

Performance Conservatory High School

FINAL REPORT



Contents

- Introduction 1
 - About This Report 1
 - About Performance Conservatory High School 1
 - Audit Process at Performance Conservatory High School 2

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

- Recommendations 5
 - Overview of Recommendations 5
 - Recommendation 1: Student Engagement 7
 - Recommendation 2: Instructional Rigor 12
 - Recommendation 3: Systemic Academic Interventions 16

- References 21

Introduction

About This Report

This final report is the result of an external school curriculum audit (ESCA) of Performance Conservatory High School by Learning Point Associates, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research. This audit was conducted in response to the school being designated as in need of improvement under the New York State Education Department 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 Performance Conservatory High School

Located in the Bronx, Performance Conservatory High School (X262) serves 418 students in Grades 9–12. The school population comprises 45 percent African-American, 53 percent Hispanic, 1 percent Caucasian, and 1 percent Asian students. The student body includes 9 percent English language learners (ELL) and 26 percent special education students. Twenty-four percent of students are boys, and 76 percent are girls. The average attendance rate for the 2009–10 school year is 79 percent. Seventy-seven percent of the students are eligible for free lunch, and 4 percent are eligible for reduced-price lunch.

The school was opened in September 2004 on the Harry S. Truman Educational Campus. In the summer of 2006, Performance Conservatory High School moved in and shares the building with Junior High School 98 and Explorations Academy. The three schools share one auditorium, two gymnasiums, a student cafeteria, and one nurse.

In 2009–10 Performance Conservatory High School did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) in English language arts (ELA) for all students, African-American students, Hispanic or Latino students, and economically disadvantaged students. Additionally, the school did not meet AYP in mathematics for all students, Hispanic or Latino students, and economically disadvantaged students.¹

In early 2011, the NYCDOE approved a proposal to phase out Performance Conservatory High School. The phase-out process will begin in fall 2011. In the NYCDOE phase-out proposal, the Department states:

The New York City Department of Education (DOE) is proposing to phase out Performance Conservatory based on its poor performance and the DOE's assessment that the school lacks capacity to turn around quickly to better support student need.²

By 2014, after all students have matriculated out of the high school, the school will close permanently.³

¹<http://www.nystart.gov/publicweb-rc/2010/94/AOR-2010-321200011262.pdf>. Accessed on July 18, 2011.

²http://schools.nyc.gov/NR/rdonlyres/F3C58C4A-0278-496B-8044-D7EB70C88435/0/PEP_Notice_PerformanceConservatory_vfinal.pdf. Accessed on July 18, 2011.

³<http://schools.nyc.gov/community/planning/changes/bronx/performance>. Accessed on July 18, 2011.

Audit Process at Performance Conservatory High School

The ESCA approach utilized at the high school level examines six topic areas: student engagement, academic interventions and supports, support for incoming students, classroom instruction, professional development, and courses and extracurriculars. Data were collected at the school level through teacher surveys, administrator interviews, classroom observations, and an analysis of documents submitted by Performance Conservatory High School during April and May, 2011. From these data, Learning Point Associates prepared a series of reports for the school's use.

These reports were presented to the school during a co-interpretationSM meeting on May 20, 2011. During this meeting, 10 stakeholders from the Performance Conservatory High School community read the reports. Through a facilitated and collaborative group process, they identified individual findings, then developed and prioritized key findings that emerged from information in the reports.

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 Performance Conservatory High School.

Key Findings

After considerable thought and discussion, a set of key findings emerged from the co-interpretation process. These key findings are detailed in this section.

Critical Key Findings

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 1:

Student engagement and classroom climate are negatively impacted by tardiness, disrespect, disregard, and external disruptions.

Classroom observations conducted by the auditors showed that students did not match their teachers' affect, and student engagement was inconsistent, with instances of blatant disrespect among students. Moreover, classrooms where negative climate was observed as a major disrupter were characterized by student disregard for the school, disregard for the teacher, and disregard for other students. Tardiness was the most common classroom disrupter; however, wasted time and lost productivity, behavior, negative climate, and external disruptions also were observed.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 2:

Inconsistent instructional practices provided limited opportunities for students to think critically and work independently.

Critical Key Finding 2 is supported by data gathered from classroom observations, the teacher survey, and school interviews. Classroom observation data showed that teachers used inconsistent modeling and scaffolding techniques; less than half of observed teachers provided support for student autonomy; opportunities for critical thinking and complex problem solving were available inconsistently to students; there were infrequent connections made with adolescent life; lesson objectives were not always clear; the focus of instruction was consistently broad with less emphasis on deeper understanding; and when students were asked questions, they were guided to the solution inconsistently by their teacher. Further, more than half of the 17 teacher survey respondents reported having students respond to textbooks or worksheet questions from one to two times a week to almost daily in their classrooms.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 3:

There is uncertainty about the effectiveness of the school's academic intervention program.

Attendance in the school's afterschool program is not mandatory and attendance is low. The only program the school has in place to address academic deficiencies is Achieve 3000. About one third of surveyed teachers suggested the school is minimally or not likely to identify the kinds of academic supports students need, and 41 percent of teachers expressed low confidence in the effectiveness of the current services and supports offered to students.

Positive Key Findings

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 1:

Teachers gain support from colleagues for new ideas on how to support students with disabilities and struggling students.

Positive Key Finding 1 is supported by data from the teacher survey, in which 75 percent of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that they seek out each other to ask questions and learn new ideas. Seventy-one percent of teachers indicated they were very likely to share their concerns about struggling students with other teachers in the school. Teachers further indicated that they most commonly consult with their colleagues around issues related to improving instruction for students with disabilities.

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 2:

Teachers use multiple sources of data to inform their planning and delivery of instruction, according to teachers surveyed and school interviews.

Forty-four percent of surveyed teachers reference classroom- or teacher-created assessments twice a week, and 19 percent indicated referencing these materials daily or almost daily. Interviewed school leaders mentioned that the school uses the results of the Regents exam and various assessments to identify and help at-risk students. Additionally, the school tracks attendance and contacts (or attempts to contact) parents each time a student is absent. The school uses the Home Language Identification Survey to identify students with limited English proficiency; this is followed up throughout the year with interim assessments for progress monitoring.

