EDUCATORS CHALLENGING POVERTY AND LATINO LOW ACHIEVEMENT: EXTENDING AND ENRICHING THE SCHOOL DAY

Margaret Sauceda Curwen[14]
Chapman University, Orange, CA

Anaida Colón-Muñiz[15]
Chapman University, Orange, CA

ABSTRACT

Latino students, as children of historically underachieving populations, often have their academic success in jeopardy. For many schools, after-school programs complement the regular school day, with more than half of the 49,700 U.S. elementary schools having one or more on-site programs. Such programs vary in intent, purposes, and resources and typically emphasize remediation rather than developing interests or competencies in curricular areas beyond language arts and math. This qualitative case study explores the practices of one dual language elementary school in a high poverty Latino community and its academic/enrichment extended day program. Wenger's (1998) community of practice framework captures the mutual engagement, joint enterprise, and shared repertoire of practices tightly woven between the regular school day's classroom teachers and the after-school instructional assistants. This investigation provides insight into collaborative efforts that can counter the isolation, segregation, and mediocrity of school experiences that children in poverty often experience and provide points for offering dual language and cultural experiences through an extension of the school day.

Keywords: After school elementary program, Dual immersion,
Latino/bilingual education, Community of practice, Academic achievement

Poverty plagues Latino communities more than ever in recent history (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011) with Latino children weighted by the greatest share of poverty (37%), compared to their White (30.5%), and African-American (26.6%) counterparts (Jordan, 2011). Further, "[o]f the 6.1 million Latino children living in poverty, more than two-thirds are the children of immigrant parents" (Lopez & Velasco, 2011, p. 5). The strong correlation between poverty and low academic achievement (Hout, 2011) perpetuates a cycle of poverty that Ladson-Billings (2006) attributes to this group's persistent academic achievement gap.

Latino children comprise nearly one-half of the overall student population

---

[14] **Margaret Sauceda Curwen** is an Assistant Professor in the College of Educational Studies at Chapman University in Orange, California. Her research includes sociocultural contexts of literacy and learning. Dr. Curwen can be reached at Chapman University, One University Drive, Orange, CA 92866 or at mcurwen@chapman.edu .

[15] **Anaida Colón-Muñiz** is an Associate Professor of Education at Chapman University in Orange, California. Her research interests include bilingual multicultural education, teacher education, and the educational civil rights of Latinos. Dr. Colón-Muñiz can be reached at Chapman University, One University Drive, Orange, CA 92866 or at acolon@chapman.edu.

in California where this study takes place. As children of historically underachieving populations, Latino students often find their academic success in jeopardy (Orfield, 2002; Rist, 2000). Children growing up in poverty often attend schools that have lost funding. For example, in California 11.1% in funding to schools was dropped between 2007 and 2011 (California Budget Project, 2012). This daunting financial reality has limited the level of support and enrichment that public schools provide children, especially beyond traditional schooling hours.

One approach that schools have used is augmenting the school day with after-school programs. In the U.S., more than half of the 49,700 elementary schools have one or more on-site after-school programs (Parsad & Lewis, 2009) that vary in intent, purposes, resources, and institutional affiliation. While some out-of-school learning environments are dynamic spaces for dual language development, problem-solving skills, and peer group interdependence (see Vasquez, 1994; Gutiérrez, Banquedano-Lopez, & Alvarez, 2001), many after-school programs are limited by their requirements to meet funding conditions and focus on "particular conceptions of achievement and reading" (Kirkland & Hull, 2011, p. 720).

One school's after-school program is recently credited for impressive academic gains for students. Located in a high-poverty neighborhood with a high concentration of immigrant families, primarily from Mexico, this dual-immersion school's extended day program has evolved to seamlessly link the learning from the regular school day with creative enrichment experiences after school. While research into after-school programs is typically evaluative (Kirkland & Hull, 2011), this qualitative case study explores the nature of one elementary school's practices, processes, and routines that involve engagement between classroom teachers and after-school program instructional assistants to enhance student learning. Insight into promising educational practices can provide learning contexts—such as robust after-school programs— to counter the isolation, segregation, and mediocrity of school experiences that children in poverty often experience (Orfield, Siegel-Hawley, & Kucsera, 2011).

