

Academy of Urban Planning

FINAL REPORT



New York City Department of Education External School Curriculum Audit | August 2011

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

Contents

- Introduction 1
 - About This Report 1
 - About Academy of Urban Planning. 1
 - Audit Process at Academy of Urban Planning. 2
- Key Findings 3
 - Critical Key Findings 3
 - Additional Key Findings 4
- Recommendations 5
 - Overview of Recommendations. 5
 - Recommendation 1: Common Positive Behavior Expectations. 6
 - Recommendation 2: Progress Monitoring 11
 - Recommendation 3: Implementation of Practices Learned in Professional Development. .15
 - Recommendation 4: Instructional Rigor. 21
- References 25

Introduction

About This Report

This final report is the result of an external school curriculum audit (ESCA) of Academy of Urban Planning conducted by Learning Point Associates, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research. This audit was conducted in response to the school being identified as in need of Improvement (Year 1) 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 Academy of Urban Planning

Located in Brooklyn, Academy of Urban Planning (K552) is a high school with 470 students in Grades 9–12. The school population comprises 35 percent Black, 62 percent Hispanic, 2 percent White, and 1 percent Asian students. The school serves a growing number of English language learners with a current population of 16 percent. Nineteen percent of the students are identified as special education students (Special Education Service Delivery Report¹). Fifty-two percent of students are boys, and 48 percent are girls. The average attendance rate for the 2009–10 school year was 78 percent. Seventy-two percent of the students are eligible for free lunch, and 3 percent are eligible for reduced-price lunch (Accountability and Overview Report 2009–2010²).

Academy of Urban Planning is a small school community located on the Bushwick Educational Campus in Brooklyn. It opened in 2003 and is co-located on the campus with three other high schools, each with its own primary floor and sharing common spaces like auditoriums, libraries, gymnasiums, and cafeterias. The curriculum at Academy of Urban Planning aims to help students develop and apply leadership skills, engage them in the community, and support their academic success. The Brooklyn Center for the Urban Environment is the school's network partner and provides professional development, technical assistance, student programming, and curriculum development service to the school (2010–11 Comprehensive Educational Plan³). Academy of Urban Planning has received several awards in recognition of its unique focus and is the only high school in the country to offer a full-time year-long course on geographic information systems. During the 2010–11 school year, the school experienced a change in leadership. While the outgoing principal served as a primary contact at the start of the audit process, both the former and incoming principals attended the co-interpretationSM meeting.

¹http://schools.nyc.gov/documents/teachandlearn/sesdr/2010-11/sesdr_K552.pdf

²<https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb-rc/2010/16/AOR-2010-333200011552.pdf>

³http://schools.nyc.gov/documents/oaosi/cep/2010-11/cep_K552.pdf

Audit Process at Academy of Urban Planning

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 Academy of Urban Planning. 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-interpretation meeting on May 11 and 12, 2011. During this meeting, 21 stakeholders from Academy for Urban Planning 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 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 Academy of Urban Planning.

Key Findings

Critical Key Findings

After considerable thought and discussion, co-interpretation participants determined a set of key findings. These key findings are detailed in this section.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 1:

Teachers report they have minimal to no influence over setting schoolwide standards for student behavior. Observed major and minor classroom disruptions included tardiness, absenteeism, and misbehavior.

Critical Key Finding 1 is supported by information from classroom observations and the teacher survey. The survey was completed by classroom teachers, and results are based on a 41 percent response rate. A total of eighteen classroom observation cycles were completed in various subject areas using an observation protocol titled the Classroom Assessment Scoring System for Secondary Schools (CLASS-S). Observation data indicate that tardiness, lost productivity, student behavior, negative climate, and external disruptions were minor disruptors for a handful of classrooms. Tardiness, absenteeism, and behavior were each major disruptors in one classroom. In addition, observation data indicate that active student engagement was evident but inconsistently so within and across classrooms. Survey results show that half the teacher respondents feel they have minimal to no influence over setting standards for student behavior. A little over a third of survey respondents believe the school does not have a schoolwide behavior plan.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 2:

Interviews, documents, and surveys reveal that there are various levels of academic intervention at the programming, extracurricular, and counseling levels such as collaborative team teaching, afterschool tutoring, Saturday school, guidance supports, and advisory. These supports, according to 8 of 14 surveys, were minimally likely to be timely.

Critical Key Finding 2 is supported by information from interviews, documents, and survey data. Documents and interviews revealed that the school provides a variety of supports for struggling students, which are delivered both in the regular classroom (e.g., team teaching, Ramp-Up English, double block classes), outside the classroom, and beyond the regular school day (e.g., credit recovery, evening school, tutoring). Survey respondents were somewhat divided with regards to the timeliness, effectiveness, and needed duration of supports.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 3:

Survey respondents indicate that professional development is not sustained or coherently focused. There is very little follow-up by administration.

Critical Key Finding 3 is supported by information from the teacher survey. Survey respondents were divided as to whether the principal presses them to implement what they have learned in professional development. About half the respondents indicated that the principal did not press them to implement practices learned in professional development.

Survey respondents expressed mixed opinions on whether professional development experiences were sustained and coherently focused, with 5 of 13 teachers indicating that professional development experiences have not been sustained and coherently focused nor do they include opportunities to work productively with colleagues. In addition, a similar number reported that professional development experiences did not include enough time to think carefully about, try, and evaluate new ideas. However, most survey respondents did indicate that professional development topics were connected to school goals.

Additional Key Findings

Additional key findings were identified by co-interpretation participants but were not prioritized by the group for action planning. However, the auditors found these key findings worthy of consideration in developing recommendations.

ADDITIONAL KEY FINDING 1:

The classroom observation report indicates that the depth and duration of content understanding and analysis and problem solving indicators were mixed and inconsistent.

