



National Alliance of Black School Educators

Legislative & Advocacy Priorities for

The 113th Congress



We argue that public schools and public education historically have been a bedrock of our country's robust democratic institutions.

We therefore believe that, among federal roles, the ideal of equity must remain.

Excellence is undermined if equity is ignored.

PRIORITY 1

Funding Equity: Title I

While NABSE is most appreciative of the expanded and needed Title I funding for FY 2011, the funding formula applied still uses a methodology that does not ensure full funding for all of America's needy children.

The federal government has a limited but important role to play in realizing this vision of high quality schooling for all. It should help provide tools and resources to empower schools where students are underserved by partnering with schools, districts, states, communities, and organizations to ensure all schools are of higher quality.

This brings us to the discussion of resources for poor school districts in our country. **While NABSE certainly advocates for children of African descent, the advocacy argument holds true for the children in the hills of Tennessee, the factory-idle regions of Pennsylvania, the hollows of Kentucky, and the children of mine workers in West Virginia as well as the barrios of urban centers.**

The most prevalent and persistent gaps in student achievement exist as a result of the effects of poverty. Children of poverty tend to live in low-income neighborhoods and attend low-income schools where student achievement often lags.

We ask Congress address the funding formula in the section of Title I-A that provides for targeted grants and finances incentive grants. Currently, these grants are determined by concentration of poverty. This, of course, is the right focus. We are, however, as concerned as our other colleagues in the educational community: The American Association of School Administrators, the Children's Defense Fund, and the Rural trust the ways in which the concentration of poverty is defined. Currently, concentration of poverty is based on the number of poor students in a district or the percentage of poverty in the district, whichever is higher. Thus, districts with a given number of poor students may receive Title I funding even though they have a relatively small concentration of poverty and may in fact receive more Title I funding per student that smaller districts with much higher percentages of poverty. This is particularly troublesome because small districts with high concentrations of poverty have lower poverty wealth and require additional support to provide per pupil spending comparable to larger, wealthier districts.



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

We strongly believe that the weighting based on the **number** of poor students should be eliminated from this definition. Instead, we believe that school district allocations should be based on *their* percentage of poverty. That way, all districts at the same percentage of poverty will receive the same amount per student.

We have been here before. During the sixties and early seventies, in poor and minority communities (from the Delta in Mississippi, to the rural mountains of Vermont and New Hampshire, to the Appalachian communities of West Virginia, to the Urban Epicenters of Chicago, New York City, Los Angeles, Houston and Birmingham) citizens were engaged in making their once divided and isolated communities whole. Through various community actions and model city and school programs, visible progress was being made and the horrible vestiges of segregation, isolation, and poverty were being chipped away.

Just as these efforts began to work and to show some promise, progress was halted by voices that said that the “Great Society programs” were a waste and a failure. A campaign was forged to carry out an agenda that in fact blamed the victims, namely poor, disenfranchised families and communities for their plight.

This discussion is not about whether Title I is a success or failure. That is another argument, another story and another construct. NABSE can respond quite compellingly that Title I has been a strong force in impacting the lives of less advantaged students socially, emotionally, and academically. As Jack Jennings so eloquently stated in past articles in both *The Kappan* and *Education Week*, the while eliminating the achievement gap is a worthy goal—and we agree that it is—that this is not the stated purpose of Title I, nor the standard for determining its success.

On another note, much has been made of the notion that “we’ve spent billions over 40 years.” We continue to applaud the Federal Government’s significant interest (accounting for the 9% of the National budget of \$9,683 per pupil) because it is a marker for leveling the playing field. Our argument, thus, is not about Federal involvement but rather how and where it allocates taxpayers’ dollars. Does money matter for poor students? Does parity cost? You bet! As Grissmer, Flanagan and Williamson conclude in their research for the National Center for Research that “the money doesn’t matter” argument doesn’t hold. There seems to be significant support for the thesis that money directed at disadvantaged students *does* bring higher academic score but money directed toward more advantaged students may have a smaller or negligible effect.

