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BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

For quite some time, serious concern has been expressed about the quality of education that is provided for our youngsters. Fueling public interest, A Nation at Risk, the Carnegie report, and other published reports recorded strong disenchantment with public education and gave legislators, educators, and parents a challenge that could not be ignored. As a result, reforms have been launched and much has been done in subsequent years to address the challenge. However, while some progress has been noted, the performance of our minority students remains a disturbing problem.

During the planning process for CRESST, the staff articulated its commitment to assuring educational quality for all students. Coupled with this commitment was the belief that the efforts of any one group, such as educational researchers, was clearly insufficient to the scope and importance of the problem. We believed that we needed to be a part of a larger effort, drawing from teachers, parents, community organizations, and government, from people who had recent and direct insight on the problem. Consequently, the idea of bringing such people together evolved. We wanted a gathering where information would be shared, positive courses of actions could be evaluated, and collaborative efforts could be created.

We broached this idea when we participated in the annual meeting of the Council of the Great City Schools in New York, where the magnitude of the problem was reinforced. At the meeting members concurred with the need for action and raised such questions as: What are the intergenerational issues? How much investment is society willing to make in the illiterate? What kind of jobs will be available for the underachiever, and in what quantity will they be available? What role ought research and evaluation play in solving the dilemma? And finally, what really works? Where can we find processes and programs that actually and consistently address the problems of the underachiever?

Members of the Council agreed that there were many promising educational practices in the field, but some
questioned whether such practices had been validated sufficiently and whether they truly could be replicated in other localities. The Council, through its president Dr. Richard Green and its executive director, Dr. Samuel Husk, expressed great interest in the problem and offered all possible assistance to efforts that might be made. This concern added impetus to CRESST's desire to offer suggestions for intervention through planned research and evaluation.

Pursuing the problem further, we discovered that many individuals, community groups, and organizations were approaching the problem of underachieving minority students with a sense of urgency. Most felt something could and should be done. Two such groups were the National Urban League and The National Council of La Raza.

The Urban League has launched a five-year national educational initiative designed to improve the educational performance of Black students. John Jacob, President of the National Urban League, in the formal announcement on September 30, 1986, described the program by saying, "Our educational initiative will mobilize the community to define key issues, maximize the use of existing resources, build coalitions and support for change, and implement concrete action plans. Our initiative is not an exercise in confrontation, but a program that mobilizes citizens and institutions in a collaborative effort to make the public schools work better for our children. We have no illusions that a quick fix can solve the crisis."

Similarly, demonstrating its serious commitment, the National Council of La Raza has established a multi-year effort, the Innovative Education Project, that is designed to develop, demonstrate, evaluate, and replicate five innovative community-based approaches to reduce the dropout rate and improve the quality of education available to Hispanics. La Raza's President and Chief Executive Officer Raul Yzaguirre, says about the project, "There is an overwhelming need for community-based educational programs which can supplement school offerings, work with youths who have dropped out or been pushed out of school systems, and help
parents and teachers increase their ability to help Hispanic children learn."

Building on these shared interests and as a first step in an intervention process, CRESST initiated a national conference in collaboration with the Council of the Great City Schools, The National Urban League, and the National Council of La Raza with principal financial support from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. Held at the UCLA Faculty Center on June 25-26, 1987, MAKING SCHOOLS WORK FOR UNDERACHIEVING MINORITY STUDENTS: NEXT STEPS FOR RESEARCH, POLICY and PRACTICE was planned to further a number of critical goals:

To focus national attention on the problem of underachieving minority students and call for action to improve their educational achievement;

To share and promote dialogue on promising practices that can help solve the current educational crisis for these students;

To foster active collaboration on creative solutions among practitioner, policymaker, and researcher constituencies;

To identify critical R&D needs and collaborative arrangements as important next steps toward problem solution; and

To collaborate on CRESST's research agenda by specifically identifying significant testing and evaluation issues for the subsequent inquiry.

