ABSTRACT
        Social and demographic changes in American society
have given rise to an abundance of educational literature about the
role of schools. Schools must provide both basic and advanced
academic preparation, but should they also compensate for and assume
some of the roles of the family? This document identifies current
trends and issues in education by presenting a profile of urban
students as reflected in the current literature, and by describing
current programs and practices in urban schools. Information is
provided in the following categories: (1) the demographics of
minority populations, immigrants, dropouts, and pregnant teenagers;
(2) programs for dropout prevention; (3) school and classroom
organization for learning; (4) creation and maintenance of a
professional urban work force; (5) special programs for diverse
students; (6) science and mathematics for minority and female
students; (7) parents and schooling; (8) business involvement; and
(9) minorities and nonpublic schooling. A 205-item bibliography is
included. (VM)

TRENDS AND ISSUES
IN URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION, 1987

Carol Ascher
ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

TRENDS AND ISSUES
IN URBAN AND MINORITY EDUCATION, 1987

Carol Ascher
ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Teachers College, Columbia University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EMERGING TRENDS AND ISSUES

Overview: 1987

Demographic Changes. Our society is changing, as everything we
read or hear makes clear. The density, ethnicity, and social class of
the populations in urban communities, as well as the very fabric of
the communities themselves, are some of the most important of these
changes. And with them, many feel, must come changes in the function
and nature of education.

Our society is getting poorer. The number of people in the
United States living below poverty has grown from 11.7 percent of the
population in 1979 to 15 percent in 1985, and now totals more than 33
million.[1] Not only are there more poor people, but since 1980
households in every income fifth except the top fifth have lost in
real income.[2]

Of all segments of our society, children are now the poorest.[3]
As Samuel Preston has argued, as poverty among the elderly has become
less acute, children are constituting an increasing proportion of the
nation's poor.[4] A major reason for the alarming increase in poor
children is the growing number of single-parent, female-headed
households. Like many other groups, a typical female-headed household
with children had significantly less after-tax income in 1985 than in
1980.[5] For children living in female-headed households, low wages are
a common source of poverty even when there is employment.
Out-of-wedlock births have greatly increased over the past 25 years,
and now constitute over 18 percent of all births. These children are
likely to grow up in families with no male wage earner. Even for
those children born to married parents, divorce deprives 43 percent of
them of fathers (and male wages) before they are 16. Moreover,
children's share of Medicaid payments has dropped sharply since 1979,
and the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) Program has
been cut sharply. (In 1982 AFDC served only 52 children out of every
100 who were poor.[6])

The increase in poor children is also caused by other demographic
changes. As the birth rate among whites has declined, the proportion
of minority children in the population has grown. Of the children
under age 15, nearly a quarter are now black or Hispanic--and this
compares to 16 percent who are minority among persons aged 35-44 and a
mere 11 percent minority among the elderly.[7] Two in five nonwhite and
Hispanic children are poor.[8]

While our society is getting poorer and more heavily minority at
its youthful end, it is also getting more densely poor and minority in
many urban neighborhoods. In the nation's 100 largest cities, 64
percent of the poor live in poverty areas (defined by at least 20

1

6

percent of the population living below poverty). Moreover, among poor blacks as many as 83 percent live in these poverty areas. The unemployment rate for poor people in poverty areas is more than three times the rate for all income groups citywide. Moreover, poverty for poor minorities in these areas is becoming a more intense, long-term experience.[9] Poor blacks and Hispanics living in poor urban neighborhoods have a much higher proportion of female-headed families than whites in comparable areas--74 percent among blacks, 55 percent among Hispanics, as compared with 49 percent among whites.[10]

The number of rental housing units affordable to poor households has declined by 2 million since 1974, and 24 percent of the poor renters and 19 percent of the poor homeowners continue to live in neighborhoods plagued by abandoned buildings, crime, and other undesirable conditions.[11] With the decrease in low income housing, homelessness in our cities will increase, spreading to families and increasing the number of urban school children who are homeless.

Finally, children and youth are more likely to live in metropolitan areas and central cities than the overall population, and minority youths are highly concentrated in the central cities. Over half of all black youth live in central cities compared to less than a quarter of all white youth, with the proportion of Hispanic youth lying between blacks and whites. These minority youth are also likely to live in areas "where the schools are generally considered inferior, job opportunities are more limited, and street crime rates are high," and where opportunities for personal growth and participation in mainstream society are curtailed in many ways.[12]

Demographic studies suggest that these trends will accelerate over the next years. More families will be urban and more of these urban families will be minority and poor. For urban schools, this means that there will be poor children to teach and care for, and more children from single-parent households (including from parents who were never married) and from families merged by remarriage. With many mothers working, more will be "latchkey" children.[13] Moreover, unless rapid changes in schooling and society are made, many of these children will themselves become teenage mothers and fathers.

Role of the Schools. Given these large demographic shifts, it is not surprising that the recent educational literature has reflected an important new concern about the role of the schools. Clearly schools must provide "the basics," as well as more advanced academic and vocational training, and preparation for civic life. But should schools compensate for and assume the socialization and caretaking roles of the absent family and torn community? As James Coleman notes, the historic division of labor between the family and the school no longer pertains.[14] But should schools be the institution to provide what many families cannot offer, or should families be helped to assume their traditional responsibilities?

For some observers of education, the emerging conflict has become between quality and equality: between serving the best students (often white and middle class) with the best, and diluting standards to meet the needs of those "on the margin." For example, in speaking of the dropout problem, Chester Finn argues that schools can do little to alter "symptoms of the 'underclass' phenomena," and that "enlisting society's commitment to equality" is a way of "infiltrating and weakening the school reform movement"--that is, educators should concentrate on raising academic standards and on generating school improvement, rather than on compensating for social conditions that may not be amenable to anything the schools can do.[15] On the other side, however, are those who argue that serving these children in need, and working for equality through diverse educational programs and expanded services, does not mean sacrificing quality, and that, in fact, the approaches that work in schools for disadvantaged children will also improve schooling for all children.[16]

Coleman and Hoffer provide another framework for viewing the current discussion about the changing responsibilities of schools. They note that American schools have always fluctuated between acting as extensions of the family and emancipators of the family. While independent and parochial schools have acted as extensions of the family (offering values the families themselves hold), there have been periods, particularly during eras of high immigration, when public schools have actively worked as emancipators of the family, socializing children to the values of their new society, which the family cannot do. In their recent book, Public and Private High Schools, Coleman and Hoffer argue that, "Schools complement the family and the immediate community as agents of socialization, which means as the role and functioning of the family changes in modern society, different problems are posed for the school. It means also that the role and functioning of the school must change if it is to constitute an effective complement to the changing institutions of the family and the community."[17] However, because schools have traditionally provided the kind of learning that Coleman loosely characterizes as "opportunities and demands," while relegating what he calls "attitudes and effort" to the family, he argues that, "schools, of whatever quality, are more effective for children from strong family backgrounds than for children from weak ones."[18] Both in his own analysis, and in his work with Hoffer, Coleman suggests that, when families are weak (and the human capital from the family is scarce), schools are more effective if they can draw on the social capital of the surrounding community--that is, on a network of people and a community of shared values that most often goes along with religiously homogeneous schools (but not necessarily independent private schools).[19]

Although Coleman and Hoffer suggest policy changes that might make it easier for public schools to draw on the resources of churches and religious institutions, their framework is based largely on the traditional notion of "complementarity" between the home and the

3

8

school. In <u>Public and Private High Schools</u> they make clear that, for
those students from single parent families and working parents,
parochial schools may be the best educational choice.

During the past year, this model of complementarity has been
rejected by many educational thinkers, who argue that these both the
school and the family have become too frail for the enormous tasks at
hand. Instead, they suggest an expanded vision of those who should be
called on to participate in the task of educating our nation's
students. The recent publication of the Committee for Economic
Development (CED), <u>Children in Need</u>, for example, urges the combined
efforts of many institutions: public schools, businesses, foundations,
community agencies, and every level of government. The CED advocates
a particularly strong role for business, both as a pacesetter in
educational change and an advocate in support of educational
programming and funding.[20] This view of the school working in tandem,
or "as partners," with other urban institutions is increasingly ·
expressed by urban educators.[21] Pointing out that "only 7 percent of
families could be described as the 'typical family':..of the mid
1960s," Brice Heath and McLaughlin argue that the old role of the
school as the "deliverer" of educational services no longer can
pertain. They call for a new view of the school as a "'broker' of the
multiple services that can be used to achieve the functions previously
filled by families or by families and schools acting together."[22]

Thus the changing demography of our society, and particularly of
our cities, is being reflected in a new, vital discussion of the ways
to educate urban and minority youth. It will be the task of the ERIC
Clearinghouse on Urban Education to monitor how this discussion will
take shape over the next five years, and what changes will, in fact,
be made in urban schools.

ERIC/CUE Concerns. The scope of interest of the ERIC
Clearinghouse on Urban Education is problem-centered: it encompasses
research, policy, and practice in a number of areas to explain and
improve schooling for urban and minority populations.

To provide a snapshot of current trends and issues in urban
education, we divide the following discussion into two major sections.
The first presents a profile of urban students as reflected in the
most current literature; it includes both the major minority
populations in urban schools--blacks, Hispanics, and Asians--and other
populations currently receiving special interest--immigrants,
dropouts, and pregnant and parenting teenagers.

The second section looks at trends in programs and practices in
urban schools and classes, as they are documented by a variety of
types of literature, from research analyses to program evaluations.
During the last year the incumbent Clearinghouse played a major
research and documentation role in developing a report on dropout

programs and practices created by the Urban Superintendents' Network
under the auspices of OERI. This effort enabled us to collect
efficiently and rapidly a wide variety of program descriptions and
evaluations that would otherwise have demanded an extensive
acquisitions effort. These materials, rich in content and insight,
are reflected in the following discussion.

TODAY'S URBAN POPULATIONS

Blacks

Several interdependent factors are currently being documented
about the condition of black Americans:

o   the out-of-proportion burden of poverty they suffer;
o   the preponderance of female-headed households; and
o   the particular plight of black males.

While the poverty rate for whites is about 11 percent, it is 31
percent for blacks.[23]   Although poverty among white children increased
more rapidly than poverty among black children between 1969 and 1984,
the vast disparity at the beginning point means that black child
poverty is nearly three times the white rate. Compared to white
children, black children are

twice as likely to

o   die in the first year of life;
o   live in substandard housing;
o   have no parent employed;

three times as likely to

o   live in a female-headed family;
o   be in foster care;

four times as likely to
o   be murdered before one year of age or as a teenager;
o   be incarcerated between fifteen and nineteen; and

five times as likely to

o   be dependent on welfare.[24]

About a fifth of all U.S. families are now headed by a woman (the
same proportion that caused Moynihan to speak of a crisis in the black
family in 1960). Nevertheless, the preponderance of female-headed
black households has risen greatly in the past 30 years. In 1983, 58

5

percent of all births to black women were out of wedlock, and among black women under the age of 20 the proportion was over 86 percent. As Edelman notes,

> Today black children in young female-headed households are the poorest in the nation. While a black child born in the United States has a one in two chance of being born poor, a black child in a female-headed household has a two in three chance of being poor. If that household is headed by a mother under twenty-five years of age, that baby has a four in five chance of being poor.[25]

Not surprisingly, one of the reasons for the great number of black female-headed households is the unemployment and poverty of black men. Among black men, the rate of poverty is 15 percent, and for black male teens it is more than 40 percent. In fact, as many as half of the young black males in certain cities find themselves unemployed and undereducated--cut off from society's mainstream. While black men account for only 6 percent of the country's population, they make up half of all male prisoners.[26] Young black men are also more than twice as likely to be in the military than are young white men. And black males die at nearly twice the white rates.[27]

When one considers the severe economic and social disadvantages experienced by black families over the past decades, improvements in schooling by black children are particularly noteworthy. In the context of generally improved reading proficiency since 1971, black students have made particular progress. On National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading exercises, black-white differences between students born in 1970 were cut in half when compared with those of students born in 1953. Moreover, there are similar positive trends in NAEP mathematics assessments. Part of the increase in these scores is attributable to better enrollment by blacks in academic courses. As of 1980, a third of all black students were in academic programs (compared with 39.8 percent of all whites). And between 1976 and 1984, the average number of mathematics courses taken in high school increased by 13 percent for black students--compared to 9 percent for whites.[28] The high school completion rate among blacks has also increased in the last decade, although it still lags behind that of whites.[29] There are also steady gains by black students in college admission test scores, at the same time as substantially greater numbers of black students are taking the tests.[30] Thus, not only does the general preparation of black students appear to be improving, but more black students seem to have college in mind.