The Grissmer study demonstrates that, if we look at the fact that 46 percent of Title I goes to the very poorest 15 percent of all schools, a more consistent story is emerging from the empirical data (a story we believe is not being told and can easily be ignored). What the research shows is that the largest gain in test scores over the past 35 to 40 years has been made by White, African American, and Hispanic economically disadvantaged children. This did not happen without federal support for the past two decades. Does money count? You bet! No, it is not the only variable, but it is clear and present significant variable.

So what does it take to “get on with it” and to provide equity, access, and equal protection in the financial realm for all American’s poor children in public schools?

We recognize the inequities in per pupil spending between schools, between school districts, and between states. Many states have certainly begun to weigh in on this phenomenon. Still, as the federal government looks to strengthen its role in “School Reform” and “High Standards,” it must also provide an effective means to assist in assuring equity in funding for the poorest of America’s children through full and



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

equitable funding of Title I. As John Podesta and Cynthia Brown explained, “It is fundamentally unfair to hold educators accountable for reaching uniform high standards when the monetary tools they are given are so unequal.”

Equity in full funding for Title I would mean that school districts with the highest concentrations of poverty would be able to spend as much per pupil as districts with lower concentrations of poverty. This would require an allocation of resources based on formula change specifically targeted at districts with higher than average percentages of pupils eligible for free or reduced lunch.

The Center for American Progress’ report February 2010 points out the need for a formula revision. The document states, “There is much confusion about the four distinct formulas in current use. These formulas—the product of 40-plus years of political compromise—are poorly aligned with the clear purpose of Title I-A funds:”... to provide financial assistance to local education agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means...”

NABSE revised its concerns about targeting poverty in a substantial way, as early as the reauthorization of ESEA during the Clinton Administration, and continued during the Bush 2 Administration. We continued in a more focused means during the hearings in 2008 including testifying before the HHS Committee. Since that time, other policy organization educators and members of Congress have begun to voice the same concern.



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

Mills and Brown shed a very transparent light on the issue of funding with state and across states as follows:

- **Illinois and California both face very high costs and exert low fiscal effort, yet California received \$1,521 per poor child to Illinois' \$1,819.**

What's worse, the state with the higher concentration of children in poverty has the lower allocation rate in each of these pairs. And while these per poor children differences may seem small, they matter a great deal when scaled up to the school or state level. Take California, which has more children in poverty than any other state and runs larger schools than all but five, with an average enrollment of 651 pupils. A high-poverty school in California could receive nearly \$200,000 less than it would receive if it were in Illinois. The cumulative shortfall for California amounts to several hundred million dollars, a sum worthy of concern.

Interstate funding inequity in Title I-A funding is perhaps of even great concern. For instance, poor children served by Michigan's Flint City School District drew \$1,984 in Title I-A funds, while those served by Detroit City School district drew \$2,266. Detroit's 19 percent advantage outstrips the difference in the cost of providing education, as reflected by these districts' values on the Comparable Wage Index. Moreover, their different allocation rates highlights a bias toward extremely large districts as Flint and Detroit serve roughly the same high concentration of children in poverty—38 and 39 percent, respectively—although Flint serves 9,577 low-income children while Detroit serves 80,289 low-income children.

It is not hard to find even more grave examples of inequity. Take South Carolina, for example, where the Greenville County School District serves a substantially lower concentration of children in poverty, 14 percent, than other districts in the state, particularly those in the "corridor of shame" along Interstate 95. Nearly 22 percent of the children served by the Calhoun County School District, the eastern portion of which is definitively in the "corridor of shame," come from low-income families, but the district receives \$1,266 per poor child, substantially less than the \$1,700 seen in Greenville. This allocation pattern flies in the face of fairness considering that the two districts face nearly identical costs.

NABSE will support their formula change that:

- 1.) Is based totally on percentage of poverty rate from free and reduced lunch provisions rather than "number" weighting,
- 2.) Enforces the Title I comparability provisions,
- 3.) Replace the current hodgepodge of formulas.

