Symposium Introduction

A family of four earning $19,307 or less a year is defined by the federal government as living in poverty.

In 2004, 37.0 million (12.7 percent) of Americans were living in poverty, an increase of 1.1 million (12.5 percent) in 2003. Poverty rates remained unchanged for Blacks (24.7 percent) and Hispanics (21.9 percent), rose for non-Hispanic Whites (8.6 percent in 2004, up from 8.2 percent in 2003) and decreased for Asians (9.8 percent in 2004, down from 11.8 percent in 2003.)

The poverty rate in 2004 (12.7 percent) was 9.7 percentage points lower than in 1959, the first year for which poverty estimates are available. Both the poverty rate and number have risen for four consecutive years from 31.6 million (11.3 percent) in 2000, to 37.0 million (12.7 percent) in 2004 respectively.

For children under 18 year old both the 2004 poverty rate (17.8%) and the number in poverty (13.0) remained unchanged from 2003. The poverty rate for children under 18 remained higher than that of 18-to-64 year olds (11.3 percent).


Ohio ranks 10th in the top ten states with the greatest increase in poverty between 2003-2004.

Today, in 2006, 37 million American men, women and children live in poverty. That exceeds the number from last year and in fact, is more than ever before. In the push for the reform of urban education, children living in poverty, hardship and hunger are expected to achieve at increasingly higher levels. Teachers are charged with leaving no child behind academically regardless of their circumstances. Children and youth are impacted by their environments as is their growth, development and their academic achievement. If we are to improve one outcome (academic achievement) – all of the mitigating forces impacting that outcome must be addressed.

Our current disjointed system of urban school and public policy makes teachers and children’s jobs so incredibly difficult. Today’s speaker, Dr. Jean Anyon, argues that to be successful we must take a comprehensive approach to reforming urban schools that includes a “New Paradigm for Urban Education Policy that would simultaneously address reform of public and education policy.

“It is important to note that federal education policies intended to improve urban schools did not take aim at the economic arrangements practices that themselves produced the poverty in which city schools were embedded. Despite increases in educational opportunity the effects of almost a century of educational policies on urban school and student achievement have by most accounts been disappointing.”

Anyon, Jean; “what counts as Educational Policy: Notes Toward a New Paradigm.” Harvard Educational Review Vol. 75 No 1 spring 2005 pp. 6-85. Ohio, one of the top
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Symposium Introduction

A family of four earning $19,307 or less a year is defined by the federal government as living in poverty.

In 2004, 37.0 million (12.7 percent) of Americans were living in poverty, an increase of 1.1 million (12.5 percent) over 2003. Poverty rates remained unchanged for Blacks (24.7 percent) and Hispanics (21.9 percent), rose for non-Hispanic Whites (8.6 percent in 2004, up from 8.2 percent in 2003), and decreased for Asians (9.8 percent in 2004, down from 11.8 percent in 2003.)

The poverty rate in 2004 (12.7 percent) was 9.7 percentage points lower than in 1959, the first year for which poverty estimates are available. Both the poverty rate and number have risen for four consecutive years from 31.6 million (11.3 percent) in 2000, to 37.0 million (12.7 percent) in 2004.

For children under 18 years old, both the 2004 poverty rate (17.8%) and the number in poverty (13.0) remained unchanged from 2003. The poverty rate for children under 18 remained higher than that of 18-to-64 year olds (11.3 percent).


Ohio ranks 10th in the top ten states with the greatest increase in poverty between 2003-2004. Today, in 2006, 37 million American men, women and children live in poverty. That exceeds the number from last year and in fact is more than ever before. In the push for the reform of urban education, children living in poverty, hardship, and hunger are expected to achieve at increasingly higher levels. Teachers are charged with leaving no child behind academically regardless of their circumstances. Children and youth are impacted by their environments in their growth, development, and their academic achievement. If we are to improve one outcome (academic achievement), all of the mitigating forces impacting that outcome must be addressed.

Our current disjointed system of urban school and public policy makes teachers’ and children’s jobs incredibly difficult. Symposium keynote speaker Dr. Jean Anyon argues that to be successful we must take a comprehensive approach to reforming urban schools that includes a “New Paradigm for Urban Education Policy” that would simultaneously address reform of public and education policy.

