Why Integrated Student Supports?

How many of you have started off your day, sometime in the past few weeks, on the totally wrong foot? You woke up fifteen minutes late and couldn’t make a cup of coffee, so you arrived at work kind of cranky. Your kids were scrambling to make it to the bus, one forgot her lunch (which you realized as the bus pulled away), and you argued with your spouse about who had to be late to work to take the lunch to the forgetful one. How much did that throw off your morning or the whole day?

With these words, former Joplin, Missouri, school superintendent C. J. Huff opens his presentation to dozens of audiences every year. And his description of the scenario always elicits a strong response from the crowd, whether it’s a dozen people in a small workshop at one of his Bright Futures conferences or a big room of 250, where he’s a plenary speaker. People nod in recognition, turn to their neighbors to find similar
smiles on their faces, and laugh about the disastrous days those inauspicious mornings prompted.

But then he strikes a more serious note:

Now put yourselves in the shoes of a child who is having this kind of morning. A child whose morning is a continuation of the night that preceded it. Forget the coffee—this kid didn’t have breakfast. And not because he didn’t have time to make it, but because there wasn’t any food in the house. And he was already hungry, because he also didn’t eat dinner. Or maybe there was dinner, but there wasn’t a table to eat it at (which is also why he had a hard time doing his homework). Or maybe there is a table, and he was hiding under it because there were bullets flying outside the window and that was the best place to take shelter.

You all just agreed that not having coffee—or milk or sugar to put in it—could throw your morning off track. Yet we expect kids whose mornings start off like this to come to class, to sit down quietly, to ignore the rumbling in their stomachs and in their minds, and to listen, take in what their teachers are saying, and do great work. Really?

We begin this book with this short soliloquy by our colleague because it illustrates the degree to which schools and teachers across the country—a fair share of them, at least—are playing an inevitably losing game. They are ignoring what we have learned about children and learning in recent years—as well as common sense.

This book is about changing our collective disregard of what research says about educational advancements. It shines a light on two parallel sets of gaps that jointly drive achievement gaps: disparities in support and in learning opportunities. It aims to connect the dots between what we know about human motivation and how children learn (and why many students in the United States are not learning to their potential). In so doing, we hope to make a case for radically rethinking the design of not only our schools but also our communities and their policies and practices affecting children and education. Specifically, the book advocates helping schools
and communities come together to create systems of integrated student supports (ISS) for all children. Throughout these pages, we identify leading initiatives, advocates, organizations and networks working toward the common goal of providing a pipeline of supports from cradle to career across a variety of settings throughout the United States.

Importantly, this book highlights how twelve diverse communities in a dozen states are making progress in doing just that: designing child development and education interventions and systems to meet children’s needs inside and outside school. All the communities employ ISS in service of whole-child education. These supports free children up to engage in the type of critical thinking and deeper learning to which our schools and education systems aspire, as psychologist Abraham Maslow illustrated in his well-known hierarchy. And these communities ensure that rich learning experiences are available to every student, not just a lucky minority of them. While the bulk of the book is devoted to highlighting the unique practices and strengths of these ISS initiatives, which can serve as models for other communities and school systems, we also feature other examples of promising initiatives.

These diverse ISS efforts, while admirable, are by no means perfect. This book does not wave a Mission Accomplished banner, nor do the initiatives’ leaders suggest that their work is complete. Indeed, the headway these districts have made in boosting achievement, tackling chronic absenteeism, meaningfully engaging students, and narrowing race- and income-based opportunity and achievement gaps are intentionally described as indicators of progress, not successes. Moreover, while all these initiatives put schools at the center (with community partnerships playing key roles), other ISS models divide the task differently. In many models, schools are only one of several bodies or agencies that drive community initiatives to foster child development and well-being. And besides offering inspiration and guidance, these case studies also present caveats about the challenges these communities have faced and the limitations to scaling up and expanding their efforts.
This book illustrates how communities (or school districts)—the level at which many important education decisions are made—can shift their focus toward a comprehensive, support-based set of strategies designed to enable all children to come to school every day, genuinely ready to learn. By providing wraparound support to students in need, communities ensure enhanced learning and school effectiveness and diminish gaps in opportunity and thus achievement. They effectively make the case for unifying and building the ISS field, so that policies are enacted at the federal, state, and local levels to support the growth of such services and their availability to children all across the country.

