2018 Brock International Prize in Education Nominee

Pedro Noguera

Nominated by Jayanti Tambe
"He that would be a leader must also be a bridge."

Dr. Pedro Noguera exemplifies this Welsh proverb, as is seen in his life's accomplishments as a leader in the field of education. Dr. Noguera is the Distinguished Professor of Education at the Graduate School of Education and Information Studies at the University of California, Los Angeles.

Akin to a bridge across choppy waters, Dr. Noguera has spent his life in building a bridge across educational divides, establishing a firm vision towards an emphasis on the development of the whole child. A suspension bridge must be designed and constructed to withstand unforeseen events and disasters. Engineers look at the topology, the soil and the climate to determine the kind of anchor and foundation to lay. So also, Dr. Noguera has taken into account the fabric of the society of world in which we live. His willingness to dedicate over three decades
to his education and life’s work has ensured stability for the children whose lives he has been working to improve.

Stan Trecker, Dean Emeritus of Lesley University, complimented Dr. Noguera’s knowledge and achievements, “His talk about the importance of creativity in addressing the challenges and issues facing the field of Education was truly inspiring and thought-provoking. The capacity audience was enthralled with the depth of his knowledge, his life experiences, and his graceful ease during his presentation. We received very positive feedback from students, faculty, and general public in attendance.”

**Anchorages and Foundations:** Anchorages are structures that provide stability to the overall bridge. So also, Dr. Noguera’s education has been his anchor, firmly establishing him in the field of education. He has a Ph.D. in Sociology from the University of California, Berkeley, an M.A. in Sociology from Brown University, a B.A. in Sociology, also from Brown University and a Teaching Credential from Brown University.

Linda Darling-Hammond, the Charles E. Ducommun Professor of Education at the Stanford Graduate School of Education, has this to say about Dr. Noguera: “His research on school reform at high schools in Boston proved highly influential to educators throughout the country who were attempting to find ways to increase graduation rates and raise student achievement through the implementation of small learning communities and standards-based reforms. The scholarship he has produced as a result of this work, including *City Schools and the American Dream*, a book that is now widely regarded as one of the seminal pieces of scholarship on the topic of urban school reform, derive much of their originality from his direct involvement in schools. His unique intellectual vantage point as scholar, policymaker and practitioner, have made Dr. Noguera’s writings a source of guidance and inspiration to a wide variety of people in the field of education.”

**Deck of a suspension bridge:** The deck of a suspension bridge is the load-bearing portion of the bridge. A deck is the part of the bridge that is built to withstand the tension and stressors on the bridge.

Dr. Pedro Noguera ensured that he built himself a strong deck by investing many years, growing his way up from teacher to President of the Berkeley Unified School District to his current position at UCLA. He began his career as a classroom teacher in the K-12 system, working with young children in order to understand them better. He moved on to become a lecturer at UC Berkeley in the Department of Peace and Conflict Studies. After several appointments at Berkeley, Dr. Noguera joined Harvard University as the Chair of the Doctoral Program in Communities and Schools in the Graduate School of Education. He was the Sussman Visiting Professor of Education at Columbia University before he joined the Steinhart School of Culture at New York University as the Peter L. Agnews Professor of Education. Additionally, he was also the Executive Director of the Metropolitan Center for Research on Equity and the Transformation of Schools at the New York University. Dr. Noguera also worked as the Co-Director for the Institute for the Study of Globalization and Education in Metropolitan Settings (IGEMS) at the New York University.
Dr. John Sexton at New York University extolled Dr. Pedro Noguera's achievements: "While still a young Assistant Professor at UC Berkeley, Dr. Noguera served as the youngest President of the Berkeley Board of Education, and a classroom teacher at an alternative high school. Later, his tireless efforts to use research to understand and close the achievement gap at Berkeley High School, an effort that began long before there was so much national attention on this issue, now serves as a national model for how schools can address this issue." Dr. Pedro Noguera, he stated, "has dedicated his life to teaching and conducting research on the role of education as a source of social equity, and he continues to extend himself, well beyond the confines of the university to influence educational policy and work directly with schools." Dr. Noguera is, in his opinion, "truly a public intellectual who exemplifies the best in what universities should do in the name of public service."

**Cables in a suspension bridge:** Most of the bridge's load and weight is primarily suspended from the cables. These cables need to be both strong, and extremely flexible.

Dr. Noguera disseminates his knowledge to the public with a view to reforming the state of education in society. He is well respected in the field, so much so that Dr. Darling-Hammond stated, "In 2007 when I was asked to assist candidate Obama in developing policy positions on education, Dr. Noguera was one of the people I turned to for assistance. My past experience with Dr. Noguera and my familiarity with his scholarship made me confident that he was someone who could help in devising policies that could help not only the candidacy but the entire country in moving education forward."

When reviewing Dr. Noguera's book, *The Trouble with Black Boys and Other Reflections on Race, Equity, and the Future of Public Education*, Heather Killelea McEntarfer stated, "As an educational researcher myself, I admit that I tend to be drawn toward the latter. But Noguera's suggestions are specific and, as he notes, "politically feasible" (p. 187). It seems fair to count that last bit an advantage. What's more, the essays cover an impressive range of issues. They feel as if they've been written by a man who's walked the perimeter of American education, peered from this angle and from that, and offered solutions from each of several perspectives. The trouble with black boys, it turns out, can often be traced back to the trouble with American schools, and of those, Noguera offers an insightful and engaging analysis."
The Towers of the bridge:

When engineers design suspension bridges, they do so in a manner that ensures that most of the load bearing in the bridge is supported by the towers of the bridge. The towers in turn transfer the forces and the tension to the cables that support the bridge.

Dr. Noguera has been credited with understanding and interpreting the paradigm shift in the field of education. Dr. Noguera offers a new paradigm for “excellence through equity,” one grounded in the interaction and application of three areas of research: child development, neuroscience, and environmental influences. Dr. Nogeura has been the recipient of numerous awards which is a testament to the great work that he has been engaged in. The following awards are a few that he has received in the past five years.

- 2015 Horace Mann Award for distinguished service to the field of education
- 2015 Honorary Doctorate Duquesne University
- 2015 Honorary Doctorate Leslie University
- 2014 Center for the Advanced Study of the Behavioral Sciences/Sage Award for outstanding achievement in advancing the understanding of the behavioral and social sciences as they are applied to pressing social issues.
- 2014 National Association of Secondary Principals, award for distinguished service to the field of education.
- 2014 SAGE-CASBS Award (Center for the Advanced Behavioral Sciences)
- 2013 National Academy of Education, elected to membership
- 2013 McSilver Award for Combating Poverty (NYU School of Social Work)
- 2013 Honorary Doctorate, Lewis and Clark College
- 2012 John Dewey Award for Critical Scholarship in Education
- 2012 Martin Luther King Award, New York University
- 2012 Honorary Doctorate Metropolitan College of New York
- 2010 Border Crosser Award for leadership in Promoting Racial Understanding and Justice

Dr. Noguera asks of us: “So what kind of society are we going to become and what role will education play in creating a more just and equitable society? Hungry kids don’t do so well in school,” Noguera says. “Schools serving the most impoverished children are always the schools that are failing.” His research focuses on the ways in which schools are influenced by social and economic conditions, as well as by demographic trends. These are not issues that schools can solve on their own.

Dr. Pedro Noguera, through his dedicated career spanning three decades, continues to educate us on societal issues and problems and helps us grapple with real-life solutions. He has truly exemplified Ralph Ellison’s quote, “Education is all a matter of building bridges.”
PEDRO A. NOGUERA

VITA
pnoguera@gseis.ucla.edu

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT:
Distinguished Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies, UCLA

EDUCATION:
Ph.D. Sociology–December 1989, University of California, Berkeley
MA Sociology–1982, Brown University
BA Sociology/American History–1981, Brown University
Teaching Credential–1981, Brown University

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:

2003 – 2015 Peter L. Agnew Professor of Education, Departments of Teaching and Learning and Social Science and Humanities, Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Development at New York University

Affiliated appointments – Department of Sociology, Africana Studies, Latin American Studies

Executive Director of the Metropolitan Center for Research on Equity and the Transformation of Schools, New York University

Co-Director Institute for the study of Globalization and Education in Metropolitan Settings (IGEMS)

Fall 2003 Sussman Visiting Professor of Education, Teachers College, Columbia University

2000 – 2003 Judith K. Dimon Professor of Communities and Schools, Chair, Doctoral Program in Communities and Schools, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University

1996 – 2000 Associate Professor–Division of Social and Cultural Studies
Graduate School of Education, UC Berkeley
Director, Institute for the Study of Social Change, University of California, Berkeley

1990 – 1996 Assistant Professor–Division of Social and Cultural Studies
Graduate School of Education, UC Berkeley

1989 Lecturer–Department of Afro-American Studies, UC Berkeley
Instructor–Department of Social Science, Diablo Valley College

1986 Lecturer–Department of Ethnic Studies, UC Berkeley
Lecturer–Department of Peace and Conflict Studies, UC Berkeley

1981 – Present Classroom Teacher, grades K-12
RELATED PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE:


1989 – 1990  Coordinator – Diversity Initiatives, University of California, Berkeley
Responsible for designing new courses, developing campus programs, and assisting administrative units in areas related to racial and ethnic diversity. Supervised staff of five Directors who worked on multicultural issues with students.