The conference brought together a distinguished group of approximately 200 educators, policymakers, and researchers to share the best of what we know about how to improve educational opportunities for minority students and to deliberate on their implications for research, policy and practice. Those who served as keynoters and presenters were leading figures in the field of education. They represented a
broad range of viewpoints, experience and academic training, and each participant had keen interest in the topic and felt that change was possible.

The agenda featured a provocative mix of keynote addresses, special topic panels, small working discussion groups, and opportunities for more informal interaction and conversation.

The first morning session, "Our National Dilemma," commenced with consideration of the current status of education for underachieving minority students and the special problems which underlie it. Distinguished researchers presented their views of the roots of this national dilemma and of the critical and sustained action required for its resolution with reactions from two school superintendents.

The afternoon, "Bridges To Change: More Effective Practices," featured smaller group panels which presented brief overviews of promising approaches for addressing specific problem areas. Each conference participant chose two from among five available problem-focused panels. Composed of both researchers and practitioners, the panels dealt with Creating Effective Instructional Programs for All Students; Reducing the Drop-Out Rate; Preparing Students for Success at the Post-Secondary Level; Assuring Effective Programs for Language Minority Students; and Improving Teacher Quality.

Issues of evaluation and testing, subthemes during the first day, became primary foci on the morning of the second day. After keynote addresses on The Role of Testing and Evaluation in Effective Schools, conference attendees then chose from among a number of smaller group panels focused on: Creating Better Evaluation Strategies to Monitor and Improve School Effectiveness and Developing Alternative Strategies for Better Diagnosing and Meeting Individual Student Learning Needs.
The activities of the final afternoon were designed to encourage conference participants to actively synthesize what they had learned from the conference and to identify next steps, including consideration of potential collaborations among conference attendees and the constituencies they represented. Following brief keynote presentations on a variety of models of collaboration, participants were assigned to small working groups to discuss the implications of the two-day proceedings for future school improvement efforts; to identify implications for local, state, and federal action; and to articulate implications for national R&D, particularly in the areas of testing and evaluation.

What follows is a summary of the major themes and core ideas expressed at the conference and recommendations for next steps that can be taken to make schools work more effectively for underachieving minority students. (A copy of the full conference program is provided in the appendix.)
SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Speakers and participants at MAKING SCHOOLS WORK FOR UNDERACHIEVING MINORITY STUDENTS eloquently articulated the national dilemma which continues to confront us. Each acknowledged that we have yet to realize the dream of making it possible for all students to gain sufficient education to become productive and contributing members of our society. The depth and severity of this dilemma, the consequences if it is not resolved, and some key dimensions of potential solutions were carefully explored by the keynote speakers, Samuel Betances, James Comer, and Henry Levin who opened the conference. Participants then explored with great enthusiasm and optimism promising programs and innovative practices that could brighten the future for currently at-risk students and an action agenda to help promote that future.

The findings of the conference, based on a synthesis of conference presentations and working group deliberations, are structured around four major questions, namely:

1. What are the most important keys to improving education for underachieving minority students? Are there common ideas, factors or processes that appear to characterize various promising practices?

2. What are the most significant impediments to implementing these key ideas?

3. What federal, state and/or local actions (other than only money) would most help?

4. How could R & D in educational testing and/or evaluation best contribute to solutions? Are there important testing and/or evaluation issues that need to be addressed? What kinds of testing and/or evaluation information, if any, could help improve educational opportunities for minority students?
These findings suggest an important and ambitious agenda for continued work to help resolve a critical national problem.

**What Are Important Keys To Improving Education For Underachieving Minority Students?**

Recommendations for improving education for minority students focused on five areas (1) instructional development, (2) the professional development and training of teachers, (3) school climate, (4) community and parental involvement in the education of minority children, and (5) educational research and evaluation.

1. **Recommendations for Instructional Development:**

   *Effective instruction must be linked with a focused assessment of school outcomes and sound diagnosis of student needs and abilities.* In essence, a dynamic model of assessment and instruction must be developed which allows for the following activities: improved diagnosis and prescription; varying instructional strategies and materials in response to individual and group needs; continually monitoring and improving the quality of school programs; and setting high expectations for all students and all schools. In addition, research and development is needed to enable better matching of teaching strategies with student learning styles.