“It is important to note that federal education policies intended to improve urban schools did not take aim at the economic arrangements and practices that themselves produced the poverty in which city schools were embedded. Despite increases in educational opportunity the effects of almost a century of educational policies on urban school and student achievement have by most accounts been disappointing.”

In addition to our major speaker, Dr. Jean Anyon, Dr. Cynthia Tyson, Associate Professor of Education at The Ohio State University, and Dr. Jim Mahoney, Executive Director for Battelle Kids in Columbus, Ohio, discussed the implications of issues raised by Dr. Anyon. Guided group discussions provided the opportunity to elicit a wide array of perspectives from symposium participants as they explored a strategy for improving urban education through a “new paradigm” for education and public policy issues critical to the health of our urban communities and schools, and thus to the health of our country.

Questions addressed included: What might constitute essential elements of an integrated “new urban education policy paradigm?” What kind of linkages might be needed? Who could create and sustain these linkages? How might these “connected elements” look in practice? What would it take to create and test the impact of such an integrated public policy agenda?

In the interest of focusing the discussion on Ohio, its policies, urban schools, and environments, Dr. Lawrence Libby, Interim Director of the John Glenn Institute for Public Policy and Public Service, presented an overview of the demographics of the state of Ohio, its history, people, and public policies regarding housing and neighborhood development and their effects on where people live, who lives there, and how that affects our urban communities and the quality of our urban schools.
A New Paradigm for Education Policy and Practice

Jean Anyon, Ph.D. and Professor of Education Policy at the CUNY Graduate Center in Urban Education, delivered the Symposium keynote address. A prominent political economist, Dr. Anyon is widely regarded as an expert on urban education and inner city revitalization. She has authored several books and scholarly articles on educational issues involving the confluence of social class and race, been interviewed on numerous radio and television programs, and has been an invited speaker at universities throughout the United States and England. Dr. Anyon’s remarks were drawn from her latest book, Radical Possibilities: Public Policy, Urban Education, and a New Social Movement.

Dr. Anyon maintains socio-economic policies at the local, regional, state, and federal levels, such as the minimum wage, job availability, tax rates, transportation, and affordable housing, create conditions in cities that make it exceedingly difficult if not impossible for urban school reform efforts to succeed. Failing urban schools, she contends, are not primarily a consequence of failed education policy or urban family dynamics, but are a logical consequence of the economic and social policies and practices that support it. These contextual policies and practices create barriers to educational success that cannot be overcome by changes in educational practice alone. The evidence, Dr. Anyon argues, lies in our efforts to reform education and close the achievement gap between children of poverty and their more advantaged peers for over three decades – and there is little significant and sustained improvement that we can document.

Dr. Anyon acknowledges that more equitable socio-economic policies will not by themselves create high-quality urban schools. Such policies will need to be augmented by successful educational reform. Socio-economic policies and practices can create conditions in urban neighborhoods that allow for and support successful urban schools. Equally important as these nurturing conditions are changes in educational policy and practices that eliminate racial tracking, low-level curriculum, low expectations, inadequate funding, and poor teaching.

The solution, Dr. Anyon contends, is to join these two independent struggles by connecting school reform to campaigns for increased social opportunity. By purposely engaging community organizations active in economic and housing struggles with groups actively engaged in educational reform efforts, a synergy will emerge and create the neighborhood conditions needed to sustain and support school-level changes and improvement. The convergence of these various movements around a set of issues that all can agree upon, support, and work toward solving is crucial if we are to significantly improve educational outcomes for urban (poor) students.

Dr. Anyon argued that we can draw on lessons learned from past social movements to create a new paradigm for educational policy – one that links efforts to improve urban education with efforts to address poverty wages, joblessness, and housing injustices found in urban neighborhoods across our country, and one that recognizes that success in the educational arena will not come about without success in the social arena at the same time.
Reactions and Implications

Drs. Cynthia A. Tyson and James Mahoney shared responses to the comments of the main speaker, Dr. Jean Anyon.

