

P.S. 94 Kings College School

FINAL REPORT



Contents

- Introduction 1
 - About This Report 1
 - About P.S. 94 Kings College School 1
 - Audit Process at P.S. 94 Kings College School. 1

- Key Findings 3
 - Critical Key Findings 3
 - Positive Key Findings 4

- Recommendations 6
 - Overview of Recommendations. 6
 - Recommendation 1: Balanced Literacy Block. 8
 - Recommendation 2: Instruction 11
 - Recommendation 3: Word-Study Curriculum 16
 - Recommendation 4: Classroom Management 21
 - Recommendation 5: Common Core 26

- References 30

Introduction

About This Report

This final report is the result of an external school curriculum audit (ESCA) of P.S. 94 Kings College School conducted by Learning Point Associates, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research. This audit was conducted in response to the school being identified as being in restructuring (year 1) under the New York State Education Department (NYSED) differentiated accountability plan, pursuant to the accountability requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act. The utilized ESCA process was developed for and carried out under the auspices of the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) Office of School Development, within the Division of Portfolio Planning.

About P.S. 94 Kings College School

Located in the Bronx, P.S. 94 Kings College School (X094) is an elementary school with 899 students from kindergarten through Grade 5. Sixty-two percent of the students are Hispanic or Latino; 21 percent are black or African American, and 15 percent are Asian. Twenty-six percent of the students are classified as English language learners (ELL), and 15 percent are classified as students with disabilities. Eighty-three percent of the student population is eligible for free lunch, and 6 percent are eligible for reduced-price lunch (Accountability and Overview Report 2009–2010).

In 2009–10, P.S. 94 did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) in English language arts (ELA) for all students, the black or African-American subgroup, and economically disadvantaged students. In 2010–11, P.S. 94's state accountability status was designated as "Restructuring (year 1)."¹

Audit Process at P.S. 94 Kings College School

The ESCA approach utilized at the elementary school level examines six topic areas related to literacy: student engagement, instruction, academic interventions and supports, professional learning and collaboration, curriculum, and assessments and their use. Data were collected at the school level through teacher surveys, administrator interviews, classroom observations, and an analysis of documents submitted by P.S. 94. From these data, Learning Point Associates prepared a series of reports for the school's use.

These reports were presented to the school at a co-interpretationSM meeting on June 18, 2011. During this meeting, 18 stakeholders from the P.S. 94 community read the reports. Through a facilitated and collaborative group process, they identified individual findings and then developed and prioritized key findings that emerged from information in the reports.

¹ <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb-rc/2010/72/AOR-2010-321000010094.pdf>. Accessed on March 3, 2011

The remainder of this report presents the key findings that emerged from the co-interpretation process and the actionable recommendations that Learning Point Associates has developed in response. Please note that there is not necessarily a one-to-one connection between key findings and recommendations; rather, the key findings are considered as a group, and the recommended strategies are those that we believe are most likely to have the greatest positive impact on student performance at P.S. 94 Kings College School.

Key Findings

After considerable thought and discussion, co-interpretation participants determined a set of key findings. The wording of the following key findings matches the wording developed and agreed upon by co-interpretation participants at the meeting. These key findings are detailed in this section.

Critical Key Findings

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 1:

The application of the reading components of balanced literacy (daily read-alouds, independent reading, guided reading, reading workshop) is inconsistent.

Critical Key Finding 1 is supported by information from classroom observations and the review of school-submitted documents. While all 33 observed classrooms had charts for the 25 Book Challenge displayed, only in one room did students have dedicated folders for the project. Supports for independent reading varied. One classroom had a chart on how to choose a book. Another classroom had a chart explaining independent reading. Independent reading was observed in only seven of the 33 observed classrooms. During instructional time, 10 of the classrooms included little or no modeling or demonstrations for students. Teachers assigned tasks without providing adequate examples. Guided reading was observed in only some of the classrooms. None of the teachers who were observed conducted read-alouds for their students.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 2:

Student engagement is not consistent across classrooms.

Critical Key Finding 2 is supported by information from classroom observations and teacher survey results. Nine of the 33 observed classrooms had low student engagement. None of the classrooms had routines to increase engagement during question-and-answer time. One third of teachers who completed the teacher survey reported that their students sometimes or never participate in classroom discussions.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 3:

Word-study instruction is focused mainly on phonics.

Critical Key Finding 3 is supported by information from school interviews, the review of school-submitted documents, and classroom observations. The school expects teachers to provide systematic, explicit, and direct phonics instruction. Classrooms had charts explaining the decoding process and other aspects of word study.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 4:

Classroom routines are not consistent.

Critical Key Finding 4 is supported by information from classroom observations. Ten of the 33 observed classrooms had only limited transition routines, resulting in lost instructional time. The classrooms that did have established transitions all used different methods to call students to attention.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 5:

Teachers consider supports and interventions to be minimal.

Critical Key Finding 5 is supported by information from teacher survey results. Thirty-eight percent of surveyed teachers reported that the school is minimally to not at all likely to systematically identify the kinds of academic supports struggling students need. In addition, 45 percent of surveyed teachers indicated that the school is minimally or not at all likely to provide supports and services to struggling students in a timely manner.

Positive Key Findings

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 1:

Most teachers reported that a schoolwide behavior plan exists.

Positive Key Finding 1 is supported by information from teacher survey results. Seventy-nine percent of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that a schoolwide behavior plan is in place. STARS (safety, team player, always responsible, respect, and self-control) specifies expectations for student conduct.

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 2:

The school provides curriculum maps, which outline a framework for standards-based instruction.

Positive Key Finding 2 is supported by information from the review of school-submitted documents. The literacy curriculum maps include duration, focus, standards, unit overview, and cross-curriculum connections assessments performance indicators for each unit. The curriculum maps are aligned with New York state standards. Teachers also have access to calendars for each grade level that identify weekly reading and writing goals for the first 30 days.

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 3:

Nearly half of the teachers report meeting collaboratively daily or one to two times weekly.

Positive Key Finding 3 is supported by information from the teacher survey results. Less than half of surveyed teachers reported meeting with other teachers daily or weekly. Thirty-eight percent of the surveyed teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that teachers collaborate across subjects and grade levels.

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 4:

The majority of teachers indicate that discussions about instruction occur informally and at faculty meetings.

Positive Key Finding 4 is supported by information from teacher survey results. Ninety-three percent of teachers indicated that discussions about instruction occur in the teachers' lounge, at lunch, and at faculty meetings. Sixty-seven percent also agreed or strongly agreed that collaboration between special education and general education instructors occurs on an informal basis, and 58 percent of the surveyed teachers indicated the same for ELL and general education teachers.

Recommendations

Overview of Recommendations

Participants at the P.S. 94 Kings College School co-interpretation prioritized critical key findings that identify where the school's ELA program and instruction can improve, as well as several positive findings highlighting school strengths.

