



<i>Assuring Civil Rights Protection with State ESEA</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>No Back-Tracking – Supporting More Opportunities</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Effective Dropout Prevention</i>	<i>7</i>

Focus: College Access and Success

Teaching Quality – What We Know and What We Still Need

by Albert Cortez, Ph.D.

Researchers studying which aspects of education have the most substantial impact on students have long declared that the quality of teaching provided to students is the single most important factor contributing to long-term student success, which includes not only post-high school job performance, but also enrollment in and graduation from college (Darling-Hammond, 1997; Fuller, 1999; Cochran-Smith, 2003). Research also indicates that “quality teaching is more important than a student’s ethnicity, family income, school attended or class size” (Policy Studies Associates, 2005). Despite these findings, not enough has been done at the state or national levels to improve teaching quality, and in some cases ineffective or dysfunctional policies have been created that actually exacerbated the problem (Yuan, et al., 2013).

Looking at the literature about what is needed to improve the quality of teaching in many U.S. schools systems, we do know that high quality preparation of teachers is crucial to producing well qualified educators. This means that colleges and universities that prepare new teachers have needed to update their teacher training processes to include more mentoring and support in the preparation and transition phases. Alternative certification programs – including non-university-sponsored teacher preparation efforts – were created to accelerate the process by re-training professionals choosing to change their career

paths. Those programs soon learned that content specialization was not enough and that instruction in pedagogy was critically important for future teacher success.

Research on teacher quality also has examined distribution patterns of quality teaching and discovered that high quality teaching often was not equitably distributed across, or not even within, school districts. Research on Texas schools conducted by Ed Fuller (2010) found that schools with more resources had access to a higher quality teaching pool than those with more limited resources.

On a related note, the Education Trust (2008) conducted its own study on teaching quality distribution across several states. That research found that teaching quality was less than equitable in schools serving inner cities in major urban areas. Follow-up efforts included making local school leaders aware of the existing distribution inequities in the hope that greater awareness of the teaching quality inequity within large school districts would trigger changes in teacher assignment practices.

Examining different states and existing teacher pools, Linda Darling-Hammond found that some states had surplus teachers while others had critical shortages, particularly in specific areas of specialization (2011). In a later study, Darling (cont. on Page 2)

“Our future depends on having an excellent public education system, where all students graduate from high school prepared for college or the world of work, no matter what the color of their skin, the language they speak, or where they happen to be born. And this is a goal I believe we can achieve.”

– Dr. María “Cuca” Robledo Montecel, IDRA President and CEO

(Teaching Quality – What we Know and What We Still Need, continued from Page 1)

Hammond (2003) found that inner-city students tended to “receive teaching from staff that had fewer credentials and less experience than peers in low minority, middle-income school systems.” Other researchers cited teacher unions and collective bargaining agreements that advocated for expansive teacher control over assignments as factors impacting teacher placements in districts around the country.

What Reforms Should Be Considered

The research findings on inequitable distribution of teaching quality and the critical role it plays in preparing students for later success in college raises questions of what can be done to ensure equitable access to high quality teaching for all students. Among the options most often cited in the literature are: (1) expanding the pool of well-prepared teachers by providing greater incentives and support for undergraduates to pursue teaching as a career (Cochran-Smith & Power, 2010); (2) improving new teacher preparation by revamping teacher education programs; (3) strengthening professional development for teachers already in the field who can benefit from targeted support (Villarreal & Gonzalez, 2008); (4) changing policies to allow for placing best qualified teachers in highest need schools (Alliance for Excellent Education, 2008; Sawchuck, 2010); and (5) improving teacher compensation to support excellence and persistence (Schacter & Thum, 2004). These options are consistent with IDRA’s Quality School Action Framework, which shows the interrelationship of teaching quality with curriculum quality and access, student engagement, and parent and community engagement along with the fundamentals of fair funding and governance efficacy. The framework deliberately uses the term *teaching quality*

in contrast to *teacher quality* to go beyond the qualities of an individual and rather to examine the preparation of teachers and their placement in their fields of study as well as teacher instructional practices and administrative support (Grayson, 2009).

Review of research on quality teaching indicates that the more effectively we unbundle what contributes to quality teaching, the more effectively we can target reforms. It also suggests that the inequality in access to teaching quality is not accidental and that any real reforms will require changes in teacher preparation, distribution and school funding systems.