Recommendations

Overview of Recommendations

During the site visit, observers were unaware that there were plans to close the school. However, our staff did learn of the high rate of principal turnover at the school. Toward the end of the co-interpretation, the audit staff became aware that Performance Conservatory High School would be phased out. It appeared that the school was notified of this decision just prior to the co-interpretation process. The staff and co-interpretation participants were mindful of this in their prioritization of key findings. For example, one key finding that surfaced was related to programs the school used to help ninth graders transition into high school. However, since Performance Conservatory High School will not have another ninth grade class, participants chose to invest the resources they had into other areas.

During the co-interpretation at Performance Conservatory High School, participants identified several critical issues related to student engagement and behavior, rigorous instruction, and implementing systematic academic interventions. The recommendations provided in this report are designed to address each of these three areas and to provide guidance for the school's focus areas during the transition to closure period. Co-interpretation participants also identified several areas where the school is performing strongly, including data-driven instruction, informal teacher collaboration, and using data to identify at-risk students and to monitor their progress.

THE THREE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Develop and implement a schoolwide initiative aimed at increasing student engagement and creating a sustainable and supportive learning environment.
2. Implement instructional strategies that increase opportunities for higher-order thinking, analysis and problem solving, and deeper content understanding.
3. Develop and implement a schoolwide system to identify at-risk students using assessment data, provide multitiered academic interventions, and employ ongoing progress monitoring to address student needs.

These three recommendations are discussed on the following pages. Each recommendation provides a review of research, specific actions the school may wish to take during its implementation process, examples of real-life schools that have successfully implemented strategies, and online resources for additional information. Each recommendation is provided with the understanding that Performance Conservatory High School is phasing out. Each of these recommendations is designed to help the school best serve its current students. All works cited, as well as suggestions for further reading, appear in the References section at the end of this report.

Potentially negative effects of school closure may be mitigated by implementing these recommendations. According to the Consortium on Chicago School Research (de la Torre & Gwynne, 2009), the most significant impact of school closing on both reading and math achievement occurred before schools were actually closed. Students' reading scores on the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills showed loss of about a month and half of learning during the 2010–11 school year. In math, the learning loss was equivalent to slightly more than half a month. These Chicago schools were closed with approximately six months of notice, rather than on a grade-by-grade phase-out routine.

While Performance Conservatory High School has time to manage the anxiety experienced by students, parents, and teachers, the school's leadership must be cognizant of how the educational needs of their students will be met. It is important for schools that are preparing for closure to continue to use data to guide decisions; make it clear to stakeholders how students will continue to thrive; provide support to students and families throughout the transition; clarify the principal's new role in the transition; and provide staff members with clear information about next steps (Steiner, 2009).

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

Recommendation 1: Student Engagement

Develop and implement a schoolwide initiative aimed at increasing student engagement and creating a sustainable and supportive learning environment.

LINK TO RESEARCH

Student engagement provides an essential foundation for increasing achievement levels. “Educators must work to build engagement levels if they hope to support students in meeting higher standards” (Learning Point Associates, 2005, p. 2).

In a report on the 2009 High School Survey of Student Engagement, which was taken by 42,754 students, Yazzie-Mintz (2010, pp. 2–3) describes a spectrum of student disengagement—from temporary boredom to dropping out—and attributes this disengagement to the following: uninteresting and irrelevant material, work being too challenging or not challenging enough, no interaction with the teacher, not liking the school or the teacher, not seeing value in the assigned work, adults at the school not caring about the student, safety and bullying concerns, schoolwork not connecting to real world or real work, feeling little connection with any adult at the school, teacher favoritism, ineffective instruction or instructional methods, feeling unheard and not responded to or respected, and feelings of frustration and disconnection.

When students feel marginalized or alienated at school, they lose interest and become disengaged. Yazzie-Mintz (2010, p. 17) concludes that there are considerable gaps not only in academic achievement but also in student engagement, and suggests the integration of engagement data with academic data as a useful tool for school planning and decision making.

Factors that would increase student engagement, according to the surveyed students (Yazzie-Mintz, pp. 18–23) are as follows: supportive and nurturing schools; increased individualization; classes that are more fun as well as interactive, experiential, and relevant; a schoolwide belief in relationships, respect, and responsibility; coaching and modeling for the staff of good student engagement practices; reflection on and response to student ideas; adult understanding of student skills, strengths, and interests and having these qualities inform instruction; experiential learning and interdisciplinary studies; and opportunities for students to work together on finding solutions to real-world problems and issues.

Students need to build a sense of self-efficacy (Alvermann, 2003) in an inclusive environment in which they can achieve competence. They should be engaged in authentic and personally meaningful work, using a culturally relevant curriculum with an appropriate level of difficulty and challenge—one that requires problem solving (Voke, 2002). In addition, Gordon (2006) suggests the recognition and leveraging of individual student strengths and recalls a typical student response from the 2005 Gallup Youth Survey (pp. 77–80):

“My teacher understood the way that I learned and worked. I was never criticized for my ideas or feelings, but I was met with questions and ideas that could change the way I looked at something.” —Jessica, 17, Waverly, IA (p. 77)

A rubric titled the “Partnership Guide for Culturally Responsive Teaching” (Ginsberg & Wlodkowski, 2000, pp. 185–187), offers a list of engagement activities (establishing inclusion, developing a positive attitude, enhancing meaning, and engendering competence)

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

Center for Mental Health in Schools (Website)

<http://smhp.psych.ucla.edu/>

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (Website)

<http://www.casel.org>

Illinois Learning Standards for Social/Emotional Learning (Website)

http://isbe.state.il.us/ils/social_emotional/standards.htm

Morningside Center for Teaching Social Responsibility (Website)

<http://www.morningsidecenter.org>

and assessment tools. The Executive Summary of *Engaging Schools* (National Academy of Sciences, 2003) provides 10 recommendations for reaching “the goals of meaningful engagement and genuine improvements in achievement” for high school students (pp. 4–9). Easton (2008) discusses engaging struggling high school students by using experiential learning, essential questions and a whole-child perspective in curriculum development, instructional strategies, professional development, and teacher evaluations. “If there is a secret to motivation in the classroom,” says Gordon (2006, p. 80), “it lies in the interaction between the teacher and the student.”