Literature Review of After-School Programs

With No Child Left Behind (NCLB), school districts have used special funding to supplement the hours of daily instruction by creating after-school programs. These programs range from stand-alone day care, academic instruction/tutoring, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, and other broad-based programs (e.g., content specific) (Parsad & Lewis, 2009). Typically programs emphasize remediation and rarely develop interests or competencies in curricular areas besides language arts and math.

In an analysis of best practices, Huang, Cho, Mostafavi, and Nam (2010) in their nationwide study of 53 promising after-school programs identified key characteristics including the following elements: establishing academic goals linked to standards; strong leadership; staff development and retention; availability of academic and enrichment programs; and research-based instructional strategies. Relevant to this current study, there were structural,

program, and instructional concerns including the following challenges: (1) little coordination between regular school and after-school program; (2) sparse professional development and/or uneven participation; (3) staff's lack of clarity between standards and instruction; and (4) students' limited opportunity for practicing skills during the after-school program that had been learned in the regular school day.

These findings echo California Tomorrow's national survey which found that most after-school programs serving students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds have neither skilled staffing nor training to support students in their home language and English development (Bhattacharya, et al., 2002). These points were corroborated by McNair and Wambalaba (2006) who suggested, "programs must go beyond what they provide for mainstream students and pay particular attention to the social, cultural, linguistic, and literacy needs of diverse students and families" (p. 3). With the federal government's recent investment of $3.6 billion in after-school programs (Durlak & Weissberg, 2007), naturalistic studies, such as this one, can provide insight into practices of learning environments for supporting today's students.

A Community of Practice Perspective

Wenger's (1998) social theory of learning explores how learning occurs in arenas through individuals' participation in a community of meaningful practices. It is applicable to understanding the ongoing interaction by classroom teachers and instructional aides at Sunshine Elementary Charter School (pseudonym) in unifying the school's regular day instruction with its academic and enrichment-based after-school program. According to Wenger, a community of practice is characterized by three dimensions. First is *mutual engagement*, which includes the ability of individuals to engage and respond to one another's actions. Second is *joint enterprise*, which is the mutual accountability of a group's members to contribute in the pursuit of the community's goals. Lastly is the *shared repertoire* of resources between participants that are understood and taken up by the group. The use of the repertoire, which includes tools, artifacts, gestures, stories, and resources, is in constant negotiation among participants (cf. Gutiérrez & Rogoff, 2003). Other aspects include apprenticing newcomers to the learning community through differing levels of engagement and acknowledging *legitimate peripheral participation*.

To establish community membership, individuals must demonstrate competency in the community's valued behaviors, dispositions, and actions. A community of practice is not necessarily utopian and in fact can be sites for tension as humans negotiate, exercise agency, and interpret particular practices. This social learning theory is instrumental because, "[a]s a locus of engagement in action, interpersonal relations, shared knowledge, and negotiation of enterprises, such communities hold the key to real transformation—the kind that has real effects on people's lives" (Wenger, 1998, p. 85). We found a community of practice explanatory framework useful in understanding the nature of shared practice between educators as they sought to provide intervention and enrichment

instruction for children.

Background and Context

School Context

Sunshine Elementary School is an independent charter school selected as an exceptional case. Located in Southern California, this community K-8 school serves approximately 700 mostly Latino children of whom 80% qualify for the federal free- or reduced-lunch program and 70% are English language learners. While a spate of state legislation in the late 80s and 90s has all but eliminated bilingual education (Halcón, 2001; Moll & Ruiz, 2002), this school operates as a dual-immersion English-Spanish bilingual educational site that leads to fluency in both languages. Science content instruction, as well as the arts, is emphasized in and across both the regular school day and the after-school program. Families are required to contribute twenty service hours a year. The school has received numerous awards including state recognition for academic excellence. According to school administrators, its Academic Performance Index (API), which measures a school's academic performance and improvement (California Department of Education), has increased substantially, from the mid-500s in 2005 to surpassing the state's target of 800 in 2011.