Additional Key Finding 1 is supported by information from classroom observations. Two dimensions of the observation protocol that focus on aspects of instructional support in the classroom are content understanding and analysis and problem solving. The observation data indicate that the characteristics associated with these dimensions were evident but inconsistently so within and across classrooms. This means that the depth and duration of indicators such as encouraging a deep understanding of content through meaningful, interactive discussion and explanation of broad, organizing ideas was mixed and inconsistent in the classrooms observed. Further, some classrooms did provide students with challenging questions for activities that required them to apply their knowledge and skills. However, the applications provided limited opportunities for students to apply critical thinking skills, and often focused on finding a single correct answer.

ADDITIONAL KEY FINDING 2:

According to classroom observations and the comprehensive plan, teacher feedback is limited to general statements such as “nice” and “good.” Feedback lacked specific instructional follow up and inquiry.

Additional Key Finding 2 is supported by information from classroom observations and documents submitted to the auditor. One dimension of the observation protocol focuses on quality of feedback. This dimension examines the extent to which back-and-forth exchanges and follow-up questions between teacher and student or between students serve to deepen and expand student understanding. Other indicators associated with this dimension include prompting student thought processes, scaffolding, and encouraging persistence. Observation data indicate that some instances of quality feedback occurred, but overall, evidence of this indicator was inconsistent within and across classrooms. The Comprehensive Education Plan indicates that students did not always receive specific feedback on their work and professional development. Materials submitted by the school indicate that providing high quality instructional feedback to students has been a focus in the 2010–11 school year.

Recommendations

Overview of Recommendations

The co-interpretation event was attended by a variety of stakeholders with the majority of participants representing classroom teachers. As a result, the voting results strongly reflect the teacher concerns of classroom behavior, support for struggling students, and sustained professional development. Some discussion at the co-interpretation centered on the appropriate focus for improvement efforts. Building leaders pointed to the need to ensure rigorous instruction in all classrooms as a means for improving student achievement and suggested that there is a lack of awareness amongst all staff of the strategies that serve to support struggling students (e.g., smaller class size, double block periods). On the other hand, classroom teachers strongly expressed a desire for a schoolwide behavior plan and referenced past discussions on the issue.

THE FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Develop and implement a set of concise positive expectations for classroom behavior with clearly articulated consequences for misbehavior and recognitions for adherence.
2. Develop and implement clear policies, regulations, and feedback loops within the school to determine how students are identified for interventions and supports and measure student progress.
3. Apply strategies and best practices for monitoring the implementation of what is learned in professional development.
4. Continue to work to implement instructional strategies that increase opportunities for higher-order thinking, analysis and problem solving, and deeper content understanding.

These four 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. All works cited, as well as suggestions for further reading, 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: Common Positive Behavior Expectations

Develop and implement a set of concise positive expectations for classroom behavior with clearly articulated consequences for misbehavior and recognitions for adherence.

LINK TO RESEARCH

One of the greatest obstacles within urban schools is the large number of students whose behavior interferes with their achievement or the achievement of others. Often these students have behaved in a manner that disrupts the educational climate of the classroom and the school. One key element for changing this pattern is the implementation of a schoolwide behavior program that is developed with the input and support of parents and staff. Establishing a set of common positive behavior expectations is one hallmark of such programs.

“Effective schoolwide behavior programs have clearly established standards for safety, discipline, and respect. Students need a secure, orderly environment that promotes their personal well-being and supports learning. Rules should also be fair and stress the students’ responsibility to the school community, their parents and themselves. All students in the school need to be aware of the rules, the reasons for the rules, and the consequences for breaking the rules. Effective discipline programs are based on praise and encouragement for positive behavior and clear, consistent consequences for misbehavior” (Chicago Public Schools Office of Specialized Services, 1998).

“Effective schools build and maintain a positive ‘social culture.’ Successful students are safe (don’t hurt themselves or others), respectful (follow adult requests and get along with their peers), and responsible (arrive to class on time and complete assignments). These foundational skills are essential for a safe and orderly school environment. In addition, members of a positive social culture use ‘higher order’ skills, such as (a) impulse control, (b) anger management, (c) conflict resolution, (d) empathy, and (e) drug and alcohol use resistance and prevention. Research studies consistently show that schools that establish a positive social culture also achieve the best academic gains” (Sprague, 2011).

Researchers have only recently begun to study the effects of schoolwide behavior management systems and what it takes to implement these systems effectively. While it is too early to offer “recipes for success,” the work of key researchers and their school-based colleagues are providing some encouraging developments. While there are many different schoolwide systems of behavioral support, most have certain features in common. The emphasis is on consistency—both throughout the building and across classrooms. The entire school staff is expected to adopt strategies that will be uniformly implemented. As a result, professional development and long-term commitment by the school leadership are necessary in order for this innovation to take hold. Change is incremental, and full implementation of schoolwide systems occurs carefully, thoughtfully, and over an extended time period.

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

Alcott Middle School
Behavior Expectations and
Related Teaching Materials
(Video)

http://www.pbis.org/swpbs_videos/alcott_mid.aspx

Discovering School-Wide
PBS: Moving Towards a
Positive Future from Florida’s
Positive Behavior Support
Project (Video)

http://www.pbis.org/swpbs_videos/pbs_video-discovering_swpbs.aspx

Practical guides for applying
research to practice,
developed by Successful
Schools, Inc. (Website)

<http://successfuleduc.org/resources/field-trips>

Common Features of Schoolwide Behavior Management Systems

- Total staff commitment to managing behavior, whatever approach is taken.
- Clearly defined and communicated expectations and rules.
- Consequences and clearly stated procedures for correcting rule-breaking behaviors.
- An instructional component for teaching students self-control and/or social skill strategies.

(The Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice, 1997)

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

The observation data indicate that behavior was a minor disruptor, and punitive language and sarcasm were briefly evident in a number of observed classrooms. In one observation, behavior was observed to be a major disruptor. While misbehavior was not pervasive and egregious misbehavior was not observed, it was evident that teachers do not utilize consistent strategies for classroom management. Co-interpretation participants felt strongly that consistent schoolwide behavior expectations are needed.

