Overcoming the Poverty Challenge to Enable College and Career Readiness for All

The Crucial Role of Student Supports

Robert Balfanz

May 2012

Acknowledgements

Overcoming the Poverty Challenge to Enable College and Career Readiness for All: The Crucial Role of Student Supports

Robert Balfanz, Everyone Graduates Center, School of Education, Johns Hopkins University

This is a working paper, being circulated to receive input, in preparation for a final version in June

Introduction-College and Career Readiness for all and the Poverty Challenge

We are in what promises to be a transformational decade in American education. Like the advent of public schooling in the 1840's, the Land Grant Colleges, the formation of the great city school systems at the turn of the 20th century, the GI Bill, and the response to Sputnik, our current era is shaping up as a time when advances in public education can propel the nation forward. The most recent recession has made clear that there is little work in the 21st century for young adults without a high school diploma and limited work that is sufficient to support a family for those who lack at least some post-secondary schooling or training. Education is now the primary pathway to adult success and as a result public education needs to be designed to prepare all students for post-secondary schooling or training. In short, a high school diploma is no longer an end point in the educational system. This may seem on the surface to be a prosaic statement, but in fact it is quite revolutionary.

The great American school system that helped drive the nation to prosperity in the 20th century was built on the implicit premise that for a quarter or more of students, a high school diploma was not necessary for adult success, and for another substantial portion of students, a high school diploma was sufficient to secure a family-sustaining career. The nation's current educational attainment outcomes with a 75% high school graduation rate and a 41.1 percent college completion rate are reflections of this.[i] In the 1960's such outcomes made the United States first in the world in educational attainment. Much of the world, however, is catching up and a growing number of nations have surpassed the United States in academic achievement, high school graduation rates, and post-secondary completion. As the United States' educational achievement rates have remained stagnant, employers' demands for a more educated, skilled workforce are increasing, creating a rapidly growing gap between the skills American businesses require and citizens' workforce preparedness.[ii]

Redesigning the elementary and secondary public education system to make its core mission preparing all students for post-secondary schooling and/or training will have a profound impact on the nation's economic and social future. There is reason for optimism that we are heading in the right direction. The Common Core State Standards movement led by states and supported by the federal government to organize public education around a set of common college and career readiness standards, supported by a curriculum designed to achieve it, and assessments which can establish progress towards it, provides a blueprint. Advances in the effective use of technology and a deeper understanding of the dimensions of teacher quality and how to more routinely achieve it have the potential to accelerate the transformation. The recognition that the lowest performing schools need dramatic reforms and improvements indicates awareness that all students need strong pathways to post-secondary success.

Unfortunately it won't be this easy. One thing which stands in the way of creating a public education system that routinely graduates all of its students from high school, prepared for post-secondary schooling or training, is poverty.   This can be seen in the fact that over the last four decades, the achievement, high school graduation, and post-secondary completion gaps between affluent and low income students have widened. Duncan and Murane (2011) highlight this growing educational attainment gap between low-income students and their more affluent peers, and the resulting economic inequality. As the gap between poor and more affluent student achievement is widening, the public education system has come to educate a greater proportion of low income students, resulting in greater numbers of students not being afforded the opportunity to reach their full potential and threatening our nation's future prosperity. As a result, in order to achieve the educational outcomes the nation needs, it must solve the poverty challenge.

To do this, we need a deep understanding of how poverty impacts educational outcomes. Strong arguments can be made that the very reforms currently being championed at the federal and state level—a common core curriculum linked to college and career ready standards, improved teacher quality, and turning around the lowest performing schools—are essential to solving the poverty challenge. In short, low income students, more than any others, suffer from limited access to strong curricula, good teachers, and effective schools.   As crucial as they are though, better instruction, teachers, and schools alone will not solve the poverty challenge. In order for the impact of these reforms to be fully realized, students need to attend school, behave, and try.   The strongest curriculum and best teachers in the world will have limited impact if students are not in class regularly, paying attention, and able or willing to put forth the effort required to complete their school work. Yet, the truth is that overcoming the poverty challenge will require not only a better supply of educational opportunities, but also additional supports to enable students who live in poverty to fully partake in and benefit from these high quality educational options.

Emerging evidence is clear: poverty keeps students from attending school regularly, diminishes their ability to pay attention in class, and undermines a foundational driver of positive student behavior, the lived experience that effort leads to success. If each public school in the United States had only five to ten percent of students who experienced these poverty distractors, then it is possible to imagine how the current school structure and existing student supports—guidance counselors, school nurses, social workers, and others—could be mobilized to meet the poverty challenge. However, fewer and fewer schools in the US meet this condition. Increasing numbers of schools have many students who live in poverty, and there are as many or more schools where nearly all students are low income as there are schools where only a few students are. So, a further piece of the poverty challenge is the fact that the nation's highest-need students are concentrated in a sub-set of schools, where it is routine for hundreds of students to need more support than a good lesson and a skilled teacher in every classroom can provide. [iii]

The good news is that emerging evidence indicates that the poverty challenge can be overcome. Poverty complicates, and, if ignored, undercuts our quest to put all students on secure pathways to post-secondary success, but it does not have to prevent it. The range and extent of beat-the-odds counter-examples cannot be ignored. Their existence not only undermines arguments that educational and social interventions strong enough to overcome the impacts of poverty cannot be built, but also creates an obligation and accountability to provide them to all students who need them to reach their fullest potential.

To solve the poverty challenge, we need more innovation particularly in school design, but we also need to improve the ability to implement and scale existing evidence-based reforms and supports that have been shown to work. Fortunately, tools exist which can help accomplish this. One of them is federal policy and funding levers. The stated purpose of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is to help schools and students overcome the effects of poverty – to even the playing field. Its impending re-authorization offers the opportunity to better our ability to meet the poverty challenge, as do the re-authorization of the Perkins and Workforce Investment acts. The Serve America Act and the Education Corps it created provide another powerful tool. Finally, the ESEA flexibility currently being given to states who adopt innovative reform strategies, the Race to Top, and Investing in Innovation federal programs offer another set of opportunities to redesign the current school structure to meet the scale and intensity of low-income students' needs.

Another underused tool is the rapid advancement over the past decade of the nonprofit sector. Both established and entrepreneurial nonprofit organizations are uniquely positioned to project additional person power employing evidence-based strategies and reforms into schools and school systems which educate high concentrations of low income students. Student and family support organizations like the Boys and Girls Club, Big Brothers and Big Sisters, Communities In Schools, and the United Way, along with national service organizations like City Year and Experience Corps, and human capital development efforts like Teach for America and New Leaders for New Schools, as well as programmatic efforts like Citizen Schools and College Summit, have all increased and continue to increase their capacities. The impact these enhanced capacities can have on meeting the poverty challenge, however, has not been systematically exploited yet.