Dr. Cynthia A. Tyson

Dr. Cynthia Tyson began her career as a social studies teacher in the Columbus, Ohio Public School system. Currently she is an Associate Professor in the College of Education at The Ohio State University where she teaches courses in social studies and multicultural education. Her research interests include the development of cultural competence in teacher education, the examination of race/racism in qualitative research, and the use of literature written for children and young adults and its impact on social action in civic education.

Dr. Tyson referenced a study entitled “A Hope for Education,” in which nine (9) high-performing urban high schools were chronicled. Of the 10 recommendations derived from the study the one that she posed as relevant to the symposium theme was a call for educators and community members to participate in the political sector with special attention to legislation involving those public policies influencing schools.

Dr. Tyson pointed out that while past segregated schools had their challenges, some of the compensations included teachers who were committed to the children – who gave love, time and attention to children, their families and the communities that helped “fill the gap” and “move children to another level.” These strengths have been compromised by a shifting paradigm relative to public policies that, while disenfranching such schools, do not offer an alternative that strengthens the experiences of urban poor children.

Finally, she discussed the systems that relate to public policy such as minimum wages, jobs—or lack thereof public transportation, housing, health benefits, and the backlash that sometimes accompanies public policies surrounding these issues that can hurt rather than help those whom the policies are intended to serve. She stressed the importance of citizen participation in the democratic process.

Dr. Jim Mahoney

Dr. Mahoney has been a leader in education for more than 30 years, serving in roles including superintendent, assistant superintendent, principal, teacher, and professor. He currently is the director of Battelle for Kids in Columbus, Ohio – a non-profit organization committed to enhancing student learning by bringing clarity to school improvement efforts.

Dr. Mahoney pointed out that Dr. Anyon had given us “lots to look for — job policies, taxation, wages, transportation, zoning, AND education.” He said that good communities = good schools; thus, what the best parent wants for his or her child, the community should want for all children. How do we get people to have ownership in all children in all communities? How do we connect public policy to urban education to actively influence
issues of access to “good communities and good schools” for poor urban children and their families? He strongly urged us to not be so overwhelmed by working to connect public and education policy that we neglect to take action. Ultimately, we must take action. He agreed with Dr. Anyon that social movement is necessary to effect a new paradigm, and the key is to DO something—become actively engaged with no excuses!! There is an action that we can take as we begin to connect, – collaborate, and cooperate in creating an agenda that will impact those public policies that have direct consequences for conditions that affect poor urban children and their families – especially their schooling and academic achievement.

Finally, Dr. Mahoney noted that if we – through our public actions – create urban schooling initiatives that are proven to make a difference and those initiatives are not state-funded, that is immoral!
The Ohio Context

Lawrence Libby, Ph.D. and Interim Director of the John Glenn Institute for Public Service and Public Policy at The Ohio State University, provided a specific context for Symposium participants as they tackled the issue of how to significantly improve educational outcomes for urban students and close the achievement gap between students living in low-income neighborhoods and their more affluent peers. Libby is an economist with policy experience focused on the many issues at the rural-urban interface.

Dr. Libby argues that land-use patterns are a physical template of the various social and economic forces affecting the quality of life. Those social forces include urban education and the relative quality of schools in urban, suburban, and exurban communities. Schools are often cited as a primary motivation for people leaving an urban center and moving to the countryside. Demographic trends are important for understanding the roots of problems with urban education and understanding potential solutions. Population shifts, revealed in land-use patterns, indicate many of the challenges to achieving equity in education opportunity. There are both push and pull factors underlying demographic change – some are seeking something new outside the city, others are escaping conditions they find unacceptable downtown. Dr. Libby uses Ohio as the exemplar for this kind of analysis – a process that could be used by any community interested in improving educational opportunities and outcomes for its youngest citizens.

