

**Shared Decision-Making Committee  
Position Statement on Retention  
February 26, 2015**

**Statement:** It is the position of the District Shared-Decision Making Committee that the use of *retention as an intervention* to improve student performance on grade level learning standards and subject area mastery be used only after all other interventions have been tried without success and documented as such.

Many factors must be considered before making a recommendation to retain a student. Considerations include the following:

- Chronological age at school entrance
- Gender
- Attendance
- Homelessness
- Mobility
- Lack of preschool experience
- Trauma such as death, divorce, violence
- Known disability
- Physical size of the student in relation to peer group
- Child's and parent's support for retention
- Previous retention or additional year of learning time, such as Pre-First Grade
- Language proficiency (ELN)
- Interventions provided

**Potential Negative Impact on Retained Students and Community:**

- Increased risk of dropping-out or non-completion of school
- Depression, low self-esteem, poor social interactions with peers, general dislike of school, increased behavioral problems
- According to middle school students, repeating a grade is “as stressful than wetting in class, being caught stealing, going blind, or losing a parent”
- Costs estimates for the additional learning year range from \$9,319 for a general education student, to \$22,005 for a special education student.

**Recommended Interventions:** Research studies and National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) suggests that school personnel collaborate to provide the following:

- Multitiered problem-solving models (RTI, AIS) to provide early and intensive evidence-based instruction and intervention to meet the needs of all students across academic, behavioral, and social-emotional domains
- Equitable opportunities to learn for all students
- Universal screening for academic, behavioral, and social-emotional difficulties
- Frequent progress monitoring and evaluation of interventions
- Extended learning opportunities beyond the school day and the school year
- Evidenced-based alternatives to grade retention and promotion
- Parental involvement to further support extended learning opportunities

**Summary:** The District Shared Decision Making Committee strongly recommends that *retention as an intervention* is considered only on an individual, case by case basis involving a multidisciplinary team to include teachers, service providers, school psychologist, building principal, parent, and child where appropriate. Because of the potential for long-term negative impact on the student, retention should only be considered after all other interventions have been tried, documented, and proven unsuccessful.

**References:**

David, Jane L. “What Research Says About .../Grade Retention.” *Educational Leadership*. Vol. 65. No. 6 (March 2008): 83-84. ASCD. Web. 19 Nov 2014.

Grant, Jim. “The Do’s and Don’ts of Grade-Level Retention.” 2005 Annual Conference of National Association of Elementary School Principals: Baltimore Convention Center, Baltimore. 17 Apr 2005. Lecture.

Jimerson, Shane R., Sarah M. Woehr, Amber M. Kaufman and Gabrielle E. Anderson. “Grade Retention and Promotion: Information and Strategies for Educators.” *Helping Children at Home and School II: Handouts for Families and Educators*. (2004): S3-61-S3-64. NASP. Web. 19 Nov 2014.

Laitsch, Dan. “Retention and Student Achievement.” Research Brief. Vol. 2. No. 11. 25 May 2004. ASCD. Web. 19 Nov 2014.

National Association of School Psychologists. (2011). Grade retention and social promotion (Position Statement). Bethesda, MD: Author.

National Association of School Psychologists. (2011). Grade retention and social promotion (White Paper). Bethesda, MD: Author.

New York State. New York State Education Department. *The New York State School Report and Fiscal Accountability Supplement for Gouverneur Central School District*. Albany, State of New York, 2011. NYSED. Web. Nov 2014.

Range, Bret G., Carleton R. Holt, John Pijanowski, and Suzie Young. “The Perceptions of Primary Grade Teachers and Elementary Principals about the Effectiveness of Grade-Level Retention.” *The Professional Educator*. Vol. 36. No. 1 (2012). ERIC. Web. 4 Nov 2014.

Ritzema, Anne M. and Steven R. Shaw. “Grade Retention and Borderline Intelligence: The Social-Emotional Cost.” *School Psychology Forum: Research in Practice*. Vol. 6. No. 1 (2012): 1-14. NASP. Web. 19 Nov 2014.

Shepard, Lorrie A. and Mary Lee Smith. “Synthesis of Research on Grade Retention.” *Educational Leadership*. (1990): 84-88. ASCD. Web. 19 Nov 2014.

West, Martin R. “Is Retaining Students in the Early Grades Self-Defeating?” Issue brief no 49. Washington: Brookings, 2012. Center on Children and Families. Brookings. Web. 02 Mar 2015.