DISPARITIES IN SUPPORT: MASLOW’S HIERARCHY VERSUS CHILDREN’S REALITIES

Maslow posited that, to achieve full potential, every human being needs to have certain needs met.1 At the most basic level, those needs include food, water, warmth, and rest. Just above that are needs for security and safety. With those fundamentals in place, people can focus on their innate need to be part of something larger—which Maslow characterizes as “belongingness and love needs” and which include friendships and other intimate relationships. People who have all those needs met can then work toward fulfilling higher-order needs related to esteem and, at the apex, self-actualization: achieving one’s full potential, including creative activities (figure 1.1).2

Life’s realities, however, pose high barriers for a growing share of our children to viably reach for that pinnacle. Indeed, data paints a stark picture of a country whose failure to attend to children’s fundamental needs has guaranteed that schooling, despite all our costly education reforms, will also fail for many of these children. Decades of education reform efforts have yielded modest if any improvements in most places where poverty is prevalent. To be sure, there are outliers, schools and individuals defying the odds, but on average, we still have an iron-clad correlation
between socioeconomic status and educational achievement and attainment (figure 1.2).

Poverty and its attendant stresses matter profoundly to a child’s odds of succeeding in school. The data shows that on average, schooling is an insufficient instrument for overcoming the disadvantages of poverty. This observation is borne out by the diminishing social mobility in our society, but few have figured out what to do about it. The communities featured in this book have made a start.

POVERTY: TROUBLING TRENDS

The fiftieth anniversary of President Lyndon Johnson’s 1964 declaration of the War on Poverty sparked substantial debate. Many conservatives
declared the war a total failure, noting that the share of Americans deemed poor by federal standards has barely changed and that the poor are now more dependent on government handouts than they were in 1964. Pro-
gressive voices counter that those so-called government handouts keep many American families out of poverty but that this assistance is both insufficient to meet the high demand and politically contentious. In reality, the enactment of safety net programs such as cash welfare and food stamps, along with help from older social insurance programs like social security and unemployment insurance, made a major dent between 1964 and the late 1970s.

But the poverty rate has since climbed back up. Decades of stagnant wages, increasingly regressive tax policies, and declining support for safety net social policies, all exacerbated by the major recession of 2008, have pushed millions of American children back into poverty. In 2013, the Southern Education Foundation reported an alarming tipping point: for
the first time since data on school meals has been collected, over half of all US public school children qualified. And the rise in poverty had been rapid. Just seven years before that report, the national rate was 41 percent (versus 51 percent in 2013).

A 2014 report by the American Federation of Teachers dives into this data state by state and county by county, illustrating the alarming trend from the academic generation that began school in 2000 to its 2012 successor cohort. Aptly titled Child Poverty: Moving in the Wrong Direction, side-by-side maps of the fifty states and the District of Columbia reveal that by 2014, twenty states had no counties with a low poverty rate (with less than 10 percent of its children living in poverty) (figure 1.3).

An increasing number of children are also growing up in very deprived circumstances. Currently, 11 percent of young children live in households with annual incomes below 50 percent of the federal poverty line—that is, $10,210 for a family of three—up from 9 percent in 2008. The number of children living in areas of concentrated poverty—areas in which 30 percent or more of their neighbors are also poor—likewise grew rapidly. In 2012, some 21 percent of all children were poor, and of those, 36 percent, or more than one in three, were living in concentrated poverty.

POVERTY: INCREASING IMPACTS

Rising poverty over the past few decades is associated with several factors that directly and indirectly impede children’s readiness and ability to learn and teachers’ abilities to be effective instructors. In 2016, one in four US children was sufficiently food insecure to qualify for food stamps, and the number of homeless children was a whopping 1.3 million in the 2013–2014 school year, double the number from a decade earlier. Some of the country’s largest cities have discovered unsafe lead levels in water, the most basic of basics, with children in poverty disproportionately at risk.

