

---

# Building School and Teacher Capacity to Eliminate the School-to-Prison Pipeline

Teacher Education and Special Education  
XX(X) 1–13  
© 2012 Teacher Education Division of  
the Council for Exceptional Children  
Reprints and permission:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/0888406412453930  
http://tese.sagepub.com



David Osher<sup>1</sup>, Jane Coggshall<sup>1</sup>, Greta Colombi<sup>1</sup>,  
Darren Woodruff<sup>1</sup>, Samantha Francois<sup>1</sup>, and Trina Osher<sup>2</sup>

## Abstract

The school-to-prison pipeline (STPP)—disproportionately impacting students of color— involves a set of interactions between and among children, youth, their families, school personnel, other service providers, and gatekeepers to such outcomes as incarceration or college. Educators can, through their interactions with and expectations for students, contribute significantly to negative outcomes or lead the charge toward more positive outcomes. In this article, the authors first examine four factors that amplify the pipeline to prison, which if addressed effectively by educators can reduce it while creating alternative pathways to success. They then provide concrete suggestions for bolstering educator and school capacity to eliminate the STPP and implications for teacher preparation.

## Keywords

conditions for learning, cultural competence, family engagement, teacher professional development, teacher recruitment

The school-to-prison pipeline (STPP), which affects a disproportionate number of students of color, involves a set of interactions between and among children, youth, their families, school personnel, other service providers, and gatekeepers of outcomes. These interactions contribute to a cycle of negative encounters that can lead to or exacerbate a student's behavioral and academic problems, disengagement from learning, and disconnection from school (McNeely & Falci, 2004). These interactions also contribute to dropout, delinquency, arrest, and incarceration (D. Osher, Quinn, Poirer, & Rutherford, 2003; D. Osher, Woodruff, & Sims, 2002).

Many factors contribute to the STPP. Some factors are external to schools, including adverse childhood experiences, poverty, racism, parent-child problems, and lack of access to appropriate health care. However,

schools play a key role in accelerating or intervening on the STPP. As Wang and Gordon (1994) asserted, schools can “magnify the circumstances known to enhance development and education, so that the burden of adversity is reduced and opportunities are advanced” (p. x). Doing this depends on building strong conditions for learning (CFL; Rothstein, 2004) as well as addressing student social, emotional, and academic needs.

Key to realizing this goal is the capacity of schools and the competencies of their

---

<sup>1</sup>American Institutes for Research, Washington, DC, USA

<sup>2</sup>Huff Osher Consulting Inc., Takoma Park, MD, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Greta Colombi, American Institutes for Research, 1000 Thomas Jefferson St., NW Washington, DC 20007, USA  
Email: gcolombi@air.org

staffs to build CFL and to address diverse student needs. Unfortunately, many schools lack this capacity; instead, they function as *dropout factories*, a term conceptualized by Balfanz and Legters (2004). In addition, schools can accelerate the STPP (D. Osher et al., 2002). Although this label has been assigned primarily to secondary schools, the course of action that leads to students dropping out starts much earlier, and elementary schools also function as a component in preventing dropout.

The STPP is costly. Some programs reduce the likelihood of delinquency and antisocial behavior while providing a positive return on investment, whereas others do the opposite (Aos, Lieb, Mayfield, Miller, & Penucci, 2004). Redeployment of resources can be cost-effective in the short run and cost-beneficial in the long run (D. Osher, Quinn, et al., 2003).

This article examines four factors that perpetuate the STPP, which, if addressed effectively, can create alternative pathways to success. These four factors are (a) racial disparities, (b) poor CFL, (c) family-school disconnection, and (d) the failure to build the social and emotional capacity of youth. Threaded through each of these factors is a troubling lack of capacity in the agencies (e.g., schools) working most closely with children, youth, and families. The final section provides practical suggestions for bolstering educator and school capacity.

## Understanding What Perpetuates the STPP

*Racial disparities.* Gaps in academic achievement between racial “minorities” and their White counterparts are indicative of the continued inequities in students’ opportunities to learn in America’s schools, as shown by the following examples:

- African American and Hispanic students scored 25 points lower than their White counterparts on the 2008-2009 National Assessment of Education Progress (NAEP) Grade

4 reading test (National Center for Education Statistics [NCES], n.d.).

- English language learners scored 36 points lower than their English-speaking peers on the 2008-2009 NAEP Grade 4 reading test (NCES, n.d.).
- Only 3.6% and 4.2% of African American and Hispanic students, respectively, are identified by schools as gifted and talented in comparison with 13.1% and 8% of Asian and White students, respectively (T. D. Snyder, Dillow, & Hoffman, 2009).

Over the past three decades, African American students experienced an increase of 9% points in school suspension rates, from 6% in 1973 to 15% in 2006 (Losen & Skiba, 2010). During the same period, the suspension rate for all students grew at a much smaller rate from 3.7% to 6.9%. The gap between suspension rates for African American students and White students has grown from 3% in the 1970s to more than 10% in the 2000s. African Americans are now over three times more likely than White students to be suspended for behavioral offenses in schools that were at various stages of implementing schoolwide positive behavior supports (Skiba & Horner, 2011).