As the research indicates, an effective schoolwide behavior plan not only involves a set of common positive behavior expectations, but also a system of recognitions, awards, and a plan to 'teach' the expectations to students, and consistent application by all stakeholders. Documents provided by the school indicate that some elements and structural pieces are in place at Academy of Urban Planning. Less evident is the degree to which these elements form a cohesive and transparent system. To illustrate, a document submitted by the school lists general types of data that are used to select students for interventions (e.g., behavior, teacher referrals, attendance reports); however, specific guidance for the types of behavior that would necessitate a referral was not provided. Also, incentives were identified but criteria for earning the incentives and a schedule for distributing awards was not provided.

Leaders may wish to collaborate with a team or committee that oversees behavior and/or garner additional input from teachers to decide the needed and appropriate first steps. Discussion at the co-interpretation event seemed to indicate that collaboration on a concise set of positive behavior expectations for consistent application across classrooms may be a beginning step. The school is encouraged to review the following considerations and identify a manageable set of actions.

1. Incorporate key guiding principles of student behavior management.

The Office of Special Education Program's Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) has established the guiding principles. Included here are those that focus on establishing a set of common behavior expectations:

- **Develop a continuum of scientifically based behavior and academic interventions and supports.**

A well-articulated schoolwide behavior policy/student code that includes positive expectations, minor and major infractions, etc. must first be in place. Clarity

around expectations for staff's handling of in-class behaviors is important here. Authentic faculty feedback and participation are important throughout the policy and system-development processes.

- **Arrange the environment to prevent the development and occurrence of problem behavior.**

This includes three to five positively stated overarching schoolwide social expectations posted around the school, particularly in problematic areas.

- **Teach and encourage prosocial skills and behaviors.**

Students should be introduced to/taught the schoolwide expectations, rules for specific settings, reward/consequence system, and related interventions/supports. Staff should be trained on how to present expectations to students. Ongoing communication and collaboration with families and the community are very important.

2. Build a team.

Florida's Positive Behavior Support Project (2005) outlines a process that provides a systematic structure and formalized procedures that can be implemented during the summer. The initial steps are to establish and get all staff to buy in. Establishing a schoolwide leadership team or behavior support team supports this goal. If possible, fold schoolwide positive behavioral supports (SWPBS) into the roles and responsibilities of an already established team, rather than developing yet another group. Members of the team should include administrators (i.e., principal, assistant principal or dean), counselors, social workers, regular education teachers, special education teachers, members with behavior expertise, and a coach/district representative. It is vital that administration supports the process, takes an active role, and attends most meetings.

3. Determine school capacity.

It is important to assess and develop the school's capacity to implement a comprehensive program. Key questions include:

- What are the schoolwide social expectations, routines, etc.?
- Who at the school has the unique disposition necessary to both firmly hold students accountable *and* support them as they attempt to adjust with fidelity?
- What are the procedural expectations of teachers for managing in-class behaviors?
- What manageable recourse do teachers have for extremely disruptive or disrespectful instances of behavior "in the moment" (e.g., immediate referrals to a dean/counselor/administration, in-school "timeout room," and criteria for reentry)?
- What is the specific, realistic *and manageable* continuum of consequences for patterns of disruptive in-class behavior?
- How will the efficacy of chosen interventions and supports be monitored and adjusted as needed in a data-driven manner? Who is responsible for this?

- What are the mechanisms for notifying and collaborating with students' parents/guardians in the process early and often? Who is responsible for this (i.e., teachers, counselors, social workers, deans, administrators)?
- What are the thresholds for more severe consequences/privilege losses for patterns or disruptive behaviors?
- What outside resources are available to support students and families struggling with issues that are affecting students' behavior, but well outside of the school's capacity to address?
- What privileges and incentives (e.g., extracurriculars, athletics, fieldtrips, social activities) are currently in-place that can serve as points of leverage? Do more need to be identified or developed?
- How are students who actively exhibit established desirable social behaviors formally recognized? Perhaps most importantly, how are students who are actively attempting to make sustained social adjustments formally recognized and supported (without stigmatizing)?

Positive Behavior Support in the Classroom

- Arrange classroom to minimize crowding and distraction.
- Provide explicit classroom routines and directions that are linked to schoolwide routines and directions.
- Post three to five positively stated expectations. Teach and reinforce them.
- Provide frequent acknowledgment of appropriate behaviors.
- Give students multiple opportunities to respond and participate during instruction.
- Actively supervise classes during instruction.
- Ignore or provide quick, direct, explicit reprimands/redirections in response to inappropriate behavior.
- Incorporate multiple strategies to acknowledge appropriate behavior (points, praise) linked to schoolwide strategies.
- Provide specific feedback in response to social and academic errors, and correct responses.

Source: *Classroom Management: Self-Assessment Revised*, by Brandi Simonsen, Sarah Fairbanks, Amy Briesch, and George Sugai, available online at http://www.pbis.org/pbis_resource_detail_page.aspx?Type=4&PBIS_ResourceID=174. This document was published in 2006 by the Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.

A Case Study on the Schoolwide Application of Positive Behavior Support in an Urban High School

A rare three-year participatory case study of schoolwide PBS implementation in an urban high school yielded the following findings.

- **Degree of schoolwide implementation:** It took the school roughly three academic years to approach full implementation across five domains of the plan (expectations are defined, expectations are acknowledged, system for responding to behavior, making data-based decisions, and management); two additional domains (behavioral expectations are taught, and district-level support) were found to be more difficult to achieve.
- **Behavioral outcomes:** After three years, the school saw significant reductions in the total number of referrals per student per year, incidents of serious disobedience of authority, daily referrals, and uniform violations. The overall result of this success was less administrative time spent on discipline, and increased instructional time for students.