Resources

- Alliance for Excellent Education. *Improving the Distribution of Teachers in Low Performing High Schools*, policy brief (Washington, D.C.: Alliance for Excellent Education, April 2008).
- Cochran-Smith, M. “Teaching Quality Matters,” *Journal of Teacher Education* (2003).
- Cochran-Smith, Marilyn & Christine Power. “New Direction in Teacher Preparation,” *Education Leadership* (May 2010).
- Darling-Hammond, L. “The Quality of Teaching Matters Most,” *Journal of Staff Development* (Winter 1997).
- Darling-Hammond, L. “Symposium: Access to Quality Teaching: An Analysis of Inequality in California Public Schools,” *Santa Clara Law Review* (2003).
- Darling-Hammond, L. *Recruiting and Retaining Teachers: What Matters Most and What Can Government Do?* (Stewart, Ohio: The Forum on Education and Democracy, 2011).
- Education Trust. *Their Fair Share: How Texas Sized Gaps in Teacher Quality Shortchange Minority Children in Texas* (Washington, D.C.: Education Trust, February 2008).
- Fuller, E.J. *Does Teacher Certification Matter? A Comparison of TAAS Performance in 1997 Between Schools with Low and High Percentages of Certified Teachers* (Austin: University of Texas at Austin, Charles A. Dana Center, 1999).
- Fuller, E.J. *Study on the Distribution of Teacher Quality in Texas Schools* (Austin, Texas: Association of Texas Professional Educators, Fall 2010).
- Grayson, Kristin. “Defining Quality Teaching Beyond the

Certificate,” *IDRA Newsletter* (San Antonio, Texas: Intercultural Development Research Association, February, 2009).

Policy Studies Associates. *Teacher Quality and Student Achievement: Research Review* (Alexandria, Va.: Center for Public Education, November 1, 2005).

Robledo Montecel, M. “Time to Make High School Graduation the New Minimum,” in *Courage to Connect: A Quality Schools Action Framework™*, Robledo Montecel, M., & C. Goodman (eds) (San Antonio, Texas: Intercultural Development Research Association, 2010).

Sawchuk, S. “New Teacher Distribution Methods Hold Promise,” *Education Week* (June 10, 2010).

Schacter, J., & Y.M. Thum. “Paying For High and Low Quality Teaching,” *Economics of Education Review* (August 2004).

Villarreal, A., & Gonzalez, J. “Professional Development.” In *Encyclopedia on Bilingual Education*, Josue M. Gonzalez (ed.) (Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications, 2008).

Yuan, K., & L. Vi-Nhuan, D.F. McCaffee, J.A. Marsh, L.S. Hamilton, B.M. Stecher, M.G. Springer. “Incentive Pay Programs Do Not Affect Teacher Motivation or Reported Practice: Results from Three Randomized Studies,” *Education Evaluation and Policy Analysis* (March 2013).

Albert Cortez, Ph.D., is the policy director at IDRA. Comments and questions may be directed to him via email at comment@idra.org.

The Intercultural Development Research Association (IDRA) is a non-profit organization with a 501(c)(3) tax exempt status. IDRA fulfills its mission through professional development, research and evaluation, policy and leadership development, and programs and materials development.

The IDRA Newsletter (ISSN 1069-5672, ©2013) serves as a vehicle for communication with educators, school board members, decision-makers, parents, and the general public concerning the educational needs of all children in Texas and across the United States.

Permission to reproduce material contained herein www.idra.org

is granted provided the article or item is reprinted in its entirety and proper credit is given to IDRA and the author. Please send a copy of the material in its reprinted form to the IDRA Newsletter production offices. Editorial submissions, news releases, subscription requests, and change-of-address data should be submitted in writing to the IDRA Newsletter production editor. The IDRA Newsletter staff welcomes your comments on editorial material.

Portions of the contents of this newsletter were developed under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. However, those contents do not necessarily represent the policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and endorsement by the federal government should not be assumed.

Publication offices:
5815 Callaghan Road, Suite 101
San Antonio, Texas 78228
210-444-1710; Fax 210-444-1714
www.idra.org | contact@idra.org

Maria Robledo Montecel, Ph. D.
IDRA President and CEO
Newsletter Executive Editor

Christie L. Goodman, APR
IDRA Communication Manager
Newsletter Production Editor

Sarah H. Aleman
Secretary
Newsletter Layout



Assuring Civil Rights Protection with State ESEA Flexibility Waivers

by Bradley Scott, Ph.D.

