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Letter from the Editors

By Jill Heiney-Smith, Emily Huff, and Pete Renn

Seattle Pacific University (SPU) is honored to host the Curriculum in Context journal, beginning with this timely issue on equity and access. As a board member in my second year, I am keenly aware of the powerfully relevant resources and opportunities that a connection with WSASCD can provide.

On October 29, SPU welcomed attendees and WSASCD board members for a workshop on Depth of Knowledge with Dr. Norm Webb. Dr. Webb worked with participants to examine their own district artifacts and consider whether the tasks offered access to rigorous and complex learning. This content mirrors much of what you will read in this issue of Curriculum in Context, where we blend academic research with current district and state programs and offer a new imagination for equity work in your own context.

Popielarz & Monreal compel the reader to reimagine place-based pedagogies by linking teaching and learning practices to local communities. Bruner describes the fifteen-year effort in the Mt. Vernon school district to grow and refine its Leading for Equity initiative. Figet shares the stunning success of the Ocean Fest Youth Story Contest, designed to encourage the voices of all youth and specifically to welcome and include indigenous culture. Laurie Dils offers readers an opportunity to consider equity and access through the lens of comprehensive sexual health education, suggesting strategies to focus on student needs rather than the fears of adults. Link and Guskey and Koetje each offer timely and relevant contributions as well. Link and Guskey examine the connection between race, gender, and traditional grading and propose a new paradigm for criteria-based grading, while Koetje examines how districts can fill the equity gap through new research and practice on E-Mentoring during the induction of new teachers.

The editorial team at SPU was delighted to work with each of these authors through the draft-to-publication process. We hope you enjoy the issue.

Dr. Jill Heiney-Smith is managing editor and the director of graduate teacher education at SPU. A former English teacher, Jill has worked in teacher education for fifteen years at both UW and SPU. Jill’s research focuses on preservice mentor teacher development and equitable curriculum and programming for teacher candidates. Jill finds serving on the WSASCD board an invaluable resource in staying current and connected to K-12 education.

Emily Huff is co-editor and a member of the School of Education faculty at Seattle Pacific University; she also works as the director of field placements at SPU. Her teaching experience ranges from first grade through high school in Seattle and Tukwila, and she has supported teacher candidates at Vanderbilt University, University of Tennessee and SPU. She also serves as the director of an educational non-profit advocating for children in India and Kenya.

Dr. Pete Renn is co-editor and an assistant dean and faculty member in the School of Education at Seattle Pacific University. An educator for 28 years, Pete’s experience includes teaching at the middle school level and serving as a school principal. His research interests focus on the social foundations of education and the application of the principles of critical pedagogy in the classroom.
Message from the President

By Hannah Gbenro

Public education in the United States is continually reformed and reshaped through the process of implementing innovations in an effort to change the existing culture and find hope for the future (Gbenro, 2016; Hall & Hord, 2011; Schein, 2010; Tyack & Cuban, 1997). An innovation is something that’s new to an existing system, which means something considered “innovative” by one school or district might not seem like anything special from the lens of leaders within a different school or district (Hall & Hord, 2011).

Disruption that comes through facilitating innovative change for equity requires leadership at every level – from the Class Room to the Board Room to the Living Room (Klein & Knight, 2005). With this in mind, it is essential that schools and districts establish systems to engage, equip, and empower leadership within stakeholder groups; this proactive approach to communication and continuous improvement will position us to better implement and sustain innovations for a true impact on students (Gbenro, 2016).

Disrupting the status quo through innovation for the purpose of increasing equity and access for all learners to daily high quality, Whole Child supports and learning experiences is not easy. In fact, it’s really hard and there are so many places where we can potentially go sideways. Each step of the journey is important. As you engage with this issue of Curriculum in Context, my hope is (1) you’ll think about where you’re at with an innovation that intends to impact equity and access for students and (2) you’ll be equipped with some tools and ideas for next steps.

A myriad of equity-driven innovative reforms related to our 5 Tenets of the Whole Child have been implemented in educational systems over the last century with the hope of shifting classroom and leadership practices to better support student success (Burbridge, 2008; Everhart & Doyl, 1980; Gbenro, 2016; Hall & Hord, 2011; McLain & Thompson, 2001; Polikoff, 2012). Too many of these reforms have failed our students, educators, and families. We must do better by clarifying the need for innovations, communicating this need with stakeholders, and cultivating a continued understanding of why a given innovation is being implemented (Anderson, 2012; Casserly et al., 2011; Gbenro, 2016; Hall & Hord, 2011; Harris, 2012). To support you, and your team, with these pieces, I’m sharing some considerations for each stage of implementing an innovation. These guiding questions can be used alongside articles in this issue, which are relevant to the stage you’re at with implementing innovation(s) for equity (Gbenro, 2016).

Plan

What is the desired state of implementation? How will we know we’ve reached this desired state? What practices and processes can we systematize? How does implementing this innovation further the mission of our district? What is the evidence this innovation can be effective elsewhere? What evidence-based implementation framework are we using to ensure the innovation is effective? How are we laying the foundation to ensure this innovation is effective within our schools and district? What are the potential benefits and risks of implementing this innovation? How will we mitigate risks? How are we assessing, and communicating, the need for the innovation? How will we communicate progress about this project with others? How are we ensuring valid and reliable processes are used throughout the implementation?
Do
How will we communicate as a team? How are we leveraging the strengths of a cross-functional team? How are we valuing functional diversity and promoting effective communication practices? How are we laying the foundation for this change to be adopted and truly shift practice? How are we engaging, equipping, and empowering team members? How are we tapping into the knowledge, talents, and diverse perspectives of team members? How are we intentionally creating, and supporting, second-order change? How are we framing the message for different sets of stakeholders? How are we laying the foundation for the cultural shift at each level (artifacts, espoused beliefs and values, basic underlying assumptions)?

Learn
To what extent is this innovation being implemented? What implementation data supports our understanding of the extent to which the innovation is implemented? What results data do we have so far? How can we use our implementation data as a lens through which to review our results data?

Act
Based on what we know about the extent to which the innovation is currently being implemented, what do we need to adjust moving forward? How will we document that we made these adjustments? What additional supports and/or resources are needed to make this a successful implementation? What policies, practices, and systems need to be adjusted moving forward? (Additional Guiding Questions from the “Do” implementation stage are applicable here.)

Our students and families are counting on us to lead the way for equity. There isn’t a back-up plan or a superhero waiting behind the scenes to come and save our educational system in Washington State. Instead, we are the leaders charged with seeing the possibilities of the future, while laying a foundation in the present. This is not about having the right job title or role to lead for equity; instead, it is about leading through influence not authority within your current role as parent, student, teacher, principal, assistant principal, district administrator, or superintendent. If you need permission to lead for equity - to think outside the box for solutions, to monitor the implementation of innovative solutions using continuous improvement processes, to put student needs above the preferences of adults - you have permission and you have a tribe of fellow Washington State ASCD leaders who are excited about learning from you and alongside you. Please tag us in your journey (Twitter: @WSASCD) so we can highlight, and support, your work.

Clock Hour Update
As of August 24, 2019, Washington State ASCD is unable to process clock hours for ASCD online courses and ASCD Conference/Institutes due to recent clock hour policy updates. WSASCD is unable to process clock hour requests retroactively. If you are currently enrolled or recently completed an ASCD Online PD course(s) you may apply for academic credit in lieu of clock hours. For more information visit: Academic Credit and Academic Credit Listings. The additional cost and requirements are between the educator and the academic institution. WSASCD or ASCD is not involved in the process.
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Dr. Hannah Gbenro is the mother of Nathan and Kameron, as well as the wife of Malik. She serves as the Director of Academic Alignment and Innovation in Tacoma Public Schools. She holds multiple degrees and certifications from the fields of education and business. Dr. Gbenro served at each level – elementary, middle, high, district – as a teacher and/or administrator. Dr. Gbenro’s leadership has been recognized at a regional and national level for leadership and effectively facilitating the implementation of largescale innovations within Pk-12 settings. Follow her on Twitter @DrGbenro.
Teaching (for) Spatial Justice is Teaching (for) Social Justice

By: Kaitlin Popielarz and Timothy Monreal

Toward a Spatial Justice Pedagogy

As teacher educators, our teaching and learning practice aims to center critical and place-based pedagogies. By rooting our methods, foundational courses, and field experiences around the strengths, needs, and context of local place, we provide teacher candidates a model, and an opportunity to learn with and from the community in which they will teach. In this article, we (Kaitlin and Tim) share learning experiences that we used with undergraduate students to better connect issues of equity, place, and social justice to classroom teaching and learning. It is our hope that the lessons will provide an impetus for classroom teachers to integrate issues of spatial justice (Soja, 2010) into student-led projects or activism to deepen their connections to the potentialities of their local communities (Stovall, Calderon, Carrera, & King, 2009).

We root our thinking under the broad conception of spatial justice (Soja, 2010) acknowledging that notions of space and spatial justice vary dramatically from physical place, to learning from the land (Simpson, 2014), to more post-structuralist understandings of relational space (Murdoch, 2006; Rodriguez, 2017). For this particular article we tend to leave more theoretical framings aside to focus on the material inequalities and unequal (power) relations of physical place. In advocating for spatial justice, Soja (2010) argues we should start with the “view that the spatiality of (in)justice affects society and social life just as much as social processes shape the spatiality or specific geography of (in)justice” (p. 5). Generally, we believe (critical) educators are well served by focusing much more deeply on critical and place-based pedagogies that center the life experiences of students and their communities in order to work toward purposeful and relevant learning opportunities aimed at social/spatial change (Guillen & Zeichner, 2018; Popielarz, 2018; Schlemper, Stewart, Shetty, & Czajkowski, 2018). Such a practice challenges traditional methods because the knowledge and cultural heritage of students become the driving force of what is taught and learned in the classroom (González, Moll, & Amanti, 2005). Thus, critical and place-based pedagogies emphasize a more equitable and humanizing education that also emboldens educators to link their teaching and learning practices to the strengths and knowledges of local communities (Katsarou, Picower, & Stovall, 2013).

In this short article, we provide examples as to how future and current teachers can develop an understanding of critical and place-based pedagogies to aid student success and build a sustaining practice within their own classrooms. In this way, engagement in place extends to a multitude of future spaces they will (re)create and (re)encounter (Del Vecchio, Toomey, & Tuck, 2017; Tuck, McKenzie, & McCoy, 2014). Significantly, this chapter fills a gap in linking a practical understanding of place/space with developing, implementing, and revising critical and place-based pedagogies for current and future teachers (Helfenbein & Taylor, 2009). Acknowledging that our work for socially just and equitable teacher education is always becoming, we share collaborative dialogue about the lessons we are actively learning from in order to model such a practice in higher education for teacher candidates.

While our work is situated within Detroit, Michigan and Columbia, South Carolina, it is our intention to engage the
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reader in generative thought about the possibilities and limitations of critical and place-based pedagogies for social justice and equity within all of their own schools and communities (Soja, 2010). Our hope is that this article pushes teachers towards developing critical and place-based pedagogies for their own teaching and learning practices (Agarwal-Rangnath, Dover, & Henning, 2016). Our objective is “to simulate new ways of thinking about and acting to change the unjust geographies in which we all live” (Soja, 2010, p. 5).