2. **Recommendations for Teacher Development:**

   *Particular attention must be paid to the training and professional development of teachers.* Further research is necessary to increase our understanding of the key dimensions and indicators of excellent teaching; these in turn need to be incorporated into strong preservice and inservice training programs. Because teachers must also understand the culture of minority students to improve their education, teacher education
and administration programs should develop cultural awareness, encourage the value of cultural diversity, and develop positive attitudes among their students.

There is also a need to recruit minority candidates into teacher training programs and to utilize practitioners in these programs who can serve as strong role models (e.g., black mentors who have recently taught in inner city schools). These actions will lead to the recruitment, training (and retraining) of a culturally-sensitive and culturally-enriched teaching and administrative workforce.

Finally, the empowerment of teachers is necessary to support a strong teaching profession and a profession to which the best are attracted. Empowerment will also promote efficacy and responsibility, encouraging teachers to explore a wider variety of techniques, collaborative teaching strategies, and other innovations to build students' basic and problem solving skills.

3. Recommendations for School Climate:

*Elements of the school climate are essential to successful educational improvement.* In particular, the conference reaffirmed characteristics associated with effective schools as identified in the literature. Leadership is a central element in promoting a productive school climate, with the principal functioning as a strong and commited instructional leader. A school climate is crucial which encourages high expectations, quality relationships among and between teachers and students, order, articulated goals and equity.

4. Recommendations for Community/Parental Involvement:

*The creation of broad based efforts which involve all members of the community (business, church, parents) in the education of children is highly recommended for improving the education of*
minority students. To promote active involvement in and reinforcement of their students' learning, minority parents and significant others in the child's life must begin to feel a sense of possibility and hope for the future as well as a change in their perception that schools are "not for us or our children." Efforts must be directed to bring about and build an atmosphere of concern, high expectations, and positive perceptions.

5. Recommendations for Research and Evaluation:

The bridging of research, evaluation and practice is a critical element in bringing about change. Applied research and evaluation can assist school planning, focus outcomes, and help support effective policymaking at various levels. Concrete plans of action for individual schools and school systems need to be established, then systematically monitored and evaluated for both summative and formative purposes.

What are the Significant Impediments to Implementing Key Improvements for Minority Education?

Conference participants identified what they deemed the most significant impediments to implementing innovations that could improve education for minority students. The areas most troublesome included those related to (1) school management and bureaucratic constraints, (2) attitudes, and (3) problems in research and development.

1. Impediments Related to School Management and Bureaucratic Constraints:

Bureaucratic constraints and problems in how schools are managed appear to present serious obstacles to reform and innovation. Some of the problems cited include: government mandates without resources to implement them; restrictions in the use of special funds; inflexibility in schools' organization and
management (e.g., structure of school time); and a lack of support for risk taking and innovation in implementing new ideas to help minority achievement. Further, in some cases, school management is not held accountable for the use of funds targeted to particular groups, making it difficult to get resources where they are most needed.

Another aspect of the problem related to management is the scarcity of minority role models in leadership positions and the lack of serious commitment at all management levels. The latter means insufficient leadership for mobilization and change efforts within the schools. Exacerbating the problem is an increasingly diverse population which makes it difficult to set and mount a unified effort toward common objectives.

2. Impediments Based on Attitudes:

Public attitudes and racism are major impediments to recognition and resolution of the problems of minority achievement. Changes in attitudes/perceptions must occur before significant gains for minority education are possible, yet changing entrenched attitudes and dispelling fears and stereotypes is a recalcitrant problem. Among the most difficult is changing attitudes from "those children can't learn" to "all children can learn and should be encouraged to do so". The lack of will, the lack of real commitment to improve minority achievement continues to plague us. These negative attitudes have been communicated to students, creating learner apathy and lack of motivation, inspiration and hope. If attitudes do not change, students must be taught to reject rejection.