As noted in Critical Key Findings 1, 2, 3, and 4, the ELA program could be strengthened by addressing specific areas of the curriculum and instruction. First, the balanced literacy block is not implemented consistently across the school. This was evident in the content of instruction as well as in instructional practices, particularly practices that encourage student engagement and reduce the amount of time spent on transitions and behavior management. The first four recommendations address Critical Key Findings 1 through 4.

Recommendation 5 addresses the challenges posed by the implementation of the Common Core standards, which all New York City schools must address.

No recommendation is being developed for Critical Key Finding 5 concerning supports and interventions. The school should evaluate the existing academic intervention services (AIS) and other supports and determine if these are being maximized.

The positive key findings (particularly Findings 2 through 4) identify strengths of the school that can be leveraged to address the school's challenges and build a more comprehensive ELA program.

THE FIVE RECOMMENDATIONS

With these issues in mind, Learning Point Associates auditors developed the following five recommendations:

1. Implement with fidelity the components of the balanced literacy block.
2. Develop and implement with fidelity a plan to ensure challenging, engaging, and intentional instruction in every classroom.
3. Evaluate the existing word-study curriculum and implement any changes resulting from the evaluation.
4. Develop and implement with fidelity a plan to ensure that the components of effective classroom management are evident in every classroom.
5. Develop and implement a multiyear plan to align the school's curriculum, instruction, assessments, and instructional materials to the Common Core standards.

These five recommendations are discussed on the following pages. Each recommendation provides a review of research, online resources for additional information, specific actions the school may wish to take during its implementation process, and examples of real-life schools that have successfully implemented strategies. All works cited appear in the References section at the end of this report.

Please note that the order in which these recommendations are presented does not reflect a ranking or prioritization of the recommendations.

Recommendation 1: Balanced Literacy Block

Implement with fidelity the components of the balanced literacy block.

LINK TO RESEARCH

Much of the research on effective reading instruction in the elementary grades has focused on the content of reading instruction—teaching phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and reading comprehension. Research on how to organize literacy instruction is not as clear. The New York City Department of Education recommends the Comprehensive Approach to Balanced Literacy for elementary schools. In the balanced literacy block, phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and expressiveness, vocabulary, and comprehension are using certain instructional methods and formats, including daily read-alouds, independent reading time, reading workshop, writing workshop, and systematic word study instruction. Teachers use the following structures during the block: read-aloud, guided reading, shared reading, interactive writing, and minilessons.

During a reading or writing workshop, the teacher teaches a 10- to 15-minute minilesson, which focuses on a teaching point: a reading or writing strategy or skill. The teacher explicitly models or demonstrates the strategy or skill. Students are then given an opportunity to practice the skill or strategy. This exemplifies the “gradual release of responsibility” model of instruction, which is critical to effective instruction in the workshop model.

Research suggests that effective literacy instruction needs to be sequenced, systematic, intentional, teacher directed, and explicit. Instruction includes explanations, modeling, and scaffolding. The gradual release of responsibility instructional model was introduced by Pearson and Gallagher (1983) after they reviewed studies on reading comprehension instruction. The researchers found that learning occurred when it happened over time within a repeated instructional cycle that included explanation, guided practice, feedback, independent practice, and application. The gradual release of responsibility model of instruction requires that the teacher shift from assuming “all the responsibility for performing a task...to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility” (Duke & Pearson, 2002). Gradual release may occur over a day, a week, a month, or a year. Pearson and Gallagher envisioned instruction that moved from explicit modeling and instruction to guided practice and then to activities that incrementally positioned students into becoming independent learners.

The gradual release of responsibility model of instruction has been documented as an effective approach for improving literacy achievement (Fisher & Frey, 2007), reading comprehension (Lloyd, 2004), and literacy outcomes for English language learners (Kong & Pearson, 2003).

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

The key to implementation for the balanced literacy block is professional learning through teacher collaboration and professional development. As noted earlier, the balanced literacy block has multiple components and structures, and teachers should be observed and assessed to determine how well they understand and implement each component and

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

Teaching Matters Explicit Instruction (Video)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N9leUP-yrW8>

structure. The components and structures that are least understood and implemented with fidelity will then be the focus of professional learning. Following are implementation considerations related to professional learning, which will support the teacher understanding and implementation of balanced literacy.

1. Provide opportunities for regular teacher collaboration.

Build on and focus the current model for teacher collaboration.

2. Consider different formats for professional development.

When planning professional development, consider the numerous formats that might be used to focus teacher collaboration and learning. These include action research/inquiry cycle, case discussions, coaching, Critical Friends Group, data teams/assessment development, examining student work, lesson study, mentoring, portfolio reviews, and study groups. Other approaches for job-embedded professional learning are as follows:

- **Providing initial training, using outside or local experts.** As appropriate to the topic, either outside experts or administrators, specialists, or teachers at the school could provide initial training.
- **Coaching at the school.** Teacher leaders may be trained to provide instructional support to all teachers. Another option is for all teachers to be trained to coach each other as members of professional learning communities.
- **Peer observation.** A feedback form can be created, and a schedule for peer observation can be developed. Expectations for peer observation can be set and clearly communicated.

3. Monitor implementation.

It is important for school administrators and/or coaches to monitor implementation to ensure that the components of the literacy block are implemented with fidelity. Monitoring may include information learning walks as well as formal observations.

DOING WHAT WORKS: Examples From Real Schools

A teacher in the New York City schools for 28 years, Sharon Taberski implemented reading workshop and writing workshop effectively in her diverse classroom of students. In her book *On Solid Ground: Strategies for Teaching Reading K-3* (2000), she helps others think systematically about the components of balanced literacy. Sharon's blog can be found at <http://allaboutcomprehension.blogspot.com/>.

Debbie Miller implements reading and writing workshops in her first-grade classroom. She describes her approach in her book *Reading With Meaning*. Two videos are available showing Debbie in her classroom working with her students:

Happy Reading Part 1 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4Ly9cRS4Cm8&feature=related> and

Happy Reading Part 2 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qPPLDIKkRnl&feature=related>

The videos *Inside Reading Writing Workshops* show a teacher teaching a minilesson and a teacher conferencing with a student:

Part 1 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?NR=1&v=kfkLk9QCn28>;

Part 2 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TMeGgkmhoo4&NR=1>;

Part 3 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Jl6qcfSkYI&feature=related>

Recommendation 2: Instruction

Develop and implement with fidelity a plan to ensure challenging, engaging, and intentional instruction in every classroom.

LINK TO RESEARCH

After reviewing hundreds of studies on teaching effects, John Hattie concluded that “it is teachers *using particular teaching methods*, teachers *with high expectations for all students*, and teachers *who have created positive student-teacher relationships* that are more likely to have the above average effects on student achievement” (Hattie, 2009, p. 126). Decades of research suggest that three behaviors distinguish highly effective teachers: challenging students, creating a positive classroom environment, and being intentional about their teaching.