In addition, the action researchers identified a number of challenges to implementation that they considered unique to high schools:

- **The schoolwide acknowledgment system:** It was important for this adolescent population that rewards/acknowledgments be meaningful and “cool,” but not “babyish.” Acquiring student input through surveys, student councils, or focus groups are strategies for generating ideas. These strategies also benefit the program by fostering student engagement and buy-in.
- **Teaching behaviors in a high school setting:** There was a need to overcome staff resistance to directly teaching behaviors vs. reinforcing them. This points to the need for a system in which teaching these behaviors occurs on a regular basis and is integrated into the curriculum. Understanding the training, priorities, and needs of high school teachers is also critical.
- **Logistics of implementation:** Owing to the complexity and sheer size of many high schools, initial implementation may take longer and require more energy and effort during the initial data gathering efforts and development of partnerships than at other levels. Moreover, a perfect stepwise assumption should not be made regarding the succession of interventions.
- **Enacting consistent policies that address behavior:** Again, because of the sheer numbers of staff and students that are within a large high school, developing and agreeing on a consistent policy for a range of issues requires sustained effort.
- **Modifying office discipline referral forms to track data:** Another challenge was the modification of the discipline referral form to meaningfully assess and track behaviors. Modifications included making it easier for teachers to provide data about the location and time of referrals, and asking teachers to hypothesize about the students’ possible motivation for their behavior (e.g., gaining attention).

Source: Bohanon, H., Fenning, P., Carney, K. L., Minnis-Kim, M. J., et al. (2006).

Recommendation 2: Progress Monitoring

Develop and implement clear policies, regulations, and feedback loops within the school to determine how students are identified for interventions and supports and measure student progress.

This recommendation addresses Critical Key Finding 2, which noted that while the school has in place a number of academic interventions and supports, survey responses were mixed with regards to the timeliness of those supports. Discussion of this key finding at co-interpretation revealed that not all teachers are aware of what is considered an intervention or support, such as double-block English classes for ninth grade. Further, while many teachers stated they did not know how students were progressing once they began participating in an intervention or support, building leaders indicated that the data are available and are reviewed. This suggests to the auditors that lines of communication, awareness of the supports available for students, and how students are progressing can be improved. This recommendation presents a full-scope of what progress monitoring can look like. The school is encouraged to explore the information presented here, reflect on current practice, and identify gaps in practice to improve upon.

LINK TO RESEARCH

Progress monitoring has become a critical element in New York Schools, since schools have been required to implement academic intervention services (AIS) designed to provide appropriate supports to underperforming students; see Section 100.1(g) and Section 100.2(ee) of the Part 100 Regulations of the Commissioner of Education (New York State Education Department, n.d.). Schools are facing constant pressure to identify, assess, and address the needs of students who are not meeting academic standards in order to meet stringent accountability standards (Deno et al., 2009; Stecker, Lembke, & Foegen, 2008). As a result of this policy, there has been an increased effort around standards-based reform in schools (Deno et al., 2009). These efforts consist of developing and implementing policies and systems to identify students who are in need of academic interventions and supports as well as monitoring their progress using benchmark assessments once they have been placed in the appropriate academic intervention service (Stecker et al., 2008).

Research has shown that implementing student progress monitoring can result in improved student learning and achievement and can also inform instructional decisions (Cotton, 1988). A number of studies have shown that progress monitoring tools can be used to predict outcomes related to student performance and used for data-driven decisions related to student engagement in curriculum and instruction (Stecker, Fuchs, & Fuchs, 2005, Mellard, McKnight, & Woods, 2009). Progress monitoring is commonly used in the context of response to intervention (RTI), a model of academic supports that utilizes assessments and interventions in the context of a multi-level prevention system to promote student achievement. However, progress monitoring can be used even if a school has not fully implemented an RTI framework (Mellard et al., 2009).

The primary goal of progress monitoring is to determine whether the academic intervention is having the expected result or whether adjustment needs to be made. This concept is often referred to as using “assessment to drive instruction” and should be implemented continuously to improve instruction (Mellard, 2009; Hamilton et al., 2009). Thus, practitioners need to have an understanding of key assessment tools that allow them to identify students

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

National Center on
Response to Intervention
(Website)

<http://www.rti4success.org>

National Center on Student
Progress Monitoring
(Website)

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

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

<http://www.nysrti.org>

Student Progress Monitoring
Resources from the Center
for Instruction (Website)

http://centerforinstruction.org/resources_searchresults.cfm?searchterms=progress+monitoring

“Tiered Service-Delivery
Model,” National Research
Center on Learning
Disabilities (Website)

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

in need of intervention, monitor students' progress, and diagnose the specific academic issue facing students.

A common approach that integrates both screening and progress monitoring is curriculum-based measurement (CBM), which can be used for both general and special education (Stecker et al., 2005; Deno et al., 2009). This method consists of straightforward procedure for regularly evaluating student progress in basic academic areas. CBM has been proven to provide reliable and valid measures in key academic areas such as reading, mathematics, written expression, and spelling (Deno et al., 2009). This method is also aligned with curriculum content and annual performance goals and consists of procedures that are regularly implemented (e.g. every three weeks). CBM is also a measure that is sensitive to student growth in the sense that teachers can determine a student's rate of progress (Stecker et al., 2008). Additionally, CBM data can be aggregated at the classroom and school level to facilitate data analysis around meeting state accountability targets (Deno, 2003).

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

1. Consider additional assessments in conjunction with progress monitoring.

Progress monitoring should be implemented (along with screening and diagnostic strategies) with either a small group of students or individual students (receiving targeted instruction) in order to monitor changes in academic skills for students placed into academic intervention services. Table 1 shows key guidelines to consider:

Table 1. Strategies for Implementing a Schoolwide Monitoring System

	Monitoring Strategy		
	Screening	Progress Monitoring	Diagnostic Tests
Target Population	School level	Class or small group level	Individual student level
Uses	Establish broad benchmarks	Identify specific academic or behavioral target	Identify specific academic areas related to knowledge skills, or abilities,
Frequency	Annually	Every three weeks/weekly	Annually
Purpose	Anticipate students who are at-risk	Adjust classroom assignments or student groups	Identify individual student challenges
Focus	School	Student class/ small group	Student
Instruction	Decisions related to class/school instruction and curriculum	Evaluate curriculum/ instruction intervention	Select appropriate curriculum and instructional methods
Implications	First step in intervention planning process	Maintain or adjust placement	Intervention preparation or specification

Adapted from Mellard, D. F., McKnight, M., & Woods, K. (2009).