This white paper focuses on an important and under-conceptualized thread in the weave of efforts needed to ensure that all students graduate from high school prepared for college and/or career training: enhanced student supports. In order to overcome the poverty challenge, schools that serve high concentrations of low income students need to be able to provide direct, evidence-based supports that help students attend school regularly, act in a productive manner, believe they will succeed, overcome external obstacles, complete their coursework, and put forth the effort required to graduate college-and-career ready. This paper will accomplish this goal by first looking at the impacts of poverty more closely, then showing how current efforts to provide student supports have and will continue to fall short. Next, it will examine what the evidence base says about effective student supports. It will conclude by exploring how federal policy and funding can be designed to promote the implementation and spread of evidence-based, direct student supports, how the nonprofit sector can be organized to increase the effectiveness of the student supports it provides, and how schools and school districts can create the conditions needed to maximize the impact of these direct student supports. The paper draws on the emerging evidence base to examine these topics, and call upon the insights gleaned through the author's fifteen years of participant-observation in the effort to create schools strong enough to overcome the ramifications of poverty and prepare all students for adult success.

The Impact of Poverty on School Success

Poverty is a bear. Its impacts on students are both obvious and subtle. The impacts of food scarcity, housing instability, and insufficient access to medical and dental care are clear. If a student is hungry, without a home, suffering from untreated ailments or in need of glasses, it is difficult for him or her to focus on schoolwork. Poverty also brings with it an increased exposure to violence and the lived experience that life is capricious which further shapes student behavior directly and indirectly in complicated and often counter-productive ways.   Another characteristic of poverty is living under constant stress, which research is beginning to show has a wide range of negative physical, emotional, and mental health effects. Finally, since in the US a large percentage of students who live in poverty come from single-parent, but sometimes multi-generational households, especially as students hit early adolescence there can be a range of sibling, family, and elder-care responsibilities thrust upon them that their more affluent peers do not, in general, experience.   These impacts of poverty, in turn, influence students' success at school, not only through their preparation for academic achievement but also by affecting their attendance rates and patterns, their inter-personal behaviors and relations, and the amount of effort they can and will put into their school work.

Poverty's effects on students' preparation to achieve academically are well documented in Paul Barton's 2003 "Parsing the Achievement Gap: Baselines for Tracking Progress." Students living in poverty, on average, start their educational experience significantly behind their peers in terms of the precursor reading and mathematics skills and the knowledge they bring to school. Differential experiences during the summers between grades widen these gaps. As they grow older, students in poverty tend to have less academic background knowledge and more limited vocabularies which further challenge the pace with which they read and absorb new academic material.

Because students who live in poverty often experience less stimulating learning environments outside of school, steady school attendance and participation is even more critical for students who live in poverty than it is for their more affluent peers. Poverty, however, greatly increases the likelihood that a student will be chronically absent (miss 10% or more of school, in essence a month or more of schooling in a year) and not attend regularly (miss 5 or fewer days of schooling). Neither the magnitude of chronic absenteeism nor its negative effects are commonly understood, because chronic absenteeism is typically not measured.

Currently, only a handful of states report chronic absenteeism rates at the school level. Yet the emerging evidence is clear: student's academic achievement, odds of graduating from high school and likelihood of enrolling in post-secondary school or training are all highly sensitive to a student's attendance patterns. Missing even two or three weeks of school in a year has negative consequences for students who live in poverty, and missing a month or more throws a student completely off track. In high-poverty schools however, the chronic absenteeism rate can easily reach 15% at the elementary level (50 or more students), 25% in the middle grades (100 or more students), and 40% (250 to 500 students) or more at the high school level. At these levels, even students who attend regularly are affected, as teachers are faced with a different constellation of students in their classrooms every day, undercutting the flow and effectiveness of instruction. In this situation, teachers face an impossible choice of either slowing instruction to review what was covered yesterday or the day before for returning students or to forge ahead and then likely face behavioral interruptions from frustrated students who have missed class and are struggling to grasp the material. Without a thoughtful and sufficiently supported response, the high levels of chronic absenteeism often found in high poverty schools can completely overwhelm a school's ability to serve its students effectively.

Poverty also affects students' behavior in school. Students arrive at school weighed down by the tensions of living in poverty: the after-effects of family and neighborhood disputes, the fatigue of juggling school, home, and work responsibilities, and the need to toggle between a street persona and a school persona.   In high-poverty schools, the impact of this can be seen in sky high suspension rates involving hundreds of students. Data recently released by the Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights shows that over time, in some school districts the majority of poor and minority male students will be suspended at least once. Some, perhaps many, of these suspensions result from an overreaction to student behavior and overuse of suspensions for behavioral infractions that could be handled through less drastic sanctions. Even so, the suspension data indicates the prevalence in high poverty schools of a significant gap between expected and realized student behavior. As a result, large amounts of class time and adult energy are expended managing student behavior, and students perceive that they are constantly being sent signals that they are not conforming to the norms of the school. This in turn can propel the students to push back, skip school, or simply withdraw from active participation.

Student effort is also affected by poverty. Many of the circumstances of poverty cited above that lead to behavioral issues can also undermine the amount of effort students can or will put into their schoolwork. This dearth of effort can be seen in the low GPA's found in urban school systems, where in non-selective secondary schools average GPA's are often in the D range (i.e. below 2.0). Retention rates are also high because students fail core courses. This data challenges the urban myth, that students are given good grades for just showing up and not misbehaving. A major reason why students receive low or failing grades is because they do not turn in assignments or complete their schoolwork. This sets up a number of counter-productive dynamics.

First, there are students who pass key exams but receive low or failing grades because they have accumulated multiple zeros for not completing assignments. The student assumes that because they passed the test, they should pass the course. When they fail the course, they attribute the failure to the teacher not liking them, rather than recognizing that the course failure stems from not turning in their assignments. Students' misunderstanding of the source of their poor course performance prevents them from reflecting on what they might need to do to improve their academic performance.

Second, because many students who live in poverty have experienced the sting of course failure in earlier grades they seek to shield themselves from again experiencing the negative feelings associated with this failure by denying effort. In this way, the anticipated course failure can be attributed to the fact that they did not care or try, which can be self-corrected in the future, rather than putting themselves in a situation in which they believe they tried their hardest and still failed.   Alternatively, some students act out in this situation because they would rather be viewed by their classmates as bad than dumb.

Finally, there is the case of the highly engaged C or D student with very heavy family responsibilities. This student is desperately trying to manage schoolwork and family responsibilities, but the time he or she has to complete homework outside of school hours is very limited. When a teacher, unaware of the student's home situation, benignly states that the student has not put in enough effort lately, it can trigger a negative response from the student. The impacts of poverty on student effort are hugely consequential because the evidence is clear: course failure propels students on the path towards dropping out, and course success (earning a B or better) launches students towards post-secondary educational attainment.

Why the Standard Operating Procedures Currently Employed by Schools to Mitigate the Effects of Poverty Don't Work

Currently there are standard operating procedures schools use to deal with the effects of poverty on students' ability to attend, behave and try. These strategies include grade retention; class size reduction; test prep and the ad hoc, temporary, non-strategic accumulation of externally funded student supports. Since these practices are not specifically designed to improve students' attendance, behavior, and effort their impact is limited. The ineffectiveness of these strategies also makes them costly, resulting in wasted federal and local dollars that if invested in initiatives specially designed to address the effects of poverty could yield positive outcomes for students and maximize the taxpayer investment. In the paragraphs that follow, I provide greater detail on the shortcomings of the strategies listed above.