Challenging Students. Highly effective teachers set high expectations for all students and challenge their students by providing instruction that develops high-order thinking skills. Rosenthal and Jacobson in their 1965 study coined the term “Pygmalion effect” to describe how teachers’ expectations of students affects the performance of the students. (See Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1992.) More than 600 studies conducted since have confirmed that teacher expectations can have a powerful effect on student achievement. Conveying expectations by praising students has minimal effects. Carol Dweck (2006) has determined that praising students by telling them they are smart may actually have a detrimental effect on their achievement.

Positive Environment. Setting high expectations for students is not enough. Teachers must create positive classroom environments and build strong relationships with students. Kleinfeld (1972) identified four types of teachers—traditionalists (teachers who set high expectations for students but offered little academic or emotional support to help students meet those expectations), sophisticates (teachers who were aloof and undemanding), sentimentalists (teachers who were warm but undemanding), and supportive gadflies (teachers who combined high personal warmth with high expectations for students). Researchers since 1972 have used the term “warm demander” to describe effective teachers who set high expectations while nurturing student growth.

Intentionality. Highly effective teachers are intentional about their teaching. Good teachers are clear about what they are teaching and have a broad repertoire of instructional strategies to help students accomplish their learning goals. They are intentional in selecting the most appropriate instructional strategy for each situation.

Research suggests that effective literacy instruction needs to be sequenced, systematic, intentional, teacher directed, and explicit, involving explanations, modeling, and scaffolding. These characteristics are evident in the “gradual release of responsibility” instructional model, introduced by Pearson and Gallagher in 1983 after they reviewed studies on reading comprehension instruction. These researchers found that learning occurred when it happened over time within a repeated instructional cycle that included explanation, guided practice, feedback, independent practice, and application. The gradual-release-of-responsibility model of instruction requires that the teacher shift from assuming “all the responsibility for performing a task...to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility” (Duke &

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

New York City Department of
Education (NYCDOE)
[http://schools.
nyc.gov/Teachers/
TeacherDevelopment/
TeacherDevelopmentToolkit/
PTS/Engagingstudents](http://schools.nyc.gov/Teachers/TeacherDevelopment/TeacherDevelopmentToolkit/PTS/Engagingstudents)

Pearson, 2002, p. 211). This gradual release may occur over a day, a week, a month, or a year. Pearson and Gallagher envisioned instruction that moved from explicit modeling and instruction to guided practice and then to activities that incrementally positioned students for becoming independent learners.

The gradual-release-of-responsibility model of instruction has been documented as an effective approach for improving literacy achievement (Fisher & Frey, 2007), reading comprehension (Lloyd, 2004), and literacy outcomes for English language learners (Kong & Pearson, 2003).

Related to the gradual-release-of-responsibility model is consistent and active engagement of students in their learning. Student engagement has long been recognized as the core of effective schooling (Marzano & Pickering, 2010). In her framework for enhancing student achievement, Charlotte Danielson (2007) describes exemplary instruction:

All students are highly engaged in learning and make material contributions to the success of the class by asking questions and participating in discussions, getting actively involved in learning activities, and using feedback in their learning. The teacher ensures the success of every student by creating a high-level learning environment; providing timely, high-quality feedback; and continuously searching for approaches that meet student needs. (p. 113)

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

In order to ensure challenging, engaging, and intentional instruction in every classroom, teachers should take the following actions:

1. Teach according to the principles of effective instruction.

The gradual-release-of-responsibility model of instruction enhances effective literacy instruction. Teacher-directed, explicit instruction of literacy skills and strategies involves explanation, modeling, guided practice, feedback, independent practice, and application.

2. Guide students in setting personal goals and in monitoring their progress.

Marzano and Pickering (2010) suggests that self-efficacy is possibly the most important factor affecting student engagement. Self-efficacy is commonly defined as the belief in one's capabilities to achieve a goal. Students with a strong sense of efficacy are more likely to challenge themselves with difficult tasks and be intrinsically motivated. One approach for developing student self-efficacy is to have students chart their progress on a specific learning goal. Using percentage scores works well when the assessments address a very specific skill area, such as spelling or using a specific type of punctuation. In most situations, however, a rubric or scale is a better way to help students track their progress. Having students set personal goals for their individual progress and think about what they will do to accomplish their goals influences student engagement.

3. Provide feedback to students that emphasizes the link between effort and improvement.

Because it is important for students to attribute their success or failure to their effort and not luck or ability, teachers may have students use a scale to track their effort and preparation along with their academic progress. The oral feedback teachers give students should focus on the effort students make.

4. Use active learning strategies.

Teachers can use techniques such as *turn and talk* or *think-pair-share* to engage students. Cooperative learning structures described by Spencer Kagan (2010) also are effective in engaging students. Other approaches are *peer partners*, where on-task partners check to see whether their partner is following the direction of the teacher; *response partners*, who are taught to “look, lean, whisper” when discussing with their partner; *response cards* that provide students with prepared response cards labeled true and false or a, b, c, and so on, which allows all students respond to teacher questions; and *writing answers*, according to which each student writes answers on a individual whiteboard or slate.

5. Vary instructional strategies.

It is important to use a variety of *instructional strategies*.

6. Use interactive reading techniques.

Interactive reading techniques are helpful for engaging students. Examples are Say Something; Read, Cover, Remember, Retell; Partner Jigsaw; Two-Word; and Reverse Think-Aloud.

7. Use questioning strategies that make all students think and answer.

Teachers should ensure that students’ opportunity to respond is high. The opportunity to respond is positively related to achievement because the more opportunities students have to respond or practice a skill, the better their understanding. Ways to increase opportunities to respond include making sure all students are called on, not calling on volunteers to respond, using choral response techniques, and calling on students randomly to respond. Teachers can facilitate active involvement by providing cues and prompts that lead students to correct answers, sequencing instruction so that high rates of accuracy are achieved, and asking frequent questions.

8. Provide students with choices whenever possible.

Managed choice is an effective way to engage students. Students should be given opportunities to choose books that interest them, and whenever possible, students should have some choice about assignments.

9. Use processing activities.

Instructional strategies such as think-pair-share and quick writes are ways to engage students in the lesson and have them process the content of the lesson.

10. Select materials and tasks that are at a correct level of difficulty.

Recognizing the difficulty of doing this in a classroom of students with diverse learning needs, it still is important to do so as much as possible. Matching the reading levels of the materials students are asked to read and the reading levels of the students is critical. This is not possible all the time, particularly with the new demands of the text complexity of the Common Core, but it is critical that students are reading at their independent and instructional levels at least part of the day.

11. Foster a culture of achievement.

A culture of achievement is fostered in classrooms where instruction is challenging, students feel comfortable asking questions, and students are expected to do their best. High-quality instruction—instruction that is rigorous, aligned with standards, and uses instructional strategies to meet the needs of all students—helps promote a culture of achievement in the classroom. Clear, high, yet attainable expectations for all students ensure that students feel challenged and not bored or discouraged. Students need both high expectations and support for learning.

12. Build relationships with students.

One of the strongest correlates of effective teaching is the strength of relationships teachers develop with students. When students feel valued, honored, and respected, they tend to be more engaged. Teachers should create positive classroom environments.

