DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 473 361 EA 032 048

AUTHOR	Buechler, Mark
TITLE	Catalog of School Reform Models. Program Report.
INSTITUTION	Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, OR.; National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	2002-09-12
NOTE	202p.; Several pages have significant amounts of text cut off. For first edition, see ED 439 510.
CONTRACT	ED-01-R-0001
AVAILABLE FROM	Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 101 S.W. Main, Suite 500, Portland, OR 97204. Tel: 503-275-9615; Fax: 503-275-9621; e-mail: blumb@nwrel.org; Web site: http://www.nwrel.org. For full text: http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/ catalog.
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Directories/Catalogs (132)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Change Strategies; *Comprehensive Programs; *Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Improvement Programs; Instructional Improvement; *Models; School Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS	*Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Program

ABSTRACT

Comprehensive school reform involves changes in every aspect of school operations, from classroom instruction to school governance. Some schools develop their own reform approach from within. Others seek assistance from without, particularly from organizations that have developed coherent, research-based approaches, or school-reform models. For such schools, selecting the right reform model is crucial. This catalog describes 48 school-reform models. Its purpose is to aid schools, school districts, and states as they investigate external models that can be incorporated into comprehensive school-reform programs. The catalog divides these models into several categories: entire-school models, reading/language models, mathematics models, science models, and other models, which can be used as building blocks for comprehensive reform. It contains introductory information on 27 entire-school models and 21 skill- and content-based models. Each entry analyzes the model's general approach, student results, implementation assistance, and costs, among other elements. Criteria for selecting models include evidence of effectiveness in improving student academic achievement, extent of replication, implementation assistance provided to schools, and comprehensiveness. Each description lists the model's origin or scope, a general description, results, implementation plan, costs, student populations, special considerations, selected evaluations, sample sites, contact information, and state standards and accountability. (RT)

THE Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

PROGRAM REPORT

ED 473 361

CATALOG OF SCHOOL REFORM MODELS

Task 2
OERI Event No. 15
Deliverable 16614

September 12, 2002

Submitted by
Mark Buechler

School Improvement Program
Robert E. Blum, Director

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 S.W. Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204

Sponsored by OERI
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education

CATALOG OF SCHOOL REFORM MODELS

August 2002

Produced by:

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 SW Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon, 97204

National Clearinghouse for Comprehensive School Reform
2121 K Street NW, Suite 250
Washington, DC 20037-1801

Catalog of School Reform Models Web Site: http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/catalog/

This publication is based on work sponsored wholly or in part by the U.S. Department of Education under contract number ED-01-R-0001. The content of this publication does not necessarily reflect the views of the department or any other agency of the U.S. government. Articles and information in this publication are in the public domain and may be reproduced and disseminated without permission. Please acknowledge NWREL/NCCSR as a source.

Table of Contents

PREFACE iii

ENTIRE-SCHOOL MODELS

Accelerated Schools Project (K–8) 2
America's Choice School Design (K–12) 7
ATLAS Communities (PreK–12) 12
Center for Effective Schools (K–12) 17
Child Development Project (K–6) 21
Community for Learning (K–12) 25
Co-nect Schools (K–12) 30
Core Knowledge (K–8) 35
Different Ways of Knowing (K–8) 40
Direct Instruction (K–6) 45
Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (K–12) 50
High Schools That Work (9–12) 55
High/Scope Primary Grades Approach to Education (K–3) 60
Integrated Thematic Instruction (K–12) 65
MicroSociety® (K–8) 70
Modern Red Schoolhouse (K–12) 74
Onward to Excellence (K–12) 79
QuESt (K–12) 84
Roots & Wings (PreK–6) 88
School Development Program (K–12) 93
Success for All (PreK–6) 97
Talent Development High School with Career Academies (9–12) 102
Talent Development Middle School (4–9) 107
The Learning Network (K–8) 111
Turning Points (6–8)) 115
Urban Learning Centers (PreK–12) 119
Ventures Initiative and Focus® System (K–12) 124

READING/LANGUAGE ARTS MODELS

Carbo Reading Styles Program (K–8) 129
CELL/ExLL (PreK–6) 134
CORE (K–8) 138
Early Intervention in Reading (K–4) 142
Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (K–12) 146
First Steps™ (K–10) 150

Junior Great Books (K–12) 155
Literacy Collaborative (K–2) 159
National Writing Project (K–16) 163

MATHEMATICS MODELS

Core Plus Mathematics Project/Contemporary Mathematics in Context (9–12) 168
Growing with Mathematics (K–5) 172
MATH Connections™ (9–12) 176

SCIENCE MODELS

GALAXY Classroom Science (K–5) 181
Iowa Chautauqua Program (K–12) 185

OTHER MODELS

ACCESS (PreK–1) 190
HOSTS: Help One Student To Succeed (K–12) 194
HOTS: Higher Order Thinking Skills (4–8) 198
Lightspan Achieve Now (K–6) 202
Positive Action (K–12) 206
Responsive Classroom® (K–8) 210
Success-in-the-Making (K–9) 214

Preface

Comprehensive school reform involves changes in every aspect of school operations, from classroom instruction to school governance. Some schools develop their own reform approach from within. Others seek assistance from without, particularly from organizations that have developed coherent, research-based approaches, or school reform models.

For schools that use external assistance, selecting the right model is crucial. The process begins with an assessment of school needs, capacities, and goals. Staff then examine a variety of models, identify several that appear promising, and investigate these in greater depth.

The *Catalog of School Reform Models* gathers information on multiple models into a single location, thus facilitating efforts to identify promising models. The catalog contains descriptions of 27 entire-school models, 9 reading/language arts models, 3 mathematics models, 2 science models, and 7 "other" models (critical thinking or classroom management, for example). Each entry analyzes the model's general approach, results with students, implementation assistance, and costs, among other elements. A table accompanying each entry summarizes this information in a concise format. Demographic data and contact information for at least four sample sites are also included.

Criteria for selecting models included evidence of effectiveness in improving student academic achievement, extent of replication, implementation assistance provided to schools, and comprehensiveness.

It is important to note that the catalog is not a list of models "approved" by NWREL, NCCSR, or the U.S. Department of Education for CSRD or any other federally funded program. No such list exists. Department guidance on CSRD does allow individual states to establish their own list of preferred models. The guidance also says, however, that states "should exercise caution . . . in establishing a competitive preference for a particular set of externally developed models, to ensure that its LEAs and schools still have sufficient flexibility to adopt a program that best meets their needs as determined by the whole school community based on a comprehensive needs assessment."

For more information on the models, the selection process, and comprehensive school reform in general, please visit the catalog Web site at:

http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/catalog/

Entire-School Models

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted November 2001
Description Updated December 2001

Accelerated Schools Project (K–8)

IN BRIEF Accelerated Schools	
Founder	Henry Levin, Stanford University
Current Service Provider	National Center for Accelerated Schools Project at the University of Connecticut, and various regional centers
Year Established	1986
# Schools Served (9/1/01)	1,300
Level	primarily K-8
Primary Goal	provide all students with enriched instruction based on entire school community's vision of learning
Main Features	• gifted-and-talented instruction for all students through "powerful learning" • participatory process for whole-school transformation • three guiding principles (unity of purpose, empowerment plus responsibility, and building on strengths)
Impact on Instruction	teachers adapt instructional practices usually reserved for gifted-and-talented children for all students
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	governance structure that empowers the whole school community to make key decisions based on the Inquiry Process
Impact on Schedule	depends on collective decisions of staff
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	parent and community involvement is built into participatory governance structure
Technology	depends on collective decisions of staff
Materials	*Accelerated Schools Resource Guide* plus a field guide for each training component

Origin/Scope

The accelerated schools approach, developed by Henry Levin of Stanford University, was first implemented in 1986 in two San Francisco Bay Area elementary schools. The Accelerated Schools Project has now reached over 1,300 schools.

General Approach

Many schools serve students in at-risk situations by remediating them, which all too often involves less challenging curricula and lowered expectations. Accelerated schools take the opposite approach: they offer enriched curricula and instructional programs (the kind traditionally reserved for gifted-and-talented children) to all students. Members of the school community work together to transform every classroom into a "powerful learning" environment, where students and teachers are encouraged to think creatively, explore their interests, and achieve at high levels.

No single feature makes a school accelerated. Rather, each school community uses the accelerated schools process and philosophy to determine its own vision and collaboratively work to achieve its goals. The philosophy is based on three democratic principles: unity of purpose, empowerment coupled with responsibility, and building on strengths.

Transformation into an accelerated school begins with the entire school community examining its present situation through a process called taking stock. The school community then forges a shared vision of what it wants the school to be. By comparing the vision to its present situation, the school community identifies priority challenge areas. Then it sets out to address those areas, working through an accelerated schools governance structure and analyzing problems through an Inquiry Process. The Inquiry Process is a systematic method that helps

school communities clearly understand problems, find and implement solutions, and assess results.

Results

Two early small-scale evaluations yielded initial evidence of improved achievement, school climate, and parent and community involvement in accelerated schools. A 1993 evaluation comparing an accelerated school in Texas to a control school revealed that over a two-year period, fifth grade SRA scores in reading, language arts, and mathematics at the accelerated school climbed considerably. Over the same period, the scores of a control school declined (McCarthy & Still, 1993). In the other study, Metropolitan Achievement Test grade-equivalent reading scores at an accelerated school improved more than scores in a control school in four of five grades, although the results for language scores were mixed (Knight & Stallings, 1995).

More recent studies involving larger numbers of elementary schools have also demonstrated gains for accelerated schools relative to comparison schools. In an independent study of eight different reform models in Memphis, the Accelerated Schools Project was one of three models that demonstrated statistically significant or nearly significant growth across all subjects on the TVAAS (Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System) compared with control schools. In reading, the Accelerated Schools Project showed the highest gain of any model across the three years of the study (Ross, Wang, Sanders, Wright, & Stringfield, 1999). Unpublished data from 34 elementary schools in Ohio that implemented the Accelerated Schools Project in 1997 or before reveal that accelerated schools on average showed greater gains from 1997 to 1999 in fourth- and sixth-grade reading and mathematics on the Ohio Proficiency Test than the districts in which they were located. For schools starting their fifth year or beyond in 1997, the advantages were much larger. For example, 12% more students in these accelerated schools scored proficient or advanced on the sixth-grade reading test in 1999 than in 1997, compared to a 3% decline for district schools (Report for Ohio Center, 1999).

Researchers from the Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC) recently completed a five-year study of eight accelerated schools. They used third-grade reading and mathematics scores from the three years prior to implementation to predict what scores would have been during the following five years with no intervention. They then compared these predictions with actual scores to see if the accelerated schools approach had any impact. They found little or no impact on test scores during the first three years of implementation (when the focus was on reforming school structure and governance), then a gradual increase in scores during the fourth and fifth years (when substantial changes in curriculum and instruction were taking place). Average scores in the fifth year exceeded predicted scores by seven percentile points in reading and eight in mathematics, a statistically significant amount (Bloom et al., 2001).

To date, no studies have analyzed the impact of the Accelerated Schools Project on middle schools.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The National Center for the Accelerated Schools Project is located at the University of Connecticut. There are also 12 regional centers across the country based in universities and state departments of education. Across the national and regional centers, the Accelerated Schools Project employs 62 full-time and 27 part-time staff.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** 90% of the school community (all teaching and nonteaching staff plus a

representative sample of other school community members including parents and district personnel) must agree to transform the school into an accelerated school. Students are also involved in age-appropriate discussions during the buy-in process.

- ***Initial Training:*** For each accelerated school, the National Center or a regional center trains a five-member team comprising the principal, a designated coach (often from the district office), a school staff member who will serve as an internal facilitator, and two other school staff members. Training for this team involves an intensive five-day summer workshop, two subsequent two-day sessions on Inquiry and Powerful Learning, and ongoing mentoring by a center staff member. The coach provides two days of training for the entire school staff just before the school year begins.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** During the first year of implementation, the coach provides the equivalent of at least four additional days of training for all staff. Coaches also spend 25% of their time (generally at least one day per week) supporting the school. In the early stages, the coach is more of a trainer, introducing the process and guiding school community members through the first steps of implementation. In later stages, the coach helps schools evaluate how well the model is working, assists in overcoming challenges, and continually reinforces the accelerated schools philosophy to keep momentum alive. Additionally, an Accelerated Schools Project staff member visits the school three times. During the second and third years of implementation, the five-member school team receives a total of nine more days of training.
- ***Networking:*** The National Center and regional centers host an annual national conference and regional conferences, publish newsletters, support Web sites, and maintain a listserv connecting teachers, coaches, and centers via e-mail. Networking opportunities also enable accelerated school communities to interact with each other on a regular basis.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Continual self-evaluation is part of the process in accelerated schools. To help schools gather information, the National Center has developed a comprehensive assessment tool called The Tools for Assessing School Progress.

Costs

The Accelerated Schools Project (National Center and regional centers) charges approximately $45,000 per year for a Basic Partnership Agreement (minimum three-year commitment). This fee varies from state to state depending on subsidies and grants provided to the local regional center. The agreement includes, in the first year:

- training of a five-member team including the coach, the principal, and three school staff member (excluding travel expenses)
- training materials, including five copies of the *Accelerated Schools Resource Guide*
- three site visits by a project staff member
- technical assistance by phone, fax, and e-mail
- monthly networking opportunities
- a year-end retreat
- a subscription to newsletters and the project's electronic network

In addition, schools and/or districts must provide release time for the entire teaching staff for two days of initial training and the equivalent of four days of additional training during the first year. They must also schedule weekly meeting time amounting to about 36 hours per year and cover 25% of the full-time salary and benefits of the coach (estimated at $12,000-$20,000 for a coach external to the school).

Over the next two years schools receive targeted professional development in key components of the model, on-going technical assistance, monthly networking opportunities, and one site visit by a project staff member. Schools may contract with a center for additional site visits and other services as needed.

State Standards and Accountability

The Accelerated Schools Project empowers school communities to determine their own priorities for improvement. If the school community determines that aligning instruction with state standards and assessments is a priority area, then community members address that area by working through the accelerated schools governance structure and Inquiry Process.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

The Accelerated Schools Project is highlighted in all five categories. It was designed primarily to serve schools with high proportions of students in at-risk situations. Hundreds of rural and urban schools with large concentrations of high poverty students have become accelerated schools. The model provides a process for addressing the unique needs of each school, often resulting in special efforts such as tutoring, after-school programs, or connections with social service organizations. Training includes strategies for instruction and curriculum development within the context of multicultural classrooms. The accelerated schools governance model joins special and regular education teachers together in teams, where they work toward the integration of special and regular education students.

Special Considerations

The accelerated schools process can be a challenging one. Teachers and administrators must be willing to relinquish hierarchical decision-making structures, work together, and expend considerable time and energy to transform a traditional school into an accelerated school. Founder Henry Levin estimates that this process can take three to five years. During this time, it is crucial to maintain regular meeting time and active coaching at the school site.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Knight, S. L., & Stallings, J. A. (1995). The implementation of the accelerated school model in an urban elementary school. In R. L. Allington & S. A. Walmsley (Eds.), *No quick fix: Rethinking literacy programs in America's elementary schools* (pp. 236-251). New York: Teachers College Press.

McCarthy, J., & Still, S. (1993). Hollibrook Accelerated Elementary School. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), *Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts* (pp. 63-83). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Segal, T. (1999). [Report for Ohio center]. Unpublished raw data.

Independent Researchers

Bloom, H. S., Ham, S., Melton, L., & O'Brien, J., with Doolittle, F. C., & Kagehiro, S. (2001). *Evaluating the Accelerated Schools Approach: A look at early implementation and impacts on student achievement in eight elementary schools.* New York: Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.

Ross, S. M., Wang, L. W., Sanders, W. L., Wright, S. P., & Stringfield, S. (1999). *Two- and three-year achievement results on the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System for restructuring schools in Memphis.* Memphis: Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Memorial School Complex (PreK-4) 39 Harvard Road; Box 37 Lancaster, MA 01523 978-368-8482 Contact: Patricia Liner Kemper	441	rural	3%	0%	<1%	3%	94%	0%	10%	18%
Sheppard Accelerated Elementary (K-6) 1777 West Avenue Santa Rosa, CA 95407 707-547-7050 Contact: Gail Ahlas	601	urban fringe of large city	3%	5%	9%	58%	25%	83%	55%	14%
Academy of Accelerated Learning (PreK-5) 3727 South 78th Street Milwaukee, WI 53220 414-327-5782 Contact: Susan Miller	521	large city	18%	1%	34%	5%	42%	73%	38%	18%
World of Wonder Accelerated Learning Community (K-3) 4411 Oakridge Drive Dayton, OH 45417 937-542-3600 Contact: Dick Penry	246	mid-size city	95%	0%	0%	1%	4%	95%	0%	2%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Gene Chasin, Director
National Center for Accelerated Schools Project
University of Connecticut
2131 Hillside Road, Unit 3224
Storrs, CT 06269
Phone: 860-486-6330
Fax: 860-486-6348
E-mail: info@acceleratedschools.net
Web site: http://www.acceleratedschools.net

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted November 2001
Description Updated May 2002

America's Choice (K–12)

IN BRIEF America's Choice School Design	
Founder	National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE)
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1989
# Schools Served (5/1/2002)	455
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	enabling all students to reach internationally benchmarked standards
Main Features	• standards and assessments • aligned instructional system • planning system based on student performance data • focus on literacy in the early grades
Impact on Instruction	teaching keyed to getting all students to meet standards; focus on assessing student work against the standards; use of rituals and routines to manage classrooms
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	2 full-time coaches; looping in elementary schools; interdisciplinary teams in secondary schools; smaller learning communities in high schools
Impact on Schedule	elementary: literacy blocks; secondary: double-period in English language arts for students with reading deficits; all schools: faculty study groups and after-hours programs
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	literacy focus in elementary grades; some curricular materials for math and English language arts
Parental Involvement	home-school notebooks to increase communication
Technology	integrated as a tool to support student learning
Materials	New Standards Performance Standards; English language arts genre and author studies; reading and writing monographs and mini-lessons; math core assignments

Origin/Scope

The America's Choice School Design grew out of the work of the National Alliance for Restructuring Education (NARE), a New American Schools project funded to the National Center on Education and the Economy in 1989. NARE involved more than 300 schools/districts in the development and implementation of New Standards Performance Standards and Reference Examinations, the creation of aligned instructional materials in English language arts and mathematics, and the development of a data-driven system known as Planning for Results. In 1998, the America's Choice School Design was created, incorporating the work of NARE and expanding the design to meet additional components of comprehensive school reform. The first cohort of 42 America's Choice schools began implementing the full design in 1998. By May 2002, there were 455 schools in the network.

General Approach

The America's Choice School Design is a comprehensive, research-based design for grades K-12. It was developed with one goal in mind: to make sure all but the most severely handicapped students reach an internationally benchmarked standard of achievement in English language arts and mathematics by the time they graduate.

The design is based on methods of preventing student failure by early detection, intervention, and acceleration. Student progress is constantly monitored, and those who are falling behind are immediately given extra instruction. In fourth, eighth, and ninth grades, students take the America's Choice Reference Examinations in English language arts and mathematics.

In elementary schools, the design focuses on literacy, emphasizing phonics, oral language, shared books, and guided and independent reading and writing. Schools schedule a

two-and-a-half hour literacy block each day, plus a one hour mathematics block. Structures such as the literacy workshop and the Book of the Month club support student progress. At the secondary level, students performing below grade level continue to receive extra support in literacy through a double period "ramp-up" course. Secondary teachers work in interdisciplinary teams, and high schools are encouraged to establish smaller learning communities.

All America's Choice schools establish a Leadership Management Team to ensure that policies, practices, and structures are aligned in support of the design.

Results

An external longitudinal evaluation of three jurisdictions implementing the America's Choice School Design (Plainfield, New Jersey; Duval County, Florida; and Rochester, New York) revealed a clear difference between America's Choice schools and comparison schools in the performance of students on state assessments. After one year's implementation of the design in Plainfield, the percentage of students at or above the state standard in English language arts climbed from 30 percent to 49 percent. The percentage in demographically matched comparison schools increased from 33 percent to 34 percent. In Duval County, after one year of implementation, the percentage of students meeting the state writing standard in fourth grade increased in America's Choice schools from 16 percent to 27 percent, while the comparison schools showed a decline, from 17 percent to 16 percent. In Rochester, after two years of implementation, the percentage of students at or above the standard in English language arts in America's Choice schools increased from 17 percent to 35 percent. The percentage of students at or above the standard in the comparison schools increased from 17 percent to 26 percent.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE) has a staff of 150. The national office is located in Washington, DC. There are regional offices in New York, New Jersey, Florida, Kentucky, Texas, and California. Over 50 regional staff members work directly with schools in 15 states and the District of Columbia.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** A substantial majority of the school faculty must be committed to the comprehensive America's Choice School Design.
- ***Initial Training:*** When a school adopts the America's Choice School Design, it agrees to participate in off-site and on-site professional development. The principal, Parent/Community Outreach Coordinator, and two designated coaches attend a three-day summer institute. Principals also participate in two-day midyear academy. At the elementary level, the summer institute for the two coaches represents the first in a series of 4 four-day Literacy Institutes held during the school year. At the middle school level, the literacy coach attends 3 four-day institutes, and the mathematics coach attends a series of three institutes ranging in length from two to three days. In the second year, the literacy Coach and an additional English teacher attend a six-day summer institute, followed by two- and three-day follow-ups to prepare for the ramp up program for middle school students. At the high school level, during the first year, the focus of training is on the Leadership Team and literacy. The on-site professional development, led by the principal and the coaches, consists of all-staff workshops, teacher meetings, and study groups. These workshops, which take place during the school's regularly scheduled professional development days, tend to be a half-day in length.

- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** During scheduled teacher planning time or grade level meetings, teachers have the opportunity to work one-on-one and in small groups with the coaches to better understand the design and the instructional strategies needed in the classroom. During study groups, new teaching strategies are introduced through, for example, reading and discussing America's Choice monographs on specific strategies. At the teacher meetings, discussion focuses on the classroom practices and results of implementing strategies. Coaches are expected to set up model classrooms from which the language arts and mathematics programs roll out. Additionally, the school's Cluster Leader, usually an NCEE employee with responsibility for eight schools, provides on-site technical assistance to the Leadership Team on a day-per-month basis.
- ***Networking:*** Through the NCEE national conference and Web site, America's Choice schools are able to network with each other. Also, principal network meetings are held monthly, and coaches observe, learn from, and support one another at national/regional institutes and meetings.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Two quality reviews are conducted each year at each America's Choice school to measure progress in implementation. Using a diagnostic and assessment tool, based upon an implementation rubric organized around the design tasks, the cluster leader and leadership team assess where the school is at the beginning and end of the year. The quality review also includes a focused walk at the school and a review of the America's Choice school portfolio.

Costs

For schools that adopt this design, the cost is approximately $70,000 per year (assuming about 700 students per school) for elementary schools, $75,000 per year for middle schools (1,000 students), and $85,000 per year for high schools (1,000 students). Schools or districts may contract for additional services. Elementary schools must have two full-time positions dedicated to the design: a primary coach and an upper elementary coach. Middle schools designate a full-time literacy coach and a full-time mathematics coach. High schools establish two full-time positions in the second year. The literacy program has a strong emphasis on leveled books, and schools are expected to provide those leveled books and build classroom libraries for student use. Schools are expected to administer the New Standards Reference Examination at the fourth, eighth, and ninth grades. In addition, the master schedule will be impacted as schools are expected to implement safety nets, including "ramp-up" programs, tutoring, and beyond-the-bells programs.

State Standards and Accountability

America's Choice schools use the New Standards Performance Standards in English language arts, mathematics, science, and applied learning. Benchmarked at grades 4, 8, and 10, the standards include examples of student work that are analyzed to show how and why they meet the standards. These standards complement the content standards that states and many districts have developed.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

The America's Choice School Design is highlighted in three categories: high poverty, urban, and rural. The model includes specific strategies for students in these schools, such as a two-and-a-half hour literacy block in elementary school, a double English language arts period at the secondary level for students performing below grade level, classroom management rituals and routines, and looping (teachers staying with the same group of students for multiple grades). Also for rural schools, the model offers "combo" packages that treat two small schools as one in terms of pricing and services. Staff from regional centers are available to provide training to hard-to-reach sites in certain areas of the country.

Special Considerations

The America's Choice School Design supports an inclusion model for students with disabilities. The New Standards Performance Standards used with the design are for all students, whether in the regular program or in a program that includes special accommodations.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

None available.

Independent Researchers

Supovitz, J. A., Poglinco, S. M., & Snyder, B. A. (2001). *Moving mountains: Successes and challenges of the America's Choice comprehensive school reform design.* Philadelphia: Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Sheldon Clark High School HC 63 Box 810 Inez, KY 41224 606-298-3591 Contact: John Haney	780	rural	0%	1%	0%	0%	99%	46%	0%	10%
J.E.B. Stuart Middle School 4815 Wesconnett Boulevard Jacksonville, FL 32210 904-573-1000 Contact: Carol Daniels	1,077	urban fringe of large city	44%	1%	3%	4%	48%	68%	1%	5%
P.S. 16 41-15 104th Street Corona, NY 11368 718-505-0140 Contact: Audrey Murphy	1,500	large city	0%	0%	98%	<1%	<1%	89%	20%	1%

R. E. Davis Elementary 345 Eastern School Road Sumter, SC 29153 803-495-3243 Contact: Brenda Bowens	240	urban fringe of large city	86%	0%	0%	0%	13%	86%	0%	25%
Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.										

For more information, contact:

Judy Aaronson
National Center on Education and the Economy
One Thomas Circle, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Phone: 202-783-3668
Fax: 202-783-3672
E-mail: schooldesign@ncee.org
Web site: http://www.ncee.org

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted November 2001
Description Updated December 2001

ATLAS Communities (PreK–12)

IN BRIEF ATLAS Communities	
Founder	Coalition of Essential Schools, Education Development Center, Project Zero, School Development Program
Current Service Provider	ATLAS Communities
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (9/1/01)	105
Level	preK-12
Primary Goal	align the efforts of a school district, K-12 feeder patterns of schools, individual faculties, and parents to promote student success
Main Features	• preK-12 pathways • development of coherent K-12 educational programs for every student • authentic curriculum, instruction, and assessment • whole-faculty study groups • school/pathway planning and management teams
Impact on Instruction	teachers focus on active inquiry and are trained to be attuned to students' individual strengths and limitations
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	each preK-12 pathway has a pathway coordinator supported by the district (0.5-1.0 FTE depending on the number and size of schools in the pathway)
Impact on Schedule	within schools, teachers meet in study groups; across pathway schools, teachers need time to plan together
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	parent and community involvement is integral to the ATLAS approach
Technology	no special technology required
Materials	tools for helping teachers, administrators, and leadership teams analyze student work, mobilize community assets, modify curricula, implement whole-faculty study groups, and evaluate the success of implementation

Origin/Scope

ATLAS Communities was formed in 1992 as a partnership of four leading educational organizations: Education Development Center, the Coalition of Essential Schools, Project Zero, and the School Development Program. There are 105 ATLAS schools.

General Approach

Building on the experience and research of the School Development Program, the Coalition of Essential Schools, Project Zero, and the Education Development Center, ATLAS was designed to offer a comprehensive approach to improving teaching and learning across a preK-12 pathway of schools. The ATLAS framework revolves around five interrelated elements:

- ***Teaching and Learning:*** Adopting Project Zero's Teaching for Understanding framework to help students develop understanding of essential concepts and apply what they have learned in real-world situations; designing a coherent preK-12 curriculum tied to state and local standards; creating personalized learning environments for students.
- ***Assessment:*** Developing a comprehensive, integrated system of assessments, including authentic assessments (exhibitions) that address rigorous standards.
- ***Professional Development:*** Establishing whole-faculty study groups within and across schools that meet weekly to examine classroom practice.
- ***Family and Community:*** Engaging parents in improving student performance and creating asset-based partnerships between school and community.