Part of the reason for these disparities may be the shortage of teachers of color. The mismatch between the demographics of the U.S. student population and the teaching workforce is stark. Although 45% of the 49 million public school students in the United States are students of color, only 16.5% of the 3.2 million teachers are of color (Coopersmith, 2009). For example, 22% of students and only 7% of teachers are Hispanic, and 16% of students and 7% of teachers are African American.

Educators from different racial, ethnic, and social backgrounds can teach economically disadvantaged students of color successfully (Ladson-Billings, 1994). However, a lack of understanding and separation from the out-of-school lives of students and their families often create problems such as misinterpreting causes, for example, attributing poor school

performance to deficient ability levels or to problematic home environments (Cartledge, Kea, & Ida, 2000). The failure to understand culturally specific behaviors (Townsend, 2000) or the inability to establish positive relationships with students (Noguera, 1995) can contribute to classroom discipline challenges. This inability to intervene when problems occur can be reinforced by victim-blaming, cognitive models that ignore factors that may contribute to youth problems as well as deficit-oriented approaches to intervention, which ignore the strengths of students and their families (T. W. Osher & Osher, 2002). Together, these forms of thinking contribute to what Delpit (1985) conceptualized as the challenge of teaching *other people's children* and what Valenzuela (1999) conceptualized as *subtractive schooling*. The commonality in both cases is a set of low expectations and a failure to both differentiate academic and social-emotional instruction and engage with students in a supportive manner.

#### *Social and emotional capacity of students.*

One factor in meeting student needs, especially for teachers of racially and economically marginalized youth, is the ability to understand and address students' social and emotional skills. Moreover, educators' own social and emotional skills play a key role in their ability to foster positive social-emotional development in students, and in establishing positive student relationships and an understanding of their communities. Social and emotional learning (SEL) is the process through which individuals enhance their ability to integrate thinking, feeling, and behaving to achieve important life tasks. Key SEL competencies are self-awareness, social awareness, self-management, relationship management, and responsible decision making (Durlak & Weissberg, 2007). Students who exhibit social and emotional competence are able to recognize and manage their emotions, establish healthy relationships, meet personal and social needs, set positive goals, and make responsible decisions. SEL contributes to social, emotional, and academic success by promoting positive development, reducing problem behaviors, and increasing motivation to learn, especially

in the school context (Durlak, Weissberg, Dymnicki, Taylor, & Schellinger, 2011).

SEL outcomes are related to contact with the STPP. Durlak and Weissberg's (2005) meta-analysis found that schools without programs focused on promoting one or more SEL competencies had students with either unchanged or worsened antisocial behaviors and aggression, serious discipline problems, and increased school suspensions. If not addressed, these behavior patterns could develop into more serious youth behaviors that lead to the STPP. Similarly, children who placed high on relational and overt aggression scales also tended to be rated low on prosocial behaviors and self-regulatory behaviors (Biermann et al., 2008). Biermann et al. (2008) also found that implementation of an intervention designed to promote academic and social-emotional school readiness was effective at reducing teacher reports of aggressive behaviors in children. Likewise, children who participated in a social-skills training intervention were less likely to have aggressive behavior problems and more likely to have positive peer interactions than children who did not participate (Pope & Biermann, 1999). The social-skills intervention included the development of skills for emotional understanding and communication (i.e., recognizing and labeling emotions), friendship skills (i.e., participation, cooperation, fair play, and negotiation), self-control skills (i.e., behavioral inhibition and arousal modulation), and social problem-solving skills.

*Family-school disconnection.* Families of children who are at risk of school failure often are estranged from schools (Lightfoot, 1981). This is particularly true for parents of children with behavioral problems (Friesen & Osher, 1996; T. W. Osher & Huff, 2006) and for children of color in general (T. W. Osher & Huff, 2000). The success of the No Child Left Behind Act's (2001) accountability provisions depends significantly on intense parent involvement; lack of district parent involvement programs continue to be the most common monitoring problem (Benson, 2008).

Family-centered or family-driven approaches (T. W. Osher, Osher, & Blau, 2008) can help

engage families (J. P. Comer & Haynes, 1991; Hoover-Dempsey et al., 2005). Cultural competence supports connections between schools and families, and promising interventions such as Families and Schools Together (FAST) and Acquisition of Language and Academic Skills (ALAS) have been developed to engage culturally and linguistically diverse families (Kratochwill, McDonald, & Levin, 2004; Rumberger, Larson, Palardy, Ream, & Schleicher, 1998).

Henderson and Mapp's (2002) synthesis of many studies suggests that high-performing schools share a critical common trait: a high level of involvement with families and with the community. In these schools, there is a focus on building trust and collaborative relationships among teachers, families, and community members. Staff in these schools recognize, respect, and address families' needs, as well as class and cultural differences. They embrace a philosophy of partnership in which power and responsibility are shared.