Grade Retention

Grade retention is used when students fail to demonstrate sufficient mastery of key academic skills or are unable to pass courses required for grade promotion. Chronic absenteeism is a key driver of grade retention. Students who do not attend school regularly have trouble mastering critical academic skills and/or passing courses, and are compelled to repeat the grade. The theory behind grade retention is two-fold: first, it is thought that providing extra time will enable students to acquire core academic competencies and, second, it is believed that the fear of grade retention will propel students to try harder to master the key academic material required to pass the course. In practice, there is little evidence that grade retention works and compelling evidence that students who are retained, especially if it occurs more than once, have considerably lower odds of graduating from high school.[iv]

The growth of grade retention polices and multiple grade promotion gates, such as third, fifth, and eighth grade, has led in some states to growing numbers of middle grade students who are two or more years over age.[v] No one is angrier than a 16 year old 8th grader, and there are few effective strategies to get these students back on track. In a 2002 analysis, Andrew Martin found that grade retention had a consistently negative impact on student motivation, engagement, and academic performance, undercutting the very goals of grade retention practices. Moreover, in a perverse way, some high school students, in schools where grade retention has become a norm, and therefore lost much of its stigma, use grade retention to shop for better or different teachers. If they don't like a teacher, they skip class, confident that they can take the class again with another teacher, the following year.

It should be noted that a distinction can be drawn between grade retention and grade promotion policies. It is possible to have strong grade promotion policies, which establish key points in time when students need to demonstrate mastery of key academic skills to move on to the next grade, without using grade retention as the default remediation strategy. Students failing to meet the promotion gate can be designated to receive individualized tutoring tailored to their unique learning needs or can be asked to attend intensive summer, Saturday, or after-school extra-help programs that employ evidence-based strategies to close critical skill and knowledge gaps.

One reason why grade retention may remain popular despite the evidence against its effectiveness is that it is perceived not to cost much, if anything. This perception is an artifact of how public education is often funded. In school districts that receive per pupil funding from local, state, and federal revenue sources, funding is based on the number of pupils in a school or district, and not their grade progression. In short, whether a student is promoted from 3rd to 4th grade or retained in 3rd grade, the school district receives the same funding. However, in terms of total dollars needed to educate a student, or the true cost of educating a student successfully to a given outcome, grade retention is incredibly costly. Take the simple case of a school district which spends $10,000 in local, state, and federal funds to educate each student. If a student repeats third grade, the cost of educating that student to a 3rd grade standard has doubled for the third grade from $10,000 to $20,000. Moreover, the cost of providing that student with a kindergarten through third grade education has increased 25%--from $40,000 to $50,000. Given that grade retention often has negative rather than positive benefits, the actual cost is much higher, because if the grade retention ends up contributing to the factors that propel a student to drop out then in part it is responsible for the lost tax revenue and increased social service costs that research has shown are incurred when a student drops out of secondary school.

By contrast, if an intensive summer intervention, at a cost of $2,000 per student, or even a targeted prevention intervention, such a one-on-one tutoring or mentoring at the cost of $500 per student, with solid evidence of success were proposed as the best intervention for students at risk of not meeting grade promotion criteria, these strategies would erroneously be viewed as additional costs, and cut when funds got tight. Yet, from a return-on-investment and total-cost- to-educate-to-standards perspective, effective summer intervention programs and high quality mentoring and tutoring for struggling students would be far more cost effective than grade retention.

Class Size Reduction

The economist Edward Lazear has elegantly shown how the contradictions of class size reduction can be reconciled. The evidence shows that class size reduction yields significant positive results in only a few narrow situations, primarily when very significant class size reductions to 15 students or less are applied to classes of low income students, particularly in the early grades. Yet most practicing teachers and administrators advocate for class size reduction. In fact, small increases in class size—adding one or two more students per classroom—are often seen as major setbacks only to be taken in times of extreme economic duress. The answer Lazear argues is neither academics nor pedagogy, but rather behavior. Through class size reduction, teachers are trying to minimize the odds that they will be overwhelmed by disruptive, distracting, or time-consuming students. In short, the larger the class, the greater the likelihood that teachers will have numerous rather than just one or two students whose behavior disrupts classroom learning. Administrators explicitly or implicitly see the value of attempting to reduce the behavioral load in classrooms because the bane of their existence is office referrals: students sent to the office for acting out or behaving inappropriately in class. Administrators recognize that if teachers cannot manage their classrooms, not only does instruction suffer, but also administrators will be distracted from their tasks by the sheer number of students sitting in the office. Seen in this light, class size reduction is in essence the go-to intervention teachers and administrators use to offset the effect students in need of additional behavior support have on classroom learning. Since it is a broad-stroked and non-directed strategy—it does not directly seek to improve student behavior, just limit its effect – class size reduction is a low impact, and hence high-cost strategy.[vi]

Test Prep

If grade retention is viewed as a no-cost solution to the effects of poverty on students' ability to attend and try, and class size reduction is viewed as an implicit strategy to address student behavior, then test prep is simply seen as a necessity. Given the realities of high stakes testing, schools view test prep as a means to narrow and focus student effort on the most essential skills needed to reach mandated levels of performance on state or local assessments. Schools calculate that students on their own will not do the necessary work to get ready for the exam and that regular classroom instruction is not sufficient.

The effectiveness of test prep, however, is weakened by the same ramifications of poverty that plague classroom instruction, namely poor attendance, inappropriate behavior, and inconsistent effort. Test prep may be even further affected by these factors as students view test prep as repeating prior instruction often in a very rigid and non-engaging manner. As a result, students determine that not much will be missed if they skip the class, act out, or tune out. By the time they are early adolescents, students who live in poverty are often managing complex lives with a fair degree of autonomy. They are balancing home responsibilities such as caring for younger siblings and providing elder or even parent care, and the need or desire to make money. In their cost-benefit analysis, if they believe not much is going on in the classroom because it is only test prep, then they make the calculation that it is a good time to attend to other aspects of their lives.

This decision to be elsewhere or not put forth much effort in test prep is also propelled by the fact that many "high stakes" assessments actually have limited or no stakes for students, as they are used to evaluate the success of the school and, increasingly, teachers and administrators. However, the very fact that administrators and teachers view students as not trying on something which does matter to the school, or teacher's and administrator's ability to retain their jobs or earn a promotion can lead to a further loss of hope and investment in students. Perceived lack of effort among the highest needs students can also provide implicit justification for focusing attention on students who are close to proficiency rather than those with the largest skill gaps.[vii]

Ad Hoc Accumulation of Externally Funded Student Supports

The final de facto student support strategy which predominates in schools which serve high poverty populations is a hodge-podge of externally funded student support programs. Schools, by and large, are aware that many of their students do need extra supports. As a result, they accept whatever help comes their way, as long as it is fully or partly paid for by someone else. This leads to a "random acts of kindness" approach to supporting struggling students. In any given year, as external funding ebbs and flows, there is a different collection of programs in the school serving a different sub-set of student needs. The effectiveness of this approach is undermined at four levels.