- ***Management and Decision Making:*** Aligning systems and structures to support the instructional vision of schools and pathways; establishing a culture of organizational self-assessment and reflection; developing district/school co-management relationships.

A central feature of ATLAS is the "pathway": the alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment across a preK-12 feeder pattern, from which challenging learning experiences for students emerge. The pathway represents a commitment to providing continuity for students from preschool to high school. The Pathway Leadership Team enables students, families, teachers, and administrators to work together to graduate students who exhibit a deep understanding of their world and have the skills to apply that understanding in productive ways. Using data to lay the foundation for ongoing reflection and analysis, the Pathway Leadership Team and whole-faculty study groups provide a forum for all adults to place a common set of student expectations at the heart of a clearly articulated preK-12 curriculum.

Results

Independent evaluations of ATLAS Communities have focused on qualitative examination of implementation. In two school districts that were among the earliest to adopt the model, for example, researchers found evidence of institutionalization five years after initial implementation. Multiple elements of the model had become embedded practices in both districts, including pathways, project-based learning, authentic assessment, and a culture of collaboration and reflection (Rosenblum, 1998). Other studies (Bodilly et al., 1996; Bodilly et al., 1998) have suggested that, of seven New American Schools design teams being examined, ATLAS was one of the most difficult to implement, at least in the early stages.

ATLAS developers have gathered data on student achievement from a variety of schools. At a high school in Virginia (in one of the districts described above), the percentage of students passing that state's Standards of Learning tests rose substantially from 1998 to 2000 in 10 of 11 subjects tested, and outpaced district and statewide gains in 9 of the subjects. Three elementary schools that were part of an ATLAS pathway implemented in 1996 in Philadelphia met performance targets set by the district after two years. From 1997-2000, the percentage of fifth-grade students scoring in the bottom group in reading and mathematics on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment decreased considerably at all three schools. In many cases, the decrease was greater than that at similar schools in the district. Trends from three ATLAS pathways in Washington state are positive across subjects and levels. For example, in the Everett pathway, noted for its depth of implementation, reading scores increased from 42 percent meeting the state standard in 1997 (the first year of implementation) to 71 percent meeting the standard in grade 4, from 25 percent to 30 percent in grade 7, and from 34 percent to 54 percent in grade 10.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** In addition to its central office in Newton, Massachusetts, ATLAS places site developers on-site for each pathway. ATLAS has the capacity to add up to 20 new schools each year.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** School and district staffs must support implementation of the ATLAS design, but ATLAS does not specify the process or the percentage who must approve. Before making a commitment, a school district and pathway of schools work with ATLAS staff to ensure that the ATLAS framework fits with local and/or state requirements and builds on existing assets to further school and district goals.

- ***Initial Training:*** ATLAS holds an initial three- to five-day leadership institute on-site for the Pathway Leadership Team (the district, school, and parent representatives that guide alignment of curriculum and instruction across the pathway).
- ***Follow-up Coaching:*** An ATLAS site developer for each pathway provides customized technical assistance, works closely with school and district staff, organizes professional development activities, brokers additional resources as needed, and ensures that the ATLAS framework is in full operation. The ATLAS Community Study Group Specialist works intensively with each pathway during the initial year to launch whole-faculty study groups in the pathway schools.
- ***Networking:*** Each year ATLAS holds a Principals' Institute, a Summer Leadership Institute, and a Cross-Site Institute. ATLAS staff also help organize regional institutes and site visits upon request. A quarterly newsletter and a Web site provide additional information on the model.
- ***Implementation Review:*** The Information System for ATLAS Communities (ISAC) helps each site monitor and guide implementation through a set of criteria, indicators, and rubrics. This system also enables ATLAS to gather and analyze information about the degree of implementation in various pathways and track value-added results on commonly accepted measures of educational success.

Costs

The cost information that follows applies to schools and districts that began implementing the model during the 2001-2002 school year. All quoted costs apply to schools with fewer than 1,000 students. ATLAS provides comparable services each year for three years.

- For a single elementary or middle school, the implementation cost is $60,000-$80,000 per year for three years, depending on a range of factors such as geographic location and number of students. For a single high school, the cost begins at $75,000 per year.
- For a three-school pathway, the cost begins at $180,000 per year.

In addition to these costs, a district also must appoint a part- or full-time coordinator (depending on the number of schools involved).

State Standards and Accountability

The ATLAS framework includes strategies for working with staff to align curriculum, instruction, and assessment to local and state standards. These strategies include a systematic, data-driven school planning process that helps staff (a) determine an instructional focus tied to standards, (b) set measurable goals, and (c) identify content and best practice initiatives to support the instructional focus. In addition, ATLAS provides materials in literacy and mathematics that help teachers link the Teaching for Understanding framework to these content areas around a common set of K-12 standards. (Science and social studies are being developed.)

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

ATLAS is highlighted in the urban and high poverty categories. In addition to serving multiple schools in these categories, ATLAS helps schools examine and marshal community resources in support of school goals.

Special Considerations

An ATLAS Community pathway typically consists of at least three schools (one elementary, one middle, and one high school). However, it is possible for individual schools to adopt ATLAS.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Gerstle, L. (2001). [ATLAS outcomes for students]. Unpublished raw data.

Independent Researchers

Bodilly, S., with Purnell, S., Ramsey, K., & Keith, S. J. (1996). *Lessons from New American Schools Development Corporation's demonstration phase.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Bodilly, S., with Keltner, B., Purnell, S., Reichardt, R., & Schuyler, G. (1998). *Lessons from New American Schools' scale-up phase: Prospects for bringing designs to multiple schools.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Rosenblum Brigham Associates. (1998). *ATLAS Communities: Staying the course. Implementation and sustainability of the ATLAS design framework in two sites.* Philadelphia: Author.

Rosenblum Brigham Associates. (2000). *Final report on the Schwab teacher study group project.* Philadelphia: Author.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Keeseville Elementary School 1825 Main Street Keeseville, NY 12944 518-834-2839 Contact: Patricia Atkinson	515	rural	2%	0%	<1%	<1%	98%	33%	0%	M
Rhodes Middle School 29th & Clearfield Streets Philadelphia, PA 19132 215-227-4402 Contact: Gwen Baggett	1,100	large city	99%	0%	0%	1%	<1%	N/A	M	M
Norview High School 1070 Middleton Place Norfolk, VA 23513 757-852-4500 Contact: Marjorie Stealey	1,704	mid-size city	68%	<1%	2%	1%	29%	39%	M	M
Boynton K-8 Learning Community 12800 Visger Detroit, MI 48217 313-386-5530 Contact: Ronald Peart	756	large city	79%	<1%	0%	4%	17%	62%	M	M

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M = Missing data.

For more information, contact:

Sharon Dash
Education Development Center
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02458
Phone: 617-969-7100, ext. 2401, or 617-618-2401
Fax: 617-969-3440
E-mail: atlas@edc.org
Web site: http://www.atlascommunities.org

Accepted for Inclusion January 1999
Description Written March 1999
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

Center for Effective Schools (K–12)

IN BRIEF Center for Effective Schools	
Founder	Beverly Bancroft, Larry Lezotte, and Barbara Taylor at Michigan State University
Current Service Provider	Phi Delta Kappa International Center for Effective Schools
Year Established	1986 (at Michigan State University)
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	19 since 1998; more than 1,000 overall
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	to improve the academic achievement of all students
Main Features	a continuous improvement process based upon the precepts that: • all children can and will learn • increased academic achievement is the mark of effectiveness • the unit of change is the individual school within a systemic arena • improvement plans must involve all stakeholders
Impact on Instruction	increased teacher ownership in instructional decision making
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	increased levels of teacher leadership in school reform
Impact on Schedule	maximizing of instructional time
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	central to the process
Technology	off-the-shelf database management software can be used for analysis and tracking
Materials	books, video series, and other materials are provided

Origin/Scope

The Effective Schools Model began with research conducted in the 1970s by Ron Edmonds and others on characteristics, or "correlates," that distinguish unusually effective schools from less effective ones. In 1986, Beverly Bancroft, Larry Lezotte, and Barbara Taylor organized the Center for Effective Schools (CES) at Michigan State University to help schools implement the correlates. In 1995, the Center moved to Bloomington, Indiana, where it became the Phi Delta Kappa International Center for Effective Schools. (Lezotte, in the meantime, left to form a private company, Effective Schools Products.) CES has served 19 schools since 1998 and more than 1,000 overall.

General Approach

The Effective Schools Model is based on the conviction that all children, regardless of race, socioeconomic status, or gender, can and will learn the required curriculum. The model provides a framework for school reform based on seven correlates, or guiding principles. These correlates, derived from empirical investigations and case studies of schools that have successfully taught the intended curriculum of basic skills to all students, are:

- A clear and focused mission on learning for all
- Instructional leadership
- High expectations for all stakeholders
- Opportunity to learn and student time on task
- Frequent monitoring of student progress
- Safe and orderly environment for learning
- Positive home/school/community relations

Under the Effective Schools Model, the individual school is viewed as the unit of improvement. Each school, through a faculty-administrator-parent-community team-planning approach, uses student achievement data and the seven correlates to develop and implement a long-range improvement plan. In addition, the model promotes districtwide, systemic restructuring for continuous improvement. Districts are advised that the process takes at least three years to fully implement.

Results

An ongoing multiyear CES project involving 200 teachers and nearly 14,000 students in six northern Ohio school districts (two urban, two suburban, and two rural) is being studied by Phi Delta Kappa consultants. With data available for five of the six districts from a variety of reading, language arts, and mathematics tests, scores showed an overall pattern of increases across the grades tested over a two-year period (1996-98). For example, in one district, reading and language arts scores improved by 2 to 7 NCEs in all grades tested (one, three, five, and seven). Mathematics scores improved by 2 to 5 NCEs in grades one, three, and five, and remained the same in grade seven.

One of these six districts — Elyria City Schools — has also engaged in numerous other long-term Effective Schools initiatives over the years, including sponsorship of faculty who attend state-government Effective Schools retreats, establishment of an office to help schools develop and implement Effective Schools approaches, and incorporation of Effective Schools principles in school board policy. Participating in this process, several Elyria schools have registered impressive gains in student performance. For example, at Cascade Elementary School, where approximately 60 percent of students are eligible for subsidized lunch, the percentage of sixth graders passing state proficiency tests improved from 61 percent in 1996 to 77 percent in 1998. Also, the percentage of second and third graders more than half a year below grade level in reading declined from 30 percent in 1991-92 to 18 percent in 1998, despite an influx of learning disabled students. At Crestwood Elementary School, where approximately 50 percent of students are eligible for subsidized lunch, the percentage of sixth graders passing state tests improved from 73 percent in 1996 to 88 percent in 1998; the percentage of fourth, fifth, and sixth graders more than half a year below grade in reading declined from 21 percent in 1991-92 to 10 percent in 1998.

The Spring Branch School District in Houston has been working with CES since the late 1980s. At Westwood Elementary, where 54 percent of students were eligible for subsidized lunch in 1998, the percentage of fourth grade students who passed the Texas assessment tests (TAAS) increased from 85 percent (1994) to 98 percent (1998) in reading, and from 71 percent (1994) to 87 percent (1998) in mathematics. Similar gains were registered in fifth grade. At Hollibrook Elementary School, a school with a predominantly Hispanic student population where almost 90 percent of the children are on the free lunch program, the percentage of third grade students mastering the Texas Educational Assessment of Minimum Skills (TEAMS) improved as follows: in mathematics, from 77 percent (1988) to 96 percent (1990); in reading, from 65 percent (1988) to 86 percent (1990); and in writing, from 58 percent (1988) to 81 percent (1990).

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The Phi Delta Kappa International Center for Effective Schools has three satellites: the Northeast Regional Satellite at Kent State University, the Central

Regional Satellite at University of Oklahoma, and the Southwest Regional Satellite in Phoenix. All work under the direction of headquarters staff in Bloomington. Satellite centers are also planned for the southeast, northwest, and Pacific regions. CES offers awareness training, continuous improvement design, and evaluation services to schools throughout the U.S. and Canada. Regionally based CES consultants provide onsite support services.

- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Participants in the Effective Schools Process must reflect stakeholders from the entire school community, and the seven correlates must be embraced as the mosaic for all continuous improvement planning.
- ***Initial Training:*** A diagnostic of the school/district is completed before training begins. Based on the findings of this diagnostic, the following services may be provided during the first year: customized training, consulting services, technical assistance, implementation support, related professional development, networking, and availability to demonstration sites. Awareness training is a typical first step. The training involves a two-day experience followed by two days of follow-up later in the year.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** The second year of the process involves the formation of a leadership team, a needs assessment, the development and implementation of continuous improvement action plans, and an ongoing evaluation process. Consultant assistance is provided throughout this phase. The third year involves at least three onsite visits providing an audit of progress, a review of data, and assurance testing that the process is on track.
- ***Networking:*** Participating schools/districts have access to all of the resources and contacts of the CES and its parent organization, Phi Delta Kappa International.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Data on implementation is utilized throughout the process, using the diagnostic as the baseline. During the third year a report card provides a narrative of progress and a recommendation for future directions.

Costs

Costs are based on the specific plan agreed upon between the participating school/district and CES. Specific costs depend on the need, size of school/district, and level of involvement. A sliding cost schedule is available based on increased district involvement and/or multiple schools' participation. Average costs are $70,000-$90,000 per school for a three-year plan.

Student Populations

The Effective Schools Model is based upon the belief that all children can and will learn, regardless of race, socioeconomic background, or gender. Thus, the model has equal application to all school settings.

Special Considerations

Schools/districts adopting the Effective Schools Model for continuous improvement must endorse the belief that all children can learn and must involve all stakeholders in the school improvement process.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Serious school reform: The Redesign of classroom instruction. (1998). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Independent Researchers

No third-party evaluations of the work of CES with schools are available. There are, however, numerous books and articles on other Effective Schools initiatives (for example, those initiated by school districts or by trainers affiliated with other organizations). The following documents are representative:

Lezotte, L. W., & Bancroft, B. A. (1985). School improvement based on Effective Schools research: A promising approach for economically disadvantaged and minority students. *The Journal of Negro Education, 54*(3): 301-312.

Taylor, B., & Bullard, P. (1994). *Keepers of the dream: The triumph of Effective Schools.* Chicago: Excelsior!

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Breeke Elementary 1400 Martin Luther King Oxnard, CA 93030 805-485-1224 Contact: Anthony Zubia	951	urban fringe of large city	<1%	0%	1%	96%	5%	76%	76%	0%
Chavez Elementary 224 North Juanita Avenue Oxnard, CA 93030 805-483-2389 Contact: Julia Vallapando	878	urban fringe of large city	1%	0%	<1%	97%	2%	91%	75%	0%
Berlin Elementary 20 Center Street Berlin Heights, OH 44814 419-588-2079 Contact: Linda Moon	350	rural	1%	0%	<1%	4%	95%	14%	0%	22%
Tallmadge Middle School 76 North Avenue Tallmadge, OH 44278 330-633-4994 Contact: Greg Misch	675	urban fringe of large city	2%	0%	1%	<1%	97%	9%	0%	12%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Center for Effective Schools
Phi Delta Kappa International
408 North Union
PO Box 789
Bloomington, IN 47402-0789
Phone: 800-766-1156
Fax: 812-339-0018
E-mail: effective.schools@pdkintl.org
Web site: http://www.pdkintl.org

Accepted for Inclusion November 1998
Description Written December 1998
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

Child Development Project (K–6)

IN BRIEF Child Development Project	
Founder	Developmental Studies Center
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1981
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	165
Level	K-6
Primary Goal	to help schools become caring communities of learners that promote students' intellectual, social, and ethical development
Main Features	• literature-based reading and language arts curriculum • cooperative learning • developmental discipline • schoolwide community-building activities • parent involvement activities • restructuring to support teacher collaboration, planning, reflection
Impact on Instruction	changes in classroom organization and management; changes in some aspects of instruction (content and pedagogy)
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	school site project coordinator needed
Impact on Schedule	3-day summer institute; release time during school year
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	yes (literature-based reading and language arts)
Parental Involvement	family participation activities are coordinated with the curriculum; parents have opportunities for membership on a school coordinating team
Technology	none required
Materials	provided

Origin/Scope

The Child Development Project (CDP) was created by the Developmental Studies Center of Oakland, California, in 1981. The program has been implemented in 165 schools.

General Approach

The Child Development Project is an approach to school restructuring that revamps teaching, learning, school organization, school climate, and teachers' work environments to promote the intellectual, social, and ethical development of students. The CDP seeks to transform schools into communities where children feel cared for and learn to care in return — communities that help students develop the academic and practical skills needed to function productively in society, and the ethical and intellectual skills needed to function humanely and wisely.

The program has five main components:

1. ***Literature-Based Reading and Language Arts:*** This component explicitly integrates ethical content into the curriculum and focuses on teaching for understanding. The selection of books, the accompanying teachers' guides, and the supporting workshops are all designed to help teachers encourage children to think deeply about what they read. Teachers lead students in open-ended discussions of important issues evoked by the books and provide structured opportunities for students to discuss these issues with one another.
2. ***Collaborative Classroom Learning:*** This component emphasizes the importance of learning to work with others in fair, caring, and responsible ways. The program provides 25 general lesson formats that can be used in various academic areas, plus 10 sample activities to illustrate each format.

3. ***Developmental Discipline:*** Developmental discipline is an approach to classroom management that focuses on building caring, respectful relationships among all members of the classroom community. It uses problem-solving approaches rather than rewards and punishments to promote student responsibility.
4. ***Parent Involvement:*** This component incorporates two avenues for parent involvement: (a) family participation activities that are coordinated with the curriculum and relevant to family interests, and (b) membership on a school "coordinating team" of parents and teachers who plan schoolwide activities.
5. ***Schoolwide Activities:*** The school coordinating team examines traditional schoolwide activities to ensure that they allow participation by all, avoid competition, and respect difference while lessening divisions between students, teachers, and parents.

Results

There have been three separate quasi-experimental studies of CDP over the past 16 years. The schools (17 program and 17 matched comparison schools) participating in these evaluations have been diverse in setting, student population, and ethnicity. The program has been found to result in (a) significant increases in students' sense of their school as a community and in their school-related attitudes, motivation, and behavior; (b) significant increases in a variety of social and ethical outcomes, including conflict resolution skills and commitments; and (c) significant decreases in students' involvement in alcohol and marijuana use.

Effects on academic achievement reported in these studies were less pronounced. In one study, sixth-grade students in three CDP schools scored higher on reading comprehension tests (developed by the CDP) than counterparts in the control schools, but the advantages disappeared in a middle school follow-up study. A larger study of schools in six districts reported few differences between CDP and control schools either on reading comprehension tests or standardized achievement tests. In one district, however, students in CDP schools significantly outperformed control-school students on state-developed performance-based tests in reading, mathematics, science, and social studies during the three years of program intervention.

Data from other CDP schools show considerable improvement in reading and mathematics scores. At one CDP school, the percentage of students characterized as "novice readers" (based on Kentucky Instructional Results Information System scores for fourth graders) dropped from 41 the first year of implementation to 3 five years later, while the percentage of "novices in mathematics" dropped from 65 to 32. Over the same period, another CDP school witnessed drops in reading and mathematics novices from 45 to 7 and 86 to 45, respectively. Similar improvements in basic reading and mathematics skills have been reported in over 20 other CDP schools.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The Developmental Studies Center, located in Oakland, California, has approximately 50 full-time professional staff. In addition, the center can draw upon many practitioner/trainers from around the country to provide professional development services.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** After participating in an initial orientation session, a minimum of 80% of the school faculty must indicate support (by secret ballot) for the implementation of CDP. The school must agree to focus its reform efforts on CDP for a minimum of three years. Both the school and the district must make other specific commitments to the

program including providing a project coordinator at the school site and release time for staff development, coaching, and collegial planning and support.

- ***Initial Training:*** Initial training in CDP is provided by Developmental Studies Center staff during three-day summer institutes each year, conducted at or near the school site. Teachers are provided with all CDP instructional and curricular materials.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Program staff make three weeklong visits to the site during each school year to conduct follow-up workshops and work with individuals or small groups on coaching, planning, and problem solving. In addition, teachers meet regularly during the year ("partner study and support") for collegial planning and study.
- ***Networking:*** Consultation with program staff is available by telephone (toll free), fax, and e-mail. The Developmental Studies Center also supports a Web site and provides electronic forums (discussion listservs) to facilitate the exchange of information and resources by e-mail.
- ***Implementation Review:*** The principal is expected to monitor implementation on an ongoing basis, and program staff assess implementation during site visits. In addition, Developmental Studies Center research staff collect implementation data to determine progress, areas in need of improvement, and priorities for additional staff development services. Technical assistance and research instruments for evaluating program implementation and outcomes are available.

Costs

Materials, staff development, and onsite support total approximately $65,000 per year for the first two years, and $55,000 for the third year, depending on a school's needs and size. In addition, the school will need to provide a half-time literacy coordinator, any compensation necessary for teachers to attend summer institutes, and 24 days of substitutes per year to allow release time for teachers.

Student Populations

CDP has been implemented in urban, suburban, and rural schools serving a wide variety of student populations, including disadvantaged and minority students, and students learning English as a second language. A large proportion of current CDP sites are schoolwide Title I schools.

Special Considerations

CDP is a systemic reform effort that affects all aspects of schooling. Teachers must be committed to collaborative planning and decision making, establishing a climate of mutual trust and respect, focusing their efforts on implementing CDP throughout the school, and establishing the structures and routines that support reflective practice and continuous improvement. The Developmental Studies Center estimates that it takes a minimum of three years in most schools to achieve effective implementation of CDP throughout the school.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Battistich, V., Schaps, E., Watson, M., & Solomon, D. (1996). Prevention effects of the Child Development Project: Early findings from an ongoing multisite demonstration trial. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 11,* 12-35.

Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Watson, M., & Schaps, E. (1997). Caring school communities. *Educational Psychologist, 32,* 137-151.

Solomon, D., Watson, M., Battistich, V., Schaps, E., & Delucchi, K. (1996). Creating classrooms that students experience as communities. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 24,* 719-748.

Independent Researchers

Coburn, C. E., & Meyer, E. R. (1998, April). *Shaping context to support and sustain reform.* Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Bel Aire Park Elementary 3580 Beckworth Drive Napa, CA 94558-2846 707-253-3775 Contact: Melissa Strongman	415	mid-size city	0%	2%	2%	35%	61%	53%	33%	7%
Sedgwick Elementary 19200 Phil Lane Cupertino, CA 95014-3566 408-252-3103 Contact: Lynn Shimada	656	urban fringe of large city	3%	1%	36%	8%	53%	16%	4%	6%
Lowell Elementary 1409 Linton Avenue St. Louis, MO 63107-1116 314-534-5050 Contact: Audrey Washington	449	large city	96%	0%	1%	0%	4%	95%	0%	0%
Frayser Elementary 1230 Larchmont Avenue Louisville, KY 40215-2232 502-485-8255 Contact: Rebecca Harmon	489	large city	50%	0%	1%	<1%	48%	87%	0%	16%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Denise Wood
Developmental Studies Center
2000 Embarcadero, Suite 305
Oakland, CA 94606
Phone: 510-533-0213
Fax: 510-464-3670
E-mail: dsc_information@devstu.org
Web site: http://www.devstu.org

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted June 2002
Description Updated July 2002

Community for Learning (K–12)

IN BRIEF Community for Learning	
Founder	Margaret C. Wang
Current Service Provider	Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory for Student Success
Year Established	1990
# Schools Served (6/1/02)	200
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	to achieve social and academic success for students by linking schools with community institutions
Main Features	• collaboration with homes, libraries, museums, and other places where students learn • coordinated health and human services delivery • site-specific implementation design • Adaptive Learning Environments Model of instruction
Impact on Instruction	teams of regular teachers and specialists work together in the classroom, providing individual and small-group instruction for regular and special students; all students have individualized learning plans
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	full-time site facilitator; teacher teams
Impact on Schedule	flexible use of time for instructional teaming and planning (block scheduling)
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	parental involvement is an essential component of the design
Technology	no specially designed equipment required
Materials	no specially designed materials required

Origin/Scope

The Community for Learning model (CFL) has evolved over three decades. The classroom instructional component, Adaptive Learning Environments Model, was originally developed by Margaret Wang and her associates under the aegis of the National Follow Through Project in the late 1960s. Other components have been added over the years. As of June 2002, the comprehensive model had been implemented in more than 200 schools in 13 states and the District of Columbia.

General Approach

School is not the only place where students learn. They learn in a variety of environments, including libraries, museums, workplaces, and their own homes. Community for Learning (CFL) links the school to these and other institutions, including health, social services, and law enforcement agencies. The idea is to provide a range of learning opportunities for students, coordinate service delivery across organizations, and foster a community-wide commitment to student success.

The emphasis on collaboration extends into the classroom itself, where regular teachers and specialists (such as special education teachers, Title I teachers, and school psychologists) work in teams to meet the diverse academic and social needs of all children. The instructional component of CFL is called the Adaptive Learning Environments Model (ALEM), an inclusive approach to meeting the learning needs of individual students in regular classes, including students with special needs. ALEM includes a diagnostic/prescriptive process to provide for the diverse needs of all students. Teachers adapt instruction for each student, using a variety of instructional strategies and grouping patterns. Students are taught to take responsibility for planning and monitoring their own progress. Learning tasks are divided into small units and evaluated frequently by the teacher, who modifies learning plans and

instructional strategies on an ongoing basis. Students progress at their own pace, advancing when ready and taking extra time when necessary. Individualized attention is provided for those who are not progressing well and for those who are exceptionally talented and ready for advanced lessons in given subjects.

Each CFL school has a full-time facilitator, who oversees implementation and assists with training. Districts with clusters of CFL schools generally appoint a project coordinator, who serves as the liaison between schools, the district office, and Mid-Atlantic Regional Educational Laboratory for Student Success (LSS). The project coordinator, the facilitator, and the principal develop a site-specific plan that mobilizes the school's resources in support of classroom and community-wide implementation.

Results

A CFL consultant recently analyzed student achievement data for all schools that adopted the model in 1998 (19 schools, all in New Jersey) and 1999 (42 schools in New Jersey and four other states). Data consisted of statewide assessment scores in reading and mathematics in multiple grades. The consultant found that after three years of implementation, 1998 CFL schools had made greater progress than the state as a whole on 63 percent of the reading measures and 68 percent of the mathematics measures. After two years of implementation, the 1999 CFL cohort had made greater progress than the state as a whole on about half the measures. This suggested that student performance tends to increase as schools have more time to implement the model (Redding, 2002).

Several earlier studies examined student achievement at smaller numbers of CFL schools. For example, one study focused on five schools in the District of Columbia that began implementing CFL in fall 1996, plus one school that adopted the model in fall 1997. The six schools had been identified as among the lowest performing in the district. Despite substantial student and staff turnover, the schools made considerable progress in implementing CFL. From fall 1997 to spring 1998, there were statistically significant changes in classroom practice on 11 of 12 critical dimensions of ALEM, the model's instructional component. On the Stanford 9, all six CFL schools exceeded the district-mandated improvement standard of 10 percent gain from fall to spring. The mean gain for the CFL schools was comparable to that of other targeted assistance schools in the district (Wang & Manning, 2000).

Considerable effort has been expended in studying whether implementation of CFL components leads to "learner-centered" instructional practices. For example, in one study of grades four through eight at 23 CFL schools, students with high-implementing CFL teachers reported that their teachers performed more learner-centered practices than students with medium- or low-implementing teachers. The four domains of learner-centered practice (providing positive classroom climate, honoring student voice, encouraging higher order thinking, and adapting to individual differences) were measured by the Assessment of Learner-Centered Practices, a survey tool developed by the American Psychological Association (McCombs & Weinberger, 2000).

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** Community for Learning is headquartered at LSS at Temple University in Philadelphia. LSS has established a network of three regional centers to provide professional development and technical assistance to schools. The centers are located in Philadelphia, in Penn Hills, Pennsylvania, and in Lincoln, Illinois.

- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Commitment by the consensus of a school's staff is required for whole-school implementation.
- ***Initial Training:*** An initial two-day planning meeting with site facilitators and principals involves (a) an overview of the program design, (b) a needs assessment process that helps identify training needs at each school, (c) visits to established Community for Learning sites, and (d) the development of an implementation plan for each school. Shortly after this meeting, teachers attend a four-day workshop for training and classroom preparation.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Program implementation staff provide 12-15 days of on-site professional development and technical assistance to teachers and related services staff as needed. This assistance is custom designed for each school based on needs identified by teachers, observations by principals, and implementation assessment data gathered by program staff. Additionally, the project coordinator, site facilitators, and principals from participating schools assist with professional development, and successful CFL teachers provide peer coaching and mentoring. The goal is to strengthen capacity at school and district levels to provide professional development and technical support so that a high degree of program implementation can be maintained at each school.
- ***Networking:*** LSS holds seminars for the network of CFL schools. School facilitators meet periodically for planning. A listserv has been created for CFL teachers to share ideas, and school staff receive research briefs and publications from LSS on a regular basis.
- ***Implementation Review:*** The Degree of Implementation Assessment Battery for Adaptive Instruction is used to determine the extent to which 12 critical dimensions of ALEM (the instructional component of CFL) are being implemented. Data on implementation are formally collected twice per year. Results are used to plan subsequent professional development.

Costs

The CFL program delivery system is built on existing resources and personnel at each school, so costs vary from site to site. However, the estimated cost for planning, training, and ongoing technical assistance is $35,000 per school for years one through three, and $22,000 for each year thereafter. Schools must also cover a full-time site facilitator and release time or stipends for teachers engaged in professional development.

State Standards and Accountability

CFL has a defined process for aligning a school's curriculum with the standards of its state. Through the diagnostic/prescriptive component of CFL, teachers plan units and sequences of lessons that incorporate state standards, good instructional strategies, pacing, exploratory learning centers, and assessment. Site facilitators and principals work with teachers throughout the year to ensure that proper alignment is achieved and maintained.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

Community for Learning did not apply for inclusion in any of the categories.

Special Considerations

To the extent possible, implementation of CFL involves the inclusion of students with disabilities in regular classes with special education support.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Redding, S. (2002). *Community for Learning effectiveness study.* Unpublished manuscript.

Wang, M. C., & Manning, J. (2000). *Turning around low-performing schools: The case of the Washington, DC schools.* Philadelphia: Laboratory for Student Success.

Wang, M. C., Oates, J., & Weishew, N. (1995). Effective school responses to student diversity in inner-city schools: A coordinated approach. *Education and Urban Society, 27*(4), 484-503.

Independent Researchers

Brookhart, S. M., Casile, W. J., & McCown, R. R. (1997). *Evaluation of the implementation of continuous progress instruction in the Fox Chapel Area School District 1995-1996.* Pittsburgh: Duquesne University.

McCombs, B. L., & Quiat, M. (2000). *Results of pilot study to evaluate the Community for Learning (CFL) program.* Philadelphia: Laboratory for Student Success.

McCombs, B. L., & Weinberger, E. (2000). *National study of the Community for Learning program: Relationships between program implementation, learner-centeredness, and student academic and non-academic outcomes.* Unpublished manuscript.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Van Ness Elementary 1150 5th Street SE Washington, DC 20003 202-698-3818 Contact: George Moore	363	large city	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0%	11%
Grant Elementary 159 North Clinton Avenue Trenton, NJ 08609 609-989-2640 Contact: Veronica Taylor	448	mid-size city	39%	0%	1%	60%	0%	95%	34%	13%
Warren East Middle School 7031 Louisville Road Bowling Green, KY 42101 270-843-0181 Contact: Beverly Dillard	440	rural	11%	0%	0%	0%	88%	50%	2%	10%

All figures were obtained from each school for the 2000-01 school year.

For more information, contact:

Karen Gerdts
CFL Field Coordinator
Laboratory for Student Success
1301 Cecil B. Moore Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19122-6091
Phone: 800-759-1495
Fax: 217-732-3696
E-mail: kgerdts@adi.org
Web site: http://www.temple.edu/LSS

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted November 2001
Description Updated April 2002

Co-nect (K–12)

IN BRIEF Co-nect	
Founder	BBN Corporation
Current Service Provider	Co-nect Inc.
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (2/1/02)	175
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	improved achievement in core subjects
Main Features	• design-based assistance for comprehensive reform • customized on-line/on-site training and personal support • project-based learning • peer and progress review programs • leadership processes for whole-school technology integration
Impact on Instruction	emphasis on authentic problems, practical applications, and interdisciplinary projects
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	organization of school into small learning communities ("clusters"); full-time facilitator preferred
Impact on Schedule	flexible block scheduling; common planning time for teachers
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	literacy program for elementary schools
Parental Involvement	parents are encouraged to be more involved in their children's learning
Technology	significant investment required; schools need computers and Internet access for teachers (at least) to make the most of the online products and services; Co-nect does not provide equipment
Materials	Schoolwide Action Priorities (printed kits to help schools address schoolwide issues such as literacy); online resources including mini-lessons on teaching strategies, database of best practices, facilitated learning modules, and searchable selection of curriculum projects tied to a custom-built state standards database

Origin/Scope

Co-nect was founded in 1992 by members of the Educational Technologies Group at BBN Corporation. As of winter 2002, there were 175 Co-nect schools.

General Approach

Co-nect helps schools work through a structured process of school improvement, the ultimate focus of which is high quality teaching and learning. The model features a nationwide staff of teaching professionals who work directly with teachers and administrators within schools and districts. Co-nect's training and consulting services are supported by a suite of diagnostic tools, on-line learning modules, and other teaching resources, including a library of best practices. This combination has been designed to help schools meet adequate yearly progress goals through sound, sustainable classroom practices.

Co-nect offers comprehensive schoolwide and districtwide capacity-building programs that include planning for continuous improvement, data-driven decision making, alignment strategies such as curriculum mapping, technology integration, benchmarking, and leadership training. In addition, Co-nect provides specialized content in project-based learning, authentic assessment, and literacy (for elementary schools). For example, Co-nect consultants help teachers working in interdisciplinary teams to guide students through challenging, engaging projects that align with state and local standards.

Co-nect schools are encouraged to have computers in every classroom, with internet capability, thereby enabling client schools to access all of the available on-line resources.

Results

A national study conducted by independent researchers from Boston College compared achievement gains in 24 Co-nect schools across the country with gains in demographically similar schools in the same districts. Positive changes occurred in most of the Co-nect schools, and four of the schools had consistently higher gains than their comparison schools. Overall, however, the researchers concluded that "the Co-nect design was associated with similar changes in test scores as were the comparison schools" (Russel & Robinson, 2000).

An independent study conducted by researchers at the University of Memphis and University of Tennessee found that four Co-nect schools in Memphis showed stronger achievement gains across all subject areas over a three-year period (1995-98) on the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment System than control schools. Across all subjects (reading, language, mathematics, science, and social studies), Co-nect schools' 1995-98 change was 14.2 points higher than that of control schools on a Cumulative Percent of Norm scale (where a score of 100 indicates that a school has made the expected gain for the year). While not statistically significant, this advantage was depicted by the researchers as a "moderately large effect size" (Ross, Sanders, Stringfield, Wang, & Wright, 1999). A follow-up analysis showed that these Co-nect schools maintained "noticeably higher" gain scores than control schools through 1999 (Ross, Sanders, & Wright, 2000). Two schools that began using Co-nect in 1997 had not shown a similar advantage, however.

A third study of Memphis schools compared five Co-nect schools to four control schools during 1999-2000 on classroom teaching, computer usage, school climate, and student achievement, among other variables. Classrooms in Co-nect schools were characterized by greater use of technology, sustained writing, project-based learning, independent inquiry, and cooperative learning than classrooms in control schools. Co-nect schools were also found to have more positive school climates. Three of the five Co-nect schools were rated as higher-implementing by the district office. From 1998 to 2000, these three schools showed greater gains in student achievement than state and district schools (Ross & Lowther, 2000).

According to a study conducted by the evaluation office of the Cincinnati Public Schools, the six Co-nect schools in the district showed an improvement in student performance from 1996 to 1999 that exceeded district changes over the same period (Lewis & Bartz, 1999). The researchers calculated T-scores for the Ohio Proficiency Test in grades four and six in such a way that the district score each year stayed at 50. The Co-nect schools' scores improved from 45.9 in 1996 to 49.8 in 1999. Although they didn't calculate statistical significance because of small sample sizes, the researchers characterized this as a "meaningful improvement."

Data from other school districts around the country also show student performance improving in Co-nect schools. For example, from 1999 to 2001, the six Co-nect elementary schools in southern Florida demonstrated higher achievement gains than the state as a whole on the Florida Comprehensive Achievement Tests. In reading, the percentage of fourth-grade students in Co-nect schools scoring at the proficient level or higher increased from 44 percent in 1999 to 64 percent in 2001. Over the same period, the average score statewide increased from 52 percent to 61 percent. In mathematics, scores in Co-nect schools increased from 42 percent to 67 percent, again considerably greater than the statewide increase.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** Co-nect's headquarters is in Arlington, Massachusetts. Co-nect currently has 108 full-time employees, with a small majority based in the field.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Co-nect provides an informational orientation and buy-in process leading to a faculty vote. Co-nect strongly recommends at least a 75 percent vote in favor to proceed with adoption.
- ***Initial Training:*** Prior to implementation, the school principal attends a two-and-a-half-day Principal Summit in Massachusetts, and the school facilitator attends the weeklong School Facilitator Institute, also in Massachusetts.
- ***Follow-up Coaching:*** Local school consultants conduct training workshops throughout the year and work directly with teams and individuals in the schools. All faculty members attend at least three days of training annually. Members of the instructional leadership team have an additional day, and small groups of teachers attend specialized sessions. All told, Co-nect consultants spend about two days per month on-site. Telephone and e-mail support are also provided by school consultants, area managers in the field, and headquarters staff, in addition to online curriculum and technical support.
- ***Networking:*** The Co-nect Exchange, the organization's Web site, delivers professional training for teachers and leaders and supports the growth of a collaborative professional community among participating schools. The Exchange offers telecollaborative projects, curriculum resources, online training modules, and discussion areas. Co-nect Peer Review is a national school visitation program. Co-nect also offers an annual conference for teachers and administrators.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Co-nect closely monitors and regularly reviews the progress of implementation efforts through a series of annual school progress reviews.

Costs

A number of factors determine the cost of a standard three-year implementation, including the size and location of the school and the number of other Co-nect schools in the area. Typically, the cost is $65,000 per year for three years. This figure assumes a school with up to 40 faculty members, partnering with at least four other schools in the same region. It covers the following services:

- Customized professional development, including workshops for principals, the school design team, and the full faculty
- Frequent visits by regional Co-nect school consultants to work directly with school faculty members, conduct customized training, and model best teaching practices
- Customized assistance with initial data gathering, analysis, and planning during the first few months of implementation

In addition, each school must support a full-time school-based facilitator (typically a faculty member) to assist with the change process. The school must provide high-speed classroom Internet access for all teachers (at least by the end of the first year of implementation) to take advantage of online training and resources. Finally, the school must commit to full participation in Co-nect's national conference, the Critical Friends process, training workshops, and other key activities.

State Standards and Accountability

A significant amount of the professional development work Co-nect does in schools revolves around standards. Co-nect consultants help teachers identify priorities and map effective strategies that address standards and speak to students' interests. Curriculum mapping helps teachers understand the detail and scope of what is being taught across subject areas and grade levels, and it creates opportunities for cross-grade/cross-discipline teaching and sharing.

Additionally, Co-nect has compiled an online standards database that includes standards from all 32 states where the model has been adopted, as well as selected local and national standards. The standards database ties directly into the online ProjectBuilder, thus helping teachers create projects aligned to standards. Co-nect also maintains a database of existing projects. In the summer of 2002, this database will be tied into the standards database, enabling teachers to tailor projects developed in other states to their own state and local standards.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

Co-nect is highlighted in four categories: urban, rural, high poverty, and special education. Most Co-nect schools are inner city schools with large numbers of students eligible for free/reduced-price lunch. To address the needs of these schools, Co-nect promotes the sensible use of technology to help offset the effects of the "digital divide." The model also offers strategies to ensure a safe and nurturing environment for all students. Rural schools can take advantage of Co-nect's distance learning opportunities: the Co-nect Exchange (Web site) and videoconferencing facilities. As for special education, Co-nect supports flexible grouping strategies for students and teaming of regular and special education teachers.

Special Considerations

Technology requirements include computers and high-speed Internet access for all staff.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Lewis, J. L., & Bartz, M. (1999). *New American Schools designs: An analysis of program results in district schools.* Cincinnati, OH: Cincinnati Public Schools.

Independent Researchers

Ross, S. M., & Lowther, D. L. (2000). *Impacts of the Co-nect school reform design on classroom instruction, school climate, and student achievement in inner-city schools.* Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S. M., Sanders, W. L., Stringfield, S., Wang, L. W., & Wright, S. (1999). *Two- and three-year achievement results on the Tennessee value-added assessment system for restructuring schools in Memphis.* Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Ross, S. M., Sanders, W. L., & Wright, S. (2000). *Value-added achievement results for two cohorts of Co-nect schools in Memphis: 1995-1999 outcomes.* Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational

Policy.
Russel, M., & Robinson, R. (2000). *Co-nect retrospectives outcomes study.* Chestnut Hill, MA: Boston College, Center for the Study of Testing, Evaluation, and Educational Policy.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Bloomington Elementary 334 North Branch Avenue Bloomington, MD 21523 301-359-0331 Contact: James Morris	97	rural	1%	0%	0%	0%	99%	54%	0%	21%
Braddock High School 3601 SW 147th Avenue Miami, FL 33186 305-225-9729 Contact: Donald Hoecherl	5,020	large city	7%	0%	1%	82%	10%	44%	11%	8%
Bolger Middle School 100 Palmer Place Keansburg, NJ 07734 732-787-2007 Contact: Nick Eremita	600	urban fringe of large city	5%	0%	2%	7%	86%	63%	2%	9%
Vandenberg Elementary 16100 Edwards Avenue Southfield, MI 48076 248-746-7617 Contact: Sherry Charns	410	urban fringe of large city	55%	0%	2%	1%	42%	50%	40%	7%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Co-nect
37 Broadway
Arlington, MA 02474
Phone: 617-995-3100 or 877-7CONECT
Fax: 617-955-3103
E-mail: info@co-nect.net
Web site: http://www.co-nect.net

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Description Written March 1998
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

Core Knowledge (K–8)

IN BRIEF Core Knowledge	
Founder	E. D. Hirsch, Jr.
Current Service Provider	Core Knowledge Foundation
Year Established	1986
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	1,020
Level	K-8
Primary Goal	to help students establish a strong foundation of core knowledge for higher levels of learning
Main Features	• sequential program of specific grade-by-grade topics for core subjects • rest of curriculum (approximately half) left for schools to design
Impact on Instruction	instructional methods (to teach core topics) are designed by individual teachers/schools
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	minimal
Impact on Schedule	minimal
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	yes
Parental Involvement	schools are expected to involve parents in planning and resource development
Technology	none required
Materials	detailed material provided

Origin/Scope

The Core Knowledge Foundation is an independent, non-profit, non-partisan organization founded in 1986 by E. D. Hirsch, Jr. The foundation's essential program, a core curriculum titled the Core Knowledge Sequence, was first implemented in 1990. By May 2001, it was being used in 1,020 schools.

General Approach

Core Knowledge is an approach to curriculum based on the work of E. D. Hirsch and described in his books *Cultural Literacy* and *The Schools We Need and Why We Don't Have Them.* The focus of the approach is on teaching a common core of concepts, skills, and knowledge that characterize a "culturally literate" and educated individual. The purpose of the approach is to increase academic performance as demonstrated on national and state norm- and criterion-referenced tests, to help narrow the gap between academic "haves" and "have nots," and to build consensus among teachers, parents, and administrators.

Core Knowledge is based on the principle that the grasp of a specific and shared body of knowledge will help students establish strong foundations for higher levels of learning. Developed through research examining successful national and local core curricula and through consultation with education experts in each subject area, the Core Knowledge sequence provides a consensus-based model of specific content guidelines for students in the elementary grades. It offers a progression of detailed grade-by-grade topics of knowledge in history, geography, mathematics, science, language arts, and fine arts, so that students build on knowledge from year to year in grades K-8. Instructional strategies are left to the discretion of teachers.

The Core Knowledge sequence typically comprises 50% of a school's curriculum; the other 50% allows schools to meet state and local requirements and teachers to contribute personal strengths. Teachers are also expected to provide effective instruction in reading and mathematics. The Core Knowledge curriculum is detailed in the *Core Knowledge Sequence Content Guidelines for Preschool through Grade Eight* and illustrated in a series of books entitled *What Your (First-, Second- etc.) Grader Needs to Know.*

Parental involvement and consensus building contribute to the success of the Core

Knowledge Sequence. Parents and community members are invited to be involved in obtaining resources, planning activities, and developing a schoolwide plan. The schoolwide plan integrates Core Knowledge content with district and state requirements and assessments. Additionally, parents and teachers are encouraged to cooperate in planning learning goals and lesson plans.

Results

A study conducted by Johns Hopkins University is currently in its third year. This study analyzes six established Core Knowledge schools, six Core Knowledge schools deemed promising implementation sites, and four matched control schools. The first year qualitative report outlined the benefits educators observed in the advanced Core Knowledge schools. Students appeared to gain self-confidence and were more interested in learning, and discipline problems decreased. Additionally, teachers described their work lives as more interesting and found that they worked collaboratively more often. Early quantitative data shows slight gains for Core Knowledge students in reading and mathematics on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills and slight gains on the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program in mathematics, social studies, writing, and language use. Core Knowledge students scored worse than controls on science.

Additional studies of single Core Knowledge schools have demonstrated significant improvement in raising the scores of students of low socio-economic status and decreasing the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged students. Data from the Paul H. Cale Elementary School, a Core Knowledge school in Virginia, showed much higher achievement than predicted for disadvantaged students (70% scored higher than national norm on the CAT).

The Nathaniel Hawthorne Elementary School in Texas has also achieved at higher than expected levels. Hawthorne is an inner-city school with a large Hispanic population and a 96% free and reduced lunch rate. Hawthorne adopted the Core Knowledge Sequence in the 1992-93 school year. The average reading pass rate for grades 3-5 in the district is 55%. Hawthorne students enter grade 3 with a 34 % pass rate. By grade 5, Hawthorne students have a 67% pass rate that far exceeds the district's 56% pass rate for grade 5. Gains also were observed in the mathematics skills assessment. Similar results have been found in case studies in a variety of Core Knowledge schools in Massachusetts, Washington, and Colorado.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** Headquartered in Charlottesville, Virginia; prototype regional center at Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas; cadres of trainers in Texas, Florida, Maryland, Ohio, and Colorado.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** The school or school district must obtain the commitment of at least 80% of the teachers who will be involved in the implementation. Implementation requires full school participation for a minimum of three years. Teachers are expected to teach all of the topics in the Core Knowledge Sequence at the specified grade levels.
- ***Initial Training:*** Initial training consists of a three to five day (depending on district needs and resources) on-site intensive training for all teachers and administrators, spread over the first year of implementation. The training includes an overview of Core Knowledge, development of a schoolwide plan, advice on obtaining resources and parent involvement, and specific unit writing.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** A variety of workshops, mentorships, and follow-up site visits are offered to help ensure successful implementation. Summer workshops are available

focusing on integrating the Core Knowledge Sequence with local curricular guidelines, collaborative planning, and lesson-writing sessions.

- ***Networking:*** Core Knowledge supports a Web site, publishes a quarterly newsletter, and hosts an annual national conference in March.
- ***Implementation Review:*** After receiving letters of commitment from the school demonstrating 80% support for the Core Knowledge Sequence, the school is recognized as a Core Knowledge school.

Costs

Schools are required to commit to the implementation of Core Knowledge for a minimum of three years. The cost to implement Core Knowledge is determined by the number of staff members and students on a given campus. For a school with 25 teachers and 500 students, estimated costs would be $36,000 for year one, $32,000 for year two, and $32,000 for year three. These fees cover the following services and materials:

- Leadership training for the principal and Core Knowledge coordinator (two days per year)
- Professional development training conducted by Core Knowledge consultants (five days per year)
- Site visits by Core Knowledge consultants (three two-day visits per year)
- School Kit
- Core Knowledge training materials for teachers (new materials each year)
- Core Knowledge curriculum tests for students

In addition to the estimated cost, the Core Knowledge Foundation expects a minimum of $1,000 per teacher be allocated for Core Knowledge related materials.

Student Populations

Core Knowledge was developed to serve all children. Core Knowledge programs currently serve disadvantaged students, Title I schools, minority students, and English-language learners. Core Knowledge schools are established in rural, suburban, and urban areas.

Special Considerations

Teachers must be willing to implement the Core Knowledge Sequence for three years and to develop and implement a sequential program of skills instruction in the areas of reading and mathematics. The school must develop a schoolwide planning document that contains the Core Knowledge topics and district/state standards.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Marshall, M. (1996). *Core Knowledge sequence credited in test score boosts.* Charlottesville, VA: Core Knowledge Foundation.

Independent Researchers

Schubnell, G. (1996). Hawthorne Elementary School: The evaluator's perspective. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk, 1*(1), 33-39.

Stringfield, S., & McHugh, B. (1997). *The Maryland Core Knowledge implementation: First year evaluation.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, CRESPAR.

Stringfield, S., Datnow, A., & Nunnery, J. (1997). *First-year evaluation of the implementation of the Core Knowledge sequence: Qualitative report.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins

University, CRESPAR.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Virgil Grissom Elementary 4900 Sismbrook Houston, TX 77045 713-434-5662 Contact: Doris Bilton	900	large city	48%	0%	<1%	50%	1%	80%	0%	0%
S. L. Mason Elementary 1605 Azalea Drive Valdosta, GA 31602 912-333-8525 Contact: John Davis	588	large town	64%	0%	4%	0%	32%	64%	<1%	11%
Cale Elementary 1757 Avon Street Extended Charlottesville, VA 22902ll 804-293-7455 Contact: Gerald Terre	540	rural	22%	0%	1%	2%	75%	40%	40%	12%
O. L. Slaton Junior High 1602 32nd Street Lubbock, TX 79405 806-866-1555 Contact: Robert Guerrero	830	mid-size city	9%	0%	1%	45%	45%	49%	0%	0%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Yolanda VanNess
Core Knowledge Foundation
801 East High Street
Charlottesville, VA 22902
Phone: 434-977-7550 or 800-238-3233, ext. 237
Fax: 434-977-0021
E-mail: yvancore@aol.com
Web site: http://www.coreknowledge.org

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted August 2001
Description Updated December 2001

Different Ways of Knowing (PreK–8)

IN BRIEF Different Ways of Knowing (DWoK)	
Founder	Galef Institute
Current Service Provider	Galef Institute
Year Established	1989
# Schools Served (9/1/01)	675
Level	preK-8
Primary Goal	raise students' academic achievement and improve their attitudes toward school
Main Features	• standards-based interdisciplinary arts-infused curriculum • development of multiple intelligences • promotion of collaborative learning and higher-order thinking • increase in independent research and engaged learning time
Impact on Instruction	using literacy strategies all day long; planning "backwards" from standards and assessments; integrating arts as tools for learning
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	data-driven decisions based on school context and needs of staff; study group meetings
Impact on Schedule	time required for workshops and collaborative planning and study
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	developer provides content area materials in social studies, language arts, science, math, music, visual arts, dance, drama
Parental Involvement	family cultures and community integrated into curriculum; parents included in orientations and workshops; family literacy support; partnerships with arts and community organizations
Technology	developer supports schools with existing technology; emphasis on media literacy and teacher networking
Materials	developer provides curriculum modules, teacher guides, children's literature, video and audio, and assessment resources

Origin/Scope

Founded in 1989 by Los Angeles philanthropists Andrew G. Galef and Bronya Pereira Galef, the Galef Institute is a nonprofit educational organization whose primary goal is comprehensive school reform. The Different Ways of Knowing four-year pilot included 500 classrooms in five states. By 2001, the model had been implemented in 675 schools. During the 2001-02 school year, the Institute is working with 170 active sites involving more than 4,000 classrooms in school communities in 24 states.

General Approach

Different Ways of Knowing (DWoK) is a multi-year professional development program for teachers, administrators, and other stakeholders that provides an integrated approach to curriculum, instruction, assessment, and reporting. The program includes year-long curriculum modules that integrate social studies and history with language arts, mathematics, science, and the visual, performing, and media arts. The modules provide a foundation for teachers to use while developing their own year-round, inquiry-based instructional strategies linked to standards and goals for assessment.

DWoK aims to engage and strengthen the multiple intelligences of students in grades preK-8. Specifically, it engages students in literacy and other skills development through hands-on, collaborative activities. The visual, performing, and media arts serve to develop students' literacy by tapping into their prior knowledge, deepening understandings through metaphor and

analogy, enlarging opportunities for communication, and making connections to culture and lifelong learning.

Results

DWoK has been studied by different independent research teams in three large-scale implementation trials. The first, a national longitudinal study led by UCLA's James Catterall (1995), followed 1,000 children in four school districts in Los Angeles and Boston over three years between 1991 and 1994. Among the findings:

- Students with one year in the DWoK program experienced approximately 8 percentile point gains on standardized language arts tests. Two-year participants gained approximately 16 percentile points. Over the same period, on average, students without DWoK experience showed no percentile changes in test scores.
- Students scored higher on writing and drawing tests of social studies content knowledge.
- As measured by teacher interviews and student surveys, DWoK increased cognitive engagement and intrinsic interest in the humanities, and increased levels of achievement and motivation, as opposed to patterns of eroding motivation for non-DWoK students.

The second study involved three separate research projects led by researchers at the University of Louisville and the University of Kentucky. One of the projects compared 24 test scores at DWoK schools in Kentucky to non-DWoK schools statewide from 1993 to 1995. The 24 schools represented all populations and regions. On the KIRIS statewide assessment of fourth-grade students, DWoK schools demonstrated greater gains in all subjects (reading, writing, mathematics, science, social studies, arts and humanities, and practical living) than schools statewide over the two-year period (Petrosko, 1997). These studies also documented positive changes in teachers' beliefs, knowledge, and practice and in students' motivation as a result of DWoK implementation.

A third study by the Program Evaluation and Research Office of the San Francisco Unified School District, summarized in a larger WestEd study (Peterson, Schwager, Crepeau, & Curry, 1998), involved all DWoK students in the district (3,036 students in 11 schools). Eighty-seven percent of the students were of minority background, and 34 percent were Limited English Proficient. The data indicated that during the 1997-98 school year, these students showed more than a year's growth in reading as measured by the CTBS. The gain in Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE) scores of over 3 points was statistically significant.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The Galef Institute's national headquarters is in Los Angeles. There are regional offices in the Midwest, East, South, and Northwest. The Institute has a staff of 62. Each participating school site is matched with an interdisciplinary team of coaches in literacy, instructional strategies, the visual and performing arts, and leadership.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** The faculty and leadership of each participating school agree to (1) engage in a multi-year partnership with DWoK; (2) allocate time for professional development; (3) integrate reform initiatives, curriculum, and family programs at the classroom level; (4) work to integrate the DWoK philosophy and practices into their reform plans; (5) build an evaluation plan; (6) co-design a support structure and process for sustaining and spreading successful practices; and (7) designate school community and district DWoK advisory teams to work closely with the Galef Institute and other participating schools.