Other, more common health problems also put low-income students at particular disadvantage. Asthma, which affects less than 8 percent of US
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The United States has one of the highest child poverty rates among industrialized nations. Many
American households are struggling, creating a real educational challenge for far too many
students.
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children overall, has much higher rates among black children, Puerto Rican children, and low-income children living in urban centers. Triggers like pests and dirty air cause acute attacks that make it hard to focus in class and can lead to chronic absence from school. Cavities are so prevalent and are so frequently left untreated among poor children that studies suggest that dental problems may be the second-most significant cause, after asthma, of children's loss of multiple school days. Other research documents the frequent misdiagnosis of children living in poverty as learning disabled when, in fact, they have unidentified vision problems. When these children receive eyeglasses, their ability to learn can dramatically improve.

Many students also lack second-rung safety and security needs. Their public housing complexes are the frequent sites of violence, or their routes to school require navigating hostile gang territory. In sum, a significant share of children are not having many of their most basic needs met.

Living in poverty, especially in deep or concentrated poverty, also takes a heavy toll on parents in ways that reduce children's ability to learn and achieve in school. A parent's inability to survive day-to-day, put food on the table, ensure children's physical safety, and keep a roof over the family's head induces massive parental stress, which can lead to depression, addiction, and other forms of dysfunction. Exacerbating these problems, especially for children of color, is the sharp rise in the number of adults being sentenced to prison, often for nonviolent offenses. As two education economists report in a recent study, up to 10 percent of African American students have a parent in prison, and one-quarter have a parent who has been incarcerated.\(^5\)

Living with these dire daily realities leads to a condition that scientists call toxic stress, which we now know impedes healthy brain development, reduces the ability to focus, and increases impulsivity.\(^6\) It also drives high levels of the stress hormone cortisol, which can cause the deterioration of bodily systems, increase vulnerability to disease, and even negatively affect genetics and heredity, generally lowering people's prospects for success.\(^7\) And like the other impediments to effective teaching and learning described here, toxic stress is heavily concentrated in certain neighborhoods
and schools, adding to the other burdens felt by those schools’ teachers, principals, and students.8

These are the realities facing millions of American students and the teachers and schools that serve these children. And increasing stratification by social class and resulting segregation of children concentrates the country’s highest-needs students in some districts, schools, and even classrooms. Anthony Bryk, who founded the Consortium for Chicago School Research, described a critical minority of the high-poverty Chicago public schools that he and his colleagues studied as “truly disadvantaged” because of their high share of students living in “extraordinary circumstances.” They assessed schools in which one in four children have been reported to social services for abuse or neglect, meaning that in a classroom of thirty students, a teacher might have seven or eight students experiencing that level of trauma.9 Not coincidentally, academic performance in such schools is abysmal.

While the schools described by Bryk and his fellow researchers are extreme examples, they are by no means isolated. Moreover, it does not require this level of dysfunction to make a teacher struggle to have all his or her children reading, adding, and subtracting at grade level, let alone attaining higher-order thinking. In other words, students’ and schools’ realities are increasingly butting up against the human needs in Maslow’s hierarchy, and meeting those needs is proving an insurmountable obstacle.

OPPORTUNITY GAPS: PERVASIVE AND PREDICTIVE

Disparities in learning opportunities compound the gaps in support for disadvantaged children, forcing these students even further behind their more privileged peers. And just as Huff describes in personally identifiable terms the challenges posed to children who lack the basics, upper-middle-class people’s experiences with their own children illustrate this second set of gaps.

Take a typical week in the lives of such children. After a day at school where teachers appreciated the children’s intelligence and abilities and created experiences to support and enhance them, the kids spent their
afternoon at (pick one) chess club, music lessons, soccer practice, or doing homework in a quiet, orderly space. If it was nice out, they walked or biked to a safe, well-maintained neighborhood park. On the weekend, one of the parents or a grandparent took them to a movie, a museum, or, if they were really lucky, a theater production in the city. This fairly normal week in upper-middle-class children’s lives is replete with opportunities to build on what they learned during class, explore things they are curious about, spend quality time with adults who care about them and are imparting knowledge, and broaden their horizons.

Now contrast that week with the life of a “typical” child living in poverty. The school is much less likely to offer chess club or robotics, and if it does, those extras might cost money or public bus fare that parents cannot afford. Or the activities might require the child to walk home through a dangerous neighborhood. Music lessons and organized sports are out of reach financially and pose logistical challenges for parents working multiple jobs or odd hours. There may or may not be space to do homework, and such a space is unlikely to be quiet or stocked with snacks that make thinking more constructive. There is little or no access to the kinds of technology tools and devices that infinitely enrich the lives of affluent peers. Weekends are not time off, but often periods of boredom interspersed with rushed trips to the grocery store and other errands that are frustrating with only one parent and little money. Movies and museums are rare indulgences, and travel may be nonexistent.