This kind of partnership is evident in the mental-health arena that is making the shift from provider-driven to family-driven systems of care and practice where families have a primary decision-making role in the care of their own children as well as the policies and procedures governing care for all children in their community. This includes choosing culturally and linguistically competent supports, services, and providers; setting goals; designing, implementing, and evaluating programs; monitoring outcomes; and partnering in funding decisions (T.W. Osher & Penn, 2010).

Educators who seek to have good relationships with their students' families make an effort to learn about each family, and they apply that knowledge in their professional interactions with families. For example, they are careful not to interpret a quiet or obliging deference as indicating agreement, or assume that boisterous assertiveness is a sign of hostility or defiance (T. Osher, 2004). Adults who use good social and emotional skills are able to avoid conflict. They are aware of and manage their own emotions; they try to see events from all other points of view and evaluate all

the possibilities before making decisions. Parents and teachers can learn and practice these skills along with their children and students (T. W. Osher & Osher, 2002).

*Poor CFL.* At least four social and emotional conditions are necessary for learning (D. Osher & Kendziora, 2010), which are particularly important to youth at risk of poor outcomes. The first involves *physical and emotional safety*. Individuals in a safe school environment are able to share a sense of mutual trust and respect, and are more apt to align with and commit to the school community's norms and rules. Evidence also indicates that unsafe school environments are associated with higher levels of negative risk-taking behavior and disengagement from school. The second involves *connectedness* and the experience of support, both of which related to dropout and delinquency (Cairns & Cairns, 1994). Optimizing support requires creating caring connections with adults who have a capacity to care. The third condition involves *engagement and challenge*. For students to be engaged and feel challenged in their academic setting, they must be challenged with high expectations, be personally motivated, feel that school is connected to larger life goals, and be given tangible academic opportunities. Culturally competent approaches that address individual learning needs and provide an appropriate balance between challenge and support can enhance engagement. The fourth condition involves *peer social-emotional capacity and values*. Both students and teachers are affected by the social-emotional capacity and values of students' peers.

These four conditions are interdependent and reinforce each other. Unfortunately, the lack of educator professional development and support to build these conditions and to respond positively rather than punitively to student misbehavior is widespread. For example, in a recent nationwide poll, after being presented with 12 strategies, ranging from reducing class sizes to raising salaries to improving professional development opportunities, teachers rated "ensuring that students

who have severe discipline problems are removed from the classroom and placed in alternative programs more suited to them” as the most effective strategy to improve teacher effectiveness (Coggshall & Ott, 2010). In a Public Agenda (2004) survey, a similar percentage of teachers thought that establishing and enforcing zero-tolerance policies for serious violations would be “very effective” (70%) or “somewhat effective” (23%) as a solution to the discipline and behavioral problems (Public Agenda, 2004).

The factors leading to these attitudes include a lack of understanding of students’ developmental needs and how such factors as culture, trauma, and health (including mental health) affect student behavior. This lack of understanding, particularly when coupled with rigid behavioral expectations (Gerber & Semmel, 1984), can contribute to misinterpreting the behavior of students who are harder to reach (Bergin & Bergin, 2009). Similarly, a lack of understanding and skills regarding how to respond to problematic behavior can allow small incidents to intensify, unnecessarily escalate problem behaviors, or sustain a chaotic classroom environment that enhances the behavioral problems of students who already exhibit behavioral problems, contributing to subsequent involvement in the justice system. These challenges are also manifested in how administrators and specialists respond to troubling students with significant behavioral challenges.

Classrooms characterized by low rates of academic engagement, praise, and reinforcement and high rates of reprimand may encourage the behavior patterns of coercion and dominance (Farmer, Farmer, & Gut, 1999). Classrooms with large amounts of aggressive behavior increase the risk for persistent aggressive behavior problems (Barth, Dunlap, Dane, Lochman, & Wells, 2004; Kellam, Ling, Merisca, Brown, & Ialongo, 1998). While highly aggressive classrooms decrease the chances for teachers to forge positive relationships with students and to use effective classroom-management strategies (Brophy, 1996; Hawkins, Von Cleve, & Catalano, 1991;

Hughes, Cavell, & Jackson, 1999), these challenges can be addressed.

Positive teacher–student relationships are an extremely important aspect of the CFL. Hamre and Pianta (2001) found that negative relationships marked by conflict and dependency between teachers and students in kindergarten were positively correlated to negative academic and behavioral outcomes in eighth grade. Cornelius-White (2007) suggested that teacher–student relationships play a powerful role in moderating classroom management. Sutherland and Wehby (2001) found that students with emotional and behavioral disorders were far less likely than typical students to be given opportunities to respond in class, and received far less praise and considerably more reprimands (Sutherland, 2000). Van Acker, Grant, and Henry (1996) found that in the same general education classrooms, students with aggressive behavior patterns received significantly different responses from teachers for their behaviors, both good and bad.

