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About This Series

*The legislature shall provide for the maintenance and support of a system of free common schools, wherein all the children of this state may be educated.*

New York State Constitution, Article XI, Section 1

This policy briefing is the second in a series addressing the issue of racial and economic segregation in the New York City system – the third most segregated school district in the country according to the *New York Times*. This series summarizes research and advocacy findings conducted by New York Appleseed and the global law firm Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe. From 2011 to the present, while actively engaged in advocacy with community partners, we have separately interviewed scores of experts in New York City and around the country – academics, parents, advocates, principals, teachers, government officials.

Our series of briefings advances a simple proposition: meaningful school diversity is possible and necessary in large areas of the city comprising multiple community school districts and hundreds of thousands of students. Our belief that school diversity is within our reach both logistically and politically derives from over 50 interviews conducted with experts across the city and also from successful advocacy conducted with parent groups.

It has not always been the case that school diversity was possible in New York City. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, integration efforts stalled in New York City due to large-scale white flight from the city. At the same time, many reasonably asked why integration was even necessary or desirable when merely equalizing resources among schools might accomplish the same goals.

Three things happened in the four decades that followed: First, in all the jurisdictions that have attempted it, achieving resource equity among schools in the absence of integration has proven difficult, if not impossible. We have learned yet again that separate is not equal. Second, social-science researchers have developed a far more sophisticated understanding of the benefits of diverse schools – benefits not easily replicated even under the most equitable conditions. Finally and more recently, in a historic demographic shift, middle class and white populations are returning to New York City in a process that one scholar has dubbed a “reversal of white flight.” In light of these realities, New York Appleseed believes we must return to the fundamental American project of the common school, where children of different backgrounds and income levels may attend school together.

Seizing today’s opportunity for promoting school diversity in New York City, however, requires an understanding of the complex and often surprising ways in which segregation currently plays out in the school system. Yes, housing segregation plays a key and – in some sectors of the city – dispositive role in perpetuating school segregation. The New York City metro region is the
second most segregated in the nation, and appropriate policies to affirmatively
further fair housing and promote residential inclusion are more important than
ever. Residential patterns do not explain much of the school segregation that
we see in more diverse and rapidly gentrifying community school districts,
however. In some cases, school segregation may be doing more to increase
neighborhood segregation than the other way around.

This series is intended to uncover and demystify those formal structures
beyond housing patterns that perpetuate racial and economic segregation
in schools. We also wish to provide practical and achievable strategies to
overcome those structures. Our hope is that this series will give parents and
policy makers the analytic tools they need to understand the incidence of
school segregation in their communities and workable strategies to address
the underlying causes.

Please visit our website ny.appleseednetwork.org for more information about
New York Appleseed’s work to promote school diversity and the scholarship
demonstrating the educational benefits of diversity for all children.

David Tipson, Director
New York Appleseed
dtipson@appleseednetwork.org
Introduction

New York Appleseed’s first briefing in this series, “Segregation in NYC District Elementary Schools and What We Can Do About It: School-to-School Diversity,” explained the complex mechanisms by which such inter-school segregation occurs. Even as the system as a whole has become more segregated, however, some schools have become more integrated – at least temporarily.

Without intentional efforts by school leadership, however, a school that appears to moving toward greater integration may in fact be “flipping” to become predominantly white and more affluent. Even schools in New York City that appear to be stably integrated from the outside can be deeply segregated within the walls of the building. Other schools may not be internally segregated, but nevertheless fail to foster the kind of school environment where diversity thrives and redounds to the educational benefit of students.

The racial and socioeconomic composition of a school is not always reflected in the classroom, cafeteria, or after school program.¹ David Johnson and Roger Johnson observe, “Once diverse children are brought together in the same school and classroom whether the diversity among students results in positive or negative outcomes depends largely on how student-student interaction within learning situations is structured: competitively, individualistically, or cooperatively.”² Without an active and intentional school program that recognizes the importance and value of diverse learning, a school runs the risk of creating a segregated student body even within an ostensibly diverse school.

This briefing examines how issues of segregation and school diversity play out within individual elementary schools in New York City. Part I describes Gifted & Talented (G&T) and dual language programs – what one scholar has called “enclaves” within schools.³ Part II describes steps that teachers and administrators can take to facilitate integration within the school and classroom.
Part I: Avoiding Internal Segregation in School Programs

Gifted & Talented Programs

“At the classroom level, students enrolled in the few public schools that are more diverse overall tend to be divided into special ‘gifted and talented’ … versus ‘general education’ classrooms based on testing and an application process that occurs when they are in pre-school. In these more ‘diverse’ schools, G&T and general education classes are remarkably distinct racially and ethnically, with all the white and Asian students in the G&T classrooms and virtually all the black and Latino students in the general education classes….

“Walking down the hallways of these schools evokes in researchers and parents alike a sense of racial apartheid.”

Professor Amy Stuart Wells in a recent article in Poverty & Race

New York City Gifted and Talented (G&T) programs are a mechanism of sorting students based on academic abilities and intelligence (real or perceived), and were originally intended as a strategy to retain more white and middle-class families in public schools. Regrettably, they also divide students of different races and socioeconomic levels. This section focuses on the City’s traditional G&T programs in elementary schools.

A national study found that when classes within a school are segregated, it can almost always be traced to a form of academic tracking. Tracking, also called ability grouping, is the practice of grouping students according to skill or ability levels. Assignments to tracks “tend to be racially biased, making classrooms more segregated than they would have been had assignments been made strictly on ‘objective’ criteria.” When elementary school students are sorted by ability, these divisions largely reflect and reinforce socioeconomic differences that have shaped children’s experiences and exposure during their earliest years.

G&T programs have long been a divisive topic within the New York City education community. They have been the subject of legal and policy challenges as well as investigations internally, by outside groups, and by United States Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights. In 2003, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York (ABCNY) published a report detailing documented problems of discrimination within the City G&T program going back to 1995. These individual programs used a wide array of application procedures. Many relied on IQ tests as the sole point of entry. Others required an application or testing fee. In response to Title VI complaints filed against both an individual community school district and the city program as a whole, Chancellor Rudolph Crew threatened to promulgate
citywide regulations, but never followed through. In 1998, the advocacy group ACORN found that New York City G&T programs segregated white students in enclaves within racially diverse general school populations.\textsuperscript{9} Reports issued by New York City Department of Education (DOE) found “minimal effort on the part of some districts/schools to familiarize parents with the existence of G&T programs and admission requirements.”\textsuperscript{10} In one district, whites were 47 times more likely to both apply and be admitted to the G&T program than African Americans. English Language Learners (then called Limited English Proficiency students) and special education students were vastly underrepresented.\textsuperscript{11}

These issues notwithstanding, former Chancellor Joel Klein expanded G&T programs rapidly during his tenure – apparently under the belief that providing such enclaves was the way to keep middle-class families in the public school system.\textsuperscript{12} Five years after ABCNY released its report, DOE adopted a single, citywide admission criterion and process for G&T admissions which ended the policy of allowing districts to determine what constituted “giftedness.” Admission to both district-based programs and citywide programs is now based solely on standardized tests.\textsuperscript{13} Children who score above the national 90th percentile are eligible for the programs within their school district. Children who score above the national 97th percentile are eligible for both the district and citywide programs, but are not guaranteed a seat in the latter. Every year far more students qualify than there are available seats for the citywide programs.