In turn, we may join with our students and communities in collectively (re)creating more sustaining and humanizing school and community spaces (Ares, 2011; Valenzuela, Zamora, & Rubio, 2015). For through critical and place-based practices, educational opportunities can be a powerful agent to help remake our immediate environments and locales (Taylor, 2018).

Learning Experiences

Kaitlin’s Example
Within a PreK-8 social studies methods course, teacher candidates participated in a community engaged learning experience by taking the opportunity to learn about a specific person, event, neighborhood, community site, and/or social issue within Detroit (Haddix, 2015). The assignment to curate a community asset map prompted teacher candidates to focus upon the community cultural wealth of a particular aspect of Detroit, which correlated to teacher candidates (re)learning of the social studies for elementary classrooms (Yosso, 2005). Following their community engaged learning experience, teacher candidates shared their community asset mapping with their peers in order to engage in generative and reflexive dialogue pertaining to their developing cultural and social awareness. In turn, each teacher candidate was invited to learn how specific people (Motown), event (Detroit 1967 Rebellion), neighborhood (The Heidelberg Project), community site (The Detroit Institute of Arts), or social issue (climate justice and the Great Lakes waterways) in Detroit could be connected to social studies for current and future students in order to make meaningful connections in the elementary classroom. Multi-modal resources – practitioner articles from Rethinking Schools, podcasts such as NPR’s Code Switch, and documentary films like Detroit 48202: Conversations Along a Postal Route – acted as paired texts to the place-conscious learning experiences of teacher candidates. In addition, teacher candidates engaged in adult ally workshops facilitated by Detroit-based grassroots youth organizations in order to connect the identities of students and local communities to the classroom curriculum.

Following this community-engaged learning experience, teacher candidates utilized their community asset map to inspire the curation of a lesson and/or unit plan project grounded in critical and place-based pedagogies. Through this experience, teacher candidates connected the Michigan K-8 State Standards and the NCSS C3 Framework to the community of their students for relevant and justice-oriented learning opportunities. Teacher candidates were prompted to break free from the confinement of traditional social studies curricular and pedagogical practices allowing for students to engage in their role as active community members and citizens (Ladson-Billings, 2003). For example, after learning more about the necessity of climate justice to address the growing concerns of rising water levels in Detroit, one teacher candidate developed a unit plan for second grade students to (1) determine how human activity is causing the water levels of the Detroit River to rise, (2) analyze how rising water levels impact humans and the Detroit ecosystem, and (3) develop and present possible solutions to mitigate rising water levels in Detroit. This assignment was inspiring for this particular teacher candidate as she recently marched during the 2019 global Climate Strike in Detroit, which was led by one of the youth-led grassroots youth organizations that visited our social studies methods course. At the end of the semester, teacher candidates expressed an increased capacity, knowledge, and self-efficacy in developing critical and place-based practices within their current and future classrooms.

Tim’s Example
Within an undergraduate foundations of education class, Schools and Society, students participated in an assignment to investigate how particular places are (re)made. The assignment called on students to visit, and then critically analyze, a (hyper)local place, specifically one with a powerful, although often hidden, history of
uplift, struggle, and/or continual injustice. The goal being to interrogate what stories are told about places, by whom, and why? Perhaps more theoretically why is this place the space it is at this particular moment in time? Further, how might we as educators include such intentional engagements about the “historical sedimentation of spatial injustice” (Taylor, 2018, p. 189) within the curriculum? Taylor (2018) offers the example of her high school which even as a former school for freed slaves had Confederate flags painted on cafeteria walls and the “Lil’ Colonel” as its mascot. Taylor (2018) then challenges educators to disrupt pernicious place-remaking that “depends on an intentional and false separation between educating young people in the present and histories of race, politics, and power” (p. 188).

To develop a critical eye towards place (re-making), and the long reach of spatial injustice, students read, and the class discussed, a number of accessible articles and media pieces before starting the assignment. Some of these included two podcasts about community and school segregation (Gross 2017; Hannah-Jones, 2015) and Ta-Nehisi Coates’ (2014) longform essay, The Case for Reparations, which highlights the lasting consequences of red-lining. Further, the class tied such readings to South Carolina’s abhorrent funding, and maintenance of public schools, the so-called “Corridor of Shame” (Ferillo, 2005; Wellington, 2004) that serve rural students of color. In final preparation for the assignment, Taylor’s (2018) reflection of place-remaking served as a general framework for students to follow. In an effort to share (critical) knowledge about the places around us, students created a brief five slide presentation to share with peers in small groups. Beside visual representations of their visit, students discussed the place in relation to the critical material we covered in class, and the potential to bring this place into school curriculum. Two examples of student selections include:

» The Carver Theatre, Columbia, SC: Built in 1941, it was one of Columbia’s exclusive African-American theatres during segregation. The student mentioned that although she passes the building every day, she had never taken the time to read the historical marker, look inside, or engage with the lasting legacies of segregation around her.

» Barr Street High School, Lancaster, SC: This high school is an example of a segregated school for Black children that continues to serve as a community center. Not only did the student walk the (former) school, but she talked with her grandmother who attended the school. Through this conversation and visit the student remarked, “although Barr Street was a segregated school, it had quality education, sports, and staff. The people who worked with Barr Street cared for their students, and I think that’s why it was successful.” The student reflected on how place can serve as a way to (re)connect us with those around us and suggested places such as Barr Street can be used in/as the curriculum as an impetus for children to learn with/from their elders in the community.

Growth, Possibility, and Implications for Classroom Teaching/Learning

We contend that critical and place-based practices within PreK-12 and higher education classrooms have the potential to facilitate transformative social change in our local communities. By engaging with our students in learning opportunities rooted in the context of place, we are inspired to push forward new ideas for humanizing teaching and learning. This has required us (Kaitlin and Tim) to engage in active (re)learning alongside our students about the struggle for social and spatial justice in the communities we teach. This is not easy. It is work that we approach with humility and openness, acknowledging that we are often guests in new places. However, both pedagogically and reflexively, this purposeful, slow, and time-consuming work encourages us to ground our teaching and learning in relationships to our shared communities (Ulmer, 2017). In turn, we often find ourselves challenged to move beyond traditional education reforms as we collaborate with community members and grassroots organizations, rather than disconnected bureaucrats, for transformative social change (Love, 2019). Although not immediate, we join our students as we weave spatial justice into our critical and place-based pedagogical and curricular practices for limitless possibilities understanding that we have much to learn and many different people/places to learn from.
Innovative Approaches to Access and Equity for All Learners

References


Innovative Approaches to Access and Equity for All Learners

Kaitlin Popielarz is a PhD Candidate and teacher educator at Wayne State University’s College of Education. Kaitlin’s research and teaching interests include connecting teacher education programs to the local grassroots community in order to provide future educators the opportunity to learn community-based and culturally sustaining pedagogies for transformative social change. She is an advocate, action researcher, and community organizer for education justice in Detroit.

Timothy Monreal is a Ph.D. candidate in Foundations of Education at the University of South Carolina. Tim has been a middle school teacher for the past 11 years, mostly in California and more recently in South Carolina. His research interests include the New Latinx/Nuevo South, Latinx teachers in the Southeast, social studies teaching, and teacher subjectivity. In addition to a number of book chapters, Tim’s work has appeared in journals such as Educational Policy, Latino Studies, Current Issues in Comparative Education, Journal of Latinos and Education, and Middle Grades Review. Tim is a 2019 Spencer Dissertation Fellow and a 2019 Southern Regional Education Board Dissertation Awardee.


Washington State ASCD is the only educational organization in Washington State that reaches practitioners at all levels of education and your involvement is one of the keys to our success. As a member of WSASCD, you can take advantage of our member benefits.

How will you benefit from joining WSASCD?

» Professional development offerings at member rates

» Receive an award-winning eJournal, *Curriculum in Context*, twice a year

» Receive quarterly Newsletters and Newflashes via email to inform you about the latest WSASCD events and updates on educational issues in Washington.

» Attend regional workshops covering topics relevant to the needs of local educators

» Opportunities to earn clock hours when you attend WSASCD conference/workshops

» Opportunities for leadership, networking, and to attend events that will promote professional growth and development of members

» Membership in a community committed to promoting promising practices to ensure ALL students are safe, healthy, engaged, supported and challenged

Join online or call (360) 357-9535
How Traditional Grading Contributes to Student Inequalities and How to Fix It

By Laura J. Link and Thomas R. Guskey

Grades have long been identified by those in the measurement community as prime examples of unreliable measurement (Brookhart, 1994; Stiggins, Frisbie, & Griswold, 1989). What one teacher considers in calculating students' grades may differ greatly from another teacher (Guskey & Link, 2019; McMillan, 2001; McMillan, Myran, & Workman, 2002). A major factor contributing to the unreliability of grades is teachers' inclusion of aspects of students' behavior in the grades they assign. Despite the recommendation of experts to separate behavior from academic achievement in formulating students' grades, teachers at all grade levels typically include student behavior as a contributing factor in determining grades (Brookhart, Guskey, Bowers, McMillan, Smith, J., Smith, L., & Welsh, 2016; Frary, Cross, & Weber, 1993; Gullickson, 1985; Link, 2018; McMillian & Nash, 2000; Randall & Engelhard, 2010).

In assigning grades, teachers typically divide the evidence they gather from students into different categories such as tests, quizzes, homework, labs, participation, effort, attendance, etc. Using a computerized grading program, they then assign a percentage weight to each category specifying its contribution to each student's subject area or course grade. This combination of evidence yields an amalgamated “hodgepodge” grade (Brookhart, 1991, p. 36) that mixes achievement and other non-academic factors related to various aspects of students' behavior. Including indicators of students' behavior distorts their meaning of grades, however, and drastically diminishes their communicative value. In addition, because teachers vary in the weight they attach to these factors in determining students' grades, it also makes grades less reliable indicators of students' performance. Grades that include factors such as effort and participation become tools for managing students' behavior as much as they are indicators of students' learning (Olsen & Buchanan, 2019).

Despite their noted unreliability, grades remain the basis for making many important decisions about students (Brookhart et al., 2016; Guskey, 2015). Report card grades determine whether or not students are promoted from one grade level to the next. They also determine honor roll status, enrollment in advanced or remedial classes, special education services, and college or university admissions (Brookhart & Nitko, 2008). Because grades typically include a mix of academic and behavioral factors, however, students' academic opportunities may be unevenly affected when implicit racial and gender biases influence how teachers consider behavioral factors when assigning grades.

Race and Behavioral Grades

Research shows that teachers treat students differently depending on students’ race, and these differences contribute to racial inequalities in grading, especially when behavioral factors are considered (Mckown & Weinstein, 2008; Okonofua, Walton, & Eberhart, 2016; Rubie-Davies, Hattie & Hamilton, 2006). Studies indicate, for example, that white teachers tend to perceive black students as more disruptive than white students (Downey & Pribesh, 2004; Ferguson, 2000), and as less mature (Alexander, Entwistle, & Thompson, 1987). These
differences in teachers’ perceptions shape their treatment of students in the classroom and their use of disciplinary actions. Other studies reveal that black students are more likely than their white peers to be reprimanded for behavioral offenses such as insubordination, disrespect, and excessive noise (Diamond & Lewis, 2015; Ford, 2016). Black students are also more likely than white students to be referred to the office or suspended, even when the misbehaviors are similar (Lleras, 2008). Results of suspensions often translate into reduced teaching and learning access, which can negatively impact students’ success in the classroom. Subsequently, when teachers include indicators of student behavior in determining students’ grades, black students are more likely to be negatively affected than their white peers.