DOING WHAT WORKS: Examples From Real Schools

Catalina Ventura in Phoenix, Arizona, is a K-8 school with more than 1,300 students. The school is an inner-city school with a 75 percent poverty rate. During the past five years, teachers at Catalina have been trained in using Kagan cooperative learning structures in their classrooms. Dr. Spencer Kagan devised several generic, content-free cooperative learning techniques that can be used to increase student engagement. Numbered Heads Together, Corners, Think-Pair-Share, and Line-up are examples of these structures. At Catalina Ventura School, a new Kagan structure was taught monthly to the entire staff at staff meetings. The principal attributes the dramatic improvement in test scores at the school to teachers using these structures in their classrooms and having students more engaged as a result. (More information about the Kagan structures is available at www.KaganOnline.com. The video *Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures for Success* is available on www.youtube.com.)

TESA (Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement) is a professional development program designed to help teachers interact equitably with all students. TESA raises the awareness of teachers about how their expectations affect student performance. Teachers reflect on their interactions with their students in their questioning and feedback and the effects on student self-esteem. Teachers observe each other to provide feedback on whether they treat some students differently from others. Results of the program include improvement in student academic performance, increases in attendance, decreases in discipline problems, and improvement in classroom climate. Information about the professional development program is available from the Los Angeles County Office of Education at <http://www.lacoe.edu/orgs/165/index.cfm>.

Recommendation 3: Word-Study Curriculum

Evaluate the existing word-study curriculum and implement any changes resulting from the evaluation.

LINK TO RESEARCH

Word recognition is basic to reading comprehension (Chall, 1983). There is a strong relationship between word recognition and higher order comprehension processes (Brown & Felton, 1990; Kame'enui, Simmons, Baker, Chard, Dickson, et al., 1998). Weak word-identification skills “are strongly coupled with poor reading comprehension in both children and adults” (Adams & Bruck, 1993, p. 119). When decoding requires little attention, more attention can be allocated to comprehending text.

It is critical that word study include phonics and vocabulary. Although a word-study curriculum includes more than these two elements (as will be described in the implementation considerations section), phonics and vocabulary anchor word study and are essential for developing decoding skills and expanding one’s reading comprehension. Research on phonics and vocabulary are briefly presented in this section.

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

New York City Department
of Education

<http://schools.nyc.gov/Academics/EnglishLanguageArts/StandardsCurriculum/default.htm>

Phonics. The National Reading Panel (2000) concluded that systematic phonics instruction produces a significant impact on students’ growth as readers. Pressley, Wharton-McDonald, Ranking, Mistretta, Yokoi, et al. (1996) conclude that the development of letter-sound associations and explicit decoding instruction focusing on the sounds of words is definitely associated with later reading success. Programs that include systematic instruction on letter-sound correspondences lead to higher achievement in both word recognition and spelling, at least in the early grades and especially for struggling or economically disadvantaged students (Adams, 1990). There is no significant difference in effectiveness among the kinds of systematic phonics instruction.

Vocabulary. One of the most persistent findings in reading research is that the size of students’ vocabulary relates strongly to their reading comprehension and overall academic success (Baumann, Kame'enui, & Ash, 2003; Becker, 1977; Davis, 1942; Whipple, 1925). Although most word learning occurs incidentally through experiences with oral language and wide reading (National Reading Panel, 2000), intentional, explicit teaching of specific words and word-learning strategies can both add words to students’ vocabularies (Tomeson & Aarnoutse, 1998; White, Graves, & Slater, 1990) and improve reading comprehension of texts containing those words (McKeown, Beck, Omanson, & Pople, 1985; Stahl & Fairbanks, 1986). Effective instruction includes opportunities for both incidental word learning and intentional word learning. Vocabulary instruction should address academic vocabulary, which is critical to understanding the concepts of the content taught in school.

Research shows that background knowledge is more important to the understanding of reading than IQ. According to Marzano (2004), the most important thing a teacher can do to ensure that students have the background knowledge to understand the content they will encounter in the areas of science, social studies, and so on, is to provide students with direct instruction in academic vocabulary terms. Academic vocabulary is the vocabulary critical to understanding the concepts of the content taught in school. Vocabulary instruction in

specific content-area terms builds up students' background knowledge in the content areas. When students understand the academic vocabulary, it is easier for them to understand the information they will read and hear in class.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

1. Evaluate the existing word-study curriculum, considering the following goals.

- Students are able to read a large core of high-frequency words.
- Students understand simple and complex letter-sound relationships.
- Students know and use patterns within words.
- Students are continually expanding their vocabularies.
- Students use word-solving strategies.
- Students use references, resources, and proofreading.

2. Build a vocabulary of common words.

In English, about 120 words make up half of all written text. Students must learn to quickly and automatically recognize and spell these most common words (*of, and, the, is, etc.*). As part of word study, teachers should assess students' sight word knowledge and ensure that students know these high-frequency words. *Fry's Instant Word List* or the *Dolch List* can be used to assess students' sight word knowledge. (These lists can be found on numerous websites.) Expectations on sight word knowledge can be established for each grade level.

In the primary grades, the words on the word walls should be high-frequency words. Teachers should introduce five new words each week until mid-April. The goal is to have all students know the words with some automaticity before going to the next grade level. *Month-by-Month Phonics* by Pat Cunningham identifies appropriate word wall words.

3. Provide systematic phonics instruction in a balanced literacy program.

Phonics instruction works best when it is part of a balanced literacy program. Phonics should not dominate reading instruction. A program of systematic phonics instruction identifies a carefully selected and useful set of letter-sound relationships and then organizes the instruction of these relationships into a logical instructional sequence. Characteristics of effective phonics instruction include the following:

- Teachers explicitly and systematically instruct students in how to relate letters and sounds, how to break spoken words into sounds, and how to blend sounds to form words.
- Students understand why they are learning the relationships between letters and sounds.
- Students apply their knowledge of phonics as they read words, sentences, and text.
- Students apply what they learn about sounds and letters to their own writing.
- Instruction can be adapted to the needs of individual students as informed by assessment.

- Students are provided with many opportunities to practice the letter-sound relationships they are learning.

Research suggests that the most effective phonics instruction is planned and sequential, explicit, and systematic.

4. Provide opportunities to broaden students' vocabulary exposure.

Vocabulary refers to words students must know to read increasingly demanding text with comprehension. Effective vocabulary instruction includes opportunities for both incidental word learning and intentional word teaching. A comprehensive vocabulary program should include the following components:

- Frequent, varied, and extensive language experiences
- Teaching individual words through explicit vocabulary instruction
- Teaching word learning strategies
- Strategies for fostering word consciousness (Graves, 2006)

Vocabulary can be learned through reading and talking (incidental word learning). To promote incidental word learning, teachers provide opportunities to use oral language experiences at school to promote vocabulary growth. Reading children's books aloud, particularly when accompanied by teacher-student talk, can increase students' vocabularies. Once students are reading on their own, a wide range of reading materials will aid vocabulary growth.