1988 – 1989  Special Assistant to the Vice Chancellor – Business and Administrative Services, University of California, Berkeley
Responsible for administration for summer and year round youth employment programs at the University of California, Berkeley. Responsible for a staff, which recruited high school students and provided them with training, job placements, education support services, and counseling. Served as a community liaison between UC Berkeley and the Oakland/Berkeley community.

1986 – 1988  Executive Assistant – Mayor of Berkeley
Responsible for policy development, staff coordination and implementation in the following areas: youth services, crime and law enforcement, economic development and housing, homelessness and relations with the University of California. Also served as the Mayor's community liaison.

1985 – 1986  Director – South Berkeley Youth Project
Community service project established by the Office of Economic Development of the City of Berkeley, and the University of California. Trained and hired twenty-two teenagers to implement a door-to-door needs assessment survey of South Berkeley and to organize community educational events related to community development issues.
PUBLICATIONS:

Books


In Progress

Refereed Journal Articles


**Invited Chapters in Edited Volumes**


Noguera, P. A. (2008) “Immigration, Demographic Change and the Role of Educational Leadership” in by Andrew Hargraves


Non-Refereed Publications


Noguera, P. (2015) “What it Takes: The debate Over LA’s charter expansion plan is an opportunity to devise ways to ensure all schools succeed.” In EdSource, November 16th.


Noguera, P.A. “The Goal Should Be To Keep Students in School” EGPNews, June 18, 2007


Professional Reports


**FUNDED RESEARCH: (Partial listing)**

2011 – present Research to Support Comprehensive School Reform  
Denver 800K, Pittsburgh 125K, Northforest ISD 430K

2009 – present A Broader and Bolder Approach to School Reform in Newark  
Ford Foundation 1.3m, Prudential Foundation 300k, Victoria Foundation 200k


2006 – 2009 Research on Disproportionality in Special Education 8m


2001 – Present Pathways for Student Success: How School Organization and Culture Impacts  
Academic Achievement, National Science Foundation, Schott Family Foundation,  
Nellie Mae Foundation 500K

2001 Increasing parental and Community Engagement in Secondary Schools. In  
collaboration with the Boston Plan for Excellence. Funded by the Carnegie

1998 – Present Principal Investigator, Youth Together Violence Prevention Initiative, a study on  
race relations and violence prevention at seven northern California high schools.

1996-Present Principal Investigator, Lowell High School Admissions Study

1996–Present Principal Investigator, The Diversity Project, a collaborative research and reform  
initiative at Berkeley High School

1995-1996 De-Tracking the Urban High School, El Cerrito High School

1992–1996 Principal Investigator, Urban School Collaborative, Lowell Middle School,  
Oakland, CA

1989-1991 Principal Investigator, Real Alternatives Project, study on educational alternatives  
for at-risk youth

1987 – 1988 Ethnographic and historical research in Grenada

1985 Research Consultant–Goldberg and Associates. Conducted on research efforts to  
reduce illiteracy in the State of California.

1984 Research on resettlement of Salvadoran refugees in Belize. United Nations High  
Commission for Refugees.

1983 Field research on adult education and political socialization in Grenada. Conducted  
in cooperation with a UNESCO literacy project.
1982 Participant observation research on the resettlement of Cuban refugees in East Oakland.

**Advisor to the Following School Districts and State Departments of Education:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miami/Dade County, FL</td>
<td>Dayton, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta, GA</td>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore County</td>
<td>Springfield, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broward County, FL</td>
<td>Everett, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobb County, GA</td>
<td>Tacoma, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit, MI</td>
<td>Montclair, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles County, CA</td>
<td>Cambridge, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newark, NJ</td>
<td>Elizabeth, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td>Evanston, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City, NY</td>
<td>Providence, RI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HONORS AND AWARDS:

2015  Horace Mann Award for distinguished service to the field of education
2015  Honorary Doctorate Duquesne University
2015  Honorary Doctorate Leslie University
2014  Center for the Advanced Study of the Behavioral Sciences/Sage Award for outstanding achievement in advancing the understanding of the behavioral and social sciences as they are applied to pressing social issues.
2014  National Association of Secondary Principals, award for distinguished service to the field of education.
2014  SAGE-CASBS Award (Center for the Advanced Behavioral Sciences)
2013  National Academy of Education, elected to membership
2013  McSilver Award for Combating Poverty (NYU School of Social Work)
2013  Honorary Doctorate, Lewis and Clark College
2012  John Dewey Award for Critical Scholarship in Education
2012  Martin Luther King Award, New York University
2012  Honorary Doctorate Metropolitan College of New York
2010  Border Crosser Award for leadership in Promoting Racial Understanding and Justice
2010  Honorary doctorate from Bank Street College
2009  Hero Award for Leadership in Education. Scholastic Books.
2008  Hot Schott Award for Research on Race and Gender. Schott Foundation.
2006  25 Most Influential Hispanics in New York City El Diario Magazine
2005  Whitney Young Award for Leadership in Field of Education, Nation Urban League, Orlando, Florida
2005  Eugene Carothers Human Relations Award
2003  100 Most Influential Hispanic Leader, Hispanic Business Magazine
2002  Honorary Doctorate in Education, University of San Francisco
2001  Faculty Speaker, Commencement Address, graduate School of Education, Harvard University
2001  Centennial Medal for Outstanding Contributions in the Field of Education Philadelphia University
2000  Distinguished Service Award from the Berkeley Public Education Foundation
2000  Distinguished Service Award, Dean of Student Life, UC Berkeley
1997  University of California, Berkeley Distinguished Teaching Award
1996  University of California Award for Community Service
1995  California Wellness Foundation–Award for Research on Youth Violence
1994  City of Berkeley Icon Award for Community Service
1994  Hellman Family Faculty Fellowship
1994  40 Leaders Under 40, EastBay Express
1993  Eisenhower Mathematics, Engineering and Science Award
1992  Presidential School Improvement Award
1992  San Francisco Foundation School Improvement Research Award
1991  Junior Faculty Research Fellowship
1986  30 Top Leaders Under 30, Ebony Magazine
1985  President, Associated Students, University of California, Berkeley
1984  Chairman, Graduate Assembly, University of California, Berkeley
1984  Tinker Foundation Travel Award for Research in Belize and El Salvador
1981  American Sociology Association Graduate Fellowship
1981  Brown University Teaching Assistant Prize
1981  Samuel P. Lampert Prize for Advanced International Understanding in Sociology
PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES:

Board Member, The After School Corporation, 2006 – present
Board Member, Scholastic Corporation Education Advisory Committee, 2006 – 2008.
Board Member, Brotherhood Sister Sol, 2008
Board Member, Alliance for Quality Education, 2006 – present
Board Member, Economic Policy Institute, 2007 – present
Member, Blue Ribbon Commission on the Education of the Whole Child, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development
Chair, New York City Council Task Force on Middle Schools
President, Caribbean Studies Association 2005 –’06
Vice President, Caribbean Studies Association, 2004 – ‘05
Chair—AERA Committee on Ethics in Research and Human Rights (1993 – 95)
Member, Executive Committee, Pacific Sociological Association (1998 – 2000)
Member—American Sociological Association, Committee of International Sociology
Member—Youth Violence Prevention Taskforce, Centers for Disease Control, Atlanta, GA
Member—Task Force on Black Student Retention, UC Berkeley
Member—Board of Directors, South African Education Fund
Member—Board of Directors Koshland Awards Committee
Member—Caribbean Studies Association
Member—Board of Directors, Berkeley Community Foundation
Member—Congressman Ronald V. Dellums, District Executive Committee

FOREIGN LANGUAGES:
Spanish (read/write)
Portuguese (adequate reading)
The 2017 RHSU Edu-Scholar Public Influence Rankings

By Rick Hess on January 11, 2017 6:30 AM

Today, we unveil the 2017 RHSU Edu-Scholar Public Influence Rankings. Simply being included in this list of 200 scholars is an honor, given the tens of thousands who might qualify. The ranked scholars include the top 146 finishers from last year, along with 54 "at-large" nominees chosen by the 27-member selection committee (see yesterday's post for a list of committee members and all the salacious methodological details). The metrics, as explained yesterday, recognize those university-based scholars in the U.S. who are doing the most to influence educational policy and practice. The rubric reflects both a scholar's larger body of work and their impact on the public discourse last year.