At the national level, the southern and western sections of the US have experienced the fastest rates of population growth over the past 40 years as compared to the midwest and northeast. The largest increases in population have occurred in the 1990s (see Figure 1). Those regions experiencing rapid growth need new schools to handle the additional demands, while regions that are not growing experience the pressures linked to migration from urban to exurban areas, with decline in school infrastructure in the cities and pressure at the urban fringe. Both of these factors impact education policy and practices, but additional analysis is needed at the state and local levels if we are to gain insights that can be useful in helping inform future policy decisions that will lead to the desired goal of dramatically improving achievement in urban schools.

Figure 1: National Population Shifts
A closer look at these national changes in population reveals that differences in the rate of change in the urban core, the metropolitan edge, the non-metropolitan adjacent and non-adjacent areas have implications for both better understanding the current conditions and for shaping future policies to improve educational and social outcomes. Figure 2 depicts the relatively stable population of the urban core and the significant increases in migration of people areas outside the central city. This population shift is accompanied by decreases in resource availability to the urban core.

Figure 2: U.S. Population Change, 1982-1997

Figure 3 depicts the relative changes in population density in four kinds of communities within the state of Ohio: villages, small cities, large cities, and townships. A clear pattern of people moving to unincorporated areas emerges. Accompanying survey data indicate that people moved to gain an increased sense of security and to improve their quality of life by living in open spaces.

Figure 3: Population of Ohio Townships, Villages and Cities, 1960-2000
More detailed examination of urban growth trends provides another way to understand factors influencing urban schools and their outcomes. Figure 4 provides an example of how examining growth trends in “old” Columbus (urban core) and “new” Columbus that includes the substantial outlying area that has been annexed to the city since 1970 can help us understand the challenges urban schools face, and provides a platform for thinking about how different policy options might impact these trends. Population of “old” Columbus, before aggressive annexation of the past 35 years, has steadily declined, while “new” Columbus is growing. And the rate of poverty is far greater in the old than in the new.

Figure 4: Growth Trends in “New” and “Old” Columbus

Clearly, maps and graphs that depict demographic trends provide useful tools that citizens and policy makers can use to analyze the impact of current polices and practices as they affect education, to better understand the relationships among them, and to purposefully think about a more comprehensive approach to policy development that can lead to improved social and educational outcomes.
Guided Discussion: Linking Social and Educational Policy to Achieve New Outcomes

Using the perspectives provided by Drs. Anyon, Libby, Tyson, and Mahoney and their own expertise, Symposium participants were organized into six work teams and charged with grappling with issues associated with developing a new strategy for improving urban education that linked social and education policy. Each work team was asked to tackle one of the following “clusters” of questions:

Cluster 1: Partner Roles and Responsibilities
- What should be the roles and responsibilities of higher education and research in creating and implementing a new framework for education policy and practice?
- What should be the roles and responsibilities of K-12 practitioners in creating and implementing a new framework for education policy and practice?
- What should be the roles and responsibilities of community leaders and public policy makers in creating and implementing a new framework for education policy and practice?
- If children’s academic success is a shared responsibility among families, communities, and schools for the conditions in which children live and grow, what strategies can be used to share the accountability?

Cluster 2: Collaboration Among Key Stakeholders
- What are the barriers to collaboration among those working on “community, family, and workplace” issues and those working to improve what is taking place in schools and classrooms?
- What strategies might be used to foster dialogue among these groups?
- What strategies could be used to align and integrate public and education policy?
- What kinds of linkages might be needed, and who should/could create and sustain these linkages?

Cluster 3: Thinking About a New Paradigm for Policy and Practice
- What might constitute essential elements of an integrated education policy paradigm?
- What might be key attributes of promising strategies/solutions? What might success look like?
- At what level(s) (e.g. neighborhood, school district, neighborhood, community, state, region, national) should “actions” be initiated?
- How would the day-to-day activities of K-12 practitioners, community leaders and public
• What would it take to create and test the impact of an integrated public policy agenda linked to education improvement?

Final Question and Next Steps

• Given the links among public policy and education policy, what are the critical attributes of a comprehensive 21st century urban K-12 education policy framework? And what are possible next steps?