After-School Program

The connection between the regular school day and the after-school intervention program is strategically structured. According to a school administrator, the after-school program has been purposely transformed from "45 kids doing homework at a lunch table" when started in 2005 to one that today is focused on the holistic needs of 350 students. The administrators attribute the regular school's academic growth to the after-school program's complex collaborative model, which includes the following elements: (a) academic and enrichment focus; (b) classroom teachers leading instructional focus; and (c) expansion from a voluntary few days to required five days a week. The program's students have been identified as underperforming in their regular classroom and attend with parental agreement. There are eighteen instructional assistants who work both during the regular school day and after school to provide the small group instruction rotating in language arts, math, and other content areas. Other instructors provide enrichment in visual and performing arts, physical education, and chess. The students are divided into three intervention groups based on levels and needs, which are dynamically formed with students' progress monitored weekly. High levels of accountability measures have been built in so no student is locked into one group but rather grows with the program.

Methods and Data Sources

In this qualitative case study (Stake, 2000; Yin, 2004), we used

ethnographic methods over two years to gather data. As an intrinsic and instrumental study (Stake, 2000), it provides ways to address a particular aspect of a situation (i.e., one after-school program) and adds further understanding to an issue (i.e., educational supports for bilingual children in a low-income context). As university researchers, we conducted five observations of after-school classrooms and one to two observations of each K-5 grade level's collaborative planning meetings. We attended various school events throughout the year. Formal and informal interviews (Fontana & Frey, 2001) were conducted with two school administrators, six classroom teachers, and seven after-school instructional assistants. Typically, the instructional assistants are simultaneously attending community or four-year colleges, and may or may not have chosen education as a career. Participation was voluntary. The audiotaped interviews ranged from 30 to 60 minutes and were professionally transcribed. School document artifacts were also collected. Field notes documented observations and early analytic steps.

Wenger's (1998) framework was used as a unit of analysis and theoretical backdrop (Stake, 2000) into the nature of participants' engagement in cultural practices, processes, and shared resources. Transcripts, field notes, and memos were analyzed initially using open coding and then selective coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1998) in conversation with the three dimensions of a community of practice. A constant comparative method was used to categorize themes and patterns in the data (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). Data sources were triangulated to check the integrity of researcher inferences. Member checking and peer debriefing provided ongoing feedback to confirm and disconfirm evolving research themes and strengthen the soundness of categories.

Findings

The practices, processes, and routines between Sunshine School's elementary classroom teachers and the after-school program's instructional assistants were tightly woven between the regular school day and the on-site after-school program. The following sections elaborate on each dimension aligned with the community of practice's framework. Participants' comments are enclosed in quotation marks.

Engaging as an Instructional Team

Wenger contends that within a community of practice, participants must demonstrate the ability to "engage with other members and respond in kind to their actions…[which becomes] the basis for an identity of participation" (1998, p. 137). There are several ways that the classroom teachers and instructional assistants meaningfully engaged.

One structural practice is the instructional assistants' dual role providing support in a classroom teacher's instruction during the day and in the after-school program assuming the primary teaching responsibility. This dual role provides the instructional assistants and classroom teachers with certain affordances. For example, instructional assistants are able to observe a classroom teacher not only

introducing a concept such as a language arts objective incorporating adjectives into elementary students' writing but also an appropriate pedagogical approach. According to one school administrator, this practice enables an instructional assistant to incorporate "the same strategies, the same techniques." This pedagogical overlap reinforces students' continuity of learning from the regular school day to the after-school program.

Informal conversations between the classroom teachers and instructional assistants during transitions or recess breaks are opportunities to clarify pedagogical techniques, review a lesson plan, or inquire about a particular student. This mutual teaching does not escape the students' notice either. Educators reported students are more likely to self-monitor their behavior throughout the day because of the ongoing communication of their "*maestras*" (teachers). So crucial is this continual dialogue that one new instructional assistant, whose first educational experience is being shaped at Sunshine Elementary, expressed surprise that other programs do not always build in similar communication and organizational structures.