“There is a growing consensus that whatever else is done, schools must also become places where it is easier for students and teachers to know one another well and for students to connect to the school and its purposes, says Sergiovanni (2000, p. 58). “Schools in other words must be caring and learning communities.”

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS: WHOLE-SCHOOL PRACTICES

Incorporating student engagement practices should be part of the annual school improvement process. Whole-school practices such as building a safe and supportive school environment are part of this process. Students can learn effectively only in environments in which they feel safe and supported and where their teachers have high expectations for their learning. Implementation of a schoolwide positive behavior plan that is based on prosocial values, social competencies, incentives, and positive peer relationships will lay the foundation for classroom-level work and must occur before the classroom work can begin.

The following guidelines were developed by the Victoria Department of Education and Early Child Development (2009) for implementation of effective student engagement strategies across whole schools at the building level:

1. Create a positive school culture.

Teachers and staff must recognize students as individuals by acknowledging and celebrating the diversity of the student population. The school must find ways to connect students to school (through clubs, sports, student council, and other activities) so they develop a sense of belonging. The school should provide transition programs and practices at different stages of schooling that will minimize anxiety, increase resilience, and ensure that students develop a readiness to enter their new environment and make successful transitions between year levels.

2. Encourage student participation.

Giving students a voice is not simply about the opportunity to communicate ideas and opinions; it also is about having the power to influence change. Incorporating meaningful involvement of students means validating and authorizing them to represent their own ideas, opinions, knowledge, and experiences throughout education to improve the school.

3. Proactively engage with parents/caretakers.

Keys to successful partnerships with parents/caretakers and families include strong two-way communication, volunteer opportunities, curricula-related collaborations, shared decision making, community-based partnerships, and efficacy building.

4. Implement preventative and early interventions.

The school needs to determine how it will intervene when students exhibit disengaged behaviors—specifically poor attendance and antisocial behaviors. Prevention strategies should target the whole school and should be designed to reduce any risk factors that may contribute to attendance or behavioral issues.

5. Respond to individual students.

The school should have a process in place to identify and respond to individual students who require additional assistance and support. It is imperative to coordinate early intervention and prevention strategies that utilize internal as well as external support services in order to identify and address the barriers to learning that individual students may be facing.

Schools also can implement major changes to their structures that can make it easier to develop positive learning relationships, including small learning communities, alternative scheduling, team teaching, teaching continuity, school-based enterprises, and professional learning communities.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS: CLASSROOM PRACTICES

Keeping students focused and engaged in the classroom is quite a challenge amid all the complex changes—physical, intellectual, emotional, and social—that they experience during this phase of their lives. Adolescence represents a critical period during which youth struggle to take on new responsibilities and learn decision-making skills while concurrently establishing a sense of self and identity. This period also marks a stage where adolescents are learning to regulate their behavior, which can present a challenge to keeping them on-task in the classroom. (Zimmer-Gembeck and Collins, 2003).

1. Relate lessons to students' lives.

A relevant curriculum relates content to the daily lives, concerns, experiences, and pertinent social issues of the learners. Teachers can gain insight into student concerns by taking periodic interest inventories, through informal conversations, and from classroom dialogue (Learning Point Associates, 2005). These issues and topics then can be incorporated into units, lesson plans, and further classroom discussions.

2. Make the learning authentic.

Newmann et al. (1995) advocate for authentic instructional practices to engage learners and offer three criteria for authentic instructional practices: construction of knowledge, disciplined inquiry, and value beyond the school.

The first criterion for authentic instructional practices is to facilitate the construction of knowledge by acknowledging students' existing understanding and experience. Identifying students' preconceptions and initial understanding is critical to the learning process. "If students' preconceptions are not addressed directly, they often memorize content (e.g., formulas in physics), yet still use their experience-based preconceptions to act in the world" (Donovan & Bransford, 2005, p. 5).

The second criterion for authentic instructional practices is to facilitate disciplined inquiry through structured activities; the inquiry process is critical to the construction of knowledge (Marzano, 2003; Newmann et al., 1995). This process consists of building on the learner's prior knowledge to develop a deeper understanding, integrating new information, and using the knowledge in new ways.

The third criterion for authentic instructional practices is value beyond school (Newmann et al., 1995). This criterion may entail connecting content to personal or public issues as well as the demonstration of understanding to an audience beyond the school. Examples of such activities include writing persuasive letters to the city council to advocate for a skate park, interviewing community elders for an oral history project, or communicating the impact of a development project using scientific concepts.

3. Give students choices.

Finally, providing choice in high school classrooms will engage learners. Providing opportunities for students to select a topic or text acknowledges young adolescents' need to exercise more decision-making power. Giving students ownership in their learning process increases motivation and keeps interest levels high. Students who have a strong interest in a specific subject may wish to pursue an independent project. These projects may be used as a differentiated way to explore the curriculum.

Regard for Adolescent Perspectives in the Classroom

Following are some suggestions for showing regard for adolescent perspectives. These ideas are based on the work of Smutny, Walker, and Meckstroth (1997) and Tomlinson (1999).

- Independent projects will extend learning beyond the curriculum in the textbook and develop enthusiasm, commitment, and academic skills in addition to allowing students to develop deeper relationships with subject matter.
- "Brainstorming with...children on what kinds of projects they could do may also generate ideas teachers may never have thought of on their own" (Smutny, 2000, p. 7).
- Surveying students' interests in the beginning of the school year will give teachers direction in planning activities that will "get students on board" from the start."
- Surveying again at key points during the year will inform teachers of new interests that develop as their students grow.
- Interest centers are designed to motivate students' exploration of topics in which they have a particular interest. They are usually comprised of objects that students can explore, such as shells, leaves, maps, or projects, and are centered around broad topics.
- Students can choose from the menu and note their choices accordingly.... Teachers decide how many items on the menu (minimum) that each student is required to complete. This is adjusted to meet instructional needs on an individual basis.