Discussion Results:

Cluster 1: Partner Roles and Responsibilities

• What would be the role and responsibilities of higher education and research in creating and implementing a new framework for education policy and practice?

  o Deconstruct old system: stop compartmentalizing K-12, higher education and community; think P-16 and beyond
  o Recognize that education for the masses matters and is a shared responsibility
  o Engage in collaboration, not just cooperation
  o Recognize and articulate economic benefit of investing in education
  o Craft and frame issues and messages in clear and consistent ways across all partners
  o Increase involvement of higher education in K-12
  o Tap and use university resources to address shared problems – both at the administrative and grassroots levels
  o Work with school districts to reframe relationships with K-12 by refocusing the depth and breadth of activities in which they can work together
  o Assume greater responsibility for educating legislators about the issues related to improving K-12 outcomes
  o Increase access to resources related to collecting, analyzing, and using data and research in ways that will assist public schools and communities to advocate for needed changes
  o Promote conversations among educators (e.g. teachers, administrators) about their role in policy development and responsibility for influencing policy

• What would be the roles and responsibilities of K-12 practitioners in creating and implementing a new framework for education policy and practice?

  o Leverage all the resources in the community
  o Acknowledge history of relationships and rebuild trust
  o Increase sense of responsibility for advocacy and action among teachers and administrators
  o Recognize that high-quality education must be for all, not for “someone else”
  o Organize within groups and become active, help develop K-12 resources, become advocates, take risks to step outside the box versus adhering to rigid accountability requirements
• What would be the role and responsibilities for community leaders, child advocates, and public policy makers in creating and implementing a new framework for education policy and practice?
  o Community agencies become involved in supporting activism for education
  o Increase community involvement and interest in education

• If children’s academic success is a shared responsibility among families, communities, and schools for the conditions in which children live and grow, what strategies can be used to share the accountability?
  o Convene community forums to involve members in discussions of problems and possible solutions
  o Help to bridge social issues and education by developing consensus among many different stakeholder groups about a vision for schooling and desired outcomes
  o Examine both long-term and short-term actions and solutions
  o Seek a common voice among groups, associations, and agencies
  o Work to achieve better understanding about related issues by the public

**Cluster 2: Collaboration Among Key Stakeholders**

• What are the barriers to collaboration among those working on “community, family, and workplace” issues and those working to improve what is taking place in schools and classrooms?
  o Funding: difficult to align and separate pots of funding, the structure of funding, and groups
  o Fragmented blending and braiding of priorities
  o Private sector focus: difficult to talk about collaborating when there is little incentive to do so
  o Competing agendas among the various stakeholder organizations and groups
  o Lack of awareness and/or communication among various stakeholder organizations and groups – few established mechanisms for ongoing communication and/or collaboration
  o Turf issues can impede collaboration
  o Schools and community groups get rewarded for different things: schools for students passing tests, agencies for serving clients
  o There is a tendency to come together after serious issues arise rather than before
  o Lack of organizational structures that sustain long-term interactions and build relationships
  o Policies, practices, and regulations that do not support the inclusion of stakeholder groups

• What strategies might be used to foster dialogue among these groups?
  o Talk with politicians to get them fired up and involved
  o Find common places to meet and talk
  o Find common issues
- Study successful collaborations
- Establish schools as community centers and places to gather, meet, and talk
- Adequately fund coordinators for collaboration
- Ask groups like the Glenn Institute to convene diverse groups across the state
- Acknowledge the existence of those issues that act as distractions to the education sector’s ability to achieve
- Look at joint policy development (e.g., poverty, job discrimination, under-employment)

**What strategies could be used to align and integrate public and education policy?**
- Create political will for cross-organizational conversations and participation by elected officials and their staffs
- Break down silos across multiple agencies
- Expand the conversation to PreK-16 and beyond
- Develop roundtables comprised of policy developers and stakeholders
- Conduct cross-organizational team-building and problem-solving training
- Develop ways to give K-12 students a sense of empowerment and increased involvement in problems impacting their communities and their schools’ success
- Increase higher education’s willingness to listen to and respond to suggestions and recommendations of K-12 personnel, parents, and communities
- Replicate what we are doing at this symposium
- Increase understanding and commitment among key stakeholder organizations and individuals within those organizations of the meaning of education beyond “schooling”