In 2008, the new, citywide system of G&T admissions used two standardized tests to identify students who would benefit from placement: the Otis-Lennon School Ability Test (OLSAT) and the Bracken School Readiness Assessment (BSRA). These tests were administered by NYC certified/licensed teachers trained by Pearson Assessments.\textsuperscript{14}

DOE took great pains to explain that the tests were fair, an accurate predictor of student intelligence and ability and race neutral:

Each test question on the OLSAT has been rigorously reviewed by educators, measurement specialists, and psychologists to ensure that it is of high quality and without bias toward any subgroup, including gender and ethnic/racial categories. The questions have also been reviewed for clarity, appropriateness of content, accuracy of correct answers, plausibility of answer options, and appropriateness of vocabulary. All items on the BSRA have been statistically analyzed and evaluated for difficulty, reliability, fit, bias, and effectiveness across each age group and for each subtest. Both tests have proven to be reliable and valid assessments according to official studies. Reliability refers to the accuracy and precision of the test scores. Validity refers to the extent to which the test measures what it is intended to measure.\textsuperscript{15}
The city G&T program, however, became even less diverse after centralization of the application process, and many of the problems described in the ABCNY report remained. In 2011, even as black and Latino students made up 70 percent of all children in the school system, 73 percent of kindergarteners in G&T were white or Asian, up from 68 percent in 2009-2010. Black representation dropped from 15 percent to 11 percent, while Latino representation remained at 12 percent. Many attributed that trend, and the general low percentage of minority enrollment, to more affluent parents providing their children with professional test preparation and other similar advantages, like persistent advocacy and retesting, to secure their child a seat. A data request placed by the *Wall Street Journal* found similar demographics in the 2012-2013 school year.

Last year the DOE modified the application process again with a new test, the Naglieri Nonverbal Ability Test (NNAT), which now counts for two thirds of an applicant’s score. Much as they did with OLSAT and BSRA in 2008, DOE officials claimed that NNAT is a better measure of intelligence, will not prejudice applicants who do not speak English, and is less susceptible to test preparation. They also expressed hope that emphasis on the new test would improve the diversity of G&T programs – although declined to state that diversity was a goal.

Substituting one standardized test for another, however, was unlikely to improve equity of access or diversity in the G&T programs. Test results from last year revealed an alarming trend of increasing numbers of qualifying scores in the city’s most affluent community school districts and decreasing numbers in the poorest districts. In fact, under the new test the number of community school districts where fewer than 25 students qualified (the minimum number required even to have a program in the district) has increased from six to nine – nearly a third of the total number of districts. By contrast, over 50 percent of children taking the test in Manhattan Districts 2 and 3 received qualifying scores.

The issue of inequitable access to the city’s G&T program would be alarming enough by itself, but is made even more serious in light of the fact that G&T students are typically separated from general education students. Some schools are split evenly between separate G&T and general education classes, giving the impression of two different schools. The separation can be so extreme that G&T children enter the school through a different door, and have their class schedules staggered from those of the rest of the student body so that the two populations do not meet and interact. These practices tend to have the effect of isolating white and more affluent children from African American and Latino children. They create the impression that children of color must be kept separate from children in the G&T program and reinforce harmful stereotypes about race and intelligence.

Since the departure of Chancellor Klein, many have perceived a shift in the DOE’s priorities away from G&T to more “heterogeneous classes.”
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programs, however, remain a fixture of the educational landscape in New York — and a major barrier to racially and economically integrated classrooms — perhaps because school officials and principals believe them to be too closely guarded by the most affluent and powerful parents. New research, however, undercuts the prevailing view that the existence of G&T programs accurately reflects the preferences of middle-class parents. In her recent study, researcher Jennifer Stillman found profound ambivalence and in some cases opposition to the inequity and segregation endemic in the city’s G&T programs among what she calls “gentry” parents.²⁵ Columbia University professor Amy Stuart Wells and Allison Roda have even found that a substantial number of white and more affluent parents choose private schools precisely to avoid the racial segregation they perceive within public elementary schools.²⁶ Although Park Slope, Brooklyn is generally regarded as an upper middle-class stronghold, its extremely popular schools have no G&T programs (PS 10 ended its G&T program a few years ago, and nearby PS 139 just announced that it will be following suit.)²⁷ Roda observes the irony that G&T programs and the racial segregation that accompanies them may actually be driving some middle-class parents from the public school system, noting “how uncomfortable parents are with the ongoing segregation between programs and the feelings of superiority and inferiority that the G&T and Gen Ed labels produce for parents and students.”²⁸

Whatever the ethics of providing segregated G&T programs in elementary schools to retain middle-class families in the public school system, such a strategy is outdated and counterproductive. The strategy is outdated because the forces driving the so-called “reversal of white flight” in New York City are social, historical, global, and beyond the ability of targeted education policies to influence in either direction. While the memories of abandonment, disinvestment, and decline are still fresh in the minds of many New Yorkers, the reality today is that many areas of the city are rapidly gentrifying with harmful and destabilizing effects on low-income communities.²⁹ In fact, the supply of apartments for rent or purchase in large portions of the city is currently at a historic low, and families whose commitment to living in the city is predicated on the hope of their children attending G&T programs would be happily replaced by middle-class families who do not place such demands on public schools. Although many white and upper-income families do in fact choose private schools, these schools are largely at capacity.³⁰ Even assuming the private school sector in the region would grow in proportion to demand, many middle-class families – particularly since the onset of the current economic recession – cannot afford private education for their children.³¹

And it is counterproductive because new research suggests that the appearance of “apartheid” presented by segregated G&T programs may be repelling as many middle-class parents as the programs are attracting.³² Many private schools in New York City have made remarkable strides in improving their own racial and economic diversity — often in the face of opposition from privileged persons.³³ If upper-income students are choosing diverse private
schools over segregated public schools, the DOE would do well to learn from their counterparts in the private sector.

G&T programs are a form of special education. In its recent Special Education reform initiative DOE has concluded that “all schools should have the curricular, instructional, and scheduling flexibility needed to meet the diverse needs of students with disabilities with accountability outcomes.” The Department repeats a mantra equally applicable to G&T programs: “Special Education is a service, not a place.” As public school systems around the country are increasingly using integration by achievement level as a strategy to achieve diversity in the classroom, New York City is doing the opposite with its elementary school Gifted & Talented programs.