- ***Initial Training:*** Professional development is designed in collaboration with the site in order to best meet local goals and needs. Each year a summer session is held locally for at least three days for all teachers and administrators and is followed by three to four one-day professional development workshops conducted throughout the year. Specialists, family, and community members are included.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Schools receive monthly visits from the DWoK interdisciplinary team of coaches, who are teacher instructional leaders and artist educators. Coaches observe in classrooms, offer feedback, give demonstration lessons, and facilitate group study meetings. Over time, this team identifies and trains a local team of Galef coaches to build long-term internal capacity for planning and training.
- ***Networking:*** The Institute works to create multiple types of opportunities for large-scale participation of teachers, administrators, specialists, families, and community members in building school reform partnerships with districts or clusters of schools in various regions across the country. The Institute also supports networks of teachers, administrators, parents, and community members through national leadership conferences, the DWoKnet Web site, and the newsletter, *Teacher-To-Teacher*.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Coaches support schools in their ongoing assessment and review of DWoK implementation. The Institute works with schools and districts to tailor an evaluation and documentation plan to meet their needs. The plan is designed by James Catterall of UCLA to collect data to provide multiple views of student learning, instructional development, and institutional change.

Costs

Costs are based on the partnership-building plan created with a given district or cluster of schools. The average cost is $70,000 per school for each year of the three-year course of study, which covers all training and materials. For school faculties above 20 there are additional costs for participation, depending on the school size and schedule of trainings. Additional expenses include release time for professional development (an average of three days in the summer and four days during the year) and costs to cover teachers' time for curriculum planning, support study groups, and on-site coaching sessions. Any desired independent evaluation, additional leadership training, preservice partnerships with local universities and colleges, and/or summer school program support would add to program costs.

The Institute works closely with schools and school systems to identify diverse funding sources and integrate public as well as private funding resources. Through technical assistance and the creation of practical, written tools, the Institute helps administrators identify and maximize the resources available to them for reform.

State Standards and Accountability

Different Ways of Knowing helps teachers align state and district standards to their curriculum framework. The Institute provides curriculum alignment study sessions for teachers to strengthen standards-based planning and teaching.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for

a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

DWoK is highlighted in three categories: urban, high poverty, and ELL. The model has been implemented in a number of urban and high poverty schools, and in schools with a significant number of ELL students. Components for each category include the following:

- ***Urban:*** DWoK learning materials give students opportunities to appreciate their own and others' cultures; students have opportunities to involve their families and communities in their learning.
- ***High Poverty:*** After-school and summer school programs are available; teachers are trained in specific interdisciplinary strategies to meet the needs of high poverty students.
- ***ELL:*** DWoK includes specific training for teachers on understanding the needs of English language learners and specific materials that support ELL students.

Special Considerations

The Galef Institute wishes to work with a cluster of schools (within a single district or multiple districts in a state) to encourage networking across school communities. When the Institute considers building a partnership with a school, staff work on multiple levels to develop relationships with district leadership, state leadership, and community members.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Kentucky Department of Education and The Galef Institute-Kentucky Collaborative for Teaching and Learning. (1998). [Different Ways of Knowing and Kentucky Title I schools]. Unpublished raw data.

Independent Researchers

Catterall, J. S. (1995). *Different Ways of Knowing 1991-94 longitudinal study final report: Program effects on students and teachers.* Los Angeles: UCLA.

Catterall, J. S., Dreyfus, J. P., & DeJarnette, K. (1995). *Different Ways of Knowing: 1994-95 evaluation report.* Los Angeles: UCLA.

Peterson, J., Schwager, M., Crepeau, M., & Curry, K. (1998). *The Galef/WestEd evaluation of San Francisco Unified School District's (SFUSD) implementation of Different Ways of Knowing (DWoK) report.* San Francisco: WestEd.

Petrosko, J. M. (1997). *Study A: Implementation of student-centered teaching and learning practices and student assessment results for research demonstration site (RDS) schools participating in Different Ways of Knowing.* Louisville, KY: Galef Institute-Kentucky Collaborative for Teaching and Learning.

Sample Sites

Contact the Galef Institute first, and staff will connect you with these or other sites:

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Eastside Elementary 6743 East Avenue H Lancaster, CA 93535 661-946-2813 Contact: Alfonzo Gamino	600	mid-size city	14%	0%	0%	43%	39%	77%	35%	21%
Betz Elementary School 605 West 27th Avenue Bellevue, NE 68005 402-293-4587 Contact: Jolene Heibel	400	urban fringe of large city	7%	1%	2%	6%	83%	50%	9%	17%
Jason Lee Elementary School 2222 NE 92nd Portland, OR 97220 503-916-6144 Contact: Chris Bodganow	400	large city	9%	2%	28%	0%	54%	60%	25%	3%
Roy P. Benavidez Elementary 6262 Gulfton Houston, TX 77081 713-778-3350 Contact: Diana De La Rosa	1350	large city	12%	0%	1%	86%	1%	94%	82%	5%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Lin Shakir
The Galef Institute
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, 20th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90036
Phone: 323-525-0042
Fax: 323-525-0408
E-mail: lshakir@galef.org
Web site: http://www.dwoknet.galef.org/

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted June 2002
Description Updated July 2002

Direct Instruction Model (K–8)

IN BRIEF Direct Instruction Model	
Founder	Siegfried Engelmann
Current Service Provider	National Institute for Direct Instruction (NIFDI)
Year Established	1968
# Schools Served (6/1/02)	40 by NIFDI, 300 including implementation by other providers
Level	K-8
Primary Goal	significantly improve academic performance over current performance levels
Main Features	• field tested reading, language arts, and math curricula • scripted instructional strategies • extensive training • schoolwide analysis of student performance data
Impact on Instruction	highly interactive lessons presented to small groups of students in the primary grades; flexible grouping of students by performance level; frequent assessment of student progress
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	school management team; full-time building coordinator; principal expected to become instructional leader; some teachers serve as peer coaches
Impact on Schedule	schedule must be coordinated to facilitate cross-class and cross-grade grouping
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	yes (reading, language arts, spelling, mathematics, and other subjects)
Parental Involvement	optional
Technology	none required
Materials	detailed curricular materials provided by publisher for all major subjects

Origin/Scope

The Direct Instruction Model has evolved from a theory of instruction developed by Siegfried Engelmann of the University of Oregon. Engelmann's early works, which focused on beginning reading, language, and math, were published by Science Research Associates in 1968 under the trade name DISTAR. Over the years, the original curricula have been revised and new ones developed through eighth grade.

These curricula have been incorporated into the comprehensive school reform model known as the Direct Instruction Model. The lead service provider for the model is the National Institute for Direct Instruction (NIFDI), founded and directed by Engelmann. More than 40 schools nationwide have implemented the model through NIFDI. Including sites contracting with other Direct Instruction providers, the model has been implemented in some 300 schools nationwide. Direct Instruction curricular materials have been used in thousands more schools.

General Approach

Engelmann's theory of instruction is that learning can be greatly accelerated if instructional presentations are clear, rule out likely misinterpretations, and facilitate generalizations. Based on this theory, he and his associates have developed over 50 instructional programs in reading, language, mathematics, and other subjects. Each program is shaped through field tryouts; student errors are evaluated and lessons revised prior to publication. The lessons are fast paced, carefully scripted, and tightly sequenced.

The comprehensive Direct Instruction Model incorporates professional development and organizational components intended to optimize use of these programs, particularly the reading/language arts and mathematics programs. Through substantial training and in-class coaching, teachers learn to define tasks clearly, preteach subconcepts and skills, work toward more complex concepts, present highly interactive lessons to large and small groups, elicit

frequent oral responses, ensure a high rate of teacher praise for responses, monitor and correct errors immediately, and periodically review skills and concepts. Mastery tests, given every few lessons, help teachers closely track student performance. Students are placed in appropriate instructional groups based on performance. Grouping may take place across classes and grades. Students who progress faster or slower than expected are re-grouped accordingly. Those with special needs are included in regular classrooms except in the most extreme cases.

To support change in the classroom, the model requires significant schoolwide change as well. The principal must attend training sessions, become knowledgeable about the model, and spend considerable time in classrooms monitoring teacher practice. A school management team consisting of the principal, the Direct Instruction building coordinator, and peer coaches (selected teachers who have received additional training) helps oversee implementation. The school schedule is adjusted to maximize time on task for all students and to enable cross-class and cross-grade grouping. Student performance data are collected weekly, analyzed off-site by NIFDI consultants, and discussed in a weekly conference call between NIFDI personnel and the school management team. A schoolwide behavioral system that involves positive expectations, a time-out system, and procedures for celebrating student academic success is put in place. In general, the entire school is organized to facilitate the training, monitoring, feedback, and problem-solving necessary to ensure successful implementation of the instructional system.

Results

The instructional programs incorporated in the Direct Instruction Model have been the subject of numerous research studies over the past 30 years, including Project Follow Through, a large-scale federal research project that funded and examined multiple approaches to educating disadvantaged students from kindergarten to third grade. The Project Follow Through evaluation found that Direct Instruction was the most effective approach in all three areas studied: basic skills (reading, language, spelling, and math), cognitive skills, and affective behavior (Stebbins et al., 1977). Many other evaluations of the programs, for both regular and special education students, have also found significant positive effects as measured by a variety of tests.

An independent researcher conducted a meta-analysis of all studies on Direct Instruction programs from 1972 to 1995 (Adams & Engelmann, 1996). Out of some 350 publications, he identified 34 studies that met criteria for methodological rigor (e.g., pre-test scores, a comparison group). The 34 studies generated 173 comparisons between Direct Instruction and non-Direct Instruction groups; in 87 percent of the comparisons, the difference favored Direct Instruction. The mean effect size was 0.97 (an effect size of 0.25 is generally considered educationally significant). He also examined studies that tracked Direct Instruction students into later grades. Several of these studies reported that Direct Instruction students continued to outperform control students in middle and high school, and two found that Direct Instruction students had higher graduation rates and college acceptance rates than control group students.

More recent studies of the Direct Instruction reading program, published in a special issue of the *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk* (Volume 7, Number 2, 2002), have also reported positive effects. In one study, for example, researchers found that primary students in 20 Direct Instruction elementary schools in Houston made significantly greater gains in reading than students in 20 control schools (Carlson & Francis, 2002). The differences were particularly pronounced in kindergarten and first grade. Students who had spent more years in the program outperformed children with less program exposure, and students with teachers who demonstrated greater use of Direct Instruction techniques outperformed other students.

Researchers have also begun studying the full implementation model. In one study, independent researchers examined reading achievement at six elementary schools in Baltimore that began implementing the Direct Instruction Model in 1996, using six demographically matched schools as a control group (Mac Iver & Kemper, 2002). They found that students in the Direct Instruction schools made considerable progress in reading comprehension and vocabulary as measured by the CTBS. For example, after scoring in the 17th percentile on a readiness test, the kindergarten cohort was reading on grade level (49th percentile) by the end of third grade. However, students in the control schools showed similar progress, and the small advantages achieved by the Direct Instruction cohort were not statistically significant. Direct Instruction did have a statistically significant one-year effect on reading vocabulary and oral fluency in several grades (but not on reading comprehension), and Direct Instruction schools had a much lower retention rate than control schools.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The National Institute for Direct Instruction (a non-profit corporation) is located in Eugene, Oregon. NIFDI has three full-time staff members and some 30 consultants on contract for serving schools that adopt the whole-school model. Training for whole-school implementation can also be provided by a variety of independent consultants and organizations, such as the Center for Applied Research in Education, which implements the Direct Instruction Model in middle schools. The Association for Direct Instruction maintains a list of implementing consultants and organizations.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Unless the model is mandated by the district, at least 80 percent of teachers must vote in favor of implementing the Direct Instruction Model. All staff and faculty must then agree to follow the specifications of the model and to discontinue any programs that conflict with Direct Instruction.
- ***Initial Training:*** Direct Instruction's training program begins with a one-week on-site pre-implementation session for all staff, including paraprofessionals.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Implementation managers from NIFDI (or another provider) visit each school approximately four days per month for three years. Managers model techniques, observe classrooms, address problems teachers are having, and help manage the grouping of students. During the first year, they train teachers in diagnostic and instructional strategies, the schoolwide discipline program, and language arts and reading programs. The second year, teachers are trained in mathematics and spelling, with continued attention to diagnosis and instruction. In the third year, they are trained how to apply Direct Instruction techniques to the rest of the curriculum (i.e., subjects for which published Direct Instruction materials are unavailable). Over the years, teachers are introduced to more sophisticated techniques for accelerating student learning. Additionally, NIFDI identifies teachers to serve as peer coaches, usually one per grade. Peer coaches participate in an additional training and gradually assume more responsibility for observation and coaching. Finally, a full-time building coordinator is trained to manage day-to-day aspects of implementation and act as the lead coach.
- ***Networking:*** Each year the Association for Direct Instruction sponsors several regional Direct Instruction conferences and a national conference in Eugene. Additionally, the Association publishes two journals: the *Journal of Direct Instruction* (JODI), which contains mostly research and research-related articles, and *DI News,* which provides broader information on issues related to Direct Instruction.

- ***Implementation Review:*** Teacher mastery of Direct Instruction techniques is carefully monitored. Student academic progress is analyzed and discussed weekly in a conference call. NIFDI staff write annual reports on the state of implementation at each school.

Costs

The cost of training services provided by NIFDI or another Direct Instruction provider for a school is usually $65,000-$75,000 per year for three to five years. Curricular materials, purchased separately from Science Research Associates (SRA), a division of McGraw-Hill, cost approximately $200 per child the first year, $150 per child the second, and $50 per child after that. Also, schools must ensure proper student/teacher ratios in K-1, cover release time for teachers and coaches throughout the school year, and support a full-time building coordinator.

State Standards and Accountability

The Direct Instruction Model places a premium on in-program measures of student performance: number of lessons completed and mastery of material taught. Preparation for standardized tests and other measures of accountability is limited to six weeks prior to the test, and test preparation is incorporated into teaching schedules in such a way as to allow other instruction to continue without disruption. NIFDI supplies materials that prepare students to take major standardized tests. These materials provide a bridge in terms of terminology and format between Direct Instruction and the tests. In addition, SRA/McGraw-Hill, the publisher of most Direct Instruction materials, has conducted correlation studies between Direct Instruction programs and many state standards.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

The Direct Instruction Model is highlighted in four categories: urban, high poverty, ELL, and special education. Many schools served by NIFDI are high poverty urban schools with considerable numbers of ELL and special education students. The model was originally designed to provide a curriculum that would accelerate the performance of disadvantaged children lacking many fundamental skills. The student grouping system allows for the formation of groups with relatively small numbers (as low as six to eight students for low performing primary students). The Direct Instruction materials have been used as the core special education curriculum in many schools, and a sizable portion of the research conducted on the model has focused on special education students. In full implementation schools, special education and regular students use the same materials, and special education students are generally included in regular classrooms.

Special Considerations

Direct Instruction uses highly prescribed curricula and classroom procedures. Instruction is fast-paced and demands frequent interaction between teachers and students. During the first two years of implementation, principals and coaches visit classrooms frequently. Developers estimate that schoolwide implementation of all curricular areas can take three years or more.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Engelmann, S., Becker, W. C., Carnine, D., & Gersten, R. (1988). The Direct Instruction Follow Through Model: Design and outcomes. *Education and Treatment of Children, 11*(4), 303-317.

Gersten, R., Keating, T., & Becker, W. (1988). The continued impact of the Direct Instruction Model: Longitudinal studies of Follow Through students. *Education and Treatment of Children, 11*(4), 318-327.

Independent Researchers

Adams, G. L., & Engelmann, S. (1996). *Research on Direct Instruction: 25 years beyond DISTAR.* Seattle, WA: Educational Achievement Systems. (Adams, an independent researcher, conducted the meta-analysis.)

Carlson, C. D., & Francis, D. J. (2002). Increasing the reading achievement of at-risk children through Direct Instruction: Evaluation of the Rodeo Institute for Teacher Excellence (RITE). *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk, 7*(2), 141-166.

Mac Iver, M. A., & Kemper, E. (2002). The impact of Direct Instruction on elementary students' reading achievement in an urban school district. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk, 7*(2), 197-220.

Stebbins, L. B., St. Pierre, R. G., Proper, E. C., Anderson, R. B., & Cerva, T. R. (1977). *Education as experimentation: A planned variation model.* Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Gunnison Elementary 682 South Main Gunnison, UT 84634 435-528-7880 Contact: Elizabeth Jensen	481	rural	0%	2%	0%	7%	91%	55%	5%	16%
City Springs Elementary 100 South Caroline Street Baltimore, MD 21231 410-396-0610 Contact: Bernice Welchel	338	large city	98%	0%	1%	0%	1%	88%	<1%	<1%
Dickey Hill Elementary 5025 Dickey Hill Road Baltimore, MD 21207 410-396-0610 Contact: Jerome Butler	647	large city	99%	0%	0%	1%	1%	77%	1%	20%
Hampstead Hill Elementary 500 South Linwood Avenue Baltimore, MD 21224 410-396-9146 Contact: Sharman Rowe	542	large city	6%	6%	1%	3%	84%	71%	3%	8%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Kurt Engelmann
National Institute for Direct Instruction
PO Box 11248
Eugene, OR 97440

Phone: 877-485-1973 or 541-485-1973
Fax: 541-683-7543
E-mail: kurt@nifdi.org
Web site: http://www.nifdi.org

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted August 2001
Description Updated December 2001

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (K–12)

IN BRIEF Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB)	
Founder	Outward Bound, USA
Current Service Provider	Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (12/1/01)	115
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	high achievement for all students
Main Features	• challenging learning expeditions that involve authentic projects and fieldwork • high expectations for all students • standards-based instruction and assessment • intensive professional development • regular review of student achievement and level of implementation
Impact on Instruction	interdisciplinary projects; experiential learning; literacy strategies integrated into curriculum
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	at least three hours of team planning time for teachers weekly; 15-20 days of professional development per teacher per year
Impact on Schedule	requires large, flexible blocks of time for in-depth investigation in school and in the field; students stay with same teacher for more than one year
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	many opportunities for parents and community to be involved in students' learning expeditions
Technology	none required
Materials	planning guides for learning expeditions; books on infusing service and literacy practices into curriculum; ELOB implementation benchmarks; descriptions of effective expeditions

Origin/Scope

Formed in 1992, Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB) is based on the principles of Outward Bound, which educator Kurt Hahn founded in 1941. There were 115 ELOB schools as of December 2001.

General Approach

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound focuses teaching and learning toward enabling all students to meet rigorous academic standards and character goals. Curriculum, instruction, assessment, school culture, and school structures are organized around producing high quality student work in learning expeditions — long term, in-depth investigations of themes or topics that engage students in the classroom and in the wider world through authentic projects, fieldwork, and service.

Learning expeditions are designed with clear learning goals that are aligned with district and state standards. Ongoing assessment is woven throughout each learning expedition.

In Expeditionary Learning schools, teachers, students, and school leaders build a culture of high expectations for all students. Teachers work collaboratively in teams, with regular common planning time to plan interdisciplinary expeditions, critique each others' expedition plans, and reflect on student work and teacher practices to improve curriculum and instruction. To strengthen relationships in the classroom, students stay with the same teacher or team of teachers for more than one year. Teachers and school leaders participate in a sequence of on-site and

national professional development activities including planning institutes, workshops on using data on student achievement to improve curriculum and instruction, and seminars on incorporating state-of-the-art literacy practices. They also participate in intensive learning expeditions for teachers, Outward Bound courses for educators, and conferences that bring together Expeditionary Learning practitioners throughout the country.

Schools assess progress each year and use ELOB benchmarks to drive continuous improvement.

Results

A Brown University longitudinal study (Ulichny, 2000) examined a middle school in Maine and a K-8 school in Massachusetts. At the middle school, the following findings were reported:

- On the Maine Educational Assessment, over a seven-year period that included pre-implementation, early implementation, and full implementation, eighth-grade scores in reading, math, science, art, humanities, and health all showed solid increases. Writing scores decreased and then increased, and social studies scores dropped slightly.
- Those performances were slightly higher than or equal to the district average and to scores from other middle schools with lower percentages of bilingual students and students in poverty.
- On a districtwide writing assessment, the school performed in the same range as the other schools, but showed more improvement over the final two years (1998-99) than the first two years (1995-96).

In the K-8 ELOB school, results were more variable. The researcher did report, however, that in 1998 and 1999 the ELOB school outperformed the district as a whole and a comparison school on the fourth- and eighth-grade Massachusetts Comprehensive Assessment System language arts and mathematics tests. The school also showed greater progress than the district and comparison school in reducing the percentage of students in the lowest performance level.

A study by the Academy for Educational Development (1995) found "notable increases in the percentage of students in the top two quartiles . . . in 3 elementary schools where students had received ELOB instruction for two years." Also noted was a decrease in the number in the bottom quartile on statewide standardized tests. According to teacher survey data, ELOB enhanced teacher collaboration, parental involvement, and community outreach and influenced school organization and leadership.

According to *An Educators' Guide to Schoolwide Reform* (American Institutes for Research, 1999), despite the fact that ELOB is a relatively new model, it is already amassing a "promising" research base on student achievement effects. On standardized tests such as the Iowa Test of Basic Skills and the Georgia Curriculum-Based Assessment test, students in ELOB schools tend to perform well across subjects in comparison with other state and district schools. The *Educators' Guide* concluded that "the research results indicated that ELOB can help to improve student achievement," and that results were seen across subjects.

A 1998 study by the RAND Corporation (Bodilly, 1998) found that ELOB demonstrated significantly higher levels of implementation in comparison with other New American Schools models, with successful implementation in core areas of school transformation (curriculum, instruction, assessment, student grouping, and professional development) in five out of six ELOB sites.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** Expeditionary Learning has a national headquarters in Garrison, New York, and regional offices in the Northeast (Boston), New York/New Jersey (New York City), the Southeast (Tampa), the Mid-Atlantic states (Annapolis, Maryland), the Midwest (Dubuque, Iowa), the Northwest (Yakima, Washington), the Southwest (Phoenix), and Puerto Rico. Each regional office is staffed with a field director (five full-time, three part-time) and professional developers, called school designers. The design also uses consultants as national faculty (expert Expeditionary Learning practitioners who work in other Expeditionary Learning schools).
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** At least 80 percent of the faculty and all of the school's leadership should endorse adoption of the design.
- ***Initial Training:*** A two-day on-site leadership institute focuses school leaders on the structural and cultural components of the Expeditionary Learning design. The institute assesses the school's readiness to implement Expeditionary Learning and helps plan schedules, student groupings, teacher teams, and related issues. This is followed by a five-day all-faculty institute, also on-site, in which teachers develop and plan their first learning expeditions and learn about the design's instructional and assessment strategies.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Expeditionary Learning provides on average 30 days of on-site technical assistance and professional development each year for the first three years to help teachers align their learning expeditions with state standards and adopt or adapt instructional tools and strategies compatible with the design. A five-day summer institute helps teachers plan and refine learning expeditions. In addition, professional development activities are scheduled throughout the school year. These activities may include (a) modeling instructional practices in the classroom, (b) workshops on using test data to improve instruction, (c) organizing galleries of student work produced in learning expeditions, (d) peer critique sessions, (e) sessions demonstrating effective community- and culture-building techniques, and (f) intense work with new teachers.
- ***Networking:*** ELOB holds a national leadership conference and a national conference for teachers, helps organize site visits and seminars at other Expeditionary Learning schools, publishes a quarterly newsletter, and administers an e-mail network.
- ***Implementation Review:*** ELOB staff work with schools to conduct an annual self-review and a three-year Expeditionary Learning review by external reviewers. Expeditionary Learning benchmarks track the degree and quality of implementation.

Costs

The annual costs of implementing Expeditionary Learning vary according to the number of students in a school, ranging from $42,000 for a school with 100 students or fewer to $114,000 for a school of 600 students or more. These fees cover professional development, technical assistance, and materials. There is a surcharge of $600 per on-site day (up to 30 days per year) for schools that are not within commuting distance of other Expeditionary Learning schools. The design also recommends that schools budget approximately $1,000 per teacher for training stipends and travel to national professional development activities.

State Standards and Accountability

Expeditionary Learning works with teacher teams to develop curriculum maps to ensure that learning expeditions are aligned with local standards. Schools participate fully in state and local assessments.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

ELOB is highlighted in all five categories. The model is being implemented in many:

- Schools with a significant number of English language learners. ELOB provides key training materials in Spanish as well as a Spanish marketing/training video and brings parents into the schools to encourage family involvement.
- Schools with a large population of special education students. Flexible, heterogeneous student groupings that integrate special education students into mainstream classrooms for most of the school day are a feature of ELOB.
- Rural schools. The model supports an active Web site and e-mail network, allowing opportunities for distance learning for isolated schools. The monthly on-site professional development schedule brings professional developers to schools.
- Urban schools. ELOB staff meet with urban principals as a group to facilitate communication and sharing of best practices.
- High poverty areas. The model includes parent involvement as a major component and community service.

Special Considerations

Schools should provide for 15-20 days of professional development time for each teacher and budget for at least three hours of common team planning time per week.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

None available.

Independent Researchers

Academy for Educational Development. (1995). *Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound project.* New York: Author.

Bodilly, S., with Keltner, B., Purnell, S., Reichardt, R., & Schuyler, G. (1998). *Lessons from New American Schools' scale-up phase: Prospects for bringing designs to multiple schools.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Ulichny, P. (2000). *Academic achievement in two Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound demonstration schools.* Providence, RI: Brown University.

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted August 2001
Description Updated December 2001

High Schools That Work (9–12)

IN BRIEF High Schools That Work	
Founder	Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) in Atlanta, Georgia
Current Service Provider	SREB
Year Established	1987
# Schools Served (9/1/01)	over 1,300
Level	9-12
Primary Goal	to increase the achievement of all students with special emphasis on career-bound students by blending the content of traditional college prep studies with quality vocational and technical studies
Main Features	• upgraded academic core • common planning time for teachers to integrate instruction • higher standards/expectations
Impact on Instruction	sites are expected to end low-level courses for all students, increase the use of engaging instructional strategies, and provide extra help to all students
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	sites develop a guidance and advisement system and align with middle schools and postsecondary institutions; more teachers work together; faculties form focus teams
Impact on Schedule	use of larger blocks of instructional time
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no; however, consultants provide subject-specific workshops customized to school needs
Parental Involvement	parents are expected to help their children select a four-year program of study that reflects *HSTW* principles
Technology	sites are expected to have access to the Internet and e-mail
Materials	specific materials are suggested to guide schools in making changes

Origin/Scope

High Schools That Work (HSTW) is an initiative of the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) State Vocational Education Consortium that began in 1987. More than 1,300 schools are members of the HSTW network.

General Approach

High Schools That Work is a whole-school, research- and assessment-based reform effort that offers a framework of goals and key practices for improving the academic, technical, and intellectual achievement of all high school students. HSTW blends traditional college-preparatory content with quality technical/vocational studies. It provides technical assistance and staff development focused on techniques and strategies such as teamwork, applied learning, and project-based instruction. It also provides a nationally recognized yardstick for measuring program effectiveness: the HSTW Assessment, a test based upon the National Assessment of Educational Progress.

HSTW promotes a changed school environment as a context for implementing 10 key practices: (1) high expectations; (2) challenging vocational studies; (3) increasing access to academic studies; (4) a program of study that includes four years of English, three of math, and three of science; (5) work-based learning; (6) collaboration among academic and vocational teachers; (7) students actively engaged; (8) an individualized advising system; (9) extra help; and (10) keeping score (using assessment and evaluation data to foster continuous improvement). HSTW sets high expectations, identifies a recommended curriculum to meet the expectations, and sets student performance goals benchmarked to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

Three main ideas lay the foundation for HSTW:

- Academic and vocational teachers, principals, and counselors work together to establish unity of vision, a common process for reorganizing the school, and a plan for doing so.
- Teachers and school leaders are empowered to accomplish their goals when they share expertise and learn from each other.
- Assessment, evaluation, and feedback should drive the process and implementation of reform.