Using the percent of pupils eligible for free or reduced lunch within a school district as an indicator of school district poverty, those districts having lower concentrations of poverty spend far more money per pupil with respect to both total spending and spending on instruction. Districts with higher concentrations of poverty, on the other hand, tend to have less money to spend per pupil compared to districts with lower concentrations of poverty.



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

Therefore, we urge Congress in this reauthorization to:

- a.) Address the spending gap in a fair and equitable means through the formula change,
- b.) Provide strong regulatory language (in the statute) for state and district with high concentrations of poverty that ensure that federal dollars as supplementary and not supplementing.
- c.) Retain a strong, robust, accounting system that ensures that states will follow the formula. We recognize that it means that some alterations to funded and select districts. We would therefore entertain a hold-harmless provision. Children in poverty have for too long have been the losers in America's resource allocations. Their "losing" continues to impact the quality of life in our nation. If change is coming, now is the time!

PRIORITY 2

Retaining Today's Student for Tomorrow's Success (addressing the school-to-prison-pipeline)

We support the Obama administration's "Blue Print" goal of assuring that America's youth are college and career ready. We would add that our youth should also be prepared to be civic-ready.

We would like to call attention to the large pool of students, particularly poor White, Black, and Brown students who are on a trajectory that is commonly referred to as the school-to-prison-pipeline.

Within that construct, there are myriad studies and reports that confirm the cost to America when we lose such a large pool of students: Low graduation rates, lost wages, and declining or stagnating literacy and numeracy rate among our youth. While it is true that there are communities in our country that benefit from the prison industry, a growing and robust economy for all of America's communities is impacted by the loss of talent, ingenuity and civic literacy.

The "Blue Print" and the President's budget provide Congress with several actions intersects in the reauthorization deliberations.

The National Alliance of Black School Educators (NABSE) and other policy organizations including the Advancement Project, the Southern Poverty Law Center, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, and the Charles Hamilton Institute for Race and Justice provide reams of evidence detailing the problem. The most recent report from the Advancement Project *Exploring the School-to-Prison-Pipeline* explores in depth this issue. The question is what role the federal government, through Congress, can play to aid in solutions to the problems as it prepares to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. We believe that within the framework of the administration's "Blue Print" that there are several junctures to begin to put into language specific actions... These junctures are:



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

1. The School Turnaround Construct
2. The Homeless Youth Construct
3. The Rural Education Construct
4. The Promised Neighborhood's Construct &
5. The 21st Century Community Learning Construct

Congress has already authorized—a ready and able—network to address solutions to abort the school-to-prison-pipeline.

The USDOE now funds a network of service providers (two located in the office of Elementary and Secondary Educators and one in the Institute of Education Sciences) namely the comprehensive centers, the equity assistance centers, and the regional laboratory **program**.

NABSE recommends that these programs be coordinated to assist districts, provide direct developmental and technical assistance programs to communities where turnaround programs are located.

The CC program awards discretionary grants to established comprehensive technical assistance centers to help low-performing schools and districts close achievement gaps and meet the goals of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. Section 203 of Title II of the Educational Technical Assistance Act of 2002 (TA Act) authorizes the Department to establish not fewer than 20 comprehensive technical assistance centers to provide technical assistance to States to benefit school districts and schools, especially those in need of improvement.

The Secretary has awarded a total of 21 grants to fund comprehensive centers in two specific categories:

The Regional Education Laboratory Program (REL) consists of a network of ten laboratories that serve the educational needs of a designated region by providing access to high quality scientifically valid education research through applied research and development projects, studies, and other related technical assistance activities.

We would recommend that the network construct the mission of these USDOE service providers be altered to include direct work with turnaround and promised neighborhoods to assist community stakeholders (from preschool to family homes to community action centers to school boards to teacher unions—the array of folks who live , work, and play together in the neighborhood).

These coordinated service providers would then help to develop and implement strategies of intervention, proven best practices, and research-based effective strategies. In short, we can find no more compelling use of taxpayers' dollars than to support existing structures that would enable communities to disrupt the criminalization process of our youth that starts in the middle school and continues through high schools.