**Recommendations**

First, DOE should eliminate separate classrooms for G&T instruction and should instead integrate G&T students and G&T instruction into general education classrooms as they have already done with other special-needs students. In the meantime, schools that currently offer segregated G&T classrooms should begin phasing them out either through outright elimination of the program where possible or by moving independently to integrate G&T students and curriculum into general education classrooms. By integrating G&T students into general education classrooms, and thus eliminating the feeling of academic inequity between the populations, schools can work to ensure that student diversity has a positive outcome.

Second, challenge all children using the Schoolwide Enrichment Model (SEM), in which children receive enrichment in clusters based on interest in particular subject areas. Some New York City public schools already use SEM. For example, PS/IS 78Q in Long Island City, Queens finds its pool of talent from parent and community volunteers and experts who help to develop curriculum for the entire student population in grades 1-5 —special needs, ELL, and G&T. Two middle schools in Washington, DC have implemented SEM programs in place of traditional self-contained gifted classes. Instead of separating children out by test results, a practice that has clearly resulted in classrooms divided along race and socioeconomic status, the SEM provides enrichment to all students. Using SEM, schools can ensure that classrooms retain diversity without sacrificing academic rigor for its higher-achieving students.

Advocates and candidates for office have proposed multiple fixes to the G&T program in recent years. They fall into the categories of mitigating the impact of test preparation, delaying the testing of children until they are old enough to be tested meaningfully, increasing outreach to parents, and ensuring that more (if not all) students take the admissions tests. The DOE, for its part, has issued an RFP for yet another set of “assessment instruments suitable for children between 4-8 years old.”
Some of these proposed solutions, if implemented, may serve marginally to increase equity and diversity but will not address the problematic idea at the core of many G&T programs – namely that elementary school children need to be segregated by “ability,” when such “ability” is likely to reflect primarily the privilege and experiences conferred by socioeconomic status. As one G&T parent acknowledged to the *New York Times*: “I don’t think the fact that G.&T. programs are clearly and disproportionately white … is the result of anyone’s bad intentions …. I think it is really the result of people committed to a system that can never work if the objective is diversity.”

History demonstrates that it is impossible to administer G&T admissions in a way that is neither discriminatory towards individuals nor inequitable towards disadvantaged student populations. Even if assessing children’s abilities at age four were not inherently problematic, there appears to be little pedagogical justification for segregating students by ability in elementary school. Research suggests that tracked classes may harm lower achievers, while offering a single, de-tracked, rigorous curriculum for all students can improve performance of lower-achieving students without harming higher achievers. Arguments that G&T programs are necessary to retain middle-class parents in the public schools are no longer relevant, at least in New York City. For all of these reasons, we believe that values of equal opportunity, integration, and equitable access to education are fundamentally incompatible with segregated G&T programs in New York City’s elementary schools.

**Dual Language Programs**

New York Appleseed’s first briefing in this series endorsed dual language programs as a strategy for overcoming *inter*-school segregation – a logical first step in fostering integrated classrooms. Some principals have successfully used dual language programs to attract middle-class parents to an otherwise segregated school. If not carefully designed and managed, however, dual language programs can contribute to exclusion and *intra*-school segregation.

Although good data on dual language programs is nearly impossible to obtain, at present about 200 elementary schools have bilingual programs (either Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) or dual language), and about 80 of those have some kind of dual language program. Programs identified as dual language in New York City elementary schools in fact comprise a surprisingly broad range of bi-lingual programs with different pedagogical philosophies, admissions policies, and classroom compositions. For better and for worse, elementary schools have enjoyed substantial freedom in addressing these aspects of the program. Generally, however, New York City’s dual language programs provide learning environments such that at least half of the students are native speakers of English, and half speak a different primary language at home. Classes are taught in each language on alternating days or weeks so that the students become fluent in both.
Dual language programs were originally intended to serve the educational needs of English Language Learners (ELLs), but they provide enormous benefits to all children. Rather than approaching limited English as a disadvantage, dual language programs harness the great strength of ELLs – namely their fluency in their first language – to further the cognitive and linguistic advantages of bilingualism for all of the students in the classroom. Two-way immersion programs, in which two linguistic groups are simultaneously learning in both their own and another language, are by necessity integrated environments. Properly structured, dual language programs can serve the needs of the city’s ELL children while providing tremendous benefits to other children who participate. Many of the city’s dual language programs undoubtedly serve this important purpose.

In recent years, however, some dual language programs have increasingly functioned more like G&T programs – separating white and more affluent children from other students for academic enrichment and superior resources. In one school, the French dual language program is not only segregated vis-à-vis the school as a whole, but also as compared to the Spanish language program. In that school, the nearly all-white French program is widely perceived as having teachers and resources superior to those of the Spanish program, which has a high percentage of Latino students, and to those of the general education program. Whatever their educational merits, dual language programs become vehicles for segregation when they are designed for the educational goals of more affluent parents rather than the needs of ELLs in the community school district. Some schools, for instance, have initiated programs that teach languages appealing to more affluent parents but not spoken by ELLs in the district. In other cases, a language like French may be chosen, but the school fails to recruit and attract ELLs from French-speaking immigrant families.

In these instances, so long as language-proficiency requirements are met, schools have enjoyed enormous discretion in selecting students and have not been required to respect even a zone preference. Although parents of Anglophone students do need to make a serious commitment to embracing the second language in the home, excessive emphasis on the program’s rigor and “advance commitment” may discourage some parents of ELLs from applying. Moreover, such warnings betray merit-based admissions priorities that undermine values of inclusion and integration. Under these circumstances, middle- or upper-income children can qualify for the nonnative-speaker slots if their parents are foreigners or they speak a different language with their caretakers, and in some programs may even enjoy an advantage over ELLs if they and their parents are perceived to have more “commitment.” Ideally, such students would fill the English-dominant seats in a dual language program rather than ELL seats. The combination of these factors leads some dual language programs to become vehicles of exclusion and segregation and denies their promise of integrated education.
**Recommendations**

Dual language programs should rededicate themselves to the educational needs of English Language Learners in their districts while allowing schools to modify their instructional model based on the actual populations within their schools. Since there are abundant models for dual language programs with ELLs representing more than half of the class, DOE should adopt a policy that ELL applicants should be given priority admission to a dual language program over non-ELL applicants. By selecting languages for study appropriate for local ELLs, marketing affirmatively to their communities, and removing admissions preferences that screen out rather than include, dual language programs can model integrated learning practices.

Parents of ELLs are uniquely positioned to accomplish this goal: In New York City, if there are 15 ELLs who speak the same language in two contiguous grades in the same school, those children are legally entitled to bilingual education – either a dual language program or transitional bilingual education. Many community school districts in the city, however, are not in compliance with this requirement, and parents have an opportunity to stand up for their right to bilingual education. The Asian American Legal & Educational Defense Fund and Advocates for Children are currently pushing DOE to survey parent preferences more frequently once children are in school so as to expand access to bilingual education. Parents who demand dual language education in particular can reorient the program to its appropriate goals and to facilitate diverse learning classrooms that will benefit ELLs and Anglophone children alike.