The HSTW framework builds support and collaboration among school and district leaders, teachers, students, and families for raising expectations for a more challenging and meaningful high school program of study. SREB and its partners assist high schools in customizing the HSTW framework into action plans for creating more personalized learning environments leading to improved student motivation and performance.

Results

All sites are required to participate in the HSTW Assessment. Based on the curriculum frameworks for the National Assessment of Educational Progress, the assessment involves achievement tests in reading, mathematics, and science for 12th grade students about to complete a vocational or technical concentration.

The 260 HSTW sites that participated in the assessment in 1994 and 1996 showed significant improvement in mean reading and mathematics scores: from 264 to 273 in reading, and from 281 to 285 in mathematics (on a scale of 1 to 500). The percentage of career-bound students meeting the HSTW performance goal (279 in reading and 295 in mathematics) increased from 33 percent to 43 percent in reading and from 34 percent to 44 percent in mathematics. Career-bound students who completed the recommended HSTW curriculum or completed intellectually challenging assignments scored higher than career-bound students who did not. The 18 HSTW schools that participated in an advanced integrated learning network, which provided time for academic and vocational teams to do collaborative planning, made more progress over the two-year period than all HSTW sites (Bottoms, 1997).

The 1996 and 1998 HSTW Assessment results were analyzed in separate studies by two external evaluators: MPR Associates, Inc., and the Research Triangle Institute. MPR researchers reported that the average gain in achievement at the 424 HSTW schools that participated in both assessments was 4 points in reading, 13 points in mathematics, and 9 points in science. They also found that when schools increase the number of students completing the HSTW curriculum by 10 percentage points, they are likely to see a gain in achievement scores of 10 to 20 points. Other factors, such as increased belief among teachers in students' capacity to complete challenging courses, increased collaboration among academic and vocational teachers, and increased guidance and advisement, were also associated with higher achievement gains (Kaufman, Bradby, & Teitelbaum, 2000).

The Research Triangle Institute study (Frome, 2001) involved 393 schools that had collected student test scores and student and teacher survey data in 1996 and 1998. This study reported that (a) the percentage of students completing a rigorous program of study, (b) the level of implementation of key HSTW practices, and (c) the percentage of students reaching HSTW achievement goals in reading, mathematics, and science had all risen significantly over the two-year period. The study also found that schools with larger increases in the percentage of seniors who completed the HSTW program of study in each academic area had larger increases in the percentage of students who met the achievement goals. Finally, an increase in the use of best

Costs

Three years of HSTW implementation costs $25,000-$35,000 per year. These costs include services such as a site development conference, planning, technical assistance visits, staff and curriculum development, training and resource materials, team conference registration, the assessment package, and an evaluative study. Other expenses include funds for stipends and substitute teachers, new kinds of curriculum materials, and travel expenses for state, regional or national training.

State Standards and Accountability

Sites are expected to align curriculum with state and national standards, and to develop K-12 curriculum maps and pacing guides that are to be reflected in planning of instructional activities. HSTW provides a facilitator to assist faculty in the process of aligning curriculum to state and national standards.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

HSTW is highlighted in two categories, urban and high poverty. The model serves many urban schools and schools in high poverty areas. HSTW training includes specific strategies shown by research to be successful in urban settings. Additionally, the model provides extra help (tutoring) and guidance for students.

Special Considerations

HSTW requires that sites work to replace the general track, raise graduation requirements, participate in the HSTW assessment program, develop a site action plan, and use assessment data to update their action plan.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Bottoms, G. (1997, June). *The 1996 High Schools That Work assessment: Good news, bad news and hope* (Research Brief No. 1). Atlanta: Southern Regional Educational Board. (Other HSTW Research Briefs provide additional analysis of 1994, 1996, 1998, and 2000 assessments.)

Bottoms, G., & HSTW Staff. (1996-2000). *Case studies* (including high schools in DE, GA, KY, MA, NC, SC, TX, and WV). Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board.

Independent Researchers

Kaufman, P., Bradby, D., & Teitelbaum, P. (2000). *High Schools That Work and whole school reform: Raising academic achievement of vocational completers through the reform of school practice.* Berkeley, CA: University of California at Berkeley, National Center for Research in Vocational Education.

Frome, P. (2001). *High Schools That Work: Findings from the 1996 and 1998 assessments.* Research Triangle Park, NC: Research Triangle Institute.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Loganville High School 3305 Georgia Hwy 78, SW Loganville, GA 30052 770-466-4892 Contact: Steve Miletto	1,137	urban fringe of large city	2%	0%	<1%	<1%	98%	5%	1%	10%
Los Fresnos High School PO Box 309 Los Fresnos, TX 78566-0309 956-233-3300 Contact:	1,824	urban fringe of mid-size city	<1%	<1%	<1%	91%	9%	74%	4%	16%
Daviess County High School 4255 New Hartford Road Owensboro, KY 42303-1802 270-684-5285 Contact: Brad Stanley	1,696	rural	1%	<1%	0%	<1%	99%	11%	0%	1%
Sussez Technical High School PO Box 351 Georgetown, DE 19947-0351 302-856-0961 Contact: Sandra Walls-Culotta	1,178	small town	23%	1%	1%	2%	74%	14%	<1%	12%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Scott Warren, Director of CSRD
Southern Regional Education Board
592 Tenth Street NW
Atlanta, GA 30318
Phone: 404-875-9211
Fax: 404-872-1477
E-mail: scott.warren@sreb.org
Web site: http://www.sreb.org

researchers examined the percentage of fourth-graders at six program schools and six comparison schools who passed statewide reading and mathematics tests from three states (Michigan, Texas, and Wisconsin). They found that, from the baseline year to the final year of support (which varied from site to site but averaged three years), the mean increase in the percentage of students passing the reading tests at the High/Scope schools was 10.7 points, compared to a mean increase of 1.0 points at the comparison schools. In mathematics, the mean increase at the High/Scope schools was 25.7 points, compared to a mean increase of 17.5 points at the comparison schools. For low-income students at three of the schools for which data were available, the differences were even larger: 15.7 for High/Scope versus 0.4 for comparison schools in reading, and 26.9 versus -2.1 in mathematics (Schweinhart & Smith, 2001).

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The High/Scope Educational Research Foundation is headquartered in Ypsilanti, Michigan. Several full-time staff members work directly with elementary schools. Additionally, the foundation contracts with 45 trainers across the country who work on-site with teachers and administrators.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** High/Scope works in schools that are supportive of the model, but the model does not require a formal vote by school staff.
- ***Initial Training:*** A one-week, on-site, preservice training involving the entire school staff provides a general overview of the program. Parents also are invited to attend.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** A High/Scope trainer visits each site at least three times a year to conduct one-day workshops, observe classroom activities over several days, and present feedback to teachers.
- ***Networking:*** Opportunities for networking include the annual High/Scope International Conference held each spring, regional conferences, a High/Scope publication called *Resource* published three times a year, and a High/Scope Web site.
- ***Implementation Review:*** After each site visit, the trainer writes a report using the High/Scope Elementary Program Implementation Profile. The report, which synthesizes classroom observations and recommended follow-up for individual teachers, is reviewed by the school staff and by High/Scope supervisors. Reviews are conducted no less than three times during the school year.

Costs

Project cost is negotiated on an individual basis to account accurately for the number of classrooms in a project and travel costs associated with a particular site. However, a typical charge for a three-year, on-site inservice training contract for a school that contains eight K-3 classrooms would be as follows:

- Consulting fee for one-week preservice training plus nine site visits over three school years: $50,350
- Curriculum guides and recordings for eight classrooms: $4,800
- Workshop materials: $750
- Registration fees for six local staff to attend High/Scope International Conference over three years: $2,100
- Estimated travel and subsistence costs for trainer: $22,100

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Public School 92 Manhattan Follow Through Project and High/Scope Educational Research Foundation. (1981). *Submission to the Joint Dissemination Review Panel.* Unpublished manuscript.

Schweinhart, L. J., & Wallgren, C. R. (1993). Effects of a Follow Through program on school achievement. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 8,* 43-56.

Schweinhart, L. J., & Smith, C. (2001). *Effects of recent High/Scope curriculum support on school achievement and reducing discipline referrals.* Unpublished manuscript.

Independent Researchers

No recent independent research available. High/Scope was one of the models examined as part of the Project Follow Through study, but that research was conducted in the 1970s.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Bessie Hoffman Elementary 50700 Willow Road Belleville MI 48111 734-484-3150 Contact: Marilyn Goodsman	270	rural	15%	0%	2%	0%	83%	12%	0%	12%
Florence Elementary & Junior High PO Box 440 Florence, WI 54121 715-528-3262 Contact: Paul Bierman	427	rural	1%	6%	0%	23%	70%	23%	0%	9%
West Lincoln Elementary 5901 O Street Lincoln, NE 68510 402-436-1994 Contact: Cheri Bailey	456	mid-size city	7%	4%	3%	3%	83%	51%	<1%	23%
To'Hajiilee-He School PO Box 438 Canoncito, NM 87026 505-831-6426 Contact: Gene Johnson	378	rural	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	100%	80%	20%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Gavin Haque
High/Scope Educational Research Foundation
600 North River Street
Ypsilanti, MI 48198
Phone: 734-485-2000
Fax: 734-485-0704
E-mail: gavinh@highscope.org
Web site: http://www.highscope.org

Accepted for Inclusion January 1999
Description Written February 1999
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

Integrated Thematic Instruction (K–12)

IN BRIEF Integrated Thematic Instruction	
Founder	Susan Kovalik
Current Service Provider	Susan Kovalik & Associates, Inc.
Year Established	1982
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	1,434
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	apply current brain research to teaching strategies and curriculum to develop responsible citizens
Main Features	• based on current brain research • yearlong theme to integrate curriculum • enriched school and classroom environment • lifelong guidelines and LIFESKILLS • learning tied to locations and issues in the community
Impact on Instruction	yearlong theme; cooperative learning; use of multiple intelligences
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	strong emphasis on adult collaboration
Impact on Schedule	reduced pull-out programs; longer blocks of instructional time; time during the day for teams of adults to plan
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	parent training; parents involved as speakers and site hosts
Technology	access to information via Internet and student access to desktop publishing desirable
Materials	full line of books and videotapes

Origin/Scope

Integrated Thematic Instruction (ITI) was created in 1982 by Susan Kovalik and is continuously updated based on the most recent brain research. It is used in more than 1,400 schools (mostly elementary) in over half of the states and throughout the country of Slovakia.

General Approach

ITI is a model for applying current brain research to schools and classrooms to maximize student achievement and prepare responsible citizens. Schools create a "bodybrain-compatible" learning environment based on eight elements:

1. Absence of Threat: Students are free from anxiety about their physical safety and experience a sense of well-being as they learn.
2. Meaningful Content: Teachers select topics that address standards and engage students.
3. Choices: Students have the opportunity to select assignments that meet individual learning needs.
4. Adequate Time: The schedule provides ample and flexible time for thorough exploration.
5. Enriched Environment: The school offers an interesting and inviting setting, with emphasis on objects from the real world for students to see and touch.
6. Collaboration: Students work together to enhance achievement and build social skills.
7. Immediate Feedback: Students receive accurate feedback as they learn, not later.
8. Mastery at the Application Level: Students internalize deeply what they learn and apply it to real-world situations.
9. Movement to Enhance Learning: Movement activates and focuses bodybrain systems for learning.

In the classroom, teachers use instructional strategies based on the eight brain compatible elements. For example, they develop learning activities that address multiple intelligences (Choice), organize students in small groups instead of rows (Collaboration), and provide opportunities for students to create real products for real audiences (Mastery on the Application Level). Each teacher also develops an integrated curriculum organized around a yearlong theme.

Special Considerations

Success implementing ITI requires strong support from school and district leaders, including the school board. Such support must go beyond the financial to an understanding of ITI and its implications for doing business throughout the organization. For best results, the whole organization makes a commitment to become a community of learners. Everyone understands that the reform effort will take three to five years to implement, so decision-makers avoid introducing other major initiatives during the implementation period. Also, old policies and procedures that contradict new practices are revised or eliminated.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

None published to date. An ethnographic study in preparation.

Independent Researchers

Buechler, M. (1993). *Connecting Learning Assures Successful Students: A study of the CLASS program.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana Education Policy Center.

Grisham, D. L. (1995, April). *Integrating the curriculum: The case of an award-winning elementary school.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Berkeley, CA.

Morgan, W. (1998). *The impact of CLASS on teaching and learning in Indiana.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Ruth, N. S. (1998). *A comparative study of Integrated Thematic Instruction (ITI) and non-integrated thematic instruction.* Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Sul Ross Elementary School 501 South 7th Street Waco, TX 76706-1311 254-753-3541 Contact: Terri Patterson	350	mid-size city	22%	0%	0%	77%	4%	99%	53%	9%
Federal Elementary 27280 Powers Avenue Dearborn, MI 48125-1332 333-295-5790 Contact: Rick Prunty	240	urban fringe of mid-size city	14%	0%	0%	0%	86%	51%	5%	10%
Manatee Education Center (K-8) 1880 Manatee Road Naples, FL 34114-8340 941-417-4577 Contact: Santo Pino	550	rural	14%	0%	0%	56%	30%	80%	35%	25%
Fort Craig School (PreK-4) 520 South Washington Street Maryville, TN 37804-5804 865-983-4371 Contact: Pete Carter	300	urban fringe of mid-size city	1%	0%	0%	1%	98%	9%	0%	12%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Jane McGeehan
Susan Kovalik & Associates, Inc.
17051 SE 272nd Street, Suite 17
Covington, WA 98042
Phone: 253-631-4400
Fax: 253-631-7500
E-mail: skovalik@oz.net
Web site: http://www.kovalik.com

Accepted for Inclusion October 1998
Description Written November 1998
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

MicroSociety® (K–8)

IN BRIEF MicroSociety	
Founder	George H. Richmond
Current Service Provider	MICROSOCIETY, Inc.
Year Established	1992 (organization established)
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	200
Level	K-8
Primary Goal	preparing students to become active, caring, responsible citizens by multiplying opportunities for success
Main Features	• allows children to create a miniature society in the school • adapts instruction to real world experience • incorporates democratic ideals and entrepreneurship in a culturally sensitive community • helps children develop positive attitudes toward learning, school, themselves, and their community
Impact on Instruction	teachers can draw connections between academic skills, learning, and "Micro" activities
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	part- or full-time MicroSociety coordinator
Impact on Schedule	"Micro" typically runs three to five class periods per week
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	interdisciplinary instructional materials help teachers connect subject areas to the MicroSociety
Parental Involvement	creates many opportunities for substantive parent and community involvement
Technology	none required, but high quality technology applications can be embedded in all aspects of the miniature society
Materials	training materials provided

Origin/Scope

George H. Richmond outlined the microsociety concept in his book *The Micro-Society School: A Real World in Miniature* (Harper & Row, 1973). The idea was first implemented schoolwide in 1981. Richmond founded the nonprofit MICROSOCIETY, Inc., in 1992 to provide support, materials, training, technical assistance, and networking for educators implementing MicroSociety. As of May 2001, the model had served over 200 schools.

General Approach

In the MicroSociety program, students collaborate with parents, community members, and teachers to build a miniature community in the school and establish a center of commerce and governance in which every child and adult participates. Children create and manage business ventures that produce goods and services. They also run agencies that handle governmental functions and lay the groundwork for organized accountability.

K-8 students spend one class period each day at their jobs. They assume management or employee responsibilities in businesses, agencies, and nonprofits. In their work places, students apply technology, think critically about authentic crises, prepare and analyze budgets, resolve ethical issues, and develop cultural sensitivities. These experiences often raise profound issues such as the fairness of democracy, the rewards of entrepreneurship, cultural differences and similarities, the role of law in society, how to humanize institutions, and how much tax an individual should pay.

When fully implemented, the MicroSociety has six strands: technology, economy, academy, citizenship and government, humanities and arts, and heart (volunteerism and the ethical aspects of society). The MicroSociety also has 12 essential elements: an internal currency; a retail labor market; private property; public property; organizations such as ventures,

agencies, and nonprofits; agreement on a common purpose; definition of personal goals by teachers and students; meaningful contact with parents; meaningful contact with community partners; teacher planning time for the program; and a technology strand.

Where most schools rely on teachers to discipline children, MicroSociety promotes development of internal self-control. Children create a legislature that makes laws, develop a court system that administers them, and launch Crime-Stoppers, a group of students who enforce the laws. Because children are deeply involved in rule making and law enforcement, and want to avoid the expense and notoriety of litigation, disciplinary infractions decline. In MicroSociety schools, the peer group allies itself with law abiding interests rather than with outlaws.

The MicroSociety program results in improved student learning in several ways. First, it is integrated into the regular curriculum, making the basics more interesting and relevant to students. Second, it gives children opportunities to apply concepts learned in the classroom in real situations. Third, it rewards children for success in a broad array of intelligences, building self-esteem and motivation in those who might fail in traditional academic settings. Fourth, the program's flexibility allows educators to tailor it to local and state standards.

Results

In 1998, an outside evaluator conducted a study of 15 schools in six states that began implementing the program in 1993 or 1994 and had two or three years of comparable, nationally normed post-intervention test data. Analysis of this data showed a 25 percent increase over baseline performance in math; 11 percent for language arts; and 7 percent for reading. When gains were compared to those of the district as a whole, MicroSociety schools on average outperformed the district in all three subject areas. Due to the small sample, however, results were statistically significant only in mathematics.

A 1997 developer survey of 29 MicroSociety schools found that most reported significant increases in test scores as well as increased attendance and reduced disciplinary infractions. Individual schools had significant results: Sageland Elementary (El Paso, TX) increased the number of students passing the state math standards by 52 percent, writing by 36 percent, and reading by 11 percent; West Middle (Sioux City, IA) increased average daily attendance from 74 percent to 98 percent and reduced disciplinary infractions from 6,234 to 1,802; Sherman Elementary (San Diego, CA) raised its district ranking from 126th out 156 schools to 37th.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** National headquarters are in Philadelphia. Presently, MICROSOCIETY draws on an experienced pool of 25 certified trainers. Plans are in place to increase the number of trainers each summer.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** MICROSOCIETY requires a vote of 80 percent of the staff.
- ***Initial Training:*** MICROSOCIETY customizes professional development to take advantage of community resources and meet school goals. Certified trainers provide up to 20 days of technical assistance for planning and implementation, over a three-year period. Technical assistance is designed to facilitate experimentation, observation, reflection, and program modification by teachers, administrators, students, and partners. Program coordinators, administrators, parents, community partners, and students all have opportunities for training.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** MICROSOCIETY trains site coordinators to observe both classrooms and MicroSociety program activities, while offering feedback to teachers.

Follow-up coaching is also provided by a certified trainer.

- ***Networking:*** The national headquarters facilitates networking by teachers, administrators, parents, and community members through a national quarterly newsletter, a Web site, e-mail, listserv, national/regional conferences, and Parent/Community Outreach Networks. Multisite Leadership Collaboratives, Teacher Support Networks, and Turn Around Trainers can help build capacity in a community and deepen the grassroots network.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Every registered MicroSociety school has a yearly accreditation review to gauge progress against benchmarks associated with MicroSociety's 12 essential elements. Reviews are performed through telephone interviews and on-site visits.

Costs

The standard training and support package costs $45,000 for year one, $35,000 for year two, and $35,000 for year three, for a three-year total of $115,000. This package includes:

- ***Professional Development:*** Three years of on-site training for school staff on all key aspects of the program are provided by two MICROSOCIETY Certified Trainers. Tailoring training to the school's needs, they take the staff through planning, piloting, and implementation and offer specialized training for the principal and coordinator.
- ***Curriculum:*** Instructional materials include manuals for teachers, workbooks for students, Testblasters (the MicroSociety balanced literacy program), and lesson plans and test preparation materials for standards integration.
- ***Evaluation and Assessment:*** Fees cover MICROSOCIETY Authentic Assessments, in-depth evaluation of program implementation (year two), and third-party evaluation of student impact (year three).
- ***Networking Support:*** Schools receive a subscription to MICROSOCIETY's newsletter and tuition for CSRD principals and coordinators for the Annual Summer Conference.

Additional costs include support for the program coordinator; release time for teachers (30 hours in year one, 24 in year two, and 18 in year three); a one-time cost of $7,000 for books and software for Testblasters; expenses for up to four teachers to attend the National Training Conference; and $10-$20 per student per year for agencies and ventures.

Student Populations

MicroSociety has been implemented in urban, suburban, and rural schools. A majority of schools are Title I eligible.

Special Considerations

A school must sign a letter of intent with MICROSOCIETY prior to proposal submission in which it:

- States that it has secured 80 percent affirmative vote of its staff
- Agrees to hire or assign an existing staff person to the role of MicroSociety coordinator
- Agrees to formulate a set of policies aimed at increasing parent and community participation in the society-building experience

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Richmond, G. (1989). The future school: Is Lowell pointing us toward a revolution in education? *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(3), 232-236.

Independent Researchers

Cherniss, C. (1997). *MicroSociety program implementation study.* Unpublished manuscript, Rutgers University, School of Applied and Professional Psychology, New Brunswick.

INOVA International Services Group. (1997). *Sageland MicroSociety organizational assessment survey summary.* Unpublished manuscript.

Kutzik, D. M. (1998). *MicroSociety program impact on standardized test performance.* Unpublished study, Drexel University, Philadelphia.

Ysleta Independent School District Office of Student Assessment. (1997). *Sageland Elementary End of the Year MicroSociety Student Survey.* Unpublished manuscript.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Sageland Elementary MicroSociety School 7901 Santa Monica Court El Paso, TX 79935 915-434-2900 Contact: Triana Olivas	582	large city	2%	<1%	0%	91%	4%	79%	36%	16%
Chocachatti Elementary Performing Arts MicroSociety Magnet 4135 California Street Brooksville, FL 34609 352-797-7067 Contact: Michael Tellone	697	urban fringe of large city	5%	0%	1%	4%	89%	39%	1%	13%
William Davison Elementary 2800 East Davison Street Detroit, MI 48212-1680 313-252-3118 Contact: Lorol Brackx	952	large city	77%	0%	21%	0%	2%	87%	21%	11%
Wilson Middle School 1800 Cottman Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19111 215-728-5015 Contact: Andrea Seitchik	1,263	large city	31%	0%	8%	8%	53%	43%	8%	13%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Katherine Primus
Director of Business Development
MICROSOCIETY
13 South Third Street, Suite 500
Philadelphia, PA 19106

Phone: 215-922-4006
Fax: 215-922-3303
E-mail: kprimus@microsociety.com
Web site: http://www.microsociety.org

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted June 2002
Description Updated June 2002

Modern Red SchoolHouse (K–12)

IN BRIEF Modern Red SchoolHouse	
Founder	Hudson Institute
Current Service Provider	Modern Red SchoolHouse Institute
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (6/1/02)	250
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	high achievement for all students through development of a coherent instructional program aligned with state standards and implementation of school governance practices that support school improvement
Main Features	• differentiated instruction • data-based schoolwide planning process • alignment with state standards and assessments • participatory governance structure (leadership team and task forces) • integration of instructional technology • parent and community partnerships
Impact on Instruction	use of best practice; performance assessment; coherence across grades and subjects
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	task force structure allows all staff to influence school policy
Impact on Schedule	common planning time for teachers; more time for students in need of support
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	CD-ROM instructional units in literacy and math for K-8
Parental Involvement	family/community task force receives tools and training to increase parent engagement
Technology	existing technology is integrated into classroom practice; instructional management technology supports curriculum alignment
Materials	training materials; professional development library; curriculum development library via CD-ROM or Web site

Origin/Scope

Modern Red SchoolHouse (MRSH) was developed in 1992 by the Hudson Institute, a private, nonprofit research organization. The design was field tested from 1993 to 1996 in nine elementary, middle, and high schools. In 1997, MRSH developers established the Modern Red SchoolHouse Institute as a nonprofit organization to oversee implementation of the design and provide professional development services. Through the 2001-02 school year, MRSH has served over 250 schools.

General Approach

MRSH is a capacity-building design that builds on the strengths of a school, using a detailed analysis of the school's characteristics and student achievement data as a starting point. MRSH then develops a customized implementation program that provides the school with tools and strategies to:

- Design standards-driven curriculum, instruction, and assessment using state and district standards, based on a schoolwide scope and sequence that creates coherence across grade levels and content areas;
- Use best instructional practices in all content areas;
- Differentiate instructional strategies to meet the needs of all students in all classrooms;
- Establish effective organizational practices, including a school leadership team and task forces to support and sustain school improvement;

- Use technology to improve communication between teachers and parents, develop standards-based instructional units, and enhance instruction; and
- Develop parent and community partnership programs that support teachers and students in attaining high academic standards.

MRSH establishes a long-term relationship of at least three years with each school, providing an average of 25 days of on-site training annually. The design team has developed over 30 training modules, organized into groups that address key areas of school and classroom change. For example, the classroom change group includes six modules: diagnostic analysis, principal coaching, using data instructionally, classroom organization and management, instructional coaching, and classroom behavior/management. Training for a given module may take anywhere from a half-day with an individual (such as the principal) or small group of teachers to two full days with grade-level teams or the entire staff.

Each school may select a different combination of modules (plus additional training), depending on the customized plan it develops with MRSH. The plan is developed after a diagnostic process that includes a school site visit, analysis of student achievement data, classroom observations, and dialogue with all stakeholder groups. Its ultimate focus is the alignment of all practices within the school to meet and eventually exceed student achievement performance levels required by the state and/or district.

The MRSH design involves all stakeholders in the reform process:

- ***Teachers:*** All teachers participate in professional development addressing the change process, vision-setting, curriculum development, student data analysis, instructional coaching, classroom management, performance assessment, and rubric development. Teachers are expected to receive common planning time to participate in grade level or content level standards-based curriculum, instruction, and assessment development.
- ***Administrators:*** Principals and the school leadership team are provided with coaching to support greater staff engagement in school governance, implementation of an effective task force structure, and alignment of resources to support reform.
- ***Paraprofessionals:*** Paraprofessionals are included in staff development specific to their role in the school.
- ***Parents:*** Parents serve on the Family and Community Involvement Task Force to ensure effective representation as the task force designs outreach programs for parents. Parents also participate in the evaluation of their own children when an Individualized Education Compact (IEC) is developed in the third year of MRSH implementation. Parent workshops may be offered focusing on effective math and reading support activities.
- ***Community:*** Community representatives may participate in the Family and Community Involvement Task Force. When the school plans a Character Education initiative, community representatives are surveyed to identify community resources.

Results

Data from more than 30 schools that began implementing the MRSH design in 1998 and 1999 were analyzed by independent researchers and presented at the AERA Annual Meeting in 2002. For each school, researchers calculated the gain in percentage of students passing the statewide test from the baseline year (the year prior to MRSH implementation) forward. They found that the mean cumulative gain for MRSH schools over a four year period was 17.2 percent. Comparing MRSH schools to other district schools, they found that in the year prior to implementation, MRSH schools on average performed worse than district schools, with a mean

difference of negative 3.3 percent. After one year of implementation, the mean difference was positive 6.6 percent, yielding a swing of 9.9 percent in favor of MRSH schools (Peevely & Henson, 2002).

Two studies of New American Schools (including MRSH and other designs) included some data on student achievement for the individual designs. In one, conducted by the RAND institute, 8 of 11 MRSH schools (73 percent) made greater progress in reading than the district, and 7 of 11 (64 percent) made greater progress in mathematics. For both subjects, these percentages were higher than the percentages of any other model (Berends, Kirby, Naftel, & McKelvey, 2000). Similarly, analysis of data from the San Antonio school district by district evaluation staff showed that, when adjusting statistically for prior achievement, MRSH's deviation from the predicted mean was higher than that of any other model and the district as a whole (Cadena, 1999).