Here are the 2017 rankings (click chart for larger view). Please note that all university affiliations reflect a scholar's institution as of December 2016. Only university-based researchers are eligible. (As explained yesterday, "university-based" requires a formal university affiliation, including a webpage on a university site.) After all, the point is to encourage universities to pay more attention to the stuff of scholarly participation in the public square. The bottom line: this is a serious but inevitably imperfect attempt to nudge academe to do more to encourage and recognize scholarship that impacts the real world.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Google Scholar</th>
<th>Book Points</th>
<th>Highest Amazon Ranking</th>
<th>Tylenol Points</th>
<th>Newspaper Mentions</th>
<th>Education Press Mentions</th>
<th>Web Mentions</th>
<th>Congressional Record Mentions</th>
<th>Short Point</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Twitter Handle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linda Darling-Hammond</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>80.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>173.9</td>
<td>@lindahammondd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Ravitch</td>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>@dianeravitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvie Ladson-Billings</td>
<td>U. Wisconsin</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>154.8</td>
<td>@ladsonbillings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Duckworth</td>
<td>U. Penn</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>123.0</td>
<td>@angeladuckw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Gardner</td>
<td>Harvard</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>148.4</td>
<td>@howardgardner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude Steele</td>
<td>UC Berkeley</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>@oascle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedro Noguera</td>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>@pdrenoguera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry Cuban</td>
<td>Stanford</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>125.8</td>
<td>@cubanlarry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaun R. Harper</td>
<td>U. Penn</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>@shaunharper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sara Goldrick-Rab</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>126.9</td>
<td>@sagoldrickrab</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Without further ado, let's get to the results. The top scorers? All are familiar edu-names, who have authored influential works and who have played outsized public and professional roles. Topping the rankings, just as she did last year, was Stanford University's Linda Darling-Hammond. The rest of the top five, in order, were Diane Ravitch of NYU, Gloria Ladson-Billings of the University of Wisconsin, U. Penn's Angela Duckworth, and Harvard's Howard Gardner. Rounding out the top ten were UC Berkeley's Claude Steele, UCLA's Pedro Noguera, Larry Cuban of Stanford, Shaun R. Harper of U. Penn, and Temple's Sara Goldrick-Rab. These are veteran, accomplished scholars who have accumulated large bodies of heavily cited scholarly work and who have spent decades in the public square. In an interesting turn, though, three—Duckworth, Harper, and Goldrick-Rab—are of a much younger academic generation, but have carved out outsized public profiles on issues ranging from social and emotional learning to college costs.

Columbia (TC)'s Christopher Emdin made the biggest single leap from last year, climbing 99 spots to 32nd place. His rise was fueled by the remarkable success of his bestselling Beacon

Stanford University and Harvard University each fared exceptionally well, with Stanford placing five scholars in the top 20 and Harvard three. UCLA, U. Penn, and the University of Virginia also placed multiple scholars in the top 20. When it came to overall representation, Harvard led the way with 25 ranked scholars. Stanford was second, with 19, and Columbia was third, with 16. Overall, 54 universities had at least one scholar make the cut.

A number of top scorers penned influential books of recent vintage. Just in the past year, U. Penn’s Angela Duckworth authored the blockbuster *Grit: The Power of Passion and Perseverance*; Morehouse’s Marc Lamont Hill published *Nobody: Causalities of America’s War on the Vulnerable, from Ferguson to Flint and Beyond*; and Sara Goldrick-Rab made it onto the late-night talk shows with her timely *Paying the Price*.

As with any such ranking, this exercise ought to be interpreted with appropriate caveats. Given that the ratings are a snapshot, the results obviously favor scholars who published a successful book or big study last year. But that’s how the world works. And that’s why we do this every year.

A few scholars tended to lead the field in any given category. For those of you keeping score at home, here’s a quick review of the category-killers:

More than thirty scholars maxed out on Google Scholar. When it came to book points, fourteen scholars maxed out, including Darling-Hammond, Ravitch, Gardner, Larry Cuban of Stanford, and Paul Peterson of Harvard. Duckworth and Stanford’s Jo Boaler took top honors for Amazon points, with 20.0 and 19.8 respectively. Twenty scholars maxed out on syllabus points, including Drew University’s Patrick McGuinn, Michael Feuer of George Washington University, Northwestern’s David Figlio, and UCLA’s Patricia Gandara. (The syllabus category is new this year: Scores were calculated by identifying the work of each scholar that is used most often on syllabi from across American, British and Canadian universities and then tallying how frequently the work was assigned.)

As far as attention in the education press, Darling-Hammond, Ravitch, Duckworth, Harvard’s Jim Ryan, Harper, and University of Virginia’s Daniel Willingham topped the charts. When it came to mentions in mainstream newspapers, Duckworth, Goldrick-Rab, the University of Michigan’s Susan Dynarski, Marc Lamont Hill, Steele, and Jacob Vigdor of the University of Washington were tops. In terms of web visibility, the top finishers were Stanford's Reardon, Ladson-Billings, NYU’s Flores of NYU, Johns Hopkins’ Robert Slavin and Gene Glass of CU Boulder were tops. In the wild-and-woolly world of social media, Ravitch and Marc Lamont Hill posted the top Klout scores.

If readers want to argue the relevance, construction, reliability, or validity of the metrics, go for it. I’m not sure that I’ve got the measures right or even how much these results can or should tell us. That said, I think the same can be said about college rankings, NFL quarterback ratings, or
international scorecards of human rights. For all their imperfections, I think such efforts convey real information—and help spark useful discussion.
reframing the achievement gap

For the past two decades, sociologist Pedro Noguera has been at the forefront of a national conversation about how to strengthen urban schools. In contrast to those who focus on factors such as accountability and test scores in addressing the achievement gap, Noguera favors programs that emphasize the social, intellectual, and emotional development of low-income students. He is the co-founder of a Broader, Bolder Approach to Education, a national campaign that focuses on addressing social and economic disadvantages. BBA provides empirical research that demonstrates the value of a holistic approach for reducing the achievement gap among low-income students. The son of Caribbean immigrant parents, Noguera is the Peter L. Agnew Professor of Education at New York University, the executive director of the Metropolitan Center for Urban Education, and co-director of the Institute for the Study of Globalization and Education in Metropolitan Settings (IGEMS). Contexts editorial board member Victor Rios, professor of sociology at University of California, Santa Barbara, conducted this interview.

VICTOR RIOS: The Secretary of Education, Arnie Duncan, has called the achievement gap—the disparity in educational performance between black and Latino students, and white students—the most pressing educational issue in our country today. Your pioneering research seeks ways to close this gap. How do you think we can go about closing this achievement gap?

PEDRO NOGUERA: I would reframe it. I would say that the most pressing issue today facing the country is inequality, and that the achievement gap is an educational manifestation of inequality. The only way we can really think about reducing disparities in achievement is by addressing social inequality. As it relates to education, we have to think about it on multiple levels. Those disparities are produced both by the backgrounds of kids, that is, family income, parent education, neighborhood support, and social capital, but also by conditions within schools, such as pupil spending and teacher effectiveness. So, we really should think about both.

There’s a lot less willingness to address the out-of-school factors. But I think there are things that could be done at a local level to reduce, or at least mitigate, some of the effects of poverty and inequality, like developing full service schools with extended day care programs and school-based clinics. Mainly, you have to think in terms of compensating for the disadvantages that affect the learning and development of children. For example, you have to think about extending learning opportunities after school such as summer school. You have to think about reducing class size, because we know that when teachers who are capable teach smaller numbers of kids, their ability to reach their kids goes up.

VR: You write about the educational marginalization of black and Latino boys who are often missing from university settings. What is the future of higher education for these young people?