First, there is usually a lack of strategically matching student need with the service offered. Many schools do not conduct needs assessments. As a result, the students in need of additional support are not always accurately identified, the type of support struggling students need is often not understood, and the scale and intensity of student need is often overlooked. Thus, there can be too much of one type of support and too little or none at all of other essential supports.

Second, there is typically little coordination between external support providers and classroom teachers, resulting in a lack of alignment between the services provided and classroom lessons. The classic example here is the after school tutoring program which gives students a pre-test, identifies student weaknesses, remediates them successfully, but focused on fractions when the student's test at the end of the week was on probability. This lack of alignment results in many students participating in the afterschool programming failing the test. Numerous evaluations of after school tutoring programs have revealed that these programs have limited effectiveness if the content is not directly linked to classroom learning.[viii] Most recently, researchers from the University of Maryland and Rowan University conducted a randomized comparison of students in after-school programs to a control group of students without any educational services beyond the traditional school hours. The researchers found "no differences between treatment and control youths on measures of conduct problems, academic performance, school attendance or any of the intermediate behaviors targeted."[ix] Yet in the few cases when intentional efforts have been undertaken to link after-school activities with classroom needs and student behaviors in school, like in Providence Rhode Island, than much stronger impacts have been found.

Third, there is no stability. Student support programs come and go as their funding waxes and wanes. This prevents improvement over time, and the creation of an integrated set of providers, organized against identified student need. It also wreaks havoc with the relationships students have formed with the external providers. Students who live in poverty are in many respects starved for adult attention and support. When this support is available one year, and then simply gone the next year, it further exacerbates students' perception that adult support is inherently unreliable. This then can make students less willing to seek adult support in the future.

Finally, there is limited accountability for supporting overall student success. If external student support providers essentially have to pay for themselves, they are then driven to focus on the outcomes that are fundable and can be more easily attributed directly to their efforts. As a result, adult effort is directed to smaller and more fragmented outcomes often involving tallies of services provided rather than towards a collective effort to enable students to attend, behave, believe they can succeed, feel connected to school, and put forth the effort needed to learn and complete their schoolwork.

Supplemental Educational Services (SES), policymakers' laudable effort to provide additional support for low-income students attending low-performing schools through the No Child Left Behind Act is an excellent example of an effort to support struggling students that has yielded minimal advancement among participating students while incurring significant costs. SES has faced all four challenges outlined above: mismatch between student need and the services provided, lack of alignment with classroom learning, consistency, and misdirected focus on preset goals as opposed to adjusting curriculum to ensure students receive the right support at the right time. As a result, research indicates that supplemental educational services participation has a minimal effect on students' academic achievement.[x] In fact, an analysis of Minnesota students revealed that the academic performance of students who received tutoring services from SES providers did not differ from the performance of their non-participating peers.[xi]

Understanding Where We Are to Find a Better Way Forward

In sum, providing student supports in high poverty schools is under-conceptualized. Yet on the ground, in the classroom and the school the need exists—as teachers and administrators experience first-hand, the grinding effects of poverty as expressed through sporadic attendance, inappropriate behavior, and constrained effort. Seeking to mitigate poverty's effects with the avenues open to them and the tools at their disposal, front-line educators have adopted a series of responses that have become routinized into standard operating procedures. As such, they are often not subject to much reflection or analysis. When examined more closely, it becomes clear that grade retention, class size reduction, test prep and an ad hoc collection of externally funded student supports are neither effective nor cost-efficient means of providing students with the supports they need to mitigate the ramifications of poverty. In some circumstances, these strategies exacerbate rather than mitigate student need and in so doing, further drive up their cost.

Solving the Student Support Puzzle

The first step in creating more effective and cost-efficient student supports is to openly acknowledge student need. Poverty can neither be willed away nor ignored. If we are serious about providing all students with real pathways to post-secondary success, and as the nation we need to be, we must recognize that these pathways will not become available without an evidence-based and strategic approach to providing student supports. This approach must also have consistent, intelligently targeted funding at the federal, state, school district, and school levels.

An Evidence-based and Strategic Approach to Providing Student Supports that Mitigate the Effects of Poverty and Enable College and Career Readiness for All

Existing evidence and experience highlights the critical, core components of an evidence-based and strategic approach to providing student supports.

Establish Student Needs

To start, there is a need to understand the scope, scale, and intensity of student needs, and how these needs are distributed and concentrated across schools. At the most basic level, this means measuring and making available information on the extent of chronic absenteeism, behavioral challenges, course performance and academic achievement at the school level.   This information is currently available in some states and some districts, but much of it often is not.

Academic achievement data, thanks to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, is the most readily available. However, school readiness data for incoming elementary, middle, and high school students is often not available, making it difficult for educators to discern what critical skills students lack, and will need focused attention to acquire. Behavioral data of the most basic level –the number of students suspended—is often, but not always available. The recent US Department of Education Office of Civil Rights survey shows that more detailed behavioral data can be collected and disseminated.

Perhaps the most essential piece of information is currently the least accessible: the number of students who are chronically absent—those who miss 10% or more of school or are on a path to missing a month or more of school—and, the number who attend regularly – students with five or fewer absences in the course of the school year. Currently, as cited in the upcoming report – "The Importance of Being In School: A Report on School Absenteeism in the US," only four states—Georgia, Florida, Maryland and Rhode Island—make this important attendance data publicly available. A handful of school districts also report the data but are not sharing it in a timely manner which would allow educators to react to it, though New York City is heading in this direction.

This information on student need must be leveraged to target the right kinds of supports at the scale and intensity required. For example, if a high school learns that it will have 75 students entering 9th grade reading at the 5th grade level, then it needs to have a literacy intervention with evidence of effectiveness specifically designed for this population. This high school will also need to provide these supports to all 75 students. Having a single literacy lab that can serve 25 students would not be sufficient. Similarly, if data reveals that a school will have 50 new students with a history of chronic absenteeism, it needs to design a proactive campaign to make sure these students attend regularly and not wait until these students have missed a week of school.

While easily accessible school and student level information on the extent of chronic absenteeism, behavioral challenges, course performance, and academic achievement is essential, it is not sufficient. In order to maximize the effectiveness of student supports, it is critical to conduct building-level needs assessments and student surveys and/or focus groups. The data collected through these strategies will provide guidance as to the root causes behind the attendance, behavior, and academic data which will facilitate getting the right intervention to the right student at the right time. A growing set of tools is available to collect this survey data. Examples include the Gallup Student Poll and teacher, parent, and student surveys, which many districts and states are collecting as part of their accountability systems.

Implement Early Warning Systems and Extend Them to Post-Secondary Success Indicators

It is essential to collect data on the educational challenges which stem from living in poverty and hamper student learning in order to organize a strategic and sufficient response. However, the data collection practices outlined above do not provide the real time data needed to keep students on track to post-secondary success.

A second key component of an effective student support system is the use of early warning indicators, the signals that a student is falling off track or is on track to a desired goal like high school graduation and college attainment. Evidence shows that in high poverty environments close to 50 percent of the students who will drop out of school start to show signs of distress as early as sixth grade. The key early warning indicators are the ABC's—attendance, behavior and course performance, the very same variables identified as the mechanisms through which poverty exerts a negative influence on educational outcomes.