The discussion about the big initiatives the U.S. Department of Education and the administration have undertaken does not end with the Common Core State Standards (Scott, 2013). It must extend to the ESEA state flexibility waivers. The Secretary of Education offered an invitation to all states and territories to apply for flexibility waivers to meet the student achievement targets that were set in the original *No Child Left Behind Act*. Since states were experiencing difficulty in achieving or even approaching the targets for 2014, which in 2001 seemed to be a long way off, states and school districts established very ambitious annual goals. 2014 is practically here and, clearly, achieving grade level proficiency and success for all students will not happen by then.

The invitation to apply for flexibility to reach the achievement targets by 2014 in a different way as determined by the state and approved by the U.S. Department of Education is as much of a civil rights concern for diverse learners as is the implementation of the Common Core. Thirty-four states and the District of Columbia are approved for ESEA flexibility. Other states have applied and are awaiting review and approval. This article lays out some of the civil rights concerns that may arise around the plans for flexibility that have been submitted and approved by the U.S. Department of Education.

The *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESEA) Flexibility Waivers:

- Create an individual way for states to respond to the requirements of NCLB,
- Create an opportunity to focus on improving student learning and improve the quality of instruction,
- Intend to increase educational outcomes for all students,
- Intend to close achievement gaps, and
- Intend to increase equity.

The waivers rest upon four principles to improve

academic performance for all students, particularly those students who attend the lowest performing schools:

- Implementation of college- and career-ready expectations for all students;
- State-developed differentiated recognition, accountability and support;
- Support for effective instruction and leadership; and
- Reduction of duplication and unnecessary (reporting) burden.

As with the Common Core Standards, there are a set of seven civil rights concerns that cannot be overlooked if, in fact, educational equity is one of the principles upon which these waivers rest. I will comment on the first two of them here. The seven civil rights concerns are:

- The “deficit cliff”;
- The equity context;
- Monitoring the innovation;
- The challenge of changing regularities;
- Real access, inclusion and engagement of parents;
- Data-driven decision making versus decision making that drives data; and
- Peer review comments.

The Deficit Cliff

The deficit cliff is a concept that describes how people in certain school settings fall into an abyss of doubt, negative belief and low aspirations for certain learners based on their perceptions of those learners. Recently, I had an occasion during service training to present a session on raising expectations and performance of diverse students. The audience was a group of middle school teachers on a Title I campus (serving a high number of economically disadvantaged students). I thought I was doing a masterful job, (cont. on Page 4)

The challenge will be to raise ourselves and our doing to higher levels of being, expectation and performance so that we elevate learners to theirs.

IDRA South Central Collaborative for Equity

For more information about the IDRA South Central Collaborative for Equity or to request technical assistance, contact us at 210-444-1710 or contact@idra.org.

Additional resources are available online at http://www.idra.org/South_Central_Collaborative_for_Equity/

funded by the U.S. Department of Education

(Assuring Civil Rights Protection with State ESEA Flexibility Waivers, continued from Page 3)

when a small group of teachers began to resist and balk at my comments about what might be possible. They began to tell me that the things I was saying were good and might work “but not with our kids.”

“What you don’t understand, Dr. Scott, is that our kids are not the college-going kind. Most of them will end up like their parents. They will drop out of school and work the fields or other low-skill jobs.”

“Oh, there will be some who will make it to college, but they will be the exception.”

“They’re good kids, and we want what we know is best for them. You can help us most by giving us insight on how to properly prepare them for what most of them will do.”

Their words rattled within me, shaking my insides to dust. I had to stop them for their sake and my own sanity. I said to them: “Do you hear yourselves? Is this what you believe is possible for these students? Can’t you imagine anything more for them? Can’t you see any other ends to which they might aspire with your help and support? If you are willing to say this about them to me, an outsider you don’t know, what messages must you be sending to them on a daily basis in a thousand subtle and not-so-subtle ways? Is this really the best you can hope for them? What a dismal, disappointing place this is to come to every day.”

It stunned them and offended some. My concern is that the waivers focusing on Title I schools that are failing that are the lowest performing in a district and state may give many stakeholders a reason to jump off the deficit cliff into the abyss of blaming students because of their race, ethnicity, language, poverty, disability, gender or many other descriptors of difference, and these learners may never have a chance to do better, be better and be more successful. Interestingly, the staff I was speaking with was about 45 percent Latino, and the campus student population was more than 80 percent Latino. My point in mentioning this is that even “minorities” can fall over this deficit cliff and do the same harm regarding diverse learners as their non-minority counterparts.