Nevertheless, the problems of the low achieving black student remain severe, and many at risk students are black. Black students are overrepresented in vocational and general tracks (as well as in special compensatory programs), and underrepresented in the academic tracks.[31] Black males are particularly at risk for suspensions and

6

11

other disciplinary actions.[32] Black teenagers are also particularly
vulnerable to dropping out of school and teenage pregnancy and
parenting, as the sections below on dropouts and pregnant students
will make clearer.

Finally, affirmative action and other support programs increased
black enrollment in higher education in the late 1960s and early
1970s. However, since 1976 higher education has become an obstacle
for black men--though apparently not for black women. In 1981, nearly
12,000 more black women than black men received bachelor's degrees.
The late 1970s and early 1980s also saw severe declines in master's
degrees and Ph.D.s to black men.[33]

As will become clear in the section below on programs and
practices, the situation of black youth in America has generated
several important educational programs.

Hispanics

After a long period with little literature on Hispanics,
statistical and other research is finally beginning to document the
situation of our country's youngest population and fastest growing
population. With a fertility rate well above the national average, as
well as increased immigration, the Census Bureau predicts that by the
year 2050 Hispanics will outstrip blacks to comprise over 30 percent
of the population. Nationally, 85 percent of Hispanics now live in
metropolitan areas, which means that, excepting Asians (a much smaller
group), Hispanics are the most urbanized population in the United
States.[34] Most poor Hispanics live in segregated neighborhoods in
deteriorated inner cities.[35]

Some of the problems faced by Hispanics are variations on those
that blacks face. As with blacks, poverty, under- and unemployment,
and female-headed households are all frequent and serious. A
disproportionate number of Hispanics are poor--over 28 percent were
below the poverty line in 1983-- and the poverty rate for Hispanics
under 18 is over twice that of Anglos. Hispanic unemployment is from
40 to 50 percent higher than the national rate, and it is particularly
high among Puerto Ricans. In most regions of the country, Hispanics
are also underemployed: they work intermittently, accept part-time
employment, and hold marginal jobs.[36] Although Hispanic workers have
captured an increasing share of the nation's jobs over the past few
years, most gains have been in the low-wage service industries, with
many of the new workers women.[37] Hispanic female-headed households
are not as frequent as black female-headed households, but their
numbers are rising, and Hispanic female-headed households are
particularly prone to poverty.

Of all the major ethnic groups, Hispanics are profiting the least
from American public education. Hispanics are underrepresented in all

7

educational achievement areas. Reading performance improved among
Hispanic students between 1971 and 1984, as it did for blacks;
however, like that of black students, it still lags significantly
behind the scores of whites.[38] Fewer Hispanic seniors describe
themselves in academic programs than do nonHispanic whites and blacks
(31 percent, as compared with 45 percent and 35 percent). On the
other hand, 52 percent of Hispanics report being enrolled in
vocational programs, as compared with 34 percent of nonHispanic whites
and 51 percent of blacks. A quarter of all Hispanics enter high
school overage, often because of language problems in the earlier
years.[39] Equally important--and not unrelated--the Hispanic dropout
rate has become notorious, being significantly higher than that of
either nonHispanic whites or blacks.

Moreover, over two-thirds of all Hispanic students attend schools
with student bodies that are over 50 percent minority, and where
opportunities are limited. As for those Hispanic young men and women
who go on to college, the majority attend community colleges where the
chance of transferring to a four-year college is poor and the
completion rate is low. Little data are available for the 1980s, but
of those who entered college in 1972 only 13 percent had completed
their baccalaureates four years later. As for Hispanics in
professional schools, 52 percent drop out before obtaining their
degrees--compared with 41 percent of Anglos.[40]

Again, it is important not to overlook vast differences among
Hispanic subgroups--much of which has to do with social class.
Participation in academic programs, for example, runs from a low among
Mexicans, to a high among Cubans, with Puerto Ricans and other
Hispanics in between. At the low achievement end, over half of all
Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and other Hispanics (most of whom are poor)
but less than a third of all Cubans (most of whom are middle class)
are enrolled in vocational programs. Finally, Puerto Ricans lead the
Hispanics dropouts, followed by Mexicans, Cubans and other
Hispanics.[41]

Poverty, cultural difference, and language problems are some of
the most obvious reasons for the troublesome school histories of many
Hispanic students. More male Hispanic students than other groups tend
to work, and they work long hours--a fact which has been shown to be
related to lowered school achievement. The educational level of most
Hispanic families is also lower than that of other groups, which means
that few Hispanics who reach secondary schooling have their parents'
experiences to rely on.[42] Given Hispanics' reliance on help from
school staff, the failure of counseling to adequately serve Hispanics
is particularly troublesome.[43]

Finally, Hispanic students differ widely in their English-
language background; while some are monolingual speakers of English,
many speak Spanish some or all of the time at home, and some have
almost no proficiency in English. Estimates of the number of
limited-English-proficient students range from 1.2 to 1.7 million.[44]

8

Nevertheless, there appears to be agreement that a far smaller number of students are served by bilingual and other language assistance programs than might be helped by these programs. Although Hispanic immigrants may receive special language assistance with English, "the language problems of most Hispanics who stay in school are simply ignored, or acknowledged but not addressed, by the high schools they attend."[45] Only 4 percent of the 1982 Hispanic seniors in the <u>High School and Beyond</u> survey had studied three or more years of Spanish.[46]

The section below on programs and practices will make clear how language difficulties, low achievement, and dropping out of school among Hispanics have all led to the development of special programs and practices.

Asian/Pacific Americans

Largely as a result of vastly expanded immigration since the mid 1970s, Asian Americans have recently been the fastest growing minority group in the United States. Between 1970 and 1980, the Asian/Pacific American population increased by 142 percent, over twice the growth rate of Hispanics. In 1980, there were 3.7 million Asians in the United States, of whom 59 percent were foreign-born and two-thirds spoke an Asian language at home.[47]

Asian/Pacific Americans are also a highly concentrated group; over two-thirds live in Hawaii, California, and New York, and most of them live in large urban areas. Nearly half of all Asian/Pacific Americans live in Los Angeles/Long Beach, San Francisco/Oakland, New York City, and Honolulu. San Francisco alone accounts for nearly a quarter of the population.[48]

Since the mid 1960s, the popular press has portrayed Asian Americans as model minorities: hardworking, diligent, uncomplaining achievers. Yet this "positive" stereotype has had some negative consequences for Asian Americans.[49] First, it overlooks their great diversity. Asian Americans are also a heterogeneous group, consisting of, among others, Chinese, Filipinos, Japanese, Asian Indians, Koreans, Vietnamese, Laotians, Thai, Cambodians, and Pacific Islanders. These subgroups, in turn, differ widely in their social class, the recency of their immigration, and thus the percentage who are foreign or native born and who use English as their first language. Although many Asian Americans are currently middle class, for every Asian American in a high-prestige occupation, many more are in low-prestige jobs. Moreover, the 1980 U.S. Census statistics that report the median family income among Asian Americans as higher than that of whites disregard a number of compounding factors·

o   the youth of the Asian/Pacific population, which enables more to engage in productive labor;

o   the higher educational attainment of Asian/Pacific

Americans;

o   the fact that Asian/Pacific Americans work more hours per week than any other group;

o   the greater number of wage earners in Asian/Pacific American families than in other families; and

o   the concentration of Asian/Pacific Americans in urban areas where both wages and the cost of living are higher.

Finally, poverty among Asians who immigrated during the past decade is significantly higher than either that of native-born Asian-Americans or recent immigrants from Europe.[50]

Overall, Asian/Pacific Americans have a higher percentage of children between 3 and 17 in school than any other ethnic group, including whites. However, this obscures the enormous variation among them, with Filipinos and Vietnamese having a lower percentage than whites, and Koreans, Chinese, Asian Indians and Japanese having a higher percentage. Asian/Pacific Americans are also more likely to be enrolled in programs for the gifted and talented, and less likely to present discipline problems or to be in programs for students with learning difficulties, than any other group. High School and Beyond data show the average Asian/Pacific American score to be slightly higher than average white score in mathematics and slightly lower in verbal skills and science. However, these scores vary by length of residence in the United States; with a few exceptions, Asian American students who have lived here at least six years or who were born here scored at about the same level or higher than the white students on all three tests.[51]

Although the high average educational level among Asian Americans results from the fact that many of them have had post secondary education in their own countries, the academic achievement of Asian Americans has made them prime candidates for post secondary education in the U.S., and they have moved in full force into many colleges and universities in their areas. In fact, a recent study of four elite colleges suggests the possibility of racial discrimination. While the average SAT scores and school records of Asian Americans admitted were significantly higher than those of their Anglo peers, in at least one institution Asian/Pacific Americans with the same averages scores as Anglos were admitted at a lower rate.[52]

Whatever the apparent academic success of Asian/Pacific Americans, there is still a serious question of what role American schools actually played in making the students succeed. The Asian family is close and highly motivated to do the work necessary for achievement, which has allowed these students to succeed even against great odds. On the other hand, there are indications that schools have not fostered high achievement by students whose family background does not make them candidates for immediate success, and have not served well students in need of extra assistance in certain subjects, such as English. Recent analysis of High School and Beyond data show that Asian-Americans for whom English is not the primary language

10

(about half of whom are low income) are systematically assigned to lower academic tracks, and that, not unlike black males, Asian American males who are not primarily English speakers are particularly likely to be placed in lower academic tracks.[53]

Finally, evidence suggests that the economic rewards of education are more limited for Asian/Pacific Americans than they are for Anglos, and that Asian American women are particularly underpaid for their qualifications. Most Asian/Pacific Americans underutilize their education in their occupation: despite high educational attainment, most are located at the lower end of the professional, administrative and managerial ranks. For example, it is not uncommon to find an Asian/Pacific American Ph.D. in physics teaching high school mechanics, or an MBA working as a secretary.[54] Asian/Pacific Americans also have a higher proportion of self-employed than nonAsians.[55] In college teaching, Asian/Pacific Americans are often paid less than their black or white colleagues.[56]

Immigrants

During the 1970s, the United States admitted more immigrants, legal and illegal, than in any decade since 1910-20. In 1980, one out of every 20 youths was foreign born of non-U.S. citizen parents. Recent immigrants have come mainly from less developed countries, particularly Central America, the West Indies, and Asia. Of those foreign-born youths who were between 5 and 17 in 1980, more than 4.5 million spoke only a foreign language at home.[57]

Today, 60 percent of the Hispanic adults living on the U.S. mainland were born outside the continental United States, and 20 percent of all Hispanic school children were born outside the country.[58] Most recently, Hispanic immigrants have come from Nicaragua, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala and El Salvador: more than half these immigrants have come to the United States since 1970, and less than a third are native-born.[59]

Between 1970 and 1979, Asians accounted for 34 percent of all legal immigrants, and this percentage increased to 48 percent between 1980 and 1984. While fewer than one-third of Japanese are foreign-born, nearly two-thirds of Chinese and Filipinos are immigrants, and 90 percent of Vietnamese were born outside the United States. Within the new Asian immigrant groups, those where the influx was highest tend to show the highest percentage of individuals and families living in poverty.[60] Except for Southeast Asians, whose recent immigration has generated a number of educational responses, Asians tend to have been ignored by most urban schools, the assumption being that Asians do rather well on their own.

11

Dropouts

This group, which cross-cuts ethnic, racial, and class boundaries (though certainly not with an even distribution), has recently become much publicized, and new research is providing new knowledge about the number of school dropouts as well as drawing an increasingly clear picture of their characteristics.