When teachers interpret student behaviors through the lens of race, credit for behaviors such as being seated when the bell rings, following directions, cooperation, and dressing appropriately may be inequitably assigned. In an early study, for example, Brophy and Good (1974) found that some teachers develop simplistic and rigid stereotypes, and they react more to the stereotypes than to the students themselves. A more recent meta-analysis examining teachers’ expectations of students based on race and other teacher stereotyping studies support similar findings (Tenenbaum & Ruck, 2007; Willard, Isaac, & Carney, 2015). As a result, racial stereotypes may lead teachers to award more behavioral credit to white students and less to black students for their perceived classroom conduct.

Such differences can have profound influence on students’ grades. If, for instance, a combination of behavioral factors (e.g., effort, participation, class conduct, homework completion, etc.) counts 20 percent of the final grade, awarding maximum points for behavior could move a student from a C to an A in the typical percentage grading system. Conversely, students who are perceived as not meeting behavioral expectations could drop from a grade of C to a D or F.

In addition, teachers work under conditions that tend to heighten the negative impact of racial stereotypes. Throughout the school day, teachers make numerous micro-decisions about students’ behavior amid working conditions that are highly stressful and cognitively demanding. This is particularly true in low-resourced schools that serve disproportionately large numbers of minority students of color (Warikoo, Sinclair, Fei, & Jacoby-Senghor, 2016). These are precisely the kinds of situations in which implicit biases and stereotypes have their greatest effect. Implicit associations have an even stronger impact when teachers are unable to devote cognitive resources to their own behaviors and decisions, instead relying on spontaneous, gut reactions (Cameron, Brown-lannuzzi, & Payne, 2012; Olson & Fazio, 2009). These reactions play out in teachers’ grading decisions. In moments of cognitive overload, teachers are more likely to impose grade reductions on students who aren’t following established classroom procedures or who display disruptive behavior. Evidence indicates that when teachers are trying to balance multiple demands, they are more susceptible to the influence of implicit racial biases and to use grades as a means of control (Warikoo, Sinclair, Fei, & Jacoby-Senghor, 2016).

Gender and Behavioral Grades

Teachers’ grading practices are also influenced by students’ gender. Girls have long received higher grades in school than boys. Even in the 1950s and 1960s, girls earned better grades and had higher class standing in high school (Alexander & Eckland, 1974; Mickelson, 1989). Today, from kindergarten through high school and even in college, girls get better grades in all major subjects, including math and science – subjects traditionally viewed more suitable for boys (Perkins, Kleiner, Roey, & Brown, 2004; Terrier, 2016). This may be explained in part because girls typically display better social skills and classroom behavior.

As early as kindergarten, boys exhibit more disruptive conduct in class and less positive orientations to learning activities (Zill & West, 2001). According to elementary school teacher reports, twice as many boys as girls have difficulty paying attention (Buchman & DiPrete, 2006). Girls also demonstrate greater persistence in completing tasks and greater eagerness to learn (Buchman & DiPrete, 2006; McDaniel, 2007). During adolescence, high school teachers consistently rate girls as putting forth more effort, being more attentive, more organized, and less
disruptive than boys (Downey & Vogt Yuan, 2005). Furthermore, girls are generally more adept at reading test instructions before proceeding to the questions, paying attention to the teacher rather than daydreaming, choosing homework over TV, and persisting in long-term assignments despite boredom and frustration than are boys. These differences in non-cognitive skills may be central in explaining why girls generally get higher grades. Boys’ less developed self-discipline skills leave them at a disadvantage in school settings where grades weigh self-regulation and organizational skills alongside demonstrations of acquired knowledge.

Including behavior in grades plays right into most girls’ strengths — and most boys’ weaknesses. A host of cross-cultural studies show that females tend to be more conscientious than males (Hogan, 1981; King & Hill, 1993; Kobrin, Sathy, & Shaw, 2007). In school, girls are more apt to take more detailed notes in class, transcribe more accurately what teachers say, complete homework on time, and invest in impressing their teachers with their efforts (Buchmann & DiPrete, 2006; McDaniel, 2007).

On a whole, boys approach schoolwork differently. They are less satisfied with the whole enterprise of organizing their work and tending to details. As a result, they are more apt to be inattentive, leave completed assignments at home, and fail to turn the page and complete the questions on the back (Gnaulati, 2014). Boys are also more likely to blurt out answers, doodle instead of taking notes, have messy backpacks, and even poke students who sit in front of them (McLeod & Kaiser, 2004). When such transgressions are considered in determining students’ grades, fairness issues come into play, especially if teachers assign zeroes for work that is missing, turned in late, or incomplete. A single zero can doom a student to failure, regardless of what dedicated effort or level of performance might follow (Guskey, 2015). When combined with the common practice of averaging scores from different sources of evidence, a single zero can have a devastating effect on a student’s percentage grade. The overall grade is unfairly skewed by that one score, leaving boys’ achievement underestimated and feeling alienated in an environment where self-regulation and conscientiousness account for a good portion of their grades.
Grades versus Other Measures of Achievement

Even though minority students and boys are more susceptible to lower course grades due to perceptions of classroom behavior, they are paradoxically experiencing increasing levels of success on external assessments of their achievement. Although still not outscoring their white peers, black and Hispanic students, in particular, are earning higher scores than ever in math and reading on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, or NAEP. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2015), while the overall math averages for 9-year-olds grew by 25 points between 1978 and 2012, average NAEP scores among black and Hispanic students increased by 34 and 31 points, respectively. Among 13-year-olds, math scores for white students increased by 21 points, while results for blacks and Hispanics increased by 34 points and 33 points, respectively. White 17-year-olds, many of whom are one year away from enrolling in college, nudged upward by six points overall between 1978 and 2012 on the math portion of NAEP, but scores for black and Hispanic students increased by 20 and 18 points, respectively. The same holds true for NAEP reading scores. Between 1975 and 2016, black and Hispanic students’ reading assessment scores grew by more than 20 points on average across all grade levels (NCES, 2017). Additionally, the number of minority students earning a passing score on at least one Advanced Placement course exam has nearly doubled from 2004 to 2018 (College Board, 2018).

A similar grade paradox holds true for boys: Girls may earn higher grades than boys throughout elementary, middle and high school, but they do not outperform boys on achievement or IQ tests. In a landmark study by Duckworth and Seligman (2006) investigating the role of gender in grades and achievement, girls earned significantly higher final grades than boys in high school Algebra II, English, and social studies. Despite these high grades, however, since 1972, boys have overshadowed girls on the SAT, registering higher overall scores every year by an average of 45 points (College Board, 2018).

How to Fix Grade Inequities

To fix these grade inequalities and limit the potential influence of bias in grading, we must do three things: (1) Determine students’ grades based on learning criteria; (2) Distinguish product, process, and progress criteria; and (3) Report each type of criteria separately.

Determine Students’ Grades Based on Learning Criteria

When asked to identify the purpose of grading, most teachers indicate that grades should describe how well students have achieved the learning goals established for a grade level or course. In other words, grades should reflect students’ performance based on specific learning criteria, not their relative standing among classmates. Teachers as well as students prefer this approach because they consider it both fair and equitable (Kovas, 1993).

Distinguish Product, Process, and Progress Criteria

As we described earlier, teachers use widely varying criteria in determining students’ grades. In most cases, these different criteria can be grouped into three broad categories: product, process, and progress criteria (Guskey, 1996).

* Product criteria reflect what students know and are able to do at a particular point in time. Teachers who use product criteria typically base students’ grades on final examination scores, final products (reports or projects), overall assessments, and other culminating demonstrations of learning.

* Process criteria emphasize behaviors that enable or facilitate learning. Teachers who consider effort or work habits when assigning grades are using process criteria. So are teachers who count formative assessments, homework, punctuality of assignments, class participation, or attendance.

* Progress criteria describe how much students gain from their learning experiences. Other names for progress criteria include “learning gain,” “improvement scoring,” “value-added learning,” and “educational growth.” Teachers who use progress criteria typically look at how much improvement students have made over a particular period of time, rather than just where they are.
Because of concerns about student motivation, self-esteem, and the social consequences of grading, most teachers routinely base their grading procedures on some combination of all three types of criteria. Many also vary their grading criteria from student to student, taking into account individual circumstances. Although teachers defend this practice on the basis of fairness, it seriously confounds the meaning of any grade. A grade of A, for example, may mean the student knew what was intended before instruction began (product), did not learn as well as expected but tried very hard (process), or simply made significant improvement (progress).

Report Each Type of Criteria Separately
After establishing explicit indicators of product, process, and progress learning criteria, teachers should assign separate grades for each. In other words, they provide a “dashboard” of information rather than a single hodgepodge grade. In this way grades for homework, effort, work habits, responsibility or learning progress are kept distinct from grades that reflect academic achievement and performance. The intent is to provide a better, more accurate, and much more comprehensive picture of what students accomplish in school.

While schools in the U.S. are just beginning to catch onto the idea of separate grades for product, process, and progress criteria, many Canadian educators have used the practice for years (Bailey & McTighe, 1996). Each marking period, for example, teachers in Ontario assign an “achievement” grade to students based on their academic performance on projects, assessments, and other demonstrations of learning. In addition, they assign separate grades or marks for behaviors related to responsibility, organization, independent work, collaboration, initiative, and self-regulation. Ontario teachers say that reporting such factors separately compels students to take these behaviors more seriously. In addition, it offers parents a more comprehensive picture of their children’s performance in school (Tierney, Simon, & Charland, 2011).

Teachers often presume that reporting multiple grades will increase their grading workload. But those who use the procedure claim that it actually makes grading easier and less work. Teachers gather the same evidence on student learning that they did before, but no longer worry about how to weight or combine that evidence in calculating an overall grade. As a result, they avoid irresolvable arguments about the appropriateness or fairness of different weighting strategies.

Perhaps most important, reporting separate grades for product, process, and progress criteria also makes grading more meaningful and less prone to the influence of bias. By pulling out non-achievement factors from an achievement grade, the grade-inflating or deflating influence of students’ behavior is eliminated. Yet by including separate grades or marks on behavioral factors in the reporting procedures, however, their importance to teachers and students is maintained. It simply makes grading a more accurate and more meaningful form of communication. In turn, report cards and transcripts become more robust documents that present a better and more discerning portrait of students’ performance in school.

Conclusion
Developing meaningful, reliable, and equitable grading policies and practices will continue to challenge educators. Distinguishing specific product criteria and reporting achievement grades based on these criteria allow teachers to offer a more precise description of students’ academic achievement and performance. Reporting on specific process criteria related to homework, class participation, attitude, effort, responsibility, behavior, and other non-academic factors ensures they remain important but distinct. Doing so will clarify the meaning of grades, enhance their communicative value, and ensure far greater equity in grading at all education levels.
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Critical Question Series

Each year, WSASCD provides a forum for educators in our state to read and write about topics of interest to our members. Check out these articles, which are available on the WSASCD website:

» Is there a right kind of Instructional Rigor?
» When you think about RIGOR and challenging all students, what comes to mind?
» How can we understand students’ STEM experiences through empathy interviews?
» How does a district systemically support teacher leadership?
» What strategies can school districts use to engage their community in developing Life-Ready students?
» How do schools use an MTSS Framework to support the whole child?