## Finding Solutions

The myriad of challenges and factors contributing to the STPP can be addressed through the effective implementation of programs designed to enhance the critical CFL involving safety, connectedness and support, engagement, and challenge and SEL. The success of such programs hinges on the competencies (i.e., knowledge, skills, beliefs, values, attitudes, and distilled experiences) of educators and other professionals who too often are unknowingly complicit in the STPP. Enhancing the professional capacity of educators requires the following:

- a. identifying what knowledge, skills, beliefs, values, attitudes, experiences, and competencies educators need to work effectively with at-risk youth;
- b. recruiting teachers and others into the educator workforce that is more likely to have those capacities;

- c. providing high-quality professional development opportunities to enhance those capacities<sup>1</sup>;
- d. reorganizing schools to support staff development and to enable staff to use their skills to eradicate the pipeline to prison and promote pathways to thriving for all children of color; and
- e. supporting teachers as they engage families in the educational process.

*Teacher knowledge and competency.* Knowledge includes general understanding and specific procedural skills. General knowledge involves an understanding of child and adolescent development across all domains of development, including the physical, cognitive, linguistic, social, psychological, and ethical (R. J. Comer, 2004; National Institute of Child Health and Human Development & National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2007; J. Snyder & Lit, 2010) as well as those factors that relate to the need for differentiation, student motivation, and management of learning and behavior. Procedural-skills knowledge includes the ability to apply general knowledge to implementing effective approaches to classroom management, demonstrating and reinforcing positive behavior, differentiating and personalizing instruction, monitoring progress, developing and supporting critical thinking and metacognitive capacities, and using student-centered pedagogies. Finally, specific knowledge includes subject matter knowledge and knowledge of what is necessary to implement effective evidenced-based academic and social-emotional-behavioral interventions.

Beliefs, attitudes, and values are grounded in the experiences that people have and, simultaneously, assist people to interpret and remember those experiences. In the case of the STPP, educators' attitudes, perceptions, and beliefs about student behavior, as well as their ability to interact with students, are affected by educator gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (Casteel, 1998, 2000). It is therefore important to increase the diversity of the

educator workforce, particularly the teaching workforce, so that educators face fewer challenges in establishing supportive relationships with students. Holding high expectations for student success is one attitudinal stance that has been repeatedly shown to influence student outcomes (Pedersen, Faucher, & Eaton, 1978). To work effectively with children who are at risk, teachers and others need (a) to be culturally and linguistically competent, (b) to be able to use positive behavioral approaches, (c) to apply their understanding of learning and emotional/behavioral disorders, and (d) to identify student strengths as opposed to employing a deficit approach. Moreover, evidence suggests that teachers who promote and facilitate SEL in classrooms contribute to positive student outcomes across all grade levels (Brackett & Katulak, 2007; Elias & Kress, 2004; Greenberg et al., 2003; Patti & Tobin, 2006; Zins & Elias, 2006; Zins, Elias, & Greenberg, 2007). For example, teachers who incorporate social-emotional skills (i.e., effective communication, conflict management, differential perspective taking, and decision making) into their academic content improve academic performance and social-emotional skill development (Elias & Kress, 2004; Patti & Tobin, 2006; Zins et al., 2007). Similarly, Durlak and Weissberg (2005) found that programs focused on promoting SEL competencies in youth produced positive outcomes that ranged from decreased antisocial behaviors and aggression, fewer serious discipline problems, and fewer school suspensions to enhanced social competencies, better attendance, higher grade point averages, and higher academic achievement test scores.

The social-emotional capacity of school personnel themselves also seems critically important. Jennings and Greenberg (2009) noted that teachers' social and emotional behaviors can affect student outcomes. Teachers' social and emotional behaviors set the tone for a classroom climate that can facilitate desired student outcomes or exacerbate poor student outcomes (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; La Paro, Pianta, & Stuhlman, 2004; Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering, 2003).

Although investigation into the social and emotional capacity of school leaders is limited, the SEL implementation literature does indicate that teachers' social and emotional capacity potentially impacts their ability to effectively administer SEL programs. Not only is ongoing professional development in planning, implementing, and sustaining SEL interventions important, but the social and emotional capacity of school leaders also is germane to school and classroom climate, teacher–student relationships, instructional practices, and school safety (Chang, 2009; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; D. Osher, Dwyer, & Jackson, 2004).

Student perceptions of teacher support and teacher expectations can influence student motivation, self-perceptions, and academic performance (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Jussim & Harber, 2005). Furthermore, teacher stress and burnout, which can result from teachers' inability to cope with the emotional demands of teaching, can negatively affect student outcomes (Chang, 2009; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009). Current ongoing work aims to develop a measure of teachers' social-emotional competency to be used as a research tool and a professional development tool to capture and measure teachers' own skills and their impact on student outcomes (Jennings & Greenberg, 2009).