Examples of Student Engagement

The National Center for School Engagement (2007) compiled the following examples of student engagement best practices from school districts across the United States:

Factor in Math Fun: In Oswego, New York, a Factoring Fan Club was created for ninth grade math students to get them excited about factoring, to keep it fresh in their minds, and to be good at factoring. Source: Oswego School District, Oswego, NY

Celebrate Pi Day on 3/14: This event was created to help students enjoy math by offering a fun-filled day honoring pi. Events included a pie-eating contest, measuring the diameter and circumference of round objects to calculate pi, and other games related to circles. Source: Independence School District, Independence, VA

Mobilize Community: Community Now! is an asset-based community development tool of the Connection Institute. It uses asset-based language and planning to bring the community together to discover what values the community shares as a whole. It then works to mobilize community members around its assets and shares values to become proactive rather than reactive in its planning. Source: Kittery Children's Leadership Council, Kittery, ME

Collaborate with Higher Education: In Mesquite, Texas, a local college delivers 3.5 hours of continuing education courses (educational opportunities) to truant students and their families. The curriculum includes the negative consequences associated with poor school attendance and the positive consequences associated with scholastic achievement. Discussion of transition from high school to college is discussed, and a tour of the college is provided. Source: Dallas Independent School District, TX

Offer Incentives: As a reward, a lunchtime soccer game is organized for students with good attendance by school staff. Source: Summit School District, Frisco, CO

Support Positive Behavior: Jacksonville School District adapted the principles of *Got Fish?* (a book to build business morale) for the classroom. Principles include: being there, playing, choosing your behavior, and making their day. Students are recognized when observed living each of the principles. Source: Jacksonville School District, Jacksonville, FL

Create Student-Generated Classroom Rules: In Eugene, Oregon, students create a list of classroom rules to be followed. Each student signs off on the rules and is held accountable by fellow students. In addition, they developed their own honor roll, in which students are recognized for doing their best, following directions, and not talking out more than three times a day. Source: Linn Benton Lincoln Education Service District, Eugene, OR

Facilitate Positive Student-Teacher Connections: Some schools in Oregon encourage students to sign up for a one-on-one lunch with their teacher during school time. The teacher uses this time to get to know the student and offer encouragement and praise. Students benefit when their teachers demonstrate that they care about student well being in addition to academic success. Source: Linn Benton Lincoln Education Service District, Eugene, OR

Reprinted from *21 Ways to Engage Students in School*, available online at <http://www.schoolengagement.org/TuancypreventionRegistry/Admin/Resources/Resources/21WaystoEngageStudentsinSchool.pdf>. Copyright © 2007 National Center for School Engagement. Reprinted with permission.

Recommendation 2: Instructional Rigor

Implement instructional strategies that increase opportunities for higher-order thinking, analysis and problem solving, and deeper content understanding.

LINK TO RESEARCH

Instruction that pushes students to engage in higher-level thinking leads to deeper learning (Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock, 2001; Newmann, Bryk, & Nagaoka, 2001; Pashler et al., 2007). Too often, particularly in schools where students are struggling, instruction focuses on lower-level thinking skills, basic content, and test preparation. Teachers of struggling student groups or tracks usually offer students “less exciting instruction, less emphasis on meaning and conceptualization, and more rote drill and practice activities” than do teachers of high-performing or heterogeneous groups and classes (Cotton, 1989, p. 8). Yet, this focus on basic skills does not necessarily improve student achievement.

Several research studies were completed from 1990 to 2003 “which demonstrated that students who experienced higher levels of authentic instruction and assessment showed higher achievement than students who experienced lower levels of authentic instruction and assessment” (Newmann, King, & Carmichael, 2007, p. vii). These results included higher achievement on standardized tests (Newmann et al., 2001). It is also important to note that these results “were consistent for Grades 3–12, across different subject areas (mathematics, social studies, language arts, science), and for different students regardless of race, gender, or socioeconomic status” (Newmann et al., 2007, p. vii).

Teachers need to provide structured opportunities and time for students to take on higher-level cognitive work (Tomlinson, 2003). In discussing the gradual release of responsibility model, Fisher and Frey (2008) state that “the cognitive load should shift slowly and purposefully from teacher-as-model, to joint responsibility, to independent practice and application by the learner” (p. 2). This process allows students to become what Graves and Fitzgerald (2003) call “competent, independent learners” (p. 98).

There are several steps to ensure that students are being asked to complete this type of intellectually challenging work, which increases test scores and improves performance on authentic assessment measures as well. Newmann et al. (2001) define authentically challenging intellectual work as the “construction of knowledge, through the use of disciplined inquiry, to produce discourse, products, or performances that have value beyond school” (p. 14).

Daggett (2005) agrees, stating that all students should be pushed “to achieve academic excellence, which ultimately boils down to applying rigorous knowledge to unpredictable, real-world situations, such as those that drive our rapidly changing world” (p. 5). Disciplined inquiry, which occurs in the classroom, requires that students “(1) use a prior knowledge base; (2) strive for in-depth understanding rather than superficial awareness; and (3) express their ideas and findings with elaborated communication” (Newmann et al., 2001, p. 15).

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

Providing Research-Based
Education Practices Online
(Website)

<http://dww.ed.gov/>

Organizing Instruction and
Study to Improve Learning
(Publication)

[http://ies.ed.gov/
ncee/wwc/pdf/
practiceguides/20072004.
pdf](http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/20072004.pdf)

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Performance Conservatory must keep in mind that with each year, staff will be reduced and/or have to contend with increased usage of substitutes to cover teacher classes, as teachers and staff begin to become less engaged in the transition process themselves. As such, maintaining a focus on instruction rigor becomes even more critical to ensuring student progress during a time of transition.

1. Cultivate schoolwide high expectations for students.

- Align instruction with the New York State P–12 Common Core Learning Standards. According to NYCDOE (2011), schools in New York City are set to have fully adopted the P–12 Common Core Learning Standards for students to take aligned assessments during the 2014–15 school year. These standards are internationally benchmarked and rigorous; they explain clearly what students at each grade level are expected to know and be able to do. Some schools were involved in pilot programs in 2010–11.
- Develop a shared understanding of instructional rigor through collaborative curriculum planning, design, and/or redesign. When developing or revising curriculum maps, identify opportunities for formative assessment tasks that encourage higher-level thinking for each unit of study.
- Through teacher collaboration, develop common student assignments that ask students to perform rigorous and authentic tasks.
- Through teacher collaboration, develop common student assessments that include rigorous and authentic summative assessment tasks.
- Monitor implementation of expectations through classroom observations, lesson plan review, and student achievement results on common formative assessments.