Selected MRSH schools across the country have shown particularly good results. The most reliable data from an individual school come from Rozelle Elementary in Memphis, which was the subject of a five-year evaluation by an independent researcher. The researcher found that from 1995 to 2000, the Rozelle TCAP (Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program) Total Score (all subjects combined) rose from a mean percentile of 43.1 to a mean percentile of 56.5. Over the same period, the state mean percentile rose only 7.1 points, and the district mean percentile dropped. Using the School Climate Inventory (SCI), an instrument designed to measure school organizational climate, researchers found significant differences between Rozelle and comparison schools on all seven SCI dimensions, including order, leadership, environment, involvement, instruction, expectation, and collaboration (Sterbin, 2001).

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** MRSH offices are located in Nashville; the organization serves schools and districts in 30 states. MRSH regional field site managers facilitate and monitor implementation in schools and districts. Overall, MRSH employs 28 full-time staff and 70 consultants who have an ongoing relationship with the organization. MRSH staff and consultants are based in the following states: Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and Washington.
- ***Faculty Buy-in:*** MRSH recommends that at least 80 percent of staff vote in favor of adopting the design to demonstrate faculty buy-in. State requirements for buy-in naturally supercede the design's recommendations.
- ***Initial Training:*** In year one, MRSH consultants are on site 25 to 30 days, preferably beginning with an on-site, four-day summer training institute for all school staff. Subsequent training is completed individually (principal coaching), in small groups (task force training, leadership team training), or in grade level or content teams (scope and sequence, model teaching, classroom management, instructional strategies), depending on the customized staff development plan for each school. MRSH consultants make themselves available by phone and e-mail to provide feedback, review work between training events, and ensure progress is being made.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** In years two and three, MRSH schools receive 20 to 25 days of annual on-site professional development. Each year's staff development plan is based on the prior year's progress, analysis of student achievement scores, and individual client needs. MRSH consultants continue to make themselves available by phone and e-mail.

- ***Networking:*** MRSH hosts annual educators' conferences and leadership academies, issues a newsletter and other teacher-oriented publications, and maintains a Web site.
- ***Implementation Review:*** To assess implementation, MRSH conducts an annual survey of teachers and principals and provides schoolwide results for each school. In addition, MRSH senior staff conduct site visits and review benchmarks with participating sites, and all training programs are routinely evaluated by participants.

Costs

Costs depend on two factors: number of grade levels and total staff (administrators, teachers, paraprofessionals, and support staff). The average cost for program implementation in a school with 30 to 40 staff members is $68,000 per year. Costs include training fees and materials. MRSH provides approximately 25 days of on-site professional development per year over a three-year period for individuals, small groups, grade level teams, and all staff, depending on the school's needs. The following costs are not part of MRSH implementation: hardware or software purchases, substitutes, staff stipends, registration for conferences, and travel expenses.

State Standards and Accountability

A group of nine MRSH modules, involving multiple days of training, guides teachers through a gaps analysis of existing curriculum and helps them develop curriculum, instruction, and assessment aligned with state standards and assessments. MRSH also provides staff development for all schools in the analysis of student achievement data generated by the state's accountability system, to identify areas of weakness by school, classroom, and student. Teachers are coached in the selection of instructional strategies to improve student achievement in those areas. Finally, to help schools complete a comprehensive curriculum map, MRSH provides a CD-ROM with K-8 instructional units in reading and mathematics, including performance assessments, parent activities, and modifications for special education, gifted/talented, and English language learners.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

MRSH is highlighted in the urban, rural, and high poverty categories. The model has been implemented in a significant number of urban and rural schools. Its focus on individualizing instruction for each student helps address challenges often associated with disadvantaged populations. Parent and community partnership programs increase the chances that school efforts will be supported by social service agencies and other community resources. Helping teachers incorporate technology into instructional practice enhances access to technology for those who may not otherwise have it.

Special Considerations

None.

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted August 2001
Description Updated September 2001

Onward to Excellence (K–12)

IN BRIEF Onward to Excellence	
Founder	Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL)
Current Service Provider	NWREL
Year Established	1981
# Schools Served (9/1/01)	over 1,000 (including 56 OTE II schools)
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	help schools build capacity through shared leadership for continuous improvement
Main Features	• school leadership teams • two-year improvement process • school profiles (data on student achievement) • effective practices research • curriculum mapping
Impact on Instruction	depends on decisions of leadership team and school community
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	leadership team composed of principal, teachers, and (sometimes) parents, students, or district representatives
Impact on Schedule	depends on decisions of leadership team and school community
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	parents often serve on leadership teams; input of parents and community members sought for key decisions
Technology	depends on decisions of leadership team and school community
Materials	materials provided to guide schools through the process (e.g., sample school profiles, research syntheses, and implementation guides for school leadership teams)

Origin/Scope

Onward to Excellence (OTE) was developed at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory in the early 1980s. The model was piloted in 14 schools in three states between 1981 and 1984, then made available to schools across the country. Recently, certain aspects have been updated to incorporate new research on school improvement. Thus the model is now called OTE II. Overall, more than 1,000 schools participated in the original OTE process, and 56 schools have implemented OTE II since 1999.

General Approach

OTE II helps school communities work together to (a) set goals for student achievement, (b) use data to drive decision making, and (c) build capacity for continuous improvement. The model brings a broad base of research on effective practice into the school improvement process to maximize the potential for increases in student learning.

At each participating school, a school leadership team composed of the principal, selected school staff, community members, and students (secondary only) is formed to lead the school and community through the improvement process. An external study team (including representatives from other schools, the central office, local universities, and the community) is established to collect data and help monitor improvement. Finally, a facilitator is appointed at the school or district level to assure that the process moves forward.

The process itself consists of a series of workshops plus follow-up over a two-year period. Some of the workshops involve the school leadership or external study teams, and some involve the entire faculty. The workshops and assistance cover the following areas:

- Awareness-building activities for the faculty, district leadership, and school board
- "Getting Started" activities to form teams and organize resources
- Introducing OTE II and a consensus decision-making process
- Creating a school profile of student achievement
- Establishing a student achievement goal based on the profile and community input
- Conducting a more in-depth school improvement assessment to supplement the profile
- Aligning and mapping the curriculum in the goal area to state standards and tests
- Using research to decide on best practices in the goal area (through faculty study groups)
- Assessing current practice in goal-related areas
- Developing an implementation plan for meeting the goal
- Monitoring progress toward the goal

The final step is to prepare new leaders and renew the process, ensuring that each school sustains continuous improvement on its own.

Results

Selected OTE schools across the country have witnessed considerable improvements in student achievement. At an OTE elementary school in Washington state, for example, CTBS math scores for grades 2-5 increased over a five-year period from 52 to 75, and reading scores improved almost as much (Landis, 1997). And at an OTE high school, Functional Literacy Exam scores (a composite of reading, writing, and mathematics) increased over a three-year period from 795 to 818, leapfrogging both district and state scores (Landis, 1998).

A study of 33 OTE schools in five Mississippi districts found that high implementation schools focusing on reading showed steady gains and outperformed comparison schools. However, the same study also found that high implementation is relatively infrequent and that achievement scores in OTE schools as a whole changed little over the course of the study (Kushman & Yap, 1997). A broader study of OTE schools in 37 Mississippi districts found that OTE schools in high poverty districts outgained non-OTE peer schools over a two-year period by a statistically significant margin on ITBS reading and language tests (Simmons, 1997).

An earlier study of OTE schools across the Northwest region found that OTE had a positive impact on roles and relationships in schools and districts, including more collegiality, better communication, increased staff involvement, shared leadership, and greater commitment. OTE also led to changed practices in schools and classrooms, and school staff members reported progress toward or achievement of their improvement goals. Actual progress as measured by student performance data was less positive than reported progress, however (Blum, Yap, & Butler, 1990).

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** OTE II headquarters are located at the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NWREL) in Portland, Oregon. NWREL has established a network of five regional centers to develop more trainers and serve more schools in areas where interest in the model is high. The centers include the Appalachian Educational Laboratory (West Virginia), SERVE (Florida), the Western Regional Professional Development Center (Ohio), the Southeast Kansas Education Service Center, and WestEd (California).
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** The local school board, superintendent, key central office staff, principals, school staff, and community must learn about the OTE II process and make a

commitment to full participation in training and implementation.

- ***Initial Training:*** The training program consists of 15 workshops spread over two years. The first workshop is for school and central office administrators, teacher leaders, community members, and representatives from the external study team. All subsequent workshops are for the school leadership team/facilitator, the external study team, or the whole faculty. Each workshop is between one and two days in length and focuses on specific aspects of the improvement process.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Coaching for the school leadership team and external study team follows each workshop and is done primarily by the school improvement facilitator. OTE II trainers provide coaching as needed to the facilitator.
- ***Networking:*** OTE II supports a Web site and hosts annual Trainer Update Workshops. Agencies providing OTE II training and assistance are encouraged to facilitate networking among school leadership teams, external study teams, and staff.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Collecting data about implementation is the responsibility of the external study team and the leadership team at each school. Data on implementation of the process and plans, positive changes in learning and teaching practices, and changes in student performance are collected and reviewed at least twice each year.

Costs

When schools enter into a contract for OTE II, there is a basic fee of approximately $21,500 for two years of training and technical assistance. The fee can vary slightly from region to region. Some regional centers (such as WestEd) charge more because of higher costs of doing business in their states. When multiple schools in the same district (up to four) are trained at the same time, a lower per-school fee is generally negotiated given that some of the workshops can be held with multiple teams. The basic fee does not include trainer travel costs, which are generally paid by the school on a cost-reimbursable or a fixed-fee basis.

Additional known costs include 0.25 FTE per school for a school improvement facilitator; release time for team members (usually eight days per year for between three and six teachers); and time for the full faculty to participate in improvement and professional development activities (at least six days). Other costs may include purchase of resource materials, instructional materials, and/or the services of content experts to lead professional development related to the improvement goal(s).

For more information on costs, including an electronic cost-estimate worksheet, please visit the OTE II Web site (URL listed below).

State Standards and Accountability

OTE II includes two full days of training for all faculty in a process called Aligning and Mapping the Curriculum. Teachers examine their taught curriculum in a goal area (e.g., reading) against state standards and assessments, and learn how to repeat this process in other subject areas. This workshop is customized by state to ensure that teachers understand and apply state standards to their teaching practices as part of the comprehensive reform work.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for

a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

OTE II is highlighted in the rural category. The model serves rural schools in states across the Southeast and Northwest. Additionally, OTE II training is structured so that, in small districts with two to four schools, it can be delivered to all schools at once.

Special Considerations

It is critical that schools identify and contract with experts who can provide training in the school improvement goal(s) area above and beyond the research synthesis materials and other resources provided by OTE II trainers.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Blum, R. E., Yap, K. O., & Butler, J. A. (1990). *Onward to Excellence impact study.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Kushman, J. W., & Yap, K. (1997). *Mississippi Onward to Excellence impact study: Final report.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Landis, S. (1997). *Snoqualmie Valley: There's a real buzz on around here about education.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Landis, S. (1998). *Bruce, Mississippi: The catalyst for change.* Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Independent Researchers

Simmons, J. (1997). *Database analysis of Mississippi OTE schools: A summary of results to date.* Jackson, MS: Mississippi Department of Education.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Broadway High School 269 Gobbler Drive Broadway, VA 22815 540-896-7081 Contact: Steve Leaman	971	rural	0%	0%	0%	3%	96%	17%	4%	7%
Lonoke Elementary School 800 West Palm Street Lonoke, AR 72086 501-676-6740 Contact: Marilyn Hinson-Royal	405	urban fringe of mid-size city	22%	0%	0%	0%	77%	33%	1%	19%
Wescove Elementary School 1010 West Vine Avenue West Covina, CA 91790-3406 626-939-4870 Contact: Mike Chaix	468	urban fringe of large city	14%	2%	11%	60%	13%	63%	25%	3%
Lowndes Middle School 2379 Copeland Road Valdosta, GA 31601 912-245-2280 Contact: Samuel Clemons	1,080	large town	24%	0%	0%	2%	73%	46%	<1%	13%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Robert E. Blum, Director
School Improvement Program
Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
101 SW Main Street, Suite 500
Portland, Oregon 97204
Phone: 503-275-9615
Fax: 503-275-9621
E-mail: blumb@nwrel.org
Web site: http://www.nwrel.org/scpd/ote

Accepted for Inclusion March 1999
Description Written April 1999
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated June 2002

QuESt (K–12)

IN BRIEF QuESt	
Founder	Diane Rivers, Quality Educational Systems, Inc.
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1990; revised 1996
# Schools Served (6/1/02)	100+
Level	K-12 (initial emphasis 6-8)
Primary Goal	to increase student achievement through quality process improvements
Main Features	• total quality principles applied to schools and districts • standards-based processes • educational auditing • curriculum alignment • curriculum and instructional mapping • systemic assessment model
Impact on Instruction	standards-based curriculum/ instruction/assessment process in an interdisciplinary, team-based instructional design
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	team-based teaching and learning; school improvement teams; leadership training
Impact on Schedule	professional development time; planning time
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	parent satisfaction surveys; parent involvement teams; home-school linkages program (optional)
Technology	Internet access critical to successful implementation of Phase III
Materials	auditing templates and software; strategic planning software; school improvement templates; training materials; curriculum and instructional mapping software; Web site; server access

Origin/Scope

The Quality Educational Systems – Tools for Transformation (QuESt) model was developed by Diane Rivers, founder of a research, development, and consulting firm called Educational Concepts (now called Quality Educational Systems). Since 1990, QuESt has been used in efforts to improve educational environments by applying principles and processes of total quality management. As of June 2002, QuESt had been implemented in more than 100 schools.

General Description

QuESt is a whole-school reform model that enables administrators, teachers, and students to create and sustain a high quality learning environment. The QuESt model is based on the belief that improvement occurs at the process level. Therefore, to improve schools, processes must first be addressed. Furthermore, when multiple processes are improved in an integrated fashion, significant school improvements can occur in less time than change theory typically suggests.

The model's design incorporates 3 phases, 7 quality principles, and 10 key processes. The 3 phases are:

Phase I: Quality Educational Audit that enables a school or district to analyze current performance, establish a baseline for strategic improvement purposes, and identify and implement quality processes for educational transformation.

Phase II: Strategic Quality Planning and Design that helps schools identify their mission and vision for the future, align educational practices with sound educational philosophy and research, identify key processes that drive the organization's performance, infuse quality principles and practices into those processes, and develop a set of aggressive, integrated strategies to ensure that the school's vision for the future becomes a reality.

- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Although no formal buy-in process is required, each school that has adopted QuESt has had buy-in or opt-out opportunities throughout each phase. Individual administrators and teachers within each school have the same options from phase to phase. Schools that have implemented the model have ranged from 98 to 100 percent participation rates.
- ***Initial Training:*** The initial work with faculty involves a "learning-by-assessing" design. Consultants are on-site up to 20 days for Phase I efforts (based on size of school and number of faculty). Phase II involves an additional 2 days of faculty time for planning. Phase III requires an additional 20 days of development and training based on specific needs identified and prioritized in the first two phases.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** QuESt sites receive ongoing support and development in curriculum, instruction, technology, and assessment areas. Consultants spend up to 10 days in year two and 4 days in year three on-site. The model is designed to build internal capacity and systematically reduce the need for external support.
- ***Networking:*** QuESt sites are linked together through a network of internal and external consultants. Visits to other schools, e-mail, and Web site linkages bring schools together. Grade level chat rooms are being planned to connect teachers across the country.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Regularly scheduled site visits with administrators and teachers provide opportunities for consultants to assist sites with implementation issues. Additionally, the audit (assessment) tool is available to each school, and schools are encouraged to monitor their progress in each of the 10 key process areas.

Costs

Schools are licensed to use the technology and materials that support the QuESt model. The cost for full implementation averages $100,000 over a two-year period ($40,000 for Phase I, $10,000 for Phase II, and $50,000 for Phase III). Additional support for Year 3 averages $50,000 per school, depending on specific follow-up needs. These costs cover all consulting services for educational teams, licensing fees for all software, a Web-enabled access site, QuESt training materials, auditing tools, leadership training, teacher training and development, and three software tools (auditing software, planning software, and curriculum/instructional/assessment alignment tools). Optional software for student assessment is available for a one-time per school fee of $12,500, plus set-up and installation costs. Schools also need to cover release time for teachers involved in professional development.

Student Populations

QuESt was originally implemented to address the needs of urban middle-school students who were eligible for Title I. QuESt has been successfully implemented in urban, suburban, and rural schools serving Title I students, disadvantaged students, students with disabilities, and elementary and secondary students.

Special Considerations

Ideally, an entire district (K-12) with multiple sites will elect to implement QuESt, thus enhancing the opportunity for sustained systemic reform.

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted August 2001
Description Updated September 2001

Roots &Wings (PreK–6)

IN BRIEF Roots & Wings	
Founder	Robert Slavin, Nancy Madden, and a team of developers from Johns Hopkins University
Current Service Provider	Success for All Foundation
Year Established	1993
# Schools Served (6/1/01)	1,800 schools use Success for All; 200 of these have added Roots & Wings components
Level	preK-6
Primary Goal	to ensure that all children learn to read, acquire basic skills in other subjects areas, and build problem solving and critical thinking skills
Main Features	• research-based curricula in four subjects • integrated science and social studies program • cooperative learning • one-to-one tutoring • family support team
Impact on Instruction	prescribed curriculum in the areas of literacy, math, and social and scientific problem solving
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	building advisory committee; full-time facilitator; family support team; one-to-one tutoring
Impact on Schedule	90-minute reading periods; 75 minutes daily for primary math, 60 for intermediate math
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	yes (reading, math, science, social studies)
Parental Involvement	family support team works to increase school-home connections
Technology	none required
Materials	detailed curriculum materials, teachers manuals, and other materials provided for all core subjects

Origin/Scope

Roots & Wings, created in 1993 by Robert Slavin, Nancy Madden, and a team of developers at Johns Hopkins University, is a comprehensive, whole-school reform model designed to boost the basic skills achievement of all students while building problem solving skills, creativity, and critical thinking. As of June 2001, Success for All, the reading component of Roots & Wings, was operating in 1,800 schools. Some 200 of these schools have added the math, science, and/or social studies components that constitute Roots & Wings.

General Description

The purpose of Roots & Wings is to create well-structured curricular and instructional approaches for all core academic subjects, prekindergarten to grade six, based on well-evaluated components and well-researched principles of instruction, assessment, classroom management, motivation, and professional development.

Roots & Wings builds on the Success for All program, initiated in 1987, which provides research-based curricula for students in reading, writing, and language arts; one-to-one tutoring for primary grade students struggling in reading; and extensive family support services (see description of Success for All). To these, Roots & Wings adds MathWings and WorldLab. MathWings is based on the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards, which emphasize problem solving, reasoning, real-world applications, and communication. Students work in mixed ability groups, progressing from concrete experience with manipulatives to a more abstract understanding of mathematical concepts. Many MathWings units use works of literature to help students explore concepts in meaningful contexts.

WorldLab is an integrated approach to social studies and science for grades one through five which emphasizes group simulations and investigations of real-world problems. For

example, students pretend to be citizens of a town struggling with environmental issues. This simulation leads them to investigate real problems in their own communities. WorldLab is designed to build on knowledge and skills students are learning in language arts and mathematics classes. Physical education, music, and visual arts are used to enhance WorldLab simulations and investigations.

Each school has one full-time facilitator to help implement the program, a family support team to foster community and parent involvement, and a building advisory team to evaluate the entire school climate and advise the principal on general direction and goals.

Results

Success for All, the reading/language arts component of Roots & Wings, has been evaluated extensively, with statistically significant positive results for program students compared to control students across many studies. (See the description of Success for All for more details.)

Research on the entire Roots & Wings model is neither as extensive nor as rigorous as that on Success for All. However, available data do show positive trends for selected Roots & Wings schools. Over the first three years of implementation (1993-96), the four pilot Roots & Wings schools in Maryland demonstrated substantially greater gains in third and fifth grade on the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP) in all six subjects tested (reading, writing, language, math, science, and social studies) than schools statewide. After implementation declined over the next two years (the result of reductions in funding and the resignation of a supportive superintendent), scores leveled off. Still, over the five year period, model schools showed greater gains than schools statewide on every measure except fifth-grade language (Slavin & Madden, 2000). Twelve other Roots & Wings schools in five other states have outgained schools statewide on state mathematics tests (Madden, Slavin, & Simons, 2000).

In a study of restructuring schools in Memphis, Tennessee, researchers reported that schools that adopted school reform models, including Roots & Wings, demonstrated greater gains on the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS) than non-restructuring schools. Roots & Wings was one of two models overall that showed statistically significant effects compared to non-restructuring schools (Ross et al., 2001).

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The Success for All Foundation, located in Baltimore, is the national headquarters for Roots & Wings. There are also 20 regional centers throughout the U.S. Overall, the foundation employs about 240 full-time trainers, including 180 reading trainers, 20 MathWings trainers, 5 WorldLab trainers, 20 family support trainers, and 15 middle school trainers. There are also 10 part-time trainers.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** At least 80% of a school's professional staff must vote on a secret ballot to adopt the program.
- ***Initial Training:*** For each component (Success for All, MathWings, and WorldLab), all teachers receive detailed manuals supplemented by three days of training at the beginning of the school year provided by Roots & Wings trainers. Schools often phase in the three components, starting with Success for All in year one, followed by MathWings in year two and WorldLab in year three.
- ***Follow-up Coaching:*** As noted in the Success for All description, trainers provide at least 26 person-days of on-site assistance over the first year of implementation for that

component. Follow-up support for the other components is comparable. Trainers make presentations, lead discussions, visit classrooms, and work with the building facilitator. The facilitator also organizes informal sessions to allow teachers to share problems, suggest changes, and discuss individual children.

- ***Networking:*** Conferences are held annually for principals and facilitators to network with those from other schools, receive program updates, and share problem-solving strategies. In many parts of the country, schools are joining forces with each other to create local support networks, and in some cases experienced schools are becoming mentors for new schools. Roots & Wings produces an annual newsletter for all its schools, and its Web site contains general program information and research articles.
- ***Implementation Review:*** As mentioned in the Success for All description, two trainers make three 2-day visits to assess the extent of implementation of that component. (These 12 person-days are part of the 26 for that component). Implementation visits continue at a lower level after the first year (8 person-days in year 2, and 6 person-days each year thereafter). The same review schedule holds for MathWings and WorldLab as these components are phased in. The review process involves interviewing staff, observing classes, examining data, and writing a summary of their findings. Trainers also use these opportunities to coach staff and consult with the facilitator.

Costs

Sample costs for a school of 500 students (preK-5) typically range from $75,000 to $80,000 for each of three years, as reading, math, and social studies/science are phased in. These estimates include training, materials, and follow-up visits (including travel costs). Actual costs, which depend on school size, location, specific needs (such as bilingual, ESL, or year-round training), and number of schools collaborating in training, are calculated for individual schools. Schools also must cover the costs of a full-time facilitator and staff time for attending training sessions. Typically, the program is funded by reallocating a school's current Title I monies, often supplemented by other federal or state funds, such as CSRD funds.

State Standards and Accountability

Roots & Wings curricula have been matched with state standards and assessments for almost all states. Further, modifications to the program have been made to match state standards, assessments, and response forms for many states. Documents showing the alignment of Success for All with state standards and assessments can be obtained from the Success for All Foundation.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

Roots & Wings is highlighted in all five categories. It has been implemented in many schools serving each population. The family support team and the promotion of links with social service organizations help support disadvantaged students and families. Provisions for distance

learning and joint service to multiple schools (with consequent fee reductions) facilitate implementation in rural schools. Success for All, the reading program, offers numerous components designed to address the needs of urban students, English Language Learners, and special education students. See the description of Success for All for more details.

Special Considerations

Teachers must be willing to use detailed curricular materials. The inclusion of students with learning problems in regular classrooms is encouraged to the extent possible. Applications for a given school year must be filed before May 1 of the preceding school year.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Madden, N. A., Slavin, R. E., & Simons, K. (2000). *MathWings: Effects on student performance* (Report No. 39). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk.

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (2000). Roots & Wings: Effects of whole-school reform on student achievement. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk, 5*(1&2), 109-136.

(See the Success for All description for additional research on that component of the design.)

Independent Researchers

Bodilly, S., with Keltner, B., Purnell, S., Reichardt, R., & Schyler, G. (1998). *Lessons from New American Schools' scale-up phase.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND.

Ross, S. M., Wang, L. W., Alberg, M., Sanders, W. L., Wright, S. P., & Stringfield, S. (2001, April). *Fourth-year achievement results on the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System for restructuring schools in Memphis.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Seattle.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Earl Warren Elementary 5420 Lowell Street Sacramento, CA 95820 916-382-5930 Contact: Betsy Inchausti	501	large city	11%	3%	34%	39%	12%	100%	49%	6%
Grasonville Elementary 5435 Main Street Grasonville, MD 21638 410-827-8070 Contact: Lawrence Dunn	383	rural	24%	0%	0%	0%	76%	26%	<1%	16%
Lackland City Elementary 101 Dumont San Antonio, TX 78236 210-678-2940 Contact: Jerry Allen	525	large city	7%	0%	0%	78%	14%	93%	11%	15%
Tyee Park Elementary 11920 Seminole Rd. Tacoma, WA 98499 253-589-7820 Contact: Tom Prentice	330	urban fringe of large city	25%	0%	0%	10%	50%	77%	11%	12%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information contact:

Roots & Wings
Success for All Foundation
200 West Towsontown Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21204
Phone: 800-548-4998
Fax: 410-324-4444
E-mail: sfainfo@successforall.net
Web site: http://www.successforall.net

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Description Written March 1998
Tests, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

School Development Program (K–12)

IN BRIEF School Development Program	
Founder	James Comer, Yale University
Current Service Provider	School Development Program National Center and various regional centers
Year Established	1968
# Schools Served (9/1/02)	600
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	mobilize entire community of adult caretakers to support students' holistic development to bring about academic success
Main Features	• three teams (school planning and management team, student and staff support team, parent team) • three operations (comprehensive school plan, staff development plan, monitoring and assessment) • three guiding principles (no-fault, consensus, collaboration)
Impact on Instruction	goals and outcomes are developed through the comprehensive school plan process
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	representative teams provide input into decision-making process; decisions made through collaboration and consensus
Impact on Schedule	depends on decisions of teams
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	generally not, although a literacy program has been developed and piloted
Parental Involvement	parent team; parents serve on school planning and management team; in general, parental involvement is central to the program
Technology	depends on decisions of teams
Materials	training manual with materials; 14-segment video series

Origin/Scope

The School Development Program, founded by child psychiatrist James Comer of Yale University, was first implemented in 1968 in the two lowest achieving schools in New Haven, Connecticut. As of May 2001, over 600 elementary, middle, and high schools had used the program, also known as the Comer Process.

General Description

Many children in inner city schools, Comer believes, come to school without the personal, social, and moral development necessary for academic success. To compound this problem, many school staff members, lacking adequate knowledge of child development and the children's home culture, are unprepared to deal appropriately with these students and their families.

Over a period of years, Comer developed a nine-part process to improve educators' understanding of child development and to foster healthier relations between school and home. Three mechanisms, three operations, and three principles provide the process:

Mechanisms

- School Planning and Management Team: develops and monitors a Comprehensive School Plan; includes administrators, teachers, support staff, parents, and others.
- Student and Staff Support Team: helps improve the social climate of the school; includes social workers, counselors, special education teachers, and other staff with child development and mental health backgrounds.
- Parent Team: promotes parent involvement in all areas of school life.

Operations

- Comprehensive School Plan: gives direction to the school improvement process; covers academics, school climate, staff development, public relations, and other areas.

staffs. They may be assisted upon request by members of the national or regional staffs.

- ***Networking:*** The School Development Program publishes a quarterly newsletter and supports a Web site. The program has also experimented with a variety of teleconferencing strategies, including satellite broadcasts and desktop video-conferencing.
- ***Implementation Review:*** School Development Program staff members visit member schools twice per year to assess the quality of implementation. Schools also complete a variety of checklists and questionnaires each year to document progress.