*Whole-school redesign: Creating conditions for enhancing student and teacher capacity.* Implementing comprehensive recruitment and meaningful professional learning designs will fall short if schools remain impersonal environments and places where instructional and relational dynamics are idiosyncratic from classroom to classroom and hallway to hallway. High teacher and leader turnover in high-needs schools continues to obviate recruitment and development investments, and turnover is higher across the board among minority teachers than majority teachers (Keigher & Cross, 2010). Even when individuals have the knowledge, skills, or competencies, they may not be able to implement these assets without systemic support for using the skills well. Teachers also need systemic support to enhance the

caring manner in which they work with students.

Given the important role of school personnel as facilitators of the development of social and emotional capacity in children and adolescents, the impact that teachers' social and emotional capacity can have on their relationships with students and instructional practice, and the relationships between school climate and student behaviors, efforts to combat the STPP must address the capacity of school personnel to serve as social and emotional sources of support for all youth, particularly for youth who are at risk for poor outcomes. Achieving this goal encompasses a focus on the development of social and emotional capacity in children and adolescents, and a simultaneous focus on the development of social and emotional capacity in school leaders. Thus, a whole-school approach to addressing the social and emotional climate and needs is required to address the student behaviors that are precursors to the STPP.

Systemic support includes the reorganization of teachers' days to provide ample opportunity for shared practice, collaboration, and peer learning, as well as the time, space, tools, and resources to get to know their students (Little, 1999). The culture and structure of schools also should allow for frequent and sustained interaction with peers as well as with other student support providers such as parents, other family members, paraprofessionals, nurses, social workers, speech/language pathologists, guidance counselors, and school psychologists (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Other systemic supports include improved structural conditions (i.e., reduced student–teacher ratios, increased time for planning, strategic approaches to addressing problems such as three-tiered models, the use of student support teams and/or teacher consultation, and the use of evidence-based programs and practices; Kemple, Herlihy, & Smith, 2005).

## Conclusion

All students are more likely to thrive in safe, caring, positive, and engaging learning envi-

ronments characterized by positive and supportive relationships among adults, students, and families, where children's cognitive as well as SEL are supported and challenged to grow. Students of color who are economically disadvantaged with social and behavioral challenges are the least likely to have access to such environments and, therefore, are the most likely to enter the STPP. Building teachers' and school leaders' capacities to create and sustain the CFL and break the STPP is crucial for those students as well as for society.

Too often, teachers and school leaders do not recognize their role in the STPP, or if they do, they are not sure what to do about it. Teachers and leaders need to have a deep knowledge of human development as well as the ability to apply that knowledge in their classrooms and schools. They need to have the social-emotional capacity to be able to deal with discipline and behavioral problems positively rather than punitively, as well as establish productive relationships with students and their families who may or may not meet their expectations. They need to be able to effectively implement evidence-based curricula and programs designed to promote students' SEL. The solutions presented are focused on how teacher preparation programs and education leaders can work together to ensure that educators know and can do all these things. Teacher educators also can address relevant factors. From comprehensive recruitment strategies to intense, clinical preservice and in-service professional learning opportunities to reorganization of schools to support teacher and leader capacity, all these together hold great promise for building a pipeline to a good life and a healthier and fairer society.

### Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Note

1. See the "Safe Schools, Staff Development, and the School to Prison Pipeline" article in this issue for best practices in staff development in the context of changing school management and discipline practices and recommended alternatives to ways in which schools respond to chronic and serious violations of the school behavioral code.

### References

- Aos, S., Lieb, R., Mayfield, J., Miller, M., & Pennucci, A. (2004). *Benefits and costs of prevention and early intervention programs for youth*. Olympia: Washington State Institute for Public Policy.
- Balfanz, R., & Legters, N. (2004). *Locating the dropout crisis: Which high schools produce the nation's dropouts? Where are they located? Who attends them* (Report 70). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk (CRESPAR).
- Barth, J. M., Dunlap, S. T., Dane, H., Lochman, J. E., & Wells, K. C. (2004). Classroom environment influences on aggression, peer relations, and academic focus. *Journal of School Psychology, 42*, 115-133.
- Benson, P. L. (2008). *Sparks: How parents can help ignite the hidden strengths of TEENAGERS*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bergin, C. A., & Bergin, D. A. (2009). Attachment in the classroom. *Educational Psychology Review, 21*, 141-170.
- Biermann, K. L., Domitrovich, C. E., Nix, R. L., Gest, S. D., Greenberg, M. T., . . . Gill, S. (2008). Promoting academic and social-emotional school readiness: The Head Start REDI program. *Child Development, 79*, 1802-1817.
- Brackett, M. A., & Katulak, N. (2007). The emotionally intelligent classroom: Skill-based training for teachers and students. In J. Ciarrochi & J. D. Mayer (Eds.), *Improving emotional intelligence: A practitioner's guide* (pp. 1-27). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Brophy, J. E. (1996). *Teaching problem students*. New York, NY: Guilford.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for reform*. New York, NY: Russell SAGE.