School districts that do not have the required number of ELL students to be mandated to provide bilingual education should nevertheless be encouraged to maintain dual language programs to support bilingualism in languages spoken by ELLs in the district. These schools need flexibility to implement best practices in dual language education based on the needs of the students in these programs.

Finally, although dual language programs are by design separate from the general education classes, school administrators and educators should find opportunities to have students in the dual language program mix with the rest of the student body without undermining the goals of the program. School administrators should be careful to avoid the reality and appearance that dual language program students are receiving more or better educational resources.
Part II: Leveraging the Potential of Diversity in Elementary Schools

Successful, diverse schools form partnerships and welcome collaboration between administrators, teachers and staff, families, and community members. Inclusive schools are not only receptive to the idea that staff and students have different, valid experiences, they are also open to adapting their pedagogical and administrative practices to the needs of their diverse population. While this can be a daunting undertaking, New York Appleseed has identified resources for administrators, teachers, and families to explore and, most importantly, to adapt to their individual needs.

Administrative Practices that Manage Diversity

Managing diversity, defined by B.R. Grobler as "a planned, systematic and comprehensive managerial process for developing a school environment in which all people, with their similarities and differences, can contribute to the strategic and competitive advantage of the school and where no one is excluded on the basis of factors unrelated to productivity," is key for a school to take advantage of the learning spaces provided by diversity within the student body, administration, and staff. As Caleb Rosado articulates, "Managing diversity is an on-going process that unleashes the various talents and capabilities which a diverse population bring to an organization, community or society, so as to create a wholesome, inclusive environment, that is ‘safe for differences,’ enables people to ‘reject rejection,’ celebrates diversity, and maximizes the full potential of all, in a cultural context where everyone benefits.”

Successful integration therefore requires not only an awareness of how diversity can be involved in nearly every administrative and curricular choice, but also the ability to share leadership with the people on the front lines—teachers, families, and members of the community.

An administrator must exercise responsibility for managing education programs for all students. Some of the tasks that principals may find themselves performing outside of more traditional roles include: Articulating the vision and providing pedagogical and other types of support and leadership to staff members as they deal with issues related to diversity in the classroom; participating as a member of collaborative, problem-solving teams that identify and implement solutions to any barriers inhibiting the successful inclusion and education of any child; and securing supports to enable staff members to meet the needs of all children. The role of an administrator at an inclusive school is dynamic because it requires that management, or at least goal-setting, occur in a holistic manner that learns from and incorporates input from teachers, families, and community members. As a school leader, the principal is ideally positioned to ensure that a school’s diversity helps, rather than hinders, its functioning. The methods a principal uses to lead a school can directly influence the level of success it experiences.
Principals should use clear and consistent application of diversity principles in personnel decisions including recruitment, hiring, training, and promotion practices

A principal, no matter how committed, cannot successfully manage a diverse school without the support of staff and faculty. Adherence to diversity principles like recruiting, hiring, and promoting staff members who reflect the diversity of the community, are sensitive to its needs, and have the desire to work in a diverse environment is crucial. Communicating the school’s mission and commitment to diversity throughout the hiring process ensures that the teachers who are hired are a good match.62 Because of the documented shortage of diverse teachers as well as the shortage of teachers trained to succeed in diverse learning environments, the recruiting and hiring process can be difficult.63 Thus, to better support teachers, administrators must understand both the time-tested and the cutting-edge pedagogical tools available to teachers working in a multifaceted classroom.

Principals should provide pre-service and in-service training

One of the ways that schools have addressed the intimidating task of being a first-year teacher is through induction programs that include first-year mentorship coupled with intensive training.68 In addition to first-year induction programs, peer teaching can continue to serve as a source of learning for both new and veteran teachers. In-house training can benefit both students and teachers; where classrooms are combined for periods, students are able to engage with a new group of peers while teachers have the opportunity to observe one another’s practices.69

As Carolyn Riehl notes, “The development of inclusive structures and practices must be accompanied by new understandings and values or they will not result in lasting change. Principals are key agents in framing those new meanings.”70 Principals will likely need to provide training for incoming and existing teachers throughout the process of developing inclusive structures and practices. Training can come in many forms depending on the needs of the individual school. Some of these forms include courses, mentoring, team teaching, study groups, summer institutes, or workshop series.71 For example, Brooklyn New School (BNS) has partnered with Bank Street to provide professional development for supporting children in early childhood who come into the classroom with social and emotional issues stemming from community or familial disputes. This program was designed to align with both the school’s demographics and its mission to provide a great education for a diverse set of students.72 Planning is critical and, to the extent training can become a natural outgrowth of the school’s culture and structure, administrators will need to rely less on formal and resource-intensive programs.

PRACTICE POINTS

At Brooklyn New School (BNS), a public elementary school in Brooklyn’s Carroll Gardens neighborhood, the number of applications far exceeds the number of available positions. For Anna Allanbrook, principal of BNS, a successful candidate has a strong educational background coupled with extensive experience in diverse environments. Her team asks interviewees to talk about four topics: collaboration with colleagues and parents, differentiation within the classroom, a particularly good teaching moment they have had, and recent professional literature that the candidate has read or a children’s book that the candidate has used in his/her teaching.73 Although diversity within the teaching staff is important for Allanbrook, the most important factor is knowledge of the teaching practice.

Jeanene Worrell-Breeden, principal of Teachers College Community School (TCCS is a public school in Manhattanville affiliated with Teachers College), comments that the ideal candidate has both a diverse background and practice area knowledge. At the same time, when presented with a candidate who is willing to learn, that readiness can go a long way, particularly when you can help them master a particular skill. As part of the hiring process at TCCS, candidates are asked to do a demo lesson in which Worrell-Breeden looks to see how a particular candidate: (1) meets the needs of children, (2) handles a diverse classroom in terms of ensuring that everyone is engaged and understanding, (3) interacts with children, and (4) manages the classroom.74 For TCCS, diversity played a more central role in hiring than at BNS. Worrell-Breeden specifically sought out teachers with diverse backgrounds who spoke more than one language. From her perspective, these teachers would be more able to service an increasingly diverse community in the area and thus the students who would likely attend the school.

At PS 10, a public school in Brooklyn’s South Slope neighborhood, principal Laura Scott notes that “we can’t afford to hire [teachers] without diversity already in their backgrounds.”75 Although the task of selecting teachers that will be successful in diverse learning environments is not an easy one, by observing how teachers interact with kids, Scott says, she can better understand how a particular candidate deals with diversity in the classroom.76
Principals should schedule periodic meetings to access implementation and success of identified strategies

Principals play a key role in initiating and sustaining conversations in their schools around a variety of issues related to teaching and learning. In a diverse school, those conversations should include issues related to combatting intra-school segregation and fostering an inclusive environment. Weekly or monthly on- or off-campus meetings may be useful in developing collaborative curricula, sharing best practices, and tinkering with existing practices. In-house presentation by teachers to teachers on a particularly successful strategy will encourage other teachers to innovate while rewarding those teachers who have done so successfully.