2. Provide professional development for teachers on instructional strategies that push students to engage in higher-order thinking.

- Provide ongoing professional development for teachers that describes the importance of pushing students to do higher-level thinking and provide strategies for how to do so. This training may be provided through ongoing professional development sessions and/or support of an instructional coach.
- Create clear expectations regarding how teachers should implement this professional development in the classroom (e.g., one strategy utilized each day as reflected in lesson plans, authentic assessments at the end of each unit).
- Identify how this professional development can be incorporated into scheduled teacher collaboration sessions.
- Monitor implementation of professional development through classroom observations, lesson plan review, and student achievement results on common formative assessments.

3. Develop examples of authentic intellectual work.

The following example can be used to help school leaders and teachers understand what authentic intellectual work might look like.

Examples of High-Scoring and Low-Scoring Measures of Authentic Intellectual Work

The research report *Improving Chicago's Schools: Authentic Intellectual Work and Standardized Tests: Conflict or Coexistence?* provides examples of two sixth-grade writing assignments: one that scored high and one that scored low on measures of authentic intellectual work. The authors conclude each example with a commentary of why the assignment received the score that it did.

High Scoring Writing Assignment

Write a paper persuading someone to do something. Pick any topic that you feel strongly about, convince the reader to agree with your belief, and convince the reader to take a specific action on this belief.

Commentary

In this high scoring assignment, demands for construction of knowledge are evident because students have to select information and organize it into convincing arguments. By asking students to convince others to believe and act in a certain way, the task entails strong demands that the students support their views with reasons or other evidence, which calls for elaborated written communication. Finally, the intellectual challenge is connected to students' lives because they are to write on something they consider to be personally important.

Low Scoring Writing Assignment

Identify the parts of speech of each underlined word below. All eight parts of speech—nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, conjunctions, and interjections—are included in this exercise.

1. My room is arranged for comfort and efficiency.
2. As you enter, you will find a wooden table on the left.
3. I write and type.
4. There is a book shelf near the table.
5. On this book shelf, I keep both my pencils and paper supplies.
6. I spend many hours in this room.
7. I often read or write there during the evening...

Commentary

This assignment requires no construction of knowledge or elaborated communication, and does not pose a question or problem clearly connected to students' lives. Instead it asks students to recall one-word responses, based on memorization or definitions of parts of speech.

Reprinted from page 24 of *Improving Chicago's Schools: Authentic Intellectual Work and Standardized Tests: Conflict or Coexistence?* by Fred M. Newmann, Anthony S. Bryk, and Jenny K. Nagaoka, available online at <http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/publications/p0a02.pdf>. Copyright © 2001 Consortium on Chicago School Research. Reprinted with permission.

Perrysburg High School

Perrysburg High School is in Perrysburg, OH and serves students in Grades 9–12. The school has had success in improving instructional rigor.

Perrysburg is the sole high school in the Perrysburg Exempted Village District in Wood County. Nate Ash teaches physics to eleventh and twelfth graders. Ash has taught professional development programs at the Northwest Ohio Center of Excellence in Science and Mathematics Education, and at Bowling Green State University in Ohio. He acts as a mentor to new science teachers.

Ash teaches physics using an inquiry approach. Students do lab activities and solve problems together to understand key concepts in physics. In each lesson he poses higher order questions to help his students build explanations: How do you know that? What would happen if we changed this variable? How is this similar or different? Ash uses whiteboards in a number of ways: for group problem solving, representing a phenomenon with pictures, and student presentations.

Each new unit/topic is introduced with a hands-on activity. Ash presents a physical situation to students, has them manipulate the variables, and then narrows down their list of variables to design an experiment. Every experiment is introduced with an open-ended question (What would happen if...? What happens when...?). Students work in small groups to describe what happens with graphs, pictures, mathematical equations, and written expression. When they are finished, students present their work to the class in “whiteboard sessions.”

Ash explains how the whiteboard sessions give important insights into student thinking: “We can really see if the students understand on every different level how that problem works or how that situation works. And if there is a disjoint between any of those representations, that gives us someplace to go, that gives us something to talk about, something to work through.”

Students appreciate being in charge of their own learning, having the opportunity to challenge their peers, and develop critical thinking skills as they explain their ideas in front of a group. As Ash says, “Students really like this approach because, instead of just giving them the answer, it gives them a chance to explain to each other what’s going on. And I like it because all the times that I have done physics problems on the board and gone through the answers, I got pretty good at doing physics problems but my students never got any better at all.”

Ash has found that with this approach his students are no longer trying to find equations that fit the problems, but working to develop a deep understanding of the underlying concepts.

Description excerpted from the *Doing What Works* website at http://dww.ed.gov/media/CL/OIS/TopicLevel/case_perrysburg_52708rev.pdf. This information is in the public domain.

Recommendation 3: Systemic Academic Interventions

Develop and implement a schoolwide system to identify at-risk students using assessment data, provide multitiered academic interventions, and employ ongoing progress monitoring to address student needs.

LINK TO RESEARCH

Academic intervention services is defined by New York State Education Department (2008) as “additional instruction which supplements the instruction provided in the general curriculum” for “students who are at risk of not achieving the state learning standards in English language arts, mathematics, social studies and/or science, or who are at risk of not gaining the knowledge and skills needed to meet or exceed designated performance levels on state assessments.” Across the state of New York, school leaders are searching for ways to enhance the current academic intervention services (AIS) programs in their schools to be able to identify students earlier, provide services to all students who require them, and measure student outcomes (Killeen & Sipple, 2004). Many schools begin to implement response to intervention (RTI) after determining that their current structures and processes were not meeting their students’ academic needs.

The incorporation of an RTI model into established interventions has been found to improve student academic progress; specifically, it has been found to increase the number of children who demonstrate proficiency on state accountability tests (Heartland Area Education Agency 11, 2004).

According to the National Center on Response to Intervention (Prewitt & Mellard, 2010), RTI is a model of academic supports that “integrates assessment and intervention within a multi-level prevention system to maximize student achievement and to reduce behavioral problems.” These goals are accomplished by identifying students at risk for poor learning outcomes, providing evidence-based interventions, monitoring student progress regularly, and adjusting the intensity and nature of those interventions regularly depending on a student’s responsiveness.

In a national study conducted by the National Center on Response to Intervention (Prewitt & Mellard, 2010), middle schools across 28 states, including New York, participated in a study to identify current RTI practices, identify key factors of successful implementation, and identify RTI practices linked to positive student learning outcomes. Schools involved in the study chose RTI to (1) close the student achievement gaps, (2) meet AYP every year with every subgroup, or (3) address undesirable and disruptive student behaviors.

According to Prewitt and Mellard (2010), models of a responsive academic intervention program include a data-driven decision-making model that includes:

- The use of a schoolwide (universal) screening assessment to identify students at risk for poor learning outcomes
- Multitiered intervention programs and strategies that increase in levels of intensity
- Frequent and ongoing progress monitoring to determine student progress and determine program efficacy

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

Doing What Works: Providing Research-Based Education Practices Online (Website)

<http://dww.ed.gov/>

National Center on Response to Intervention: *What Is RTI?* (Website)

<http://www.rti4success.org/whatisrti/>

National Research Center on Learning Disabilities: Tiered Service-Delivery Model (Website)

http://www.nrclid.org/rti_practices/tiers.html

New York State Response To Intervention Technical Assistance Center (Website)

<http://www.nysrti.org>

- A team structure to organize and analyze student performance using progress monitoring data

Although research indicates minimum components for successful implementation of responsive intervention programs, no specific model of RTI, intervention program or strategy, or progress monitoring tool is endorsed by Learning Point Associates. Instead, schools are encouraged to consider these research-based recommendations to make specific decisions regarding the structure and design of intervention programs that will best meet their needs.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Schools face a number of challenges when selecting a strategy for implementing academic interventions. Local regulations, contracts, and resources such as time, funding, and personnel all play a major role. In this instance, it becomes even more challenging when the school personnel are facing the added complexity of a school closure. As the number of pupils decreases, the flow of resources to the school also decreases. Yet, the need for effective strategies becomes even greater because the risk of students dropping out can increase as each grade is phased out and the school population shrinks.

Schools must make the determination, based on individualized circumstances, of what will ultimately work best. The most effective programs are those that are launched with clear leadership, built from careful planning, and supported with schoolwide awareness and professional development prior to full implementation.

1. Identify a team of school staff members who will lead the rollout of the intervention.

This leadership team may vary according to the school's demographics. Some schools choose to include teachers who work with subpopulations (e.g., English language learners and students with disabilities), and other schools include teachers who teach in the content areas in which RTI is being implemented (e.g., ELA teachers from each grade, literacy coach, and reading specialist). Network resources and coaches also should be considered.

2. Conduct careful planning to ensure the success of the rollout.

School leadership defines the intervention infrastructure, scheduling, resources, funding, staffing, screening and progress monitoring assessments, intervention programs, tools, and strategies. This process includes developing explicit plans, processes, and procedures prior to implementation. Following is a checklist of topics to cover:

Data-Based Decision Making

- Establish a team structure, routines, and procedures for making decisions.
- Set explicit decision rules to decide when students will move in, out, or within interventions.
- Develop record-keeping systems that communicate student progress to stakeholders (e.g., student, parent, teachers, AIS coordinator).

Assessments and Screenings

- Establish a yearly, schoolwide schedule for assessments and screening procedures (e.g., three times each year).
- Identify screening instrument(s) that will be used to identify students for interventions. Screening instruments should be valid and reliable and aligned with grade-level curriculum based on learning standards (e.g., state assessments, Acuity predictive assessments, or instructionally targeted assessments) or subject-specific and researched-based assessments (e.g., Woodcock-Johnson III Diagnostic Reading Battery, Qualitative Reading Inventory, Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills).
- Establish participation criteria, select benchmarks or cut points at which risk is determined, and identify students who fail to meet benchmarks or fall below specified cut points.
- Create multitiered entry points, and establish multiple benchmarks to slice the pie, allowing students to receive targeted interventions that vary in levels of intensity (e.g., students 0 percent to 40 percent and 41 percent to 65 percent, or Level 1 and Level 2 on state assessments).

Tiered Intervention Programs

- Select evidence-based intervention programs and/or strategies to use with students who fall into various ranges based on the screening tool used.
- Determine the method for delivery of service (e.g., pull-out small-group instruction, afterschool instruction, Saturday program), and the duration and frequency of service.
- Ensure that services and programs are tiered and that they increase in levels of intensity that match the increasing needs of students.

Progress Monitoring

- Determine assessments to be used. Assessments can be both formal (e.g., AIMSweb, Acuity predictive assessments, or instructionally targeted assessments) and informal (e.g., checklist, running records).
- Establish benchmarks for performance (e.g., >40 percent and >65 percent). These benchmarks determine when students will move within, through, and out of tiers of interventions.
- Establish a timeline for progress monitoring. Monitoring may occur as frequently as every two weeks.

3. Create an awareness of the intervention, and provide adequate professional development to ensure that everyone is on board.

Many schools follow a train the trainers model in which selected staff members attend training and share that training with other staff members. Depending on which teachers and staff will be providing interventions, training also may be schoolwide. A critical component of the RTI implementation process is to ensure that stakeholders are clear about what is being implemented and why it is being implemented. School leaders must establish and communicate the goals and expected outcomes of adopting an RTI model while providing ongoing training and sufficient time for staff to fully understand

the components and structures of a new intervention model. Successful implementation relies heavily on the ability of teachers and school leaders to implement RTI with fidelity.

Opportunities for AIS-related professional development should be embedded into the school's annual professional development plan. Careful planning is essential when rolling out professional learning opportunities in the area of AIS.

4. Put the intervention plan into action.

Recommendations for implementation include starting small. This approach might include starting in one grade, one content area, or one classroom; or it could begin by focusing on one or two components of RTI. This decision should be what makes the most sense for the school based on existing resources, tools, and structures. At this phase, adjustments and adaptations are an ongoing part of the process.

Starting Small

Two approaches for starting small with an academic intervention program are to start with one essential component or to start with one small group.

Starting With One Essential Component. Build a model with a focus on one component at a time (e.g., screening, then data-based decision making, then progress monitoring, then intervention levels). Create a timeline for the implementation of each component, and align training for school staff with each phase of implementation.

***Example:** A middle school in the Midwest began the implementation of its RTI program by first focusing on reading programs and strategies for students identified as at risk. A second tier of interventions and progress monitoring were rolled out later in the year.*

Starting With One Small Group: Implement the intervention program with a small pilot group. With this approach, it is best to investigate which components worked well and which need to be refined before scaling up to other classes, grades, or content areas.

***Example:** A Pennsylvania school implemented RTI in a small number of classrooms during the first year to determine what worked and what did not work. The school's intervention team focused on creating a balance between moving too slowly (which they felt would minimize the impact of RTI and decrease staff buy-in) and moving too quickly (which might overwhelm teachers and students).*

Adapted from *Response to Intervention Practices in Middle Schools*, a 2011 presentation by Daryl F. Mellard and Sarah L. Prewett, available online at http://www.rti4success.org/ppt/WBNR_April2011.ppt. This document was produced by the National Center on Response to Intervention and is in the public domain.

Approaches to Tiered Intervention

In California, schools are not permitted to use IQ-Achievement testing as a criterion for determining eligibility for special education services. The Long Beach Unified School District in California employs regular assessments and tiered interventions as part of both the prereferral process and as best practice for serving the needs of all students. The district has responded to their high school students' literacy needs using a multitiered approach that incorporates a battery of eighth-grade assessments that are used to determine the needs of incoming ninth graders. In the spring, all eighth-grade students participate in a screening series, which is an examination of multiple measures of student achievement that includes the CA standards test, course grades, and an assessment that is part of the *Language!* curriculum the district has adopted.

All incoming ninth-grade students receive core literacy instruction. Based on a review of assessment data, students entering high school half a year to two years behind receive the core literacy instructional program as well as an additional literacy workshop course that provides them with support materials that scaffold the core literacy program. Entering high school students who are more than two years below grade level are enrolled in a double block of language arts that consists of an intensive English language arts program or an afterschool reading program.

For their language arts curriculum, Long Beach has adopted the *Language!* and Lindamood-Bell curricula for intensive instructional programs in literacy. Lindamood-Bell focuses on developing phonemic skills for students having serious difficulties with text. Typically, students spend a semester in that intensive intervention and then transition into *Language!* Student progress is monitored throughout the school year using cluster tests taken primarily from the Lindamood-Bell and *Language!* curricula. In addition to the systematic supports for students, the Long Beach model includes monthly support meetings for teachers, summer institutes, and coaches who provide professional learning opportunities for teachers.

While the Long Beach approach to instruction and tiered intervention shares its key characteristics with RTI, they do not call this practice RTI, but simply call it "best practice for all students." They ask, "What do the data say about how students are performing and what instructional programs are necessary to support student growth?" Another important aspect of the Long Beach system, according to Office of Special Education Assistant Superintendent Judy Elliott, is that they do not base their decisions on a single data point. Multiple sources of data are examined to determine student needs. Long Beach views its practice as a systems approach to good instruction for all students rather than just a process to diagnose students with learning disabilities. They had such success with the practice at the high school level that they have recently applied it to their middle schools. Roughly 7 percent of students in Long Beach have IEPs, as opposed to an average of 12-14 percent nationally (Elliott, 2006).

Description excerpted from the Doing What Works website at http://www.betterhighschools.org/docs/NHSC_RTIBrief_08-02-07.pdf. This information is in the public domain.

References

- Alvermann, D. E. (2003). *Seeing themselves as capable and engaged readers: Adolescents and remediated instruction*. Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/literacy/readers.pdf>
- Cotton, K. (1989). *Expectations and student outcomes*. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from http://educationnorthwest.org/webfm_send/562
- Daggett, W. R. (2005, September). *Achieving academic excellence through rigor and relevance*. Rexford, NY: International Center for Leadership in Education.
- de la Torre, M., & Gwynne, M. (2009). *When schools close: Effects on displaced students in Chicago public schools*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/publications/CCSRSchoolClosings-Final.pdf>
- Doing What Works. *Research-based education practices online*. (n.d.). Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://dww.ed.gov>
- Donovan, M. S., & Bransford, J. D. (Eds.). (2005). *How students learn: History, mathematics, and science in the classroom*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Easton, L. B. (2008). *Engaging the disengaged: How schools can help struggling students succeed*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2008). *Better learning through structured teaching: A framework for the gradual release of responsibility*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ginsberg, M. B., Wlodkowski, R. J. (2000). *Creating highly motivating classrooms for all students: A school wide approach to powerful teaching with diverse learners*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gordon, G. (2006). *Building engaging schools: Getting the most out of America's classrooms*. New York: Gallup Press.
- Graves, M. F., & Fitzgerald, J. (2003). Scaffolding reading experiences for multilingual classrooms. In G. G. García (Ed.), *English learners: Reaching the highest levels of English literacy* (pp. 96–124). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Heartland Area Education Agency 11. (2004). *Heartland AEA 11 annual progress report*. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.aea11.k12.ia.us/downloads/2004apr.pdf>
- Killeen K. M., & Sipple J. W. (2004). *The implementation of academic intervention services (AIS) in NYS: Implications for school organization and instruction*. Albany, NY: Educational Finance Research Consortium. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.albany.edu/edfin/>
- Learning Point Associates. (2003). *Seeing themselves as capable and engaged readers: Adolescents and remediated instruction*. Naperville, IL: Author. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/literacy/readers.pdf>
- Learning Point Associates. (2005). *Using student engagement to improve adolescent literacy* (Quick Key 10 Action Guide). Naperville, IL: Author. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/qkey10.pdf>
- Marzano, R. J. (2003). *What works in schools: Translating research into action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., Pickering, D. J., & Pollock, J. E. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- National Academy of Sciences. (2003). *Engaging schools: Fostering high school students' motivation to learn*. Executive Summary. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.nap.edu>
- National Center on Response to Intervention. *What is RTI? The essential components*. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.rti4success.org/>