A full collection of Critical Question articles can be found here
To contribute a topic, contact Carrie Lam at Carrie.LamASCD@gmail.com

WHAT WE DO

Every day we’re in classrooms researching our products at work and connecting with educators. Our relentless push to improve and advance our products is driven by our belief that all learners can achieve and grow. Each of our programs has been designed to support this belief and help deliver on the promise of equitable learning for all students in every classroom.

Together with educators, we’re helping schools perform better by providing teachers with high-quality curricula and tools to meaningfully differentiate instruction. Our shared goal is to actively engage students in their learning and motivate them to persevere and achieve.

Using what our experience, research, and best practices tell us to be true, our programs address head on some of the chief challenges that educators face. Read on to learn more about some of the many ways we strive to make classrooms better places for teachers and students.
Washington State ASCD 2020 Awards Program

WSASCD offers two annual awards. The Outstanding Young Educator Award recognizes an educational leader and The Whole Child Award acknowledges a school. Beginning February 7, 2020, nomination forms can be found on our website at www.wsascd.org under the “Resources” menu. Nominations will be accepted until April 10, 2020.

Washington State ASCD, in its ongoing search for quality leadership, will seek out, highlight, and celebrate the accomplishments of a young educator who achieves excellence in instructional leadership in teaching and learning.

The Washington State ASCD Outstanding Young Educator Award (OYEA!) is our way of recognizing an emerging educational leader and sharing his or her exemplary practices with the education community. This is an annual award.

Washington State ASCD sponsors this award program in support of ASCD Worldwide and The Whole Child Initiative. This program seeks to identify a school in Washington that has created a school culture with programs that exemplify one or more of the five tenets of The Whole Child Initiative: Healthy, Safe, Engaged, Supported, and Challenged.

How the 2020 Census Helps Schools

The 2020 Census responses drive decisions on the annual allocation of more than $675 billion in federal funds to states and communities, which includes support for special education, teacher training, class size reduction, technology, school lunch assistance, Head Start, and after-school programs.

The U.S. Census Bureau’s Statistics in Schools (SIS) program provides free activities and resources for teachers to help bring statistics to life in the classroom and prepare students for a data-driven world.

This school year, SIS activities will be more topical than ever. They will teach students and their parents why everyone should respond to the 2020 Census and how it will help shape the future of their communities for the next 10 years.

Use Promo Code WAAFF when shopping the ASCD store!

When you purchase ASCD books, videos, courses, and other products you can also support WSASCD by entering promo code WAAFF. The promo code WAAFF can also be applied to purchases for a new and renewed ASCD membership as well as when you register to ASCD conferences and professional learning events. Each eligible purchase will be contributing to our affiliate. Thank you in advance for your support! Shop the ASCD store.
Conducting Capacity for Equity

By Carl Bruner

On September 7, 2004, the Mount Vernon School District, located 60 miles north of Seattle, welcomed 5,300 students to the 2004-05 school year. As the new superintendent, I was focused on the completion of a construction bond, a top priority for the School Board and community. While my team and I were ready for the challenge, we were not prepared to face the underlying racial tensions that began to surface in the district within a few short months. Although difficult at times, the journey to identify and address these tensions resulted in new initiatives supporting more equitable treatment for students within the district.

A Short History of the Mount Vernon School District (MVSD)

During the five years leading up to this moment, the Mount Vernon School District experienced a 50% increase in their Latinx student population, a 22% decrease in the white student population, and a 63% percent increase of the student population eligible for bilingual services. With this demographic shift came troubling academic outcomes. Upwards of 40% fewer Latinx students met standards on state assessments in Math and Reading than students who identified as white. Additionally, the gap in on-time graduation rates was estimated at 30% in favor of white students. Despite a broad and growing awareness that the District’s Latinx student population was not achieving at rates commensurate with their white peers, many educators were not sure how they could influence these outcomes, pointing to poverty and language barriers as reasons for declining academic scores.

In the fall of 2004, several Mount Vernon High School (MVHS) alumni began working with the high school's longstanding Latinx service club. By the spring of 2005, students from both MVHS and the alumni began to challenge the District’s narrative that our teachers and schools were doing all we could for our Latinx students. When one of the former students was trespassed from campus due to the administration’s perception that he was directing the student group in violation of Board policy, tensions between the administration and current/former students escalated quickly and soon, students, families, and members of the Latinx community were calling for change.

In March 2006, the Board directed me to form a Diversity Advisory Committee (DAC). After meeting for 18 months, they presented their action plan to the School Board. Their plan identified five goals: increase learning supports; build rapport between teachers and students; community engagement; recruiting/retaining diverse teachers; and increasing student ethnic self-esteem.

The DAC plan influenced the District’s work, and resulted in:

1. A pipeline to teaching certification for MVSD Latinx students via Skagit Valley College and Western Washington University;
2. MV Parent Academies taught by native Spanish, Mixteco, and Slavic speakers;
3. District collaboration with the Latino/a Educational Achievement Project;
4. A focus on teaching strategies for English Language Learners.

The District realized some positive outcomes in family engagement and student leadership. However, despite large investments in instructional coaching, the gaps in
academic achievement between Latinx and white students, as measured by state assessments, remained at an average of between 25% and 30% in favor of white students.

A group of teacher leaders suggested that the root cause of the gap was a disconnect between our staff’s cultural/racial backgrounds and those of their Latinx students and their families. They argued that even powerful instructional strategies could be rendered ineffective by District, school, and classroom practices that implicitly and explicitly conveyed a deficit ideology of Latinx students’ abilities to learn at high levels. If the District was serious about creating equitable learning opportunities for all students, we would have to address our educators’ implicit attitudes and bias toward our Latinx students.

The Shift Towards Equity and Social Justice

For over a decade, several different approaches were implemented to address the concern about disposition, but eventually the lack of internal capacity to lead this effort became apparent. In 2017, the District partnered with the University of Florida and the School Reform Initiative (SRI) creating a three-year teacher-led professional development program linking conversations about classroom strategies to staff dispositions about equity and social justice. Several months of co-construction resulted in the Leading for Equity Initiative (LEI) facilitated and led by Dr. Rebekah Cordova & Pedro R. Bermudez. The LEI set three goals for the Mount Vernon School District:

- To develop knowledge and awareness of the impact that individual, internalized, institutional and structural racism has on students of color.
- To apply knowledge about racialized experiences in education that impact students’ educational experiences individually and collectively.
- To enhance and practice skills associated with facilitative leadership to support equity-focused Communities of Practice.

The initiative was informed by three adult learning principles, drawn from the features of successful professional development for teachers discussed by Darling-Hammond, Hyler, and Gardner (2017) and Drago-Severson (2004):

1. Professional Learning should be relevant and pertinent to educators.
2. Professional Learning should be rooted in educator choice and agency.
3. Professional Learning should be on-going and embedded in the daily work of the educator.

Relevant Professional Learning that Privileges Educator Choice and Agency

The design of the LEI incorporated content supporting the District’s goal of addressing behavior rooted in implicit bias and deficit-thinking. The structure of the learning experiences asked teachers to engage with texts and videos and hold dialogue surrounding social justice and education equity content. Of equal importance, teachers practiced collaborative tools and processes to support Equity-Focused Communities of Practice at their schools.

Toward this aim, the LEI was launched with an institute specifically designed to:

- Build background knowledge on equity issues affecting students of color;
- Expand critical consciousness and develop an individual and collective equity lens;
- Establish equity-focused communities of practice throughout the school district; and
- Apply knowledge about racism and education that impacts students’ educational experiences.

In addition to gaining a greater understanding of how implicit bias shows up in classroom instruction, teachers worked collaboratively on ways to identify and dismantle harmful actions within their schools. As the learning became more specific to individual school-based work, it became clear to teachers there was a lack of parent voice in the discussions and that caregivers had pertinent feedback essential to creating an equitable school culture.
Thus, content and experiences were designed to support increased dialogue between schools and the communities they served.

**Ongoing Support for the Job-Embedded Equity Work**

In its first year, the LEI introduced teachers to social justice content and professional collaborative processes. Participants examined their social justice disposition at a personal and collective level; conducted teacher inquiry around equity-related questions of practice; and grew an equity-focused community of practice within their school setting.

In an effort to build local capacity to sustain the LEI, the second year saw the selection of teacher leaders, Building Equity Leads (BEL), to participate in a two-day training experience focused on site-based equity-focused professional development; including creating brave spaces, collaborative examination of student and teacher work, and equity-problems of practice. BELs also co-designed and co-facilitated on-going Leading for Equity work sessions for faculty and staff.

Participants at the district and school level also engaged in regularly facilitated follow-up work sessions throughout the school year. In these sessions’ participants worked as members of an equity-focused community where they continued to learn, apply, and assess instructional methods and strategies, as well as receive feedback from peers.

**The Impact of the LEI**

The impact the LEI had on teachers and administrators was significant. Feedback was collected from participants through a series of individual interviews conducted during September 2019, by a third party consultant. Four themes emerged:

1. **Trust and Collaboration**
2. **Focus on Student Experience**
3. **Willingness and Vulnerability**
4. **Supporting Teachers of Color**

**Trust and Collaboration**

The Mount Vernon School District LEI was designed to nurture equity-focused teacher leadership, which had a direct impact on the way teachers interacted with each other. Dave Riddle, Principal at La Venture Middle School, describes the culture before and during the LEI (D. Riddle, personal communication, August 26, 2019):

> Before (the LEI) there were some people more attuned with equity work, but they didn’t really have the forum. But most of us didn’t really know how to talk about it. Now, I think it has flipped. I think most people have the vocabulary. We talk about the elephant. It is not something we don’t talk about anymore; we are much more intentional about talking about the things we need to talk about.

Robert Hand, a Family Sciences and Consumer Studies teacher at MVHS and the 2018-2019 Washington State Teacher of the Year, describes the collaboration required to advance the work through the BELs (R. Hand, personal communication, September 4, 2019):

> We have people who are putting the thought, time, and energy into figuring out what it is we are doing well and should continue. But more importantly, what is it that we need to change to make sure we are serving all students equitably? We will find areas of opportunities for growth for us. And we must end up putting some solutions into place.

**Focus on Student Experience**

While much of the LEI work focused on teacher disposition and awareness of implicit bias, the outcomes were always with the student experience in mind. When asked about the work ahead district-wide, Robert Hand states (R. Hand, personal communication, September 4, 2019):

> We need to be casting a critical lens on every aspect of our schools and asking: are they really set up in a way to serve every student equitably and in a culturally
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...responsive way? Right now, the answer is no, and we need to address that. Equity work is of the utmost importance.

Angelica Garcia, a veteran staff member at Mount Vernon High School and BEL agreed (A. Garcia, personal communication, August 28, 2019):

Due to my work with ELL/Migrant/Bilingual students and many students who come from low-socioeconomic families it is unjust for me to not have their best interest at heart and the equity work for me goes hand in hand, but at this time we are not serving our students to the best of our ability, especially in regards to equity.

Garcia added the LEI “allowed equity leads to discuss solutions to the explicit barriers to student success” (i.e. student tracking systems, discipline policies, and outdated curriculum).

Willingness and Vulnerability
Riddle acknowledges that the LEI “made La Venture grow.” Despite the process not being easy, he admits that his biggest learning on creating an equitable school “is it really begins and ends with humility.” Additionally, he describes (D. Riddle, personal communication, August 26, 2019) the LEI process as one where you have to:

...understand what you don’t know, have the ability to learn, take a risk, and realize your perspective might be limited or it might be out of date. I feel like it is personally what I had to learn, and I was grateful to do so.