Finally, we believe that the Federal Government's support of this proposal complemented with the provision (hopefully soon enacted) of Congressman Robert Scott and his colleagues' youth provision act will go a long way to stop the costly prison-pipeline for America's children.



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

PRIORITY 3

Addressing the Teacher Pipeline

At HBCUs, HSIs and Tribal Colleges

The work of Linda Darling Hammond, the multi-year grant program of the Carnegie Corporation (TNE) and the recent AACTE policy briefing all support the principle that the quality of teaching is recognized as the most important factor in student learning. * Darling Hammond's work posits that that "The effects on student achievement of having a teacher with very weak credentials as compared to having one with very strong credentials were greater than the effects of race and parent education combined. That is, the difference between the effect of having a very well-qualified teacher rather than one who was poorly qualified was larger than the average difference in achievement between a typical white student with college-educated parents and a typical black student with high-school educated parents. The achievement gap would be much reduced if low-income minority students were routinely assigned such highly-qualified teachers rather than the poorly qualified teachers they most often encounter."

The 107th Congress recognized the importance of the above principle, including provision in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2002 that states should ensure that all students have access to "Highly qualified teachers," defined as teachers with full certification and demonstrated competence in the subject matter field(s) they teach. This provision was historic, especially since the students targeted by federal legislation—students who are low-income, low-achieving, new English language learners, or identified with special education needs—have been in many communities those least likely to be served by experienced and well-prepared teachers.

We expect that the 111th Congress will continue this provision.

We, however, believe that Congress should seize the opportunity in this organization to expand the diverse pool of teacher inductees who will work in high need committees and prepare for high-need fields.

HBCUs, traditionally are the strongest producers of black teachers in a significant number of communities in our country; if the nation is to offer its children a diverse and qualified teacher workforce, it will need to engage minority-serving colleges and universities to achieve the goal. HBCUs prepare 50 percent of the nation's African American teachers though they represent only two percent of the nation's colleges and universities. Additionally, a single institution, the University of Texas, San Antonio (USTA), is a Hispanic-Serving Institution (HIS) producing one of the largest numbers of Hispanic/Latino teachers in Texas and third largest in the nation.



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

The National Alliance of Black School Educators recommends:

- Establish a demonstration *clinical practice professions* model program that would enable these institutions to improve and expand teacher and leadership education program that can help produce a well-prepared diverse educator work force commitment to staying in high-need communities.
- Adopt AACTE’s recommended change as to the definition of a “Highly Qualified Teacher.” The “Highly Qualified Teacher” definition in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) should be revised to require that teachers establish not only their content expertise but their ability to teach it effectively, as measured by their actual performance in classrooms, following extended clinical experience. Prospective teachers should exhibit consistent success through a substantial pre-service clinical experience in a challenging school setting supervised by both university- and school-based faculty. This requirement should pertain to both traditional- and alternative –route candidates. A minimum of 450 sequential hours of closely monitored and supervised clinical experience should be required. No candidate should serve as teacher of record until he or she has completed a preparation program.
- Support national accreditation and ongoing assessment of teacher education programs at HBCUs and other MSIs. Policymakers should support ongoing internal and external examinations of teacher education programs at all MSIs to determine if the programs build on the institution’s mission and strengths and are based in the best research on teacher preparation and development. There are 84 teacher education programs at HBCUs, and 62 (47%) are accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) currently has one School of Education at an HBCU as a candidate for accreditation (TEAC, 2009). According to Fenwick (2009), these numbers will increase only when HBCUs and other MSIs are provided the resources necessary to create an institutional infrastructure that supports a culture of assessment. Targeted resources could assist with creating an assessment infrastructure by providing funding for hiring assessment personnel, purchasing computer software and hardware, and supporting professional development and training (on program and student evaluation and assessment) for deans, department chairs and faculty.
- Assist State Boards in supporting collaborative university and school-based programs that produce African American Board-certified teachers. The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) and its assessments complement initial teacher preparation, licensing, accreditation, and quality professional development. NBPTS is the greatest distinction for accomplished teachers in the U.S., with the standards and assessments serving as a model for nations worldwide. A congressionally mandated 3-year evaluation found that NBPTS exemplifies the characteristics of effective professional development and promotes student achievement and learning (Hakel, Koenig, & Elliot, 2008). Importantly, the data revealed that Board-certified teachers benefited African American and Hispanic students more than other students (Cavalluzzo, 2004). There are approximately 74,000 Board-certified teachers, of which 7,667 are African American and