What these teachers were saying about their students’ futures will come true if the teachers continue on their current path. The challenge will be to raise ourselves and our doing to higher levels of being, expectation and performance so

that we elevate learners to theirs.

The Equity Context

The equity context has been previously described in this newsletter (Scott, 2013). My concern about the waivers is threefold.

First, it is not clear that the plans for flexibility that were submitted and approved have been constructed to answer certain “questions of impact,” like: *What might create a negative or adverse impact on any identifiable population of students?* and, *How do we address any adverse impact?* among others (Scott, 2013). In fact, some of the things being proposed, (like the creation of “super groups” that may combine for example English learners and disabled learners who also are American Indian into one group) will thereby mask or hide the performance of certain student populations. This is a civil rights concern that could take us back to a pre-NCLB era.

Second, not using an equity context may inadvertently give permission to highly qualified teachers and leaders to conduct business as usual, thus ensuring a deficit approach to reform, instruction, innovation and the institutionalization of inappropriate and ineffective practice that likely will reproduce the same bad outcomes for students, and particularly for certain groups of students, as we have seen during the past 10 years of NCLB implementation.

Finally, implementing an equity lens without preparing teachers and leaders to build their knowledge and understanding about these powerful notions, thoughtfully and intentionally creating systems change as described in the IDRA Quality School Actions Framework (Robledo Montecel & Goodman, 2010), will not succeed. Neither will neglecting to help these teachers and leaders to build personal capacity to properly engage other stakeholders, including parents, and garner their support, input, involvement and participation. Stakeholders must be committed to different outcomes driven by different regularities and practices of habit.

These civil rights concerns can best addressed and established to benefit all learners. I am convinced of this, but it will require an approach that creates a different truth, a more specific intention, a more powerful commitment and a higher level of expectation about what is possible. The only question I have is: Are we really up to the task?

Get More Online at the IDRA Newsletter Plus

- Podcasts about creating a college-ready campus
- Videos by Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program students
- *Courage to Connect: A Quality Schools Action Framework™* website with related resources
- IDRA policy note about the dangers of student tracking
- Podcasts about civil rights concerns with the Common Core and flexibility waivers
- Information on IDRA teacher professional development programs in math, science and college-readiness

Visit www.idra.org for more information.

Resources

Robledo Montecel, M., & C. Goodman (eds). *Courage to Connect: A Quality Schools Action Framework™*, (San Antonio, Texas: Intercultural Development Research Association, 2010).

Scott, B. “Building a Civil Rights Juggernaut Using the Common Core Standards,” *IDRA Newsletter* (San Antonio, Texas: Intercultural Development Research Association, February 2013).

Bradley Scott, Ph.D., is a senior education associate in IDRA Field Services. Comments and questions may be directed to him via email at comment@idra.org.

No Back-Tracking – Supporting More Opportunities Not Limitations

Preparing Our Children for College and 21st Century Options

by Aurelio M. Montemayor, M.Ed.

Tracking is bad educational policy and practice. It is damaging to many students. Its failure is well documented. Returning to bad policy as Texas is doing, will return us to a time of great failure. But successful policy and practice exists. Reneging of the policy successes requiring rigorous, high-level curriculum and instruction for every child is damaging to everyone, to our economy and our future. We must avoid policy that tracks students into low level curriculum and instead put in place practice that prepares all students to enroll in and complete college.

A form of tracking called *ability grouping* is a sorting approach schools used to organize classes and assign students. Decades of research point to the fact that it does not help teachers succeed more in their instruction of students and, even worse, castigates students (mostly poor, of color or English learners) to limited results. The data clearly show academic failure and subsequent limited access to, and success in, college. Ability grouping has helped very few and harmed many. It's a myth that such clustering facilitates better and more appropriate instruction.

Instead, tracking of all kinds encourages bias toward students, and these classifications narrow the expectations of the teachers and the school community. Tracking has led to “disappointing and enduring outcomes.” Dr. Jeannie Oakes and others have done extensive research in this area. Oakes’ *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality* (1985) is one of the most significant books on education in the 20th century.

On the positive side, there is evidence that diversity can be accommodated without sorting. “Since the late 1980s, policymakers and educators have recommended that schools dismantle structures that privilege so-called homogenous grouping” (Oakes, et al., 2012). Heterogeneous grouping has been successfully accomplished through a variety of approaches, including detracking; high-track classes for all; school-wide improvement rather than remedial “pull-out” programs;

linked learning; inclusion of disabled and gifted students; and supporting English learners and biliteracy.