Intentional and explicit instruction of specific words and word-learning strategies also is important. In selecting specific words to teach, teachers should consider two criteria: importance (words that are important for understanding a specific reading selection or concept) and usefulness and frequency (words that are generally useful for students to know and that they are likely to encounter with some frequency in their reading).

Students should be given a student-friendly definition of the words targeted for explicit instruction. They also should be repeatedly exposed to new words in multiple oral and written contexts and provided sufficient practice opportunities for learning words. Researchers estimate that it could take as many as 17 exposures for a student to learn a new word. Repeated exposure will be most effective if exposures appear over an extended period of time. For this reason, a small number of words should be selected for each week and receive attention all week. Teachers should give students sufficient opportunities to use new vocabulary in a variety of contexts through activities such as discussion, writing, and independent reading.

Students require strategies that will support them in learning new vocabulary independently. Students can be taught the word-learning strategies, such as learning to use context clues to determine word meanings, learning to use dictionaries and other word resources, and learning to use base words, prefixes, and suffixes to figure out meanings of words.

Academic vocabulary should be built throughout elementary school. To facilitate the development of students' academic vocabulary, the school can develop a list

of academic vocabulary words and terms by grade level that all teachers will teach. Marzano and Pickering in their book, *Building Academic Vocabulary Teacher's Manual* (2005), provide a list of academic vocabulary terms that schools can use to create their own list of subject-specific vocabulary words. They recommend that teachers teach one word weekly for each academic subject (30 terms per year per subject). They also recommend that all teachers follow the same six-step process to teach the terms:

- The teacher provides a description, explanation, or example of the new term.
- Students restate the explanation of the new term in their own words.
- Students create a nonlinguistic representation of the term (draw a picture, a symbol, etc.).
- Students periodically do activities that help add to their knowledge of the vocabulary terms.
- Periodically, students are asked to discuss the terms with one another.
- Periodically, students are involved in games that allow them to play with the terms.

DOING WHAT WORKS: Examples From Real Schools

Text Talk, developed by Beck and McKeown (2001), is designed to increase both comprehension and vocabulary by incorporating word learning in the context of reading new books. The goals of Text Talk are to develop comprehension with open-ended questions and to enhance vocabulary development. In order to increase comprehension, the teacher intersperses open-ended questions that require students to explain and describe text ideas and then asks follow-up questions that encourage elaboration of initial ideas. The pictures in the book are presented after students have responded to the text. Discussions are based on the actual text. Students are not permitted to rely heavily on their background knowledge. This aligns well with the expectations of the Common Core.

Using explicit instruction, three or four vocabulary words are taught after the story has been read. The teacher gives the word within the context that appears in the story and then provides a student-friendly definition. Students repeat the word and then interact with the word in different contexts to assure understanding. The word is then repeated. This process continues with the remaining words. Finally, students are given exercises using the word—including, responding to questions, making comparisons, and choosing the correct word within the context of a scenario.

District U-46 in Elgin, Illinois, implements the Text Talk instructional strategy with its diverse student population. Information including demonstration videos about Text Talk are posted on their website <http://www.u-46.org/roadmap/dyncat.cfm?catid=640>. Text Talk lessons created by Utah educators for more than 100 books are available on the Utah State Office of Education website <http://www.schools.utah.gov/curr/readingfirst/documents/combinedtexttalklessons.pdf>.

Recommendation 4: Classroom Management

Develop and implement with fidelity a plan to ensure that the components of effective classroom management are evident in every classroom.

LINK TO RESEARCH

Studies of effective teachers, effective reading programs, and productive schools show that management at the classroom level is critical to ensuring that time is used well and that reading achievement is maximized (Fountas & Pinnell, 1999; Samuels, 1981). In classrooms taught by skilled teachers, more of the available learning time “is spent in activities with academic value” (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985).

Routines. Classroom routines positively affect students’ academic performance as well as their behavior (Vallecorsa, deBettencourt, & Zigmond, 2000). Teachers in schools with high levels of student literacy “maximize every instructional minute” (Briggs & Thomas, 1997). Well-managed classrooms are the hallmark of effective teachers. Research shows that students learn more in classrooms that are well organized and that good classroom management results in more and better student engagement.

There is a substantial body of research showing “that time allocated for academic instruction in a school day can easily slip away when a teacher cannot keep the transitional time, wait time, and behavioral problems to a minimum” (Berliner, 1981). In “unsuccessful classrooms, time is wasted because routines are not established and there are often interruptions brought about by discipline problems” (Samuels, 1981). Even in many average classes, “there is a lack of attention to classroom management that results in considerable inefficiency and reduced achievement on standardized tests of reading” (Berliner, 1981).

In contrast, when teachers are effective managers, the classrooms are characterized as “being orderly because less time is wasted on discipline problems and giving instructions on routine matters, such as passing out books and transitions from one activity to another” (Samuels, 1981) and because there are routines for ensuring that learning activities run smoothly (Anderson et al., 1985; Briggs & Thomas, 1997). The great portion of class time is devoted to the lesson at hand (Rutter, 1983).

Self-Regulation. Research shows that effective teachers foster self-regulation in their students. Self-regulation includes and is related to children’s capacity to focus attention upon, engage in, and persist at learning tasks; their ability to manage both positive and negative emotions in a group setting; and their capacity to plan and follow through on their plans. Warmth, organization, and predictability are factors that improve self-regulation in the home and also seem to be important in classrooms.

Preschool children with good self-regulation have higher levels of school readiness. Good self-regulation in preschool predicts children’s academic success in primary grades better than children’s IQ, their socioeconomic background, or their preschool knowledge of mathematics and literacy (Blair, 2011). Self-regulation continues to be a strong predictor of academic achievement in elementary school and middle school. Low-income students consistently demonstrate lower levels of self-regulation and higher incidences of behavior problems than their middle-income peers (Evans & Rosenbaum, 2008).

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

New York City Department
of Education

<http://schools.nyc.gov/Teachers/TeacherDevelopment/TeacherDevelopmentToolkit/PTS/>

*Creating Classroom
Routines and
Procedures*

http://teacher.scholastic.com/classroom_management_pictures/index.htm

Tools of the Mind program

<http://www.toolsofthemind.org>

Promoting Alternative
Thinking Skills program

<http://www.channing-bete.com/prevention-programs/paths/paths.html>

Classroom Environment. A school behavior plan has an indirect influence on student achievement and is not as important in affecting student achievement as classroom environments, which have a more direct and immediate impact on achievement. Clearly articulating and enforcing rules of behavior at the school level has a moderate influence on student achievement (Marzano, 2000). Decreasing disruptive behavior in the classroom, however, and employing effective classroom management strategies have a strong influence on student achievement (Hattie, 2009). Because of this, the focus of this recommendation is on the classroom rather than the school. The school should assess whether schoolwide behavior problems warrant adopting schoolwide strategies.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

1. Establish routines.

Teachers should establish routines and procedures that minimize disruptions and provide smooth transitions within and between lessons. Establishing consistent and predictable routines let students know what to expect and what is expected of them. Routines set guidelines for acceptable and unacceptable behavior. In many classrooms, a significant proportion of class time (about 25 percent on average) is spent on transitions such as collecting and putting away materials, listening to nonacademic directions, and waiting for help or for the next activity to begin. Teachers can minimize the time lost by preparing carefully for transitions and warning students about the close of one activity and the beginning of another, providing brief but clear directions, having materials immediately available, actively monitoring and reinforcing appropriate student behavior, and beginning a new activity quickly and enthusiastically.