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

other teachers of color. More are needed to provide leadership in high-need schools and to contribute an important cultural lens and understanding to effective practice.

- Support and fund a demonstration program for partnerships between the HBCU and the school district where the HBCU or MIS is located. Such programs could include a laboratory school where future teacher recruitment is initiated.

PRIORITY 4

Parent Engagement

The administration's Blue Print does not adequately adhere in Vision for Partnering with parents in assessing America's children are college and career ready.

ON USE OF FUNDS FOR SCHOOLWIDES

A reexamination of all of the language in section 1114 as it related to schoolwides is necessary.

Many of our members reported that the 1994 schoolwide provision translated into general aid for the school or as one Superintendent remarked, "It's a fancy block grant to the local school building with no or little built-in accountability measures." A common theme emerged from our committee's responses, that there is not enough accountability to ensure that the students who need the most assistance are adequately served; that, in fact, "comprehensiveness by decree" has been at the expense of needy children in all too many cases. The threshold for schoolwides must be returned to 75% poverty student population, as was originally intended for the 1994 legislation.

ON PARENT INVOLVEMENT

There must be a commitment to continue to support parent involvement by federal supplemented programs so that school districts can involve parents more effectively.

The 1994 legislation provided a strong template for assuring expanded opportunities for parent-school collaborations. However, observations, findings by parent advocates, and reports show that, in Title I settings, partnerships with parents and the school community are not happening on a large scale.

The requirements of the 1994 legislation should remain strong; accompanying legislative language should target a better dissemination construct so that parents are aware of the basic requirements of parent involvement; appropriate technical assistance strategies for implementing parent involvement



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

requirements currently in the law, and appropriate measures that assure that states provide guidance and direction to local districts as to the importance of complying with parent involvement requirements.

Finally, we need no other studies to inform us that parents and family inputs are critical education-relevant resources. It is our view that it is in the interest of national defense for the federal government to assist localities in creating the opportunities and level of critical parent input that continues to be illusive for the parents of poor children. To that end, we advocate a federal grant to support independent, locally based and culturally relevant family training centers that partner with local school districts to help parents identify, analyze and value the processes of education so that their children receive a high quality education.

ADDITIONAL PRIORITIES

AGENDA ITEM: We support research as a lever for informing and influencing policy and legislation. But we would request that Congress review all research from diverse perspectives in a bipartisan way, just research that supports a particular perspective.

AGENDA ITEM: We support full funding of Title I through a fair and equitable formula-based funding stream. The current appropriation provided a one-time stimulus infusion into the Title I funding formula. It still left a significant number of districts not funded at a level commensurate with the needs of their populations. We expect that Congress will continue to include in the reauthorization the statute requirement directly states to use Title I funds to supplant not supplement state and local district funding.

We support the *All the Children (ACE) Act (HR 2485)*, which reverses the perverse effect of diverting funding from higher-poverty school districts to lower-poverty school districts.

AGENDA ITEM: We support all opportunities for students to learn in innovative and enriched educational settings. Further, NABSE supports strong public school systems and settings, traditional and charter, where children are instructed and nurtured in fair and equitable environments. NABSE believes that all public schools, including charter schools, must bear some level of accountability for student health and well being, student achievement, fiduciary obligations. The same level of civil rights applicable to traditional public schools must apply to charter school children. NABSE supports the use of public funds to support only those schools, traditional and charter, which are part of a public school system and therefore open to all children.