A number of reasons have been given to explain the sudden concern over school dropouts, and the vast efforts that have recently been expended to create dropout prevention programs. One is the reported decline in overall student achievement since the 1970s. Another is the problem of joblessness among black youth and the possibility that, without education, this will only increase as job requirements become more stringent. Another is the fact that minority populations, which are increasing in the schools, have disproportionately high dropout rates. Still another has been a fear among educators that higher state-enforced minimal standards of student achievement, as a result of the reforms of the 1980s, will only increase the number of dropouts unless assistance is given to students with school problems.[61]

There is no currently accepted national dropout rate. However, most data show that the number of dropouts have decreased steadily over the past several decades, and that black students have decreased their educational attainment and achievement gap with whites.[62] Nevertheless, in 1985, 3.8 million 18-24 year-olds had quit school before earning a diploma. Among these, Hispanic youths made up a disproportionate share of the total.[63] According to some data, approximately 21 percent of all Hispanics drop out of school between their sophomore and senior years, compared with 16 percent of all blacks and 12 percent of all nonHispanic whites.[64]

More important, national data obscure extremely high dropout rates in many of our nation's cities. Again, there is no way to compare accurately dropout statistics among different urban school systems, since calculations have been made quite differently. However, some urban school districts report schools as having as high a rate of dropouts as 60 percent.[65]

Substantial research has been conducted over the past year to discover which students are most at risk to drop out. Thus far, the following characteristics seem most salient: Students from households where the adults have limited formal education, are either unemployed, in low-paying jobs, or not steadily employed in desirable ones, drop out three times more often than those from the highest end of the socioeconomic scale.[66] Language and race are also factors, both as they relate to household poverty and as they affect the school's treatment of students. Black males, for example, are most prone to school suspensions and expulsions, which are frequent precursors of dropping out. Although there is no single type of urban school dropout, students who enter high school overage with academic problems that caused them to be retained in the early grades are extremely

12

likely to drop out.[67]   Whether or not they are overage, dropouts also
tend to have lower standardized test scores and lower grades, and to
be truant.   They often have lower educational aspirations and are less
likely to participate in extracurricular activities.[68]

The situation of Hispanics is so severe that it demands separate
consideration.   Not only do Hispanics drop out far more frequently
than other groups of students, but, perhaps because of their high rate
of entering high school overage, forty percent of all Hispanic
students who leave school do so before the tenth grade.[69]   Using High
School and Beyond data, an analysis of the Hispanic high school senior
cohort for 1982 showed that 40 percent were already dropouts, 25
percent had made it to the spring semester but were at risk and not
college bound, 10 percent were preparing for graduation but did not
intend to go further, and 25 percent planned on graduating and
enrolling in college.   In fact, in several of our nation's largest
cities the Hispanic dropout rate is as high as 70 or 80 percent.[70]

The concern about the dropouts has generated new efforts at data
collection, as well as a burgeoning of programs and practices aimed at
dropout prevention, which will be discussed in the following section.

Pregnant Teenagers

More than a million teenage women became pregnant in 1984, and
480,000 gave birth.   Moreover, disadvantaged young women were three to
four times more likely to become unwed mothers than were advantaged
teenagers, regardless of race.[71]   Irrespective of marital status,
early childbearing is highly correlated with lower educational
attainment. Eight out of 10 mothers under age 17 never finish high
school.[72]   The cost to the nation of teenage mothers who drop out of
school has not gone unnoticed.   In 1975, approximately 60 percent of
all teenage mothers were ending up on welfare, accounting for about
half of the national welfare bill.   In 1976, 31 percent of the teenage
mothers and former teenage mothers aged 14-20 on the AFDC rolls were
high school dropouts, while only 11 percent of the teenage mothers and
former teenage mothers who had completed high school were receiving
AFDC.[73]

Black teenage pregnancy is declining, as are black out-of-
wedlock births, while the rates of both among whites have risen
substantially.   Nevertheless, with a pregnancy rate of 10.2 percent,
black teenagers remain at a much higher risk of early parenthood than
white teenagers, and the proportion of out-of-wedlock births are much
higher for black teenagers than for whites.[74]

A recent statistical analysis shows female Hispanics between 15
and 19 to have a pregnancy rate of 7.3 percent--midway between the 4.5
percent of whites and 10.2 percent of blacks.   However, there are
great variations among young Hispanic women in different subgroups and

13

18

different parts of the country, with Mexican Americans in California
and Texas and Puerto Ricans in New York and New Jersey being
particularly at risk.   Mexican American teenage mothers also tend to
marry, while Puerto Rican mothers (more like their urban black peers)
remain single.[75]

As the next section will show, school-based programs for pregnant
and parenting teenagers are burgeoning throughout the country, despite
controversy. And pregnant teenagers have become a loci around which
the role and boundaries of the school are currently being discussed.

PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES

The sections below highlight programs and practices in urban
education that are currently being given special attention in the
literature. Some of these programs and practices have been developed
for special populations; others are simply educational developments
that are thought to improve schooling for all students. The section
on business involvement, with which we end our review of programs and
practices, has arisen out of the decreased ability of the current
urban family and community to help itself, as discussed in the
Introduction.

Programs for Dropout Prevention

The goal of holding students in school and preventing them from
dropping out has generated many programs and practices. Although some
educators feel that the concern with school dropouts may be misplaced
and diversionary,[76] there has probably been no educational
organization that has not issued its own report or analysis of the
problem and its remedies. The common view is that teenage dropouts
cost society heavily in the short- and long-run, and that the number
of students who graduate from high school should be increased by both
in-school and out-of-school methods.[77]   In fact, because educators are
wary of having schools take on the entire responsibility for keeping
students in school, there has been a move to mobilize the entire
community--parents, business, and industry, as well as social service
and other organizations--to heighten awareness about the dropout
phenomena and create dropout prevention programs.[78]

Nevertheless, a number of school improvement programs and
practices, beginning at the preschool level and reaching through
secondary school, have become associated with dropout prevention.

14

Preschool Education. Early childhood education is experiencing a wave of enthusiasm among school professionals. In the current surge of concern over dropping out of school, early childhood and pre-kindergarten programs have been offered as one of the most important dropout prevention strategies.[79] "Intervene early" might, in fact, be the motto of a number of program and policy reports. Not only is there substantial research on the cognitive malleability of children in the years before age four, but several studies of Head Start and other preschool programs have shown substantial short- and long-term academic and social gains for poor black children who attended preschool.[80] For example, preschool graduates appear to be retained less frequently than their peers, to be sent to special education classes less often, and to be more likely to complete schooling. Preschool graduates also appear to become pregnant less often than their peers, and teenage mothers who were graduated from preschool are more likely to return to school than those who were not.[81]

The current enthusiasm for preschool as a dropout prevention strategy has merely accelerated the growth in enrollment that began over a decade ago. In fact, the large number of working and single mothers have made preschool a necessity for many families. Currently, about 39 percent of all 3- and 4-year-olds are enrolled in preschool. And, although black and white children attend preschool with approximately the same frequency, black children at all family levels are more likely to attend publicly operated preschools than white children.[82] As Lilian Katz notes,

> If the present trends in family life and education
> continue into the next decade, most children under
> five will spend substantial proportions of their
> early years in various types of early childhood
> programs; most five- to six-year-olds will attend
> all-day kindergarten, and during their elementary
> school years they will spend much of their time
> before and after school in some kind of out-of-
> home setting.[83]

A number of questions, however, have been raised by both researchers and educators about the foreseeable expansion of early child care. One question has been whether the success of small programs, many of which have developed in experimental university settings, can be transferred into large school systems with little money for school resources or teacher training. Although the current decline in school enrollment has contributed to district enthusiasm for taking on preschool education, there have been few concrete discussions about where the additional funding for these new programs might come.

A second question concerns screening, since preschool programs are meant to tap and improve "learning readiness." Until now, even the most sophisticated screening instruments used by specialists have

15

20

been problematic, and transferring screening into the public schools, where personnel are more often untrained, means that instruments are likely to become simpler, cruder, and thus less likely to be useful for designing curriculum and instruction for preschool children.

Third, as children enter schooling at younger ages there has been a tendency simply to move formal instruction downward. Already, the function of kindergarten has become uncertain--squeezed as it is between preschool and the first grade--and the tendency has been to make children sit through kindergarten as though it were first grade-- something many are not really prepared to do.[84]

Finally, a recent report by the National Black Child Development Institute also questions whether public schools can create child care models that will not perpetuate their "discriminatory tradition" but will be sensitive to black children's needs.[85] Given that the schools have done poorly by black children until now, the Institute questions whether they will be able to change dramatically at the preschool level.

Effective Schooling. As a general school improvement strategy, effective schooling has been endorsed as a major dropout prevention policy in a wide variety of quarters and for varied reasons. As first articulated by Ron Edmonds, effective schools are "effective for all children."[86] In fact, the population at whom effective schools was initially aimed was poor and minority elementary school children--many of whom are at risk for dropping out. In line with common sense, and based on some initial research, Edmonds listed the following five, linked aspects as necessary for an effective school:

o   clear school mission;
o   high expectations for all students;
o   strong instructional leadership;
o   opportunity to learn (time-on-task);
o   a stable and orderly school climate; and
o   frequent monitoring of student achievement.

Over the past six or seven years, these five aspects of effective schooling have become the source of a rich and substantial literature documenting both that they work, and how they work, in improving schooling.[87] Now almost common educational wisdom, research findings have explained the dynamics of effective schooling.

Teachers' attitudes do influence students' achievement. An effective teacher believes that each and every student has the capacity to succeed academically. Because of these high expectations, effective teachers are also more likely to communicate praise and encouragement. Teachers who expect their students to do well also move through the required curriculum at a brisk pace, covering necessary material and always demanding the most from their students.

Many studies have shown that time-on-task is related to learning. Thus principals and teachers who create an orderly school and classroom climate in which students can learn without distraction are more likely to produce achieving students.

For many of the same reasons that teachers' expectations are crucial for students' performance, a principal's belief in students' capacity to learn is also essential. Moreover, principals have the power to motivate the whole school: both teachers and students. They choose good teachers and hold their teachers accountable for the progress of their students. These effective principals are less business managers and more instructional leaders, people who get involved in the classroom and closer to the children. Principals who see their mission as improved student learning, and convey their certainty that this goal can be achieved, have effective schools.

Because Edmonds and others in the early effective schooling movement wanted to insist that schools can educate all students, regardless of the homes from which they come, he and his immediate followers consciously left out any mention of parents. However, more recently, educators have added a sixth component:

o   close school/home relations.

Several factors in the home environment have been discovered to play a leading role in students' achievement: the daily schedule of the family and their work habits; parental guidance; support and assistance for the child's schoolwork; and the family's intellectual stimulation and its use of language.[88] Some of these factors will be discussed further in the section below on parental involvement; here it is sufficient to say that the effective schooling movement has developed techniques to initiate dialogues between the home and the school and to begin to change some of the ways in which the family participates in learning.

These six factors, then, have become central to most school improvement policies, whether or not they are listed as "effective schooling." For example, the U.S. Department of Education's What Works: Educating Disadvantaged Children lists among the things that schools can do: exercise leadership, establish order, build character, and raise academic standards--all variations on the effective schooling research. What Works also adds "reach out" to the list of school tasks and, reciprocally, offers suggestions for "What Parents, Guardians, and Communities Can Do."[89]

Over the last years, the components of effective schools have also been applied to improving middle and secondary schools. The U.S. Department of Education's Good Secondary Schools: What Makes Them Tick? includes among its recommendations: good principals, good teachers, high expectations, school goals, and parent and community involvement[90]--factors which remain close to the effective schooling

17

agenda. In fact, effective schools are often cited as a secondary school strategy to prevent dropping out of school. The Network for Effective Schools, for instance, argues that implementing the components of effective schooling will lead to a higher achievement rate, increased student attendance, reduced discipline problems, improvements in students' attitudes toward school, and a reduced dropout rate.[91] Similarly, the Urban Superintendents Network offers "an effective school climate" as one of its six strategies for dropout prevention.[92]

Despite almost universal acceptance of the principles of effective schooling, some critics have recently begun to raise a number of questions concerning its practice. First, they point out that the tendency to evaluate effective schools through standardized testing may well have increased the amount of testing in the schools. Equally important, they argue that some effective schools improve test scores "by focusing on performance objectives and teaching to the test."[93] In fact, according to Stedman's review of the effective schooling literature, "In many school systems, the emphasis on testing is harming the teaching process and undermining educational goals."[94] Second, the stress on instructional leadership as an effective schooling principle may make it too easy to blame a weak principal for a troubled school when there may be other explanations, such a school's socioeconomic context.[95] Third, as Bastian and her colleagues note, "The attempt to construct mechanistic templates for school improvement, designed by academic researchers and improved by school bureaucracies from the top down . . . defeats the spirit of initiative and collaboration essential to motivating teachers and improving school cultures."[96] Fourth, with pressure on schools to show improvement, urban superintendents note that there has been a tendency for schools who catch the public eye to glamourize their successes and use public relations to hold onto images that may, in fact, change. Finally, recent research suggests that most effectiveness factors are, in fact, strongly influenced by the social context of the school, and so cannot be generalized to all school settings.[97]

Management Practices (Monitoring). As urban school systems have become larger and more complex, and urban students more mobile, record-keeping has become an increasingly important aspect of delivering service. Recently, a number of school districts have installed computerized case management systems which allow for more efficient record-keeping as well as more rapid access to students' records.[98] A student who enters a new school within the district can quickly be placed in the appropriate level courses, and if he or she has academic or behavioral problems, the necessary help can be provided. (For many educators, however, computerized case management has raised issues of privacy which are currently being worked on.)