By the time typical low-income and middle-income children finish elementary school, the cumulative difference in learning opportunities has become enormous. Fully half of the 6,000-hour learning gap (by eighth grade) that scholars report is due to disparities in after-school activities. The next biggest chunk is attributable to preschool, with summer camp costing another 1,000 hours. Day trips and family reading time round it out.10

These numbers point to serious flaws in the argument that schools alone can be the great equalizer in our society. They belie the assertion that schools, even though they account for only 20 percent of a child’s waking
hours between kindergarten and graduation, can somehow miraculously overcome the enormous and growing inequalities in income, wealth, opportunity, and social mobility that characterize our society. Schools alone, as currently constituted, are inadequate to the job of becoming society’s “great balance wheel” as envisioned by that celebrated founding father of American schooling, Horace Mann. When children from backgrounds of poverty compete with affluent suburban students in school, the playing field is starkly uneven because of vastly unequal supports and opportunities. Moreover, the unfairness begins early, far before school, in babies’ earliest days and months.

One widely cited study documents that by age three, children of very poor parents already lag far behind their wealthier counterparts in knowledge and use of vocabulary—elements that predict their subsequent readiness and capacity to read and learn unless these early deficits are addressed. Those early gaps are then compounded by the lack of access to high-quality preK programs. Together, these early disparities in experiences, relationships, and stimulation drive enormous gaps in children’s readiness to learn at kindergarten entry. Whether they measure children’s math or reading skills, the gaps are larger than a full standard deviation. And while they are smaller in absolute terms, similar gaps are revealed with respect to noncognitive skills like persistence and the ability to communicate with peers and teachers. To comprehend the impact of these gaps on children’s odds of school success, the What Works Clearinghouse estimates that in the context of education, a gap of one standard deviation would require at least four, independent, highly effective interventions to close. So it isn’t hard to imagine the barriers these early achievement gaps pose for low-income children and their teachers and schools.

As described above, health and mental health problems, and insufficient support to address them, push low-income children further behind, causing them to lose focus in school and miss days from preventable illnesses. At the same time, opportunity gaps exacerbate the impediments to learning. For example, when poor children have limited access to enrichment and
learning opportunities in the summer, their learning is impeded during the school year. Mountains of data indicate that summer learning should be an entitlement, not an accident of birth, yet we continue to ignore this need and thereby resign ourselves to continuing “failure” in education. As *Freakonomics* author Malcolm Gladwell sums it up, “Virtually all of the advantage that wealthy students have over poor students is the result of differences in the way privileged students learn when they are not in school . . . America doesn’t have a school problem. It has a summer vacation problem.”13

These multiple and cumulative support and opportunity gaps point clearly to the need to radically rethink our delivery systems for child development and education—when and where it takes place, by whom, and the various partnerships required for that to happen meaningfully and consistently. Indeed, this rethinking and redesigning is what the best ISS communities are engaged in.

**BRINGING MASLOW AND MATH CLASS INTO ALIGNMENT**

Neither the impact of poverty nor disparities in learning opportunities are unknown. What is newer, however, is the growing recognition that decades of efforts to improve schools without tackling those impacts have fallen far short. Prior insistence by a prominent camp of education reformers that schools must take a no-excuses approach to poverty, and their call to focus narrowly on raising standards and holding schools accountable for doing so, have given way to increasingly widespread acknowledgment that we need to treat poverty for what it is—the largest obstacle for a significant and growing number of students.14

We are thus at a pivotal moment in education policy-making. Evidence shows that the prior generation of school reform efforts had only modest impacts in boosting achievement and narrowing gaps, although a few states, Massachusetts and New Jersey in particular, achieved quite a bit.15 Indeed, one of us (Paul) points to his state’s major progress in raising scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress but its failure, despite
those gains, to substantially shrink race- and income-based gaps in those scores and in other metrics of academic proficiency as an urgent reason to rethink how we design school reform efforts.\textsuperscript{16}

The Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the most recent iteration of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act, delegates much of the authority and responsibility to improve schools back to the state and local levels. This shift reflects popular sentiment, but because many states are divided and have limited capacity, much of that responsibility will fall on local communities. ESSA also encourages states to consider a broader set of metrics of student progress but provides little guidance on how they should do so. And the current US Department of Education under Secretary Elisabeth “Betsy” DeVos is showing little inclination to step into that breach. So what do we do?