In terms of how the work challenges staff to be more introspective, Robert Hand discusses the implications of the LEI (R. Hand, personal communication, September 4, 2019):

Staff are going to have to make the changes. I know often times people are resistant to change, especially when you are having to do things you are not used to...But that is part of what the work is. It is realizing where the gaps are and where the opportunities are.

Supporting Teachers of Color
Given the District’s small percentage of teachers of color, the focus on equity was never going to be isolated to the student experience. The systemic ways the district needed to better support and listen to teachers of color became evident. Angelica Garcia states (A. Garcia, personal communication, August 28, 2019):

...being one of the few teachers of color in MVSD, I had trust issues with peers, but this opportunity to be an equity lead has helped me find allies that I trust and appreciate more than words could express. I now know there are teachers that are willing to ask critical questions. We have created a safe space and that is very important to me.

Additionally, Robert Hand addresses the changes needed, specifically in district decision making (R. Hand, personal communication, September 4, 2019):

Because we can’t have a committee primary comprised of white people sitting around making decisions about equity in our schools. That doesn’t work. Proactively, we need to make sure those seats are at the table for the educators of color, so their voices are always at the front of the discussion.

The Third-Year of the LEI and the Implications for Future Work
At the start of the third year, the LEI is poised to deepen and expand school-based, job-embedded work in several ways, each of which were chosen by the BELs and implemented in the schools. These include whole-faculty equity work sessions designed and facilitated by BELs; book study groups on equity and social justice issues affecting schools; and facilitated job-embedded professional development sessions focused on teaching and learning from an equity lens. Taken together, these strands of work offer opportunities for all teachers and administrators to continue to both deepen background knowledge about equity and social justice and continue to work better together as they adapt practices to increase equitable experiences for all students.

The effectiveness of the BELs was evident during the 3rd Leading for Equity Institute in August 2019. Discussion among building teams toward the end of the Institute made it clear that, while work on understanding how white privilege and implicit bias impacts our practice and must continue, it is time to explicitly address equity
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barriers through changes in classroom, school, and district practices and policy.

As difficult as discussing foundational equity concepts can be, applying those concepts to long standing practices will always be more challenging. However, the LEI created a large coalition of willing educators ready to drive the change. Goals now focus on sustaining the MVSD’s Leading for Equity Initiative and providing ongoing input for Building Equity Leads, resulting in the District’s commitment to:

1. Creating a shared definition of Equity for the MVSD;
2. Crafting and sharing specific instructional practices central to ensuring equitable experiences for students; and
3. Implementing a plan holding the school system accountable to these practices.

The MVSD Board’s charge now is to engage stakeholders in developing an Equity Policy capturing these three elements. They are clear that student, staff, family, and other community voices must inform the final policy and a teacher/community-led approach to policy development will result in a stronger and more sustainable commitment to equity work.

Angelica Garcia agreed that the district work won’t be fully complete unless it is supported long term, but she acknowledges the innovation within the region (A. Garcia, personal communication, August 28, 2019):

Although it takes time, I am thankful that the Mount Vernon School District has taken on the issue of equity and that we have equity leads in each of our schools. This is something that many districts in the area can’t say they have.

Our ultimate goal matches Robert Hand’s (R. Hand, personal communication, September 4, 2019):

If we ask students: Do you feel seen, do you feel visible, do you feel like school is representing you and teaching you in a way that you need to be taught? If not, what do we need to do? My hope is that we are willing to listen and put in the time to make the change.

The importance of including student voice to inform the District’s equity work going forward cannot be overstated (Hammond, 2015).

The change Hand, Garcia, and their colleagues are advocating for is essential if, “we are to avoid remaining trapped on a path that is not only generating greater inequality in academic outcomes but also contributing to deeper inequality within our society generally” (Blankstein and Noguera, 2015, p.3).

THANK YOU to SHAPE Washington, for their continued support of Washington State ASCD’s Whole Child School Award. The Whole Child School Award seeks to identify a Washington State School that has created a school culture with programs that exemplify two or more of the 5 tenets of the Whole Child. The recipient of the 2019 Whole Child School Award, Jemtegaard Middle School in Washougal, WA, received $500 sponsored by SHAPE Washington.

About SHAPE Washington

Mission SHAPE Washington supports coordinated efforts to foster healthy, active, educated, youth in Washington State through professional development, advocacy, community outreach, and partnerships.


SHAPE Washington is one of the oldest professional associations in Washington which is dedicated to the advancement and promotion of its allied fields of Health, Physical Education, Recreation, Dance, and Adapted Physical Education. https://www.shapewa.org/
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Introducing the ASCD Whole Child Network™

Transform your school through the proven ASCD Whole Child approach

- Learn more
- Register Here

As an educator, you have a tough job ahead of you: Promote the long-term development and success of each and every student in your care. That's the ASCD Whole Child approach to education.

ASCD's Whole Child approach is an effort to transition from a focus on narrowly defined academic achievement to one that promotes the long-term development and success of all children. Through this approach, ASCD supports educators, families, community members, and policymakers as they move from a vision about educating the whole child to sustainable, collaborative actions.

Register today for the new ASCD Whole Child Network!

Be part of ASCD's mission of educating the whole child by joining the ASCD Whole Child Network, a global network of schools focused on the same goals; engaged in the same processes; and with whose educators you can discuss issues, share insights, and exchange support.
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Comprehensive Sexual Health Education and Equity

By Laurie Dils

“Amid the ongoing debate over how Spokane students should be taught sex education, a Lewis and Clark High School senior’s research project stole the moment Wednesday.”

This is one of many examples of students acting in support of sexual health education that meets the needs of students rather than addressing the fears and concerns of adults. In Spokane, Isabel Greeley presented the findings of a survey she conducted with over 300 students in her high school. Students indicated not being satisfied with the sexual health education they were receiving, and wanting more information regarding sexual orientation, abortion, healthy relationships, communication, sexual abuse, and birth control (Clouse, 2018).

A student in a social studies class in the Woodland district created a survey to assess what topics seniors wanted offered in their 20-minute advisory period classes. Survey results led to development of an optional sexual health education “refresher course” that provides updates on content provided in ninth grade health education classes (Woodland School District, personal communication, September 7, 2019).

A statewide survey of 156 youth, conducted by OSPI in Spring 2019, indicated fewer than a quarter receiving the sexual health education they needed or wanted. More students learned about abstinence than other methods of prevention, in contrast to the requirements of the state’s Healthy Youth Act. Only about a quarter felt that it was appropriate for all sexual orientations and for students with all levels of ability (WYSH, 2019).

On Vashon Island two years ago, a high school student’s efforts led to a school-wide survey, ultimately resulting in school board adoption of a condom availability policy. Barriers to condom access were identified and students successfully made the case that their health care needs were not being addressed. Student action eventually contributed to the development of a sexual health peer education program and the creation of all-gender restrooms at the high school (Dils, 2017).

When we take the time to listen to youth, authentically centering their voice in a Whole School, Whole Community, Whole Child approach, we can begin to address the disconnect between what is being offered – or not offered – in many of our state’s districts and meeting the needs of students. We can begin to address educational equity in a few important areas. Equity is in question when all students are unable to access sexual health education that is consistent with state requirements, or when sexual health education is provided but it’s not relevant to them as individuals.

Washington’s Healthy Youth Act provides districts with the option of offering sexual health education to students, and further gives districts the ability to choose which curricula to use for that instruction, leading to significant variability across the state in access, quantity and quality of sexual health education provided. (HYA. 2007) This variability, while acknowledging the diversity of community norms and values related to sexuality education, results in some districts providing no instruction and some providing instruction that is counter to Healthy Youth Act requirements. This is an equity concern. Legislation considered in 2019 (Senate Bill 5395) and pre-filed...
legislation to be considered in 2020 (House Bill 2184) would require schools to provide K-12 comprehensive sexual health education, ensuring more universal access to much needed health information.

Rising rates of sexually transmitted diseases and sexual harassment and violence point to the critical need for better access to both information and skills. Given the large body of evidence establishing the association between comprehensive sexual health education and improved health outcomes, requiring such instruction would likely result in improved outcomes for Washington students (Washington State Board of Health, 2019).

Aside from general questions related to access to comprehensive sexual health education that meets students’ needs, it is concerning from an equity standpoint that so few districts address sexual orientation and gender identity in the classroom. The School Health Profiles Survey, which is administered to randomly selected secondary schools in Washington, confirms that schools are providing less coverage of sexual orientation and gender roles, identity and expression than other sexual health topics. Only 47% of middle schools and 67% of high schools cover these topics, significantly fewer than other sexual health topics (School Health Profiles Survey, unpublished data, 2018).

A 2018 article in the American Journal of Sexuality Education highlights sexuality and relationship education as an equity issue in schools, particularly for gender and sexual minority students. The author recommends more inclusive sexual health education. Results from the 2017 National School Climate Survey show that LGBTQ students who attend schools with inclusive curricula are less likely to feel unsafe because of their sexual orientation and gender identity, less likely to miss school, and more likely to have higher GPAs (Kosciw, 2018).

In fact, ALL students benefit when an LGBTQ-inclusive environment is provided, supporting a culture that values all students and a safer overall school climate. A study conducted in British Columbia found that schools with Gay-Straight Alliances (GSAs) and anti-homophobic bullying policies had lower rates of suicidal ideation and attempts among both LGBTQ students and heterosexual boys. (Saewyc. 2014) ETR, a non-profit health education organization, addressed this concern using their Health Equity Framework, resulting in a curriculum supplement for sexual health programs that supports LGBTQ-inclusive instruction (Quackenbush. 2018). There are many other resources available on OSPI’s sexual health education resources webpage to support inclusive instruction (HIV and Sexual Health Education Resources. n.d.).

Offering an inclusive sexual health education curriculum is one step in creating an inclusive school culture. Other areas of focus include:

- district and school policies (e.g. dress codes, gender expression and identity, harassment, restroom access, locker rooms, school dances)
- general school climate (e.g. use of inclusive language, visual audits, finding ways to create groups other than by gender, diverse library offerings, affirming signs in hallways and classrooms, clubs that focus on diversity, designation of “safe spaces”)
- family engagement (e.g. recognizing the diversity of families in the community, using curricula with family engagement/homework components, family surveys and curriculum nights)

The fact that so few students in special education programs receive sexual health education also points to an equity concern. Students in special education programs are often systematically excluded from sexual health education as a matter of course, based on assumptions about these students being asexual, not able to comprehend concepts, or not being mature or sophisticated enough to understand and use sexual health information. (Walters, F.P. 2018) The reality is that “comprehensive sexuality education can help these youth—and all youth—learn and practice the skills they will need to develop appropriate peer and intimate relationships” (DiGioia, 2014, p. xxxv).

Comprehensive sexual health education is especially important for students in special education programs, as children and youth with disabilities are more likely than those without disabilities to experience serious sexual offenses (Hershkowitz. 2007). Murphy, speaking on behalf of the American Academy of Pediatrics, (2006) argues that
children need to be provided developmentally appropriate sexuality education to help them attain a life with more personal fulfillment and protect them from exploitation, unplanned pregnancy, and STDs... Children with disabilities have the right to the same education about sexuality as their peers, but often there must be modification to the program to allow the information to be presented in such a way that the child can understand and learn it... (p. 401)

The Multnomah County Health Department, based in Portland, Oregon, developed a project called Sexual Health Equity for Individuals with Intellectual/Developmental Disabilities (SHEIDDD). They asked young people experiencing intellectual and developmental disabilities (I/DD) what they want from sexual health education. The responses included identity, sexual and reproductive rights, communication, and healthy relationships. Like many youth, they also want to benefit from peer education programs, both as recipients and educators. Youth in the project developed 13 guidelines to help youth experiencing I/DD get sexual health education that meets their needs (Multnomah County. n.d.).