2. Foster a data-driven culture within the school.

Data-driven practices should be promoted in the school to make sure that teachers are engaged and supported in using data to monitor the progress of their students. Schools should implement professional development around student progress monitoring that is either curriculum based or teacher developed, such as individual or group coaching for teachers (Hamilton et al., 2009).

3. Implement standard measurement tasks.

Assessments that are standardized and validated short-duration tests represent a key component of student progress monitoring. Standardization enables teachers to establish baseline data from which progress can be measured across time. Examples of standard tasks that can be measured include reading aloud from a text and selecting words deleted from the text, writing word sequences from a story starter or picture in writing, writing letter sequences from dictation in spelling, and solving problems in arithmetic (Deno, 2003). Additionally, the exams should be fast and easy to administer to avoid impacting instructional time (Stecker et al., 2008).

4. Use benchmarks.

Assessments for student progress monitoring should allow teachers to compare student performance to pre-established cut scores, which serve as benchmarks to identify students as either not at risk or at-risk (Stecker et al., 2008). Teachers should administer tests either to groups of students or to individual students at regular intervals and then compare student scores to these benchmarks as a way of determining relative risk to inform instructional decisions (Stecker et al., 2008).

5. Graph progress.

Teachers can measure student progress by collecting baseline data using standardized assessments and then plotting the results of subsequent (at least once a month) assessments on a graph (McLane, 2006). Assessment as frequent as once or twice weekly may be required for students who are low achieving or have been diagnosed with learning disabilities (Stecker et al., 2008). A goal line can be connected from the baseline collected (representing the current level of performance) to the annual goal line to show the optimal rate of progress required to meet long-term academic achievement goals (Stecker et al., 2008).

Student Progress Monitoring Summarized in Five Steps

1. Select measurement materials.
2. Evaluate validity and reliability of assessments.
3. Administer and score measures.
4. Integrate results into goal setting.
5. Evaluate instructional efficacy.

Stecker, P. M., Lembke, E. S., & Foegen, A. (2008). Using progress-monitoring data to improve instructional decision making. *Preventing School Failure, 52*(2), 48–58.

MacArthur Ninth Grade School

MacArthur Ninth Grade School serves 9–12 grade students. Located in suburban Houston, Texas, 79 percent of students are eligible for free or reduced price lunch.

The school administers three-week and six-week assessments to regularly check students' mastery of the objectives. Teachers analyze these data for trends and provide tutorial sessions to individual students to ensure they can demonstrate mastery. Students also monitor their own data and set learning goals after each six-week benchmark assessment.

For the three-week assessments, teachers develop a test that typically includes 12–15 multiple-choice questions based on district benchmark assessments. The results help teachers plan instruction and provide interim feedback to students.

The six-week assessments are the districtwide benchmark tests that contain 15 questions.

Teachers typically add additional items to ensure a minimum of four questions about each objective. After assessments are scanned and scored, teachers return the results to the students. The students count their errors per objective, determine and record their percentages, and set personal goals for the next assessments.

To analyze these results, teachers enter them in a spreadsheet that was created by the testing coordinator. To determine whether the results of an individual teacher align with the average in the department, teachers meet by department and compare the passing percent of each class with the average in the department. Then teachers reflect on the results to determine (a) areas of instruction that need to be strengthened and (b) specific objectives that should be re-taught for a whole class period or revisited through daily warm-up activities.

The district has established a 70 percent mastery goal for the six-week benchmark assessments. Students who do not meet this goal participate in after-school tutorial sessions. Each core subject has one day after school set aside for these sessions. Students receiving this additional support are retested until they achieve the benchmark goal.

Description excerpted from the *Doing What Works* website at http://dww.ed.gov/media/DDI/DDDM/TopicLevel/case_macarthur_revised.pdf.

Recommendation 3: Implementation of Practices Learned in Professional Development

Apply strategies and best practices for effective and sustained professional development, and co-design with teachers an implementation plan for the skills and strategies learned in professional development.

This recommendation addresses Critical Key Finding 3, and Additional Key Findings 1 and 2. The critical findings identified a need for more time to think about and try new ideas. The additional findings point to a lack of consistent implementation of strategies learned in professional development, as documents provided by the school revealed that instructional feedback and higher-order thinking and problem-solving skills were the focus of some professional development efforts at the school. This recommendation addresses the design and delivery of effective professional development that has the potential to provide teachers with enough time to think carefully about, try, and evaluate new ideas. It also addresses the process of implementation and articulates stages of implementation that can be used to benchmark the extent to which practices are being used in the classroom.

LINK TO RESEARCH

Research has found that professional development for teachers is most effective and boosts student achievement when it is aligned with school goals and sustained, as opposed to one-time workshops (National Staff Development Council, 2001; Penuel et al., 2007; Steiner, 2004; Wei, Darling-Hammond, Andree, Richardson, & Orphanos, 2009; Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss, & Shapley, 2007). Sustained activities ensure that the professional development is ongoing and that teachers continue to implement reforms faithfully. The ongoing professional development creates opportunities for teachers to discuss, reflect upon, and better integrate reforms, as well as forming a feedback loop for better support and implementation (The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2007; Penuel et al., 2007). Follow-up actions may include administrator walk-throughs, peer observations, self-examination, coaching, and mentoring (The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2006, 2007; Ingvarson, Meiers, & Breavis, 2005; Joyce & Showers, 2002; Steiner, 2004;). Researchers in Australia (Ingvarson et al., 2005) found that spreading experiences over a greater time span “strengthen[ed] professional community activity” and “increased the likelihood that programs would have significant effects on teacher knowledge and practice” (Ingvarson et al., 2005, p. 15). A sustained, ongoing program is more successful.

Alignment with school and district goals, or coherency, also affects the implementation of new strategies and practices. As Steiner (2004) reported, “a national survey of teachers found that when teachers report a connection between professional development and other school improvement efforts, they are more likely to say that professional development has improved their teaching” (p. 6). In their longitudinal study, Desimone et al. (2002) concluded that coherence is one of the “core features” of effective professional development (p. 102). Therefore, administrators should communicate the role the professional development has within the school’s goals and improvement plan clearly so that teachers understand the importance of the professional development.