“School-Based Options” allow schools in New York City to modify the citywide collective bargaining agreement to accommodate the needs and philosophy of particular schools and can give teachers and principals the ability to customize teachers’ schedules to accommodate teacher collaboration across grades or curriculum areas.

Principals should make classroom assignments with diversity in mind

Principals support and promote inclusion gained through removing separate tracks when they help to establish new class assignment processes, when they provide resources so that teachers can learn to teach heterogeneous groups, and when they help teachers generate the kind of assessment information that will make the impact of tracking and de-tracking more visible.

A diverse school not only brings together people from different backgrounds, it also brings together people with different educational needs. Diversity in educational background may suggest a need for more or less challenging class offerings. Some students may need English language support, others may need extra support because of identified learning disabilities, and still others may find stimulation in an enrichment program. While it’s crucial for schools to meet students where they are, programs that separate children according to their individual learning needs have historically been sources of segregation within a school. One of the key challenges of administering a diverse school is to raise expectations for all students and to remove any obstacles that might prevent some children from achieving these expectations.

Policymakers, administrators, and teachers alike recognize the capacity and advantages of teaching all students of varying abilities in the same classroom. As Grant Wiggins wrote over two decades ago, “We will not successfully restructure schools to be effective until we stop seeing diversity in schools as a problem. Our challenge is not one of getting ‘special’ students to better adjust to the usual schoolwork, the usual teacher pace, or the usual tests. The challenge of schooling remains what it has been since the modern era began two centuries ago: ensuring that all students receive their entitlement.”

PRACTICE POINT

BNS is particularly fond of the collaborative teaching model, giving teachers the freedom and invitation to rethink the curriculum. Although BNS encourages creativity, it also wants teachers to work with one another to make sure that the curriculum is also uniform and consistent for all students. To facilitate collaboration, BNS schedules art, music, or physical education during the same blocks. This frees up at least one morning a week for teachers in a particular grade level to meet and coordinate curriculum.
**Teaching Practices that Promote Genuine Diversity**

It is equally important for teachers to have a toolbox of teaching methods that will help them to educate their diverse classroom in a way that is sensitive to students’ abilities and limitations as well as cognizant of the ways in which students can learn from other students. As DeVillar notes, “Physically integrating students of diverse language, ethnic and racial backgrounds by assigning them to ‘work together’ in small groups will not generally lead them to cooperate with one another...The principle of cooperation must then be complemented by the concurrent application of additional principles – specifically communication, and integration....”

Teachers can play an essential role in aiding the integration of a diverse classroom population through thoughtful use of teaching practices. Gordon Allport notes that when students of the presumed “dominant” and “subordinate” groups are able to demonstrate their equality in skill in situations when students aim toward a common goal, these categories can dissolve.

While there is a rich literature of innovative, integrative teaching practices, Appendix II of this briefing provides examples to give readers an idea of the breadth and range of available strategies to promote genuinely integrated, inclusive classrooms. Some examples provide an overarching framework or structure for incorporating curriculum whereas others are more concrete. Many, if not most, teachers pick and choose from portions of many different strategies and tailor those to the specific needs of their classroom. As discussed in Part I of this briefing, often teachers do not know what barriers to inclusivity they will come across until they are in an actual classroom with a diverse population of students. These teaching strategies not only promote genuine diversity, but many of them conduce to what Daniel Pink calls *A Whole New Mind*, where students gain so much more through education than can be captured on standardized tests; they gain creative and reflective skills, multiple perspectives, collaborative skills and more of the very skills the workforce and our diverse democracy need.

**Integration beyond the Classroom**

Principals, teachers, and families also face challenges when it comes to fostering diversity in non-classroom spaces such as extracurricular activities. Administrators and teachers can play a key role in encouraging broad-based participation in extracurricular activities by ensuring that a wide variety of opportunities are available and by promoting diversity within each particular activity, sport, or club.

**After School Programs**

Although extracurricular activities play less of a role at the elementary school level, many primary schools do have an after school enrichment program in addition to offering no-cost extended day help for children who need extra instruction in English and math. Because after school programs in New York City are not funded by the state, access to the programs can be difficult. The main barriers to attendance reported by schools are program costs that are too high.

---

**PRACTICE POINT**

At BNS, the school finds that the after school program may be cost-prohibitive for some parents. Additionally, many students who are bused into BNS cannot attend, because the buses only provide transportation at the end of the school day. Access to these programs, therefore, continues to be a challenge in even the more successful schools.

To compensate for students’ tendencies to self-segregate, Columbia Secondary School provides multiple non-classroom forums in which students can mix freely. The school reports that the period between 2:20 p.m. and 3:10 p.m. is allocated for students to select from a rich portfolio of elective options. Further, the principal suggests that students mix freely and across ethnic lines during the lunch period.

Some teachers also report deliberate action to counteract self-segregation, with one BNS teacher suggesting to parents certain other students to invite for a play date.
high for some families, an inability to provide school buses to bring home after school participants, and programs which often end too early in the afternoon to be a viable child care solution for working parents. While after school programming provides yet another space for students to learn and expose themselves to students of different backgrounds and abilities, preserving an otherwise diverse student body within the after school program can be a challenge. While individual schools are not able to offer transportation to students attending after school enrichment or extended day programs, they may be able to offer tuition relief or scholarships to help lower-income students whose parents are available to pick them up at the school to participate. PS 144 in Queens is piloting such a program for the spring semester of 2014. Working in conjunction with school administration to identify children who could benefit from tuition relief, the Parents’ Association of PS 144 has not only set aside enrollment costs and spaces for children to attend for free, it has also implemented a 10% discount for families with multiple children attending the program. The Wingspan after school program at the Neighborhood School in Manhattan has implemented a similar program.

Community Engagement

Students’ exposure to the values of diversity can be reinforced when the larger community shares a cohesive vision of inclusivity with the school. Educating the community about the benefits of a diverse education environment is beneficial to ensuring informed, democratic discourse. Principals and administrators can play a key role in providing these resources to the community. At the same time, stakeholders may have varying justifications for why they want an inclusive school. Bringing all these perspectives to bear will not only provide spaces for collaborating with and educating the community, but also focus the central issues and goals of the community. Community support is also key to maintaining a diverse school; if the parents and community are committed to diverse learning spaces, they will also support housing projects and other programs and policies aimed at improving access to the school.

Carolyn J. Riehl identifies the importance of involving parents and community in creating a working definition of diversity for each school, arguing that when community members are contributors to this definition, they will be more likely to not only embody those values in their conduct but also to support new school initiatives aimed to improve integration.