PN: Well, unless concerted efforts are made to address the problem, we will continue to see black and Latino males vastly underrepresented in higher education. This has significant implications for the fastest growing segments of U.S. populations, particularly for Latinos. We have to first understand why this is occurring, why males in particular
are performing less well in school. It is not simply a school issue, it is a societal issue and the factors are complex and interrelated. They have to do with the intersections of class, race, and gender and the way that identities are constructed in school and outside of school. We know for example, that stereotypes pertaining to black and Latino males in our society have an impact on aspirations, on teacher expectations, and on the ways young boys and men are treated in everyday life by employers, by the police, and by other institutions.

The good news is that there are schools that are more successful in educating black and Latino males and preparing them for college, and we have to learn from these schools and what they are doing differently. Typically, those schools provide a much more supportive learning environment—not only focused on academic needs. They are also focused on the students’ social, emotional, and psychological needs.

**VR:** What are some examples of these schools?

**PN:** Well, there is an organization, a national coalition called Coalition of Schools Educating Boys of Color (COSBOC), which is a consortium of schools educating boys of color that works with schools from around the country. In New York there are many of these schools, such as the Eagle Academy, the Urban Assembly for Law and Justice, and the Bedford Academy. These are schools where nearly all the students are African American or Latino, but where higher levels of achievement are the norm. This is largely because of the factors I mentioned, including strong school leadership and teachers who work closely with students, and who focus much more on learning than on raising test scores.

**VR:** We have seen an astronomical rise in college tuition over the past five years in the U.S. What does this mean for low income young Americans in terms of higher education?

**PN:** I think it’s quite ominous. I went to school in the 1970s, at a time where there were programs and a steady increase in access for students who are historically underrepresented. What we’re seeing now is that college is getting less affordable and students have to take on much more debt. This is not because they cannot afford school at all. I think that the long-term implications are quite troubling—especially given the growing diversity of this country and the fact that this generation of children will need to support the rapidly growing older, predominantly white population in their retirement by contributing to Social Security. So it is a huge problem facing our country.

**VR:** Your work is always policy and pedagogy relevant. Based on your extensive experience, what policy recommendations do you propose to support marginalized young people in their endeavors to achieve higher education?

**PN:** Part of what we have been pushing for is a rethinking of what we regard as standards. We need to move away from the notion that standards are about
setting the academic bar higher. Instead we should focus on the conditions under which children learn, or under which teachers teach. States and districts need to get much more focused on how to ensure that there is equity and equality in those standards. Similarly, we have also been pushing against the kinds of being a school board member (in Berkeley, California) and a university trustee (of the State University of New York). What is next for you in terms of research and policy?

PN: I’m constantly thinking about how to influence the direction of policy at local, state and federal levels, and where

VR: As a sociologist of inequality, education, and urban issues, what are your overall reflections on the future of higher education?

PN: As I said before, I think that until we can address this issue of access and the cost of higher education, we are in trouble as a nation. I think that the path we are on is unsustainable and that the institutions of higher education, particularly at public universities, are in trouble. Educational institutions cannot simply rely on tuition from affluent families or wealthy donors to cover costs. The public institutions are already in trouble. With the University of California and other large public systems, very difficult choices are being made about the future—choices that are jeopardizing the quality of higher education and certainly jeopardizing access for students from poor and working class backgrounds. I think that we have to figure out a way to address this. I haven’t seen any states yet come up with creative solutions. This is the kind of work we need to be doing right now to ensure that institutions of higher education are accessible.

We need to move away from the notion that standards are about setting the academic bar higher.

policies that allow the most disadvantaged children to be concentrated in under-resourced schools. We’ve been exposing the fact that a new form of racial segregation is really widespread in this country. Part of my work is to shine a light on what is happening, and also to point in the direction of different approaches that can be taken to address these problems.

VR: You have taught in public schools, you have studied young people in local and international educational and community settings, and you’ve been a policy maker on many levels including there is an openness or willingness to considering new approaches. I want to try to help policy makers to develop and enact new policies. For example, I’ve done work in several cities, including Pittsburgh, Hartford, Denver, and Houston, where there is a willingness to think in a more comprehensive and integrative manner about how to bring different services together to support schools. I think that kind of work can happen even when the federal government is not leading it, and we should look for areas where it is possible to do that work.
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Abstract
American society is in the midst of profound economic and demographic changes. At the same time that the racial and ethnic composition of American society is changing, disparities in income and wealth have grown wider and more pronounced than ever before. This article explores the ways in which race is implicated in the widening gaps in wealth and opportunity, and how these inequities impact educational achievement.
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American society is in the midst of profound economic and demographic changes. By the year 2043, demographers project that the United States will become a minority-majority nation—a country where those currently categorized as racial minorities will comprise the majority of the U.S. population (Taylor, 2014; for the purpose of this article, minority backgrounds will include individuals identified in the U.S. Census as anything other than "White" Americans). In a major report issued by the Pew Research Center entitled The Next America, author Paul Taylor (2014) wrote,

Our modern immigrants are different from the big waves of newcomers who came in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Back then, about nine-in-ten immigrants were from Europe. Today only about 12% are from Europe. ... Our immigrant stock—that's immigrants and their children—is projected to make up about 37% of our population by mid-century, the highest share in our history. ("Immigration Is Driving Our Demographic Makeover," paras. 1–2)
For a nation that once restricted citizenship to “free white persons”—thereby denying basic civil rights to indentured servants, free Blacks, Native Americans, and Asians (Schultz, 2000, p. 284)—it is hardly surprising that reactions to changing demographics could be unsettled. In fact, there is considerable evidence that anxiety related to the shifting demographics played a role in tilting the recent presidential election in favor of Trump (Agiesta, 2016). Yet, despite the angst and the apparent backlash against minorities and immigrants, the changes described in the Taylor report have already occurred in four states (California, Hawaii, New Mexico, and Florida) and will soon occur in others (Maciag, 2015). Moreover, not all of the change in demographics can be attributed to immigration. In 2008, 14.6% of marriages in the United States were between individuals from different racial backgrounds, and births of children of mixed-race and minority backgrounds have outpaced White births for several years (Wazwaz, 2015). Since 2014, children from minority backgrounds have constituted the majority of children in our nation’s public schools (National Center for Education Statistics, 2016, Table 203.50), and since 2014 they have constituted the majority of children in the United States under the age of five (Wazwaz, 2015).

At the same time that the racial and ethnic composition of American society is changing, disparities in income and wealth have grown wider and more pronounced than ever before. According to Nobel Prize–winning economist Joseph Stiglitz,

_The United States has become the most unequal country among the advanced industrial countries. … We have less opportunity than not only the countries of all of Europe, but any of the advanced industrial countries for which there’s data. And what that means is very simple: The life chances of an individual are more dependent on the income and education of his parent than in other countries. And an implication of that is people born in the bottom, who unfortunately chose the parents who were poor or not well-educated, will be more likely not to be able to live up to his potential._ (Ryssdal, 2012, para. 8)

Beyond income and wealth, inequality affects many aspects of life in American society. From access to transportation and health care to Internet services, employment opportunities, and education, inequality is shaping the character and quality of life for most Americans.

In the last few years it has become increasingly clear that broad analyses of the growth in racial and economic inequality often do not accurately capture the picture of what is happening to poor and working-class Whites across America. In many parts of the United States, the incomes of non–college educated Whites have been in decline (Pew Research Center, 2015). Furthermore, working-class Whites constitute the only segment of the U.S. population that has experienced a decline in life expectancy and a rise in suicide rates (Chen, 2016). While incomes and employment rates for Whites, particularly White men, continue to be significantly higher than those of Blacks and Latinos, it is important to recognize that economic inequality is a problem that affects all racial and ethnic groups.

**The Impact of Racial Inequality on Education**

As has been true throughout much of America’s history, public schools are the institution where the dramatic changes occurring in society are being experienced first. As poverty rates rose dramatically during the Great Recession of 2008, the percentage of children from
families in poverty climbed to a high of 22% (Putnam, 2015). Today, 1 out of 2 students in American public schools (approximately 52%) come from low-income homes—the highest percentage since the National Center for Education Statistics began tracking this figure decades ago (Southern Education Foundation, 2015).