AGENDA ITEM: We support federal legislative language that maintains “state’s statutory and constitutional” role of responsibility for its citizens’ education at the local level. However, we advocate that states and local institutions be held accountable for all our citizens’ civil rights. We therefore urge Congress to structure statutory language that assures the opportunity to learn. We agree with the Schott Foundation’s recommendations.



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

“Each state shall develop strategies for providing resources to overcome inequities identified by the indicators and provide resources sufficient to ensure every child can participate in high quality learning experiences. Each state should report biannually on the indicators, strategies, and progress to the public. The federal government should provide a biannual report to the public as to the status and progress on these indicators across the states.”

AGENDA ITEM: We support Targeted and Sustained investment, at the federal level, for financial equity and human capital for every student. We will support Congresspersons (and work cogently and effectively with them) who will assure that Congress provide a substantive funding to prevent further educational crises for students of African descent.

AGENDA ITEM: We support the continuation and expansion of the E-Rate program which makes advanced telecommunications services affordable to our nation’s schools and libraries.

AGENDA ITEM: We support new legislation with the reauthorization of ESEA that would renew the teacher corps program. Included in its purpose, but not limited to, is and commitment to recruiting and finding teachers who are among the best, the brightest, and the most nurturing.

AGENDA ITEM: We support the strengthening of Higher Education. This entails strengthening teacher preparation programs through support for quality interventions including distance learning and through strengthening student grants for teachers of high caliber to work in poor communities.

AGENDA ITEM: We support language that discusses school improvement, provides sufficient time for plans to take hold before applying any form of sanction. Moreover, the sufficient time required in this statute should be based on rigorous research. In addressing school improvement, states and districts must be supported in developing and implementing **richer and deeper** pools of data focusing not only on test scores, but other measures that contribute to the academic success of students. Additionally state and districts must be more effective in their use of data.

AGENDA ITEM:

New Initiative

We are seeking support from Congress to invest in a pilot world language enrichment program (different from the mono-language programs) for elementary school students, and, moreover, that such pilot programs specifically be authorized and appropriated in the reauthorization of ESEA, within the Title I construct. We further recommend, that in the interest of equity, such programs be authorized for schools with targeted Title I funds. We are joined in this initiative with the American Association of School Administrators. (See Best for Our Children.)



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

Vouchers

We oppose any voucher programs or tax credit that use taxpayers' dollars for private, faith-based, and parochial school education, even when the dollars are targeted to a select number of poor children and particularly children of color.

General Language Provision

We urge Congress to avoid language in its statutes that is problematic (e.g. subgroup when referring to disaggregated data; no group of humans should be called subgroup.)



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003

Addendum

A Proposal From The National Alliance of Black School Educators and The American Association of School Administrators

113th Congress

To establish a world language elementary enrichment program as part of **Title I** of ESEA ; (PL___ To establish a demonstration world language enrichment program in the highest concentrated poverty schools within the ten federal regions of the nation

FINDINGS

1. As demonstrated in a landmark study by Peal and Lambert (1962;2993), acquisition of a second language by young children has a measurable positive effect on children's language and cognitive development. The study showed that students, who were bilingual, whether they learned English or a foreign language, had higher academic achievement than did those who were monolingual. Recent research continues to support the benefits of students learning a second language.
2. It is important to introduce a second language to children at the elementary level because children at this level are capable of learning a second language with native-like pronunciation. Experts note that physiological changes occur in the maturing brain as a child enters puberty (Marcos, 1998). According to Mantrel (1996), "Synapses or avenues in the brain are opened up by foreign language instruction when it is introduced at an early age. If languages are not introduced at an early age, these synapses are not accessed, and language learning is much more difficult to acquire in later years" (Foreign Language and Youth, 1996). It is also important for teachers to understand that bilingual students will account for about 40 percent of school-age population by the year 2030 (Berliner & Biddle, 1995).
3. The important issues concerning learning more than one language in early development concerns itself with the cognitive and educational outcomes. In reviewing the research Bialystok and Stafford (2005) found that bilingualism is a positive force that enhances children's cognitive and linguistic development.
4. Therese Sullivan Caccavale, President of the National Network for Early Language Learning, states "to enhance children's cognitive development. Children who learn a foreign language beginning in early childhood demonstrate certain cognitive advantages over children who do not. Research conducted in Canada with young children shows that those who are bilingual develop the concept of object permanence at an earlier age. Additionally, second language learning is much more a cognitive problem solving activity than a linguistic activity, overall. Studies have shown repeatedly that second language learning increases critical thinking skills, creativity, and flexibility of mind in young children Students who are learning a second language out-score their non-second language learning peers in both the verbal and math sections of standardized tests.