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

*Professional Development:
Learning From the Best*
(Publication)

<http://www.learningpt.org/pdfs/pd/lftb.pdf>

*Implementation Research:
A Synthesis of the Literature*
(Publication)

http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~nirn/resources/publications/Monograph/pdf/Monograph_full.pdf

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

The research regarding how adults learn should inform the design of any effective professional development effort, particularly job-embedded professional development (National Staff Development Council, 2001). Bransford, Brown, and Cocking (2000) and Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998) assert that “adults learn best when they are self-directed, building new knowledge upon preexisting knowledge, and aware of the relevance and personal significance of what they are learning—grounding theoretical knowledge in actual events” (cited in Croft et al., 2010, p. 8). The literature on effective implementation practices emphasize the importance of ongoing, two-way communication and feedback to continually inform and refine practice, identify needed support, and accomplish important next steps.

Facilitators of job-embedded professional development “serve as catalysts for professional learning, supporting teachers in conducting inquiries and team collaboration while strengthening the connection of teacher learning to student learning” (Croft et al. p. 9). For this reason, the quality of job-embedded professional development is tied closely to the skills of the facilitator and these skills may be enhanced with training. Croft et al. (2010) write that “facilitators need to know what excellent teaching would look like for their colleagues in their classrooms while supporting teachers in improving their practice” (p. 9).

- 1. Co-design with teachers a plan to implement the strategies and skills learned in professional development.** Teachers who feel they have a stake in the design and implementation of interventions that directly affect their work will be more likely to engage in the professional development and improve the fidelity of implementation of professional development. The co-design process should include the following:
 - A working group of administrators, instructional leaders, and classroom teachers to represent the interests of each stakeholder group to ensure that each stakeholder group has an opportunity to share opinions.
 - Regular working group meetings held throughout the school year and in the summer for the purpose of planning professional development experiences.
 - Annual and periodic feedback from all classroom teachers and building leaders to identify and communicate areas of concern, proposed areas of focus, successes, obstacles to implementation, and needed supports. The working group can develop a schoolwide survey, or series of focus groups, designed to solicit the feedback. The working group would put together the survey or focus groups and analyze the data during a working group meeting.
 - An annual professional development plan for the school informed by the collected data. The plan should include the following details: the types of professional development to be offered, strategies for the working group to follow up on PD implementation, and a plan to evaluate the success of the PD and co-design process at the end of the school year. This would help the working group to identify opportunities for periodic feedback to school leaders.

- 2. Ensure that administrators, instructional leaders, and classroom teachers work together to:**
 - Identify priority areas for skill improvement and the “non-negotiables” for the

implementation of strategies learned in professional development. For example, if improving the quantity and quality of instructional feedback to students in the classroom is a schoolwide focus, school leaders may help to set the direction by requiring all teachers to have a professional development goal on instructional feedback. Then, staff can collaborate to determine personal and/or group goals on the topic, specific to their needs and interests. Be sure to maintain a manageable number of priorities as each will have implications for collaboration, communication, and practice.

- Identify goals for adult learning that are specific, measurable, action-oriented, relevant, and time-bound (SMART) for improving practices that are specific for groups and individuals. Consider schoolwide, departmental, and individual goals. Goals, though linked to student learning outcomes should reflect teacher learning outcomes; intentions for individual and personal practice in the classroom.
- Backwards-plan benchmarks for implementation of *all* SMART goals. Identify the indicators of success and the data needed to assess the indicators. Consider existing practices such as peer observations, administrator walkthroughs, or coaching sessions that may contribute to data collection.
- Specify the types of supports that will be available to teachers to help ensure the implementation of skills and strategies learned in professional development.
- Identify opportunities for periodic feedback to school leaders and administrators to communicate about successes, obstacles to implementation, and needed supports. This can be done by:
 - Brief online surveys
 - Written feedback at meetings
 - One-on-one check-in meetings

3. Ensure that teachers have sufficient time at regular meetings to have ongoing reflective discussions about the strategies and skills learned in professional development.

- Provide common teacher learning time, distinct from planning time.
 - Croft, et al. (2010) recommend that school leaders “release teachers as appropriate to visit other teachers’ classrooms, engage in collaborative teaching, and participate in other collaborative activities.” (p.12)
- Allocate time at regular meetings for teachers to debrief and share experiences and successes *with the strategies and skills learned in professional development*.
 - Employ discussion protocols to ensure efficient use of time to focus discussion.
 - Utilize paired or small group discussion formats.
 - Ensure feedback is tracked and shared out to all.
- Protect the allocated time by identifying alternate communication channels or meeting times to disseminate information such as administrative announcements and other school business.

- Intersperse meetings throughout the year to facilitate regular, ongoing discussions to reflect on prioritized areas of improvement and implementation benchmarks.
- Designate time for teachers to receive specific, detailed feedback on efforts to improve and modify instructional practice at regular intervals. (Perlman, & Redding, 2011, p.104)
- Align all forms of job-embedded professional development to support prioritized areas for improvement. For example, professional learning communities, intra-classroom visitation, book study, looking at student work, etc.

4. Implement a continuous improvement cycle.

- Set aside time at the end of each school year for teachers and administrators to reflect on the overall success of the new professional development plan and tracking of attendant implementation strategies, to compile lessons learned, and to plan for improved implementation in the coming year.