Not surprisingly, growing poverty and economic inequality are having an impact on education and the opportunities available to children. Writing about the detrimental effects of inequality on future generations in his book Our Kids, Harvard political scientist Robert Putnam (2015) observed,

Poor kids, through no fault of their own, are less prepared by their families, their schools, and their communities to develop their God-given talents as fully as rich kids. For economic productivity and growth, our country needs as much talent as we can find, and we certainly can’t afford to waste it. The opportunity gap imposes on all of us both real costs and what economists term “opportunity costs.” (p. 230)

Race figures prominently in the opportunity gap mentioned by Putnam, and evidence shows that widening gaps in wealth and opportunity have a profound impact on educational achievement. For the last 16 years, federal education policy has been focused on reducing racial gaps in academic achievement; however, closing opportunity gaps has been a much lower priority in the educational policy agenda. A report by the Office of Civil Rights in the U.S. Department of Education documented widespread disparities in access to preschool, college counselors, and college prep and advanced courses (U.S. Department of Education, 2014). While both Democratic and Republican politicians have asserted that education can be used to reduce inequality, it has become increasingly clear that deeply entrenched economic and racial fault lines that have widened and become even more pronounced in recent years cannot be ameliorated by education alone. Recent results from the Programme for International Student Assessment, an international academic assessment used to compare educational progress in a number of wealthy nations, show that American education continues to be characterized by distinct racial inequities in academic outcomes and, most importantly, opportunities (Yu & Cantor, 2016).

Disparities in educational performance are especially pronounced in the hypersegregated Black ghettos that dot the urban landscape throughout American society. In such communities, schools generally perform poorly and are typically grossly underfunded (Orfield, 2013). Segregation by race and class continues to prevail even in cities such as New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Denver, which have experienced dramatic shifts in demographics as the number of middle-class Whites has increased as a result of gentrification. Again, the connection between racial disparities in academic performance and growing economic inequality between racial groups should not be lost. The gap in median household income between Whites and African Americans is now the widest it has been since 1989; in 2013, the median household net worth for Blacks was $11,000, as compared to $141,900 for non-Hispanic Whites (Kochhar & Fry, 2014).

Latinos and Native Americans are less likely to be concentrated in urban areas, but their economic status and the performance of the schools that serve them are equally grim.
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Latinos, the fastest growing ethnic group in the U.S. population, gaps in income and wealth are nearly as wide as those experienced by Blacks, and increasingly Latino children are more likely to attend segregated schools than any other ethnic group. According to a 2014 report by the Civil Rights Project (Orfield & Ee, 2014), Latino students in California were more likely than any other ethnic group to attend a school where the majority of students are non-White and with high rates of concentrated poverty. Gary Orfield, the codirector of the Civil Rights Project (and a coauthor of one of the articles in this special issue) explained how these patterns are playing out in California, the state with the largest Latino population:

The playing field in California is profoundly uneven. How can a student who grows up in a family with fewer resources, in a neighborhood that has fewer educational activities, attends a less demanding school with fewer teachers and students who are well-prepared, and a more limited curriculum have a fair chance to compete with students who face none of these inequalities? (Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, 2014, para. 14)

As public schools attempt to respond to the demographic and economic changes occurring in the nation, more often than not they have been forced to do so without adequate guidance or resources. Today, even as policy makers debate immigration policy and battle one another over how to deal with the millions of undocumented people already living in the United States, public schools are denied the luxury of time to figure out how to serve the social, educational, and linguistic needs of the immigrant children. U.S. courts have consistently ruled that immigrant children, including the undocumented, have the right to a public education, and that right has been upheld even when states have attempted to deny it; in 1982, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled in Plyler v. Doe that states cannot constitutionally deny undocumented immigrant students free public education (American Immigration Council, 2012). Although many schools lack the space, trained teachers (and other personnel), or even translation services to meet the needs of these newcomers, policy makers have for the most part not modified the accountability demands placed on the schools that have been most impacted by the increased presence of immigrant students.

Likewise, policy makers have done relatively little to help schools or provide guidance in how they should address rising poverty, homelessness, and hunger. Recognizing the impossibility of separating a child’s educational needs from their social, psychological, and emotional needs, public schools are forced to devise strategies to address the social needs of children who arrive at school poorly nourished, in poor health, lacking adequate housing, and in some cases suffering from various forms of trauma and toxic stress. That they often respond inadequately is as much a testament to the difficulty of the responsibility that has been placed on them as it is to a lack of competence or commitment.

About the Special Issue

The authors in this special issue of The Educational Forum have taken on these complex issues, both to illuminate how schools are being affected by the larger trends occurring in American society (e.g., growing racial segregation, inequality, immigration, gentrification) and to offer, in some cases, recommendations for how these issues can be addressed. Doing so necessarily compels these authors to examine the relationship between macrolevel trends
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in society and their impact on schools. It also compels them to critically analyze the policy approaches that have been proffered to address these issues.

For example, several of the authors show how current approaches to school reform have affected conditions in public schools, and they make it clear that the structures and supports for vulnerable students are, for the most part, not in place. Despite the dramatic changes occurring in American society, poverty and racial segregation have not been the focus of education policy in recent years. Instead, policy makers have fixated on the possibility of using higher academic standards and increased public accountability to pressure schools into improvement. The authors of this special issue of The Educational Forum have placed these factors at the center of their analysis. They do so because the “equity impact” of U.S. education policy and the current approaches to education reforms that have been popular, especially in urban schools, have largely failed to improve educational opportunities for poor children of color, who now constitute the majority of children in America’s public schools. (For an analysis of education policy and its impact on poor children and efforts to close the achievement gap, see Barton & Coley, 2010.)

For this reason, the authors in this special issue directly address the racial and socioeconomic impact of current education policies. Such a focus represents a significant departure from most federal and state policies, which largely ignore the dynamics of race and class. Sociologist Eduardo Bonilla-Silva (2014) reminded us that equity-blind/color-mute discourse invariably perpetuates the status quo by rendering the needs of the most vulnerable children invisible. The authors in this special issue avoid this tendency by focusing directly on race and class. They recognize that strategies aimed at reducing disparities in achievement will never succeed if they do not address the blatant denial of basic educational opportunities and the unmet social needs of children. Undoubtedly, such a focus will become even more important in the years ahead as the Trump administration charts a new direction for federal policy. In such a climate, finding ways to ensure that equity becomes a priority in school reform may be difficult, but given current trends, to do any less will most assuredly imperil America’s future.
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The Trouble With Black Boys... and Other Reflections on Race, Equity, and the Future of Public Education

Review by Jeremy Cutler, University of Pennsylvania

In The Trouble With Black Boys... and Other Reflections on Race, Equity, and the Future of Public Education, Pedro Noguera takes a thoughtful yet critical look at the myriad of social, cultural, and political factors that have resulted in the troubling achievement levels for poor and minority students. Noguera critiques the currently pervasive habit of blaming schools, teachers, parents, and especially kids for the educational failures of inner-city public schools instead of acknowledging the larger social and economic inequalities at work in our society that undermine our ability to educate all children. Using many case studies and vignettes, Noguera shows how instead of recognizing the fact that poor children come to school with very different needs, policymakers have become accustomed to condemning and humiliating urban schools and the poor and minority students who attend them. And in the instances where schools are experiencing success in educating poor and minority kids, Noguera argues that remarkably less energy has been focused on studying and replicating those particular schools and techniques. In The Trouble With Black Boys, Noguera sets out to correct that: to highlight and build upon reforms that can work in urban schools; and to create ideas that can serve to support and engage the historically vulnerable and marginalized students—poor children, African American males, and recent immigrants.

Noguera’s essays are grouped, by chapters, into three main sections. The first section, “The Student Experience,” explores the ways in which cultural and structural factors, both in and outside of schools, have a profound effect on school performance. Noguera points out how critical it is to understand both the way in which racial identity is formed in schools, as well as how this identity directly influences academic performance for minority students. These studies are often missing from discussions which address the risks faced by young minority students.

The second section, “The Search for Equity,” is largely concerned with the way that the ‘traditional’ goals of public schools—sorting students, socializing them, and maintaining order and control over them—have inadvertently helped in creating environments that are more susceptible to marginalization, disengagement, and violence among students. Disciplinary measures based on control and exclusion create disadvantages for certain children more than others; few educators have been willing to look at the ways that schools structures have served to reproduce this inequality. Alternatively, in instances when schools have put energy into seeking out and/or replicating successful models, or shown a willingness to study the effects of their own practices, the possibility for progress and more equitable conditions has increased radically.

Finally, the last section, “The Schools We Need,” serves to highlight some steps that have proven effective in mitigating the ways that concentrated poverty, racial isolation, and other political factors have traditionally been impediments to school improvement. Some of the suggestions include empowering and involving both parents and community organizations by investing in social capital, and creating a culture that questions the failure of urban schools, rather than expecting and accepting it.