Formulating and Implementing a Mission Statement through Community Discourse

Community discourse should ultimately lead to the development of a mission statement for the school, preferably one that includes diversity and inclusion as core values. Although the mission statement should ultimately come from the community, principals and administrators can provide relevant information, build rapport with community members, and play a key role in its formulation,
as they will be responsible for implementing the mission pervasively through the school’s programming.\textsuperscript{92}

In \textit{It Takes A Parent: Transforming Education in the Wake of the No Child Left Behind Act}, Appleseed urges that parental and community involvement should not stop once the vision has been set.\textsuperscript{93} Rather, continued parent and community involvement is key to the success of an inclusive school. Administrators should both encourage and initiate programs at school that bring together community members. Programs could include family resource centers; remedial and enrichment activities for children outside usual school hours; recreation, athletic and arts programs for adults and children; and adult education programs.\textsuperscript{94} Using the school space as a hub for community and family activities can encourage further integration of the school into the community and, similarly, the mores of the school into the community.\textsuperscript{95}

When resources are scarce, pulling from parent and community groups can be essential to the success of a diverse school. Superintendent Vic Meyers of Colorado Springs says, “We seek out community groups to partner with---the Black Chamber of Commerce, the Asian Chamber of Commerce, the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, and the NAACP. We try to keep the community informed and to build as many partnerships as possible.”\textsuperscript{96} Closer to home, in Rockland County, New York, over half of the schools have a Family Resource Center where families can come together to determine their community and school needs and how those needs can be met.\textsuperscript{97}

\textbf{School Diversity: Not Just About Students}

Successful diverse schools have diverse and inclusive School Leadership Teams (SLT) and Parent or Parent-Teacher Associations (called PTAs in this briefing). Although they have different functions, both SLTs and PTAs have parent members elected by the parent body. When these bodies are dominated by a single group of parents with similar backgrounds, the school will be more likely to cater to the needs of represented parents, sometimes at the expense of those whose voices are not heard. Moreover, segregated parent bodies deny the opportunity for parents of different backgrounds to develop collaborative solutions to problems that will benefit all children. Because these are elected positions, it is critical that a diverse population of parents feels welcome and empowered to participate. One important resource for New York City schools is the Parent Coordinator, who builds working relationships with members of the school community and creates a welcoming school environment for all parents. The Parent Coordinator can also act as a resource for recruiting diverse parents to the SLT and PTA.

The SLT is made up of not only elected parent members but teacher representatives, a UFT representative, the principal, and the PTA president; it is responsible for developing the Comprehensive Educational Plan which sets the school’s priorities and goals and to which the school’s budget must be aligned.\textsuperscript{103} PTAs, on the other hand, are intended to be the voice of all

\textbf{PRACTICE POINT}

For community engagement, BNS has partnered with Added Value, a nonprofit organization promoting sustainable development in Red Hook where many of BNS’s lower income students live, and Brooklyn Arts Exchange, which provides arts and theater programs for students.

BNS also retains a strong relationship with its parent population, sending out weekly newsletters covering community events and politics as well as school affairs. The parent coordinator and principal also host weekly parent breakfasts and monthly “learning partner” days in which parents are invited into the classroom to observe.\textsuperscript{98} BNS teachers report that these approaches lead to individual parents as well as the Parent Teacher Association (PTA) body wanting a school that is best for all children, even if some parents begin with specific and exclusive views related to the environment afforded to their children.\textsuperscript{99}

Similar to BNS, TCCS takes a proactive approach to encouraging parent involvement, also hosting parents (up to five at a time) as learning partners. During this period, parents can see the pedagogical technology in use and observe the teacher managing the classroom.\textsuperscript{100}

At PS 10, Scott has also added outreach programs to get more parents involved. Parents of Pre-K and Kindergarten students can accompany their children to the classroom at morning drop off and spend five minutes with their kids before leaving. The trust engendered during these years, says Scott, helps build support in the later years as well.\textsuperscript{101} The school also does team learning workshops where parents are allowed into the classroom to either observe or teach alongside the teacher. The PTA at PS 10 has grown from a group of three parents to one with an executive board of 22, with significantly more non-executive participants. Parents provide volunteer and monetary support for the school programs.

In addition to investing in parental involvement, the school has developed a multi-year relationship with the Metropolitan Opera Guild which comes in to perform operas at the school. Scott successfully applied for a Goldman Sachs grant, which paid for the renovation and restocking for PS 10’s library.\textsuperscript{102}
In a diverse school, this includes a wide range of parent backgrounds and income levels. Although the challenges of involving low-income parents are frequently cited, more active parents need to understand that lower rates of participation by some parents do not mean that less active parents care less about the school or their children’s education. Low-income parents often have a range of responsibilities that may impede their ability to make meetings. Moreover, affluent parents dominating a parent board may inadvertently create and foster a culture where other parents are uncomfortable. Affirmative recruiting is critical, but to be successful in the long-term parent bodies must create a culture of inclusion and respect where all parents feel that their ideas are equally valued. PTAs must offer opportunities for issues of race, class, and privilege to be discussed often and openly. Although the conversations can be difficult, pretending that the underlying issues do not exist or that the school community is “color-blind” will ultimately lead to exit by one group of parents or another. In a thoughtful treatment of these issues, a Boston Public Schools parent, Susan Naimark, argues that difficult conversations – far from representing some unwelcome distraction – are, in fact, at the heart of the public school project:

“Enough process,” several of the white parents responded to these efforts. “We have work to do.”

But isn’t this the work?

Our public schools are among the few places where we have the opportunity to engage people of different races, ethnicities, economic circumstances, and life experiences. These schools are rich learning environments, not just for children, but for parents, teachers, and other adults who make up the school community. By avoiding such discussions, we model for our children how not to talk about race and racism.

Creating a culture that welcomes alternative perspectives in an SLT or PTA can help to avoid tensions around specific issues that may seem inconsequential out of context. While fundraising is seen as the primary role of a PTA, especially in an era of tight public school budgets, fundraising strategies must be developed sensitively and collaboratively so that they can be opportunities for the school community to come together. Parents who work full-time may feel closed out of parent groups or believe that they are seen as less willing to be involved in the school. Ensuring that meetings are scheduled when working parents can attend is important, as is distributing all PTA notices on paper as well as electronically to make sure every parent receives valuable information. While working parents may not be as visible in the school, it is important to make sure volunteer opportunities are shared with the school at large; this helps to foster a sense of community and reinforce the message that all parent participation is valid and welcome.

Because fundraising is often the most visible activity of a PTA, fundraising efforts should benefit the broadest range of students in the school rather
than an elite subset. Parents must balance the short-term benefits of certain strategies (higher prices for bake sale items and entry fees to fund raising events for instance) against long-term problems associated with excluding families who cannot participate. Parent events with connotations of privilege and exclusivity (wine tastings) should be avoided if a PTA is to create an atmosphere of welcome for all families.

More importantly, the underlying issues that make these conversations difficult is also what makes them rewarding – even transformative. Again, Susan Naimark:

This experience was one of my first lessons in the “entitlement gap”—the vast difference in understanding about what we are entitled to in our interactions with the school system. When we white, middle-class parents understand how our sense of entitlement excludes others, we begin to find our own teachable moments about racism. We then can speak up, find allies, and take specific actions to “spread the wealth.”
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Appendix I: Tools for Principals

Teacher Support

In *Creating an Inclusive School*, Richard A. Villa and Jacqueline S. Thousand have assembled the following collection of collaborative teaching models from a variety of sources that can be used to foster inclusivity in the classroom.