Costs

The School Development Program contracts with districts for the participation of four or more schools. A contract has up to five components: the administration costs ($5,000 for up to five schools per district, and $1,000 for each additional school); the training tuition costs ($1,000 per person per weeklong session); the consultation costs ($1,200 per day of site visitation, plus expenses); the costs of optional instructional support programs (Balanced Curriculum, Essentials of Literacy, and Teachers Helping Teachers); and any additional service costs. Schools also must cover release time and travel expenses for trips to Yale and release time for on-site visits. Additionally, the program recommends that the district budget for a full-time program facilitator, although some districts have managed with half-time facilitators.

Student Populations

The School Development Program was designed to meet the needs of inner city schools and students. Over the years, however, it has been implemented in a range of schools, including some suburban and rural schools.

Special Considerations

The School Development Program focuses on building positive and productive relationships. Therefore its success depends on a substantial degree of collegiality and cooperation among teachers, principals, parents, and students. Until recently, program staff have assumed that decisions about curriculum and instruction would be made by teachers and others through participation on teams. Recently, the program has established a new unit to help schools more directly address curriculum alignment, literacy skills, and other curricular and instructional areas.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Comer, J. P. (1988, November). Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American,* pp. 42-48.

Comer, J. P., Haynes, N. M., Hamilton-Lee, M., Boger, J. M., & Rollock, D. (1985). *Psychosocial and academic effects of an intervention program among minority school children.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Child Study Center.

Comer, J. P., Haynes, N. M., Hamilton-Lee, M., Boger, J. M., & Rollock, D. (1986). *Academic and affective gains from the School Development Program: A model for school improvement.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, August.

Independent Researchers

Noblit, G., Malloy, C., Malloy, W., Villenas, S., Groves, P., Jennings, M., Patterson, J., & Rayle, J. (1997). *Scaling up a supportive environment: Case studies of successful Comer schools.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina.

Stringfield, S., Millsap, M. A., Herman, R., Yoder, N., Brigham, N., Nesselfodt, P., Schaffer, E., Karweit, N., Levin, M., & Stevens, R. (1997). *Urban and suburban/rural special strategies for educating disadvantaged children: Final report.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Wong, P. L., Oberman, I., Mintrop, H., & Gamson, D.

Haynes, N. M., & Emmons, C. L. (1997). *Comer School Development Program effects: A ten-year review, 1986-1996.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Child Study Center.

(1996). *Evaluation of the San Francisco Bay Area school reform portfolio: Summary report.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Fort Foote Elementary (PreK-6) 611 Ager Road Suite 106 Hyattsville, MD 70126 301-408-7120 Contact: Sheila Jackson	512	urban fringe of large city	90%	0%	6%	0%	3%	40%	0%	15%
Gompers Elementary School (PreK-5) 1121 East McNichols Street Detroit, MI 48203 313-252-3081 Contact: Minnie Mayes	362	large city	93%	0%	0%	0%	7%	86%	0%	7%
John C. Haines Elementary School (PreK-8) 53 West Jackson Suite 950 Chicago, IL 60604-3664 312-435-3900 Contact: Vivian Loseth	695	large city	35%	0%	64%	0%	0%	96%	39%	11%
Charles R. Hadley Elementary School (K-5) 1500 Biscayne Blvd. Rm. 336 Miami, FL 33132 305-995-1975 Contact: Geneva Woodward	1,299	urban fringe of large city	1%	0%	1%	91%	7%	72%	41%	8%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Beverly Crowther, Research Associate
School Development Program
53 College Street
New Haven, CT 06510
Phone: 203-737-4008
Fax: 203-737-4001
E-mail: beverly.crowther@yale.edu
Web site: http://www.schooldevelopmentprogram.org

Because parental involvement is considered essential to student success, each Success for All school forms a family support team, which encourages parents to read to their children, involves parents in school activities, and intervenes when problems at home interfere with a child's progress in school. The operation of Success for All is coordinated at each school by a full-time facilitator who helps plan the program and coach teachers. Finally, an advisory committee composed of the principal, facilitator, teacher and parent representatives, and family support staff meets regularly to review the progress of the program.

Results

From the beginning there has been a strong focus in Success for All on research and evaluation. Numerous studies conducted by developers and others have compared scores on standardized reading tests (specifically, the Durrell Oral Reading Scale and several scales from the Woodcock Reading Mastery Test) for students in Success for All schools and control schools. For example, in one study (Madden et al., 1993), students at the first five Success for All schools outperformed students at control schools by statistically significant margins in every grade. By third grade, the advantage for Success for All students translated into a grade equivalent difference of more than eight months. For students in the lowest 25% of their cohorts, the effects were even greater. Several other studies (Dianda & Flaherty, 1995; Slavin & Madden, 1999a) have reported that English language learners in Success for All elementary schools outperform those in control schools.

Results have been similar for all but a handful of studies following the same research design. When the results of all these studies are combined (involving thousands of students), statistically significant positive effects are found for Success for All cohorts at every grade level. By fifth grade, Success for All cohorts score more than a year higher on reading measures than control groups (Slavin & Madden, 1999b).

According to a recent study (Borman & Hewes, 2000), these benefits for students appear to persist beyond participation in the program. Students who attended Success for All elementary schools outscored control students by a statistically significant margin on the eighth-grade CTBS/4 reading and mathematics tests and were less likely to be referred to special education during their middle school years.

The impact of Success for All has also been measured using statewide assessments. In Indiana, first and second grade students at two Success for All schools scored higher on the statewide ISTEP test than control students. There was little difference, however, in the scores of third graders on the test (Ross, Smith, & Casey, 1997). More recently, the performance of all 111 Success for All schools in Texas was compared to all other schools in Texas on TAAS, Texas's statewide assessment (Hurley, Chamberlain, Slavin, & Madden, 2000). TAAS reading scores for grades three, four, and five were averaged for all Success for All schools, which were divided into cohorts depending on the year of implementation. Gains for each cohort from the year prior to implementation to 1998 were compared to gains for the state as a whole over the same period. Each Success for All cohort outgained the statewide cohort by at least 4 percentage points. Overall, Success for All schools outgained other schools by 5.9 percentage points, a statistically significant difference.

Success for All recently developed a middle school model, but no evaluations of this model have been completed.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The Success for All Foundation, located in Baltimore, is the model's national headquarters. There are also 20 regional centers throughout the U.S. Overall, the foundation employs about 240 full-time trainers, including 180 reading trainers, 20 family support trainers, and 15 middle school trainers. The other 25 trainers focus on the mathematics, science, and social studies components of Roots & Wings. (See the description of Roots & Wings for more details.) There are also 10 part-time trainers.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** At least 80% of a school's professional staff must vote on a secret ballot to adopt the program.
- ***Initial Training:*** In the spring prior to implementation, the school's principal and designated building facilitator attend a week-long training session in their region. In August, project staff members visit the school for three days of intensive training for the full school staff, plus a fourth day for tutors.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Over the first year of implementation, trainers provide at least 26 person-days of on-site assistance to introduce new components of the program, coach teachers, and work with the building facilitator. Over time, the facilitator (a full-time position) assumes most of the coaching and problem-solving responsibilities.
- ***Networking:*** Success for All supports a Web site, publishes a newsletter, and hosts an annual national conference.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Three times during the first year, two trainers visit each school for two days to assess the extent of implementation. The trainers interview staff, observe classes, examine data, and write a summary of their findings. They also use these opportunities to coach staff and consult with the facilitator. (These 12 person-days are part of the 26 mentioned above.) Implementation visits continue at a lower level after the first year (8 person-days in year 2, and 6 person-days each year thereafter).

Costs

Sample costs for a school of 500 students (preK-5) typically range from $75,000 to $80,000 for year one, $30,000 to $35,000 for year two, and $23,000 to $25,000 for year three. These estimates include training, materials, and follow-up visits (including travel costs). Actual costs, which depend on school size, location, specific needs (such as bilingual, ESL, or year-round training), and number of schools collaborating in training, are calculated for individual schools. Schools also must cover the costs of a full-time facilitator, staff time for attending training sessions, and travel expenses for the principal and facilitator to attend the spring training session. Typically, the program is funded by reallocating a school's current Title I monies, often supplemented by other federal or state funds, such as Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) or Reading Excellence Act funds.

State Standards and Accountability

Success for All curricula have been matched with state standards and assessments for almost all states. Further, modifications to the program have been made to match state standards, assessments, and response forms for many states. Documents showing the alignment of Success for All with state standards/assessments can be obtained from the Success for All Foundation.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Park Avenue Elementary 100 Morton Street Yuba City, CA 95991 503-822-5265 Contact: Linda Cohee	629	mid-size city	3%	2%	6%	69%	20%	88%	36%	5%
Jupiter Elementary 950 Tupelo Road SW Palm Bay, FL 32908 407-952-5990 Contact: Lynn Spadaccini	800	rural	10%	3%	3%	10%	75%	50%	4%	24%
Otken Elementary 401 Montana Street McComb, MS 39648 601-684-3749 Contact: Rebecca Morgan	825	small town	82%	0%	0%	18%	0%	85%	0%	4%
Gordon Parks Academy 98 Greenwood Avenue East Orange, NJ 07017 Contact: Joyce Howard	430	urban fringe of large city	99%	0%	0%	0%	0%	97%	0%	13%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

Demonstration sites are available in many areas of the U.S. Contact the Success for All program for the nearest sites.

For more information, contact:

Success For All Foundation
200 West Towsontown Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21204
Phone: 800-548-4998
Fax: 410-324-4444
E-mail: sfainfo@successforall.net
Web site: http://www.successforall.net

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted November 2001
Description Updated April 2002

Talent Development High School With Career Academies (9–12)

IN BRIEF Talent Development High School	
Founder	Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk, Johns Hopkins University and Howard University
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1995
# Schools Served (9/1/01)	35
Level	9-12
Primary Goal	improve achievement and other outcomes for at-risk students in large high schools
Main Features	• 9th-grade success academy • career academies for grades 10-12 • core curriculum in a four-period day • transition courses in math and reading, freshman seminar • alternative after-hours program
Impact on Instruction	core curriculum prepares all students for college; four-period day allows in-depth instruction and project learning; transition courses enable students below grade level to catch up
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	9th-grade academy and career academies are distinct small schools with their own faculty and management
Impact on Schedule	four-period day
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	strategic reading, student team literature, and transition math
Parental Involvement	incorporates the Epstein six-fold parent/school partnership approach
Technology	integrated into curricular areas
Materials	organizational and curriculum materials provided

Origin/Scope

The Talent Development High School with Career Academies (TDHS) was first implemented in 1995. At the invitation of the Maryland State Department of Education, Patterson High School in Baltimore (one of two high schools eligible for state takeover) and the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk at Johns Hopkins University worked together to develop reforms to turn the school around. As of September 2001, 35 schools in 12 states were implementing the TDHS model.

General Description

TDHS is a reform model for large high schools struggling with low attendance rates, discipline problems, low achievement scores, and high dropout rates. Its primary components are:

- ***Ninth Grade Success Academy:*** A separate transitional program places groups of 150-180 first-year students with interdisciplinary teacher teams. These teams are composed of four to five teachers who share a block schedule with common planning time. This program has its own faculty, its own management team, and its own part of the building with a clearly labeled entrance.
- ***Career Academies for the Upper Grades:*** Several self-contained Career Academies are formed in the upper grades, each enrolling 250-350 students. Each academy offers the same common core of academic courses with a blend of career applications to match the particular academy theme, preparing students for either college entry or work. Like the ninth grade academy, each career academy has its own faculty, management team, section of the building, and entrance.
- ***Core Curriculum in a Four-Period Day:*** A basic set of core academic courses is

required for all students. The daily schedule is organized around four 90-minute class periods. The extended period is designed to enable teachers to use a wide variety of learner-centered instructional techniques.

- ***Catch-Up Curriculum and Extra Help:*** The ninth grade curriculum includes extra mathematics and English classes for students who have weak prior preparation. Students take Strategic Reading and Transition to Advanced Mathematics (developed by TDHS) during the first semester to prepare them for English I and Algebra I second semester. English I is further supported by Student Team Literature and Student Team Writing, which incorporate cooperative learning techniques and extensive fiction readings. The Freshman Seminar course prepares students for high school work by teaching study and social skills and by stimulating college and career awareness. Courses are offered in the summer, on Saturdays, and after hours for students who have not passed required courses.
- ***Twilight School:*** An alternative after-hours program is conducted in the building for students who have serious attendance or discipline problems or who are coming to the school from prison or suspension from another school. Instruction is offered in small classes, and extensive services are provided by guidance and support staff.

Results

A 1998 case study of TDHS's Patterson High School in Baltimore, conducted by the model developers, examined the percentage of ninth grade students passing the Maryland state functional examination. The percentage of students passing rose from 28 percent (1994) to 56 percent (1997) in mathematics, and from 55 percent (1994) to 57 percent (1997) percent in reading. On writing exams, the percentage of students passing fell one percentage point during that period. The TDHS math and reading pass rates in 1997 were higher than the district's mean pass rates (34 percent districtwide in math and 52 percent in reading). On the state's school performance index, which is based on attendance, retention, and test scores, Patterson rose seven percentage points from 1995-97, while the mean index for the district dropped half a point (McPartland, Balfanz, Jordan, & Legters, 1998).

Another study by the developers analyzed the impact of TDHS ninth grade academies on student achievement. Eighth-grade scores were used as a baseline. Controlling for gender, age, and absences, ninth grade students in TDHS schools demonstrated significantly higher levels of mathematics and reading achievement and greater achievement gains on end-of-year tests than students in control schools (Balfanz & Jordan, 2001).

A 2000 report examined achievement made on the SAT-9 by students attending TDHS's ninth grade academies in two Philadelphia high schools. Math scores in the two TDHS schools rose a median of 3.5 normal curve equivalents (NCEs), while the two control schools declined by a median of 0.2 NCEs. In reading, the TDHS scores declined by 4.1 NCEs, while control group scores fell 7.7 NCEs. The percentage of first time TDHS freshman passing English, Algebra I, and science rose from 24 percent (1999) to 56 percent (2000), while that of control students rose from 33 percent to 39 percent over the same period (Philadelphia Education Fund, 2000).

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** Implementation teams are available primarily from Johns Hopkins University with support from Howard University. Implementation assistance may be administered by one of three regional laboratories (NCREL, SERVE, and WestEd). The project also has established hubs in Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Newark, New Jersey,

where local teams of facilitators support implementation and build local capacity.

- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** After initial awareness activities, a school faculty undertakes a required application process during which they commit to the program by vote and engage in initial planning to outline their local TDHS design. TDHS will not work with a school that does not demonstrate widespread faculty buy-in with school- and district-level administrative support.
- ***Initial Training:*** During the summer prior to the planning year, school teams made up of administrators and faculty attend a two-day TDHS Planning Year conference to become fully versed in organizational and curricular components of the model. Schools fund a TDHS facilitator who guides the faculty and staff through the year-long planning phase in which the schools plan academies, facilities changes, and curricula. During the planning year, relevant faculty and staff participate in training in leadership, scheduling, teaming, use of the extended period, and ninth grade curricular components. The planning year culminates in a two-day retreat for school faculty and administrators.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** During the first and second years of implementation, a technical assistance team composed of the program facilitator and two to three instructional facilitators provides on-site coaching and technical assistance on a weekly basis to support the development of the school organization components and the math, language arts, and Freshman Seminar curriculum components. On-site assistance in the curricular components is supported by monthly follow-up instructional workshops that occur across schools in sites where multiple schools are implementing or via teleconferencing technology for schools in remote areas.
- ***Networking:*** The TDHS program currently supports a national network of TDHS principals, which is convened twice per year. The program also facilitates the establishment and growth of cross-school local professional development and leadership networks in urban districts where TDHS is being implemented in more than one school. Planning Year training described above and semi-annual national conferences provide additional networking opportunities.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Implementation checks are conducted by TDHS facilitators and/or developers twice yearly over the first several implementation years. Schools also complete survey forms annually to report on implementation and results. Feedback is offered to schools in facilitated planning sessions and through analysis of data reports.

Costs

Planning year and implementation year costs vary due to school configurations and availability of professional development time for planning and training. Redesign of entrances, signs, and space for the academies must be covered, as well as time for teachers to plan academies and attend workshops. Additional management team leaders for each academy may need to be added if redeployment of vice principals and department chairs is insufficient. In addition, there are the following direct costs:

- ***Partnership Fee:*** An annual fee of $10,000 covers faculty and student surveys and feedback, and regular contact with a dedicated school point person from the design team.
- ***Technical Assistance:*** Technical assistance from TDHS organizational and instructional facilitators ranges from 10 to 40 days per year, depending on local circumstances, and costs between $10,000 and $50,000. In addition, the school must fund the full-time

program facilitator (or 0.5 FTE if two schools in a district are implementing). This typically costs between $60,000 and $80,000.

- ***Professional Development:*** The school must fund one to two teachers from the local district who serve as curriculum coaches. English and math teachers will need to receive the local rate for attending up to 25 hours of professional development.
- ***Curriculum Materials:*** The cost of texts and materials for 500 ninth graders taking Transition to Advanced Mathematics, Strategic Reading, and Freshman Seminar courses is approximately $35,700 the first year and $17,000 the second year. For upper grade English classes, Partner Discussion Guides and student worksheets for Student Team Literature are available for many novels and plays, at an average cost of $350 per novel or play for each teacher.
- ***Student Survey:*** The Holland interest survey is given to all students during the planning year at a cost of $2.55 per student.

Depending on whether economies of scale can be achieved by implementing in more than one school in a district, total direct costs for full implementation typically range from $100 to $300 per student per year.

State Standards and Accountability

All courses developed by TDHS employ the use of higher-order thinking skills while building and reinforcing basic skills in reading, writing, and mathematics. As such, these courses help prepare students for state assessments of basic functional skills and newer assessments that emphasize higher-order reasoning. Extra help options provide additional support to students who might otherwise be daunted by high stakes tests and drop out instead of face failure. Flexibility in TDHS English and mathematics supports enables schools to adapt some curriculum materials to ensure alignment with state standards. Finally, the smaller learning community and career focus model components can provide students with more support and motivation for trying hard and succeeding on state assessments.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

TDHS is highlighted in three categories: urban, high poverty, and special education. The model was specifically designed for large urban schools that serve high poverty populations. Key strategies include smaller learning communities, multi-year advisories, transition courses for students entering high school with poor prior preparation, and multiple means of providing extra help (e.g., after-school coaching). The model also provides extensive training to help schools increase attendance, improve school climate and discipline, and create academic recovery programs for students. To support the education of students with disabilities, TDHS instructional facilitators help special education and regular education teachers who work in inclusion classrooms learn to adapt the model's courses for these students. The facilitators also help assist teacher teams and academies create positive and inclusive climates in schools with large special education populations.

Special Considerations

None.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Balfanz, R., & Jordan, W. (2001). *Catching up: The impact of the Talent Development High Schools ninth grade instructional program* (Interim Report). Baltimore: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk.

McPartland, J., Balfanz, R., Jordan, W., & Legters, N. (1998). Improving climate and achievement in a troubled urban high school through the Talent Development Model. *Journal of Education for Students Placed At Risk, 3,* 337-361.

Independent Researchers

Corbett, H. D., & Wilson, B. L. (2000). *Students' perspectives on the ninth grade academy of the Talent Development High Schools in Philadelphia: 1999-2000.* Philadelphia, PA: Philadelphia Education Fund.

Philadelphia Education Fund. (2000). *The Talent Development High School: First-year results of the ninth grade success academy in two Philadelphia schools 1999-2000.* Philadelphia: Author.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Edison High School 151 West Luzerne Street Philadelphia, PA 19140 215-324-9440 Contact: Joseph E. Lebron	2,809	large city	18%	0%	2%	78%	3%	91%	18%	18%
Strawberry Mansion High School 3133 Ridge Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19121 215-684-5089 Contact: Charles Highsmith	1,539	large city	99%	0%	0%	1%	0%	90%	0%	10%
Northern High School 2201 Pinewood Avenue Baltimore, MD 21214 410-396-6435 Contact: Betty Donaldson	1,767	large city	93%	<1%	<1%	<1%	6%	35%	0%	20%
Wingate High School PO Box 2 Fort Wingate, NM 87316 505-488-6418 Contact: Adam Bull	250	rural	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	96%	48%	20%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

James McPartland
Talent Development High School
3003 North Charles Street, Suite 200
Baltimore, MD 21218
Phone: 410-516-8800
Fax: 410-516-8890
E-mail: jmcpartland@csos.jhu.edu

Accepted for Inclusion September 2000
Description Written December 2000

Talent Development Middle School (4–9)

IN BRIEF Talent Development Middle School	
Founder	Johns Hopkins University
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1995
# Schools Served (6/1/00)	21
Level	4-9
Primary Goal	to create high-performing schools by providing all teachers with training, support, and materials and all students with standards-based learning opportunities and supportive learning environments
Main Features	• focused and sustained professional development • standards-based instructional programs in each subject • frequent extra help • restructuring of school organization and staffing
Impact on Instruction	high level core curriculum for all students combined with hands-on, inquiry-oriented teaching strategies
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	small learning communities with looping and subject-area teams
Impact on Schedule	double period for reading/ language arts; extra help and acceleration scheduled as electives
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	yes: reading/language arts, math, science, U.S. history, career exploration, extra help
Parental Involvement	Epstein's Partnership Schools model for establishing strategic school-family-community partnerships
Technology	integrated into curricular areas; extra help program requires a 10-computer lab
Materials	some provided by developer

Origin/Scope

The Talent Development Middle School (TDMS) is a whole-school reform model developed by researchers, educators, and curriculum writers at Johns Hopkins University in collaboration with middle school practitioners. The TDMS four-year pilot included five schools in Philadelphia. The model currently serves 21 schools in four states.

General Description

The TDMS mission is to establish standards-driven curriculum, instruction, school organization, and professional development that enable all students to learn challenging academic material and prepare for future education and careers. Key elements of the reform include: (a) Student Team Literature, a cooperative learning approach to reading/language arts; (b) a research- and standards-based math curriculum built around materials developed by the University of Chicago School Mathematics Project and designed to enable all students to succeed in algebra in eighth grade; (c) an inquiry-oriented science curriculum linked to national standards; (d) a U.S. history course built around a multicultural narrative series; and (e) extra help programs in mathematics and reading for students who need it.

Other elements include a three-year career and education exploration course; membership in the National Network of Partnership Schools (a network designed to help schools build strong relationships with parents and communities); and professional development in reading, language arts, mathematics, science, and U.S. history, with follow-up in-school support. TDMS also encourages changes in organizational structures when possible. These include small learning communities, looping, teaching teams, common planning periods, and semi-departmentalization. Finally, the model includes a program for creating positive learning and teaching climates in schools.

Results

TDMS model developers and researchers closely associated with the model conducted a series of controlled studies in Philadelphia on the impact of the model on students' reading and math achievement. One study examined reading scores at two schools, Central East and Cooke Middle, and their comparisons on the Stanford 9 test. During the first year of implementation of Student Team Literature, Cooke students outgained comparison students by 5 scale score points; this variation is not statistically significant. In another study, Central East TDMS students outgained control students by 12 points over the course of one academic year, a statistically significant variation. Yet another study showed that in math, Cooke students outgained comparison students by over 3 NCEs in Total Mathematics Achievement over one academic year, also a statistically significant variation. These schools have continued to display achievement gains in all subsequent years for which data are available. For example, in reading comprehension at Central East Middle School, the average annual effect size (measuring how much a typical Central East student outgained a typical comparison student each year) across a three-year span was 0.29 standard deviations. An effect size of over 0.25 is generally considered educationally significant. At Cooke, the average two-year gain was 14 NCEs in math and 14 NCEs in reading versus a 7 NCE gain in math and an 8 NCE gain in reading at Cooke's comparison school.

Additionally, independent researchers report positive effects on pedagogy, content, and learning environment.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The TDMS program is housed at the Center for the Social Organization of Schools at Johns Hopkins University. The program has 26 full- and six part-time staff members.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** At least 80 percent of a school's faculty and professional staff must vote in favor of the model by secret ballot.
- ***Initial Training:*** Teachers receive 36 hours of professional development per year per subject from a TDMS instructional facilitator, usually as a combination of after-school and half-day Saturday sessions. However, TDMS will plan a schedule that meets schools' needs. Teachers in the core subject areas implementing the model participate. In communities where TDMS works with more than one school, teachers rotate schools for workshops. Otherwise, workshops are on-site. The instructional facilitator in each subject area works with designated school staff to design the training. The training, which is grade and subject specific, generally involves extensive content information, teaching strategies such as cooperative learning, lesson modeling and review, and facilitation support.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** There are two tiers of follow-up support. First, the model recommends that TDMS instructional facilitators provide 10-20 days of on-site coaching per subject per year for at least two years. Second, each school appoints a local curriculum coach and one or more lead teachers (ideally, one per core subject area), all of whom receive additional training from TDMS and provide on-going support to colleagues. The curriculum coach is released from some teaching duties; the lead teachers may continue to teach full-time.
- ***Networking:*** A week-long summer institute is held each August for teachers and other

Research, policy, and practice in the education of poor and minority adolescents (pp. 292-319). Mahwey, NJ: Erlbaum. Available online: www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/Reports/report15.pdf

Plank, S. B., & Young, E. (2000). *Lessons for scaling up: Evaluations of the Talent Development Middle School's Student Team Literature Program* (CRESPAR Report No. 46). Baltimore & Washington, DC: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk. Available online: www.csos.jhu.edu/crespar/Reports/report46.pdf

Development Middle School training and curriculum. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Education Fund.

Wilson, B. L., & Corbett, H. D. (1999). *"No excuses": The eighth grade year in six Philadelphia middle schools.* Philadelphia: Philadelphia Education Fund.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Central East (5-8) 238 East Wyoming Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19120 215-456-3012 Principal: John Frangipani	1,104	large city	29%	0%	12%	47%	11%	90%	M	M
Cooke (5-8) 13th and Louden Street Philadelphia, PA 19141 215-456-3002 Principal: Joann Cooke	1,040	large city	80%	<1%	12%	7%	1%	86%	M	M
Clemente (5-8) 122 West Erie Avenue Philadelphia, PA 19140 215-291-5400 Principal: Patricia Mazzuca	1,482	large city	31%	<1%	<1%	67%	1%	90%	M	M
Sherwood (6-8) 3480 Rhodes Avenue Memphis, TN 38111 901-325-4870 Principal: Denise Johnson	1,067	large city	97%	<1%	1%	1%	1%	90%	M	M

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M = Missing data.

For more information, contact:

Kathy Nelson, Field Manager
Talent Development Middle Schools
Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk
Johns Hopkins University
3003 North Charles Street, Suite 200
Baltimore, MD 21218
Phone: 410-516-6431
Fax: 410-516-8890
E-mail: knelson@csos.jhu.edu
Web site: www.csos.jhu.edu

Accepted for Inclusion June 1999
Description Written July 1999
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

The Learning Network (K–8)

IN BRIEF The Learning Network	
Founder	Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	over 200
Level	K-8
Primary Goal	to support schoolwide changes in teachers' theory and practice that lead to improved learning outcomes for children
Main Features	• builds into each school a mechanism for continuous professional development • uses classroom observation, action plans, and instructional dialogue as the vehicle for change • focuses on literacy as a key curricular area • emphasizes the Literacy Learning model: assessment, evaluation, planning, and teaching
Impact on Instruction	student-centered instruction using the Literacy Learning model
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	establishes critical triangle of support: principal, two teacher leaders, and TLN coordinator; requires substantial release time for teacher leaders starting in second year of implementation
Impact on Schedule	reading and writing become part of an expanded literacy block
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	yes (focus is currently on literacy; math focus is being developed)
Parental Involvement	expectation of parental involvement that is especially notable in the development of policy statements
Technology	Internet access for listserv support
Materials	administrator and teacher leader handbooks; key professional resources for teachers; core resources for instructional resource room

Origin/Scope

Literacy Learning in the Classroom, a four-day summer institute, was established by Richard C. Owen Publishers in 1989. Its purpose was to help teachers explore an approach developed in New Zealand called the Literacy Learning model, a theory of teaching and learning that puts children at the center of the curriculum. In 1992, the company created The Learning Network (TLN) to support schoolwide implementation of the Literacy Learning model. Over the past eight years, over 200 schools have joined the network.