5. It is clear that in the global economy, knowledge of foreign languages and other cultures has become an extremely valuable skill set in the 21st Century.
6. While popular perception is that only large corporations need to operate on a global scale, the Committee on Economic Development (CED) has found that most small and medium sized businesses find it necessary to participate in the world market.
7. Furthermore, despite the fact that English is the international language of commerce, many employees in businesses must be able to speak languages other than English and operate within other cultures.
8. There are a limited number of potential employees who speak more than one language and large corporations are more likely than small and medium size businesses to be able to recruit and hire employees who speak a language in addition to English.
9. Even with a growing immigrant population in the United States, many businesses and professionals are finding they need foreign language and culture competency skills. Hospitals, law enforcement agencies, the hospitality industry, service occupations, government, and many others deal with diverse languages and cultures and need the tools to operate within them. Without these skills, many workers will be seriously limited in their ability to do their jobs effectively and gain upward mobility within their profession. (From Policy Update Vol. 16, No. 2, January 2008, a publication of NASBE)
10. Many occupations will not be available to children of poverty because the schools they attend, particularly the elementary schools they attend, do not provide the opportunity for students to learn a world language. It is precisely this lack of opportunity that the Office for Civil Rights is attempting to address in its recent initiative. The inability to speak a second language acts as a barrier to access for all too many children of poverty.
11. A national census shows a significant number and growing number of poor children throughout the country, including those living in Appalachia, those in the Hollaws of Kentucky, children of recently-arrived immigrants from Haiti and Mexico, and those from of the Eastern block.
12. A child living in poverty is deprived of an equitable opportunity to understand the racial, ethnic and linguistic fabric of our country when he or she does not have access to learning other languages and cultures. Globalization requires individuals to work with others who are from different linguistic cultural, racial, and religious backgrounds. Thus, our increasingly complex world necessitates the mastery and competence of multilingual skills as a cornerstone of education. It is most important that we not continue the generational poverty due to lack of access and that we use this opportunity to combat the last vestiges of segregation by opening up children's worlds.
13. Models already exist for teaching elementary school another language. These include, for example, the dual language model. According to the Center for Applied Linguistics, there are more than 330 similar programs around the country. Students are taught in English while also learning a range of languages, such as Spanish, Japanese, Navajo, Chinese, French and Korean.



14. Few world language programs are offered in schools and school districts with high concentrations of poverty. World language programs are most often offered in schools and school districts that have predominately middle class or upper middle class students.

World Language Demonstration Grants

Purpose: To pilot world language demonstration programs in high poverty elementary schools in order to promote equitable educational opportunities for poor students who historically have not had access to the study of languages and cultures. Native Englishspeaking children of poverty attending schools where a majority of students come from low income homes have not had the same opportunities to access language and culture studies as children in working middle class communities, wealthy communities and communities of children who come to the United States speaking another language.

Program to be authorized: The secretary is authorized to award up to four programs per federal region in the poorest Title I counties in their poorest schools where there are both mono language students and native speakers of other languages. If the poorest Title 1 school is completely monolingual and the poverty level is at 90% to 100% of the district the secretary may authorize a world language enrichment program in a monolingual school. One such program should identify a cohort where there are Native People students (American Indian).

Definition: We define world language enrichment programs as follows: An enrichment bilingual/multicultural education program in which language equity is structurally defined as equal time exposure to two languages. It promotes enhanced awareness of linguistic and cultural diversity, and high levels of academic achievement through instruction in two languages.