A second practice is the "teamwork" built during the weekly one-half hour grade level planning meetings between classroom teachers and their after-school counterparts. These meetings target academic concepts for review, address individual children's progress or needs, and provide classroom management techniques. Instructional assistants who are newcomers to the profession seek guidance from the more experienced classroom teachers. During one meeting, an instructional assistant frustrated about a child's reluctance to participate in after-school instruction was quickly mentored by other classroom teachers:

Instructional Assistant:	[Student name] is not participating. [She] says, "No!"
Classroom Teacher-1	She's really shy and doesn't want to get things wrong.
Classroom Teacher-2	Maybe give her more time.
Instructional Assistant:	I just ask her to read…
Classroom Teacher-2	She whispers and [during my class], I keep her right in front of me.

In this vignette, two classroom teachers offer an alternative perspective of the child's seemingly reticent nature and concrete suggestions for supporting the child. Sharing instruction means shared attention to the child's academic, social, and behavioral needs. Solutions are strength-based, child-centered, and respectful of the child's potential as a learner. As developing educators, instructional assistants value the expertise and support of the classroom teachers noting, "[The classroom teacher is] always good at backing me up." The feeling is mutual: a classroom teacher reflected on the partnership with her instructional assistant, noting, "She's [the] eyes on the back of my head."

Lesson plan development is a third collaborative practice. Although instructional assistants have access to all school materials and resources, there is not a pre-packaged after-school curriculum. The instructional assistants are expected to write, "…five pages [lesson] or more for each week" to be reviewed and refined by classroom teachers. At each grade level meeting, the classroom

teachers provide a list of literacy and math topics to be covered during the upcoming after-school sessions. This information was often conveyed with specific plans for how the material was to be taught. Consistent with a community of practice perspective, the responsibility of writing lesson plans reify the instructional assistants' contribution as educators in the students' learning (Wenger, 1998).

In these practices, the participants are engaged in meaningful and mutually supportive ways (Wenger, 1998). One classroom teacher noted, "We are one group united to help the kids. It's not an after-school program, it's an extended day program." Classroom teachers are quick to express appreciation to the instructional assistants and vice versa. Interviews with instructional assistants noted their ease in asking the classroom teacher not only about pedagogical techniques but also to genuinely inquire into their personal lives, noting the interdependency in their efforts. More than one educator remarked, "It's like we are family."

Contributing to the School Community's Goals

In a community of practice, individuals participate in joint enterprise and "take some responsibility and contribute to its pursuit and ongoing negotiation by the community" (Wenger, 1998, p. 137). One of Sunshine School's goals is developing students' English and Spanish proficiency. All classroom teachers, instructional assistants, and school administrators are bilingual and value the respective languages that children and family choose to use. In some grade level meetings, the school's educators communicate primarily in Spanish and during other grade level meetings they agilely code-switch between languages. Great attention is paid to incorporating the academic language specific to each grade level. This is paramount. In the first-grade team planning meeting, the classroom teacher took the lead in identifying appropriate use of the language arts teacher's edition as a resource in including Spanish academic language in an upcoming letter writing lesson. The ensuing discussion revolved around writing conventions and academic language. She mentioned the following phrases and words: "palabras sobre ortografia;" "escribir lentamente"; "incluir un saludo como querido"; "ser positivo"; "finalmente, corregir " (words about spelling; writing slowly; including a salutation, such as "dear"; being positive; finally, correcting). The instructional assistants recorded notes in their weekly lesson plan books. Since third grade is a pivotal time of transition to English language, with nearly 90 percent of the third grade enrolled in the after-school program, English language development is emphasized.

Similarly other academic goals are aligned with state content area standards and closely monitored. The instructional assistants administered the weekly quizzes prepared by the classroom teacher to assess students' progress. In a first-grade level planning meeting, one instructional assistant and a classroom teacher discussed the literacy needs of a particular child:

Classroom teacher:	I know he struggles more [in writing than reading].
Instructional assistant:	He's great. He's verbal.
Classroom teacher:	In whole group he gets distracted. If it is a topic of interest, he will talk
Instructional assistant	I noticed last week during free write [inaudible]. Yesterday, we were lining up for recess. He was reading a book.