Routines are procedures for handling both daily occurrences (e.g., taking attendance, starting a class period, turning in assignments) and minor interruptions of instruction, such as the class phone ringing. Teachers should develop routines for three types of recurring and predictable classroom events.

- Establish administrative procedures for recurring events such as storing coats or books, using the restroom, sharpening pencils, taking attendance, making announcements, and dismissing students.
- Establish behaviors that support instruction and learning to make teaching and learning as effective as possible. The routines include how to get students to pay attention such as a nonverbal signal or a countdown, how students should respond to teacher questions (hand raising or random choice of which students will answer), when and how individual students can get extra help from the teacher, and what to do when students finish tasks ahead of the rest of the class.
- Establish routines for working in groups. Routines should be established for how to participate in discussions, how to behave in groups, and how to work with a partner.

Consistency and practice are critical to making classroom routines effective. Teachers need to consistently follow through and actively explain the routines and the reasoning behind them. They then must model routines consistently and persistently. Teachers

have to teach the classroom routines in the same way they teach academic subjects and need to be proactive in keeping students focused on successful routines. Teaching the routines is particularly important at the start of the school year.

2. Foster self-regulation.

Teachers help students' ability to self-regulate by providing an organized classroom environment and by removing elements in the environment that might trigger impulsive behavior. Students begin school with a set of self-regulation skills that are a product of their genetic inheritance and their family environment. Teachers, however, can have an effect on the students who come to school without good self-regulation by improving planning and organization, making classroom management more consistent, and facilitating students' independent and small-group work. Teachers should address three factors that create problems for self-regulation—negative emotions, lapses, and cue exposure.

- Correct and redirect negative emotions. Negative emotions reduce the ability to self-regulate. Many misbehaviors—fighting, teasing, breaking rules—are associated with negative emotions such as anger or frustration. When addressing negative emotions, teachers can give students who act impulsively a correction and redirection rather than a rebuke, which makes the students feel bad (negative emotion).
- Help students to put lapses behind them. Lapses (“falling off the wagon”) can lead to people more or less giving up their attempts to self-regulate. When a student has a lapse, the teacher should encourage the student to put the lapse behind and resolve again to behave according to expectations the student is well aware of.
- Eliminate cues that prompt student distraction. Cues (subtle or overt reminders of the appeal of the thing to be avoided) can make self-regulation difficult. Teachers should get rid of the cues—remove the distraction—rather than counting on students to ignore cues.

3. Modify the learning environment.

There are several ways teachers can modify the learning environment and decrease problem behavior. Three effective strategies:

- Assign attainable academic tasks. When there is a mismatch between a student's ability level and the difficulty and/or length of an academic task, inappropriate behavior is more frequent (Umbreit, Lane, & Dejud, 2004). Teachers should increase opportunities for academic success—for example, by providing opportunities for students to answer questions correctly. Teachers should pay careful attention to the difficulty of reading assignments and support students as they are learning to read. Every student has an independent, instructional, and frustration reading level, and teachers should ensure that students are not being asked to read materials at their frustration level. Literacy activities should be challenging but attainable with effort. Teachers can boost students' confidence, which increases students' intrinsic motivation to read, by working with students to set goals, monitoring their progress toward those goals, and providing frequent positive feedback on their performance.

- Use engaging instruction. Engaging instruction is a prevention tool for problem behavior. Adapting or varying instruction to promote high rates of student engagement and on-task behavior decreases problem behavior. Instruction delivered at a brisk pace contributes to higher levels of student engagement. Instruction that includes modeling, guided practice, and independent practice also increases student engagement.
- Form positive relationships. Forming positive relationships with students is another prevention tool against problem behavior. Students need to know the teacher cares about them and their learning.

As part of the NYC Citywide Instructional Expectations for 2011–12 for strengthening teacher practice, many schools will be using Charlotte Danielson’s *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (2007). Danielson divides the complex activity of teaching into twenty-two components clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility. One of these domains is instruction, which includes engaging students in learning. Danielson identifies and provides guidance on many instructional variables that influence student engagement: the way content is represented, activities, assignments, grouping of students, instructional materials and resources, and structure and pacing, among others.

The Teacher Development Toolkit, provided online by the NYC Department of Education, addresses the Professional Teaching Standard of *Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning*. The toolkit offers guidance in five areas that support learning and engagement:

- Connecting students’ prior knowledge, life experiences, and interests with learning goals
- Using a variety of instructional strategies and resources to respond to students’ diverse needs
- Promoting self-directed, reflective learning for all students
- Facilitating learning experiences that promote autonomy, interaction, and choice
- Engaging students in problem solving, critical thinking, and other activities that make subject matter meaningful

Improving Self-Regulation in Children

An example of a curriculum designed to improve self-regulation in children once they enter school is *Tools of the Mind*, an early childhood program composed of 40 activities intended to improve self-regulation, working memory, and cognitive flexibility. The *Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)* program for preschool and elementary students is another program designed to help develop self-regulation while focusing on social and emotional learning. These two programs have some evidence of effectiveness but more research is needed.

Scholastic, the educational publisher, has launched a Keep Cool in School campaign against violence and verbal abuse. The program is founded on the work of Bruce D. Perry, M.D., Ph.D., an expert on brain development and children in crisis. Perry has identified six core strengths that children need to be more resourceful, more successful in social situations, and more resilient. Self-regulation is one of the core strengths. The six core strengths include attachment (being a friend), self-regulation (thinking before you act), affiliation (joining in), awareness (thinking of others), tolerance (accepting differences), and respect (respecting yourself and others). A child who can form and maintain healthy emotional relationships, self-regulate, join and contribute to a group, and be aware, tolerant, and respectful of himself and others will rarely become violent and will recover more quickly when exposed to violence.

Developing Self-Regulation Strategies

Explicit instruction to develop self-regulation strategies is necessary for some students. These self-regulation strategies are included as part of Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD). SRSD has been used in spelling, reading, writing, and mathematics.

For example, fourth- and fifth-grade teachers in the Montgomery County Schools in Maryland used SRSD during writers' workshop to teach their students a five-step writing strategy for writing a story and to teach the self-regulation procedures of goal setting and self-monitoring through a series of extended minilessons. They found that this had positive effects on the writing of their students with and without a learning disability.