Emerging second generation early warning systems go beyond these core measures in two ways. First, they capture early, early indicators such as attendance patterns, office referrals, and failing a test or not turning in major assignments, enabling educators to intervene at the first sign of trouble. Second, they extend from their initial focus on grades six through nine and dropout prevention, to data sets that include kindergarten through grade twelve data to capture critical post-secondary success indicators.

In order for early warning indicators to be of use, real time or near real time data needs to be easily available at the teacher and classroom levels. Time has to be built into the school schedule for teams of adults who work with common sets of students to regularly analyze early warning indicator data, share insights into the root causes of off-track behaviors, devise interventions, assign champions, and monitor each intervention's effectiveness. If the intervention is not working, then the adult team supporting the student must increase the intensity and vary the modality until success is achieved. Many schools, however, are unable to dedicate sufficient person power to carry through the interventions identified to meet student's needs. As a full-time presence in schools, national service members represent a cost-effective human capital strategy that can help schools have the person power needed to implement and deliver the needed support.

Amass the Person Power Needed to Form Relationships with All Students in Need of Additional Support

In order to provide students with the supports they need to overcome the effects of poverty, it is necessary both to develop a problem solving capacity and to be able to change student behavior. Neither of these approaches is possible without first forming a positive relationship with the student. This is why student support is ultimately a person to person retail business. In the lowest performing schools, with high percentages of students living in poverty, strategies need to be developed to amass sufficient person power to form supportive relationships with the hundreds of struggling students in need of individualized support. A second shift of well-trained adults, who are able to help teachers provide these supports at the scale and intensity required, needs to be mobilized, from both inside and outside of the school. Key sources of this person power include national service members, community volunteers organized by intermediaries like the United Way, through city-wide efforts supported by Cities of Service, peer leadership programs, and evidence-based face to face and virtual mentoring.

Teach Students Skills and Approaches to Increase their Personal Agency

As essential as a helping hand from an adult is to students in need of additional supports, it is also critical that we more formally teach students the skills and approaches they need to strengthen and expand their personal agency. Evidence-based programs that teach resiliency, self-management, study skills, conflict resolution, leadership, communication, and programs to create a college-going and career-focused student culture are important tools that need to be widely adopted.

Adopt a Prevention, Real Time intervention, and Rapid Recovery Student Support Perspective

Redefining the goal of elementary and secondary education as having all students graduate from high school prepared for college and a career necessitates a substantial change in the mindset with which student supports are approached. Keeping all students on track to post-secondary success will require more thoughtful attempts to mitigate the negative effects of poverty before they impact student achievement. This will require more extensive prevention work. For example, enrolling students who in prior years had behavior issues in a conflict resolution course at the start of the year, or assigning students who exhibited an off-track indicator the prior year to a success mentor—a role that can cost-effectively be filled by a national service member or community volunteer – will enable students to receive the support they need before they have exhibited any new signs of duress. In addition, through close monitoring of student progress, much more rapid intervention is possible. For example, if a student has miserably failed a mid-term, there is no need to wait for him or her to fail the final before action is taken. Instead, intense supports should immediately be provided to enable the student to catch up within the term and ultimately pass the course.[xii] Finally, when prevention and real-time intervention are not sufficient, recovery opportunities should be rapid. If a student fails a first term course, they should be given opportunities to pass it during the second term rather than having to wait until the summer or the following year.

Employ a Disciplined Multi-tiered Approach with Built-in Continuous Improvement Tools

In order for student supports to be both impactful and cost-effective it is necessary to reserve the most labor intensive and expensive interventions for those students for whom nothing less intense will work. In other words it is important to practice intervention discipline, by first making sure that strong prevention practices are in place, and then, when they are not sufficient, employing small-group more time-limited interventions before resorting to one on one, case managed efforts. It is also important to closely track what interventions are attempted for which students and continually evaluate if the intervention is working or if another approach is required. The core concept is to increase intensity and vary the modality of the intervention until it works. By keeping close track of which interventions work for which students under what circumstances it is possible to develop a strong local knowledge base and, through it, improve the efficiency and effectiveness of student support efforts.

Organize Against Need at School Level and Employ Different Approaches Based on the Scale and Intensity of Student Needs

The number of students in need of additional support to overcome the effects of poverty and the intensity of many low-income students' needs should determine how student supports are organized at the school level. If there are fewer than 50 students in need of additional supports, this enables a different approach than when there are 250 students with complex needs. The temptation to have a standard student support package which is made broadly available regardless of the scale and intensity of need should be avoided. Approaches which are sufficient to meet the challenge of hundreds of students in need at a single school must be identified and promulgated. Proven, comprehensive school reform models exist. These models have a demonstrated record of meeting the scale and intensity of student needs in low performing, high-poverty schools. Most of these models require schools to collaborate with a partner organization or collection of organizations. These partnerships are most successful when a lead partner is present and able to manage supporting partners through an integrated and highly coordinated approach. This strategy ensures that schools have the strong leaders, data-driven, skilled educators, and additional human capital needed to implement proven reforms. Critical to the success of these partnerships is a shared understanding of the school, partner, and supporting partner responsibilities, and a thorough appreciation for how each stakeholder will be held accountable for meeting student needs and implementing proven reforms.

Successfully Employing the Nonprofit Sector to Provide Evidence-Based, Strategic Student Supports at the Scale and Intensity Required

To meet the poverty challenge and provide students who live in poverty with the supports they need to attend, behave, and try, as well as master the academic skills needed to do college level work and/or succeed in career training, it will be necessary to increase the capacity of schools to provide the needed supports. Currently, few schools are designed or staffed to provide high quality instruction in all classrooms and provide additional student supports to anywhere from 30 to 80% of the students, as is often the need in high poverty schools. This means additional capacities and human capital to implement evidence based student supports need to be brought into many high poverty schools. Fortunately, the supply of high quality student supports and the organizational capacity to project additional human capital into high needs schools to implement them at the scale required has increased considerably within the non-profit sector over the past decade.   Strong organizations with national reach, such as Boys and Girls Club, Communities In Schools, Big Brothers Big Sisters, a growing number of local United Way affiliates, and City Year have all enhanced their capacity to project evidence-based student supports into schools.   They have been joined by a growing list of organizations designed to project student support functions into schools, accompanied either by additional adults to help implement them or by organized efforts to increase the student support capacities of school leaders and teachers.   In order to avoid replicating the pitfalls of the ad hoc, temporary assortment of student support providers in schools that represents current standard operating practice, it is important to think through how to strategically select, combine, and employ the growing number of evidence-based external student support providers.

Needed student supports can be organized into four broad categories. The challenge is to make sure that the right organization is being called upon to do the right job, and that a high-needs school has access to the range of students supports needed at the required scale.