Monitoring a child's academic and social progress even before

formal schooling begins, as well as in the early grades, has become an important dropout prevention strategy. This monitoring includes: testing children's learning problems and strengths to identify appropriate instructional strategies; keeping accurate records of students' attendance; and observing students' classroom behavior. Rapid access to this information is obviously made possible through some of the computerized case management systems.

Management Practices (Student Placement - Tracking and Alternatives). Whenever academic standards are raised, extra stress is put on students for whom learning does not come easily. Thus, the current national stress on raised academic standards has prompted educators to consider how best to protect to students at risk for dropping out. Though solutions are few, the literature has become rich with information on the outcomes of various strategies.

Since 1964, the percentage of high school students nationwide in the general track has increased from 12 to 36 percent.[99] Pressure to raise academic standards has made tracking a particularly attractive organizational alternative, since few teachers are trained to teach in heterogeneous classrooms. Unfortunately, evidence suggests schools serving predominantly minority populations tend to have few higher track courses, and that minorities are disproportionately placed in general track courses.[100] Moreover, absenteeism, transience, lower aspirations, decreased participation in sports, and higher incidences of delinquent behavior and dropping out of school are all more prevalent in the general and vocational tracks than in the academic track. Although it is not clear whether these school failures are a consequence of tracking or merely another correlation, Jeannie Oakes, who has gathered most of the research in this area, notes:

> It is important to keep in mind at this point
> that. . .low-track students do not seem to have
> lower self-concepts and aspirations or to inspire
> negative judgments in their peers and teachers
> just because they are poorer or less bright than
> students in other tracks or because they
> themselves had more negative attitudes to begin
> with. While these things might be true, a good
> portion of the negative attitude displayed by low-
> track students is attributable to the track
> placement itself.[101]

Most school districts are aware of the prejudicial effects of tracking. Nevertheless, the difficulties of training teachers for heterogeneous classrooms, particularly when class size is large, have compelled school administrators to continue tracking.

Recently, attention has been paid to developing educationally sound and manageable alternatives to homogeneous groupings and

19

traditional teaching methods. One method is to have teachers structure learning into classroom subgroups which work independently on a task and are then rewarded on the basis of a fixed standard or set of criteria.[102] A second, more innovative method, which is being devised and tested by researchers at Johns Hopkins University and the University of Minnesota, involves student cooperation. Known as cooperative learning, this method allows academically mixed groups of students to work together in learning projects that combine academic and social skills; grades are then based on the accumulated efforts of the group.[103] In contrast to traditional teaching methods, in which each student's success is dependent upon the failure of others, so that students are negatively interdependent, cooperative learning exploits student-to-student interaction.[104]

Management Practices (Student Placement - Retention). Minority school populations generally have retention rates three to four times higher than those of majority school populations, and some research has pointed to recent increases in nonpromotion that fall most heavily among minorities.[105] There is little evidence, however, that retention improves the achievement of at risk students either in the short- or long-run.[106] Instead, for most students, being held back results in stigma, low self-esteem, a lack of interest in extra curricular activities, and waning motivation.[107]

If students must be retained, research suggests that it is probably best to do so in the first or second grade, at a time when the stigma is minimized and there are some signs that repeating is useful.[108] Another strategy is to place students in special classrooms composed only of students with one or more retention; however, although this may give the retained students a chance to work on skills, it is also clear that being placed in such special classrooms is harmful for the affective and social maturation of most students.[109]

Currently, a number of urban school districts are trying out strategies to overcome the obstacles of retention. These include both policies to limit the number of allowed retentions and programs that obviate or act as alternatives to retention. Some school districts, such as New York City, have instituted "promotional gates" at the 4th and 7th grades to ensure that students who do not meet mandated standards do not slip by; those who aren't prepared for the next grade enter a Promotional Gates Program, and those who are still unready after that program enter a Gates Extension Program. The two principles of the Gates programs are that peers remain together in the remedial classes, and that material is taught differently each time a student repeats it.[110] Hartford's Project Bridge, which exists in all Hartford middle schools, allows seventh graders who should be in the ninth grade to complete three years of work in two. A number of summer school programs around the country also focus on remediation in order to prevent retention.[111] In many districts, remedial teachers

20

help students catch up so that they can rejoin their regular class. Many districts also speak of "individualized programming"; however, this is generally more promise than practice.

Management Practices (Student Placement - Suspensions). The problems stemming from suspensions are twofold: (1) they tend to take students who are already at risk out of school and thus increase their alienation from schooling; (2) because of the way they are dispensed, they often discriminate against minorities. Suspensions tend to be used three times as often with black students as with white students,[112] and black males are especially vulnerable to suspension. Most suspensions are not the result of serious offenses, but rather stem from teachers' over-reaction to the behavior of minorities.[113] Among dropouts, suspensions have often been a prelude to leaving school, although being suspended is likely one of a complex of factors which lead to dropping out, rather than a direct cause. Nationally, 44 percent of all black dropouts, 31 percent of all Hispanic dropouts, and 26 percent of all white dropouts have been suspended or put on probation at least once. This compares with 19, 17, and 11 percent of their respective stay-in-school peers.[114]

To decrease suspensions, schools have worked on three fronts. First, they have offered training to help teachers and other staff with conflict management, as well as with sensitivity to cultural differences among students. Second, they have developed positive alternatives to suspensions, including conferences with students and their parents, intensive counseling, in-school suspension or truancy centers, behavior skills training sessions and contracts between students and the school. Third, they have increased their efforts to involve parents and the community in supporting changes in students' behavior. (Some of these efforts are discussed under Parent Involvement below.)

School and Classroom Organization for Learning

The research on and testing of new practices in school and classroom organization have been developing apace, often as a result of the burgeoning of reform reports in the early 1980s and the more recent efforts to help students meet raised academic standards. Some of these practices, such as effective schooling, transitional programs to obviate retention, and cooperative learning as an alternative to tracking, have already been discussed in the section on dropout programs and practices. Here we review other innovations in both school and classroom organization and the management of learning.

After nearly fifty years' growth in school size, particularly at the secondary school level, several recent analyses suggest that some schools may have become too large. In fact, a variety of research

suggest that, as measured by scientific management and cost efficiency, specialization and range of opportunities, or educational effectiveness, the negative aspects of a large school outweigh any benefits it may offer.[115]

Most important, small schools are more successful with marginal and at risk students.[116]   According to the Southern Growth Policies Board, "Large schools and classes lead students to feel anonymous, unimportant, disassociated with the activities and goals of the school."[117]   Larger schools are also more difficult learning environments for the marginal student. The larger the school, the more problems that both students and teachers have with the quality of teaching.[118]   A number of programs for at risk youth model themselves on alternatives schools, creating small school settings or schools-within-schools in order to improve morale, community, and discipline. At the classroom level, the importance of size continues to be much debated—despite rather exhaustive research documenting how student achievement increases as class size decreases (especially to below 20 students),[119] and although most teachers are clear that students in smaller classrooms are easier to manage and teach.

Because of budget constraints throughout the nation, questions of reducing school size are often moot, and thus efforts have been made to manipulate other, less costly, classroom variables, while holding class size constant. For example, since increased interaction between students and the instructor is associated with higher achievement, some researchers suggest classroom organization can be altered to increase teacher-student interaction.[120]   The U.S. Department of Education's report, First Lessons, grants the difficulty of teaching a large class all day with no assistance in sight, but suggests weighing size at the elementary level against other possible use of resources: class aides, tutors, computers, and so on.[121]

Research on the influences affecting learning has accompanied studies of the variable outcomes of large and small class size. Bloom has called our understanding of the factors that influence learning in and out of school over the past decade "a major revolution."[122] Current research offers educators a refined way of determining the extent to which a student is covertly and overtly engaged in learning, and to relate this engagement to subsequent measures of performance. Evidence suggests that the amount of actively engaged time can be increased by:

    o   ensuring that a student is adequately prepared for the task at hand;

    o   using tests as a form of feedback to inform students about what they have learned well and what they still need to learn; and

    o   teaching with techniques that give students cues about what is to be learned and what the learner is to do in the learning process, that reinforce learning, and that allow or for active student participation.[123]

22

Bloom, who has named this feedback-corrective method <u>Mastery Learning</u>, argues that it is relevant to <u>all</u> students at <u>all</u> educational levels, including elementary, secondary, college, and even graduate.[124] Further, he suggests that it be combined with several other approaches for improving student learning:

o   improved instructional materials and educational technology;

o   improved home environmental processes; and

o   improved peer group support.[125]

However, a number of interesting questions have been raised about how engaged time is measured, among them being the tendency (notwithstanding Bloom) of time on task studies to focus on teacher-led lessons, and the lack of research on how student heterogeneity and class size interact.[126]   Researchers also point out that some learning methods, such as peer instruction and cooperation, rather than competition, may be particularly useful for some cultural and ethnic groups, and that these methods are not measurable in the same way as time-on-task.   Finally, most research on classroom context is based on elementary classrooms, and there is little work on the effect of alternative classroom organizations or teaching strategies among adolescents.[127]

Computers have become popular both as a way to offer new kinds of learning (including computer literacy) and as a means to relieve the pressure on urban school teachers.   Research on computers in education, which has burgeoned, shows that computerized instruction may be a mixed blessing.   First, computers, like other expensive educational resources, are not being used equally for all students:

o   more computers are being placed in the hands of middle and upper middle class children than poor children;

o   when computers are placed in the schools of poor children they are used for rote and drill practice instead of the "cognitive enrichment" that they provide for middle and upper class students;

o. female students regardless of social class or ethnicity, have less involvement with computers in schools than male students.[128]

Because most schools average one computer per classroom, the most effective arrangement is probably to have computers in special centers so that the time of students not using the computer will not be wasted.[129]   Where microcomputers are assimilated into existing classrooms, they create changes in student-teacher relationships as well as curriculum.   Computers may also become "intruders" in the regular flow of classroom instruction, with their potential inconveniences outweighing their benefits.[130]

Creating and Maintaining a Professional Urban Work Force

Two recent reform reports, Tomorrow's Teachers, by the Holmes Group,[131] and A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century, by the Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy,[132] have examined on the condition of teachers and teaching. Both reports point to a shortage of teachers in the coming decade, caused primarily by a lack of qualified recruits. Both emphasize the need to attract more able individuals to the profession, as well as to improve the training of recruits.

The teacher shortage, which is acute at a national level, is particularly serious in urban areas, and minority teachers are not increasing in proportion to the increase in minority students. Although rural and suburban areas will experience shortages in math, science, and special areas, the shortage will be more pervasive in the cities--and will grow increasingly severe.[133] Moreover, the shortage of qualified urban teachers will not be a matter of mere numbers. First, there is increasing evidence that teacher preparation is inadequate for the day-to-day work of urban teaching, and that learning on the job is not an adequate substitute. Second, the increase in minority students is not being matched by the yearly replacements of minority teachers. Although by the year 2000, 50 percent of all urban school children will be from ethnic minorities, only 5 percent of all college students--the pool of prospective teachers--will be minorities. "Indeed, if every minority group member in college became a teacher, [minorities] would still not be adequately represented . . .unless new methods of recruitment and preparation are developed for untapped constituencies" [underlining in original].[134] The preparation of black teachers is particularly at risk, since the loss of financial support to black colleges. These black colleges have historically provided more than half of the baccalaureate degrees awarded to blacks in the 10 Southern states, and were the main source of higher education for poor blacks, particularly for teaching careers. At the same time, teaching certification tests have placed additional requirements, beyond the four-year curriculum, for entry into the profession. (Louisiana, to take an extreme example, has a pass rate of 70 percent for white prospective teachers and a pass rate of 15 percent for black prospective teachers.)[135]

Among the suggestions for changes in the training of urban teachers are:

o   A modification of the university-based program, so that a major portion of the preparation takes place in the public schools.
o   New preservice and inservice preparation that will involve selected faculty and classroom teachers (including master teachers) in new ways.
o   New forms of licensing for urban teaching that will include a full year of supervised intern teaching.

24

o   Partnerships among parents, professionals, nonprofessional
     groups, and teacher preparation staff to give these
     constituencies a voice in teacher education.[136]

     However, improving urban teaching will also necessitate
improvements in working conditions, as well as more attractive
financial incentives and career ladders. As Ernest Boyer indicates,
summarizing a recent Carnegie Foundation nationwide survey, "urban
teachers face more problems than other teachers, and, yet, have less
authority and receive less administrative support."[137]
Compared with suburban and rural teachers, urban teachers were
significantly more likely to face disruptive behavior, student
violence, and undernourishment among their students. Far more urban
teachers than other teachers responding to the Carnegie survey said
they had no control in selecting textbooks and/or materials, in
choosing course content, or in setting goals for their students.
Urban teachers also tended to feel less satisfied with their
principal's openness to suggestions and with his or her capacity to
eliminate red tape. Equally important, urban school teachers, far
more than other teachers, felt that their school building was below
average in the quality of the plant, and in cleanliness, heating,
cooling, and security.

Special Programs for Diverse Students

     As urban students have grown more diverse in their backgrounds
and needs, urban schools have increasingly been challenged to develop
a variety of programs and services thought to be necessary for student
achievement. Although some of these programs have generated
controversies, both over the usefulness of these programs and the
school's obligation to provide them, schools have, in fact,
increasingly developed new academic programs as well as provided more
nonacademic support services.

     Compensatory Education. For 22 years, the Federal government has
funded compensatory education programs nationwide. In 1986 and 1987,
a number of reports were issued that provide new evaluative
information about the administration and effects of both Title 1 and
Chapter 1 over time. According to the most recent reports, Chapter 1
programs are currently in effect in 13,600 public school districts
around the country.[138] About 5 million children, or 9 percent of the
school population, receive Chapter 1 services each year. Most of
these are elementary school children. Chapter 1 recipients are more
likely to be poor (about 21 percent come from poor families) and to
belong to minority groups (between 29 and 35 percent are black and
between 10 and 22 percent Hispanic, depending on the survey). While
12.7 percent of all students were enrolled in private schools in 1983,
only 4.6 percent of Chapter 1 students were in private schools.[139]

25

Two recent studies offer more detailed reports, both on which students may need Chapter 1 services and on who are receiving them. A finding of the January 1986 National Assessment of Chapter 1 links poverty and achievement more tightly than previously, and so provides a more clear basis for deciding who should receive Federal compensatory education. The authors argue that "students are increasingly likely to fall behind grade levels as their families experience longer spells of poverty, and that achievement scores of all students—not just poor students—decline as the proportion of poor students in a school rises."[140] The authors also make clear that the low achievement scores often attributed to minorities are the result of their severe poverty situations.

> The preponderance of Black children, and minority
> children in general, among those experiencing
> long-term family poverty and concentrations of
> poverty in their communities suggests that
> minorities may be experiencing a qualitatively
> different form of poverty than other poor children
> experience. Their families are likely to be poor
> for longer periods of time, and their communities
> are more likely to have a preponderance of poor
> people.[141]

The authors conclude that Chapter 1 guidelines allow the delivery of Chapter 1 services to those most in need, as defined by poverty and race, but that low-achievers in general have been less well served. Instead, the proportion of low-achieving students provided with compensatory education varies, depending on the number of low-achieving students in the school and on local decisions to serve many versus a few children.[142] According to the authors, estimates of those eligible but not served by the program range around 50 percent.[143]

Drawing on data from a sample of 30 districts to refine knowledge of Chapter 1 recipients, a report by SRA Technologies argues that, although Chapter 1 schools generally have both higher concentrations of poor students, and students with lower reading levels than non-Chapter 1 schools, there are schools with very low poverty concentrations, and high achieving students, who receive program services, while other schools with very high poverty concentrations, and students who are low-achievers, do not receive services.[144] Both reports offer suggestions for improving the targeting of Chapter 1 funding.

As for the programs themselves, the recent literature suggests that districts provide a wide range of services, and exhibit considerable variety in the way they allocate Chapter 1 resources to participating schools and students. Per pupil expenditures also vary widely, with some districts allocating intensive services to fewer students and some spreading their funds over a larger number of

participants.[145] Districts further differ in the percentage of their
monies that are spent for class instruction as opposed to other
support services, the site of Chapter 1 instruction (in class, in a
pull-out situation, after school, during the summer, etc.), their
emphasis on parent involvement, and other factors. The vast majority
of programs, nevertheless, appear to focus their money on instruction,
done in pull-out contexts, and parent involvement is generally far
more rudimentary than was initially mandated by Title 1.[146]

Despite targeting problems and program variations, the recently
released National Assessment of Chapter 1 suggests that the
compensatory education programs are relatively effective for those
they serve. Although measures of Chapter 1's effects are elusive, the
groups targeted by the program have shown improvements, particularly
in reading. Among some of the report's findings are that:

    o   early elementary students in Chapter 1 programs gained more
         than those participating in later grades;
    o   low-achieving students progressed more than high-achieving
         students;
    o   minority students narrowed their gap with whites;
    o   summer programs appeared to be less effective than
         year-round programs, possibly because they were less
         rigorous academically;
    o   students who discontinued Chapter 1 services appeared to
         gradually lose ground.

Since the students were not followed more than two years after
discontinuing Chapter 1, nothing is known about its effect on such
important outcomes as dropout or graduation rates or adult
literacy.[147]

A number of findings have also emerged regarding the success of
various program components. For example, parental involvement appears
to improve student achievement. Summarizing the research on
achievement, one researcher noted that, students also do better when
teachers "emphasize academic instruction, expect their students to
master the curriculum, and allocate most of the available time to
curriculum related activities."[148] On the other hand, researchers
disagree about whether instructional strategies should be altered for
disadvantaged students. They also raise questions about the
educational value and efficiency of pull-out programs.[149] Finally,
according to the National Assessment:

         Chapter 1 may facilitate learning by providing
         small class sizes, even though these smaller
         groupings occur for only a portion of the school
         day. On the other hand, research on the features
         of effective schools suggests that Chapter 1 may
         also hinder student achievement by restricting the
         school's ability to create the shared academic
         goals, high expectations, and strong achievement-

oriented school culture that are now recognized to
be important to student achievement. These
findings also suggest that disadvantaged students
might learn even more if, for instance, the sizes
of their regular classes were reduced
substantially, or if Chapter 1 teachers were more
fully incorporated into the school's overall
instructional program.[150]

Bilingual Education. A variety of surveys have been conducted
over the years to determine how many limited-English-proficient (LEP)
students there are in the United States. In current estimates, their
numbers range from a low of 1.2 million to a high of 6.6 million,
depending on data sources, definitions, and survey methodology.[151]
When people are asked whether a language other than English is spoken
at home, their answers indicate that about 4.5 million 5- 17-year-olds
(or 9.5 percent) appear to come from a non-English-language home.
These students are most heavily concentrated in California, Texas, New
York, New Jersey, Illinois and Florida.[152] According to the U.S.
Department of Education, more than 950,000 LEP students were enrolled
in state- and locally-funded bilingual education programs in 1983,
with another 200,000 enrolled in federally sponsored projects.
Although three-quarters of these students spoke Spanish, they also
spoke over a hundred other languages as well.[153]

In a country very committed to English as the sole spoken
language, bilingual education, in all its variants, has been
politically controversial from its inception. Not only has there
been scant interest in the reciprocal potential of bilingual education
(giving English-speaking students the opportunity to become proficient
in Spanish or another language), but bilingual education programs have
increasingly had to be clearly temporary and transitional--that is,
that they lead to an all-English curriculum. Although some educators
have given convincing educational, cultural and psychological reasons
for teaching students their native language, as with desegregation,
the advocates of bilingual education have had to prove that it
increases student achievement.[154]

So far the research has only succeeded in fueling both sides of
the controversy, partly because there is no agreement about what would
constitute proof. Some reports, based largely on research conducted
in other countries, argue for bilingual education by showing that
mastery of one's native language enhances, and may even be necessary
to, the mastery of a second language. Similarly, research suggests
that the longer students remain in a bilingual program, the higher
their academic achievement, as measured in English, is likely to
be.[155] Other research shows equivocal and limited results from a
variety of bilingual education programs in this country (including
structured immersion, English as a Second Language (ESL), transitional

28

bilingual education, bilingual-bicultural education), and better
results from "submersion" classes, or programs in which
non-English-speaking children are simply placed directly in
English-speaking classes.[156] However, it has been pointed out that,
because programs vary enormously, "This lack of consistency from
classroom to classroom and school to school blurs many of the critical
differences between models when data are aggregated and instructional
methods are compared. As a result, it is difficult to sort out the
relative effects of different methods." [157] Moreover, it has been
argued that none of these studies used such criteria as dropping out
of school, addiction and alcoholism, suicide rates, and other signs of
alienation from schooling or society as means of assessing the
benefits of bilingual education.[158]

In 1987, in answer to a U.S. Department of Education initiative
to eliminate funds for native language instruction, the Government
Accounting Office (GAO) issued its own report. A compilation of
expert opinion, rather than research, this report argues that evidence
does, in fact, support the law's requirement to use students' native
languages to the extent necessary for bilingual students to learn
English, and that, again, in contrast to the position of the U.S.
Department of Education, there is no evidence that "submersion" is an
effective technique. Finally, few experts cited in the GAO report
agree with the Department's suggestion that the long-term school
problems experienced by Hispanic youth are associated with native
language instruction.[159] In response, Department Assistant Secretary
Chester Finn has objected to the GAO's methodology and has argued that
the bilingual education has still not proved its efficacy.[160] At
approximately the same time, while not altogether rejecting native
language instruction, the Department of Education's What Works:
Educating Disadvantaged Children strongly suggests moving "as quickly
as possible to enable the [English limited] students to function in an
environment where they have to use English to communicate," and says
teachers should "ensure that students' use of their native language
does not get in the way of learning English as quickly as
possible."[161]

Magnet Schools. Magnet schools, which were initiated in a few
districts in the early 1970s as a means to achieve voluntarily
desegregated education at the same time as improving achievement, had
been instituted in more than 140 urban school districts by 1982 and
have increased rapidly since then. Magnets are characterized by four
innovative elements: a) a special curricular theme or method; b)
choice of school by the student or parent; c) open access to students
beyond a regular school attendance zone; and d) a role in voluntary
desegregation within the district.[162]

The effectiveness of these schools in increasing student
achievement (generally measured by standardized English and math
scores),[163] and in increasing district desegregation[164] have both been

well documented. A recently completed analysis of 20 school districts by Rossell and Clark examines how magnets function as part of voluntary and mandatory desegregation plans. The study's major findings confirm earlier research:

o   comprehensive voluntary desegregation plans work--and, in fact, produce statistically more interracial exposure than mandatory plans;

o   dismantling mandatory plans and replacing them with comprehensive magnet-voluntary plans can further reduce racial isolation; and

o   although mandatory desegregation plans eventually produce less interracial exposure than magnet voluntary plans, mandatory plans do create more interracial exposure than if nothing at all had been done.

Rossell and Clark note that magnets enroll about a third of the students in districts with voluntary plans but only 13 percent of the students in districts with mandatory plans. The largest proportion of the magnet programs--46 percent--are in minority locations. The researchers suggest a number of components necessary to increase the effectiveness of voluntary plans, including controls on choices, magnet school placement, and publicity and recruitment methods, among others.[165]   Nevertheless, no school district studied has all its students in desegregated schools. In Northern court ordered districts 20 percent of the minority students, and in Southern court ordered districts 35 percent of the minority students, are still in severely racially isolated schools--schools with greater than 90 percent minority students.[166]

A study of magnet schools in New York State found magnets to have many characteristics in common with effective schools: high levels of student achievement, a strong program identity, active parent participation, and a school environment conducive to learning. Magnet attendance rates were higher than district-wide averages, and the dropout rates were below district-wide rates. Moreover, the magnets were also effective as desegregation tools. According to the report, "minority enrollment patterns changed dramatically in most magnet schools after the introduction of these programs in the school district." High minority schools experienced an average 35 percent decline in minority enrollment over a 10-year period. Moreover, the extreme variations in racial composition in the districts' schools were also greatly reduced.[167]

The selectiveness of a magnet school affects both achievement and desegregation, though not in the same way. Highly selective magnets, for example, have been associated with high test scores, but not always with success at desegregation or integration. Specific content or theme foci, as well as the geographic placement of magnets, may also work for or against their use as an effective desegregation strategy.[168]

30

Alternative Schools. No major new research has emerged on alternative schools over the last year. This may in part be because the language has changed, and what would once have been called an alternative program is now more usually termed a dropout prevention program or a special program for at risk students. In any case, it is clear that a number of the findings from alternative schools are currently being used to generate dropout prevention program models. For example, both the Consortium on Dropout Prevention[169] and the Institute for Educational Leadership[170] recommend small schools and classes, personal attention, institutional flexibility, job/work connections, community involvement, and other alternative school characteristics for programs for potential dropouts.

Pregnancy Prevention and Parenting Services. Although controversy has centered on whether or not it is the school's role to enter the whole area of sexuality and family life, schools in most urban districts have begun to intervene in three areas: through providing sex education, through offering access to clinics, and through creating special curriculum and courses of study for pregnant and parenting teens. Classes on human growth and development, beginning in the early grades and continuing through high school, have become an important part of school curriculum in most urban districts. As a Gallup poll showed, both teachers and the public strongly favor sex education in the schools--although they differ on what should be taught.[171]

School clinics, a more recent arena of controversy, have also sprung up around the country, as some research suggests that they can decrease student pregnancy and thus lower the dropout rate. Typically, these clinics are organized and funded by an outside organization such as a health department, hospital, or private nonprofit group, while the school contributes space and facilitates attendance.[172] Most require parental permission for student participation, and most provide contraceptive advice and referrals but avoid dispensing contraception.

Special programs for pregnant and parenting girls are now available in many urban school districts. These programs may allow the student to participate in the regular school, or they may offer a separate facility. In either case, they are likely to include counseling, health screening, social services, day care, and classes in prenatal care, family planning, and parenting. Although many aspects of these programs may contribute to their success, day care (a well researched service) appears to increase school holding power.[173] One of the most well-known and successful programs is Albuquerque's new Futures School for pregnant and parenting teenagers. This school offers educational and support services for students, child care for their children, and counseling for their parents. An overwhelming

31

number of New Futures students remain in school to graduate, and
repeat pregnancy rates for New Futures students are less than a third
the national rate for teenagers.[174]

        Vocational and Career Education. Vocational education has
sustained a good deal of recent criticism for creating a track of
generally low income students who have limited access to an enriched
academic curriculum, and for providing training that is too often
narrow and out-of-date. (Vocational education has also been
criticized for practicing sex discrimination, and federal cuts to
vocational education have further jeopardized sex equity.[175]) As the
National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education has itself
suggested, all students need schooling that enhances their
intellectual as well as vocational flexibility in order to compete in
a rapidly shifting and diversified job market.[176] At the same time,
pressures to motivate at risk students, as well as to find new sources
of funding in the face of cuts in public monies, have generated new
alliances or "partnerships" between schools and business or industry,
that have resulted in a variety of training and work-study programs.
These programs seek to create stronger school-work linkages.

Science and Mathematics for Female Students

        Increasingly, applicants for the best employment opportunities
will need a good grasp of science and mathematics. Therefore, the
fact that women have traditionally not excelled in these areas will
become a more severe handicap.

        It has been a longstanding stereotype of female students that
they cannot grasp higher level science and mathematics, and they have
not been encouraged to take such courses. By the time they reach high
school, most female students have already lost their interest in
mathematics and science as a result of social pressure and an earlier
lack of achievement in these areas.[177] Although at grade 9 boys and
girls do not differ significantly in math achievement, boys achieve
twice as rapidly as girls during high school, producing large and
statistically significant sex differences in mathematical achievement
by grade 12. Most important, virtually all of the sex differences in
12th grade mathematics scores can be explained by sex differences in
elective high school mathematics courses.[178] Although minority
females show high interest in mathematics and science, this interest
apparently does not lead to choosing advanced mathematics and science
in high school.[179] When female students (both minority and white) do
take these subjects, they are frequently ignored, for teacher
attention is concentrated on the male students, who are assumed more
likely to pursue careers in these fields.[180] A lack of women role
models has also discouraged female students from pursuing science or
mathematics careers,[181] as has the idea that these fields are not

32

"feminine."

Recently, a number of programs have been created to interest women and minorities in mathematics and science careers. Among some of the strategies used, are presenting models of other women and minorities in the field; specifically addressing stereotypes; presenting material in ways that make science and mathematics achievement seem relevant and possible; offering learning techniques that are culturally and linguistically sensitive; and using approaches that eliminate the stress of competition and reduce other anxieties.[182] Training for teachers and administrators also has been instituted, and includes sensitivity to the tendency to track girls away from more advanced science and mathematics options.

Parents and Schooling

Traditionally, public schools and middle class parents have considered each other allies. Middle class parents take an active role in socializing their children for school; they read to their children and help them with homework; and they generally are willing to participate in a wide variety of school activities from signing report cards, observing classes and chaperoning trips and dances to attending PTA meetings and sitting on school boards. To put it another way, public schools have relied on the direct and indirect support of these middle class parents, just as the parents have assumed that the schools will act as extensions of their desires and values in socializing and educating their children. There has been a continuity between the middle class home and the school.

In contrast, the links between the schools and parents of poor and minority children have been tenuous and permeated by suspicion and misunderstanding on both sides. While the schools have seen poor and minority parents as often failing to provide their children with the prerequisites for successful learning, these parents (themselves often undereducated by contemporary standards) have viewed teachers and schools with a mix of awe and anger. At the same time as poor minority parents may have complained that they had no say in the schools, and that teachers did not welcome them, educators have complained that exactly those parents whose children tend to be lower achievers and who most need extra help, have been the hardest to reach.

Several factors have recently brought the issue of parents and schooling to the fore: (1) the low scores of many urban school children in both reading and mathematics; (2) the research of Coleman and his colleagues, among others, which has shown that the home environment may account for nearly 50 percent of the variance in school achievement; (3) the long-term success of preschool programs that had extensive parental involvement; and (4) the emphasis in the recent reform reports and U.S. Department of Education publications on

33

38

what parents can do to improve their children's schooling. As the U.S. Department of Education's What Works: Research about Teaching and Learning indicates, "Parents are their children's first and most influential teachers. What parents do to help their children learn is more important to academic success than how well off the family is.[183] Based on research showing the importance of the home environment in the early years, much of this work with parents has focused on those parents who have children in preschool and the elementary grades.

Despite a universal acceptance of the importance of working with parents, however, there have been questions about how this should be done. Recent research on methods to increase parental involvement in home learning can be viewed as divided according to the amount of mutuality worked for between the home and school. Specifically, some researchers would work to reform what goes on in the low income or minority home in order to create learning situations that are more consistent with school learning.[184] For example, Walberg speaks of "the alterable curriculum of the home" and argues for cooperative efforts by parents and educators to "modify these alterable academic conditions."[185] The Committee for Economic Development argues that good programs "should teach parents how to provide a home environment that encourages learning.[186] Others place greater stress on the mutuality of home-school interaction; they argue that, just as parents can be helped in their parenting functions, teachers can become more effective partly by learning from parents how they teach. This can help make teachers' instructional styles more harmonious with those the children have grown up with.[187] Summarizing the evidence from a number of studies, Cole and Griffin note that the "school-to-home pathway . . .is more likely to be effective if the two-way nature of the path is explicitly recognized by educators."[188]

As always, schools also want to draw parents into the activities of the school. However, the difficulties with increasing parents' involvement in the school are even more serious than helping parents to be effective "teachers" at home. Most important, time appears to be increasingly precious for those on both sides of the school-home partnership. Sixty-four percent of mothers with school-age children are in the work force.[189] Of the nation's 4.6 million black families with children, 2.6 million are headed by a single woman—and in some ghetto areas it may be close to 90 percent.[190] These facts raise several issues related to school expectations for parent involvement. Can single or working parents be expected to participate as fully? What responsibility do schools have to engage parents who may be particularly busy or more difficult to reach? Research indicates that single and working parents may, in fact, be discriminated against by school personnel, who tend to decide in advance that these parents cannot be approached or relied on.[191] For working parents to become more involved, there may have to be different work arrangements, such as release time or flexible working hours and child care.[192]

The increasing number of parents whose native language is not English raise additional problems for schools trying to generate

34

parent involvement. Recently, several studies have been conducted on involving Asian/Pacific American parents, including new refugees from Southeast Asia. Not only is language a barrier, making communication between parents and school personnel difficult, but few Asians understand the American educational system. For Asians, the concept of citizen participation is alien; instead, Asians tend to believe that schools have the expertise and right to make all decisions. Because these parents come from poorer countries where shortages in educational resources far exceeded those in American schools, "few parents can see that the American schools are not equally equipped and staffed, and that children are not treated equally according to their cultural, linguistic, and socio-economic backgrounds."[193]

As with the research on helping parents become more effective in the home, research on creating programs for school involvement can also be divided according to the model of involvement. A recent comprehensive review, for example, divides approximately 65 studies (often of low income and minority communities) according to whether the model of involvement stressed one-directional influence from the school to the home, or whether the line of influence was to and from the home and school and included the larger community. While 70 percent of the research on programs in which school-to-home influence predominated showed positive effects on student achievement, all of the programs stressing mutual influence had positive results. In fact, "the fuller the participation of parents, the more effective were the results obtained." The most powerful approaches were ones in which parents had a definite role in decision-making; next best were those which exposed parents to somewhat structured programs of training in tutoring their own children.[194]

Business Involvement

In the context of universal enthusiasm for increasing parent participation in the education of their children, there has simultaneously been a growing move to add to the constituencies working to support education. As we pointed out in the overview, many educational thinkers have come to the conclusion that even a solid school-family partnership has become too frail for the enormous tasks at hand. For example, the Urban Superintendents' Network has come to the conclusion that, "To intervene in the vicious cycle of failure for many urban and minority youth, schools need to join with community institutions and agencies," and the group suggests joint school and business connections as a major strategy.[195] Researchers Brice Heath and McLaughlin speak of "moving beyond dependence on school and family."[196] Expressing the business community's increasingly common involvement in education, the Committee for Economic Development argues that "the problems of children in need call for collaborations that must extend beyond the traditional limits of the school," and suggests that, "business leaders can become a persuasive voice for the millions of disadvantaged children who lack advocates in the political

process."[197]

Throughout the nation, and particularly in urban areas, schools and businesses have already become involved in a variety of partnerships and alliances. These include adopt-a-school programs; mentorships; work and career training on the job; "compacts" between school and businesses to improve student achievement in exchange for jobs; schools placed in factories and other commercial institutions; and so on. After some years of a withdrawal from education, many corporate officials are once again joining school boards and other planning bodies. It is unclear, however, exactly how much actual funding business has contributed to education. Nor is there much hard research on the effects of these new alliances on student achievement. The Committee for Economic Development itself reports that adopt-a-school programs have had "a limited effect on the performance of students at risk."[198] And there is no evidence that the Boston Compact, one of the most highly publicized school business collaborations, has actually lowered the dropout rate in the Boston public schools.[199]

Minorities and Nonpublic Schooling

Like their white counterparts, many minority parents are sending their children to private schools in the belief that they offer sounder schooling. Nationally, about five percent of all black families have children in private schools, slightly less than half the proportion of whites with privately educated children. In the inner cities, about seven percent of all black students attend private schools, while white private school enrollment can be as high as 20 percent. In fact, four percent of black families living in poverty have children in private school, only one percentage point less than the overall black family average.[200] Among predominately white private elementary schools, Catholic schools have the highest percentage of minority students, with an enrollment of 18 percent nationally.[201]

Several major studies in the 1980s have shown that the standardized achievement test scores of black students in private schools are higher than those of black public school students, and that, at least with younger students, many behind-grade-level transferees from public to private schools make up the lost grade within a year.[202] A recent analysis of National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reading scores showed Catholic schools to be effective for minority schools in exactly those locations where public schools experience their greatest difficulties: the big cities of the Northeast and Midwest.[203] Coleman and Hoffer have also shown the particular advantage of Catholic schools for black and Hispanic students, and have focused special attention on the lower dropout rate these schools are able to achieve even with students from disadvantaged homes. (By contrast, Coleman and Hoffer find that

36

independent schools have high dropout rates even with middle class Anglo students.)[204]

Coleman and Hoffer note that, although Catholic schools have a slightly lower percentage of students from single-parent and two-working-parent homes than do public schools, the Catholic schools are especially effective with these students. As pointed out in the overview, these authors argue the importance of the value-oriented community surrounding the Catholic schools for their success with just those children whose family background does not provide them with the requisite supports for academic achievement. Speaking of the low Catholic school dropout rate, they say, "Students from families with these deficiencies are hardly more likely to drop out than are those from families without the deficiencies, while these deficiencies make a strong difference among public school students, and an even stronger difference for students from other private schools."[205] Although the authors believe that Catholic schools may not be the only solution for poor and minority students, they suggest that policies should make it easier for these students to attend Catholic schools, should they wish to do so.

Conclusion

The demographic and educational changes discussed in the previous sections are highlights in the complex condition of urban and minority education. With over 20 years of experience in tracking trends and issues in urban education, the incumbent Clearinghouse is confident in its ability to continue monitoring the rapid shifts in the situation of urban and minority children, as well as new educational developments that are most likely to enhance their achievement.

37

1. Herbers, J. (1987, May 20). Economic competition is shifting government role in low-cost housing, The New York Times, p. A18.

2. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. (1987, July 13). After-tax income of female-headed households lower in 1985 than in 1980, as gap widens between rich and poor Americans. Washington, DC: Author.

3. Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development. (1987). Children in need: Investment strategies for the educationally disadvantaged. New York, NY: Author.

4. Preston, S. H. (1984, November). Children and the elderly: Divergent paths for America's dependents. Demography, 21 (4), 435-457.

5. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.

6. Preston, S. H.

7. Preston, S. H.

8. Edelman, M. W. (1987a). The children's time. Washington, DC: Children's Defense Fund.

9. Nathan, R. P. (1986, November 14). The underclass: Will it always be with us? Prepared for a symposium at the New School for Social Research. New York, NY: New School for Social Research.

10. Nathan, R. P. (1986, November). The concentration of poor people in poverty areas in the nation's 100 largest cities. New York, NY: New School for Social Research.

11. Herbers, J.

12. Wetzel, J. R. (1987, June). American youth: A statistical snapshot. Washington, DC: The William T. Grant Foundation, Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship.

13. Bastian, A., Fruchter, N., Gittell, M., Greer, C., & Haskins, K. (1987). Choosing equality. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.

14. Coleman, J. S. (1987, April). Families and schools. Paper presented at the 1987 AERA Meetings, Washington, DC: April 20-24.

15. Finn, C. E. (1987, Spring). The high school dropout puzzle. The Public Interest, 87, 3-22.

16. Bastian, A., et al.

17. Coleman, J. S., & Hoffer, T. (1987). Public and private high schools: The impact of communities. New York, NY: Basic Books, p.27.

18. Coleman, J. S.

19. Coleman, J. S., & Hoffer, T.; Coleman, J. S.

20. Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development.

21. See, for example, Ascher, C., & Flaxman, E. (1987, March). Lowering the dropout rate: The experience of urban superintendents. (Prepared for the OERI Urban Superintendents Network). New York, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

22. Brice Heath, S., & McLaughlin, M. (1987, April). A child resource policy: Moving beyond dependence on school and family. Phi Delta Kappan, 579.

23. Today's native sons: Inner-city black males are America's newest lost generation. (1986, December 1). Time, pp. 26-32.

24. Edelman, M. W. (1987b). Families in peril; An agenda for social change. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

25. Edelman, M. W., p. 3.

26. Today's native sons: Inner-city black males are America's newest lost generation.

27. Edelman, M. W. (1987b).

28. Congress of the United States, Congressional Budget Office. (1986, April). Trends in educational achievement. Washington, DC: Author.

29. Stern, J. D., & Williams, M. F. (Eds.) (1986). The conditions of education. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Center for Education Statistics.

30. Fiske, E.B. (1987, September 23). Steady gains achieved by blacks on college admission test scores. The New York Times, pp. A1, D30.

31. Oakes, J. (1985). Keeping track: How schools structure inequality. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

32. Office for Civil Rights. (1986, May). Elementary and secondary civil rights survey, 1984. National summaries. Arlington, VA: DBS Corp; Washington, DC: Opportunity Systems, Inc. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 271 543)

33. Graham, P.A. (1987, April). Black teachers: A drastically scarce resource. Phi Delta Kappan, (68) 8, 598-605.

34. Valdivieso, R. (1986, August). Must they wait another generation? Hispanics and secondary school reform. New York, NY: ERIC/CUE URBAN Diversity Series Number 93. ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 273 705)

35. National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, Hispanic Policy Development Project. (1984). "Make something happen"--Hispanics and urban high school reform. Volume I. Washington, DC: Author.

36. National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, Hispanic Policy Development Project.

37. Cummings, J. (1987, April 2). Hispanic people gaining in new jobs. The New York Times, p. A26.

38. Stern, J. D., & Williams, M. F.

39. National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, Hispanic Policy Development Project.

40. National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, Hispanic Development Project.

41. O'Malley, J. M. (InterAmerican Research Associates). (1987, March). Academic growth of high school age Hispanic students in the United States. Washington, DC: Center for Education Statistics, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

42. Valdivieso, R.

43. National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, Hispanic Policy Development Project.

44. U.S. Department of Education. (1987). Schools that work: Educating the disadvantaged. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

45. Valdivieso, R., p.19.

46. Cited in Valdivieso, R., p.19.

47. Tsang, S. L., & Wing, L. C. (1985, Winter). Beyond Angel Island: The education of Asian Americans. New York: ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series Number 90, Teachers College, Columbia University.

40

(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 612)

48. Tsang, S. L., & Wing, L. C.

49. Yu, E. S. H., Doi, M., & Chang, C. F. (1986, November). Asian American education in Illinois: A review of the data. Chicago, IL: Pacific/Asian American Mental Health Research Center.

50. Yu, E. S. H., et al.

51. Tsang, S. L., & Wing, L. C.

52. Bunzel, J. H., & Jeffrey, K. D. A. (1987, Spring). Diversity or discrimination? Asian Americans in college, The Public Interest, 87, 49-62.

53. Flores, P. V. (1987, April). Determinants of schooling attainment among Asian Americans: A social allocation model of college plans and college attendance. Paper read at the AERA Annual Meeting in the Symposium Panel, The Socio-Cultural Context of Education, A Focus on the Minorities. Washington, DC, April 20-24.

54. Yu, E. S. H., et al.

55. Kan, S. H., Liu, W. T. (1986). The educational status of Asian Americans: An update from the 1980 census. In N. Tsuchida, (Ed.) Issues in Asian and Pacific American education. Minneapolis, MN: Asian/Pacific American Learning Resource Center.

56. Yu, E.S.H., et al.

57. Wetzel, J. R.

58. National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics, Hispanic Policy Development Project.

59. National Council of La Raza. (1986, August). The education of Hispanics: Status and implications. Washington, DC: Author.

60. Yu, E. S. H., et al.

61. United States General Accounting Office. (1986, June). School dropouts: The extent and nature of the problem. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office; Rumberger, R. W. (1987, Summer). High school dropouts: A review of issues and evidence. Review of Educational Research, 57(2), 101-21; Wetzel, J. R.

62. United States General Accounting Office.

63. Wetzel, J. R.

64. O'Malley, J. M. (InterAmerican Research Associates).

65. Rumberger, R. W.

66. Kennedy, M., Jung, R., & Orland, M. E. (1986, January).
Poverty, achievement and the distribution of compensatory education
services. An interim report from the National Assessment of Chapter
1, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of
Education. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

67. Hess, G. A., Jr., & Lauber, D. (1985, April). Dropouts from the
Chicago Public Schools: An analysis of the classes of 1982-1983-
1984. Chicago, IL: Chicago Panel on Public School Finance.

68. Rock, D. C., et al. (1985, April). Who drops out of school?
Findings from a national study. Princeton: Educational Testing
Service; cited in B. Lyke. (1986, October 10). High school dropouts
updated. Washington, DC: Education and Public Welfare Division,
Congressional Research Service.

69. National Commission on Secondary Education for Hispanics,
Hispanic Policy Development Project.

70. Valdivieso, R.

71. Wetzel, J. R.

72. Peng, S. S., Takai, R. T., & Fetters, W. B. (1983). High school
dropouts. Preliminary results from the high school and beyond survey.
Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational
Research Association, Montreal, Canada.

73. Cited in M. R. Burt. (1986, September). Estimates of public
costs for teenage childbearing: A review of recent studies and
estimates of 1985 public costs. Washington, DC: Center for
Population Options.

74. Wetzel, J. R.

75. This information is based on unpublished analyses of Census
Bureau and National Center for Health Studies data currently
being completed by Norma Lopez at the National Council for La
Raza. Personal communication, June 11, 1987.

76. Finn, C. E., Jr.

77. The rapidly growing documentation in this area is already too
vast for citation. However, see, for example, United States
General Accounting Office; Lyke, B. (1986, October). High school
dropouts updated 10/10/86. Washington, DC: Education and Public
Welfare Division, Congressional Research Service; Natriello, G. (Ed.).
(1987). School Dropouts: Patterns and Policies. New York, NY:

42

47

Teachers College Press.

78. See, for example, Urban Superintendents Network. (In press). Dealing with dropouts: The urban superintendents' call to action. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

79. See, for example, Hahn, A., & Danzberger, J. (1987, March). Dropouts in America: Enough is known for action. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership, p.27., which recommends viewing education "from preschool to high school graduation as a continuum." The Urban Superintendents Network. (1987, September). Dealing with dropouts: The urban superintendents' call to action. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, p. 22, (draft), also suggests that, "early intervention makes great sense in light of current knowledge about the cumulative process that leads to dropping out," and points out that "Preschool and early childhood programs head the urban superintendents' list of ways to help at-risk youngsters succeed."

80. See, for example, McKey, R. H., Condelli, L., Ganson, H., Barrett, B. J., McConkey, C., Plantz, M. C. (1985, June). The impact of Head Start on children, families and communities. Final Report of the Head Start Evaluation, Synthesis and Utilization Project. Washington, DC: GSR, Incorporated; Berreuta-Clement, J. J., Schweinhart, L. J., Barnett, W. S., Epstein, A. S., & Wikart, D. P. (1984). Changed lives: The effects of the Perry Preschool Program on youths through age 19. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Educational Research Foundation; Lazar, I. & Darlington, R. B. (1982). Lasting effects of early education: A report form the Consortium for Longitudinal Studies, Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development. Serial No. 195, 47, 2-3.

81. Berreuta-Clement, J. R., et al.

82. Pendleton, A. (1986). Preschool enrollment: Trends and implications. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Center for Educational Statistics.

83. Katz, L. G. (1987, January). Current issues in early childhood education. In E. Flaxman (Ed.) Trends and issues in education, 1986. Washington, DC: Council of ERIC Directors, Educational Resources Information Center, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, p. X-1.

84. Katz, L. G.

85. National Black Child Development Institute. (1985). Child care in the public schools: Incubator for inequality? Washington, DC: Author.

86. Cited in Network for Effective Schools. (1987). <u>Expecting the</u> <u>best: Effective public education for all students</u>. A Report of the Findings of a Major School Reform Study. New York, NY: Author.

87. See, for example. National Education Association. (1986, June). <u>The role of the principal in effective schools</u>. Washington, DC: Author.

88. Bloom, B. S. (1984, May). The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring. <u>Educational</u> <u>Leadership</u>, 4-17.

89. U.S. Department of Education. (1987). <u>What works educating</u> <u>disadvantaged children: Schools that work</u>. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, p.44ff.

90. Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). (1986). <u>Good secondary schools: What makes them tick?</u> Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

91. Network for Effective Schools.

92. Urban Superintendents Network; see also, Ascher, C., & Flaxman, E.

93. Stedman, L. G. (1985). A new look at the effective schools literature. <u>Urban Education</u>, <u>20</u> (3), 309.

94. Stedman, L. G., p. 311.

95. Rowan, B., & Denk, C. E. (1984, Fall). Management succession, school socioeconomic context, and basic skills achievement. <u>American</u> <u>Educational Research Journal</u>, <u>21</u> (3), 513-517.

96. Bastian, A., et al., p. 117.

97. Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1986). The social context of effective schcols. <u>American Journal of Education</u>, <u>94</u> (3), 328-55.

98. See, for example, Dade County Public Schools. (1985). <u>Student</u> <u>case management system: User's guide</u>. Miami, FL: Dade County Public Schools, Bureau of Education.

99. Valdivieso, R.

100. Oakes, J.

101. Oakes, J., p. 8.

102. Oakes, J.

44

103. Ascher, C. (1986, August). Cooperative learning in the urban classroom. New York, NY: ERIC/CUE Digest Number 30, ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

104. Oakes, J.

105. Walker, E. M., & Madhere, S. (1987, April). Multiple retentions: Some consequences for the cognitive and affective maturation of minority elementary students. Urban Review, 22 (1), 85-102.

106. Williams, K. A. (1985). What research says about grade retention and academic achievement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 259-840)

107. Bowen, J., & Lipkowitz, D. (1985). Staying in school: The dropout challenge. Albany, NY: New York State School Boards Association.

108. Rachal, J., & Hoffman, L. M. (1985, April). The effects of remediation and retention upon basic skills performance among elementary students participating in a state basic skills test program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the AERA, Chicago, IL. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 262-065); Walker, E. M., & Madhere, S.

109. Walker, E. M., & Madhere, S.

110. New York City Board of Education. (1985, Fall). Chancellor's preliminary report on AIDP and DIPP. New York, NY: Author.

111. Ascher, C., & Flaxman, E.

112. Wheelock, A. (1986, Fall). Dropping out: What the research says. Equity and Choice, 3 (1), 7-10.

113. Flax, E. (1987, April 1) Pupil placement, suspension analyzed. Education Week, 16, p. 18.

114. Wheelock, A.

115. Rosenfeld, S. (1987, January). SGPB alert: Analysis of existing issues. How big is too big: High school size and quality of education. Research Triangle Park, NC: Southern Growth Policies Board.

116. Rosenfeld, S.

117. Institute for Educational Leadership. School dropouts: Everybody's problem. (1986). Washington, DC: Author, p.26.

45

118. Strother, D. B. (1986, December). Dropping out. <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, <u>68</u>, 327.

119. Glass, G. V., & Smith, M. L. (1978, September). <u>Meta-analysis of research on the relationship of class-size and achievement</u>. Boulder, CO: Laboratory of Educational Research, University of Colorado. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 168 129)

120. Cole, M., & Griffin, P., (Eds.). (1987). <u>Contextual factors in education: Improving science and mathematics education for minorities and women</u>. Madison, WI: Committee on Research on Mathematics, Science, and Technology Education, Wisconsin Center for Educational Research.

121. Bennett, W. (1986, September). <u>First lessons: A report on elementary education in America</u>. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

122. Bloom, B. S. (1980, February). The new direction in educational research: Alterable variables. <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, 382-388.

123. Bloom, B. S. (1980, February).

124. Bloom, B. S. (1984, May). The search for methods of group instruction as effective as one-to-one tutoring. <u>Educational Leadership</u>, 4-17.

125. Bloom, B. S. (1984, May).

126. Cole, M., & Griffin, P.

127. Cole, M., & Griffin, P.

128. Center for Social Organization of Schools (CSOS). (1983-84). <u>School uses of microcomputers: Reports from a national survey</u>. Issues 1-6. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University, Author.

129. Center for Social Organization of Schools.

130. Cole, M., & Griffin, P.

131. The Holmes Group. (1986, April). <u>Tomorrow's teachers</u>. East Lansing, MI: Author.

132. Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986, May). <u>A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century</u>. The Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. Washington, DC: Author.

133. Haberman, M. (1987). <u>Recruiting and selecting teachers for urban schools</u>. Urban Diversity Series Number 95. New York, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia

46

University.

134. Haberman, M.

135. Graham, P. A. (1987, April). Black teachers: A drastically scarce resource. Phi Delta Kappan, 68 (8), 598-605.

136. Haberman, M.

137. E. L. Boyer, cited in The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1987, September 8). CF NEWS. Washington, DC: Author.

138. Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI). (1987, March). Recent oversight experience in ECIA Chapter 1 programs. Bulletin OERI. Washington, DC: Author.

139. U.S. Department of Education. (1987, March).

140. Kennedy, M. M., et al. (1986, January)., p.6.

141. Kennedy, M. M., et al. (1986. January)., p.7-8.

142. Kennedy, M. M., et al. (1986, January)., p.8-9.

143. Kennedy, M. M., et al. (1986, January).

144. Wood, C. T., Gabriel, R., Marder, C., Gamel, N. N., Davis, A. (1986, December). A study of targeting practices used in the Chapter 1 program. Final Report, prepared for the U.S. Department of Education, Contract No. 400-85-1016. Palo Alto, CA: SRA Technologies.

145. Goetz, M. E. (1987, February). School districts' allocation of Chapter 1 resources. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

146. Farrar, E., & Millsap, M. A. (1986, December). State and local administration of the Chapter 1 program. Cambridge, MA: ABT Associates, Inc; Williams, B. I., Richmond, P. A., & Mason, B. J. (1986, December). Designs for compensatory education: Conference proceedings and papers. Washington, DC: Research and Evaluation Associates, Inc.

147. Kennedy, M. M., Birman, B. F. & Demaline, R. E. (1986, July). The effectiveness of Chapter 1 services. Second Interim Report from the national Assessment of Chapter I. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

148. Kennedy, M. M. et al. (1986, July), p.89.

149. Williams, B. I., et al. (1986, December).

47

150. Kennedy, M. M., et al. (1986, July), p.90.

151. Hakuta, K. (1986). Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism. New York, NY: Basic Books.

152. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (1987, April). Building an indivisible nation: Bilingual education in context. A Report from the ASCD Panel on Bilingual Education. Alexandria, VA: Author.

153. U.S. Department of Education. (1984). The condition of bilingual education in the nation, 1984. Arlington, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

154. Hakuta, K.

155. For a good summary, see Hakuta, K.; also Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

156. See Baker, K. A., & deKanter, A. A. (1983). An answer from research on bilingual education. American Education, 9 (6), 40-48; and Danoff, M. N., Coles, G. J., McLaughlin, D. M., & Reynolds, D. J. (1977, 1978). Evaluation of the impact of ESEA Title VI Spanish/English bilingual education program. 3 Vols. Palo Alto, CA: American Institutes for Research. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service Nos. ED 138 091, ED 154 634, and ED 154 635)

157. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, p. 40.

158. Hakuta, K.

159. United States General Accounting Office. (1987, March). Bilingual education: A new look at the research evidence. Washington, DC: Author.

160. GAO findings run counter to U.S. Education Department views. (1987, April 1). Education Week, p.39.

161. U.S. Department of Education. (1987). p.32.

162. Blank, R. K., & Messier, P. R. (Eds.). (1987). Planning and developing magnet schools: Experiences and observations. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. UD 025 778)

163. Royster, E., Baltzell, C. D., & Simmons, F. C. (1979, February). Study of the Emergency School Aid Act Magnet School Program. Final Report. Cambridge, MA: ABT Associates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. ED 177 262)

164. Blank, R., Dentler, R. A., Baltzell, D. C., & Chabotar, K. (1983). Survey of magnet schools: Analyzing a model for quality integrated education. Executive Summary. Final Report of a National Study for the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Budget and Evaluation. Chicago, IL and Washington, DC: James H. Lowry & Associates and ABT Associates. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 236 304)

165. Rossell, C. H., & Clarke, R. C. (1987, March). The carrot or the stick in school desegregation policy? A report to the National Institute of Education. Boston, MA: Boston University.

166. Rossell, C. H., & Clarke, R. C.

167. MAGI Educational Services, Inc. (1985, January). New York State magnet school research study. Albany, NY: The State Education Department, Division of Civil Rights and Intercultural Relations.

168. Rossell, C. H. (1985). What is attractive about magnet schools? Urban Education, 20 (1), 7-22.

169. Clark, T. A., & Irizarry, R. A. (1986). Identifying school-based dropout prevention strategies: A survey of high school and middle school programs in nine cooperating districts. New York, NY: Consortium on Dropout Prevention, New York University.

170. Hahn, A., & Danzberger, J. (1987, March). Dropouts in America: Enough is known for action. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

171. U.S. teachers and public, strongly in favor of sex education in schools, differ on appropriate topics. (1985, July/August). Family Planning Perspectives, 17 (4), 183.

172. Kenney, A. M. (1986, January/February). School-based clinics: A national conference. Family Planning Perspectives, 18 (1), 44-46.

173. Clifford, J. C. (1986). A taxonomy of dropout prevention strategies in selected School districts. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University, Doctoral Dissertation.

174. Dressel, E. (1981). New Futures School six year follow-up study of a sample of 136 former students who attended between 1974 and 1980. Draft.

175. Bastian, A., et al.

176. National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education. (1984, December). The unfinished agenda. Washington, DC: Author.

177. Cole, M., & Griffin, P. (Eds.).

178. Cited in Berryman, S. E. (1983). <u>Who will do science? Trends, and their causes, in minority and female representation among holders of advanced degrees in science and mathematics</u>. New York, NY: Rockefeller Foundation. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service NO. ED 245 052)

179. Ascher, C. (1985, February). <u>Increasing science achievement for disadvantaged students</u>. ERIC/CUE Digest Number 25. New York, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

180. Goleman, D. (1987, August 2). Girls and math: Is biology really destiny? Education Supplement to the <u>Sunday New York Times</u>, pp. 42-3.

181. Hall, P. Q. (1987, April). <u>A day's work...a life's work: A visit with some women whose careers began with chemical, civil, electrical, industrial, mechanical, and nuclear engineering</u>. Washington, DC: Office of Opportunities in Science, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

182. Schwartz, W. (1987, October). <u>Teaching Science and mathematics to At Risk Students</u>. ERIC/CUE Digest Number 36. New York, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

183. U.S. Department of Education. (1986). <u>What works: Research about teaching and learning</u>. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, p.7.

184. See, for example, Walberg, H. J. (1984, February). Families as partners in educational productivity, <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, <u>65</u> (6), 397-400; or Grau, M. E., Weinstein, T., & Walberg, H. J. (1983). School-based home instruction and learning. A quantitative synthesis, <u>Journal of Educational Research</u>, <u>76</u>, 351-360.

185. Walberg, H. (1984, May). Improving the productivity of America's schools. <u>Educational Leadership</u>, 19-26.

186. Committee for Economic Development, p.42.

187. Heath, S. B. (1983). <u>Way with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms</u>, New York, NY: Cambridge University Press; or Lareau, A., & Benson, C. (1984, February). The economics of home/school relationships: A cautionary note, <u>Phi Delta Kappan</u>, <u>65</u>, (6), 401-404.

188. Cole, M., & Griffin, P.

189. Swap, M. S. (1987); Cole, M., & Griffins, P.

190. Today's native sons: Inner-city black males are America's newest lost generation. (1986, December 1). Time Magazine, pp. 26-32.

191. Epstein, J. (1984, March). Single parents and the schools: The effect of marital status on parent and teacher evaluations. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University, Center for Social Organization of Schools.

192. Espinoza, R. (1985, November 30). Working parents project. Final Report (December 1, 1984 - November 30, 1985). Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 266 871)

193 Tran, X. C. (1982). The factors hindering indochinese parent participation in school activities. San Diego, CA: San Diego State University, Institute for Cultural Pluralism, p. 18. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 245-018)

194. Leler, H. (1983). Parent education and involvement in relation to the schools and to parents of school-aged children. In Haskins, R., & Adamson, D. (Eds.). Parent education and public policy. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

195. Ascher, C., & Flaxman, E., pp.11, 44.

196. Heath, S. B., & McLaughlin, W.

197. Committee for Economic Development, p.65.

198. Committee for Economic Development, p.65.

199. Committee for Economic Development, p.72.

200. U.S. Census. (1980). School enrollment for related children 3 to 17 years old by type of school, age, family income, in 1979, poverty status in 1979, race and Spanish origin, 1980. (Table 261, PC 80-1-DI-A). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

201. Slaughter, D. T., & Schneider, B. (1985, Spring/August). Parental goals and black student achievement in urban private elementary schools: A synopsis of preliminary research findings. The Journal of Intergroup Relations, 13 (1), 24-33.

202. For a review of this research, see Ascher, C. (1986, August). Black students and private schooling. ERIC/CUE Trends and Issues Series Number 4. New York, NY: ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Teachers College, Columbia University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 273 710)

203. Lee, V. (1986, September). Catholic school minority students have "reading proficiency advantage." Momentum, 20-24.

204. Coleman, J. S., & Hoffer, T.

205. Coleman, J. S., & Hoffer, T., p.127.