Creating an inclusive learning environment for youth with I/DD involves working with parents/guardians and the youth themselves to get a sense of their strengths and challenges, as well as relevant aspects of their disability, asking what has worked in other settings to enhance learning, structuring the physical environment in a way to decrease distractions or make space for mobility devices, using a variety of teaching modalities to address a wide variety of learners, ensuring that enough context and specificity is provided to avoid confusion, and using programs based on universal design principles.

What does it mean to provide inclusive sexual health education? It means ensuring that ALL students see themselves reflected in instructional materials and content. OSPI’s website includes a rich assortment of resources to support educators in providing both population-specific instruction as well as comprehensive sexual health instruction that addresses the needs of a wide variety of students. We can and must do a better job meeting the needs of all students for education that supports a lifetime of sexual health, in an environment that recognizes sexuality as a natural and life-affirming part of being human.
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**Become a Washington ASCD Member!**

Washington State ASCD is the only educational organization in Washington State that reaches practitioners at all levels of education and your involvement is one of the keys to our success. As a member of WSASCD, you can take advantage of our member benefits.

**How will you benefit from joining WSASCD?**

- Professional development offerings at member rates
- Receive an award-winning eJournal, *Curriculum in Context*, twice a year
- Receive quarterly Newsletters and Newflashes via email to inform you about the latest WSASCD events and updates on educational issues in Washington.
- Attend regional workshops covering topics relevant to the needs of local educators
- Opportunities to earn clock hours when you attend WSASCD conference/workshops
- Opportunities for leadership, networking, and to attend events that will promote professional growth and development of members
- Membership in a community committed to promoting promising practices to ensure ALL students are safe, healthy, engaged, supported and challenged

Join [online](https://www.ascd.org) or call (360) 357-9535
Statistics in Schools and the 2020 Census
This is your chance to shape the future of every student for the next 10 years.

What Is Statistics in Schools?
Statistics in Schools (SIS) is a U.S. Census Bureau program (<www.census.gov/schools>) that uses census statistics to create classroom materials for grades pre-K through 12. Teachers and subject matter experts nationwide helped develop each SIS activity to make sure it is valuable and engaging. The SIS program is available now and includes more than 200 activities and resources in a variety of subjects.

What’s New for 2020?
SIS will have additional materials specifically for the 2020 Census. Available this September for the 2019-2020 school year:

- **67 new activities** for grades pre-K through 12 that have students use data in interactive ways to build skills in subjects like history, math, geography, and English.
- **Large, colorful maps** with fun, census-based facts about the country and its territories, including state-by-state comparisons.
- **A storybook** with activities and a **music video** for children in preschool and early grades.
- **Resources** for English language learners and adult English as a second language students.

How Does the Use of SIS Impact School Funding?
By using new SIS materials, you can educate students and the adults in their home on the Importance of counting everyone in the 2020 Census, especially children. Census responses drive decisions on the annual allocation of more than $675 billion in federal funds to states and communities, which includes support for school programs and services such as these:

- Special education
- Free and reduced-price lunch
- Class size reduction
- Classroom technology
- Teacher training
- After-school programs
- Head Start
Why Should You Get Involved?

By using and promoting the SIS program, you can:

- **Impact** the amount of federal funding received by schools in your community.
- **Influence** student readiness for learning.
- **Enhance** student learning across subjects.
- **Boost** students’ statistical literacy and data-finding skills.
- **Prepare** students for a data-driven world.
- **Empower** teachers to easily bolster their existing lesson plans.
- **Motivate** households to complete the 2020 Census form.

You Can Be the Difference

As a teacher, principal, superintendent, school board member, or education advocate, you can make a difference for student learning and school-related funding in your district.

- Use SIS activities, including new 2020 materials, and share your experiences with peers.
- Promote the use of SIS in your community’s schools by raising teachers’ awareness of the program and its value.
- Share information about SIS with your networks to expand its impact to benefit as many schools and students as possible.

Start Shaping the Future of Students Today! Visit the SIS website to access more than 200 free classroom activities, maps, and other resources. Search for activities by subject or grade level, pull up interactive data tools, and find videos that bring data to life.

CENSUS.GOV/SCHOOLS
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Case Study: Intentionally giving voice to youth from diverse ethnic backgrounds

By Kathleen Figetakis, David Syth, and Rosemary Ponnekanti

The Tacoma Ocean Fest Youth Story Contest is a local literacy project designed to inspire students around the topic of oceans. Rotary is an international philanthropic organization that began their international youth exchange program in 1929. However, there are millions of students who don’t have the resources or qualifications to become an exchange student. The Youth Story Contest (YSC) is a local Rotary attempt to serve those youth in other ways by intentionally giving a voice to youth from a variety of ethnic backgrounds.

Managed by Tacoma Sunrise Rotary, the YSC is an informal collaboration with anchor institutions in Tacoma including Tacoma Public Schools, Tacoma Public Library, Tacoma Art Museum, Tacoma Youth Marine Center, four local Rotaries and more. Middle school and high school youth are encouraged to express themselves on an environmental ocean theme through poetry, film, and data analysis/graphing. Incentives include pizza participation rewards, cash prizes, the opportunity to present their work at the Ocean Fest waterfront festival and more. Free poetry writing and filmmaking classes are offered to ensure all students have equal opportunity to develop skills.

Tacoma, with a population over 200,000 people, is a waterfront city in western Washington (US Census Bureau, 2019). The racial composition of children under 18 years of age in households is in Table 1. There are 20 public schools, 15 private schools, several charter schools and a nearby tribal school serving students of middle school and high school age.

Table 1: Race, children under 18 years of age in households in Tacoma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Margin of error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One race</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>+/- 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>+/- 1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>+/- 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>+/- 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>+/- 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>+/- 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>+/- 0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>+/- 1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Although American Indian and Alaska Native children statistically are only 1.6% of the Tacoma population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013-2017), the YSC management intentionally set a goal in 2019 to encourage the voice of all youth, especially indigenous students. The ocean theme is a shared value between indigenous and current residents and indigenous voices are vital to both community dialogue and ocean conservation.

The Youth Story Contest is run primarily by two volunteers. Although they have wide connections with teachers, the school district, and the arts/business/non-profit communities locally, they did not have connection with the indigenous community. Setting a goal that contest entries from indigenous students would be at least 1.6% of the entire contest entries was definitely a challenge.
Intention 1: Respect for tribal elders and leadership

An initial step was to consult with indigenous elders and regional leadership for permission and direction. To begin, the YSC project manager contacted the Tacoma Public Schools Title VI Indian education program. Title VI is part of the national Every Student Succeeds Act from 2015. Title VI coordinators from the Office of Indian Education work with local educational agencies, postsecondary organizations and tribes, supporting the unique cultural and educational needs of their students.

David Syth (Crow Nation), Indian Education Coordinator at Tacoma Public Schools, is an experienced, skilled administrator with a background in tribal school administration. David’s welcoming, relational communication style and oratives made the first of many in-person meetings productive. He intently listened to an explanation of the contest program design, made recommendations and identified where contest values aligned with tribal values.

After contacting David, he recommended other local indigenous leaders be informally consulted in person. They included the Puyallup Tribe of Indians culture director Connie McCloud, the City of Tacoma Office of Arts & Cultural Vitality arts program coordinator, and the Little Wild Wolves Youth/Community Center youth coordinator.

Puyallup tribal leadership agreed to distribute contest posters in the Chief Leschi tribal school and to encourage their youth to participate. Tribal leadership has much expertise in working with their youth and generously provides resources to support them.

Intention 2: Include and welcome indigenous culture

To make the inclusion meaningful and to demonstrate shared values to the elders and students, two local indigenous artists including a poet and filmmaker were invited to be among the 15 volunteer judges for the contest.

The Title VI coordinator provided a culture handout to all contest volunteers from Rotary and anchor institutions (view the handout). Volunteers were open to learning and were pleased to receive this helpful information.

YSC managers worked with anchor institutions to ensure indigenous culture was included.

Tacoma Ocean Fest commissioned an interactive mural by artist Ryan! Fedderson (Confederated Tribes of the Colville) for the festival. Storytelling, a shared value between the contest and the community, was a key factor in the artwork. At the artist’s recommendation, Tacoma Public Library staff provided story books at the festival and did hourly readings for younger children in a space in front of the artwork.

The Tacoma Art Museum provided a contest–affiliated poetry writing class free of charge to the community, using ocean-themed artwork. When the YSC project manager asked the Tacoma Art Museum to add an artwork by an indigenous artist to the class, they immediately acceded.

In informal communications, the contest project manager requested the public library add a work by a respected local indigenous author to their active stacks. After discussion, the library agreed to add the book to their stacks and purchased several more copies.

Additional artists invited to perform at the festival were an intentional mix of cultures, including the TUPAC West African dance troupe, Hula Hulau OkealaAkua Naniloa Mana’oakamia performing Hawaiian, Maori and Tahitian dance, and Miho & Diego playing Latin and Japanese music.

“Encouraging creativity in all our local youth, inspiring them to write, make films and graphs, is beneficial for their growth, their families and our community.”
Intention 3: Reflect student values in communications with them

Contest communication with students was intentionally designed to reflect their cultures. The main form of communication used in posters and social networking had a photo to emphasize inclusiveness for students of all cultures.

Every school was contacted by email, offering the opportunity to their students to participate in the YSC. Each of the 25 schools that responded was given contest posters at no charge.

Communication to the general student population focused on prizes and competition. For email distribution to all indigenous students and family in the school district, this communication was rewritten to be culturally sensitive, following guidance from David Syth. Changes included emphasizing community, family, and elders as well as the relationship to nature and the ocean. Prizes and competition were de-emphasized.

Input on contest design was sought from multiple student advisors. Student advisors were deliberately chosen from a mix of geographic areas. Several attended north side Stadium High School, where 35% of students receive free and reduced lunch (Washington Office of Public Instruction, 2018-2019). The majority were from the south side Henry T. Schatz location of Boys & Girls Club of South Puget Sound. Most of these students attend Gray Middle School, where 82% of students receive free and reduced lunch (Washington State Office of Public Instruction, 2018-2019). In one example of advice sought by contest management, the Boys & Girls Club students chose the naming convention for the graphing contest as well as advised on prizes and submission rules.

Following the contest, four student entrants from east side Lincoln High School (78% free and reduced lunch) (Washington State Office of Public Instruction, 2018-2019), met with a Tacoma City Council member, a teacher-librarian, the Tacoma City Council member, a teacher-librarian, the Tacoma Public Schools Director of Innovation, and YSC management to provide advice on future contest design.

Results: The Youth Story Contest exceeded its goal three times over

1. 4.8% percent of the entries were from indigenous youth, compared to the 1.6% expected. Other entries exceeding expectations included youth of Black/African American and Asian heritages. See Table 2 for data analysis.

2. Youth with indigenous heritage were voted among the contest finalists in all categories. (See all finalist and prizewinning works. Judges were blinded to entrants’ names, schools and all demographics other than age to ensure impartial judging.)