Implementing New Practices in Schools

Implementation is a process, not an event. Research suggests that full implementation can take several years. A meta-analysis of cross-industry program implementation studies identifies the following stages of the implementation process:

- **Exploration and adoption:** This stage is about awareness and acquisition of knowledge about a practice or program. “The purpose of exploration is to assess the potential match between community needs, evidence-based practice and program needs, and community resources and to make a decision to proceed (or not)” (Fixsen, Naoom, Blasé, Friedman, & Wallace, 2005, p. 15). This stage may also include an examination of readiness to act and preparation of the organization and staff.
- **Program installation:** This stage is about considering the needed elements to support a new program or practice. The innovation may require that operating norms are changed. Leaders will want to consider structural supports, including funding, human resources, policies, and frameworks for reporting and outcome expectations. Consideration of additional supports or changes to structures are needed to support effective implementation.
- **Initial implementation:** Fixsen et al. (2005) writes, “During the initial stage of implementation, the compelling forces of fear of change, inertia, and investment in the status quo combine with the inherently difficult and complex work of implementing something new” (p.16). The unwavering support of leaders is crucial at this stage as it is at this point that practitioners can become overwhelmed with new expectations layered on top of existing demands and cease their attempts at implementation.
- **Full operation:** This stage can be defined as when “new learning becomes integrated into practitioner, organizational, and community practices, policies, and procedures (Fixsen, et al., p.16). Over time, the innovation becomes the normal operating procedure and the structural supports, systems, and policies are aligned to the new way of working and communicating. It is at this stage that practitioners can expect to observe the beneficial outcomes of the new practice or program.
- **Innovation:** The unique communities, needs, and circumstances of organizations may require that modifications are needed to realize the greatest impact of a newly introduced program or practice. However, some changes may actually be considered “program drift or threats to fidelity” (Fixsen, et al., p.17). This can be avoided by first implementing the program or practice with fidelity and then developing modifications. It was noted that programs taking this approach to adapting programs were more successful than those that did not move through full operation (Fixsen, et al., p.17)
- **Sustainability:** This aspect of implementation is important to consider throughout each stage to ensure long-term survival of the program or practices. A myriad of potential changes in staff, leadership, funding streams, or shifting priorities and politics can derail implementation efforts. School leaders, staff, and stakeholders will want to maintain awareness of potential changes and their subsequent impact on implementation and sustainability.

Morse High School

In the book *Student Achievement Through Staff Development* Joyce and Showers (2002) explore the connection between effective professional development and increased student achievement.

They offer a three-point theory of action. When a teacher or community of teachers:

- Engage, for a dozen days during the school year, in the formal study of a curriculum area or a teaching strategy that is useful across curriculum areas, and
- Regularly studies implementation and consequent student learning, then
- The odds are that student achievement will rise substantially (Joyce & Showers, 2002, p. 3)

The effort at Morse High School, California, to improve adolescent reading skills began with educators examining student data, reviewing the research on effective practices for developing adolescent literacy for students who were not reading at grade level, and reflecting on past initiatives. Achievement data revealed that many middle and high school students who were failing could not read or write well enough to access the general curriculum. While a number of packaged programs had previously been introduced, they had failed to elicit the desired gains in student achievement. Leaders decided to design and implement a curriculum specifically for struggling readers.

Recognizing that secondary teachers are seldom trained in the teaching of reading, leaders designed the professional development with the needed structures and supports to foster collaborative inquiry and a sustained focus on the core elements of the curricular and instructional initiative. The elements were selected for their associated impact on increased student literacy skills and success with struggling students. Further, the design of the training for the program reflected the characteristics of effective job-embedded professional development:

“...spanned a period of years and included recurring cycles of training, analysis of student data, and testing. The teachers studied the literature on literacy, saw many demonstrations of the components of the curriculum, practiced, shared their results, and studied student response.” (Joyce & Showers, 2002, p. 22).

The initiative “depends on extensive staff development to help teachers inquire into how older students acquire literacy and then to develop the new repertoire of teaching strategies needed to implement the curricular framework” (Joyce & Showers, 2002, p. 20). Analyses of subsequent efforts at additional locations found that program success was impacted by efforts to execute the program faithfully. Student achievement gains were stronger where conditions permitted full implementation of program components.

Recommendation 4: Instructional Rigor

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

This recommendation addresses Additional Key Finding 2, which found that opportunities for analysis and problem solving were not consistent within or across classrooms.

LINK TO RESEARCH

Instruction that pushes students to engage in higher-level thinking leads to deeper learning for students (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

Doing What Works: 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

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 clearly explain 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 provides 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?* by Newmann, Bryk, and Nagaoka (2001) 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.

Further examples of authentic intellectual instruction, teachers' assignments, and student work can be found in the following source:

Newmann, F. M., King, M. B., & Carmichael, D. L. (2007). *Authentic instruction and assessment: Common standards for rigor and relevance in teaching academic subjects*. Des Moines, IA: Iowa Department of Education. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://centerforaiw.com/sites/centerforaiw.com/files/Authentic-Instruction-Assessment-BlueBook.pdf>

Perrysburg High School

Perrysburg High School in Perrysburg, Ohio serves students in grades 9–12. Perrysburg is a suburb of Toledo, OH.

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 from *Doing What Works* website: http://dww.ed.gov/media/CL/OIS/TopicLevel/case_perrysburg_52708rev.pdf)