- **Consultant Model** – support personnel (e.g., special educator, Title I teacher, psychologist, speech and language therapist) provide assistance to the general educator, enabling him to teach all students in the inclusive class.¹¹¹

- **Parallel Teaching Model** – support personnel and the classroom teacher rotate among different heterogeneous groups of students in different sections of the general education classroom.¹¹²

- **Supportive Teaching Model** – the classroom teacher takes the lead role and support personnel rotate among the students.¹¹³

- **Complementary Teaching Model** – a support person does something to complement the instruction provided by the classroom teacher (e.g., models note-taking on a transparency, paraphrases the teacher’s statements).¹¹⁴

- **Co-teaching Model** – support personnel teach alongside the general education teacher, sharing responsibility for delivering content, guiding student learning, and managing classroom behavior. At many schools throughout NYC and elsewhere, student-teachers provide support for the general education teacher. Although student-teachers are there to learn, they learn by doing and in the process support the teacher’s work in developing and delivering content.¹¹⁵

**Tools for scheduling and grouping to foster inclusive classrooms**

Hand-scheduling is a practice that allows teachers and administrators to group children in a way that ensures that each classroom has students representing a range of abilities and backgrounds. Block scheduling is a particular way of organizing a student’s schedule in which each class period, or block, exceeds sixty minutes. Longer class periods provide more space for teachers to experiment and use different teaching methods depending on the class, subject, and needs of students.¹¹⁸

Multiage grouping and looping are two techniques in which students stay with the same teacher for a period of two or more years. Multiage grouping is the grouping of children of different ages and grades in a single classroom; this group remains together for more than one academic year.¹¹⁹ Within each group, students are “encouraged to learn at different rates and levels.”¹²⁰
Teachers follow each group of students as they advance, allowing the teacher to develop practices that meet the needs of both the class and individual students. This approach has been particularly effective in elementary schools, and has been gaining some attention in middle and high schools.\textsuperscript{121}

Looping is similar to multiage grouping, but rather than being grouped in classes with heterogenous ages and grade levels, students are grouped by grade. The class stays with the same teacher typically for two but sometimes more years. At the end of the “loop” the teacher starts over with a new set of kids.\textsuperscript{122} As with multiage grouping, benefits include stronger relationships among students and between students and teacher, increased continuity in instruction, and enhanced learning. These arrangements also benefit parents, who are able to build stronger relationships with a single teacher, as opposed to rebuilding relationships with a new teacher each year.\textsuperscript{123} Looping and multiage grouping can be used in the same school – at Walnut Hill Elementary, parents can choose between traditional kindergarten, first, and second grade classes or mixed-aged classes (K-1, 1-2, and 2-3) but all students get the benefit of staying with their kindergarten teacher for at least two years.\textsuperscript{124}

\textbf{PRACTICE POINT}

Columbia Secondary School is one local organization where looping is used. In the fall, 96 students enter the school and are divided into three classes of 32 students each. The school assigns classroom names using references from popular culture (often drawing on \emph{Harry Potter}). The students in those classrooms stay together for three years. The decision to have students change classes after three years was not the original plan, which was to keep students together for seven years. However, parental pressure to reorganize the classes developed as it became clear the some students were progressing more rapidly than others. Even the principal concedes that having the students in the same group for more than three years could be too restrictive.\textsuperscript{125}
Appendix II: Tools for Teachers

As noted in Part II, teachers will need to accumulate a toolbox of integrative teaching methods to be adapted to a class’s individual needs. The following is a sampling of methods recommended for use in inclusive schools. They include Multicultural Curriculum Planning, Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, Cooperative Learning, Universal Design for Learning, and the Workshop Model.

Multicultural Curriculum Planning, as delineated by Christine I. Bennett in *Comprehensive Multicultural Education: Theory and Practice*, involves framing classroom discussion under the following six goals:  

- Develop multiple historical perspectives by cultivating an awareness of historical and contemporary experiences among the world’s diverse nations and ethnic groups.  
- Develop cultural consciousness. Cultural consciousness is the recognition or awareness on the part of an individual that he or she has a view of the world that is not universally shared and that differs profoundly from that held by many members of different nations and ethnic groups.  
- Increase intercultural consciousness, or the ability to interpret intentional communications, some unconscious cues, and customs in cultures different from one’s own.  
- Combat racism, prejudice and discrimination by revising negative attitudes and behaviors that are based upon misconceptions about the inferiority of races and cultures different from one’s own.  
- Develop awareness of the state of the planet and global dynamics through exploration of prevailing world conditions, trends and developments.  
- Develop social action skills – knowledge, attitudes, and behavior needed to help resolve major problems that threaten the future of the planet and well-being of humanity.

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy (“CRP”) – defined by Gloria Ladson-Billings as a call for a conscious link between schooling and culture – relies on three elements for an instructional framework:  

- Teachers promote students’ academic achievement by using the students’ culture.  
- Teachers communicate that students do not need to compromise their cultural identities in order to succeed in the classroom, and in fact use
a student’s unique cultural expression (e.g.: dress and/or language) as an educational tool.\textsuperscript{135}

- Teachers empower students to see themselves as agents for cultural and social change and assist them in seeing their political positions in the world.\textsuperscript{136}

Though it doesn’t declare itself as using Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, Teachers College Community School has integrated the cultural backgrounds of community leaders in its invitations to local professionals to speak to students, specifically looking for female, African American dentists to speak to students during Dental Health Month.\textsuperscript{137}

**Cooperative Learning** utilizes learning in small groups so students work together to maximize their own and each other’s learning. In “Cooperative Learning in the Culturally Diverse Classroom”, David W. Johnson and Roger T. Johnson describe five elements as being characteristic of cooperative lessons:\textsuperscript{138}

- Positive interdependence: Students must believe that they are linked with others in such a way that the individual cannot succeed unless the other members of the group succeed.\textsuperscript{139}

- Face-to-face promotive interaction: Students orally explain to each other how to solve problems, discuss with each other the nature of the concepts and strategies being learned, teach their knowledge to classmates, and explain to each other the connections between present and past learning.\textsuperscript{140}

- Individual accountability: Educators ensure that the performance of each student is assessed and the results given back to the group and the individual.\textsuperscript{141}

- Social skills: Groups cannot function effectively if students do not have and use the necessary leadership, decision-making, trust-building, communication, and conflict-management skills.\textsuperscript{142}

- Groups process: The group assesses how well students are achieving their goals and maintaining effective working relationships among members. Two relevant questions: (1) What is something each member did that was helpful for the group? and (2) What is something that each member could do to make the group better tomorrow?\textsuperscript{143}

