purpose of which is to develop leaders who have the commitment and capabilities to lead schools where all students succeed.

Kathleen also serves as an assistant professor in the Curriculum, Instruction, and Foundational Studies Department where her research and scholarly activity focuses on educational leadership, leadership development, rural education, school improvement, and poverty. She has conducted numerous presentations at national and state conferences as well as provided frequent contributions to educational journals and other publications on these topics.

Kathleen earned her doctorate from the University of Washington in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies in 2005. She was selected to participate in Leadership for Learning, an innovative, cohort-based program that emphasized the link between leadership and learning, as well as the development of leaders willing and able to address and redress issues of equity and social justice.

Prior to joining the faculty at Boise State, Kathleen served as the Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning at Educational Service District 113 in Olympia, Washington. She provided leadership to forty-five, predominately rural, school districts serving approximately 77,000 students. She led the development of a highly successful regional job-embedded professional development model and facilitated data-based improvement planning with more than 150 schools. Her leadership was recognized through being awarded the Washington Association of School Administrator’s (WASA) Regional President’s Award, the WASA Award of Merit, and the Washington Association of Educational Service Districts President’s Award for significant contribution to the state’s educational service agencies.

Kathleen also served as a Washington State Distinguished Educator/School Improvement Specialist providing training and consultation to superintendents, central office administrators, building principals and teacher-leaders in schools spanning grades preschool-12, and varying in size, demographics, and geographical location. She also served on the Statewide School Improvement Technical Assistance Council and the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction’s Curriculum Advisory and Review Committee. Additionally she was a contributing author to the School System Improvement Guide and the Washington State School Improvement Planning Guide both published by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction in Olympia, Washington.

Kathleen also has worked as a district curriculum director, an elementary principal, and an elementary and special education teacher for 17 years. She continues to maintain that her most important and significant work has been teaching first graders to read.
Andrew J. Collins, principal at Dayton’s Bluff Achievement Plus Elementary School in St. Paul. Collins has been at Dayton’s Bluff for five years with a population of 400 preK-6 students. The school has over 50 percent mobility each school year and over 90 percent economically disadvantaged families. Dayton’s Bluff melds five domains to generate a cohesive, collaborative, creative and ultimately highly constructive school. The five domains are academic coherence, focus on students, analysis and use of student data, partnerships, and targeted professional development.