Providing Student Supports During the School Day

In schools where a high percentage or large numbers of students are in need of additional supports to succeed in school, these supports need to be provided throughout the school day. By placing additional national service members in early learning centers, elementary schools, and secondary schools in a thoughtful, value added fashion, organizations such as Jumpstart, Experience Corps, City Year, Citizen Schools, and Communities In Schools increase a school's capacity to guide and support students in real time throughout the school day.

Jumpstart

> Jumpstart ensures all children have equitable access to high quality early learning programs by deploying part-time AmeriCorps members to Head Start Centers. These AmeriCorps members collaborate with Head Start staff to help young children develop the language and literacy skills needed to be successful in kindergarten and beyond. A randomized, controlled trial of Jumpstart's model revealed that young children working with Jumpstart outperformed same-classroom comparison students in literacy, school readiness and socio-emotional skills. Jumpstart post-test literacy and school-readiness scores reached expected levels for kindergarten entry, closing the achievement gap between low-income Jumpstart children and their wealthier peers. [xiii]

Nashville K-2 Reading Program

> Similar to Jumpstart, the Nashville K - 2 Reading program strives to ensure that students gain critical literacy skills during their early years. The initiative is a result of a strategic partnership between the Nashville Mayor's Office and the PENCIL Foundation. Through this initiative, well-trained community volunteers go to schools once a week to tutor students in grades K – 2 during the school day. With this support, the 57 students participating in the program increased their reading scores by an average of 7.65 reading levels, surpassing the goal of a 2-level increase, in the 2010-2011 school year.

Experience Corps

> Experience Corps engages older adults as tutors and mentors to children in urban public schools across the country. An evaluation of Experience Corps in 2009 showed that students benefiting from the Experience Corps program made 60% more progress in vocabulary acquisition and reading comprehension, and 40% more progress in grade-specific reading skill development than did the control group. Researchers concluded that Experience Corps has a "statistically significant, substantively important impact on students' reading outcomes."[xiv]

Citizen Schools

Citizen Schools partners with low-performing middle schools and leverages AmeriCorps members and community volunteers to provide students with the customized supports and additional learning time they need to be successful. An external evaluation of the Citizen Schools' program revealed that program participants had, on average, significantly higher attendance rates in high school than did matched nonparticipants. An analysis of Citizen Schools' youth outcomes in Boston revealed that participation in Citizen Schools' programming was associated with higher math performance on classroom and standardized tests. [xv]

City Year

City Year deploys teams of 8 to 20 full time AmeriCorps members to the elementary and secondary schools that produce a disproportionate number of our nation's dropouts. These 17 – 24 year old AmeriCorps members deliver research-based direct student supports in attendance, behavior and course performance, the factors shown to most effectively predict the likelihood that a student will drop out of school. This full time, targeted support is yielding positive outcomes for students. A 2009 comparison of students' literacy scores at three comparable Miami-Dade County public schools revealed that the students receiving City Year AmeriCorps members' interventions outperformed peers on standardized, interim assessments.[xvi]

Communities In Schools

Begun in 1977, Communities In Schools (CIS) is a national federation organization with about 200 affiliates currently in 25 states and the District of Columbia. Communities In Schools (CIS) places a dedicated staff member inside of each of its more than 3,000 partner schools to identify, access, and facilitate critical supports for students at risk of dropping out. CIS serves nearly 1.3 million students annually by leveraging AmeriCorps members and community volunteers to surround these students with a community of support, encouraging them to stay in school and achieve in life. A five year, national, external evaluation of CIS demonstrated that the model is working. Researchers found that "Communities In Schools is unique in its ability to lower dropout rates and increase on-time graduation compared to other dropout prevention programs."[xvii]

Each of these organizations has a specific focus, either targeting a grade band of students, or a sub-set of students within the school. This means that in some cases it will be strategic to combine them, as City Year and Communities In Schools are combined in the Diplomas Now school turnaround model. In this case, each organization enhances the impact of the other. City Year corps members leveraging their near-peer relationships with students often learn about serious out-of-school or health issues before they are discovered by other adults in the building. This enables the Communities In Schools site coordinator to get faster referrals of students in need of case-managed supports, and in so doing increases their chance of being effective. City Year corps members, by having a skilled professional to turn the highest-needs student support cases over to, then do not become first consumed and then frustrated by trying to help students they do not have the capacity to effectively support.   In other cases, it will be possible to create a continuum of care and support from pre-k to 12 with, for example, students being supported by Jump Start in Head Start, Experience Corps in early elementary school, and City Year from grades 3 to 9 and beyond

Injecting Value Added Student Support Functions into Schools

Another set of school needs and nonprofit capacities revolves around specific school functions. For example, AmeriCorps members serving with Playworks facilitate play at recess, providing students at inner-city schools with an opportunity to exercise. As a result, principals have noticed a marked improvement in student behavior. Seventy percent of principals who partner with Playworks AmeriCorps members have seen a reduction in the number of fights and 75% of teachers report increased cooperation among students in the classroom.[xviii]

Additionally, AmeriCorps*VISTA members can be trained to provide schools with the data facilitation needed to support early warning indicator meetings. In many schools, the attendance, behavior, and course performance data needed to monitor students and keep them on track to school success need to be pulled from multiple sources and then merged into a form that is easy for teachers to access and use. This takes the person power that schools are often unable to provide themselves on a consistent basis. As a result, attempts at implementing an early warning system can falter when teachers come to see that the actionable data is often not available. A third example involves report card conferences. Students often receive little or no feedback on their report cards. An effective strategy used in the Talent Development whole school reform model is to make sure every student receives a one-on-one, ten-minute consultation from a caring adult to review their report card, recognize success, discuss struggles, and most importantly plan a course of action to recover in courses that were failed.

In order to serve all students in all grades, multiple times a year, a large number of adult person power needs to be organized and present. This is an area where organizations like United Way, with its campaign to mobilize a million volunteers in schools, could play a key role by providing schools with a consistent group of organized and committed adults.

Similarly, Cities of Service is encouraging cities to leverage community volunteers to implement critically needed student support services. Examples of how community volunteers are working with schools to provide essential student supports include the Philadelphia Graduation Coaches and the Los Angeles Student Recovery Days. The Philadelphia Graduation Coaches initiative is led by the Mayor's Office and designed to provide struggling students with the support of a caring adult who can share critical educational information and guide students towards high school graduation and postsecondary success. More than 3,000 Graduation Coaches have received training and are working to accomplish the Mayor's goal of a city-wide graduation rate of 80% by 2015. Los Angeles Student Recovery Days, a joint initiative between the Mayor's Office and the Los Angeles Unified School District, strives to provide students who are at risk of dropping out or have already made the decision to leave school with the extra support they need to re-engage. Over 1,800 volunteers have worked with school officials to identify and contact over 13,000 students who are at-risk of or have already dropped out. More than 2,300 students contacted returned to school.

These efforts enable a second shift of adults who have interest and desire to help schools, but only limited time available, to provide a crucial and rewarding value added student support function. A final example is provided by organizations like College Summit which bring into schools new capacities, in this case the ability to infuse a peer-driven, college-going culture.