In the above interaction, the classroom teacher shares her knowledge of the child's academic strengths and needs. For her part as a legitimate peripheral participant (Wenger, 1998), the instructional assistant provides valuable anecdotal information about the child's literate behavior that might otherwise be invisible to the classroom teacher. Her competency as a knowledgeable educator attuned to the child's success is recognized as an integral contribution.

Professional development of all educators is paramount to keep teachers current with quality teaching (Desimone, Porter, Garet, Yoon, & Birman, 2002). Therefore, Sunshine Elementary has developed structures to develop pedagogy skills and monitor growth of after-school instructional assistants through participation, observation, and feedback mechanisms. Instructional assistants participate in professional development alongside classroom teachers in topics such as Guided Language and Academic Development (GLAD) and Thinking Maps®, encouraging a common understanding of pedagogical practices.

Classroom teachers conduct weekly formal observations of instructional assistants with debriefing conferences afterwards. One classroom teacher emphasized the value of these conferences to the instructional assistants' collective understanding and growth explaining, "When we do observations of you that you do not agree with [let us know]. If we don't address [something], please, we need your feedback. If it [the observation] just becomes another piece of paper, it is useless." All lesson plans and observations are submitted to the after-school coordinator who meets with the instructional assistants weekly to resolve any outstanding issues. This ongoing coaching strengthens the potential of each member to contribute to the school's goals.

Sharing Knowledge as a Resource

Participants within a community of practice use "routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions or concepts that the community has produced or adopted in the course of its existence" (Wenger, 1998, p. 83). The instructional assistants in collaboration with the classroom teachers develop lessons and have latitude to use creative learning activities. When one instructional assistant explained she incorporated an interactive math board game because "I was noticing that [the word problems] just became mundane," a classroom teacher was enthused over the prospect of adopting the activity. Thus, the quest of identifying effective instruction is a two-way negotiated process (Wenger, 1998). Often, classroom teachers take the lead in suggesting a pedagogical approach but it is typical for an instructional assistant to

chime in with complementary pedagogy. Other times, instructional assistants make connections in their own learning, evidenced in the following exchange on a proposed writing lesson:

Classroom teacher: Outlining is a good way to get the central idea.

Instructional assistant: Kinda like a think aloud.

In this interaction, the instructional assistant acknowledges the point and connects to her own developing understanding of pedagogical strategies that will be used later in the after-school program to strengthen students' learning.

Frequent ongoing informal communication routines capitalize on various technologies to stay abreast of events. Often classroom teachers and instructional assistants use *"daily interaction via email,"* phone calls, texting, and informal conversations to convey information about a child's progress. One instructional assistant noted the concern for timely connections with the classroom teacher, "If something happens on Friday, then I'll email her." Using available communicative tools and practices creates a climate of immediate responsiveness and differentiation to meet student needs.

Discussion

Understanding the relationship, routines, and practices of one school's educational team to support and enhance student learning throughout the school day provides insight into the structure and focus of after-school programs. These insights include the following key ideas: strategically bridging the after-school program with the regular school day; developing teachers through formal and informal processes; and broadening the program focus beyond remediation.

Bridging the After-School Program with the Regular School Day

While an established relationship between after-school programs and the conventional school is valued, it is not always in place (Huang, et al., 2010). Sunshine School's administrators' vision and strategic planning promoted a strong collaboration between the regular school and after-school staff in unique ways. This included overlap of staff teaching schedules, required weekly grade-level planning meetings, and shared lessons and assessment outcomes. So inculcated in this vision, the after-school program's staff and regular school staff formed a singular community of practice (Wenger, 1998)—an *extended* school day instead of two separate stand-alone programs. Indicative of their mutual engagement was staff's perspectives of themselves as "family" and accountability in having one another's "back" (Wenger, 1998). Such dynamic interplay between educators supports students' academic and socio-emotional strengths and needs.