In the view of some, schooling functions to sort individuals into successes and failures, thereby assuring that there will always be low achievers. This role is clearly detrimental to minorities. The current federal attitude towards minorities also shortchanges the needs of these communities.
3. Impediments Related to Testing and Evaluation:

Inappropriate use of evaluation and testing methods was noted as a particular problem. Impediments in the area of testing include a heavy reliance on standardized test scores and narrow kinds of assessment data which have been used to confirm stereotypes and limit opportunities. Tests must be designed to fairly assess student capabilities and accomplishments and evaluations must be sensitive to a full complement of school goals. Testing and evaluation should serve as bridges rather than barriers to better programs.

What Federal, State, and Local Actions (other than more money) Would Help Improve Education for Minorities?

Conference participants envisioned (1) actions which could and should be undertaken at all legislative and administrative levels, and (2) a few recommendations that were particularly salient to the federal, state, or local level.

1. Recommendations for Action at All Levels:

Sustained commitment and focused policy direction are necessary at all levels to maximize efforts to educate ALL students. Serious commitment requires attention, direction, and allocation of scarce resources. Yet all too often regulations and mandates come from various levels - federal, state, or local - without adequate resources to implement them. In order to better address the problem, all levels should recognize the full complement of quality resources and supports which are needed to improve education for the underachieving. A next step would be to focus the best available resources (e.g., teachers, instructional materials, etc.) on those with the greatest needs. This is but one way in which commitment to the improvement of
education for all can be sustained and supported without the expenditure of new funds.

*Sustained commitment involves actions which facilitate the participation of minorities at all levels, especially in leadership roles.* Such a task may be carried out in part by providing incentives to bring more minorities and women into management, higher education and research, and/or networking with and among minority groups regarding an appropriate research and action agenda. Another part of this task may require assigning sanctions to those that neglect affirmative action.

*All levels must also be committed to improving the collection and sharing of information.* Dissemination of information on promising practices to practitioners and policymakers can be the first step leading to the refinement and replication of successful programs to improve minority achievement. All levels should also consider better communication with the public, particularly using the media to educate the public about successes.

2. Recommendations for Action at the Federal-Level:

There must be sustained federal commitment to the improvement of minority achievement. Federal actions which would help bring about change include: promoting federal regulations which allow more flexibility and creativity in designing and implementing compensatory programs; and enforcing equity policies in federally supported programs. In the latter regard, it appears that enforcement has weakened in recent years. Affirmative action must be pursued vigorously, promoting equal access in the private as well as public sector.

Also of prime importance, federal policies must explicitly support multicultural efforts and assure serious attention to the special needs of limited English proficient and bilingual students. The promulgation of fair and
unbiased information about the impact of bilingual education was another immediate need.

Sustained financial commitment to existing programs that work was another obvious requirement.

3. Recommendations for Action at the State-Level:

State-level actions should include innovations directed at teachers, instructional improvement, testing and incentives for change. For example, in the area of teacher preparation, the states must assure that teacher training incorporates a truly multicultural curriculum. States also should consider policies which encourage local program adaptation and community involvement. State agencies specifically need to avoid regulations or statutes that reduce the flexibility of local districts and schools to respond to local needs and contexts.

Other state-level innovations which would help support change include: the development of a core curriculum to be taught to all in the schools; the development of more efficiency in testing; and the refocusing of testing directives to assure both the assessment of significant skills and attention to a more comprehensive range of quality indicators. In the latter area, state assessments should consider the strengths which can serve as building blocks to success rather than paying exclusive attention to weaknesses which identify schools as failures.

Flexible collaborations with local districts should encourage experimentation and new programming innovations to support learning, such as alternative learning and homework centers in neighborhood areas (e.g., malls, churches).
4. Recommendations for Action at the Local-Level:

Needed action at the local level involves strong collaboration between local school districts and their communities to secure a strong network of support for the education of minority youth. The establishment of strong partnerships between home, business, church, etc. and each school campus was widely advocated to strengthen school programs and reinforce the attainment of educational goals and expectations. The activities of individuals involved in reducing the dropout rate, of groups like the 100 Black Men and Young Black Scholars program in Los Angeles, and of programs sponsored by the National Urban League and National Council of La Raza are examples of initiatives whose success can be monitored and replicated in other communities. Volunteer task forces established by local districts and community representatives can assist in making schools work for underachieving minorities.