**What kinds of linkages might be needed, and who should/could create and sustain those linkages?**
- Roundtable discussions among various colleges at universities charged with identifying and/or creating strategies, incentives, and/or sanctions that would lead to increased collaboration and action-oriented outcomes among university faculty with needed expertise and key stakeholder groups trying to address pressing community problems
- Purposeful collaboration among PreK-16 organizations, community agencies and organizations, businesses, families, and policy makers that result in a PreK-16 seamless “pipeline”
- Policies and practices that result in increased collaboration among key stakeholder groups with CEOs being held accountable for the quality of collaboration and collaborative outcomes
- Interdisciplinary networks that are nurtured, supported, and sustained by each collaborating organization
- Development and use of a shared knowledge base and language
- Investment in leaders willing to collaborate and lead to achieve collaboratively developed outcomes
Cluster 3: Essential Elements of a New Paradigm for Policy and Practice

- What might constitute essential elements of an integrated education policy framework?
  - A shared vision for policy which: (a) makes sense, (b) can be understood by all, (c) supports and demands equitable schools, (d) provides the resources needed to be successful both in terms of equality and equity
  - Policy that can be understood on many levels and that uses simple and clear language that helps, not impedes, understanding
  - Sufficient time and resources are embedded, providing time for it to work rather than demanding “instant gratification”
  - Policy must address systemic issues at all levels – housing, transportation, economics, jobs, and education simultaneously – “We need to begin everywhere at once.” (attributed to Margaret Mead)
  - Policy infrastructure must address social issues along with educational issues so that families and community members are not disenfranchised from their communities
  - Evidence of collaboration is found in policy language, organizational and individual practices, and communication patterns of key constituent groups and organizations
  - Policy language and practices reflect integration of social and education issues
  - Policies include requirements to take discussions to the community, engage stakeholders by using professional organizers, and result in consensus on issues and goals and positive impacts on the community

- At what level(s) (e.g. neighborhood, school district, community, state, region, and/or national) should actions be initiated?
  - Actions should include diverse populations and all that are affected by the problem and/or proposed actions
  - Urban education must be viewed as part of the system which prepares students to become citizens capable of functioning well in communities, prepared to contribute to society, committed to shared community values that include high-quality schools and high-performing students
  - Cities become destination points, with all levels working at the same time toward a shared goal(s)
  - Actions should include purposefully engaging and supporting students as activists, implementers, and change agents
  - Hold legislators (local, state, national) accountable for being actively engaged in each step of the process – collaborative discussions, prioritization of issues, policy development, policy enactment, policy implementation, assessment of the extent to which policies achieve intended outcomes as well as assessing unanticipated impacts

Final Question

- Given the links among public policy and education policy, what are the critical attributes of a comprehensive 21st century urban K-12 education policy framework? And what are possible next steps?
  - Expand the conversation and collaboration to include PreK-16
Framework should be easy to market to diverse groups of stakeholders by making explicit the vision, shared goals, strategies to be used, and expected outcomes. Framework should include strategies that make it possible for key stakeholders to (a) reach consensus on a shared agenda; (b) rebuild institutional and historical memories that support collaboration and collaborative actions; and (c) restructure institutional reward structures to reward collaboration and collaborative actions to achieve shared goals.

Framework must facilitate and foster ongoing conversations among all stakeholders with incentives for actions that produce desired results. Framework must be flexible, include decision criteria for determining how well policies are achieving desired outcomes, encourage and foster diversity, and allow for continuation of existing policies that are working. Framework must result in identifying shared goals across constituency groups and provide equitable funding. Framework must rethink what it means to be culturally relevant – building a system that is connected, not disjointed.

Build on current educational policy by asset-mapping current policies to determine what is working, what is missing, and where there are gaps. Framework must demand accountability from all stakeholders, including policy makers, and include ways to measure progress. Framework must include education-focused actions, actions to address community conditions that impact school success (e.g. affordable housing), and tax incentives that promote cross-organizational and sector collaboration and action.