Capitalizing on Formal and Informal Processes of Teacher Development

Educators generally agree that students' achievement is linked to quality teaching (cf., Darling-Hammond, 2000) and ongoing professional development underlies teachers' growth (Desimone, et al., 2002). Besides the common practice of participating in Sunshine School's formal professional development, the after-school staff experienced informal development opportunities. Through the practice of overlapping schedules in regular school day, the after-school staff readily gained firsthand understanding of a classroom teacher's pedagogy. Developing a shared repertoire (Wenger, 1998) of research-based instructional practices promotes the carry-over of pedagogy and materials from the regular school into the after-school program. This instructional continuity is considered a beneficial practice in an after-school program (Huang, et al. 2010). Weekly feedback from classroom teachers as experts (Wenger, 1998) broadened focus beyond students' cognitive growth to other aspects of a child's learning including emotional and social needs (Monzó & Rueda, 2003). Ongoing collaboration encourages development of innovative lessons linked to state standards, another quality necessary in after-school programs (Huang, et al., 2010). The negotiated practice (Wenger, 1998) between the after-school staff and classroom teaching staff nurtures their legitimate inclusion into the profession and respects the knowledge and unique perspectives of after-school staff. Often this reciprocal nature of learning between school paraprofessionals and teachers is overlooked in educational settings, yet has potential to be a key resource in students' learning (Monzó & Rueda, 2003).

Broadening the After-School Program Focus

Some after-school programs focus on homework completion and remediation (Kirkland & Hull, 2011) with students in low-income neighborhoods more likely to encounter these types than other programs with enrichment opportunities (Apple, 2001). After-school programs that are expansive in addressing students' linguistic needs (Bhattacharya, et al., 2002) are also important particularly given this country's increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse student population (Howard, 2012). Accordingly, successful after-school programs require recruitment and retention of staff with requisite skills to meet context-specific goals; Sunshine School hired and developed bilingual staff to support their goal of students' dual language competency. Providing enrichment experiences to all students is one way schools and after-school programs recognize that such experiences have implications to a child's overall education. Such cultural and enrichment experiences provide students from low-income communities with cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1986) and allow students to engage in experiences that their peers in wealthier contexts enjoy (Apple, 2001) as well as build upon students' multiple intelligences.

Conclusion

Moll and Ruiz (2002) have argued for "mediating institutional arrangements" (p. 368) to ameliorate the historic subtractive and dysfunctional schooling experiences that children from minority groups and low-income parents—particularly Latino children—experience. The practices, processes, and routines within this school community contributed to development of skilled educators in creating engaging and meaningful instruction to meet the individual needs of students. Evidence of this school's promising practices is apparent in recent various recent state and institutional academic recognitions as well as the ongoing support of the schools' parents and community partners. This study points to the ways after-school programs might create communities of practice as "transformative" sites (Wenger, 1998) by strategically articulating with the regular school day programs to provide intellectually robust and enriched learning opportunities in pursuit of educational equity

References

Apple, M. (2001). *Educating the "right" way: Markets, standards, God, and inequality*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Bhattacharya, J., Jaramillo, A., Lopez, L., Olsen, L., Scharf, A., & Shah, M. (2002). *Our roots, our future: Affirming culture and language in after school and youth programs*. Oakland, CA: California Tomorrow.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). Forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for sociology of education* (pp. 241-258*).* New York: Greenwood.

California Budget Project. (2012). *California's public schools have experienced deep cuts in funding since 2007-08.* Retrieved from: http://www.cbp.org/pdfs/2012/120410_K-12_by_District_Budget_Cuts.pdf

California Department of Education. Executive Summary Explaining the Academic Performance Index (API). Retrieved from: http://www.cde.ca.gov/ta/ac/ap/documents/apiexecsummary.pdf

Darling-Hammond, L. (2000). Teacher quality and student achievement. *Educational Policy Analysis Archives, 8*(1), 1-44.

Desimone, L.M., Porter, A.C., Garet, M.S., Yoon, K.S., & Birman, B.F. (2002). Effects of professional development on teachers' instruction: Results from a three-year longitudinal study. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24*(2)*,* 81-112.

Durlak, J., & Weisberg, R. (2007). *The impact of after-school programs that promote personal and social skills*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. Retrieved from: www.casel.org

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. (2001). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 645-672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Adline De Gruyter.

Gutiérrez, K., Banquedano-Lopez, P., & Alvarez, H. (2001). Literacy as hybridity:

Moving beyond bilingualism in urban classrooms. In M. de la Luz Reyes &
J. Halcón (Eds.), *The best for our children: Critical perspectives on literacy
for Latino students* (pp. 122-139). New York: Teachers College Press.