While Noguera’s book reflects on the general role of race in schools and society, two of the chapters are devoted specifically to issues of immigration. In Chapter 3, “And What Will Become of Children Like Miguel Fernandez?” Noguera conveys his concern for Latino students in schools today. He cites that they have the highest dropout rates and lowest college attendance rates (Garcia, 2001) and are overrepresented in categories such as enrollment in special education and high suspensions from schools, while being underrepresented in positive categories such as honors courses or gifted and talented programs (Meier & Stewart, 1991). Noguera looks at some of the reasons why Latino immigrants have had little success in using education as a means to social mobility and fulfilling the ‘American dream.’ He chronicles the way in which first-generation hopeful immigrants quickly turn into second and third generation Latinos who have become angry and frustrated. These conflicting perspectives raise some interesting questions. For example, Noguera asks, how can the energy and drive of recent immigrants be harnessed in ways that are productive and positive, but at the same time empower them to refuse “a permanent place on the lower rungs of American society” (p. 59)?

Chapter 5, “Latino Youth: Immigration, Education, and the Future,” attempts to understand how Latino youth adjust to their life in the United States, as well as how they navigate the specific challenge of growing up in a society that is both politically and socially hostile to their presence. Noguera addresses some of the challenges that take place inside of or in relation to schools, and he suggests some interventions that schools can make to become more supportive and responsive. Noguera presents an interesting comparison be-
between Latino immigrants of today and European immigrants of earlier generations. Noguera recounts that while the earlier European immigrants encountered hardships and discrimination, their assimilation eventually brought social mobility and racial equality. Further, the author explores some trends which indicate that acculturation and assimilation is actually working against the success of Latino immigrants, and is resulting in the lowering of academic achievement (Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2001). On the other hand, Noguera illustrates that if schools were to focus more on implementing culturally-relevant curricula and pedagogy for these students, Latino immigrants might be more prepared to navigate the hardships.

The Trouble With Black Boys is a collection of essays; therefore some ideas reappear occasionally and some of the chapters flow into each other more fluidly than others. Taken as a whole, however, Noguera’s work is a both forceful and hopeful critique of urban education. The author writes in a style that is exceptionally clear and engaging, which may partly be due to the way that Noguera seamlessly combines his theoretical framework with examples from his practice as a high school teacher, school board president, university professor, and consultant to urban schools. Another factor that makes The Trouble With Black Boys such a compelling read is that Noguera proposes specific solutions for addressing these seemingly intractable problems, and usually provides personal data or anecdotes that support the validity of his ideas. For that reason, the book serves as an excellent guide not only for policy makers and academic reformers, but also for teachers, parents, and administrators looking for immediate and practical solutions to the daily struggles in their schools and with their own practice. Although Noguera concedes that a complete effort to improve urban public schools would “address the educational issues in concert with other issues, such as poverty, joblessness, and the lack of public services” (p. 230), Noguera’s specific suggestions in this collection serve as a solid and courageous base upon which to pursue equity for students of all races and socioeconomic levels.

Jeremy Cutler has been an elementary and middle school teacher, counselor, and Dean of Students for over 10 years in Boston, MA and Washington, DC. During the summer, he also directs an 8-week residential program for boys in Vermont. Jeremy holds a masters degree in Urban Education from Harvard University and is presently pursuing his doctorate in Educational Leadership at the University of Pennsylvania. His research interests include the ways in which schools respond to and plan for students’ social and emotional needs, as well as urban school reform. He can be reached at jcutl@dolphin.upenn.edu.
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The Achievement Gap and The Schools We Need

Creating the Conditions Where Race and Class No Longer Predict Student Achievement

by Pedro Noguera

The achievement gap is the term commonly used to describe the disparities in academic outcomes and variations on measures of academic ability that tend to correspond to the race and class backgrounds of students. Though such disparities are by no means new, in recent years the effort to “close the achievement gap” has become something of a national crusade. Politicians and private foundations have exhorted educators to take urgent steps to close the gap and put an end to this social scourge. Former President George W. Bush went so far as to accuse those who thought the gap couldn’t be closed of practicing “the soft bigotry of low expectations”. While it’s not clear that the President understood what he meant by this, it is clear that he strongly believed it could be done.

With the enactment of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) law in 2001 and its requirement for states to collect data on student achievement and disaggregate test scores by race and other demographic and educational characteristics, awareness about pervasive academic disparities has grown. As a consequence, student achievement data in schools and districts throughout the nation has been publicly revealed and discussed. Yet, bold public discussions have done little to actually close the gap, and Education Secretary Arne Duncan has recently announced that he does not believe schools in the United States will achieve the NCLB mandate of bringing all children to academic proficiency by the year 2014. Though there’s been no formal surrender, there now appears to be a growing realization that the achievement gap will not be eliminated any time soon.

For those who’ve been following the policy charade closely it was obvious long ago that it would take more than a clever slogan or public pressure to close the achievement gap. Unfortunately, under No Child Left Behind, slogans and pressure are about all that schools have received. Over the last eleven years, federal and state governments have readily mandated the use of standardized tests to hold students and schools accountable. More recently, policymakers have called for changes in the content of the curriculum, but they have provided schools with relatively little guidance on what they should actually do to reduce disparities in student achievement. More importantly, educational policy has not acknowledged that disparities in academic outcomes that correspond to the race and class backgrounds of students are actually a multi-dimensional phenomenon related to unequal access to early childhood education (the preparation gap), inequities in school funding (the allocation gap), differences in the amount of support well-educated, affluent parents can provide to their children versus poorer, less-educated parents (the parent gap).
Research also suggest that gaps in academic outcomes are sometimes related to strained relations between students and their teachers and may be influenced by lower expectations, particularly for poor and minority students (the teacher-student gap). A related phenomenon is tracking, the practice of placing students into groups based on perceptions of their ability. Finally, as many parents know, there are often gaps between how well students do in school (as measured by grades or test scores) versus how well they might have actually done if they were motivated to work to their ability (the performance gap). All of these dimensions are important to understanding student performance but none are considered in most of the discourse about the achievement gap. Moreover, there is little evidence that our policymakers even consider how these dimensions interact and influence student learning.

As one who has studied this issue for several years, written extensively on the topic, and worked closely with schools and districts across the country on efforts to address these issues, it is clear to me that our nation’s lack of progress is not merely due to a lack of effort. As a result of the pressure applied by NCLB and the strict accountability that has led districts to fire superintendents and principals when test scores don’t improve, educators across the country have been scrambling, and sometimes even cheating, to find ways to raise student test scores and show that gaps in performance can be closed. By now it is clear that neither pressure nor a narrowed focus on test preparation has worked in eliminating the achievement gap or in substantially raising achievement levels for all students. NAEP scores (National Assessment of Educational Progress), also referred to as the nation’s report card, have been flat, and in some cases declined over the last several years, graduation rates have barely improved, and on most international measures of academic performance, American children have fallen further behind children in other wealthy nations. Today in most of the nation’s largest cities -- Chicago, Los Angeles, Detroit, St. Louis, etc. -- a dropout rates hover at fifty percent and higher. Clearly, something is wrong with the approach we’ve taken.

There is absolutely no evidence, however, that our lack of educational progress can be attributed to the fact that educators are not working hard enough. In my work with schools throughout the country, I am often struck by the frenetic pace at which teachers and school administrators are working. However, I am also struck by the fact that many educators are working hard without fully understanding the nature of the problem they are trying to solve. Without clarity and support, and without some willingness to look closely at the schools where progress is being made and without a willingness to learn from them, I am certain that we will not succeed in making much of a dent in closing the achievement gap. More importantly, to the degree that a school or district is mired in debates over who is to blame for the existence of the gap -- lazy and culturally deficient students, uncaring parents, inept teachers, etc. -- and there is a reluctance to share responsibility for finding solutions, there is little chance at all that we will make much progress in addressing the factors that perpetuate the achievement gap in the first place.

Understanding the Gaps

In the research literature, much of the attention on the role and significance of race in disparities in academic outcomes can be traced to a seminal book by Christopher Jencks and Meredith Phillips entitled The Black-White Test Score Gap. In the book, the authors documented what had
been well known for some time: African American children, even those from middle class families, consistently perform less well than White children. Yet, while the book presented numerous studies, most of them based on statistical analyses of large data-bases, it actually did relatively little to shed light on the phenomena other than to document its existence. Since its release in 1998, several other books on the subject have been written, but in most cases, aside from reminding readers of the existence of the gap, relatively little in the way of answers for what should be done to address it have been offered.