Extending Student Supports Beyond the Schoolhouse

Most of the poverty distractors which push students to not attend school regularly, act out, withdraw, give up, or not complete their schoolwork occur outside of the schoolhouse. Hence students are in need of supports outside of school, as well as within it. This is where organizations like Boys and Girls Clubs, Big Brothers, Big Sisters, and a growing legion of evidence based mentoring, extended day, and summer programs come into play. Here the key, though, is still to connect their work to student's progress in school. This means continued work on developing means, protocols and tools to share student attendance, behavior and course performance data with nonprofits working in the out-of-school time space, consistent with privacy laws and regulations. The value added of these external student support partners will be greatly extended if they can share with teachers and in-school student support staff, their experience with the students when they are out of school and if in turn they can be fully aware of when the student is missing school, having behavioral issues, what assignments need to be completed, and when student's next tests are.

Non-Profits and Schools Supporting Each Other

In order for the potential of non-profits with evidence based student supports to play a critical role in enabling college and career readiness for all to be realized, they and the schools they inject capacity into will need to learn how to mutually support one another. On the non-profit side that means learning how to present themselves to schools as an organized and integrated collaborative that helps the school achieve its core goals of educating students to the common core standards and sending them on, prepared to succeed. Principals cannot hold multiple meetings with multiple providers; there must be one scheduled meeting where efforts are coordinated, plans shared, and issues resolved with all student support providers. Schools in turn need to provide non-profits with access to the data they must have to both identify the students in need of support and to monitor their improvement. They also need to help the non-profits integrate their supports into the day-to-day fabric of the school. It is also important for schools, before they welcome a student support provider into the school, to understand what the provider needs in order to implement their supports well. If, for example, a certain school schedule is needed then the school either has to be prepared to provide it, or to tell the provider before they start working at the school that it will not possible.

The Need for a Secure Funding: Implications for Re-authorization of ESEA, and Other Federal Funding Streams

In order for evidence-based student supports to mitigate the impacts of poverty and, in so doing, help enable all students to graduate from high school prepared for college and career, it is necessary to establish a secure, long term funding source for effective programs. Poverty is a stubborn foe. For students to get the supports they need to overcome its distractors so they can attend school regularly, stay out of trouble and try hard to succeed, the necessary funding needs to be consistently and continually present as students progress through school. Effective student supports cannot be there one year and gone the next. The challenges of poverty change as students grow older. Although a strong pre-k program prepares a student to start school well, the student is not inoculated against the pull of the street or increased sibling or eldercare responsibilities as they reach early adolescence. In short, evidence-based student supports need to be seen as a core function of schools that educate large numbers of students who live in poverty. As a core function, these supports should receive sustained funding.

Decision makers at the local, state and federal levels are starting to recognize the need to provide sustainable funding for evidence-based student supports.

By offering states flexibility pertaining to certain elements of the No Child Left Behind Act, the most recent reauthorization of our nation's primary elementary and secondary education law, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Department of Education provided local and state leaders with a unique opportunity to more effectively leverage funds previously set aside for Supplemental Education Services (SES), the primary funding stream for direct student supports under No Child Left Behind. Recognizing that SES has not effectively provided the right students with the right support at the right time and intensity, many states asked to waive the requirement that districts with low-performing schools set aside 20% of their Title I Part A dollars for SES.

Instead, some states plan to empower district leaders to use these funds to support school improvement efforts, including developing partnerships with organizations shown to deliver research-based, targeted student supports. For example, Louisiana has requested freedom from the SES requirement and plans to encourage districts and schools to use these freed funds to develop school-based partnerships with external organizations shown to provide the support needed to improve student achievement. Similarly, Massachusetts, which has already received flexibility, will be requiring districts to set aside up to 25% of their Title I Part A funds to support the implementation of evidence-based interventions and direct student supports in the state's lowest performing schools and those with large achievement gaps. Finally, if granted flexibility, Rhode Island plans to use the freed federal dollars to build district and school capacity to implement early warning systems and deliver response to intervention strategies to more effectively meet all struggling students' unique needs.

Like state and local leaders, some federal legislators acknowledge the need for a designated funding stream for evidence-based student supports. Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization proposals from Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate recognize the need to provide funding for these evidence-based student supports, but have approached funding for these critical supports differently.

The Senate's bi-partisan Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization Act of 2011 requires or encourages districts to partner with nonprofit or community-based partners to implement specific, evidence-based reforms shown to meet struggling students' needs, improving academic achievement. Examples include Section 1116 – School Improvement, in which districts are required to partner with organizations that have a demonstrated record of helping schools implement research-based instructional programs that provide students with needed interventions and appropriate instructional supports and provide ongoing parent and family engagement; and Section 1201 – Secondary School Reform, which requires districts to partner with organizations that have a demonstrated record of helping struggling secondary schools and their feeder middle schools to implement reform strategies shown to increase the likelihood that students will graduate from secondary school prepared for college and a career. Required reform strategies include the implementation of early warning indicator and intervention systems, the provision of credit and dropout recovery, implementing grade and school transition programs and supports, and delivering data-driven interventions.

The Encouraging Innovation and Effective Teachers Act, which was passed by the House of Representatives Education and Workforce Committee takes a different approach. It designates a separate funding stream for non-governmental entities to provide direct student supports. This structure demonstrates that the bill's authors recognize the need to devote federal resources to the delivery of critical student support services. However, the bill language could do a better job of clarifying the type of services that can be provided, the evidence base required for these services, and the quality of eligible providers.

While the various policy ideas on funding student supports at the state level and in the Senate and the House are a positive step forward in recognizing the need for funding and provide different mechanisms through which it could occur, there is a need to go further. The current delay in completing re-authorization of ESEA provides time for bolder thinking to occur. If one examines how current Title 1 funding is used at the school level, it becomes clear that in many ways it supports the standard operating procedures for student supports that have evolved into high-cost, low-impact strategies via class size reduction and test prep activities. Moreover, it is not uncommon when funds are tight, for schools to cut effective student supports, to maintain smaller classes and test prep focused extra help programs, and in so doing, create ad hoc, temporary student support structures. Finally, grade retention is implicitly supported by the per-pupil funding mechanism of Title 1, where every student in the school, whether they are repeating a grade or not, brings in the same additional dollars, making ineffective grade retention cheaper for the school than higher impact student support interventions. As a result, it is time to re-think how Title 1 funds are allocated. For schools with large numbers or high percentages of students who enter the school with prior histories of chronic absenteeism, poor behavior, course failure, or are significantly behind in grade level academic skills, some of the Title 1 funding could be tied to the degree of educational difficulty, with higher degrees of difficulty among greater numbers of students bringing higher levels of funding. Schools receiving greater funding because of a greater degree of educational difficulty walking in their door, however, should also be required to invest the additional funding in increasing their capacity to provide student supports at the scale and intensity required, by partnering with evidence-based external student support providers with proven records of success. They should also show how these student support providers will be integrated into a broader set of comprehensive whole school reforms and guided by an early warning system and, in the lowest performing schools, a led by an organizing whole school reform partner.