SRSD, developed by Harris and Graham (2008), is an approach to teaching writing that includes the development of self-regulation strategies. With the SRSD approach, students are explicitly taught strategies for specific writing genres as well as general writing strategies. In addition, they learn how to use self-regulation strategies, including goal setting, self-monitoring, self-reinforcement, and self-instruction, to help them manage the writing strategies and tasks and to obtain concrete and visible evidence of their progress. Students learn to use these writing and self-regulation strategies during the writing process.

Recommendation 5: Common Core

Develop and implement a multiyear plan to align the school’s curriculum, instruction, assessments, and instructional materials to the Common Core standards.

As reflected in Positive Key Finding 2, P.S. 94 Kings College School provides curriculum maps that outline a framework for standards-based instruction. These maps provide a strong foundation on which the school can build as they implement the Common Core standards.

LINK TO RESEARCH

The Common Core State Standards Initiative coordinated by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers with the involvement of 48 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands identified what American students need to know and do to be successful in college and careers. These standards are based on best practices in national and international education as well as research and input from numerous sources including scholars, assessment developers, professional organizations, and educators representing all grade levels from kindergarten through postsecondary. These standards are comparable with other countries’ expectations and are grounded in available evidence and research.

The state of New York adopted the Common Core State Standards on July 19, 2010.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

1. **Align curriculum to the NYS P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy.**

The adoption of the Common Core provides an opportunity for teachers at P.S. 94 Kings College School to work in collaborative teams to identify what they are currently teaching through a curriculum mapping process. It will be essential for teams to identify redundancies and gaps between what they should be teaching according to the Common Core and what they are teaching.

Teachers in teams should look closely at current student work to determine the discrepancy between that work and the level of performance that the Common Core demands, and then plan the steps needed to close any discrepancies.

Instructional Expectations for 2011–12 require teachers to work together to engage all students in rigorous tasks, embedded in well-crafted instructional units and with appropriate supports. For ELA, these tasks include:

- Teachers of prekindergarten through Grade 2 are expected to engage their students in at least one literacy task aligned to the Common Core Reading Informational Text Standards 1 and 10 and Writing Standard 2 (written response to informational texts through group activities and with prompting and support).
- Teachers of Grades 3–8 are expected to engage their students in at least one literacy task aligned to Common Core Reading Informational Text Standards 1 and

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

Common Core State Standards

<http://www.corestandards.org/>

Provides pertinent information about the state learning standards for ELA and literacy and the Common Core standards

<http://www.p12.nysed.gov>

Common Core resources

<http://schools.nyc.gov/Academics/CommonCoreLibrary/default.htm>

Resources for strengthening teacher practice

www.arisnyc.org

Common Core Curriculum Mapping Project

<http://commoncore.org>

Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC)

www.parcconline.org

10 (written analysis of informational texts) or Common Core Reading Informational Text Standards 1 and 10 and Writing Standard 1 (written opinion or argument based on an analysis of informational texts).

These tasks are to be embedded in Common Core-aligned curricula and include multiple entry points for all learners, including students with disabilities and English language learners. Through the work of implementing these performance tasks, teachers will use the inquiry cycle to adjust their curriculum and instruction to help all students meet the expectations of the Common Core. Because standards are not curriculum, teachers will need a curriculum to assist them in helping students meet the Common Core standards. The New York State Education Department is developing curriculum modules to help teachers develop curriculum that is aligned to the Common Core. These curriculum modules will be available to schools during the 2012–13 school year.

2. Align instructional materials to the Common Core.

Another task related to the Common Core standards is for schools to ensure that the texts for each grade align with the complexity requirements outlined in the Common Core. Schools need to select complex texts that are grade level appropriate and meet the text complexity requirements of the Common Core. These levels of text complexity are significantly higher than the level of texts currently being used in most schools. The expectation of the Common Core is that students have extensive classroom practice with texts at or above grade level. It is the expectation of the Common Core that students who are not reading on grade level should be given the support they need to read texts at the appropriate level of complexity rather than be given less complex texts. Many students will need careful scaffolding to enable them to read at the level of text complexity required by the Common Core.

The Common Core places a great emphasis on informational text, and expects students to read informational text 50 percent of the time and literary text 50 percent of the time. Schools need to ascertain whether enough informational text is available at all grade levels and is being used instructionally.

3. Align instruction to the expectations of the Common Core.

As part of the work outlined in the Citywide Instructional Expectations for 2011–12, teachers need to begin to adjust their instruction to help all students meet the higher expectations of the Common Core. In order to help students meet the standards outlined in the Common Core, several changes in literacy instruction will be necessary.

Literacy Instruction. One of these changes is the focus of literacy instruction. The focus of literacy instruction reflected in the Common Core is careful examination of the text itself, which requires close and careful reading. Schools must provide all students, including those who are behind, with extensive opportunities to encounter and comprehend grade-level complex texts, as required by the standards. Students can access complex texts through read-alouds or as a group reading activity. Schools should consider carefully their read-aloud selections. Students whose decoding ability is developing at a slower rate also need opportunities to read text they can read

successfully without extensive extra assistance. All students are expected to have daily opportunities for independent reading. Reading materials should include newspaper and magazine articles and websites.

Type of Questions. Another change is the type of questions teachers ask of students. Eighty to ninety percent of the standards require text dependent analysis.

To help students meet the standards outlined in the Common Core, teachers should ask high quality text dependent questions. Text dependent questions are those that can be answered only by careful scrutiny of the text, with students specifically referring to evidence from the text itself to support the answer and not referring to information or evidence from outside the text. The questions are grounded in the text, and students must think carefully about what they heard or read and draw evidence from the text in support of their ideas about the reading.

Strategy Instruction. Another change in literacy instruction is the role of strategy instruction. The Common Core standards necessitate a reconsideration of the role of reading strategies. Strategies should be embedded in the activity of reading a text rather than being taught separately from texts.

Writing Instruction. Changes in writing instruction may be necessary to help students meet the Common Core standards. Thirty percent of writing instruction should be devoted to opinion pieces, 35 percent to informative/explanatory texts, and 35 percent to narratives. Students should be given extensive practice with short focused research projects.

4. Redesign assessment to reflect the expectations in the Common Core.

During the 2012–13 school year interim assessments based on the Common Core Standards will be administered. In addition, items developed by the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), of which the state of New York is a member, will be field tested. The PARCC assessments will be operational during the 2014–15 school year. Presently, the PARCC assessments include two summative assessments, which will measure the full range of the Common Core State Standards at each grade level. One required component that counts toward the summative score includes performance-based assessments in Grades 3–8 administered as close to the end of the year as possible.

Priorities in ELA/literacy will include focusing on writing effectively when analyzing text. Another component that is required and counts toward the summative score includes end-of-year assessments comprised of computer-based machine-scorable items focusing on reading and comprehending complex texts in ELA/literacy. A third required assessment of listening/speaking can be administered at any time of the year. With this in mind, schools need to examine assessments they currently use to determine if they are aligned with the Common Core.