References

- Bohanon, H., Fenning, P., Carney, K. L., Minnis-Kim, M. J., et al. (2006). Schoolwide application of positive behavior support in an urban high school: A case study. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions*, 8(3), 131–145.
- The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2007). *Using the classroom walk-through as an instructional leadership strategy* (Newsletter). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from http://www.centerforcsri.org/files/TheCenter_NL_Feb07.pdf
- The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2006). *Redefining professional development* (Newsletter). Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://www.centerforcsri.org/files/feb06newsletter.pdf>
- Center for Effective Collaboration and Practice. (1997). *Effective behavioral supports* [Website]. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://cecp.air.org/center.asp>
- Chicago Public Schools Office of Specialized Services. (1998). *Positive behavior interventions: Policy and procedures*. Chicago: Author.
- Cotton, K. (1988). *Monitoring student learning in the classroom* (School Improvement Research Series, Close-Up #4). Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved June 22, 2011, from <http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/sirs/2/cu4.html>
- Cotton, K. (1989). *Expectations and student outcomes* (School Improvement Research Series, Close-Up #7). Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from http://educationnorthwest.org/webfm_send/562
- Croft, A., Coggshall, J., Dolan, M., Powers, E., Killion, J. (2010). *Job-embedded professional development: What it is, who is responsible, and how to get it done well* (Issue Brief). Washington, DC: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://www.tqsource.org/publications/JEPD%20Issue%20Brief.pdf>
- Daggett, W. R. (2005). *Achieving academic excellence through rigor and relevance*. Rexford, NY: International Center for Leadership in Education.
- Deno, S. L., Reschly, A. L., Lembke, E. S., Magnusson, D., Callender, S. A., Windram, H., & Stachel, N. (2009). Developing a school-wide progress-monitoring system. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46(1), 44–55.
- Deno, S. L. (2003). Developments in Curriculum-Based Measurement. *Journal of Special Education*, 37(3), 184–192.
- Desimone, L. M., Porter, A. C., Garet, M. S., Yoon, K. S., & Birman, B. F. (2002). Effects of professional development on teacher's instruction: results from a three-year longitudinal study." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 24(2), 81–112. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://epa.sagepub.com/content/24/2/81.full.pdf>
- 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.
- Fixsen, D. L., Naoom, S. F., Blase, K. A., Friedman, R. M. & Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation research: A synthesis of the literature (FMHI Publication #231)*. Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, National Implementation Research Network. Retrieved June 24, 2011 from: http://www.fpg.unc.edu/~nirn/resources/publications/Monograph/pdf/Monograph_full.pdf
- Florida's Positive Behavior Support Project. (2005). *Scoring guide: Completing the benchmarks of quality for school-wide positive behavior support (SWPBS)*. Tampa, FL: Author. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from http://www.pbis.org/common/pbisresources/tools/Benchmarks_Scoring_Guide2005.pdf.
- 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.

- Hamilton, L., Halverson, R., Jackson, S., Mandinach, E., Supovitz, J., & Wayman, J. (2009). *Using student achievement data to support instructional decision making* (NCEE 2009-4067). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/dddm_pg_092909.pdf.
- Ingvarson, L., Meiers, M., & Beavis, A. (2005). Factors affecting the impact of professional development programs on teachers' knowledge, practice, student outcomes & efficacy. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 13(10). Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v13n10/>.
- Joyce, B., & Showers, B. (2002). *Student achievement through staff development* (3rd ed.). 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.
- McLane, K. (2006). *Getting started: How do I implement progress monitoring in my school?* Washington, DC: National Center on Student Progress Monitoring. Retrieved on June 24, 2011, from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/PDFS/ED502459.pdf>
- Mellard, D. F., McKnight, M., & Woods, K. (2009). Response to intervention screening and progress-monitoring practices in 41 local schools. *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice*, 24(4), 186-195.
- National Staff Development Council. (2001). *Standards for staff development* (Revised). Oxford, OH: Author.
- Newmann, F. M., Bryk, A. S., & Nagaoka, J. (2001). *Authentic intellectual work and standardized tests: Conflict or coexistence? Chicago: Consortium on Chicago School Research*. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://ccsr.uchicago.edu/publications/p0a02.pdf>
- Newmann, F. M., King, M. B., & Carmichael, D. L. (2007). *Authentic instruction and assessment: Common standards for rigor and relevance in teaching academic subjects*. Des Moines, IA: Iowa Department of Education. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://centerforaiw.com/sites/centerforaiw.com/files/Authentic-Instruction-Assessment-BlueBook.pdf>
- New York City Department of Education. (2011). *New York City and the Common Core* [Website]. Retrieved June 22, 2011, from <http://schools.nyc.gov/Academics/CommonCoreLibrary/Why/NYSStandards/default.htm>
- New York State Education Department. (n.d.). *Part 100 regulations of the commissioner of education* [Website]. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/part100/>
- Pashler, H., Bain, P., Bottge, B., Graesser, A., Koedinger, K., McDaniel, M., & Metcalfe, J. (2007). *Organizing instruction and study to improve student learning* (NCER 2007-2004). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Research, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/20072004.pdf>
- Penuel, W. R., Fishman, B. J., Yamaguchi, R., & Gallagher, L. P. (2007). What makes professional development effective? Strategies that foster curriculum implementation. *American Educational Research Journal*, 44(4), 921-958. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://aer.sagepub.com/content/44/4/921.full.pdf+html>
- Perlman, C. L., & Redding, S., Eds. (2011). *Handbook on effective implementation of school improvement grants*. Lincoln, IL: Center on Innovation and Improvement. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from: http://www.centerii.org/handbook/Resources/Handbook_on_Effective_Implementation_of_School_Improvement_Grants.pdf
- Simonsen, B., Fairbanks, S., Briesch, A., & Sugai, G. (2006). *Classroom management: Self-assessment revised*. Storrs, CT: OSEP Technical Assistance Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports.
- Sprague, J. (2011). *Positive behavioral interventions and supports* [Website]. Retrieved June 22, 2011, from <http://www.calstat.org/behaviormessages.html>

- Stecker, P. M., Fuchs, L. S., & Fuchs, D. (2005). Using curriculum-based measurement to improve student achievement: review of research. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42(8), 795–819.
- Stecker, P. M., Lembke, E. S., & Foegen, A. (2008). Using progress-monitoring data to improve instructional decision making. *Preventing School Failure*, 52(2), 48–58.
- Steiner, L. (2004). *Designing effective professional development experiences: What do we know?* Naperville, IL: Learning Point Associates. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from http://www.tqsource.org/issueforums/plantoAction/resources/4_PDRResearchPolicyAction/DesigningEffectivePD.pdf
- Tomlinson, C.A. (2003). *Fulfilling the promise of the differentiated classroom*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- U.S. Department of Education. (n.d.). *Doing what works* [Website]. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from <http://dww.ed.gov>
- 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.
- 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 June 24, 2011, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/southwest/pdf/REL_2007033.pdf

Suggestions for Further Reading

- Herman, R., Dawson, P., Dee, T., Greene, J., Maynard, R., Redding, S., & Darwin, M. (2008). *Turning around chronically low-performing schools: A practice guide* (NCEE #2008-4020). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education. Retrieved June 24, 2011, from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/Turnaround_pg_04181.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.