Another potential way to think about reorganizing how Title 1 funds are distributed is to provide base funding according to poverty levels, adjusted for educational degree of difficulty, and then have incentive funds, for example, for schools who adopt more successful alternatives to grade retention. In other words, if schools can develop higher impact, lower costs alternative to grade retention which increase the level of student support and/or vary its modality until students are able to succeed in school at grade level standards keyed to college and career readiness, they should be rewarded by an increase in funding so they can sustain the interventions driving their success.

In Sum

In order for college and career readiness to become a reality for all of the nation's students it is necessary to have a strategic and evidence based approach to mitigate the impacts of poverty on school success. Poverty can propel students to attend school less often, struggle behaviorally, and a put forth diminished effort.   In short, it interferes with student's ability to attend, behave and try.   This in turn greatly complicates school reform efforts, because our best strategies won't work if students are not in school on a regular basis, staying out of trouble, and getting their school work done.   To successfully confront the poverty challenge we need to re-think our approach to student supports. Current efforts, which revolve around grade retention, class size reduction, test prep and an ad hoc collection of temporary externally funded student supports are not working and will not effectively provide the students supports required. As a result, these standard operating procedures represent a low impact, high cost approach.   To move towards high impact, cost-effective student support strategies, we need to adopt an evidence based framework to providing support supports and wisely deploy the increased capacity of the non-profit sector to provide the human capital and know how needed to implement and scale evidence based student supports in schools that serve high poverty populations. We need to recognize that student supports are necessary to achieving the educational outcomes the nation needs to succeed, not just nice things when we can have them.   As such, it is essential that secure and continuous federal and state funding streams be developed to enable the implementation of high impact, cost-effective student supports at the scale and intensity required, to enable all students to graduate from high school prepared for college and career. This will involve looking anew at how Tittle 1 funding is allocated across schools, and employed within them.

References

Duncan, Greg & Murnane, Richard, Ed. (2011). Whither Opportunity? Rising Inequality, Schools, and

    Children's Life Chances. Russell Sage and Spencer Foundations: New York, NY. Retrieved from

    https://www.russellsage.org/sites/all/files/Whither%20Opportunity_Executive%20Summary.pdf

Paul E. Barton (2003). "Parsing the Achievement Gap: Baselines for Tracking Progress." Policy

    Information Report, October 2003. ETS. pages 1-42. Retrieved
    from: http://www.ets.org/Media/Research/pdf/PICPARSING.pdf

Martin, A. J. (2009). "Age appropriateness and motivation, engagement, and performance in high

    school: Effects of age within cohort, grade retention, and delayed school entry." Journal of

    Educational Psychology, Vol 101(1), Feb 2009, 101-114.doi: 10.1037/a0013100

Edward P. Lazear (2000). "Smaller Class Size No Magic Bullet." Hoover Digest, January 2000, No.1.

    Hoover Institution, Stanford University. Retrieved

    from: http://www.hoover.org/publications/hoover-digest/article/6948

Endnotes

[i] OECD (2011), Education at a Glance 2011: OECD Indicators, OECD Publishing. Retrieved from http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/eag-
    2011-en.

[ii] Claudia Goldin & Lawrence F. Katz, 2007. "Long-Run Changes in the Wage Structure: Narrowing, Widening,
    Polarizing," Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, Economic Studies Program, The Brookings Institution,
    vol. 38(2007-2), pages 135-168.

[iii] Balfanz, Robert & Nield, Ruth (2006) "An Extreme Degree of Difficulty: The Educational Demographics of Urban Neighborhood
    High Schools." Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, Vol. 11(2). Retrieved from
    http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1025&context=gse_pubs

[iv] Jimerson, S; Anderson, G. & Whipple, A. (2002) "Winning the Battle and Losing the Way: Examining the
    Relation between grade retention and dropping out of high school." Psychology in the Schools, Vol. 39(4), 2002 ©
    2002 Wiley Periodicals, Inc. Published online in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com). Retrieved from
    http://www.education.ucsb.edu/jimerson/retention/PITS_DropoutRetention2002.pdf

[v] "States to Take Aim at Third Grade Retention." Retrieved from http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2012/01/11/15brief-
    3.h31.html?qs=grade+retention

vi Hoxby, C. (2000). "The Effects of Class Size on Student Achievement: New Evidence from Population Variation."*The Quarterly
    Journal of Economics (2000) 115 (4): 1239-1285. doi: 10.1162/003355300555060*

[vii] Source: Supovitzy, J. (2009). "Can high stakes testing leverage educational improvement? Prospects from the last decade of
testing and accountability reform."*Journal of Educational Change* Volume 10, Numbers 2-3 (2009), 211-227, DOI:
10.1007/s10833-009-9105-2. Retrieved from http://www.springerlink.com/content/86mj551n23l72047/export-citation/

[viii] Dynarski, M., James-Burdumy, S., Moore, M., Rosenberg, L., Deke, J., Mansfield, W., et al. (2004). "When schools stay open
    late: The national evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program: New findings." Washington,
    DC: Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, U.S.
    Department of Education.

Dynarski, M., Moore, M., Mullens, J., Gleason, P., James-Burdumy, S., Rosenberg, L., et al. (2003). "When schools stay open late:
    The national evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program: Year 1 report." Princeton, NJ:
    Mathematica Policy Research.

James-Burdumy, S., Dynarski, M., Moore, M., Deke, J., Mansfield, W., Pistorino, C., et al. (2005). "When schools stay open late:
    The national evaluation of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program." Washington, DC: U.S.
    Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, and National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional
    Assistance.

[ix] D. Gottfredson et al. (2010). "Effects of Participation in After-School Programs for Middle School Students: A Randomized
Trial." Philadelphia, PA: Journal of Educational Effectiveness, July – September (3), p. 305.

[x] Heinrich, Meyer, and Whitten 2009; Rickles and Barnhart 2007

[xi] Burch, P. 2007. "Supplemental Educational Services under NCLB: Emerging Evidence and Policy Issues." Boulder:

Educational Policy Research Unit, University of Colorado.

[xii] Fuchs, D & Fuchs, L. (2006). "Introduction to Response to Intervention: What, Why, and How Valid is it?" Nashville, TN: Peabody College of Vanderbilt University. Retrieved from http://www.scred.k12.mn.us/School/documents/FuchsFuchsWhatisRTIArticle.pdf

[xiii] Harris, Sarah & Beck, Laura. (2011). "Impact of Individualized, Supplementary Preschool Intervention on Literacy, School Readiness, and Socioemotional Skills."

[xiv] Morrow-Howell, Nancy; Jonson-Reid, Melissa; McCrary, Stacey; Lee, YungSoo Lee & Spitznagel, Ed. (2009). "Evaluation of Exerpeince Corps: Student Reading Outcomes." Washington University: St. Louis, Missouri.

[xv] Diehl Vile, Juliet & Arcaira, Erikson. (2010). "Evaluation of Citizen Schools." Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

[xvi] Miami-Dade County Public Schools. (2009). "Interim Literacy Assessment."

[xvii] ICF International. (2010). "Communities In Schools National Evaluation Five Year Executive Summary." ICF International: Fairfax, VA.

[xviii] Sagawa, Shirley. (2010). *The American Way to Change: How National Service & Volunteers Are Transforming America.* Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, CA.