Models

1. Two-way immersion programs. These enroll a balance of native English speakers and native speakers of the partner language.
2. Heritage language programs. These mainly enroll students who are dominant in English but whose parents, grandparents or other ancestors spoke the partner language.
3. Fles Program (Foreign Language Enrichment Programs)

Authorized Activities- The Secretary may use funds made available under this section for each fiscal year to —

- (1) Conduct research related to effective approaches for the world language enrichment pilot projects for low income students in schools serving concentrations of high poverty students;
- (2) Collect and analyze information estimating the educational status and world language needs of low income students in high poverty elementary schools; and
- (3) Carry out other activities that are consistent with the purpose of this part.



Eligibility- The Secretary may carry out any of the activities described directly or through grants to, or contracts or cooperative agreements to local education agencies in partnership with nonprofit organizations, state education agencies, or IHE's.

Coordination- Research activities supported under this section—

Shall be carried out in consultation with the Institute of Educational Sciences to ensure that such activities are coordinated with and enhance the research and development activities supported by the Office of Elementary and Secondary education

Dissemination of Best Practices

Awardees will be required to disseminate their best practice through THE WHAT WORKS Clearing House.

Award and Eligibility

Not less than twenty grants within the ten Federal Regions

We recommend that with funds made available under this grant, that the secretary of Education be authorized to award not less than 20 grants in the amount of \$100,000,000 to fund local school districts to mount demonstration world language enrichment programs in those districts with both high poverty counts and are eligible for “turn around” school consideration.



References

- Curtain, H., and C.A. Pesola. 1994. *Languages and Children: Making the Match*, 2d edition. White Plains, NY: Longman. ED 376 717.
- Darling-Hammond, L. & J. Baratz-Snowden. (2005). *A Good Teacher in Every Classroom: Preparing the Highly Qualified Teachers our Children Deserve*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fenwick, Leslie T., PhD. (2001) *Patterns of Excellence: Policy Perspectives on Diversity in Teaching and School Leadership*, Howard University Press.
- Geva E. Issues in the assessment of reading disabilities in L2 children: Beliefs and research evidence. *Dyslexia* 2000; 6 (1):13-28
- Geva E. Learning to read in a second language: Research, implications, and recommendations for services. In: Tremblay R.E., Barr R.G., Peters RDeVV, eds. *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development* [Online]. Montreal, Quebec: Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development; 2006:1-12. Available at: <http://www.childencyclopedia.com/documents/GevaANGxp.pdf>.
- Gray, La Ruth and Ahram, Rory. *The Unfinished Agenda: Full Funding for Title I*. NABSE (2000)
- Grissmer, D.W., *Does Money Matter for Minority and Disadvantaged Students: Assessing the Empirical Evidence*. National Center for Research, Development in School Finance, Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (1997).
- Hart, B., & Risley, T.R. (1995). *Meaningful differences in the everyday experiences of young American children*. Baltimore: Brookes.
- Jennings, John F., *Title I: Its Legislative History and Its Promise*. Phi Delta Kappan. (2000). John Podesta and Cynthia G. Brown, "NEEDED: Federal Action for Fair Funding of High Poverty Schools," *Education Week*, July 25, 2008.
- Lipton, G. 1995. *Focus on FLES*: Planning and Implementing FLES* Programs (Foreign Language in Elementary Schools)*. Baltimore, MD: National FLES* Institute.
- Raegen T. Miller and Cynthia G. Brown., "Better Bill, Better Formula Toward a Single Fair and equitable Formula for ESEA, Title I, Part A."
- Rosenbusch, M.H. 1995. *Guidelines for Starting an Elementary School Foreign Language Program*. *ERIC Digest*. Washington, DC: ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics. ED 383 227.
- Strange, Marty. Rural and Community Trust. www.rural.edu.org



National Alliance of Black School Educators – 310 Pennsylvania Ave. SE – Washington, DC 20003