**Next Steps**

- Take an inventory of current initiatives that promote best practices.
- Begin to look at business and institutional practices that would support the development of polices and practices to improve and support education and the economy.
- Initiate and sustain ongoing conversations among universities, schools, community colleges, community agencies, neighborhood groups, families, and citizens.
- Initiate and sustain ongoing inter-departmental meetings with OSU and other learning institutions with Symposium participants and other key stakeholders.
- Conduct an environmental scan at the local, regional, and state levels to identify areas for shared goals and collaborative actions.
- Contact politicians to engage them in the process and increase their understanding of the issues and connections between social and education policy.
- Choose a single issue, identify connections and influences, make the connections explicit and focus on actions to address the single issue.
- Set explicit goals, identify ways to measure progress in achieving them, begin benchmarking progress and communicating results.
- Build momentum for a broader social movement.
- Stop “tinkering” and work to change the entire system.
- Make the difficult decisions needed to develop a focus and stay the course.
Building a Policy Framework for the Future

The demands of the 21st century require a more comprehensive approach to addressing the underlying factors that contribute to or impede progress toward achieving the goal of high-performing urban schools.

What is needed is a PreK-12 urban education policy framework that aligns public policies while simultaneously addressing neighborhood, family, and school needs, thereby creating a solid social foundation on which high-quality urban schools and high-achieving students can flourish.

These include public policies such as minimum wage policy; economic development (job creation and training); access to affordable housing; accessible public transportation linked to employment; neighborhood revitalization/capacity; family capacity-building; and access to postsecondary education.

A Proposed Comprehensive Urban PreK-12 Education Policy Framework
Challenge of Applying the Proposed Policy Framework

The proposed 21st Century Comprehensive Urban PreK-12 Education Policy Framework demands that selected public policy (external to the “school house”) be aligned with urban education reform policies (internal to the “school house”) and simultaneously address neighborhood, family, and school needs, thereby creating a high-quality social foundation in which high-performing urban schools and high-achieving students can flourish.

Possible public policies that should be considered for alignment with education policies include: higher living wages; economic development (job creation and training); access to affordable housing; accessible public transportation linked with access to employment; neighborhood revitalization and capacity building; family capacity building and access to postsecondary education.

A viable strategy for implementing the proposed framework must be flexible enough to allow simultaneous action at multiple levels that is focused on a shared and aligned public and education goal.

Some barriers to creating this strategy include:

- Critical stakeholders often have independent and/or competing goals
- Lack of communication among critical stakeholders mitigates against recognizing and/or articulating potentially shared goals
- Critical stakeholders have few incentives for coming to the table to work together
- Critical stakeholders have separate and often competing funding streams
- Critical stakeholder systems tend to be reactive rather than proactive
- Some critical stakeholders, such as policy makers and/or those who directly influence policy makers, are difficult to get to the table
- Some critical community stakeholders are unaware of how to participate
- There are real and/or perceived barriers to collaboration such as real-world work schedules and/or worksite locations
- A set of guiding principles have not been developed

We propose that a set of guiding principles be created to serve as the stabilizing force for developing a strategy for implementing the proposed framework. The following seven guiding principles are offered as a starting point for an action agenda.

1. The students who are the products of the American educational system are our most critical national resource, therefore education MUST be the nation’s top priority,
2. America was founded on the principal of bold risk-taking. Once again we must draw upon this founding principle in consideration of a new paradigm for linking a public and education policy agenda.
3. Blaming individuals for the achievement gap evident in many poor urban schools is not productive.
4. Focusing on those broad public policies that perpetuate poverty and maintain disadvantage is productive.
5. Change does not come easily or without a level of apprehension. We must acknowledge and provide for this phenomenon.
6. Limited national resources necessitate shifting from independent, competing actions to shared goals and action while critically examining unintended outcomes of public and education policies that perpetuate poverty and low-achieving schools in disadvantaged urban areas.
7. “If you want to change the system you have to start everywhere at once.” –Margaret Mead
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Let us think of education as the means of developing our greatest abilities, because in each of us there is a private hope and dream which, fulfilled, can be translated into benefit for everyone and greater strength for our nation.

*John F. Kennedy* (1917 - 1963)
35th president of US