Texas policymakers have been considering bringing back policies that many decades of practice have proven unproductive, biased and student-limiting. Policy is crafted with euphemisms to mask underlying bias. A policymaker might repeat the phrase “college is not for everybody” with the assumption that students who are poor, of color or recent immigrant are given unrealistic aspirations. A policy target of facilitating students to be work-ready and giving them a variety of paths toward a career is in fact thinly-veiled bias, racism and class prejudice. As workplace spokespersons lobby for students to be prepared for jobs through vocational education, you can detect the assumption that “some students are best working with their hands.”

Battles were won over the last few decades to have high curriculum standards with all students required to have four years of high school English, math, science and social studies. Quality teaching, with variations to meet the learning styles and needs of diverse populations, hasn't caught up with the raised standards. Schools of education haven't modified teacher preparation enough to nurture high expectations wedded to effective teaching practice for the diverse populations that are the current majority student body. And in some cases as newly certified, highly motivated and expertly prepared teachers enter their first campus assignments, they face a culture of very limited expectations and even despair toward the students who most need high hopes. It is not uncommon to find high school math departments that despair of the majority of the student body ever mastering higher math. Policymakers, either for reasons of bias against certain populations or because certain voices in the community echo the “college is not for everybody” mantra attempt a rebirth of the Fundamentals of (Mickey Mouse) Math courses and, worse, the minimum require-

We must avoid policy that tracks students into low level curriculum and instead put in place practice that prepares all students to enroll in and complete college.

(No Back-Tracking – Supporting More Opportunities Not Limitations, continued from Page 7)

ment diploma.

Setting policy based on biases that are clearly unsupported by evidence and policy that dismisses the ample evidence accumulated through many generations of ineffective and damaging practice, is irresponsible and scandalous. The change toward high standards and effective instruction for every child will take persistence. It's taken several generations to modify society's views toward tobacco use and reduced the addiction so that the next generation is less disposed to use the substance. Likewise, we must persist over several generations in our vision for every student. Limited expectations, funding cuts, lack of excellent teaching and curricular resources, and old biases all combine to result in bad policy.

In policy, we must persist in these two recommendations (IDRA, 2013):

- Students should not be tracked into low-level courses nor into different diploma routes or graduation plans.
- Schools should provide a high quality curriculum that prepares all students to enroll in and complete college, supplemented by optional courses that prepare them to enter the workforce after graduation.

If we are to create true opportunities for all of our children, we must commit to high quality curriculum for all students, full funding of all our schools, especially those neighborhood public schools in our neediest communities, and we must create and voice a community will for an excellent public education for every child.

Resources

IDRA. IDRA Policy Issues in 2013 for Texas, online (San Antonio, Texas: Intercultural Development Research Association, 2013).

Robledo Montecel, M. "Time to Make High School Graduation the New Minimum," in *Courage to Connect: A Quality Schools Action Framework™*, Robledo Montecel, M., & C. Goodman (eds) (San Antonio, Texas: Intercultural Development Research Association, 2010).

Oakes, J., & M. Lipton, L. Anderson, J. Stillman. Teaching to Change the World, fourth edition (Boulder, Colo.: Paradigm Publishers, 2012).

Oakes, J. *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality*, second edition (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985).

Aurelio M. Montemayor, M.Ed., is a senior education associate in IDRA Field Services. Comments and questions may be directed to him via email at comment@idra.org.

IDRA 40th Anniversary

Supported by Houston Endowment, Inc., IDRA developed and lead the initiative, titled InterAction: Higher Education and Latinos in the New Millennium, seeking to build stronger, enduring links among K-12, institutions of higher education and the community and business sectors to effect meaningful education reform. IDRA convened three forums addressing issues facing a specific community of interest – urban, rural or border areas. The forums were hosted by the University of Houston-Downtown, the University of Texas-Permian Basin, and the University of Texas-Pan American, respectively. The LULAC State Education Committee and the Texas Latino



Education Coalition co-hosted all three forums. IDRA then held a statewide seminar where participants reviewed 31 policy solutions stemming from the series of three InterAction forums. The 31 policy solutions follow IDRA's framework that identifies seven distinct areas of opportunities for reform: preparation, access, institutional persistence, affordability, institutional resources, graduation, and graduate and professional studies.

InterAction statewide seminar participants from left to right: Norma Cantu, professor of education and law at the UT School of Law; Joe Muñoz, assistant to the president at San Angelo State University; and Charles Roeckle, deputy to the president at UT Austin. March 2005.

IDRA Newsletter Now Available by Email

We're proud to announce that the IDRA Newsletter is now available to you by email.

As before, the print version is still available by mail, and you can view the newsletter on our website (http://www.idra.org/IDRA_NL_current/). But now, you can get your news faster, see it on your mobile device and share it with others more easily. And we might even save a few trees in the process.

**Sign up now to get the IDRA Newsletter by email at
www.idra.org/Receive_IDRA_News**

While you're at it, you can also sign up to receive our monthly bilingual Graduation for All e-Letter and our occasional IDRA eNews e-Letter.



Effective Dropout Prevention – IDRA Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program

All children are valuable; none is expendable. But the fact is U.S. high schools lose more than one third of their students before graduation, and the cumulative impact of this attrition affects every person. But, schools can increase their holding power by transforming how they recognize students' inherent value, their contributions, and their potential significance to their communities and society, as a whole. The Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program is a research-based, internationally-recognized dropout prevention program that is keeping more than 98 percent of participating students in school, young people who were previously at risk of dropping out.

The Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program has worked dramatically everywhere it has been.

- Less than 2 percent dropout rate among students deemed at risk.
- More than 33,000 such students kept in school.
- Positively impacted more than 780,000 children, families and educators.
- Hundreds of schools now see promise where they once saw problems.

In the Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program, secondary students who are considered at-risk of dropping out of school are placed as tutors of elementary students, enabling them to make a difference in the younger students' lives. With a growing sense of responsibility and pride, the tutors stay and do better in school. The program supports them with positive recognition, instruction and support.

"In these young people, the program creates a sense of responsibility, worth, contribution and accomplishment. Tutors improve their grades, they show up in school more often and in the principal's office less often, and they stay in school," adds Dr. María "Cuca" Robledo Montecel, IDRA President. "In addition, the Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program succeeds



Hear from Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program tutors...

"The only thing that kept my feet firmly planted on the ground was the knowledge that I was here for someone else, and they were depending on me... These children were my light."

– High school tutor

"The Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program has made me a better student because interaction with children has helped me be more caring and understanding. Knowing that my tutees are expecting me to be there, I enjoy going every day... I understand now that we can all improve a student's outlook on school by taking time a few minutes a day to help out."

– High school tutor

"When school started, I felt a big emptiness inside me. I felt that if I missed a day of class no one would notice. Now that I started in the Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program, I have a better self-esteem. Through the VYP, three kids have made a change in my life... I know that I am making a big difference in their lives."

– Middle school tutor

because it subtly but powerfully challenges and ultimately changes people's beliefs and behaviors."

Coca-Cola Valued Youth are an inspiration to the children they tutor, positive leaders among their peers, motivated learners to their teachers, a source of pride to their parents and contributors to their communities.

One Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program teacher coordinator in San Antonio said: "I've seen firsthand the difference this program can make in the lives of young people. The kids I work with have improved as students and as people because of this program. That's been amazing to watch, especially since no one thought they'd even stay in school."

IDRA provides the full range of training, technical assistance, evaluation and support materials to preserve the integrity of the program and ensure that students succeed. In Texas, the State Board of Education approved the Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program as an innovative course eligible for elective credit at the high school level. Students participating in the program can earn one state credit for their participation in this course. For more information, contact IDRA at 210-444-1710 or contact@idra.org.



INTERCULTURAL DEVELOPMENT RESEARCH ASSOCIATION
5815 CALLAGHAN ROAD, SUITE 101
SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS 78228

Non-Profit Organization


U.S. POSTAGE PAID

Permit No. 3192
San Antonio, TX 78228

Focus: College Access and Success

“Our nation must move from its low expectation that only some of our students can successfully graduate to expecting and supporting all of our students to graduate college-ready.”

— Dr. María “Cuca” Robledo Montecel, IDRA President and CEO




semillitas de aprendizaje™

Bilingual literacy development materials

- ✓ Big Books, for early childhood and primary grades classrooms (set of 10 stories)
- ✓ Teacher Guide, with a set of classroom activities for 10 units
- ✓ Cartitas, letters for home activities tied to the 10 stories
- ✓ Preschool math and self concept books (set of 15)

Order your classroom set today!
Available from IDRA for \$345 per set plus shipping.
Also available now through Amazon. Additional Cartitas for classrooms sold separately at \$20 per set.

See a sample Big Book and list of titles online at:
www.idra.org/Quality_Early_Education/Semillitas/



*Assuring educational opportunity for every child
through research, materials development, training, technical assistance, evaluation and information dissemination*