In addition to engendering community support, school administrations at the local level must be held accountable for the delivery of equitable educational services. Therefore, local districts must put into place valid and reliable evaluation and accountability systems, including a variety of quality indicators, to monitor and support school improvement efforts.

What are the Implications for Research and Development in Educational Testing and/or Evaluation: Issues that Could Help Educational Opportunities for Minorities?

Specific recommendations were made under the general topics of (1) testing, (2) evaluation, and (3) bringing research into the schools.
1. Recommendations for R&D in Testing:

In the area of test development, removing test bias and seeking alternatives to standardized testing and reporting remain concerns with considerable advocacy. Curriculum-based testing and criterion-referenced measures as well as alternatives to a multiple-choice format are highly recommended. A new testing technology is needed to better diagnose student needs and enable students to demonstrate their talents. Test developers need to involve more minority persons (researchers and practitioners) in the development of improved tests.

Responsibilities for appropriate test use fall on the shoulders of both the user and test developer. Test developers and users must debunk myths about particular standardized tests and actively discourage their inappropriate use for Limited English Proficient and other students. The diagnostic and instructionally relevant purposes of testing should be emphasized, with better integration of testing with instruction. For example, new arrivals to a district should be tested upon entry in order to assess their educational needs and posttested later on curriculum-based skills to assess the real impact of education in the new district.

Users must also improve the quality of their decision making by cross-validating any testing data they receive against alternative sources of information. Users must understand that test results are imperfect and an insufficient basis for decisionmaking.

Test reporting must also improve. In reporting data about schools, demographic data such as SES, language and ethnic characteristics, and community context should be reported alongside testing data. School performance should be reported in a way to hold schools accountable for the progress of every ethnic group, but such reports should simultaneously take into account both SES and ethnicity.
Training in appropriate test interpretation and use must improve. A particular area of identified need was training for testing personnel and school counselors to assure that test results are not misused to limit students' opportunities. Evaluation mechanisms may be needed to assess the attitudes of counselors and others who administer and interpret tests since their attitudes may affect test-takers' performance and subsequent life chances.

Parents also need more knowledge about the meaning of test results and their appropriate interpretation.

2. Recommendations for R&D in Evaluation:

Research and development must continue to develop sensitive evaluation designs and reporting practices that support the use of evaluative data to help minority students and their communities. In designing evaluations, researchers should develop workable SES measures; broaden the range of indicators used to assess quality and equity; and use approaches that promote fair and productive use of evaluation findings. In the latter area, a balanced combination of top-down, policy relevant measures and bottom-up, locally ideographic measures was recommended. Innovative program evaluation models must be designed and more creative ways to assess teachers must be developed; both need to be sensitive to unique local circumstances but capable of generating comparable results. Evaluations should attempt to identify strengths which can serve as a foundation for improvement.

Research and development should take community politics and public interest into consideration through independent evaluations and publications of reports in concise, understandable language. Districts must give priority attention to disseminating results throughout their districts and to analyzing and addressing findings.
Researchers must assist in the interpretation of findings with explicit advice on what can and cannot be generalized from the results. Researchers and practitioners must improve the use of data at the local, state, and federal levels.

3. Recommendations for Bringing Research into the Schools:

*Strategies must be devised to bring research into the schools to be used more effectively by teaching and administrative personnel.* Districts should establish a policy on disseminating and applying research results. Dissemination efforts must include teachers. In fact, there are many who advocate the development of the "reflective practitioner"--one who uses research to reform action and decisions. Users (and non-users) need to understand testing and evaluation and how it is appropriate or inappropriate to use in assessing outcomes, determining policies and designing instructional improvement strategies.