DOING WHAT WORKS: Examples From Real Schools

The Common Core Curriculum Mapping Project provides teachers with a roadmap for translating the Common Core into instruction and resources for developing more detailed curriculum and lesson plans. For most grades, there are six English Language Arts (ELA) Curriculum Maps, each of which contains a list of focus standards taken from the Common Core, specific student objectives, an overview of skills and content the unit will cover, and sample student activities and assessments. Each also includes an essential question that frames the unit, suggested texts (including Common Core exemplar texts), a list of key terminology, and links to additional instructional resources. Future iterations of the maps will include sample student work and scoring rubrics to help teachers who would like to use the sample activities as formative assessment tools.

References

- Adams, M. J. (1990). *Beginning to read: Thinking and learning about print*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Adams, M. J., & Bruck, M. (1993). Word recognition: The interface of educational policies and scientific research. *Reading and Writing*, 5(2), 113–139.
- Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkinson, I. A. G. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the Commission on Reading*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Institute of Education.
- Baumann, J. F., Kame'enui, E. J., & Ash, G. E. (2003). Research on vocabulary instruction: Voltaire redux. In J. Flood, D. Lapp, J. R. Squire, and J. M. Jensen (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (2nd ed., pp. 752–785). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Beck, I. L., & McKeown, M. G. (2001). Text talk: Capturing the benefits of read-aloud experiences for young children. *The Reading Teacher*, 55(1), 10–20.
- Becker, W. C. (1977). Teaching reading and language to the disadvantaged—What we have learned from field research. *Harvard Educational Review*, 47(4), 518–543.
- Berliner, D. C. (1981). Academic learning time and reading achievement. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews* (pp. 203–226). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Blair, C., Protzko, J., & Ursache, A. (2011). Self-regulation and early literacy. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (Vol. 3, pp. 20–35). New York: Guilford.
- Briggs, K. L., & Thomas, K. (1997). *Patterns of success: Successful pathways to elementary literacy in Texas Spotlight Schools*. Austin: Texas Center for Educational Research.
- Brown, I. S., & Felton, R. H. (1990). Effects of instruction on beginning reading skills in children at risk for reading disability. *Reading and Writing*, 2(3), 223–241.
- Chall, J. S. (1983). *Learning to read: The great debate* (Updated ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Davis, F. B. (1942). Two new measures of reading ability. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 33(5), 365–372.
- Duke, N. K. & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 205–242). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset*. New York: Random House.
- Evans, G. W., & Rosenbaum, J. (2008). Self-regulation and the income-achievement gap. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 23(4), 504–514.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2007). Implementing a schoolwide literacy framework: Improving achievement in an urban elementary school. *Reading Teacher*, 61(1), 32–43.
- Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (1999). What does good first teaching mean? In J. S. Gaffney & B. J. Askew (Eds.), *Stirring the waters: The influence of Marie Clay* (pp. 165–185). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Graves, M. F. (2006). *The vocabulary book: Learning and instruction*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.
- Kagan, S. (2010). *Cooperative learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan.
- Kame'enui, E. J., Simmons, D. C., Baker, S., Chard, D. J., Dickson, S. V., Gunn, B., et al. (1998). Effective strategies for teaching beginning reading. In E. J. Kame'enui & D. W. Carnine (Eds.), *Effective teaching strategies that accommodate diverse learners* (pp. 45–70). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.
- Kleinfeld, J. (1972). *Effective teachers of Indian and Eskimo high school students*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska, Institute of Social, Economic, and Government Research.

- Kong, A., & Pearson, P. D. (2003). The road to participation: The construction of a literacy practice in a learning community of linguistically diverse learners. *Research in the teaching of English*, 38(1), 85–124.
- Lloyd, S. L. (2004). Using comprehension strategies as a springboard for student talk. *Journal of adolescent and adult literacy*, 48(2), 114–124.
- Marzano, R. J. (2000). *A new era of school reform: Going where the research takes us*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Marzano, R. J. (2004). *Building Background Knowledge for Academic Achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. J. (2005). *Building academic vocabulary teacher's manual*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. J. (2010). *The highly engaged classroom*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory.
- McKeown, M. G., & Beck, I. L. (2003). Taking advantage of read-alouds to help children make sense of decontextualized language. In A. van Kleeck, S. A. Stahl, & E. B. Bauer (Eds.). *On reading books to children* (pp. 153–169). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- McKeown, M. G., Beck, I. L., Omanson, R. C., & Pople, M. T. (1985). Some effects of the nature and frequency of vocabulary instruction on the knowledge and use of words. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 20(5), 522–535.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- Pearson, P. D., & Gallagher, M. C. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8(3), 317–344.
- Perry, B. D. (n.d.). *Keep the cool in school: Promoting-non-violent behavior in children*. Retrieved August 17, 2011, from <http://teacher.scholastic.com/professional/bruceperry/cool.htm>
- Pressley, M., Wharton-McDonald, R., Ranking, J., Mistretta, J., Yokoi, L., & Ettenberger, S. (1996). The nature of outstanding primary-grades literacy instruction. In E. McIntyre & M. Pressley (Eds.), *Balanced instruction: Strategies and skills in whole language* (pp. 251–276). Norwood, MA: Christopher-Gordon.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1992). *Pygmalion in the classroom*. (Exp. ed.). Norwalk, CT: Irvington.
- Rutter, M. (1983). School effects on pupil progress: Research findings and policy implications. *Child Development*, 54(1), 1–29.
- Samuels, S. J. (1981). Characteristics of exemplary reading programs. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews* (pp. 255–273). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Stahl, S. A., & Fairbanks, M. M. (1986). The effects of vocabulary instruction: A model-based meta-analysis. *Review of Educational Research*, 56(1), 72–110.
- Taberski, S. (2000). *On solid ground: Strategies for teaching reading K–3*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Tomeson, M., & Aarnoutse, C. (1998). Effects of an instructional programme for deriving word meanings. *Educational Studies*, 24(1), 107–128.
- Umbreit, J., Lane, K. L., & Dejud, C. (2004). Improving classroom behavior by modifying task difficulty: Effects of increasing the difficulty of too-easy tasks. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 6(1), 13–20.
- Vallecorsa, A. L., deBettencourt, L. U., & Zigmond, N. (2000). *Students with mild disabilities in general education settings: A guide for special educators*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Whipple, G. M. (Ed.). (1925). *The twenty-fourth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Report of the National Committee on Reading*. Bloomington, IL: Public School Publishing.
- White, T. G., Graves, M. F., & Slater, W. H. (1990). Growth of reading vocabulary in diverse elementary schools: Decoding and word meaning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(2), 281–290.

LEARNING POINT Associates®
An Affiliate of American Institutes for Research®

22 Cortlandt Street, Floor 16
New York, NY 10007-3139
800.356.2735 | 212.419.0415
www.air.org

Copyright © 2011 American Institutes for Research. All rights reserved.

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by Learning Point Associates, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research, with funds from the New York State Education Department (NYSED). The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of NYSED, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement.