

P.S. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt

FINAL REPORT



Contents

- Introduction 1
 - About This Report 1
 - About P.S. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt 1
 - Audit Process at P.S. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt. 1

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

- Recommendations 5
 - Overview of Recommendations. 5
 - Recommendation 1: Classroom Management 6
 - Recommendation 2: Professional Learning 11
 - Recommendation 3: Common Core 15

- References 19

Introduction

About This Report

This final report is the result of an external school curriculum audit (ESCA) of P.S. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt conducted by Learning Point Associates, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research. The audit was conducted in response to the school being identified as being in need of improvement (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. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt

Located in Staten Island, P.S. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt (R014) is an elementary school with 662 students from prekindergarten through Grade 5. The school includes 43 percent black/African-American students and 47 percent Hispanic/Latino students. Seven percent of the students are classified as limited English proficient, and 17 percent are classified as students with disabilities. Approximately 88 percent of the student population is eligible for free lunch, and 7 percent of the students are eligible for reduced-price lunch.¹ The average attendance rate for the 2009–10 school year was 87 percent.

In 2009–10, P.S. 14 did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) in English language arts (ELA) for all students, the black or African-American subgroup, the Hispanic or Latino subgroup, and economically disadvantaged students. In 2010–11, the school's state accountability status was designated as "Improvement (year 1)."² Because the school was designated as in need of improvement, it participated in the ESCA.

Audit Process at P.S. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt

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. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt. 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 May 20, 2011. During this meeting, 12 stakeholders from the P.S. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt 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/2010/9a/AOR-2010-353100010014.pdf>. Accessed on August 18, 2011

² <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb-rc/2010/9a/AOR-2010-353100010014.pdf>. Accessed on August 18, 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 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 PS. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt.

Key Findings

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

Critical Key Findings

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 1:

Behavioral challenges and lack of respect interfere with instruction and engagement.

Critical Key Finding 1 is supported by information from teacher survey results and classroom observations. Forty-two percent of surveyed teachers disagreed or strongly disagreed that the school has a behavior plan, and 60 percent indicated that students show respect only sometimes. Low engagement was observed in half of the classrooms, where behavioral challenges interfered with the flow of lessons and teachers spent more time on discipline than instruction.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 2:

Clear routines are not established in all classrooms.

In half of the classrooms observed, there did not appear to be strategies to support student self-regulation, an important characteristic for learning. Students in observed classrooms were not engaged during independent activities.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 3:

There is limited professional development focused on behavior management.

Among surveyed teachers, 31 percent found the professional development on managing student behavior to be minimally helpful or not helpful at all.

Positive Key Findings

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 1:

Teachers collaborate with each other.

Positive Key Finding 1 is supported by information from interviews and teacher survey results. Sixty-five percent of the surveyed teachers reported that they meet with other teachers in scheduled collaborative sessions once or twice a week. Ninety-four percent of the surveyed teachers reported that special education and general education teachers collaborate informally to share knowledge and strategies. Documents showed that Wednesday is teacher team day, when teachers meet by grade level or across grade levels.

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 2:

The school has implemented a new literacy and writing program and has interactive curriculum maps.

Positive Key Finding 2 is supported by information from interviews. The school is implementing Bookshop, published by Mondo, and Writing Fundamentals, published by Schoolwide, Inc. The school reviews and revises its curriculum maps at three-month intervals.

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 3:

Teachers use a variety of assessments to plan and deliver instruction to meet students' individual needs.

Among surveyed teachers, 94 percent reported that they use teacher-created assessments when planning and delivering instruction, and 92 percent reported that they use formative assessment data to make instructional decisions.

Recommendations

Overview of Recommendations

Participants at the P.S. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt 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.

P.S. 14 offers opportunities for teachers to collaborate and is implementing a new curriculum. Teachers use teacher-created and other formative assessments to inform instruction, and they frequently use effective strategies for teaching comprehension. These positive findings are overshadowed by findings that show teachers do not consistently use effective routines for managing classrooms. In numerous classrooms observed, students were off task, not engaged, and displayed disruptive behaviors that took away from academic time. The first recommendation addresses classroom management, which will support instruction in ELA and other subject areas. Because numerous teachers reported that professional development related to classroom management was only minimally helpful, the second recommendation addresses professional development, particularly job-embedded professional development.

A third recommendation refers to the Common Core standards. All New York City schools must address this area. P.S. 14 recently adopted a new ELA program and has interactive curriculum maps. These, and the regular collaborative sessions in which teachers participate, will be helpful as the school moves toward fully adopting the Common Core standards.

THE THREE RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Develop and implement with fidelity a plan to ensure that the components of effective classroom management are evident in every classroom.
2. Develop and implement a multiyear professional development plan that follows a job-embedded and sustained professional learning process and focuses on content related to topics identified during co-interpretation.
3. Develop and implement a multiyear plan to align the school's curriculum, instruction, assessments, and instructional materials to the Common Core.

These three 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: 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 2: Professional Learning

Develop and implement a multiyear professional development plan that follows a job-embedded and sustained professional learning process and focuses on content related to topics identified during co-interpretation.

LINK TO RESEARCH

Learning Forward (formerly National Staff Development Council), the professional association committed to enhancing educators' professional learning, defines professional development as a comprehensive, sustained, intensive, and collaborative approach to improving teachers' and principals' effectiveness in raising student achievement (Slabine, 2011).

Standalone workshops and courses have been shown to have little effect on teacher practice (Guskey, 1999). Job-embedded approaches that incorporate professional learning activities into the daily work of teachers are more effective. Research has found that professional learning for teachers is most effective and boosts student achievement when it is embedded in their daily work and sustained (National Staff Development Council, 2001; Steiner, 2004; Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson & Orphanos, 2009; Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, & Shapley, 2007).

Effective professional learning provides teachers with opportunities for collaboration, coaching, and peer observations—opportunities that allow teachers to be actively involved in their own development and practice learned skills (Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2006; Joyce & Showers, 2002).

Schools can improve teacher practice and student achievement by refining the process by which professional learning opportunities are offered, ensuring that these opportunities are embedded, and sustained and allow for active teacher participation by focusing the opportunities on teacher practice and content.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

The several suggestions that follow can be used to implement job-embedded, sustained professional learning opportunities focused on school needs:

- 1. Provide opportunities for regular teacher collaboration and job-embedded professional learning.**

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.

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

Learning Forward (Website)
www.learningforward.org

Other approaches for job-embedded professional learning include the following:

- **Providing initial training, using outside or local experts.** 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.

Resources are available to schools through the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE). Citywide Instructional Expectations provides the opportunity for job-embedded professional learning. The NYCDOE has provided resources to help educators unwrap the Common Core State Standards and begin to make the changes in curriculum and instruction necessary to help students achieve and meet the high standards. Resources include video, interactive modules, tools, articles, and podcasts to support professional development at the school.

2. Identify Books for Study Groups.

An effective way to share learning and apply new knowledge and skills is to engage in book study, with study groups meeting at regular intervals in organized sessions. Topics should be relevant to school and teacher needs. A starting point might be topics addressed in this set of recommendations.

A book possibility for a study group that we recommend as a way to focus professional learning is *Teach Like A Champion: 49 Techniques That Put Students on the Path to College* (2010) by Doug Lemov. The book is a collection of instructional techniques the author gleaned from years of observing outstanding teachers in some of the highest performing urban classrooms in the country. The book is accompanied by a DVD of 25 video clips of teachers demonstrating these techniques in the classroom. Other videos of the techniques are available on www.youtube.com. The book discusses the following:

- Setting high academic expectations
- Planning that ensures academic achievement
- Structuring and delivering your lessons
- Engaging students in lessons
- Creating a strong classroom culture
- Setting and maintaining high behavioral expectations
- Building character and trust
- Improving your pacing
- Challenging students to think critically

An example of an effective teaching practice described in the book is *Technique #1—No Opt Out*. When a student does not respond, the teacher moves on to another student. When a student gives the correct response, the teacher returns to the first student who did not respond and insists that the student repeat what the student just heard. Another technique is *Technique #22—Cold Call*. In order to make engaged participation the expectation, the teacher calls on students regardless of whether they have raised their hands.

Other books that might be the focus for study groups are as follows:

- *Teach Like a Champion Field Guide: The Complete Handbook to Master the Art of Teaching* by Doug Lemov is another resource. It has 30 additional video clips of teachers using the techniques in their classes. These techniques could be part of an ongoing cycle of observation, feedback, and debriefing.
- *Bringing Words to Life and Creating Robust Vocabulary* by Isabel Beck, Margaret McKeown, and Linda Kucan
- *The Highly Engaged Classroom* (2011) by Robert Marzano and Debra Pickering
- *Building Background Knowledge for Academic Achievement* by Robert Marzano
- *Better Learning through Structured Teaching: A Framework for the Gradual Release of Responsibility* by Doug Fisher and Nancy Frey

Free study guides for the last two books are available from ASCD at <http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/study-guides.aspx>

DOING WHAT WORKS: Examples From Real Schools

Memphis City Schools serves a student population that is 92 percent minority and among the poorest in the nation. Despite this, student achievement is improving. District administrators attribute the improvement in part to effective professional development. The district developed a five-year comprehensive professional development plan that has incorporated characteristics and formats that research has shown to be effective. District administrators consider quality professional development to be an important factor contributing to the increase in student achievement. They are now compiling data to track its impact (Slabine, 2011).

Recommendation 3: Common Core

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

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. 14 Cornelius Vanderbilt 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 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) .

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

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

- 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.
- Beck, I. L., McKeown, M. G., & Kucan, L. (2002). *Bringing words to life*. New York: Guilford Press.
- 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.
- The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2006, February). *Redefining professional development* (Newsletter). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved August 11, 2011, from <http://www.centerforcsri.org/files/Feb06newsletter.pdf>.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- 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. (2008). *Better learning through structured teaching: A framework for the gradual release of responsibility*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- 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.
- Guskey, T. R. (1999). *Evaluating professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development*. 3rd ed. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Lemov, D. (2010). *Teach like a champion: 49 techniques that put students on the path to college*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- Lemov, D. (2011). *Teach like a champion field guide: The complete handbook to master the art of teaching*. Hoboken, NJ: Jossey-Bass.
- 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. (2004). *Building background knowledge for academic achievement: Research on what works in schools*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. J. (2010). *The highly engaged classroom*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory.
- National Staff Development Council. (2001). *Standards for staff development (Revised)*. Oxford, OH: Author.
- 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>
- 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.
- Slabine, N. A. (2011). *Evidence of effectiveness*. Oxford, OH: Learning Forward. Retrieved August 11, 2011, from <http://www.learningforward.org/advancing/EvidenceOfEffectiveness.pdf>
- Steiner, L. (2004). *Designing effective professional development experiences: What do we know?* Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. Retrieved August 11, 2011, from http://www.tqsource.org/issueforums/plantoAction/resources/4_PDRResearchPolicyAction/DesigningEffectivePD.pdf
- 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., & Zigmund, N. (2000). *Students with mild disabilities in general education settings: A guide for special educators*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Wei, R. C., Darling-Hammond, L., Andree, A., Richardson, N., & Orphanos, S. (2009). *Professional learning in the learning profession: A status report on teacher development in the United States and abroad*. Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council. Retrieved August 11, 2011, from http://www.srnleads.org/resources/publications/pdf/nsdc_profdev_tech_report.pdf
- Yoon, K. S., Duncan, T., Lee, S. W. Y., Scarloss, B., & Shapley, K. (2007). *Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement* (Issues & Answers Report, REL 2007-No. 033). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Retrieved August 11, 2011, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/REL_2007033.pdf

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.