School based planning models and data-based decision making need to be more effectively utilized, an effort that will require better training of teachers and principals. These actions can make evaluation data an important tool in the improvement of educational opportunities for minorities.

THE COURSE AHEAD

The issue of minority educational achievement must be spotlighted and productive approaches need continued review, trial, and improvement. Our conference brought together people from all backgrounds and school experiences with interest in contributing to this area. Our participants had two things in common: their commitment and their own achievement. They also sounded a recurrent theme: that minority achievement problems grow from broader societal sources. Poverty, and its limiting effects on positive experience, goals, time, and know how, can only be partially assuaged by productive school environments. Continually reaffirmed, however, was the view that individual action, someone caring about students does make a difference. The challenge is to mobilize the deep concern within the community to a level where most children receive the encouragement they need.

Conferences are frequent professional events. A good conference is one that is well organized, stimulating, and engaging, and one where opportunities for informal contact are provided. By such measures, our conference was a good one. But a useful conference is one that has effects beyond the time and place of the meeting. How our conferences rates on that dimension is more difficult to assess at this early date. However, we have taken some concrete steps toward longer range impact.

In collaboration with the National Council of La Raza and the National Urban League, CRESST has developed a study group whose goal is to produce evaluation tools that can be adapted and used by community groups to assess the impact of their many programs directed toward improving minority educational options. We hope that the final product will be used and widely disseminated to community groups, churches, and school districts, to provide the impetus and alternatives for assuring that their programs are making a difference.

Within the CRESST family, the conference helped to reaffirm a rich agenda for research in testing and evaluation, an agenda that we will pursue seriously. We will contribute at a number of levels. At the policy level, we will help to assure
that local, state, and federal policymakers pay attention to indicators of equity in their assessments of school quality and will help to formulate what those indicators should be. At the school and local program levels, we will help to devise better and more useful evaluation models to support local problem-solving and program improvement for minority students. At the classroom and student levels, we are developing alternatives to traditional testing and are preparing diagnostic testing techniques that better support student learning. At all levels, we will continue to serve as a consumer advocate on behalf of our students, keeping watch over the actual use of tests and their potential misuses. In partnership with the involved communities, we look for our efforts to make significant impact on the quality of education for minority students.

This document represents a brief summary of the conference proceedings. The full text is available upon request.
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10:40a.m. - 12:00noon
California Room

Moderator: Leigh Burstein
UCLA/CRESST

Presenters:
10:40a.m. - 11:00a.m. Ramsay Selden
Council of Chief State School Officers

11:00a.m. - 11:20a.m. Walter Hathaway
Portland Schools

11:20a.m. - 11:40a.m. Todd Endo
Fairfax County Schools

12:10p.m. - 1:30p.m. Lunch (Sequoia Dining Rooms)
Speaker: John Jacob
National Urban League

FORGING COLLABORATIONS
1:30p.m. - 2:00p.m.
California Room

Moderator: Joan Herman
CRESST/UCLA

Presenters:
1:30p.m. - 1:40p.m. Eugene Cota-Robles
Office of the President, University of California

1:40p.m. - 1:50p.m. Winston Doby
UCLA

1:50p.m. - 2:00p.m. Charge to Working Groups
Working Groups to Identify Research and Policy Implications and to Chart Next Steps
2:05p.m. - 3:15p.m.

Group 1  California Room  Norma Cantu
Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund
Group 2  Hacienda Room  Gary Peterson
Milwaukee Schools
Group 3  Playa Room  Grace Pung Guthrie
Far West Regional Laboratory
Group 4  Sierra Room  Linda Davis
San Francisco Unified Schools
Group 5  Sequoia Room  Gary Estes
Northwest Regional Laboratory

Concluding Session
California Room
3:30p.m. - 4:30p.m.

3:30p.m. - 4:00p.m.  Working Group Reports

4:00p.m. - 4:15p.m.  Conference Synthesis:
Alonzo Crim
Atlanta Public Schools

4:15p.m. - 4:30p.m.  Eva Baker
CRESST/UCLA