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Introduction

Across the country it is evident that schools and communities are concerned about how to improve the way barriers to learning and development are addressed. The concern is reflected in efforts to promote such concepts as school linked services, coordinated and integrated services, full service schools, and community schools. From the perspective of many school professionals, none of these concepts captures the sense of the various interventions carried out by pupil services personnel and others who are employed by schools to carry out education support programs. And, from our perspective, such concepts tend to bypass the need for fundamental reform and restructuring of the resources of schools so that every school can evolve the type of comprehensive, multifaceted, and integrated approaches that can address barriers to development and learning.

Over the last decade, appreciation of the need to reform and restructure education support programs has emerged as a critical concern. On Monday, May 22, 2000, a group of leaders involved in pioneer initiatives participated in a day-long “summit” meeting. The session was conceived as part of an ongoing process to support and enhance such initiatives. Participants in the interchange (1) explored lessons learned, (2) clarified where the various initiatives are heading, (3) problem-solved around existing or anticipated difficulties, and (4) delineated ways in which such initiatives can continue to support each other and anyone else who is interested in similar reforms.

Represented were

- Memphis City Schools – where the reform was designed as a comprehensive restructuring at all levels so that every school site could evolve a student support system that effectively addresses barriers to learning

- Detroit Public Schools – where schools are using the mechanism of a Resource Coordinating Team and the concept of an enabling component as a framework to develop an integrated “Learner Support System”

- Los Angeles Unified School District – where Organization Facilitators (systemic change agents) are enhancing Learning Supports at the school cluster level
C Hawai‘i Dept. of Education – where a “Comprehensive Student Support System” (CSSS) is being developed throughout the state in ways that fully integrate with the instructional and management components at school sites.

C Washington State Office of Public Instruction – where the concept of a “Supportive Learning Environment” is used to enhance and integrate school and community collaborations for student and family support.

C California Department of Education – which uses the concept of “Learning Support” and is exploring how to enhance integration of its various education support systems.

C New American School’s Urban Learning Center model -- the only comprehensive school reform model to incorporate a comprehensive, multifaceted, and integrated approach to addressing barriers to learning.

The materials in this document were provided by the participants. Some editing and reformatting has been done to facilitate reproduction.

An executive summary and the full report from the summit are intended to accompany this document. The entire set is meant as a stimulus for moving forward with efforts across the country to reform and restructure education support programs. The report provides a context for such work, attempts to distill the essence and richness of the initiatives, and explores some next steps.

Howard Adelman & Linda Taylor
Note: The following materials reflect the pioneering initiative in the Memphis City Schools begun under the administration of Superintendent House and her Associate Superintendent Barbara Jones. After Superintendent House left the district in April, the work continued and was presented at the May summit.

However, in late June 2000, the interim superintendent indicated there would be changes. As of June 30, when this collection of materials was compiled, it was uncertain what aspect of the initiative would be affected.