Now is the time for communities to step up on behalf of children, a time for a promising “new localism.” Two Brookings scholars point to a path forward: “Power is shifting globally. With national governments challenged, cities in the United States and beyond have assumed increased responsibility for addressing many of our biggest policy challenges. Cities are able to act because their power rests not in government alone, but in market and civic strengths that emanate from the concentration of valuable economic, physical and social assets . . . The emerging framework of multi-sectoral governance and networked problem solving is what might be called ‘new localism.’”\textsuperscript{17}

It is in the spirit of this new localism that, in this book, we present these examples to local officials who, with their communities, have the most direct and immediate stake in the future of our children. A growing number of leaders—political, academic, and educational—are now calling for a community-driven whole-child education system, to complement high-quality school reform. By \textit{whole-child}, these advocates mean systems that work intentionally to nurture the full range of children’s developmental domains—academic, social, emotional, behavioral, and physical. These leaders are asking for communities, districts, and individual schools to
design policies and practices to realize such a vision. The ISS communities described in this book give a glimpse of what's possible.

We describe a more complex and ambitious set of goals than what most schools have historically sought. For the millions of children whose basic needs are not consistently met, we join the growing chorus calling for a broad, integrated set of student supports that bring together schools, communities, and social programs. Such a comprehensive approach could enhance school-parent-community working relationships, expand student learning opportunities with respect to both time and quality, and ensure attention to urgent social, emotional, and physical health needs that often prevent children from learning.

A good ISS system requires multiple moving parts to operate effectively. It asks schools to reach out to parents and the broader community for engagement and support, something that few schools have a track record of doing, especially in high-poverty neighborhoods. It means not only offering preschool, after-school enrichment, and summer learning, but also expanding the school day and year and making sure that those extra hours, days, and weeks are qualitatively better than what many schools currently provide. An ISS approach asks schools to become curators, but not necessarily providers, of the services and other supports needed to ensure that all children can come to school ready to learn. When it comes to health care, mental health needs, nutrition, safety, housing, and other matters, communities must step up to take responsibility, working with schools as partners to help solve the problems that prevent their students from learning at high levels.

WIDESPREAD GROWTH OF INTEGRATED STUDENT SUPPORTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Embracing these challenges, communities across the country have taken on this complex endeavor and are making comprehensive systems work. These communities recognize that schools cannot possibly do this alone, nor should they. They see that many of our schools are drowning under the
burdens of meeting children’s in-school and out-of-school needs. Naturally, schools filled with compassionate adults are ready to step up and do this work when no one else does, since our education system implicitly assumes that schools should solve these problems. But schools weren’t built to address many of these challenges. They don’t have the capacity. Children’s well-being is a 24-7 job, 365 days a year, and it must be a family and community responsibility. We now need a new social compact, one in which every member of a community assumes responsibility for building the platform of support and opportunity necessary for children to succeed. This new social compact is what the leaders in our example communities are trying to invent.

In these places, school and city leaders have come together to declare that poverty, rather than being an excuse, is a root cause of problems in both their schools and their communities. They have reached out to government leaders (in housing, public safety, and public health), to other leaders (in business and in faith- and community-based organizations), and to parents to help design systems of supports that meet students’ basic needs. These communities have taken inventories of unmet needs, mapped out the available resources to meet these needs, worked to coordinate those resources, and developed new resources to plug holes in existing services. Such efforts are under way in hundreds of communities in every state.