**Universal Design for Learning** (UDL), identified by David H. Rose and Anne Meyer, uses the following techniques to remove barriers to learning created by one-size-fits-all curriculum:\textsuperscript{144}
• Account for differences in student profiles in areas such as social and academic abilities, strengths and learning outcomes as an essential first step. Universal Design for Learning draws on Howard Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences, which assumes that all students possess an array of human intelligences that can be cultivated and that emerge in unique configurations for each individual.\textsuperscript{145}

• Account for disparities in past learning profiles, learning experiences, working, and prior knowledge as well as current interests and abilities when designing multilevel goals and objectives for members of the class.\textsuperscript{146}

• The organizational design of a learning experience or the lesson format dictates how information is imparted to students and how they will interact with that content. Strike calculated balanced between large group or whole class instruction; teacher-directed small group instruction; small group learning; one-to-one teacher-student instruction; independent or individual work; partner learning, peer tutors, or cross-age tutors; and cooperative learning groups.\textsuperscript{147}

Please see \textit{Creating an Inclusive School} for more information about the goals of UDL, its benefits, and how it can be implemented in a classroom.

The Workshop Model provides a framework aimed at comprehension and critical thinking skills. Although the Workshop Model is focused on reading curriculum, the lessons that it emphasizes can be mapped onto other subject areas as well. There are three key components that make up Workshop Model:

• Provide students daily opportunities to practice “on-level.” This means, for example, providing students with an opportunity to read a book of their choosing and within range of their skill level or scheduling independent time for some students to work on single digit multiplication while giving other students an opportunity to work on long division.\textsuperscript{148}

• Scaffold instruction for all students with a gradual release of responsibility from teacher to student – the goal is for students to be self-learners. Scaffolded instruction can be as easy as introducing the strategy, modeling the strategy, guiding students through the practice, and finally reviewing and reflecting independently.\textsuperscript{149}

• Provide opportunities for students to collaborate and talk about their learning. Throughout the day, teachers should create spaces for students to work together to talk about their learning. This can include interactive real aloud, partner time, and in older classrooms, small group instruction.\textsuperscript{150}
The goal of the Workshop Model is to ensure that teachers not only have the requisite resources to be successful in the classroom, but also that they bring a certain level of intentionality into a classroom of students with diverse backgrounds and ability levels. Although one cannot expect teachers to mimic the Workshop Model every day, it provides a general framework for being successful with a group of diverse learners over the course of the year. Students should be provided opportunities to learn from one another and, at the same time, feel supported and challenged. The approach reminds teachers to meet students where they are, but to also make sure that no student falls behind.
6 Clotfelter, 145.
11 Id.
15 G&T Handbook at 1-4.
16 See Otterman.
22 Allison Roda Where Their Children Belong: Parents’ Perceptions of the Boundaries Separating “Gifted” and “Non-Gifted” Educational Programs, (unpublished dissertation), Columbia University, 2013. 70.
24 Wani.
26 Wells and Roda, “Why NYC Should Make Diversity a School Choice”.

PS 139’s SOAR program was not part of the New York City G&T program, but the school’s reasons for abandoning this selective program were the same: Sarah Darville, “Uproar continues over ending ‘gifted’ classes at Ditmas Park’s P.S. 139, though program an outlier,” Chalkbeat, February 7, 2014, http://ny.chalkbeat.org/2014/02/07/uproar-continues-over-ending-gifted-classes-at-ditmas-parks-p-s-139-though-program-an-outlier/.

Roda dissertation at 192.


Wells and Roda; Stillman.


NYC DOE Office of Public Affairs.


PS/IS 78Q’s “About” page goes into detail about their implementation of SEM at http://www.ps78.com/about.php.


Eileen Gale Kugler, Debunking the Middle Class Myth, (2002) at 23.

See, for example, PS 133 in Brooklyn, which, having recently initiated a French dual language program and a Spanish dual language program, has steadily become more integrated economically and has seen its annual applications to the school increase eight-fold or more.

Division of Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners, Office of English Language Learners, NYC Department of Education, “New York City Transitional Bilingual Education (TBE) and Dual Language (DL) Programs,” May 2012, on file with New York Appleseed.

Interview with Jennifer Weiss Friedman, November 18, 2013.

This description is used on the Insideschools.org website at http://insideschools.org/elementary/gifted-a-other-options.

English Language Learners are “students who speak a language other than English at home and score below proficient on English assessments when they enter [the New York City] school system.” NYC DOE website at http://schools.nyc.gov/Academics/ELL/default.htm.

Remenschneider; New York City DOE, *Elementary School Directory: 2012-2013* (“In order to fulfill their instructional program model, schools may admit non-zoned students to their dual language classes.”); New York City DOE Regulation of the Chancellor A-101 Sec. II(C)(1)(b).

Jennifer Woodward, “Bilingual Education Provision in New York State: An Assessment of Local Compliance,” NYL-ARNet, Summer 2009 (un-paginated). *Note: this article inexplicably applies the statewide standard of 20 English Language Learners. Applying the NYC-specific rule (15 students) would presumably have uncovered even more instances of noncompliance by the community school districts.* See NYC DOE Office of English Language Learners in a previous footnote.


See DeVillar, Faltis, & Cummins.

Daniel Pink, *A Whole New Mind: Moving from the Information Age to the Conceptual Age* (2005).

Allanbrook.

Nightengale.

Interview with Jennifer Fleming, educator, Brooklyn New School, March 6, 2012.

Interview with Rosanne Gangi-Gaertner, P.A. President of P.S. 144Q, January 2014.

Donlan.

Grobler, at 468–69; see also *Creating an Inclusive School*, at 58.

*Creating an Inclusive School*, at 61.

Worrell-Breeden.

Scott.

Riehl, at 60.

*Id.*


*Creating an Inclusive School* at 171.

*Id.*

Kugler at 14.

*Id.* at 14-15.

Allanbrook.

Fleming.

Worrell-Breeden.

Scott.

*Id.*


Gangi-Gaertner interview.

*Id.*

Naimark at 11.

*Creating an Inclusive School* at 112

*Id.*

*Id.*

*Id.*

*Id.*

*Id.*

Allanbrook.

Scott.
Creating an Inclusive School at 109.

Id. at 106.

Id. at 107.

Id. at 106-8.

Creating at Inclusive School at 108.

Id. at 108.

Kugler at 23.

Nightengale.

Christine I. Bennett, Comprehensive Multicultural Education: Theory and Practice (Boston, 4th eds., 1999).

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Creating an Inclusive School at 99.

Ladson-Billings cited in Creating an Inclusive School at 100.

Creating an Inclusive School at 100.

P. Lipman, cited in Creating an Inclusive School at 100.

Worrell-Breeden.

DeVillar, Faltis, & Cummins at 71.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Id.

Creating an Inclusive School at 137.

Id. at 138.

Id. at 141.

Id. at 143.


Growing Readers at 21, 36-38.


See, for example, id. at 14-17.

Id. at 18-19.