3. The Puyallup Tribe of Indians Canoe Family agreed to open the festival with a meaningful and beautiful blessing, song and dance.

4. Entrants and finalists ranged from those attending Annie Wright School, a private institution with a yearly tuition of $27,000 per year, to Lincoln High School, a public high school where 78% of students receive free and reduced lunch. Additionally, homeschoolers chose to participate as well.

5. Along with the usual public and private school entries, entries were received from the local tribal school, Chief Leschi Schools.

6. Several families attended the finalist boat ride event, including a family of indigenous heritage.

7. Students and families with indigenous heritage attended the festival, presented their works to the public, and received certificates/prizes during the festival.

Table 2: Race of Youth Story Contest entrants compared to general under-18 Tacoma population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
<th>Total YSC Entrants</th>
<th>YSC</th>
<th>Tacoma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One Race</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity/Race</th>
<th>Total YSC Entrants</th>
<th>YSC</th>
<th>Tacoma</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declined to report</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics tell one story, but interviews with entrants and family give wider insight. One student was inspired to try a different language: “I always loved writing poems. I always do it in Spanish. Actually doing it in English, it was weird because I have to find a rhyme, a rhythm.” That student placed in the contest finalists.

A family member stated, “It’s always good to educate people. Sometimes we don’t do things just because we don’t know how... But we’re very capable of doing great things, so I think that’s the message too, to those kids”.

Another student says, “This was my first experiment on thinking about a topic that’s super-important that affects a lot of things...Your art is your own.”

A third student: “I just wanted to try something new.” Added his father: “I’m proud of him...We have to look forward into the world so that we have a better planet for our children...It is big for them to voice their opinion”.

Encouraging creativity in all our local youth, inspiring them to write, make films and graphs, is beneficial for their growth, their families and our community. Our thanks to the elders and leaders of the indigenous community, whose passion and pride in their youth is inspiring. We invite you to contact us: David Syth (Crow Nation), dsyth@tacoma.k12.wa.us and Kathleen Figetakis, kfiget@gmail.com. We wish the best to you on intentionally encouraging the voice of your local youth.

A final note on terminology: In this article, several terms were used including “indigenous”, “American Indian”, “tribal”, “Indian”, and “Native American”. The current terminology some local residents indicated they prefer is “indigenous”. However, when referring to a specific tribe, “tribal” is more appropriate. “Indian” is a term consistent with Title VI language, while “Native American” is wording used by the U.S. Census Bureau.
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E-Mentoring Novice Teachers to Fill the Gap

By Kirsten Koetje

Working for a private university’s teacher education program, I know it can be somewhat of a Sudoku puzzle assigning field supervisors to student teacher interns. Endorsement background and geography play large roles in assignments. One year, I was asked to supervise an orchestra teacher who lived on the Olympic Peninsula. As a former high school French and English teacher, I had never formally played an instrument, and I lived in Tacoma which is very far from the Olympic Peninsula. What could I offer this accomplished, symphony-playing intern? Due to my online skills and the building up of our online program, I accepted this student and off we went. In addition to my support as her field supervisor, she also had a veteran orchestra teacher assigned as her mentor. However, my intern and her mentor were not at the same school, and her own teaching position split between two different school buildings. Thus, the three of us pieced together a mentorship arrangement for this accomplished musician to support her teaching and learning that year.

This scenario is not entirely unique. How do we offer relevant mentorship and guidance to novice or pre-service teachers spread out over geography and specialty areas? My orchestra intern happened to be both teacher candidate and teacher of record, which is considered Route 4 in the alternative certificate landscape of Washington. Strong mentorship programs have shown to help novice teachers increase knowledge of curriculum, building policies, and improve knowledge of disciplinary standards, and heighten feelings of professionalism (Hunt et al., 2013). Additionally, strong mentor programs have been modestly correlated to teacher retention (Hunt et al., 2013; Plecki, Elfers, & Windeken, 2017). In particular, limited certificate teachers who are both pre-service and novice teachers of record, covet expert guidance and suggestions as well as a safe place to ask questions as they navigate their first year teaching (Gareis & Nussbaum, 2007; Dorner & Kumar, 2017). Novice teachers are particularly vulnerable to leaving. Plecki, Elfers, and Windeken (2017) estimated that approximately 7% of teachers leave the workforce from year to year in Washington, but new teachers exit at a rate closer to 12%. However, districts that implemented a fully fledged mentoring and induction system had an exit rate for new teachers nearer to 6% (Plecki, Elfers, & Windeken, 2017).

Online mentoring, or e-mentoring, has seen a boom in the last couple of decades with the emergence of online technologies. Educators generally consider mentoring an effective practice for both pre-service and novice teachers within their first three years of teaching. The Revised Code of Washington requires pre-service teachers to be assigned three years relevant experience. Mentoring has shown to deliver technical, instructional, emotional, and social support (Dorner & Kumar, 2017; Lipton & Wellman, 2018). For instance, a mentor teacher can also provide technical support in how to use a school’s grading software, or how to use a Smartboard, and they can also provide instructional support by sharing lesson plans, or lending insight as to common student misconceptions. For example, a middle school science teacher may share specific activities with a mentor that they have found to be effective with students who come from limited backgrounds and understand how to implement them.

The addition of e-mentoring options expands the benefits of mentoring to locations and novice teachers who may otherwise not have access. Online mentoring options were first explored in the late 1990s, and have since grown to be a viable alternative to traditional face-to-face mentoring (Hunt et al., 2013). For example, e-mentoring has been shown to improve novice teachers’ knowledge of curriculum and pedagogy (Dorner & Kumar, 2017). However, e-mentoring also has its drawbacks, such as a lack of face-to-face interaction, which can affect the quality of the mentoring relationship. Additionally, e-mentoring requires a strong technological infrastructure and a reliable internet connection.
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in resistant to the idea of human-caused global warming, a topic covered by Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS). Mentors also provide emotional and social support, giving encouragement and a listening ear when a mentee feels overwhelmed. In addition to support, mentors also provide cognitive challenge and cast professional vision (Lipton & Wellman, 2018). The question becomes: How can we provide quality mentoring support to geographically isolated teachers or low incidence teaching areas?

Online or E-mentoring Advantages

Some locales, particularly rural and remote areas, have limited access to qualified content mentors. Online mentoring, or e-mentoring, provides a possible way to leverage content and veteran expertise from geographically distant places (Ceven McNally, 2015; Knapcyzk, Hew, & Frey, 2005). Even in similar geographic locations, online mentoring affords mentors and mentees a platform for flexible scheduling when teaching schedules prohibit live meetings (Gareis & Nussbaum, 2007; Knapcyzk et al., 2005). In addition to flexibility and wide geographic reach, e-mentoring provides other advantages. Online mentoring can deepen the requirement for content expertise and better match mentees’ teaching contexts with respect to content and age level (NCIPP, 2010; Sherman & Camilli, 2014). Preparation and induction programs can recruit from a wider pool of eligible mentors in an online model, striving to provide more congruent pairings of mentors’ experiences with mentees’ placement regarding content and context. Induction programs with a discipline-specific approach for novice science teachers have found to have better results than non-discipline-specific programs (Ceven McNally, 2015). Additionally, special education teachers have reported strong preference for mentors who can relate to their teaching context in both content and age level, which can be difficult to secure under geographic limitations (NCIPP, 2010). Online mentoring also inserts a certain level of distance that can enhance mentees’ feelings of independence, safety, and confidentiality, so that they are more willing to be honest about struggles at their local site (Gareis & Nussbaum, 2007). School politics can hinder a mentee from bringing up genuine scenarios on how to handle a workplace difficulty (Knapcyzk et al., 2005). The digital nature of e-mentoring activities, such as emails, discussion boards, and video observations, offers easy archival for future reference and program improvement purposes (NCIPP, 2010). Kahraman and Kuzu (2014) emphasize the situational and personal aspects of e-mentoring and refer to it as “just in time, just enough, and just for you.” Most e-mentoring structures allow mentees to ask specific questions or receive specific feedback on particular teaching scenarios or work artifacts.

Potential E-mentoring Pitfalls

Online mentoring falls susceptible to similar concerns as face-to-face mentoring. Mentoring relationships can suffer from a poor match between the mentor and the mentee. This mis-match might be due to professional reasons such as differing subject matter expertise or for more personal reasons, such as personality clashes (Knapcyzk et al., 2005; NCIPP, 2010; Sherman & Camilli, 2014; Yayli, 2018). On the mentee side, other concerns include unmet expectations, such as mentees desiring more specific feedback from their mentors (Knapcyzk et al., 2005). In Knapcyzk’s (2005) study of university pre-service students, some students reported frustration by having one set of instructions laid out by the program, with an additional set of questions and expectations laid out by their assigned mentors. On the mentor side, they report a higher sense of motivation when they feel efficacious. Mentors often feel unsure if what they are doing is helpful (Knapcyzk et al., 2005). Yayli (2018) reported that some mentors felt pressured into their role and experienced teacher candidates as a burden, relegating mentoring to a secondary role after their primary role of classroom teaching. Another issue that commonly arises is the mentor’s lack of recent knowledge, either content or pedagogical (Yayli, 2018). Both mentees and mentors dislike a sense of confusion and non-adherence to program expectations or timelines (Knapcyzk et al., 2005). Ceven McNally (2015) reported lack of structure to observations as a common pitfall, which often leads to a mess of notes without any implication for actionable follow-up goals. Lastly, but particularly salient to e-mentoring, lack of technology competence can hinder the effectiveness of e-mentoring programs (Dorner & Kumar, 2017).
The addition of e-mentoring options expands the benefits of mentoring to locations and novice teachers who may otherwise not have access. In order to provide quality mentors, the program must consider matching, mentor training, technology platforms, and mentoring structure. While one mentor may not have all of the expertise a mentee desires, such as subject matter expertise and experience in an urban setting, a skilled mentor can help the mentee develop a network of resources to fill the gaps. This was the case with my orchestra intern. I did not have the subject matter expertise, but I could provide some support, such as emotional support and general instructional guidance like how to conduct performance assessments; French and orchestra both involve performance aspects not captured by written assignments. Her content mentor provided excellent subject matter expertise for organizing an orchestra and all those bodies and instruments in one room. The mentor should have some recognizable expertise to match the mentee’s need and circumstance. The program must decide upon technical logistics for the program, such as which online communication platform to use, and leaders must train everyone in the technical components of those programs (NCIPP, 2010; Knapcyzk, Hew, & Frey, 2005). Clear expectations must be laid out and relayed to all stakeholders such as roles, timelines, frequencies, and goals of mentorship (Knapcyzk, Hew, & Frey, 2005; NCIPP, 2010; Yayli, 2018). One role of the mentor should include data collection and driving goal-oriented conversations so that mentees are setting actionable and measurable goals for themselves (Ceven McNally, 2015; Lipton & Wellman, 2018).