Gutiérrez, K., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or
repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher*, *32*(5), 19-25.

Halcón, J. (2001). Mainstream ideology and literacy instruction for Spanish-
speaking children. In M. de la Luz Reyes & J. Halcón (Eds.), *The best for
our children: Critical perspectives on literacy for Latino students* (pp. 65-
77). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hout, M. (2011) Social and economic returns to college education in the United
States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *37,* 2-45.

Howard, T. (2010). *Why race and culture matter in schools: Closing the
achievement gap in America's classrooms.* New York: Teachers College
Press.

Huang, D., Cho, J., Mostafavi, S., & Nam, H., (2010). *What works? Common
practices in high functioning afterschool program across the nation in math,
reading, science, arts, technology and homework: A study by the National
Partnership*. The after school program assessment guide. National Center
for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST)
(Report768). Graduate School of Education & Information Studies.
University of California, Los Angeles.

Jordan, M. (2011, September 29). For the first time, largest group of poor children
in U.S. are Latino. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052970203405504576599254129
051180.html# .

Kirkland, D., & Hull, G. (2011). Literacy out of school: A review of research on
programs and practices. In M. Kamil, P.D. Pearson, E. Moje, & P.
Afflerbach (Eds.) *Handbook of Reading Research* (pp. 711-725). New York:
Routledge.

Ladson-Billings, G. J. (2006). From the Achievement Gap to the Education Debt:
Understanding Achievement in U.S. Schools. Presidential address at the
American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San
Francisco, CA.

Lopez, M., & Velasco, G. (2011). The toll of the Great Recession: Childhood
poverty among Hispanics sets record, leads nation. Pew Research Hispanic
Center. Retrieved from: *http://www.pewhispanic.org/2011/09/28/childhood-
poverty-among-hispanics-sets-record-leads-nation/*.

McNair, G., & Wambalaba, M. (2006). *Literacy in after school programs focus on
English language learners: Literature Review.* Northwest Regional
Educational Laboratory for the National Partnership for Quality Afterschool
Learning: Oregon Retrieved from
http://www.sedl.org/afterschool/toolkits/literacy/pdf/AST_lit_literature_revi
ew_ell.pdf .

Moll, L., & Ruiz, R. (2002). The schooling of Latino children. In M. Suárez-
Orozco & M. Páez (Eds.), *Latinos: Remaking America* (pp. 362-374).
Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Monzó, L. D., & Rueda, R.S. (2003). Professional roles, caring, and scaffolds: Latino teachers' and para-educators' interactions with Latino students. *American Journal of Education*, *109*(4), 438-471.

Orfield, G. (2002). Commentary. In M. Suárez-Orozco & M. Páez (Eds.), *Latinos: Remaking America* (pp. 389-397). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Orfield, G., Siegel-Hawley, G., & John Kucsera, J. (2011). Divided we fail: Segregated and Unequal Schools in the Southland. UCLA Civil Rights Project. Retrieved from: http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/metro-and-regional-inequalities/lasanti-project-los-angeles-san-diego-tijuana/divided-we-fail-segregated-and-unequal-schools-in-the-southfield/Divided-We-Fail-final-rept-v3-03-18-11.pdf.

Rist, R. C. (2000). HER Classic: Student social class and teacher expectations: The self-fulfilling prophecy in ghetto education. *Harvard Education Review, 70*(3), 257-265.

Parsad, B., & Lewis, L. (2009). After-School Programs in Public Elementary Schools. (NCES 2009–043). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC. Retrieved from: http://www.naaweb.org/downloads/Publications/After-SchoolPrograms in Public Elementary Schools.pdf.

Stake, R. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 435-454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research, 2nd ed*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). *Income, poverty, and health insurance coverage in the United States: 2010.* (Current Population Reports P60-239). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Vasquez, O. (1994). The magic of La Clase Mágica: Enhancing the learning potential of bilingual children. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, *17*(2), 120-128.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yin, R. K. (2003). *Applications of case study research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.