With little in the way of guidance from researchers, it is hardly surprising that there is so much confusion among policymakers and educators across the country about what should be done to close the gap, or even how race is related to it. As is true on other matters pertaining to race such as crime, voting behavior or immigration, once race is inserted into a policy discussion it often has the effect of distorting how an issue is perceived. Consider the fact that not all White students are high achievers. Indeed, in the Appalachian regions of Pennsylvania and southern Ohio, African American students often achieve at higher levels than White students. In states like Maine, Vermont and West Virginia where there are relatively few minority students, there are large numbers of White students who drop out of school, perform poorly on standardized tests and do not enroll in college. Yet, because the policy discourse about the achievement gap has framed the issue largely in racial terms, policy makers and many educators have overlooked the fact that many students across the country are not receiving an education that would adequately prepare them for college or adulthood.

A closer look at the evidence reveals that children from impoverished families from all ethnic backgrounds (with the notable exception of some immigrants) typically perform less well than affluent children. So too do children whose first language is something other than English, unless they are literate in their native language and were well educated in their home country. Likewise, children with learning disabilities, children in foster care, and children with incarcerated parents, all tend to do less well in school than children without these disadvantages. To some extent, this is because gaps in achievement are a reflection of disparities in other opportunities (i.e., income, parental education, healthcare, etc.). There are of course exceptions to these patterns -- poor Black children who excel, wealthy White children who don't, Asian students who are not good at math, etc. The exceptions are important because they remind us that there is nothing inherently deficient about students who happen to be low achievers, regardless of their backgrounds.

When disparities in academic achievement are studied closely, it becomes clear that in many ways the achievement gap is first and foremost an educational manifestation of social inequality. If educators fail to understand or fail to address the numerous ways in which other inequities -- in income, health, housing, etc. -- interact with learning outcomes, then much of what is done to ameliorate the problem will simply not work. We have known for years that these gaps in achievement generally show up even before students start formal schooling -- in their vocabulary, in social skills and even in their ability to sit still and listen to teachers. We have also known that family income and parental education are the strongest predictors of how well a student will perform on the SAT. Furthermore, we have known for years that when poor children of color attend under-funded, racially segregated schools they generally don’t do so well.
However, policymakers and the courts have done relatively little to incorporate what we know about inequity into strategies for improving student learning outcomes. Instead, they have offered public pressure and even condemnation of educators who have failed to produce results. More recently, educational leaders such as Arne Duncan and former New York Chancellor Joel Klein have taken to offering moral appeals such as calling the effort to close the achievement gap the civil rights issue of the 21st century. Unfortunately, they have done very little to insure that all children, regardless of their backgrounds, actually have access to a quality education.

In many schools, gaps between White and minority students grow wider even within the same cohort of children by the 3rd grade, and the disparities are more pronounced in higher-order skill domains such as deriving meaning from text, drawing inferences beyond the literal text, and understanding rate and measurement in mathematics. Again, the Black-White achievement gap has drawn the most attention, and been captured over time in results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, but it is important to keep in mind that depending on the composition of a school or community, patterns in achievement will very considerably.

Achievement and attainment gaps are revealed through a host of schooling indexes, including grade point averages; performance on district, state, and national achievement tests; rates of enrollment in rigorous courses such as advanced placement and honors classes; and differential placements in special education and gifted-and-talented programs. Significantly, gaps that correspond to the race and class backgrounds of students are also manifest across behavioral indicators such as school dropout, suspension, and discipline referral rates. Typically, minority students who come from families that have the least in the way of financial resources receive most of the punishment in school. A recent Texas study entitled Breaking School Rules followed every incoming seventh grader in Texas over three year period, and in some cases beyond high school graduation. Its most shocking finding is that nearly 60% of the students in the study were suspended at least once (this includes in-school suspension), and an alarming 31% were suspended at least four times. African American students were over-represented among those who had been suspended and subjected to the harshest forms of discipline, including placement in alternative classrooms. A shocking 83% of African American males and 74% of Latino males in the study were suspended at least once, and one in seven students in the study was suspended at least eleven times. Obviously, students who are excluded from school for punishment tend to do less well academically, but the connection between the discipline gap and the achievement gap has drawn relatively little attention at all from policymakers. This is one more example of the way policymakers ignore the many dimensions of the achievement gap.

The Roots of the Achievement Gap in American History

Throughout the history of the United States, there have been striking, persistent and often predictable gaps in achievement between African American, Native American and Latino students (both boys and girls) and their White counterparts. This is hardly surprising given America’s history of racial oppression and discrimination. The view of intelligence that prevailed throughout most of the 19th and 20th centuries held that non-Whites, particularly Blacks, Native Americans, Hispanics, and even some Eastern Europeans, were genetically inferior and possessed lower levels of intellectual capacity than Caucasians, particularly those
who originated in northwestern Europe. Such views about the relationship between race, ethnicity, and intelligence had considerable influence upon social science research, psychology, and the theories that guided the development of the I.Q. test and, more generally, the development of the comprehensive high school.

One could argue that the very notion that the achievement gap can and should be closed represents a step forward because it is in effect a repudiation of the notion that innate differences in intelligence would make equality in academic outcomes impossible. Yet, the history of beliefs about the relationship between race and intelligence in the United States continues to be highly relevant to current efforts aimed at closing the achievement gap because racist thinking about the intellectual capacity of different ethnic groups has contributed to the development of racist educational policies and practices. For example, maintaining racially segregated schools by law or social convention was practiced widely throughout US and premised on the notion that racially inferior children should be educated separately. This was true in most cases not only for African American children (both in the north and the south), but also for Mexican children throughout the Southwest, Asian children in California (Japanese Americans were required to attend racially segregated schools in San Francisco until 1947), and Native American children who were either educated on reservations or involuntarily taken from their families to be educated far away in boarding schools by missionaries. Even after such practices were effectively outlawed with the Brown Decision in 1954, schools throughout the United States to this day continue to be characterized by a high degree of separation on the basis of race and class.

What is especially important about this history is how it has coincided with the uniquely American approach to school funding. In most parts of the country, local property taxes are used to generate revenue for public schools. This typically means that wealthy communities are typically able to spend more money on their children than poor communities. Money is used to pay for teacher salaries, school facilities and learning materials. Hence, inequities in funding translate most often into inequities in educational opportunities. In general, we spend the most on the children who come from families that have the most resources, and we spend the least on those who have the greatest needs. In all of the talk about closing the achievement gap over the last eleven years, not one major policy figure has suggested that equalizing funding should be included as part of the strategy.

None of this should be new or surprising to anyone who has even a cursory understanding of American history, yet recognition of our history of unequal treatment is not reflected in current education policy. In fact, NCLB is based on a perverse form of equity. In states across the country, we hold all children regardless of their backgrounds, where they live, or the kinds of schools they attend to the same standards. Children in the South Bronx and Watts take the same exams as children in Scarsdale and Beverly Hills, even though we know they do not receive the same kind of education or receive similar types of support for learning at home. We pretend that we can create a level playing field without doing anything to address the history and current reality of racial inequality. Not surprisingly, it hasn’t worked.
Learning from the Schools Where Gaps are Closing

Advocates of NCLB, and this includes many of the national civil rights organizations, have aggressively called for common standards and defended high stakes testing. They fear that if we lower standards for some students we will effectively condemn them to an inferior education and that standardized tests are the only way to insure accountability. Their concern is understandable given that prior to NCLB it was not uncommon for students to graduate from schools in the US with minimal skills and unprepared for college or work. But NCLB hasn’t solved this problem. In fact, throughout the country there are large numbers of students who have passed state exams but are required to take remedial courses in college because they lack basic writing and math skills.

More importantly, the NCLB defenders fail to see that there is an alternative to the narrow use of standards and accountability. Rather than lowering standards for some students to compensate for their inadequate learning opportunities, we could do far more to level the educational playing field by focusing on creating optimal learning conditions for all children.

This is the approach that a handful of schools and districts have taken, and in several cases, it’s working. For example, at Brocton High School in Massachusetts, a school where over 70% of students are from low-income, minority families – many of which do not speak English as the first language at home – over 80% of students score at proficiency on the state exam, and this past spring over 90% passed the exam. This is particularly noteworthy given that the Massachusetts exam is widely regarded as the most rigorous in the country. What makes Brocton High School’s even more impressive is the fact that with over 4,100 students it is the largest school in the state and still ranks in the top 90% of all high schools in Massachusetts. The school has obtained these impressive results by methodically providing targeted help to students who have been struggling, and training teachers in all subjects, including science, math and physical education, to develop the literacy skills of students in their classes.