Promising E-Mentoring Strategies—Video Analysis with Focus

Online e-mentoring, just as face-to-face mentoring, can use a variety of models for different purposes. The following list provides options for the e-mentoring menu:

- Content-expert mentors provide focused lesson plan feedback in an online forum (Sherman & Camilli, 2014).
- Mentors and mentees analyze a sequence of video recorded observations that include a three-part protocol of a) a pre-observation focus chosen by the mentee, b) mentee records and reviews lesson separately, and c) mentor and mentee discuss lesson in a post-observation conference. This strategy has a goal of educative mentoring. It refrains from evaluative feedback or role modeling. In educative mentoring, the mentor aims to collect data, highlight evidence, and use an investigative stance with inquiry-based questions. (Ceven McNally, 2015)
- Mentees post a behavior intervention plan for their own classroom to an online forum where they receive feedback and advice for particular problems of practice (Knapcyzk et al., 2005).
- Mentees post weekly online discussion board comments specifically around instances in the classroom where they see a gap between theory and practice. This model uses group e-mentoring with a cohort of novice teachers assigned to the same mentor in a discussion forum. (Yayli, 2018)
- A trained mentor facilitates an online collaborative learning group of subject-specific novice teachers using an online communication platform (Dorner & Kumar, 2017).
- In Mentoring Matters by Lipton and Wellman (2018), they advocate for e-mentoring strategies as an accompaniment to face-to-face mentoring when scheduling and other factors hinder live meetings. Tools for e-mentoring include structured written communication tools, such as double entry journals where the mentee writes in one column a particular question or problem, and the mentor responds at a later time in another column in digital format.

When considering e-mentoring design, andragogy literature suggests that adults direct their own learning (Zepeda, 2012). Adults are more motivated when they can select an authentic area of development that pertains to their particular context (Zepeda, 2012). In Focus on Teaching: Using Video for High-Impact Instruction, Knight (2014) explains that teachers are more inclined to be defensive regarding feedback on more artful or complex
practices, such as teaching. Thus, the strategy chosen for e-mentoring relationships depends upon the customized goal of the e-mentees, which stems from their understanding of the classroom and their identified needs. Otherwise, mentees may dismiss e-mentors’ feedback as irrelevant. For instance, a special education teacher may have an urgent self-identified need in behavior management, which aligns well with the behavior intervention plan e-mentoring strategy where the mentee asks for specific advice on the plan. Elsewhere, other novice teachers may desire more targeted feedback on their daily instructional opener and benefit from the e-mentoring focused video observation structure.

I coordinate online supervision for a private university teacher education program. While supervisors have an evaluative role not usually present in a mentor relationship, they do perform a similar role as mentors in preparing future teachers. Supervisors provide support, cognitive challenge, and cast professional vision. Our online supervision program runs very similarly to the Ceven-McNally (2015) qualitative study of the e-Mentoring for Student Success (eMSS) program for novice science teachers, which relied on video observations. In that study, the mentor-mentee pairings conducted four video observation cycles. The mentee’s chosen focus set the agenda for a post-observation conversation. Comments from the mentees and mentors in that study echo our own video supervision program.

- So, rather than skimming on top of everything that was going on, we could go deeper into that one aspect and focus more on why she thinks she was at one location more than others. We could talk about ability levels and group dynamics, and really focus on that, instead of trying to cover everything. Mentor (Ceven McNally, 2015)
- ...what I hear the mentees tell me in theory, in emails, in conversations and so forth, is often very different from what I see happen in the classroom. Mentor (Ceven McNally, 2015)
- I could get specific insight into how students were interacting in POGIL groups and whether they were actually collaborating and sharing ideas, or just going along with what others were saying. I also had a better idea of where students were struggling as I went through the video of class discussions. It’s hard to see some things in the moment, but afterwards it is helpful to reflect. Mentee (Author’s university)
- Honestly, I was able to see myself improve over a period of time with the video recordings. I could see how I began to change and relax with my students, [sic] this was great to see with my own eyes. Mentee (Author’s university)

After realizing the many benefits of video self-analysis, our university program now requires that teacher candidates choose a focus question to guide their viewing of at least 10 minutes of each of their classroom recordings and self-assess before discussing with their supervisor. In addition to adding open-ended comments to the video analysis software, observers can time-stamp markers aligned to each of the university’s eight teaching program standards, which align to Washington’s “state eight” teaching standards, so interns can become familiar with looking for standards-based evidence.

When developing an e-mentoring program, designers need to thoughtfully consider mentor professional development, and, ideally, embed the trainings into their regular work (Ceven McNally, 2015; Heiney-Smith, 2018; NCIPP, 2010; Zepeda, 2012). States such as Washington have put much effort into identifying key mentoring standards and creating a thoughtful mentor training curriculum. Washington’s Beginning Educator Support Team (BEST) program uses Lipton and Wellman’s (2018) Mentoring Matters workbook and accompanying resources. Dorner and Kumar’s (2017) study found perception of online communication to be the most important factor impacting e-mentee satisfaction. Designers can set out clear expectations for technology use, frequency of contact, and response time. Lastly, programs can equip e-mentors to focus on specific aspects of novice teacher development and collect relevant data on that topic. For instance, if culturally responsive teaching (CRT) emerges as a topic of interest, programs will provide e-mentors with tools such as rubrics and checklists to promote CRT-targeted conversations with
their e-mentees. While e-mentoring programs certainly want to provide emotional support and impact teacher retention, by supporting teacher effectiveness, both instructional and employment goals can be positively influenced. When I mentored my orchestra teacher years ago, we used video analysis and lesson plan feedback strategies paired with online conferencing for debrief and reflection. We also created a network of resources for her to use including various websites and her content orchestra mentor. No one mentor can provide all of the support for another teacher, in either an online model or a face-to-face situation; however, e-mentors can fill a role that may not otherwise have been filled had it never been an option and even offers certain advantages.
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Innovative Approaches to Access and Equity for All Learners

Kirsten Koetje brings 10 years of teaching high school English and French to her teacher educator roles at Seattle Pacific University (SPU). During that time, she served public and private students in brick and mortar schools and online. Additionally, she taught in the Peace Corps with her husband in rural Mozambique. Kirsten feels privileged to have such a wide perspective on education today and has a passion for championing teachers. Kirsten has been preparing teachers at SPU since 2013. She currently coordinates the Alternative Routes to Certification program and facilitates the online supervision program. In 2017, Kirsten won the Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges of Teacher Education (AILACTE) Graduate Scholar Award. Presently, Kirsten is working on her PhD dissertation on video analysis in teacher preparation.

ASCD Emerging Leader Program

Congratulations to the 2019 Class of ASCD!

Educators selected for the Emerging Leaders program have been in the education profession for 5–15 years; demonstrate a passion for learning, teaching, and leading; come from a diverse range of positions, locations, cultural backgrounds, and perspectives; hold promise as leaders; and are committed to ASCD’s beliefs and to pursuing leadership opportunities. Washington State ASCD is proud to recognize two ELs from our state -Sean McGeeney and Hope Teague-Bowling! Read more about each 2019 Emerging Leader here.

2019 Washington State ASCD Emerging Leaders

Sean McGeeney
Yakima Public Schools
@DrSeanMcGeeney

Hope Teague-Bowling
American Community School of Abu Dhabi
@EspiOnFire
TEACHING, LEARNING, AND LEADING MATHEMATICS

Speakers Grace Kelemanik and Amy Lucenta
authors of
Routines for Reasoning:
Fostering the Mathematical Practices in All Students

JANUARY 22, 2020 | 9:00 AM - 3:00 PM
TUKWILA COMMUNITY CENTER

This professional learning opportunity will be focused on those teaching/supporting Grades 2–8. However, all who register will have the opportunity to apply the learning to their role/work.

This PD may be eligible for Title I or Title II funding, please contact your program director.
Registration link: http://www.wasa-oly.org/WSASCDjan22
Executive Connections

By Carrie Lam

Washington State ASCD is honored to serve educators in varying roles – our membership is open to teachers, principals, assistant principals, building leaders, superintendents, professors, central office leaders, in-service teachers, and retirees. WSASCD is an association of educators who collectively agree that ALL students should benefit from a Whole Child education.

WSASCD’s board of directors is made up of representatives from each ESD region along with representatives from OSPI, higher education, and student intern. WSASCD strives to provide relevant resources and valuable opportunities for educators to continue to grow and foster educating the Whole Child. I am excited to share with WSASCD members upcoming professional development and programs.

On January 22, 2020, WSASCD is partnering with Curriculum Associates to host: Learning, Teaching, and Leading Mathematics with Grace Kelemanik & Amy Lucenta, authors of Routines for Reasoning: Fostering the Mathematical Practices in All Students. This PD maybe eligible for Title I and Title II - School Improvement funding, contact your program director. Register here!

WSASCD is thrilled to continue our partnership with CharacterStrong. WSASCD will serve as the clock hour provider for their trainings. CharacterStrong curricula and trainings are focused on fostering the Whole Child with vertically-aligned lessons that teach SEL and character, side-by-side. CharacterStrong has two, two-day trainings coming your way this January 11-12, 2020 at Green River Community College in Auburn AND Chinook Middle School, in Kennewick! Register by 12/20 with the code CSWASHINGTON and save 20%. When you register for a CharacterStrong training please mention WSASCD on your form, a part of your registration will go directly to our affiliate. Visit CharacterStrong.com to learn more | CharacterStrong Trainings Schedule

In February, we will begin accepting nominations for the 2020 WSASCD Awards Program. Each year we look forward to recognizing a school with the Whole Child Award. The Whole Child Award seeks to honor a school for their sustained efforts in the systems and programs that have designed and put into action around two or more tenets of the Whole Child. We also seek to honor an educator with the Outstanding Young Educator Award-OYEA! The OYEA recognizes an educational leader (40 years and younger) who is an exceptional leader within their classroom, school building, and community. The nomination application for each award will be available on the WSASCD website on February 7th through April 10th, 2020. You can learn more about the awards program and past recipients here.

On behalf of WSASCD Board of Directors I want to thank the authors who have contributed to this journal, as well as the editorial team and publisher for producing this professional resource for WSASCD members.

In closing I want to thank YOU for your daily commitment to learn, teach, and lead. Together through innovation and collaboration you are making a positive impact for students in Washington State.

Carrie Lam is the executive coordinator for Washington State ASCD. Before becoming a parent, she taught first grade in the Renton School District. If you have an interest in partnering or have a professional learning idea, please contact me at CarrieLamASCD@gmail.com
Call for Articles: 2020 Spring/Summer Issue

The theme for the Spring/Summer 2020 issue of Curriculum in Context is **THE 21st CENTURY IS NOW**. The next issue will focus on the reality that educators, public sector and business leaders alike discuss “21st century skills” as a forward-thinking mentality, while in actuality we are already twenty-percent through the century by the year 2020.

Some related topics under this theme that may contribute to the conversation include but are not limited to:

- Examples of programs, school or district initiatives that redefine or exemplify what “readiness” means for 2020 graduates
- Examples of innovative pathways for teaching civics, CTE, or social studies
- Incorporation of the new Social Studies standards as a way to prepare students who are globally aware citizens
- Examples of curriculum or pedagogy that empowers and prepares students to be environmental change agents
- School or district initiatives that prepare students for digital literacy and/or digital safety
- Higher education studies that examine digital literacy

Submission Guidelines

Potential articles submitted for the *Learn* section should be a current book review between 500 and 750 words and should include the APA reference for the book.

Manuscripts for the *Teach and Lead* section should be between 850 and 2500 words, focus on either the classroom (i.e., teacher) perspective or the leadership perspective, and include citations written in APA format.

Please submit questions or articles for consideration by **April 1, 2020** to:

- Dr. Jill Heiney-Smith, Managing Editor  
  heineysmithj@spu.edu
- Dr. Pete Renn, Co-editor  
  renp@spu.edu
- Emily Huff, Co-editor  
  huffe@spu.edu