- Cairns, R. B., & Cairns, B. D. (1994). *Lifelines and risks: Pathways of youth in our time*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Cartledge, G., Kea, C. D., & Ida, D. J. (2000). Anticipating differences—Celebrating strengths: Providing culturally competent services for students with serious emotional disturbance. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 32(3), 30-37.
- Casteel, C. A. (1998). Teacher-student interactions and race in integrated classrooms. *Journal of Educational Research*, 92, 115-120.
- Casteel, C. A. (2000). African American students' perceptions of their treatment by Caucasian teachers. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 27, 143-148.
- Chang, M. L. (2009). An appraisal perspective of teacher burnout: Examining the emotional work of teachers. *Educational Psychology Review*, 21, 193-218.
- Coggs, J. G., & Ott, A. (with Lasagna, M.). (2010). *Retaining teacher talent: Convergence and contradictions in teachers' perceptions of policy reform ideas*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates & Public Agenda.
- Comer, J. P., & Haynes, N. M. (1991). Parent involvement in schools: An ecological approach. *Elementary School Journal*, 91, 271-277.
- Comer, R. J. (2004). *Abnormal psychology* (5th ed.). New York, NY: Worth Publishers.
- Coopersmith, J. (2009). *Characteristics of public, private, and bureau of Indian education elementary and secondary school teachers in the United States: Results from the 2007-08 Schools and Staffing Survey* (NCES 2009-324). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2009/2009324.pdf>
- Cornelius-White, J. (2007). Learner-centered teacher-student relationships are effective: A meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 77, 113-143.
- Delpit, L. (1985). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: The New Press.
- Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2005, August). *A major meta-analysis of positive youth development programs*. Presentation given at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association. Washington, DC.
- Durlak, J. A., & Weissberg, R. P. (2007). *The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL).
- Durlak, J. A., Weissberg, R. P., Dymnicki, A. B., Taylor, R. D., & Schellinger, K. B. (2011). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82, 405-432.
- Elias, M. J., & Kress, J. S. (2004). *A comprehensive skill building approach to Jewish values: Social and emotional learning and caring early childhood classrooms*. New York, NY: Coalition for the Advancement of Jewish Education.
- Farmer, T. W., Farmer, E. M. Z., & Gut, D. (1999). Implications of social development research for school based interventions for aggressive youth with EBD. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 7, 130-136.
- Friesen, B., & Osher, T. (1996). Involving families in change: Challenges and opportunities. *Special Services in the Schools*, 11, 187-207.
- Gerber, M. M., & Semmel, M. I. (1984). Teacher as imperfect test: Reconceptualizing the referral process. *Educational Psychologist*, 19, 137-148.
- Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R. P., O'Brien, M. U., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., & Elias, M. J. (2003). Enhancing school-based prevention and youth development through coordinated social, emotional, and academic learning. *American Psychologist*, 58, 466-474.
- Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development*, 72, 625-638.
- Henderson, A., & Mapp, K. (2002). *A new wave of evidence: The impact of school, family, and community connections on student achievement*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.
- Hoover-Dempsey, K. V., Walker, J. M. T., Sandler, H. M., Whetsel, D., Green, C. L., Wilkins, A. S., & Closson, K. (2005). Why do parents become involved? Research findings and implications. *Elementary School Journal*, 106, 105-130.

- Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A., & Jackson, T. (1999). Influence of the teacher-student relationship on childhood conduct problems: A prospective study. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 28*, 173-184.
- Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research, 79*, 491-525.
- Jussim, L., & Harber, K. D. (2005). Teacher expectations and self-fulfilling prophecies: Knowns and unknowns, resolved and unresolved controversies. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9*, 131-155.
- Keigher, A., & Cross, F. (2010). *Teacher attrition and mobility: Results from the 2008-2009 teacher follow-up survey*. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
- Kellam, S. G., Ling, X., Merisca, R., Brown, C. H., & Ialongo, N. (1998). The effect of level of aggression in the first grade classroom on the course and malleability of aggressive behavior into middle school. *Development and Psychopathology, 10*, 165-186.
- Kemple, J., Herlihy, C., & Smith, T. (2005). *Making progress toward graduation: Evidence from the Talent Development High School model*. New York, NY: MDRC.
- Kratochwill, T. R., McDonald, L., & Levin, J. R. (2004). Families and schools together: An experimental analysis of a parent-mediated multi-family group program for American Indian children. *Journal of School Psychology, 42*, 359-383.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- La Paro, K. M., Pianta, R., & Stuhlman, M. (2004). The classroom assessment scoring system: Findings from the prekindergarten year. *Elementary School Journal, 104*, 409-426.
- Lightfoot, S. L. (1981). *Worlds apart: The relationship between families and schools*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Little, J. W. (1999). Organizing schools for teacher learning. In L. Darling-Hammond & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Teaching as the learning profession: Handbook of policy and practice* (p. 1). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Losen, D., & Skiba, R. (2010). *Suspended education: Urban middle schools in crisis*. Montgomery, AL: Southern Poverty Law Center.
- Marzano, R. J., Marzano, J. S., & Pickering, D. J. (2003). *Classroom management that works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- McNeely, C. A., & Falci, C. (2004). School connectedness and the transition into and out of health risk behavior among adolescents: A comparison of social belonging and teacher support. *Journal of School Health, 74*, 284-292.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (n.d.). *NAEP data explorer*. Retrieved from <http://nces.ed.gov/nationsreportcard/naepdata/>
- National Institute of Child Health and Human Development & National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2007). *Child and adolescent development research and teacher education: Evidence-based pedagogy, policy, and practice* (Summary of roundtable meetings). Washington, DC: Authors.
- Noguera, P. A. (1995). A tale of two cities: School desegregation and racialized discourse in Berkeley and Kansas City. *International Journal of Comparative Race and Ethnic Studies, 2*(2), 48-62.
- Osher, D., Dwyer, K., & Jackson, S. (2004). *Safe, supportive, and successful schools: Step by step*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West Educational Services.
- Osher, D., & Kendziora, K. (2010). Building conditions for learning and healthy adolescent development: Strategic approaches. In B. Doll, W. Pfohl, & J. Yoon (Eds.), *Handbook of youth prevention science* (pp. 121-140). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Osher, D., Morrison, G., & Bailey, W. (2003). Exploring the relationship between student mobility and dropout among students with emotional and behavioral disorders. *Journal of Negro Education, 72*, 79-96.
- Osher, D., Quinn, M. M., Poirer, J. R., & Rutherford, R. (2003). Deconstructing the pipeline: Using efficacy and effectiveness data and cost-benefit analyses to reduce minority

- youth incarceration. *New Directions in Youth Development*, 99, 91-120.
- Osher, D., Woodruff, D., & Sims, A. (2002). Schools make a difference: The relationship between education services for African American children and youth and their overrepresentation in the juvenile justice system. In D. Losen (Ed.), *Minority issues in special education* (pp. 93-116). Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Publishing Group.
- Osher, T. (2004). *Understanding and using performance measurement as a tool for advocacy*. Alexandria, VA: Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health.
- Osher, T., & Penn, M. (2010). How family partners contribute to the phases and activities of the wraparound process. *National Wrap-around Initiative*. Retrieved from [http://www.nwi.pdx.edu/NWI-book/Chapters/Osher-4b.2-\(fam-partner-phases-activities\).pdf](http://www.nwi.pdx.edu/NWI-book/Chapters/Osher-4b.2-(fam-partner-phases-activities).pdf)
- Osher, T. W., & Huff, B. (2000). Involving families in making decisions about systems of care. *Journal of NAMI California*, 2(1), 14-16.
- Osher, T. W., & Huff, B. (2006). *Working with families of children in the juvenile justice and corrections systems: A guide for education program leaders, principals, and building administrators*. Washington, DC: National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At Risk.
- Osher, T. W., & Osher, D. (2002). The paradigm shift to true collaboration with families. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 11(1), 47-60.
- Osher, T. W., Osher, D., & Blau, G. M. (2008). Families matter. In T. P. Gullotta & G. M. Blau (Eds.), *Family influences on child behavior and development: Evidence-based prevention and treatment approaches* (pp. 39-63). New York, NY: Taylor & Francis.
- Patti, J., & Tobin, J. (2006). *Smart school leaders: Leading with emotional intelligence*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.
- Pedersen, E., Faucher, T. A., & Eaton, W. E. (1978). A new perspective on the effects of first-grade teachers on children's subsequent adult status. *Harvard Educational Review*, 48(1), 1-33.
- Pope, A. W., & Biermann, K. L. (1999). Predicting adolescent peer problems and antisocial activity: The relative roles of aggression and dysregulation. *Development Psychology*, 35, 335-346.
- Public Agenda. (2004). *Teaching interrupted: Do discipline policies in today's schools foster the common good*. New York, NY: Author.
- Rothstein, R. (2004). *Class and schools: Using social, economic, and educational reform to close the Black-White achievement gap*. New York, NY: Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Rumberger, R. W., Larson, K. A., Palardy, G. A., Ream, R. K., & Schleicher, N. A. (1998). *The hazards of changing schools for California Latino adolescents*. Berkeley, CA: Chicano/Latino Policy Project.
- Skiba, R., & Horner, R. (2011). Race is not neutral: A National investigation of African American and Latino disproportionality in school discipline. *School Psychology Review*, 40, 85-107.
- Snyder, J., & Lit, I. (2010). *Principles and exemplars for integrating developmental sciences knowledge into educator preparation*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Snyder, T. D., Dillow, S.A., and Hoffman, C. M. (2009). *Digest of education statistics 2008* (NCES 2009-020). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved from [http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d08/tables/dt08\\_053.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d08/tables/dt08_053.asp)
- Sutherland, K. S. (2000). Promoting positive interactions between teachers and students with emotional/behavioral disorders. *Preventing School Failure*, 44, 110-115.
- Sutherland, K. S., & Wehby, J. H. (2001). Exploring the relation between increased opportunities to respond to academic requests and the academic and behavioral outcomes of students with EBD: A review. *Remedial and Special Education*, 22, 113-121.
- Townsend, B. L. (2000). The disproportionate discipline of African American learners: Reducing school suspensions and expulsions. *Exceptional Children*, 66(3), 381-391.
- Valenzuela, A. (1999). *Subtractive schooling: U.S.-Mexican youth and the politics of caring*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Van Acker, R., Grant, S. H., & Henry, D. (1996). Teacher and student behavior as a function of risk for aggression. *Education & Treatment of Children, 19*, 316-334.
- Wang, M. C., & Gordon, E. W. (Eds.). (1994). *Educational resilience in inner-city America: Challenges and prospects*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Zins, J. E., & Elias, M. J. (2006). Social and emotional learning. In G. Bear & K. Minke (Eds.), *Children's needs III* (pp. 1-13). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Zins, J. E., Elias, M. J., & Greenberg, M. T. (2007). School practices to build social-emotional competence as the foundation of academic and life success. In R. Bar-On, J. G. Maree, & M. J. Elias (Eds.), *Educating people to be emotionally intelligent* (pp. 79-94). Westport, CT: Praeger.