- National Center for School Engagement. (2007). *21 ways to engage students in school*. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.schoolengagement.org/TuancypreventionRegistry/Admin/Resources/Resources/21WaystoEngageStudentsinSchool.pdf>
- Newmann, F. M., Bryk, A. S., & Nagaoka, J. (2001, January). *Authentic intellectual work and standardized tests: Conflict or coexistence*. Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/publications/p0a02.pdf>
- Newmann, F. M., Marks, H. M., & Gamoran, A. (1995). *Authentic pedagogy: Standards that boost student performance. Issues in Restructuring Schools* (Issue Report No. 8). Madison, WI: Center on Reorganization and Restructuring of Schools. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from http://www.wcer.wisc.edu/archive/cors/Issues_in_Restructuring_Schools/ISSUES_NO_8_SPRING_1995.pdf
- New York City Department of Education. (2011). *New York City and the common core* [Website]. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://schools.nyc.gov/Academics/CommonCoreLibrary/Why/NYSStandards/default.htm>
- New York State Education Department. (2008). *Part 100 regulations of the commissioner of education: 100.1 Definitions* [Website]. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/part100/pages/1001.html>
- Pashler, H., Bain, P., Bottge, B., Graesser, A., Koedinger, K., McDaniel, M. et al. (2007). *Organizing instruction and study to improve student learning* (NCER 2007-2004). Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/20072004.pdf>
- Prewitt, S. L., & Mellard, D. F. (2010). *RTI in middle schools* [PowerPoint]. Washington, DC: National Center on Response to Intervention. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from http://www.rti4success.org/pdf/RTI_in_Middle_Schools.pdf
- Smutny, J. F. (2000). *Teaching young gifted children in the regular classroom*. Reston, VA: ERIC clearinghouse on disabilities and gifted education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED445422).
- Smutny, J. F., Walker, S. Y., & Meckstroth, E. A. (1997). *Teaching young gifted children in the regular classroom: Identifying, nurturing, and challenging ages 4-9*. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Publishing.
- Steiner, L. (2009). *Tough decisions: Closing persistently low-performing schools*. Lincoln, IL: Center on Innovation and Improvement. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from http://www.centerii.org/survey/downloads/Tough_Decisions.pdf
- Tomlinson, C. A. (1999). *The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Tomlinson, C. A. (2003). *Fulfilling the promise of the differentiated classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Victoria Department of Education and Early Childhood Development. (2009). *Effective schools are engaging schools: Student engagement policy guidelines*. Melbourne, Victoria, Australia: Author. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.eduweb.vic.gov.au/edulibrary/public/stuman/wellbeing/segpolicy.pdf>
- Voke, H. (2002). *Student engagement: Motivating students to learn*. (ASCD InfoBrief). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Yazzie-Mintz, E. (2010). *Charting the path from engagement to achievement: A report on the 2009 High School Survey of Student Engagement*. Bloomington, IN: Center for Evaluation & Education Policy. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://ceep.indiana.edu/hssse>
- Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J., & Collins, W. A. (2003). Autonomy development during adolescence. In G. R. Adams & M. D. Brezonsky (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of adolescence* (pp. 175–204). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Suggestions for Further Reading

STUDENT ENGAGEMENT

Clark, B. (1992). *Growing up gifted: Developing the potential of children at home and at school* (4th ed.). New York: Maxwell Macmillan International.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The psychology of optimal experience*. New York: Harper and Row.

Kingore, B. (1993). *Portfolios: Enriching and assessing all students, identifying the gifted, Grades K-6*. Des Moines, IA: Leadership Publishers.

Seligman, M. E. P. (2002). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment*. New York: Free Press.

Smutny, J. F. (Ed.) (1998). *The young gifted child: Potential and promise, an anthology*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.

Winebrenner, S. (1992). *Teaching gifted kids in the regular classroom*. Minneapolis, MN: Free Spirit Publishing.

INSTRUCTIONAL RIGOR

Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S. et al. (2008). *Turning around chronically low-performing schools: A practice guide* (NCEE #2008-4020). Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/Turnaround_pg_04181.pdf

SYSTEMATIC ACADEMIC INTERVENTIONS

Carter, N. J. (2006). *Educators' perceptions of collaborative planning processes for students with disabilities*. Unpublished thesis. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://contentdm.lib.byu.edu/ETD/image/etd1344.pdf>

Laymon Med, S. R. (2011). Implications of collaboration in education. *Academic Leadership*, 9(1). Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.academicleadership.org/article/implications-of-collaboration-in-education>

Moore, C., & Gilbreath, D. (1998). *Educating students with disabilities in general education classrooms: A summary of the research*. Eugene, OR: Western Regional Resource Center, University of Oregon. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.rrcprogram.org/content/view/242/47/>

Price, B. J., Mayfield, P. K., McFadden, A. C., & Marsh, G. E. (2003). *Collaborative teaching: Special education for inclusive classrooms*. Kansas City, MO: Parrot Publishing.

Seyler, A., & Buswell, B. E. (1999). *Site visits: Seeing schools in action*. PEER Information Brief. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://fcsn.org/peer/ess/sitevisitsib.html>

Sharpe, M. N., & Hawes, M. E. (2001). Collaboration between general and special education: Making it work. *Examining Current Challenges in Secondary Education and Transition*, 2(1). Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.ncset.org/publications/viewdesc.asp?id=1097>

SYSTEMIC ACADEMIC INTERVENTIONS

Center on Instruction. (2009). *Implementing Response to Intervention—Practices and perspectives from five schools*. Retrieved July 18, 2011, from <http://www.centeroninstruction.org/implementing-response-to-intervention-practices-and-perspectives-from-five-schools-frequently-asked-questions>

National Center on Student Progress Monitoring. <http://studentprogress.org/>

National High School Center. http://www.betterhighschools.org/expert/ask_tiered.asp

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.