

and goal setting. A Summer Transition Program for incoming freshmen provides three weeks of academic enrichment in each of the core academic areas. About 70 students who fail two or more classes in the eighth grade attend the summer program.

- The **Long Beach Unified School District** assigns eighth-graders who fail two or more classes to an alternative program titled the Long Beach Preparatory Academy. The Prep Academy is a year-long program that has smaller classes than regular ninth-grade classes. A counselor and a social worker work closely with students and their families. In the program's first year in operation, close to 90 percent of over 280 participating students earned the right to be promoted to the ninth grade.

Charter Schools

Of the more than 500 federally funded charter schools operating in the nation, many serve students who are at risk of dropping out, are low achievers, or are in adjudication. Thirty percent of federally funded charter schools serve a high-poverty student population, 20 percent are alternative schools, and many focus on the needs of students with limited English language skills.

Sometimes, despite the best efforts of schools and teachers, students still are not ready to move on to the next grade. Alternative public schools or an alternative program within a school can offer a second chance for children who are failing. There are many different types, but most share the following characteristics: fewer students per teacher, individualized attention, a mentoring environment, clear academic and behavioral standards, a strong education program, strong parental participation, and counseling services.

Prevent dropouts and help students realize postsecondary opportunities

Strategies that create smaller learning environments and tailor instruction more closely to individual needs in a supportive environment are becoming a trend, not just for intervention and transition programs, but also for the design of middle and high schools more generally. Many high schools where dropping out has become a serious problem have redesigned the traditional, large, impersonal high school into smaller learning academies or schools within schools. Patterson High School in Baltimore, for example, has become a nationally recognized example of how

Reasons Students Drop of High School

- Dislike of school, often because school is boring and irrelevant to student needs;
- Low academic achievement and poor grades;
- Poverty, including the need or desire to work full time;
- A sense that teachers and administrators do not care about students; and
- Inability to feel comfortable in a large, depersonalized school setting.

personalizing relationships, along with concentrating on curriculum, can create a good learning environment.³⁵ The school adopted the Talent Development Model, reorganizing the school into four career academies and a special school just for ninth-graders. Instead of suspending or transferring students with discipline or attendance problems, Patterson has an after hours “Twilight School” to help get the students on track. After the first two years of implementation, the school’s attendance rate, school climate, and the percentage of students meeting state standards increased.³⁶

As mentioned earlier in this guide, 13 states now have exit exams aligned with state standards which high school students must pass in order to graduate. As such policies are adopted, the risk that students will drop out of school may increase if states and districts do not also implement strategies for helping students pass proficiency tests. In New York City for example, the “Post-5” program is designed to address the needs of students unable to meet graduation requirements. Students receive accelerated and alternative instruction but are held to the same high standard for graduation.

Motivating students to stay in school often involves expanding their horizons to think through and carry out career and postsecondary education goals. Several U.S. Department of Education programs respond to this new emphasis and help young people and adults develop the knowledge and skills they need for careers that often demand ever-higher levels of education and training. The School-to-Work Opportunities Act, administered jointly by the Department of Education and the Department of Labor, provides seed money to every state and to interested communities to develop and launch a comprehensive school-to-work system. These systems combine school-based and work-based learning with activities designed to prepare students for a first job.

The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act requires that schools provide transition services to help students with disabilities move more successfully from school to post-school activities, including post-secondary education, vocational training, and employment. The National Transition Alliance (NTA), funded under IDEA, provides technical assistance to state school-to-work systems to assist them in addressing the needs of students with disabilities in their programs. The NTA also develops and disseminates information about effective transition practices that support youth with disabilities in learning the skills needed to live successfully in the community and thrive in the workplace.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1998 include a new national effort to encourage more young people to have high expectations, stay in school and study hard, and go to college. In a recent survey, almost 70 percent of parents indicated that they have little information, or want more information, about which courses their child should take to prepare for college, and 89 percent of parents want more information about how to pay for college, including the use of tax credits.³⁷

Earlier this year President Clinton proposed the High Hopes for College initiative to create a national effort so that every college works in partnership with at least one middle school in a low-income community to help raise expectations and ensure that students are well prepared for

college. Under the new GEAR UP program (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs) the Department is spending \$120 million to fund competitive grants that support early college awareness activities at both the state and local levels. The initiative will award multiyear grants to locally designed partnerships between colleges and high-poverty middle and high schools, plus at least two other partners--such as community organizations, businesses, religious groups, state education agencies, parent groups, or nonprofits--to increase college attendance rates among low-income youth by:

- ▶ Informing students and parents about college options and financial aid,
- ▶ Promoting rigorous academic coursework based on college entrance requirements, and
- ▶ Providing comprehensive services--mentoring, tutoring, counseling, and other activities such as after-school programs, summer academic and enrichment programs, and college visits--to students beginning in grades 6 and 7 and continuing through high school graduation.

Each of these programs and strategies can contribute to ending social promotion by helping students feel that adults care about their future and helping the students understand how their academic careers are related to their future potential. Creating smaller learning communities, personalizing instruction, and introducing students to the world of college and work can give students a stake in their educational success that they might not otherwise develop.

Holding Schools Accountable for Performance and Helping Them Improve

Ending social promotion requires attention to the systemic issues that reduce the capacity of our schools to educate our children--plus a political will and an understanding of the long-term benefits of change. To achieve the goal of ending social promotion, states and districts will have to allocate the resources to help all students meet high standards. School administrators and teachers will then face the challenge of dealing with students who cannot make the grade. Ending social promotion involves taking risks and holding firm to the commitment to help all students reach their full potential. It requires holding stakeholders accountable for helping students reach high standards.

This section discusses the lessons to be learned from the experiences of districts that have made the effort to hold schools accountable for students' performance.

Require public reporting of school performance

Public reporting of school performance is playing an important role in holding schools more accountable and is an important tool for communicating to parents and the public about the quality of schools. To date, 36 states issue school-level report cards. An analysis of early report cards indicates that no two states report the exact same information, and the reports tended to be heavy on "input measures" that described the characteristics of schools rather than focusing on quality or performance.³⁸

To be useful, report cards need to display information about a variety of indicators, from student demographics and performance on assessments to use of resources and parental involvement. In some states, such as New York, report cards permit comparisons of student achievement results across similar schools in the state based on the age of students, the resource capacity of the district or school, and the economic needs of the students. Recent amendments to the Individuals with Disabilities Act also require that, under certain conditions, the performance of students with disabilities be included in these reports.

School Report Cards: What Do Parents Really Want to Know?

A recent special study on school report cards by *Education Week* reveals what parents, taxpayers, and educators feel they need to know about schools in order to make schools more accountable for results. Parents rated the following as the top ten indicators that could be reported to hold schools accountable:

- school safety
- teacher qualifications
- class sizes
- graduation rates
- dropout rates
- statewide test scores
- parent survey data
- SAT scores
- percent of students promoted to the next grade
- attendance rates

-Quality Counts, 1999

In many states these report cards are distributed each year to parents and are publicized in local media when released. State, district, and school leaders generally agree that publishing school level indicators of achievement has been an important means of holding schools accountable for the student performance.

Intervene in low-performing schools

Accountability for performance means that there must be consequences for schools that fail to help students achieve. Earlier this year the President released *Turning Around Low-Performing Schools: A Guide for State and Local Leaders*. The guide makes the point that holding schools accountable is not enough. Chronically low performing schools rarely have the capacity, on their own, to make the kinds of changes necessary to improve students' achievement. In these cases, states and districts must help create the capacity, vision, and commitment needed to improve. The guide examined numerous strategies pursued by districts across the country to intervene in chronically low-performing schools, including efforts in:

- ▶ **New York City**, where the city's lowest-performing schools, as identified by the New York State Education Department as Schools Under Registration Review (SURR), are assigned to the "Chancellor's District." The Chancellor's District Intervention Plan includes an in-depth assessment of existing school conditions using the Performance Assessment in Schools System (PASS) review, a comprehensive plan to address identified needs, and an intensive support system that ensures quality implementation. This focused intervention has resulted in the removal from the SURR list of all but four of the twelve schools in the Chancellor's Districts within the span of only two years.
- ▶ **In Chicago**, where very low performing schools are placed on probation. As part of the process, schools must develop a corrective action plan. Schools must select an external partner to assist them in the process. The district provides a school operations manager to deal with fiscal and administrative matters so that the principal can focus on improving instruction. The district also assigns a probation monitor (a former or current successful principal) to monitor a school's progress toward improving student achievement.

Because social promotion and retention disproportionately affect disadvantaged students in needy schools, it is essential that efforts to hold these schools and students accountable for meeting standards are accompanied by effective intervention strategies.

Reward school improvement

Holding schools accountable for performance means not only intervening in and assisting schools where students are not meeting standards but also providing incentives for schools to continually improve performance and rewarding schools that meet expectations.

- ▶ **In Maryland**, schools that attain significant improvement over a one-year period receive a certificate of recognition. Schools that improve over two to three years receive

monetary awards (ranging from \$19,000 to \$79,000 per school). School improvement teams decide how funds are spent for the benefit of the entire school.

- In **North Carolina**, schools achieving exemplary growth/gain (approximately 10 percent above statewide average) or expected growth/gain are eligible for incentive awards, which can be distributed as direct bonuses to teachers or can be used by the school. For exemplary gains, schools receive up to \$1,500 for each certified staff member and \$500 for each teacher assistant. For expected gains, schools receive up to \$750 per certified staff member and \$375 for each teacher assistant. To be eligible for incentives, schools must not have excessive exemptions and must test at least 98 percent of eligible K-8 students and 95 percent of high school students.

Ending social promotion requires real accountability for results--and this accountability must begin at the school level. These strategies require strong leadership, a sense of collective responsibility from within and outside the school, and open and honest communication among stakeholders.

Conclusion

Social promotion is an unacceptable response to the problem of low-achieving students in our nation's schools. All of us must take responsibility for ending social promotion and be prepared to ensure that *every* student achieves to his or her full potential and to the highest standards.

Few, if any, of the recommendations in this guide can, by themselves, meet this challenge. Ending social promotion is not a stand-alone policy that can be adopted and implemented but it is an important step in sending the message about how important it is for students to meet standards at critical points during their education. It requires a comprehensive effort that addresses multiple problems and a variety of student needs. It means setting high standards and measures of accountability for schools and students and taking responsibility for student performance. It also means building the capacity of schools and students to meet those expectations, and intervening to help students who fall behind. Ending social promotion requires states, districts, and schools to address issues associated with the quality of teachers, the quality of the curriculum and its alignment with standards and assessments, and family support of educational activities. A comprehensive approach to ending social promotion requires early identification and intervention for students with special needs, and effective programs for extending the time and increasing the attention that some students need to meet expectations. It also means encouraging the involvement of more parents in the education of their children at home, in the school, and with the community.

Truly embracing the idea that all children can learn--and making sure that all children do--requires that we all take responsibility for ending social promotion and commit our energy, resources, and best ideas to this effort.

U.S. Department of Education's Inventory of Resources for Ending Social Promotion

This section provides an inventory of federal program resources that states, districts, and schools can use to help end social promotion and improve academic achievement for all students.

New Programs for 1999

Class Size Reduction. The 1999 budget provides \$1.2 billion to hire approximately 30,000 new teachers. It is the first installment in the Administration's commitment to help school districts hire and train 100,000 new teachers. The initiative aims to help reduce class size in grades 1-3 to a nationwide average of 18. States are receiving funds to boost teacher quality through recruitment, hiring and training. For more information telephone Cathy Schagh at (202) 260-3858 or Connie Deshpande at (202) 401-0113.

The Reading Excellence Act. To help all children learn to read well and independently by the end of third grade, this initiative focuses on strategies for creating extended learning opportunities, providing high-quality classroom instruction, strengthening parental involvement and investment in early childhood education, promoting greater public awareness about literacy, and supporting research and evaluation. The 1999 budget provides \$260 million to support this initiative. Already, thousands of federal work-study and community volunteer tutors are helping children develop their reading skills. For further information, see the Web site at <<http://www.ed.gov/inits/americanreads>> or telephone Joseph Conaty at (202) 401-0113.

GEAR UP (Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduate Programs).

This

new competitive-grant program provides \$120 million in 1999 to support early intervention and college awareness activities at both the local and the state levels to help low-income middle-school children prepare for college. GEAR UP funding will be split between college-school-community partnership grants and state grants. To learn more about the program, telephone 1-800-USA-LEARN or visit the GEAR UP Web site at <<http://www.ed.gov/gearup>>.

High Standards of Learning for All Students

The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program. This new program helps schools identify and adopt the high-quality, well-defined, and research-based comprehensive schoolwide reform models that show the most promise of preparing children to meet challenging

state content and performance standards. In 1998, \$145 million was made available to be distributed as formula grants to state education agencies that will use the funds to make competitive grants to local education agencies. In FY 1999, \$120 million will be administered for this program under Title I and \$25 million under the Fund for the Improvement of Education. For further information, telephone Bill Kincaid at (202) 205-4292 or see the Web site at <<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/compreform/>>.

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I, the largest federal education program for prekindergarten through grade 12, has one overriding goal: to improve teaching and learning for low-achieving children so that they can meet challenging academic standards. Funds are provided to districts and schools in accordance with their numbers of poor children. Schools with poverty rates of 50 percent or higher may combine their Title I funds with state and local resources and most other federal education funds to upgrade their entire education program rather than targeting services only to identified children. Schools with poverty rates below 50 percent, or those that choose not to adopt a schoolwide program, may give services to those children identified as failing or most at risk of failing. For further information, telephone Mary Jean LeTendre at (202) 260-0826 or see the Web site at <<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/CEP/>>.

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Goals 2000 is based on the premises that higher expectations produce better performance, that academic standards should be raised, and that schools and teachers should be specific about what they expect children to learn. Goals 2000 challenges states and communities to develop and implement academic content standards, student performance standards and assessments, and plans for improving teacher training. Districts may apply for one of three types of grants: local reform, professional development, or preservice training. Goals 2000 also provides the authority to waive statutory and regulatory requirements of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act and of the following programs under the ESEA: Title I; Title II, Eisenhower Professional Development; Title IV, Safe and Drug-Free Schools; Title VI, Innovative Education Strategies; and Title VII, Part C, Emergency Immigrant Education. For further information, telephone Patricia Gore at (202) 401-0039 or see the Web site at <<http://www.ed.gov/G2K>>.

Extending Learning Time

21st Century Community Learning Centers. This program is authorized under Title X, Part I, of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The funds must be used to expand a school's capacity to address the educational needs of its community. The program's focus is on expanding learning opportunities for children in a safe, drug-free, and supervised environment and brings much-needed attention to supplementary learning activities that address adolescence and the problems of drug use, gang involvement, and violence. The program has established a priority for projects designed to assist students in meeting or exceeding state or local standards in core academic subjects. The program will award \$160 million in new grants in 1999 to serve approximately 1,700 schools and 250,000 students. For further information, telephone Bob Stonehill at (202) 219-2088 or see the Web site at <<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OERI/21stCCLC>>.

Safe Environment for Learning

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program. This program provides funds to help states, schools, and communities design, implement, and evaluate alcohol and drug education and prevention programs. State education agencies (SEAs) are required to distribute 91 percent of their program funds to local education agencies for prevention of drug use and violence. Activities authorized under the statute include: the development of instructional materials; counseling services; after-school programs; professional development programs for school personnel, students, law enforcement officials, judicial officials, or community leaders; conflict resolution, peer mediation, and mentoring programs; character education programs and community service projects; the establishment of safe zones of passage for students to and from school; and the acquisition and installation of metal detectors and the hiring of security personnel. The Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Act also requires states to target a portion of resources to districts where they are most needed. The law increases accountability by requiring states to measure the success of their programs against clearly defined goals and objectives. For further information, telephone Bill Modzeleski at (202) 260-3954 or see the Web site at <<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/SDFS>>.

Technology

Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund provides funds to states, on a formula basis, to help local districts use technology to strengthen their educational programs. The goals of the Challenge Fund are to provide all teachers with the training and support they need to help students learn by using technology, provide all schools with modern computers, connect all classrooms to the information superhighway, and make effective software and on-line learning resources integral parts of the curriculum in schools. Ninety-five percent of the funds that a state receives must be awarded to school systems on a competitive basis. For further information, telephone Charles Lovett at (202) 401-0039 or visit the Web site at <<http://www.ed.gov/Technology/inititiv.html>>.

Alternative Public Schools

The Public Charter Schools Program. The Charter Schools Program provides financial assistance for designing and implementing charter schools created by teachers, parents, and other community members. Grants are available on a competitive basis to state education agencies (SEAs) in states that allow charter schools; the SEAs make subgrants to authorized public chartering agencies in partnership with developers of charter schools. If an eligible SEA chooses not to participate or if its application for funding is not approved, the Department can make grants directly to eligible local partnerships. Charter schools are free from most education laws and regulations except civil rights and safety laws, but are accountable for results. In return for increased accountability, they gain autonomy in such areas as personnel, curriculum, budgets, scheduling, and other matters through a legal contract with a school board or other public chartering agency authorized by state law. Standards for performance

are established in the contract. For further information, telephone John Fiegel at (202) 260-2671 or visit the Web site at <<http://www.uscharterschools.org>> .

Promoting Family Involvement

The Partnership for Family Involvement in Education. The mission of the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education is to promote children's learning through the development and use of family-school-community-business partnerships that strengthen schools and improve student achievement. A growing grass-roots movement of over 4,000 schools, employers, and community and religious groups has emerged to support local and national efforts, including adopting family-friendly business practices; providing before- and after-school activities for children; giving parents the resources, training, and information they need to help children learn; and promoting family and community involvement in children's learning. For further information, visit the Web site at <<http://www.ed.gov/PFIE/>> or call 1-800-USA-LEARN.

Preparing Students for Work

School-to-Work Program. A growing understanding of the relationship between our educational performance and our competitiveness in the global economy has led to a new emphasis on the connections between school and work, and a new appreciation of the importance of vocational education and opportunities for lifelong learning. The 1994 School-to-Work Opportunities Act, administered jointly by the Department of Education and the Department of Labor, provides seed money to every state and to interested communities to develop and launch a comprehensive school-to-work system. These systems combine school-based and work-based learning with activities designed to prepare students for a first job. For more information, visit the Web site at <<http://www.stw.ed.gov>> .

Vocational Education. Perkins Act Vocational Education State grants provide funds to help pay for vocational training programs at both the secondary and postsecondary levels. Funds may be used in accordance with state-developed plans to support activities ranging from pre-vocational courses for secondary school students to retraining adults in response to changing technological and labor market conditions. Another area of significant federal support to assist states in preparing individuals for employment is Vocational Rehabilitation. The Department provides Vocational Rehabilitation state grants that assist one million adults with disabilities, most of them severe, in achieving successful employment outcomes and independent living. As a result of this program, about 200,000 individuals with disabilities are placed each year in jobs in the competitive labor market or become self-employed. About 80 percent of those individuals report that their own income, rather than public assistance or family income, is their primary source of support. For more information, visit the Web site at <<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OVAE>> .

Technical Assistance Providers

Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers. These 15 centers assist states, local education agencies (LEAs), American Indian tribes, schools, and other recipients of funds under the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA). Priority for services is given to high-poverty schools and districts, Bureau of Indian Affairs schools, and IASA recipients implementing schoolwide programs. The centers help recipients of IASA funds implement school reform programs; adopt, adapt, and implement proven practices for improving teaching and learning; coordinate school reform programs with other federal, state, and local education plans and activities; and administer IASA programs. They provide assistance by identifying and disseminating successful practices and appropriate research-based programs to schools, districts, SEAs, and other educational entities; creating mentoring relationships between low-performing and high-achieving schools; and providing high-quality professional development for state, school district, and school personnel to increase their capacities for supporting programs authorized by IASA. For further information on the centers in general, telephone Edith Harvey at (202) 260-1393 or see the Web site at <<http://www.ed.gov/oese/>>. Contact information for individual centers as follows:

Region I

Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont

New England Comprehensive Assistance Center

Wendy Allen, Director
Education Development Center, Inc.
55 Chapel St.
Newton, MA 02158-1069
Phone: (617) 969-7110, ext. 2201
Fax: (617) 965-6325
E-mail: wallen@edc.org
Web site: <http://www.edc.org/NECAC/>

Region III

Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C.

Region III Comprehensive Center

Charlene Rivera, Director
Institute for Equity & Excellence in Education
George Washington University
1730 N. Lynn St., Suite 401
Arlington, VA 22209
Phone: (703) 528-3588
Fax: (703) 528-5973
E-mail: crivera@ceee.gwu.edu
Web site: <http://www.gwu.edu/nieee>

Region II

New York State

New York Technical Assistance Center (NYTAC)

LaMar P. Miller, Executive Director
New York University
82 Washington Square East, Suite 72
New York, NY 10003
Phone: (800) 469-8224
Fax: (212) 995-4199
E-mail: millrla@is2.nyu.edu
Web site: <http://www.nyu.edu/education/metrocenter>

Region IV

Kentucky, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia

Region IV Comprehensive Technical Assistance Center

Terry Eidell, Executive Director
Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc.
Math and Science Consortium
P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325-13248
Phone: (304) 347-0400 or (800) 624-9120
Fax: (304) 347-0487
E-mail: aelinfo@ael.org
Web site: <http://www.ael.org>

Region V

Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi

Region 5 SE Comprehensive Assistance Center

Hai T. Tran, Director

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

3330 N. Causeway Blvd., Ste. 430

Metairie, LA 70002-3573

Phone: (504) 838-6861 or (800) 644-8671

Fax: (504) 831-5242

E-mail: htran@sedl.org

Web site: <http://www.sedl.org/secac/>

Region VI

Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota,

South Dakota, Wisconsin

Comprehensive Regional Assistance Center**Consortium - Region VI**

Walter Secada, Director

University of Wisconsin

1025 W. Johnson St.

Madison, WI 53706

Phone: (608) 263-4220

Fax: (608) 263-3733

E-mail: wgsecada@facstaff.wisc.edu

Web site: <http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/ccvi/>

Region VII

Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska,

Oklahoma

Region VII Comprehensive Center

John Steffens, Executive Director

Belinda Biscoe, Director

University of Oklahoma

555 E. Constitution St., Suite 111

Norman, OK 73072-7820

Phone: (405) 325-1729 or (800) 228-1766

Fax: (405) 325-1824

E-mail: regionvii@ou.edu

Web site: <http://www.occe.ou.edu/comp/comp.html>

Region VIII

Texas

Star Center

Maria Robledo Montecel, Executive Director

Albert Cortez, Site Director

Intercultural Development Research Association

Institute for Policy & Leadership

5835 Callaghan Rd., Suite 350

San Antonio, TX 78228-1190

Phone: (210) 684-8180 or (888) 394-7827

Fax: (210) 684-5389

E-mail: idra@idra.org

Web site: <http://www.idra.org>

Region IX

Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, Utah

Southwest Comprehensive Regional Assistance Center

Paul E. Martinez, Director

New Mexico Highlands University

500 Laser Rd., NE, Suite B

Rio Rancho, NM 87124

Phone: (505) 891-6111 or (800) 247-4269

Fax: (505) 891-5744

E-mail: info@cesdp.nmhu.edu

Web site: <http://www.cesdp.nmhu.edu>

Region X

Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, Wyoming

Northwest Regional Assistance Center

Carlos Sundermann, Director

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

101 Southwest Main St., Suite 500

Portland, OR 97204

Phone: (503) 275-9480

Fax: (503) 275-9625

E-mail: mwrac@nwrel.org

Web site: <http://www.nwrac.org>

Region XI

Northern California

Comprehensive Assistance Center**WestEd**

Beverly Farr, Director

730 Harrison St.

San Francisco, CA 94107-1242

Phone: (415) 565-3009 or (800) 64-LEARN

Fax: (415) 565-3012

E-mail: bfarr@wested.org

Web site: <http://www.wested.org/cc>

Region XII

Southern California

Southern California Comprehensive Assistance Center

Henry Mothner, Director

Los Angeles County Office of Education

9300 Imperial Highway

Downey, CA 90242-2890

Phone: (562) 922-6364

Fax: (562) 922-6699

E-mail: mothner_henry@laoe.edu

Web site: <http://sccas.laoe.edu>

Region XIII***Alaska*****Alaska Comprehensive Regional Assistance Center**

Bill Buell, Director

South East Regional Resource Center

210 Ferry Way, Suite 200

Juneau, AK 99801

Phone: (907) 586-6806

Fax: (907) 463-3811

E-mail: joannh@akrac.k12.ak.us

Web site: <http://www.akrac.k12.ak.us>**Region XIV*****Florida, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands*****Comprehensive Assistance Center**

Trudy Hensley, Director

Educational Testing Service

1979 Lake Side Parkway, Suite 400

Tucker, GA 30084

Phone: (770) 723-7434 or (800) 241-3865

Fax: (770) 723-7436

E-mail: thensley@ets.orgWeb site: <http://www.cal.org/cal/html/cc14.htm>**Region XV*****American Samoa, Federated States of Micronesia,
Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands,
Guam, Hawaii, Republic of the Marshall Islands,
Republic of Palau*****Pacific Center**

Pacific Resources for Education Learning

John W. Kofel, Executive Director

Fort Street Mall, Suite 500

Honolulu, HI 96813-4321

Phone: (808) 533-6000

Fax: (808) 533-7599

E-mail: kofelj@prel-oahu-1.prel.hawaii.eduWeb site: <http://prel-oahu-1.prel.hawaii.edu>

Regional Resource and Federal Center Program for Special Education. These centers promote communication among states and school districts about implementing systemwide reform with a particular focus on special education. They provide key technical assistance to state education agencies, school districts, and their partners, as well as link SEAs and school districts with providers of technical assistance.

The Federal Resource Centers for Education

Carol Valdivieso, Director

Academy for Educational Development

1875 Connecticut Ave. NW

Washington, DC 20009

Phone: (202) 884-8215

Fax: (202) 884-8443

E-mail: frc@aed.orgWeb site: <http://www.dssc.org/frc/>**Mid-South Regional Resource Center**

Ken Olson, Director

Human Development Institute

University of Kentucky

126 Mineral Industries Building

Lexington, KY 40506-0051

Phone: (606) 257-4921

Fax: (606) 257-4353

E-mail: MSRRC@ihdi.ihdi.uky.eduWeb site: <http://www.ihdi.uky.edu/projects/MSRRC/>**Northeast Regional Resource Center**

Dolly Fleming, Director

Trinity College of Vermont

Colchester Avenue

Burlington, VT 05401

Phone: (802) 658-503

Fax: (802) 658-7435

E-mail: nerrc@aol.comWebsite: <http://interact.uoregon.edu/wrrc/nerrc/index.html>**Southeast Regional Resource Center**

James Wright, Director

Auburn University Montgomery School of Education

P.O. Box 244023

Montgomery, AL 361124

Phone: (334) 244-3879

Fax: (334) 244-3835

Email: jwright@edla.aum.eduWeb: <http://edla.aum.edu/serrc/serrc.html>

Great Lakes Area Regional Resource Center

Larry Magliocca, Director
The Ohio State University
700 Ackerman Rd., Suite 440
Columbus, OH 43202
Phone: (614) 447-0844
Fax: (614) 447-9043
E-mail: marshall.76@osu.edu
Web site: <http://www.csnp.ohio-state.edu/glarrc.htm>

Western Regional Resource Center

Richard Zeller, Director
1268 University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1268
Phone: (541) 346-5641
Fax: (541) 346-5639
E-mail: richard_zeller@ccmail.uoregon.edu
Web site: <http://interact.uoregon.edu/wrrc/wrrc.html>

Mountain Plains Regional Resource Center

John Copenhaver, Director
Utah State University
1780 North Research Parkway, Suite 112
Logan, UT 84341
Phone: (801) 752-0238
Fax: (801) 753-9750
E-mail: cope@cc.usu.edu
Web site: <http://www.usu.edu/~mprrc>

The Regional Educational Laboratories. The Regional Educational Laboratory program, the Department's largest research and development investment, provides a wealth of assistance that can help schools end social promotion. The 10 regional laboratories help anyone involved in improving education to gain access to the best available research and knowledge from practice. The laboratories are especially strong in helping schools identify needs, suggesting appropriate remedies, and adapting reform programs to schools' own needs. Laboratories can also help schools improve curriculum, assessment, and evaluation practices.

Western Region

Arizona, California, Nevada, Utah

WestEd

Glen Harvey, Director
Tom Ross, Inquiries
730 Harrison St.
San Francisco, CA 94107
Phone: (415) 565-3000
Fax: (415) 565-3012
E-mail: tross@wested.org
Web site: <http://www.wested.org>
Specialty Area: Assessment and Accountability

Central Region

Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wyoming

Mid-Continent Regional Educational Laboratory

J. Timothy Waters, Executive Director
2550 S. Parker Rd., Suite 500
Aurora, CO 80014
Phone: (303) 337-0990
Fax: (303) 337-3005
E-mail: twaters@mcrel.org
Web site: www.mcrel.org
Specialty Area: Curriculum, Learning and Instruction

Midwestern Region

Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Ohio, Wisconsin

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL)

Jeri Nowakowski, Executive Director
1900 Spring Rd., Suite 300
Oak Brook, IL 60521
Phone: (630) 571-4700
Fax: (630) 571-4716
E-mail: info@ncrel.org
Web site: <http://www.ncrel.org>
Specialty Area: Technology

Northwestern Region

Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Ethel Simon-McWilliams, Executive Director
101 SW Main St., Suite 500
Portland, OR 97204
Phone: (503) 275-9500 or (800) 547-6339
Fax: (503) 275-9489
E-mail: info@nwrel.org
Web site: <http://www.nwrel.org>
Specialty Area: School Change Processes

Pacific Region

American Samoa, Federated States of Micronesia, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, Hawaii, Republic of the Marshall Islands, Republic of Palau

Pacific Resources for Education and Learning

John W. Kofel, Executive Director
828 Fort Street Mall, Suite 500
Honolulu, HI 96813-4321
Phone: (808) 533-6000
Fax: (808) 533-7599
E-mail: kofelj@prel-oahu-1.prel.hawaii.edu
Web site: <http://prel-oahu-1.prel.hawaii.edu>
Specialty Area: Language and Cultural Diversity

Northeastern Region

Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New York, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virgin Islands

Northeast and Islands Laboratory at Brown University (LAB)

Phil Zarlengo, Executive Director
222 Richmond St., Suite 300
Providence, RI 02903
Phone: (401) 274-9548 or (800) 521-9550
Fax: (401) 421-7650
E-mail: Phil_Zarlengo@Brown.edu
Web site: <http://www.lab.brown.edu>
Specialty Area: Language and Cultural Diversity

Mid-Atlantic Region

Delaware, Maryland, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Washington, D.C.

Mid-Atlantic Laboratory for Student Success (LSS)

Margaret Wang, Executive Director
933 Ritter Annex
1301 Cecil B. Moore Ave.
Philadelphia, PA 19122
Phone: (215) 204-3001
Fax: (215) 204-5130
E-mail: lss@vm.temple.org
Web site: <http://www.temple.org/LSS>
Specialty Area: Urban Education

Southeastern Region

Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina

SouthEastern Regional Vision for Education (SERVE)

Don Holznagel, Acting Executive Director
P.O. Box 5367
Greensboro, NC 27435
Phone: (910) 334-3211 or (800) 755-3277
Fax: (910) 334-3268
E-mail: rforbes@serve.org
Web site: <http://www.serve.org>
Specialty Area: Early Childhood Education

Southwestern Region

Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory

Wesley Hoover, Executive Director
211 E. Seventh St.
Austin, TX 78701
Phone: (512) 476-6861
Fax: (512) 476-2286
E-mail: whoover@sedl.org
Web site: <http://www.sedl.org>
Specialty Area: Language and Cultural Diversity

Appalachia Region

Kentucky, Tennessee, Virginia, West Virginia

Appalachia Educational Laboratory, Inc. (AEL)

Terry Eidell, Director
1031 Quarrier St.
P.O. Box 1348
Charleston, WV 25325
Phone: (304) 347-0400 or (800) 624-9120
Fax: (304) 347-0487
E-mail: eidellt@ael.org
Web site: <http://www.ael.org>
Specialty Area: Rural Education

Equity Assistance Centers (formerly Desegregation Assistance Centers). The U.S. Department of Education supports ten regional equity assistance centers under Title IV of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. They provide assistance in the areas of race, gender, and national origin equity to public school districts to promote equal educational opportunities. For links to and more information about these centers visit the Web site at [<http://www.ed.gov/EdRes/EdFed/equity.html>](http://www.ed.gov/EdRes/EdFed/equity.html).

Research

Research & Development Centers. The Department's Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) supports 12 Research & Development Centers. These centers, which are located at major universities around the country, conduct research and development on topics such as reading, the education of at-risk children, early childhood development, postsecondary education, and education policy. These centers can be accessed through the Web at [<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OERI/ResCtr.html>](http://www.ed.gov/offices/OERI/ResCtr.html).

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC). ERIC offers many resources to parents, students, teachers, and administrators who are interested in improving achievement at their schools. ERIC is a national information system that provides ready access to an extensive body of education-related literature. It is the world's largest source of education information. The ERIC database contains nearly 1 million abstracts of documents and journal articles on education research and practice. All ERIC clearinghouses have toll-free phone numbers and Web sites. In addition, the ERIC Clearinghouse on Information & Technology hosts ASK ERIC, a service that responds within 48 hours to any question about education. You can ask questions directly from the AskEric Web site at [<http://www.askeric.org>](http://www.askeric.org) or e-mail [<askeric@askeric.org>](mailto:askeric@askeric.org).

The Fund for the Improvement of Education. This fund supports nationally significant programs to improve the quality of education, help all students meet challenging state content standards, and contribute to the achievement of the National Education Goals. Grants and contracts may be awarded to state and local education agencies, institutions of higher education, and other public and private organizations and institutions. Recently, projects have been funded that might offer assistance to low-performing schools, including the development of state curriculum frameworks, content standards, and standards-based professional development projects. For more information, telephone Lois Weinberg at (202) 219-2147; e-mail: Lois_Weinberg@ed.gov; or fax: (202) 219-2053.

The Eisenhower National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education (ENC). ENC serves as a central dissemination point for information about curriculum materials and education reform. ENC promotes excellence in K-12 math and science education through a comprehensive collection of curriculum materials and nationwide dissemination of information and materials for all educators. ENC is located at Ohio State University, 1929 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210-1079; or telephone (614) 292-8389 or (800) 621-5785; or visit the Web site at [<http://www.enc.org>](http://www.enc.org).

The Eisenhower Regional Consortia for Mathematics and Science Education. The Consortia work in conjunction with the Eisenhower National Clearinghouse to support professional development of K-12 teachers, including those located in low-performing schools. The Consortia of 10 grantees provide technical assistance and disseminate information to help states and individual educators implement math and science programs in accordance with new standards. Specific areas of assistance are teacher professional development, student assessment, and uses of technology. For further information, telephone Carolyn Warren at (202) 219-2206.

Blue Ribbon Schools Program. The Blue Ribbon Schools Program promotes school improvement by identifying and recognizing outstanding public and private schools, making research-based effectiveness criteria available to all schools so that they can assess themselves and plan improvements, and encouraging schools to share information about best practices. The program specifically celebrates those schools that have shown significant improvement over five years. For further information, see the Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OERI/BlueRibbonSchools/about.html> > .

Helpful Documents

The following documents are available by calling the U.S. Department of Education at 1-877-4ED-PUBS. Additional publications are listed on the Department's Web site at <http://www.ed.gov> > .

School Reform:

- ▶ *A Call to Action for American Education in the 21st Century*
- ▶ *Answer the Call to Action: Put High Expectations and Standards of Excellence into Action in Your Schools. Questions, Ideas, and Information to Get You Started*
- ▶ *School-Based Reform Guide*
- ▶ *Implementing Schoolwide Programs*
- ▶ *Improving Schools from the Bottom Up*
- ▶ *Turning Around Low-Performing Schools: A Guide for State and Local Policymakers*

Reading Well and Independently by the End of Third Grade:

- ▶ *America Reads Challenge* information
- ▶ *Just Add Kids: A Resource Directory of Learning Partners, Reading Sites, and Other Literacy Organizations That Serve Children and Their Families*

- ▶ *Ready*Set*Read* (in English or in Spanish)
- ▶ *Simple Things*
- ▶ *Checkpoints for Progress*

Preparing Students Academically and Financially for College:

- ▶ *Preparing Your Child for College*
- ▶ *Getting Ready for College Early: A Handbook for Parents of Students in the Middle and Junior High School Years*
- ▶ *Think College? Me? Now?*

Mastering the Basic and Core Subjects to Meet High Standards:

- ▶ *Moving America to the Head of the Class*
- ▶ *Achieving the Goals, Goal 5: First in the World in Math and Science*

Teacher Quality:

- ▶ *Teachers and Goals 2000: Leading the Journey toward High Standards for All Students*
- ▶ *A New Teacher's Guide to the U.S. Department of Education*
- ▶ *New Skills for New Teachers: Preparing Teachers in Family Involvement*
- ▶ *Promising Practices: New Ways to Improve Teacher Quality*

Technology:

- ▶ *Parents' Guide to the Internet*

Family and Community Involvement in Education:

- ▶ *Strong Families, Strong Schools: Building Community Partnerships for Education*
- ▶ *Keeping Schools Open as Community Learning Centers*
- ▶ *America Goes Back to School*
- ▶ *Employers, Families, and Education*
- ▶ *Reaching All Families: Creating Family-Friendly Schools*

- ▶ *Partnership for Family Involvement in Education* information
- ▶ *A Compact for Learning: An Action Handbook for Family-School-Community Partnerships*
- ▶ *Seven Good Practices for Families* (poster)
- ▶ *Summer Home Learning Recipes for Parents*
- ▶ *Welcome to School: Questions Parents Might Ask*
- ▶ *Ideabook: Family Involvement in Children's Education: Successful Local Approaches*

Mentoring:

- ▶ *Yes You Can: A Guide for Establishing Mentoring Programs to Prepare Youth for College*

Extending Learning Time:

- ▶ *Safe and Smart: Making the After-School Hours Work for Kids*

The following documents are available by calling OERI's National Library of Education at 1-800-424-1616:

- ▶ *Read with Me: A Guide for Student Volunteers Starting Early Childhood Programs*
- ▶ *Tried and True: Tested Ideas for Teaching and Learning from the Regional Educational Laboratories*
- ▶ *Transforming Ideas for Teaching and Learning Reading*
- ▶ *Confronting the Odds: Students at Risk and the Pipeline to Higher Education*
- ▶ *Early Childhood Digest: Families and Teachers as Partners*
- ▶ *Reaching All Families*
- ▶ *Parent Involvement in Children's Education: Efforts by Public Elementary Schools*

The following documents are available by calling the Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools Clearinghouse at 1-800-624-0100:

- ▶ *Creating Safe Schools: A Resource Collection for Planning and Action*
- ▶ *Growing Up Drug Free: A Parent's Guide to Prevention*
- ▶ *Ready*Set*Go*, an early childhood publication of the Safe and Drug Free Schools program
- ▶ *Success Stories '94: A Guide to Safe, Disciplined, & Drug-Free Schools*

Notes

1. For more on the effects of retention see Woodward and Kimmey, 1997; Alexander, Entwisle, and Dauber, 1994; Westbury, 1994; Matzicopoulos and Morrison, 1992; Pierson and Connell, 1992; Reynolds, 1992; and Johnson, Merrell, and Stover, 1990.
2. Setencich, 1994.
3. Hauser, 1998.
4. National Center for Education Statistics, 1992.
5. National Center for Education Statistics, 1996; Current Population Statistics, 1996.
6. Asimov, 1998.
7. Hauser, 1998.
8. Karweit, 1998.
9. Current Population Statistics, 1996.
10. Public Agenda, 1998.
11. Peter D. Hart Associates, 1996. All of the findings were also published in American Federation of Teachers, 1997.
12. American Federation of Teachers, 1998.
13. American Federation of Teachers, 1997.
14. Smith and Shepard, 1987; Setencich, 1994; Sakowicz, 1996.
15. Shepard and Smith, 1990.
16. Daley, 1998.
17. American Federation of Teachers, 1998.
18. Public Agenda, 1996.
19. O'Day and Smith, 1993.
20. American Federation of Teachers, 1997; Education Week, 1998; Council of Chief State School Officers, 1998.
21. Bishop, 1998.
22. National Research Council, 1998.

23. National Center for Education Statistics, 1998; U.S. Department of Education, 1997; Henderson and Lewis, 1997.
24. U.S. Department of Education, 1997.
25. U.S. Department of Education, 1998.
26. NAEP, 1996; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, 1996.
27. National Research Council, 1998.
28. U.S. Department of Education, 1996; Lewis, 1992.
29. U.S. Department of Education.
30. Oakes, 1985; 1995.
31. U.S. Department of Education, 1998.
32. U.S. Department of Education, 1998.
33. U.S. Department of Education, 1998.
34. *Education Week*, 1998.
35. McPartland, 1997.
36. McPartland, 1998.
37. Gallup, 1998
38. *Education Week*, 1999.

Bibliography

Alexander, K.L., Entwisle, D.R., & Dauber, S.L. (1995). *On the Success of Failure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

American Federation of Teachers. (1998). *Making Standards Matter 1998*. Washington D.C.: Author.

American Federation of Teachers. (1997). *Eliminating Social Promotion*. Washington D.C.: Author.

American Federation of Teachers. (1997). *Passing on Failure: District Promotion Policies and Practices*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Asimov, Nanette. (1998, April 4). Teachers Told to Pump Up Grades. *San Francisco Chronicle*.

Bishop, J. (1998). *Do Curriculum-Based External Exit Systems Enhance Student Achievement?* Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Breneman, D. & Haarlow, W. (1998). *Remediation in Higher Education*. Washington D.C.: Thomas B. Fordham Foundation

Coleman, A. (1998). "Excellence and Equity in Education: High Standards for High Stakes Tests," *Virginia Journal of Social Policy & the Law* 6 (81).

Cooke, G. & Stammer, J. (1985). Grade Retention and Social Promotion. *Childhood Education*, 61(4), 302-308.

Council for Basic Education. (1998). *Standards for Excellence in Education*. Washington D.C.: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1998). *Key State Education Policies on K-12 Education: A 50 State Report*. Washington D.C.: Author.

Council of Chief State School Officers. (1998). *Survey of State Student Assessment Programs*. Washington D.C.: Author.

Daley, B. (1998, May 19). School Committee to Propose Tough Standards for Promotion. *Boston Globe*.

Darling-Hammond, S. & Falk, B. (1995) *Using Standards and Assessments to Support Student Learning*. New York: National Center for Restructuring Education.

Editorial Projects in Education. (1999). *Education Week: Quality Counts*. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Hart, P. D. (1996). *Academic Standards and Student Discipline: AFT Teachers Assess Their Schools*.

Hauser, R.M. (1998, December 4) Should We End Social Promotion? Truth and Consequences. A paper prepared for a conference on Civil Rights and High Stakes K-12 Testing, Harvard University.

Haycock, K. (1998). "Good Teaching Matters." *Thinking K-16*. Washington D.C.: Education Trust.

Hendrie, C. Do or Die. (1997, Aug 6) *Education Week*.

Holmes, C.T. (1989). Grade Level Retention Effects: A Meta-Analysis of Research Studies, in L.A. Shepard and M.L. Smith (eds.) *Flunking Grades: Research and Policies on Retention*.

Johnson, E., Merrell, K. and Stover L. (1990). The Effects of Early Grade Retention on the Academic Achievement of Fourth Grade Students. *Psychology in the Schools*.

Karweit, N.L. (1998). *Grade Retention: Prevalence, Timing, and Effects*. CRESPAR Report No. 33. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.

Karweit, N.L. (1991). *Repeating a Grade: Time to Grow or Denial of Opportunity?* Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students Report No. 16. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.

Katz, N.L. (1998, June 29). 50,000 Rush Summer School. *New York Daily News*.

Lewis, A. (1992, December). Helping Young Urban Parents Educate Themselves and Their Children, ERIC/Clearinghouse on Urban Education No. 85.

Madaus, G.F. et al. (1992). *The Influence of Testing on Teaching Math and Science in Grades 4-12*. Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College, Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy.

Madaus, G.F. (1988). The Influence of Testing on the Curriculum. In Tanner, L.N. (ed.), *Critical Issues in the Curriculum: 87th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mantzicopoulos, P. and Morrison, D. (1992). "Kindergarten Retention: Academic and Behavioral Outcomes Through the End of Second Grade." *American Educational Research Journal*, 29, 182-198.

McPartland, J. (1998). Improving Climate and Achievement in a Troubled Urban High School Through the Talent Development Model. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 3(4) 337-361.

McPartland, J. (1997, October). Finding Safety in Small Numbers. *Educational Leadership*, 14-17.

Meisels, Samuel J., & Liaw, F. (1993). Failure in Grade: Do Retained Students Catch Up? *Journal of Educational Research*, 87(2), 69-77.

National Association of School Psychologists. (1996). *Should My Child Repeat a Grade?* Bethesda, MD: Author.

National Association of School Psychologists. (1988). *Position Statement: Student Grade Retention*. Bethesda, MD: Author.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1998). *Factors Associated with Mother's and Father's Involvement in Their Children's Schools*. Washington D.C.: Author.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). *NAEP Math Report Card*. Washington D.C.: Author.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1997). *National Household Education Survey: The Elementary School Performance and Adjustment of Children Who Enter Kindergarten Late or Repeat Kindergarten*. Washington D.C.: Author.

National Center for Education Statistics. (1992). *National Adult Literacy Survey*. Washington D.C.: Author.

National Research Council. (1998). *High Stakes: Testing for Tracking, Promotion, and Graduation*. J.M. Heubert and R.M. Hauser (eds). Washington D.C: National Academy Press.

National Research Council. (1998). *Preventing Reading Difficulties in Young Children*. C.E. Snow, M.S. Burns, and P. Griffin (eds.). Washington D.C.: National Academy Press.

Oakes, J., Wells, A.S., & Jones M. (1997, Spring). Detracking: The Social Construction of Ability, Cultural Politics, and Resistance to Reform. *Teachers College Record* 98:3, 482-510.

Oakes, J. & Wells, A.S. (1996). *Beyond the Technicalities of School Reform: Policy Lessons from Detracking Schools*. Los Angeles: UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information Studies.

O'Day, J. & Smith, M. S. (1993). Systemic Reform and Educational Opportunity. In S.H. Fuhrman (ed.), *Designing Coherent Education Policy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Olson, Lynn. (1998, February 11). "The Push for Accountability Gathers Steam," *Education Week*.

Pierson, L. & Connell, J. (1992). "Effect of Grade Retention on Self-System Processes, School Engagement, and Academic Performance." *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 84, 300-307.

Public Agenda. (1998). *Reality Check*. New York: Author.

Reynolds, A., Temple, J., & McCoy, A. (1997, September 17). Grade Retention Doesn't Work. *Education Week*.

- Reynolds, A. (1992). Grade Retention and School Adjustment. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 14*, 101-121.
- Robertson, A. S. (1997, May). *When Retention Is Recommended, What Should Parents Do?* ERIC Digest, Champaign, IL: Clearinghouse on Elementary and Early Childhood Education.
- Sanchez, R. (1997, September 17). AFT Criticizes Practice of Social Promotion. *Education Week*.
- Schuyler, N. B. (1985, April). Does Retention Help? Perspectives After Three Years. Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Illinois.
- Setencich, J. (1994, March). The Impact of Early Grade Retention on the Academic Achievement and Self-Esteem of Seventh and Eight Grade Students. Paper Presented at the Annual Convention of the National Association of School Psychologists, Seattle.
- Shepard, L.A. & Smith, M.L. (1990). Synthesis of Research on Grade Retention. *Educational Leadership, 47*, 84-88.
- Shepard, L.A. & Smith, M.L. (1989). *Flunking Grades: Research and Policies on Retention*. London: Falmer Press.
- Smith, M.L., and Shepard, L.A. (1987). What Doesn't Work: Explaining Policies of Retention in the Early Grades. *Phi Delta Kappan, 69* (2), 129-134.
- Smith, M. L. (1991). Put to the Test: The Effects of External Testing on Teachers. *Educational Researcher, 20* (5), 8-11.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1996). *Reaching All Families: Creating Family-Friendly Schools*. Washington D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1996). *Factors Associated with Father's and Mother's Involvement in Their Children's Schools*. Washington D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1997). *Family Involvement in Children's Education*. Washington D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1998). *Implementing Schoolwide Programs: An Idea Book on Planning (Volume I)*. Washington D.C.: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education, (1998). District Survey: Local Implementation of Federal Programs (unpublished tabulations prepared for the Planning and Evaluation Service).
- U.S. Department of Education. *A Talented, Dedicated, and Well-Prepared Teacher in Every Classroom: Information Kit*. Washington D.C.: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (1998). *Improving Opportunities: Strategies from the Secretary of Education for Hispanic and Limited English Proficient Students*. Washington D.C.: Author.

U.S. Department of Education. (1998). *Safe and Smart: Making After-School Hours Work For Kids*. Washington D.C.: Author.

U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service. (1996). Current Population Statistics special tabulations. Washington D.C.

Westbury, M. (1994, Summer). The Effect of Elementary Grade Retention on Subsequent School Achievement. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 19:3, 241-50.

Woodward, S.K. & Kimmey, T.M. (1997). The Impact of Repeating a Grade: A Review of Research in the 90s. Occasional Paper No. 25. University of Maine Center for Research and Evaluation.

Acknowledgments

Many people helped prepare this guide by providing information, research, or feedback. The Department would like to thank the parents, teachers, and principals who participated in focus groups to discuss the issue of social promotion and strategies to prevent and intervene in school failure. Thanks go to Belden Russonello & Stewart for conducting the focus groups.

We also are grateful for the advice and reviews of several individuals outside the Department: Judith Rizzo, Deputy Chancellor for Instruction, New York City; Eric Smith, Superintendent, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools; Karl Alexander, Johns Hopkins University; Samuel Meisels, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor; Lorrie Shepard, University of Colorado, Boulder; and Steve Fleischman, American Federation of Teachers. The regional educational laboratories provided examples of districts that have made ending social promotion a priority; Barbara Vespucci and Robert Stonehill from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement assembled these examples.

Particular thanks go to the numerous people inside the Department who reviewed and commented on this guide. Many others provided examples, advice, and insight as we drafted this guide, and we apologize for not being able to acknowledge individually all of their hard work. Special thanks go to Michael Rubinstein, Lisa Weiner, and Ben Lagueruela of Policy Studies Associates for their support work on this project, and Priscilla Taylor for copyediting the manuscript.

This guide was a joint project of the Planning and Evaluation Service (PES) and the Office of Elementary and Secondary Education (OESE), with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) and the Office for Civil Rights (OCR). Planning and Evaluation Service staff member Kathryn Doherty prepared the document, assisted by summer interns, Deena Margolis and Joey Feldman, with additional help from Joanne Wiggins, PES. Frances Shadburn and Catherine Jovicich, OESE, assembled the research literature; Debra Hollinger Martinez and Edward Fuentes, OERI, prepared a synthesis of the effects of social promotion and retention. Art Coleman from the Office for Civils Rights provided the section on high-stakes testing. Joleta Reynolds and Tom Hehir (OSEP) provided guidance on special education issues. Val Plisko, PES, and Judith Johnson, OESE, provided overall direction, supported by Ellen Conaway, OESE. Terry Peterson, Counselor to the Secretary, Gerry Tirozzi, Assistant Secretary, OESE, Mike Smith, Deputy Secretary (A), and Ann O'Leary in the Office of the Deputy Secretary offered valuable insights on the issues as the manuscript progressed.