Dozens of district-level initiatives employing comprehensive approaches call their strategy community schools, and many of these schools receive technical support from the Coalition for Community Schools in Washington, DC, or the National Center for Community Schools in New York City (or both). More recently, as community schools have gained momentum, both of the national teachers unions and other organizations are also advancing this strategy. In twenty-five states, hundreds of school districts, including many that house community schools, partner with the national nonprofit organization Communities In Schools (CIS) and its state affiliates to deliver a targeted set of health, enrichment, and other services supporting nearly 1.5 million students in 2016.
As of late 2017, more than three hundred communities in forty-two states and the District of Columbia, plus Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, were affiliated with the Campaign for Grade-Level Reading and had implemented one or more components of an ISS strategy. Twenty districts and counting across eight states are affiliates of Bright Futures USA, another ISS-aligned initiative that has a strong presence among small- to medium-sized and rural districts. Distressed zones of cities (and a handful of rural areas) designated by the federal government as Promise Neighborhoods are using their federal grants to provide comprehensive education and health support for students and their families. And other community programs are using the term Promise in their names to describe philanthropic pledges of free college tuition for students who meet specific criteria. These programs have used this commitment to provide ISS that enables more students to take advantage of those scholarships. The most widely known and most researched of these programs is in Kalamazoo, Michigan (www.kalamazoopromise.com).

More intensive ISS efforts are under way in various cities under the auspices of City Connects (a Boston College–based initiative), Say Yes to Education, Harvard Graduate School of Education's By All Means campaign (operated by the school's Education Redesign Lab), and others. In some of these efforts and others, such as districts that are working with StriveTogether, schools play only one of many leadership roles. Community leaders come together in collective-impact initiatives featuring children’s cabinets and other broad-based, representative boards that set goals, develop strategies, measure progress, and hold partners accountable for making progress on key indicators of children's well-being.

BACKGROUND ON ISS COMMUNITIES, AND OUR AIDS FOR THIS BOOK
Both of us work in the areas of ISS and whole-child education and are convinced of the importance of scaling them up. One of us, Elaine Weiss, led an education policy campaign, the Broader, Bolder Approach to Education
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(BBA), which called attention to the many ways that poverty impedes effective teaching and learning and advanced strategies to alleviate those impacts. As part of that work, she collaborated with communities across the country to write about the community efforts featured in this book. As former Massachusetts secretary of education, the other of us, Paul Reville, was one of the architects of the education reform efforts that helped propel the state to the top of the pack in student achievement. He sees the large, stubborn achievement gaps that persist as evidence of the critical need to think more broadly about improving school systems so that equity goes hand-in-hand with excellence. Paul launched the aforementioned Education Redesign Lab at the Harvard Graduate School of Education to explore this issue. He is also leading the lab’s By All Means project, a six-city pilot of mayoral-led ISS efforts, to create and study some new on-the-ground efforts that can ultimately be replicated and scaled up.

Convinced of the importance of ISS and whole-child education in advancing better outcomes in education and learning, BBA spent two years studying and documenting the efforts of communities that have employed ISS for this purpose. Our selection of the twelve communities that form the basis of this book was based on recommendations from colleagues, on stand-out examples from national ISS networks, and on community leaders’ self-nominations. To be eligible for study, the community had to provide a range of student supports, advance whole-child school improvement strategies, and engage parents and educators in the effort. Finally, it had to demonstrate not only that these efforts were boosting student achievement, but also that the district was narrowing gaps in social class, racial and ethnic status, and/or other aspects of disadvantage for its students.

These communities have built on conversations spurred by community and school leaders to tackle poverty head-on. They draw on the assets, public and private, of a range of agencies and other service providers to meet every child’s basic needs and enable effective teaching and learning. Wrapping basic nutritional, physical health, and mental health supports around
disadvantaged students' school experiences, the communities are plugging holes in their early-childhood, after-school, and summer opportunities.

These programs' approaches vary according to each community's unique needs and assets, but all of the communities have designed systems to close gaps in both support and opportunities. And all have seen substantial boosts to student outcomes, school outcomes, and, in some cases, community outcomes because of the ISS work.

This book is organized into three parts. Part 1 provides the rationale for making an ISS system a common feature in communities. It also introduces the communities where this work is bearing fruit in the form of improved student outcomes. Part 2—the bulk of the book—describes the strategies that these and other communities have employed to advance whole-child education through the use of ISS and examines the challenges of doing so. Finally, part 3 explores the history of efforts that now make up the nascent ISS field. We look at where it stands today and what must happen for ISS and whole-child education to become the norm that we believe is needed, given current economic, demographic, and political realities and trends. In addition, we note that if it is to fulfill its true potential, the ISS movement must do more than address issues related to poverty and lack of opportunity. Segregation, structural racism, and related economic exploitation act as potent barriers to future success for far too many of today's students. We envision an ISS movement that breaks down those barriers and makes thriving and success meaningful options for every one of our children.