Similar results have been obtained at Osining High School in New York. Like Brocton, Osining is also very diverse but it has been ranked as one of the country’s top 100 high schools for three years in a row. The superintendent Dr. Phyllis Glassman, attributes the school’s success to a relentless focus on meeting the academic needs of students. Unlike some schools that make it difficult for students from low-income backgrounds to enroll in challenging honors and advanced placement courses, Osining HS activity encourages all students to take such courses, and it provides tutorial support after school to students who struggle and lack support at home. In a controversial move, the school set up a special mentoring program for African American male students when it found these students consistently lagging behind their peers. Called Project Earthquake, the program provides mentoring, visits to local colleges and universities and positive peer support to create a climate where Dr. Glassman believes “they no longer accept the negative stereotypes that have been projected onto them”.

Schools like Brocton and Osining High Schools may be the exceptions, but they are by no means alone. Emerson elementary school in Berkeley, South Huntington School District in Long Island, NY, Montgomery County Public Schools in Maryland and many others are all showing that
significant progress can be achieved when educators focus on expanding learning opportunities for students. This requires them to recognize that students who receive less support at home well need more in school, that students who don’t come from middle class families will need to be pushed and encouraged to take challenging courses and need greater support when applying to college, and that teachers will need to work collaboratively to share instructional strategies and discuss ways to overcome the learning obstacles their students face.

What these schools have accomplished is noteworthy; they have created learning environments where children’s race or class doesn’t automatically predict how well they will do. Not all poor and minority students are excelling, but many of them are, and when patterns of achievement become less predictable, the expectations of students and their teachers also begin to change. However, it is important to acknowledge that the success of these schools does not mean that the achievement gap has been eliminated, or that disadvantages related to income and parental support are not still in play. The latest results (2009) of the international student assessment test administered by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), hardly a left-leaning think tank, demonstrate convincingly the relationship between achievement in math, science, and reading and both the quality of education and social-economic factors like education and income level of parents and a country’s distribution of income and its social safety net for children. The United States does not fare so well on these measures. Good schools can help reduce the effects of poverty, but more is needed.

Conclusion: Changing the Focus of National Educational Policy to Obtain Better Results

In 2008, a coalition of scholars, policy makers, and educational leaders issued a policy statement that called for three major revisions in federal education policy: expanded access to learning time through quality after-school and summer school programs, universal access to pre-school, and universal healthcare for children. Called the Broader, Bolder Approach to Education (BBA), this ambitious reform project was launched as an attempt to develop a comprehensive school reform strategy that could address issues and challenges arising out of the distressed social contexts that poor families and public schools are situated within. The goal of the BBA was to shift the focus of educational policy away from a narrow focus on standards and accountability, and toward a recognition that social services, child development and civic engagement were essential to insure that all children received the educational opportunities they deserved. (For a detailed discussion of the BBA plan go to www.boldapproach.org.)

The BBA reform agenda is part of a larger national effort to change the focus and direction of educational policy to address the social and economic factors that often undermine schools and children. In cities like Newark where this strategy is presently being implemented in seven schools in the Central Ward, systems are being put in place to address the effects of concentrated poverty and the social conditions that are often associated with it: poor health, high crime rates, substance abuse, etc. The BBA approach calls for schools to be provided with the resources and support to mitigate the risks that might otherwise undermine their efforts to meet the learning needs of students. It is based on the premise that fixing schools in high poverty neighborhoods must include strategies that make it possible to respond to the wide range of challenges that affect child development and learning. Breaking with past precedent, proponents of the BBA in
cities such as Orlando, Florida and Syracuse, NY have embraced a strategy that should make it possible to address what we have known for years: children’s lives are situated within ecological systems that invariably shape their development.

Such an approach is the only way we could realistically begin on a broad scale to reduce gaps in student achievement. In a society as inequitable as the United States, where disparities in income and wealth are growing and typically reproduced across generations, schools cannot be expected to serve as the only force for equity. Still, if we hope to use education as a vehicle to counter social inequities and to create a more equitable society -- and as long as we remain unwilling or unable to adopt more far-reaching measures such as redistributing wealth through a more progressive tax system -- then the BBA strategy is at the moment our best bet.

Not surprisingly, such an approach has critics and opponents. Shortly after BBA was announced, another national group of educational leaders and policy makers launched what they called the Coalition for Civil Rights and Education (CCE). Led by an unusual combination of prominent public figures, Joel Klein, Chancellor of New York City Schools, Newt Gingrich, former House Republican Leader, and civil rights activist, Reverend Al Sharpton, the CCE described education as the most important civil rights issue of the twenty-first century and called for affirming the principles of NCLB: standards-based reform, accountability through high stakes testing, etc. The CCE also suggested that any effort to shift the focus of school reform to an effort aimed at reducing poverty or improving the health and welfare of children would be nothing more than an attempt to use poverty as an excuse for not educating all children at high standards.

Despite its critics, the BBA strategy is moving forward and gaining momentum as a broad array of stakeholders across the country agree to support it. This will not be easy. In the absence of explicit state and federal policy that encourages a more integrated and holistic educational strategy, local leaders face major challenges bridging complex interests in ethnically diverse communities, and overcoming entrenched bureaucratic patterns within school districts and municipal governments that have been accustomed to operating in silos. Nonetheless, slow but steady progress is being made in communities that have been willing to embrace the BBA strategy largely because they acknowledge that all other approaches to reform have failed.

For the last thirty years or more the schools-alone strategy has been pursued by educational policymakers. Billions of dollars have been spent on plans to revamp school curriculum, re-train teachers, introduce new technology and make schools smaller, but none of these costly measures have had the impact upon academic and developmental outcomes of the most disadvantaged children that was expected or hoped for. The history of failure in past school reform efforts has made it clear that a reform strategy based upon a more holistic framework that explicitly tackles inequality is the only way that sustainable progress in public education will be achieved.
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Domenici Conference at NMSU celebrates 10 years, focuses on foreign policy, workforce issues

By News Editor And Partners • Jul 25, 2017

The 2017 Domenici Public Policy Conference at New Mexico State University will celebrate the 10th anniversary of the conference, and this year’s topics will highlight U.S. foreign policy, equity in education and workforce issues.

The two-day conference, Sept. 13-14, will be held at the Las Cruces Convention Center. The Domenici Institute for Public Policy at NMSU is named after Pete V. Domenici, New Mexico’s longest-serving U.S. senator. The institute at NMSU was created to continue Domenici’s legacy of service to both the state and the country.

“We try to select topics for the Domenici Institute so they would be topical for state and federal policy makers,” said NMSU Chancellor Garrey Carruthers. “Once again, our timing is perfect. This year’s conference covers international policy with a collection of outstanding speakers from a policy and academic perspective. In addition, we have a section on workforce development with a focus on equity in education opportunities of which NMSU aspires to be the best. Thanks to Senator Domenici in helping us round up another collection of top-flight speakers.”

The conference will open Sept. 13 with a keynote speech from Richard G. Lugar on U.S. foreign policy. Lugar, a former U.S. Senator from Indiana, was the longest serving member of Congress in the state’s history. During his tenure in the U.S. Senate from 1977-2013, he was a leading member on issues such as food security, nuclear non-proliferation, energy independence and free trade.

The Wednesday afternoon sessions will focus on U.S. foreign policy regarding Mexico, China and Russia. Carlos Pascual, a former U.S. Ambassador to Mexico and Ukraine, will begin the discussion on the country’s foreign policy toward Mexico. Gov. Gary Locke will follow with a session on U.S. foreign policy on China. He was a former governor of Washington, former U.S. Ambassador to China and former U.S. Secretary of Commerce. The conference’s first day concludes with Eric Edelman’s presentation on the U.S. foreign policy on Russia. Edelman was the former Undersecretary of Defense for Policy and former U.S. Ambassador to Turkey.

The conference’s second day will begin with a keynote address from Pedro Noguera on equity in education. Noguera is a distinguished professor of education at UCLA’s Graduate School of Education and Information Studies.

Thursday will also feature workforce issues. Antonia Novello, M.D., the country’s first female and first Hispanic Surgeon General, will speak on education and the workforce of the future. She served from 1990-1993 and focused on public health issues such as smoking, AIDS, diet and nutrition, environmental health hazards and the importance of immunization and disease prevention.

Celina Bussey, Cabinet Secretary New Mexico Department of Workforce Solutions, will discuss workforce readiness in New Mexico. Seth Harris will conclude the conference with a session about the future of the workplace. Harris is a former acting U.S. Secretary of Labor and Deputy U.S. Secretary of Labor.