## Bios

**David Osher** is the vice president in education, human development, and the workforce at the American Institutes for Research (AIR) as well as codirector of AIR's Human and Social Development Program. His work focuses on school improvement and educational equity, interagency and cross-stakeholder collaboration, children's services, mental health, prevention, performance measurement and improvement, social-emotional learning, cultural competence, and the conditions for learning and healthy development. He currently serves as a principal investigator of four major research and technical assistance (TA) centers funded by the U. S. government, including the Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center and the National Evaluation and Technical Assistance Center for the Education of Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent and At Risk (NDTAC). He, who has consulted with ministries, non-governmental organizations, educators, and human service professionals across the world, serves on numerous expert panels and editorial boards, and has authored or coauthored more than 300 books, monographs, chapters, articles, and reports.

**Jane Coggs** is a senior researcher at the AIR, where she works on educator quality issues, as

well as the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (TQ Center). For the TQ Center, She has authored multiple articles on teacher professional learning, equitable distribution, and the assessment of teacher effectiveness, and has provided TA to states and regions on these issues. She has conducted research on teacher interstate mobility and the impact of professional development programs, and has served as a principal investigator on two studies exploring the needs, policy preferences, and potential of Gen Y teachers. Previously, she taught mathematics in an under-resourced junior high school in New York City. She received her doctorate in education studies from the University of Michigan.

**Greta Colombi** is a senior researcher at the AIR and has nearly 15 years of experience in program monitoring and reporting, TA, and research in both the education and the health and human services fields. She currently leads direct TA provision for the NDTAC, supporting the implementation of the Title I, Part D, program. She is also currently deputy director of the Safe and Supportive Schools Technical Assistance Center where she helps to manage the center, leads website development (<http://safesupportiveschools.ed.gov>), and trains Safe and Supportive Schools' grantees and the education field at large. She received her master's degree from the University of Chicago.

**Darren Woodruff** is a principal research analyst at the AIR, and works in a variety of research and TA capacities on issues related to school improvement, supports for at-risk youth, and eliminating disproportionality in special education, including as codirector of the *National Center on Response to Intervention*. He has written and presented on culturally responsive instructional practices; coauthored a chapter in the Harvard report, *Racial Inequity in Special Education*; and more recently coauthored the information brief *Using School Leadership Teams to Meet the Needs of English Language Learners*. He received his PhD in educational psychology from Howard University.

**Samantha Francois** is a researcher at the AIR and has 11 years of research, evaluation, and program

implementation experience, specializing in the social and emotional well-being and academic achievement of urban, low-income, and racial/ethnic minority youth. Her work at the AIR includes conducting formative and summative evaluations of the National Science Foundation's AGEP program using quantitative and qualitative methods, designing a critical incident study to define teacher's social and emotional capacity, evaluating an early literacy intervention program in schools with at-risk populations, and assessing the quality of resources for the Safe and Supportive Schools TA Center's website. Her methodological and analytical skill set includes quantitative and qualitative research designs, and analytical techniques. She received her PhD in developmental psychology from Tulane University.

**Trina Osher** is president of Huff Osher Consulting, Inc., and specializes in strengthening partnerships between families raising children who have mental health and behavioral problems or other special needs and the systems, agencies, and individuals who provide services for them. She is an experienced and effective collaborator having served on interagency work groups and task forces with a variety of national disability and education organizations, including the National CASSP Technical Assistance Center, the Regional Resource Center network, the State Mental Health Representatives for Children and Youth, the Mental Health Special Education Coalition, the Center for Special Education Finance, and the National Federation of the Blind. She received her MA from the Teacher's College at Columbia University.