General Description

The goals of TLN are to support changes in the attitudes, understandings, and behaviors of teachers that lead to improved learning outcomes for children, and to support long-lasting changes in the way the school organizes for teaching and learning.

TLN is based upon the belief that good classroom practice:

- crosses curricular boundaries;
- applies to any age group;
- establishes consistent language and procedures throughout the school;
- is founded on a view of teaching and learning as a cyclic activity.

The Literacy Learning model is the foundation for TLN. It consists of the four key elements of the teaching and learning cycle: assessment, evaluation, planning, and teaching, supported by an understanding of the reading process, the writing process, and the conditions that are favorable for learning. This cycle defines the process by which teachers make instructional decisions and then act on them. One strength of the model is that it is applicable to any teaching and learning situation, from a teacher working with kindergarten students to an administrator working with a group of teachers.

TLN is implemented by a critical triangle of professionals: the TLN coordinator, the school principal, and a team of two teacher leaders. Supported by the principal, the coordinator works directly with the teacher leaders during the first year. A key element of TLN is instructional dialogue, or professional conversation between the coordinator and the teacher leaders. After observing them in the classroom, the coordinator guides them through an exploration of teaching and learning designed to result in changes in classroom practice. During the second year, teacher leaders work through the same process with colleagues.

In the third and subsequent years the effort expands to include more of the faculty and to focus on developing the school as a learning organization. The critical triangle works with the faculty to identify a schoolwide focus and write policy statements that define the values and objectives of the school. Policy statements are content-specific documents that connect the collective beliefs of the staff to state and district requirements. Periodic evaluation of policy statement objectives provides guidance for ongoing professional development.

Results

Lasting changes in teacher behavior must precede changes in student achievement. In two separate studies, independent researchers reported significant changes in teachers' classroom practice in TLN schools in Arizona and Colorado.

The Colorado study also examined student achievement, reporting continuous improvement on three different measures (ITBS, Riverside Integrated Language Arts Performance Assessment, and a locally developed writing assessment) at the elementary school with the fullest implementation. Results for other schools in the study were mixed.

Numerous comparisons of students whose teachers are supported by TLN with students whose teachers have not received such support show consistent results in favor of TLN. For example, a quasi-experimental study of two fourth grade classes in Montana, one with a TLN teacher leader and the other with a non-TLN teacher, compared student scores on the ITBS. In all subjects tested except science (including reading, writing, language arts, math, and social studies), students in the TLN teacher's class demonstrated significant improvement from 1997 to 1998. The control group demonstrated significant improvement only in social studies. In Arlington, Texas, students in grades three through six whose teachers had been supported by TLN for two years showed mean gains in reading comprehension on the TAAS (Texas Assessment of Academic Skills) of almost 10 points from 1997 to 1998, compared to a mean gain of 3.5 points for students of non-TLN teachers. Similar results have been found in schools in Colorado, Florida, and Arizona using the ITBS, the SAT 9, and Florida Writes (a state performance assessment).

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** At present TLN has 16 part- and full-time coordinators. Each year a new class of 4 to 6 coordinators begins training. Training includes one year of support while coordinators are in their own classrooms, two years of intensive support while they work with schools, and continuing support for as long as they are working with TLN.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** TLN expects each school eventually to implement the model schoolwide. This generally does not happen at the outset, however. The school needs the advocacy of the principal, the commitment of a core group of teachers, and at least two qualified candidates for training as teacher leaders.

- ***Initial Training:*** Prior to the first year of implementation, the principal and teacher leader candidates attend the four-day summer institute, Literacy Learning in the Classroom. Each summer thereafter the teachers who will be supported the following year by a teacher leader attend the institute.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** A key component of TLN is the training of two school-based teacher leaders. During the first year, the coordinator makes a monthly visit to the school and spends much of the time observing and engaging teacher leaders in instructional dialogue (discussed above). In year two the teacher leaders begin working in similar fashion with colleagues on a weekly basis. The coordinator works alongside the teacher leaders, providing support as needed.
- ***Networking:*** The principal and teacher leaders participate in twice-monthly focus meetings with counterparts from other schools in their class. (The basic design calls for four schools per class.) They also attend the annual leadership seminar and the annual conference. A listserv is available for additional networking.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Benchmarks and Indicators of Teaching are used by teacher leaders to measure progress. Additionally, the school prepares an End-of-Year Review each year. After the end of the second year, TLN is available for periodic support, limited to a maximum of four days in each year. This support monitors the effectiveness of the school in reaching set goals.

Costs

For the first two years, the charge for the TLN coordinator is $12,000 per year. Coordinator travel expenses, if applicable, are extra. All members of the faculty eventually attend the summer institute, which is $350 per person. The leadership seminar (for the principal and two teacher leaders) is $250 per person. The principal and teacher leaders are required to purchase professional resources that cost about $100 per person. During the first two years there is no charge for registration at The Learning Network Conference for the principal and teacher leaders, but they do have to pay travel expenses.

In year one, teacher leaders need approximately 16 days of release time each (partial support in each of 8 days to work with the coordinator and 2 half-days per month for focus group meetings). In year two, TLN recommends 50 percent release time for each teacher leader. (In other words, the school will be adding one FTE.) Some release time also will have to be provided for the 16 teachers to be supported by the two teacher leaders. Additionally, the school will begin to build an instructional resource room.

Student Populations

Having been implemented in locations as diverse as New York City and Readsboro, Vermont, TLN has demonstrated its appropriateness for urban as well as rural schools. Many of its schools are Title I. Several in Denver and Texas are bilingual schools. No special materials are required for implementation in such schools, although TLN does publish a few Spanish language resources for young children. Special needs populations are included in all aspects of the model, which leads toward inclusion in the regular classroom.

Special Considerations

Any situation that promotes change has the potential to produce resistance. The goal of TLN is not to tell people what to do, but to help teachers understand teaching and learning in

ways that lead to productive change. TLN helps the leadership team become proactive in dealing with resistance. Problem solving becomes part of the school culture.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Elser, T. (1999). *A quasi-experimental, comparative case study of The Learning Network as implemented by Arlee Elementary School.* Unpublished manuscript.

Independent Researchers

Spencer, D. A. (1998). *The Phoenix ExCel Promising Places Project: Learning Network evaluation.* Unpublished manuscript.

Billig, S. H., Lurie, J., & Hoffman, D. (1998). *Aurora balanced literacy approach: Impact on achievement.* Denver: RMC Research Corporation.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Montview Elementary School 2055 Moline Street Aurora, CO 80010 303-364-8549 Contact: Debbie Backus	856	urban fringe of large city	28%	1%	5%	44%	22%	75%	68%	8%
Maple Elementary School 429 Division Street Jeffersonville, IN 47130 812-288-4860 Contact: Cathy Graninger	374	urban fringe of large city	31%	1%	1%	0%	67%	55%	1%	24%
Prairie Park Elementary School 2711 Kensington Lawrence, KS 66046 785-832-5740 Contact: Vicki Weseman	436	mid-size city	11%	6%	1%	3%	78%	26%	0%	15%
Auburn Elementary School 4612 Auburn Road NE Salem, OR 97301 503-399-3128 Contact: Sue Peters	566	mid-size city	1%	2%	2%	10%	85%	55%	83%	15%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Richard C. Owen, President
The Learning Network
Richard C. Owen Publishers, Inc.
PO Box 585
Katonah, NY 10536

Phone: 914-232-3903
Fax: 914-232-3977
E-mail: RichardOwen@rcowen.com
Web site: http://www.rcowen.com

Accepted for Inclusion September 2000
Description Written December 2000

Turning Points (6–8)

IN BRIEF Turning Points	
Founder	Center for Collaborative Education
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1998
# Schools Served (6/1/00)	30
Level	6-8
Primary Goal	improving teaching, learning, and achievement for all students in middle schools, including those with special needs
Main Features	• building leadership capacity and a professional collaborative culture • using data-based inquiry and decision making • creating a school culture to support high achievement and personal development • networking with other schools • developing district capacity to support school change
Impact on Instruction	wide range of flexible instructional strategies and curriculum
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	shared decision making through a representative leadership team; teacher teams engaged in curricular and organizational decisions; external coach and in-house facilitator
Impact on Schedule	flexible schedules with longer blocks of learning and common planning time
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	focus on building parent and community partnerships including involvement in decision making and students' learning
Technology	Internet access for support through interactive TP Web site
Materials	Turning Points Guides, including teacher resources covering TP Practices, literacy, and numeracy

Origin/Scope

Turning Points is a middle school change design developed and coordinated by the Center for Collaborative Education in Boston, Massachusetts. The design, a New American Schools model, is based on the *Turning Points* report issued by the Carnegie Corporation in 1989, which concentrated on the considerable risks that young adolescents face as they reach the "turning point" between childhood and adulthood. In 1999, the first year of implementation as the Turning Points Model, there were 30 schools in three states.

General Description

Turning Points is a comprehensive school reform design for middle school change that seeks to create high-performing schools, especially those serving high percentages of low-income students and students of color. The model includes support through on-site coaching, networking, professional development, a self-study survey, resource guides, a Web site, and an accountability process. The goal of this systemic approach is to dramatically improve teaching, learning, and achievement for all students, including those with special needs. In order to sustain whole school change, middle level schools engage in the following six practices based on the Turning Points principles:

Improving Learning, Teaching, and Assessment for All Students: Faculty use local and state standards to develop curriculum with a focus on literacy and numeracy, select instructional strategies to meet the diverse needs of all students, and develop authentic assessments.

Building Leadership Capacity and a Professional Collaborative Culture: Faculty create a democratic school community, establish a leadership team and teacher study groups, examine

student and teacher work, and engage in other ongoing professional learning.
Data-Based Inquiry and Decision Making: Faculty and students complete an annual self-study survey on all areas of the school. These data, together with a range of other measures, are used to identify strengths and gaps, and develop solutions for improving learning.
Creating a School Culture to Support High Achievement and Personal Development: Schools redirect resources to create small learning communities, eliminate rigid ability grouping, create longer blocks of learning time, and build family and community partnerships.
Networking with Like-Minded Schools: Schools engage in a supportive professional network, participating in a range of school-year and summer network activities.
Developing District Capacity to Support School Change: Districts partner with Turning Points schools to provide them with increased flexibility and autonomy to be innovative.

Results

No systematic evaluations have been conducted on the impact of Turning Points among the schools implementing the new design. However, studies have focused on the impact of reform efforts in schools using the Turning Points principles. The Center for Prevention Research and Development at the University of Illinois conducted a Self Study Survey of the Middle Start Initiative (Turning Points) in Michigan, comparing 20 schools receiving grants to implement the design with 127 other schools in the state not receiving this grant. The study showed that schools implementing the Turning Points principles improved in reading by 10 percent (versus a 4 percent gain by non-grant schools) and in math by 6 percent (versus 4 percent by non-grant schools) between 1994-95 and 1996-97 on the Michigan Educational Assessment Program. Achievement data were not disaggregated by demographic indicators.

Another study by the same center examined 31 middle schools in Illinois that agreed to implement the Turning Points principles. The study reported that after two years (from 1990-91 to 1991-92), sixth- and eighth-grade students in schools with high levels of implementation outperformed students in lower-implementing schools on the state achievement test by 275 to 247 in reading, 315 to 254 in language, and 298 to 248 in mathematics (the state mean score was 250 with a standard deviation of 50 points). Over the two-year period, composite test scores of high-implementation schools improved by 21 points, compared to a one-point decline in scores at the lowest-implementing schools. This pattern held for at-risk students as well as the general student population.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The Turning Points National Center is in Boston. Regional Centers include the Association of Illinois Middle Schools (AIMS), Public Education and Business Coalition (PEBC) based in Denver, and the Missouri School Reform Center.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Before a school adopts Turning Points, faculty research and discuss reform models and explore what it means to be a Turning Points school. A faculty vote is taken, and 80 percent approval is required for joining the Turning Points Network.
- ***Initial Training:*** An initial exploration phase consists of on-site and offsite meetings and workshops. This phase may take place from two to six months before the model is formally implemented. It involves up to three meetings with school leaders and/or faculty and takes from four to eight hours spread over this period. Turning Points staff communicate with an Exploring Team, a school team that includes the principal and volunteers representing each grade or discipline team. Activities include an overview of

the Turning Points design, the coach's role, and the Memorandum of Agreement, along with an informal assessment of the school.

- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Schools receive 30 days per year of support from Turning Points. The Turning Points coach supports teachers' professional development and builds shared leadership, meeting regularly with the leadership team, principal and in-house facilitator, academic and discipline-based teams, study groups, and the full faculty to assist the school in implementing the six practices.
- ***Networking:*** Networking opportunities include three network meetings each school year, a four-day summer leadership institute, a three-day summer institute for teacher teams, two-day critical friends visits between member schools, school labs, and a National Conference. The model publishes a national newsletter and is developing an interactive Web site and e-mail service. The Web site will host facilitated discussion groups on the six practices and post tools, strategies, school-developed curriculum units, and information and research on the model.
- ***Implementation Review:*** All Turning Points schools complete the Self Study Survey developed by the Center for Prevention Research and Development once every two years. The survey provides comprehensive data on school demographics, teaching, learning, assessment, teaming, leadership, climate, and student adjustment and behavior. In addition, schools use the Turning Points Benchmarks to measure progress in an annual assessment and goal-setting process, and in a more intensive School Quality Review every three to four years.

Costs

Full implementation of the Turning Points model costs schools approximately $50,000 per year. The fee covers all materials and services (including 30 days of coaching, network meetings and summer institutes, and administering the Self Study Survey). It may vary somewhat according to the school's context. Additional costs to the school include the time of the in-house facilitator, faculty release time, and/or stipends.

Student Populations

Turning Points, based on ten years of research and practice in urban, rural, and suburban middle schools, seeks to create high-performing schools serving high percentages of low-income students and students of color. Work with rural middle schools focuses on building the capacity of school-based facilitators and using the Turning Points Web site for ongoing professional development and networking.

Special Considerations

Schools must commit to having a common planning time and scheduled time for professional development, a representative Leadership Team, and assessment of progress.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Fellner, R. D, Jackson, A. W., Kasak, D., Mulhall, P., Brand, S., & Flowers, N. (1997, March). The impact of school reform for the middle years: Longitudinal study of a network engaged in *Turning Points*-based comprehensive

Independent Researchers

DePascale, C. A. (1997). *Education Reform Restructuring Network: Impact documentation report.* Cambridge, MA: Data Analysis & Testing Associates.

Mertens, S. B, Flowers, N., & Mulhall, P. (1998). *The Middle*

school transformation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, pp. 528-550.

Start Initiative, phase I: A longitudinal analysis of Michigan middle-grades schools. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois, Center for Prevention Research and Development. Available online: http://www.cprd.uiuc.edu/

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Lincoln Middle School 700 Mary Peoria, IL 61603 309-672-6542 Principal: Ron Hayes	402	mid-size city	56%	2%	3%	8%	21% (10% multi-racial)	87%	3%	18%
Eastgate Middle School 4700 NE Parvin Road Kansas City, MO 64117 816-413-5800 Principal: Tim Mattson	925	large city	8%	<1%	3%	3%	84%	42%	15%	20%
Amherst Regional Middle School 70 Chestnut Street Amherst, MA 01002 413-549-9845 Principal: Mary Cavalier	691	urban fringe of mid-size city	8%	1%	9%	7%	75%	25%	5%	M
John McCormack Middle School 315 Mt Vernon Dorchester, MA 02125 617-635-8657 Principal: Muriel Leonard	760	large city	51%	<1%	5%	30%	14%	86%	27%	M

The data in this table are reported for the 1999-2000 school year. M= Missing data.

For more information, contact:

Leah Rugen
National Turning Points Program Director
Turning Points National Center
1135 Tremont Street, Suite 490
Boston, MA 02120
Phone: 617-421-0134
Fax: 617-421-9016
E-mail: lrugen@ccebos.org
Web site: http://www.turningpts.org

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted November 2001
Description Updated January 2002

Urban Learning Centers (PreK–12)

IN BRIEF Urban Learning Centers	
Founder	Los Angeles Unified School District; United Teachers Los Angeles; Los Angeles Educational Partnership
Current Service Provider	National center based at the Los Angeles Educational Partnership
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (9/1/01)	31
Level	preK-12
Primary Goal	to build learning environments where high-quality instruction is supported by a well organized school that is strongly connected to its community
Main Features	• thematic, interdisciplinary curriculum • transitions from school to work and postsecondary education • integrated health and human services on school site • collaborative governance model
Impact on Instruction	program works with staff to develop curriculum and instructional approaches
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	structural changes (e.g., heterogeneously grouped classrooms, team teaching); shared decision making with school community
Impact on Schedule	school is likely to be open for longer hours and throughout summer; block scheduling is an option
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	parental involvement in governance; school/home partnerships; adult programs on K-12 campus
Technology	technology supports all elements of the design; cost varies
Materials	no information available

Origin/Scope

The Urban Learning Centers design (originally called Los Angeles Learning Centers) emerged in 1992 when it was chosen as one of the New American Schools Design Teams. It was a joint effort of the Los Angeles Unified School District, the United Teachers Los Angeles, and the Los Angeles Educational Partnership. Initially the design was implemented in two schools in Los Angeles. As of September 2001, it had been implemented schoolwide in 31 schools. Another 13 schools had implemented components of the model.

General Description

The Urban Learning Centers model is a comprehensive design for urban schools that calls for their reinvention into preK-12 "articulated communities," or systems for collaboration between all grade levels and schools (if K-12 is not contained on one campus). The design grows out of the work of experienced teachers and other educators, parents, community members, curriculum developers, technology specialists, and managerial consultants.

Each learning center comprises three essential strands:

- ***Teaching and Learning:*** The Urban Learning Centers model seeks to make education for each student as flexible and meaningful as possible within a framework of high standards for all. The model helps teachers develop a thematic, interdisciplinary curriculum that is integrated with state standards. Students learn by exploring issues of importance to them, often through projects rooted in the local community. The model promotes the use of various structures that help teachers know each student well: (a) division of students into

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The national Urban Learning Centers headquarters is based at the Los Angeles Educational Partnership. Seven full-time educators are on staff there, including two field directors, in addition to some 25 part-time consultants. A satellite office has opened in Utah, with a full-time field director and 6 part-time consultants.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** The Urban Learning Centers model requires the support of school leadership, consensus of the school community, a signed memo of understanding, and the allocation of 1.5 FTE (full-time equivalent) for staff to coordinate implementation.
- ***Initial Training:*** Training is customized at each school based on the school's needs and the resources available. Generally, selected school and district staff, parents, and other stakeholders attend a three- to four-day institute in Los Angeles prior to implementation, where they tour model sites, assess and prioritize needs, and begin to develop an improvement plan.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** During the first two years of implementation, Urban Learning Centers field directors and consultants may provide up to 80 person-days of on- and off-site training. Training focuses on the three model strands (teaching and learning, learning supports, and governance and management) as well as on self-assessment and collaboration with other schools. During the second year, teachers generally receive training in the use of computer technology to enhance instruction and analyze data. Urban Learning Centers staff also help schools coordinate subject-area training from other organizations as necessary.
- ***Networking:*** Urban Learning Centers has a 1-800 hotline and e-mail for technical support, a resource library of materials on best practices and standards that match the design, and a Web site for supporting information.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Urban Learning Centers staff work with each school annually to analyze progress in student achievement and implementation.

Costs

The cost of the Urban Learning Centers design depends upon the size of the school; the number of students, faculty, and tracks; and the school's specific needs. Based on these variables, Urban Learning Centers contracts range from $25,000 to over $140,000 for the first two years of support. Following is the standard full implementation package offered to large schools (1,000 or more students):

Service	*Cost*
Self Assessment and Strategic Planning	$12,000
Field Director	$12,000
Teaching and Learning	$22,000
Governance and Management	$22,000
Learning Supports	$22,000
Full Implementation at a Large Single Site	$90,000

Schools must allocate 1.5 FTE for staff to coordinate implementation. Schools may also have to cover expenses for selected staff to attend a three- to four-day institute in Los Angeles.

Schools may reduce costs and/or increase the days of service by participating in joint training with neighboring or feeder schools. Schools also may choose to focus initially on selected areas of implementation, such as Self Assessment.

Finally, schools may contract for a basic package of post-implementation services for $2,500. The package entitles schools to membership in the Urban Learning Centers network, which includes a newsletter; five registrations for the annual institute; technical assistance via phone, e-mail, and Web site; and continued analysis of the school's achievement data and implementation status. Schools may continue to contract for on-site technical assistance at the daily rate of $1,000 plus expenses.

State Standards and Accountability

Urban Learning Centers helps schools align their current curriculum to the standards of their state and/or district. Through a curriculum mapping process, the school investigates its curricula and instructional strategies to ensure that they match the standards. State and district assessments as well as school-created performance assessments are used to compare student achievement to the standards.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners (ELL), and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

Urban Learning Centers is highlighted in three categories: urban, high poverty, and ELL. The design was developed in Los Angeles primarily to support large urban schools serving high percentages of poor and ELL students. Trainers have extensive experience working with such schools. Part of the Urban Learning Centers design involves structures for dividing large schools into more manageable units (such as career academies at the high school level). The design also focuses on connecting schools to social service agencies, improving crisis assistance and prevention, and redoubling efforts to make parents, particularly parents of ELL students, feel welcome. Teachers attend workshops on best instructional practices for ELL students. Finally, the design supports the use of a schoolwide character curriculum and service learning opportunities that foster multicultural awareness and a sense of value for second languages.

Special Considerations

Urban Learning Centers is designed to serve two to five elementary and secondary schools located in the same neighborhood and sharing the same student population. An ideal combination is three elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. However, the design can also accommodate other combinations that bridge elementary and secondary levels.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Johnson, J., & Pruitt, G. (2001). [Urban Learning Centers: School profiles and data reports 1994-2000]. Unpublished raw data.

Independent Researchers

Guiton, G., & Keinze, M. (2001). *Report of a one-year study into Urban Learning Centers scale-up efforts in twenty schools.* Unpublished manuscript.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Foshay Learning Center (K-12) 3751 South Harvard Boulevard Los Angeles, CA 90018 323-735-0241 Contact: Howard Lappin	3,426	large city	30%	0%	0%	70%	0%	90%	33%	9%
Laurel Elementary 1321 West Laurel Street Compton, CA 90220 310-898-6440 Contact: Steven Schatz	379	urban fringe of large city	15%	0%	0%	85%	0%	89%	80%	4%
Westwood Middle School 500 Apollo Street Danville, VA 24540 804-797-8860 Contact: Laurell Malone	598	mid-size city	67%	0%	0%	0%	33%	53%	1%	16%
Pleasant Green Elementary 8201 West 2700 South Magna, UT 84044 801-250-8635 Contact: Judith Kissell	770	urban fringe of mid-size city	1%	2%	3%	13%	81%	41%	9%	3%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Rita Flynn, Director
Urban Learning Centers
315 West 9th Street, Suite 1110
Los Angeles, CA 90015
Phone: 213-622-5237, ext. 274
Fax: 213-629-5288
E-mail: rflynn@laep.org
Web site: http://www.urbanlearning.org

Accepted for Inclusion March 1999
Description Written April 1999
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

Ventures Initiative and Focus® System (K–12)

IN BRIEF Ventures Initiative and Focus System	
Founder	Ventures In Education, Inc.
Current Service Provider	Ventures Education Systems Corporation
Year Established	1981
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	191
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	to raise students' academic performance
Main Features	• development of students' communication/thinking skills • student-centered instruction • interdisciplinary project learning • a balanced approach to early literacy • literacy instruction for older students based on application of thinking skills
Impact on Instruction	transition to instruction that is student-centered, inquiry-based, project-based, arts-infused, and aligned with standards
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	leadership training with a focus on student performance
Impact on Schedule	time required for professional development workshops, collaborative planning, and study
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	yes (particularly science, math, and literacy)
Parental Involvement	parents apprised at beginning and end of year; parent(s) may be included in training cohort
Technology	integration of instructional methods and technology with content
Materials	provided by developer (*e.g.*, books from various publishers, tapes, worksheets, monthly forms for measuring staff development progress)

Origin/Scope

The Ventures Initiative and Focus Comprehensive Reform System was developed by Ventures In Education, Inc. Begun in 1981 as a funded program of the Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation and established as an independent corporation in 1990, Ventures In Education has granted to its affiliate company, Ventures Education Systems Corporation (VESC), exclusive rights to market the Ventures Initiative and Focus system to schools. As of May 2001, VESC had worked with 191 schools.

General Description

The goal of the Ventures Initiative and Focus system is to raise the academic achievement of minority and economically disadvantaged students so that they are performing at or above grade level and are well-prepared to enter the work force or pursue higher education upon graduation. This is accomplished by providing teachers with long-term staff development in student-centered, inquiry-based instructional strategies that are fully integrated with content and aligned with national, state, and local standards.

The Ventures Initiative and Focus system is a synthesis of applied teaching and learning methods. Its step-by-step approach is designed to lead to more effective classroom management and school functioning. The system is based on research in the cognitive and neurological sciences. Specifically, the approach:

- Establishes an educational environment conducive to lifelong learning — by teaching students to communicate constructively and to work effectively together and alone
- Guides students to learn, master, and retain new information, to seek resolution of complex problems, and to complete interdisciplinary projects

- Provides a balanced literacy approach integrating phonological awareness and language-based literacy instruction for grades K-3, and structured thinking skills and content instruction for grades 4-12
- Aligns measurable goals for student performance and achievement with schoolwide curricula and instruction, as well as with national, state, and local content and performance standards, across all grade levels and academic disciplines
- Creates opportunities for school-to-job/career learning (through problem-based learning and project learning) as students interact with community members from a variety of fields
- Helps administrators learn to assess student performance on standardized tests so they can identify areas that require improvement
- Invites selected parents and community members to participate in staff development and offer their professional expertise in the classroom
- Helps senior administrators evolve from managers of day-to-day operations to facilitators of the change process and leaders in curriculum and instruction

Results

In the 1980s, an earlier version of the Ventures program served selected students in 39 urban and rural high schools attended largely by poor and minority students. A study published by the McKenzie Group in 1990 reported that, among other positive findings, Ventures students scored considerably higher on the SAT than their same-race peers across the country. An interim report on more than 50 high schools involved in a Ventures in Science program from 1993-96 noted improvements across sites in students' math and science grades. A 1995 study of the first two years of the Walks of Life program, a New York City school-to-work program of which the Ventures Initiative and Focus system was a cornerstone, concluded that it was too early to discern significant differences between Walks of Life schools and comparison schools in students' math and reading performance.

Data from these and other sources show improvements in students' scores on a variety of standardized tests at individual Ventures schools. For example, at an Arkansas school, average ACT scores rose from 16 to 21 over a two-year period. After 11th grade teachers at an Alabama school had undergone Ventures training, 11th grade students outscored the prior year's cohort on the Stanford Achievement Test in reading comprehension and English by wide margins. The number of Regents exams passed by students at a high school in the Bronx increased by 146 percent over a five-year period.

Increases on other indicators (e.g., enrollment in Advanced Placement courses, graduation rate, college attendance, and acceptance into medical school) also suggest the impact the Ventures Initiative and Focus system has had on students.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** VESC's New York City office includes a staff of 10 who supervise all planning, training, and on-site coaching activities for a network of close to 100 professional educators around the country. Each school's cohort of participating teachers and administrators is matched with a school-based trainer who lives in the vicinity.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** As a prerequisite for working with any school, VESC requires that the school leadership and a majority of the teaching staff are in support of such a partnership. VESC works collaboratively with the principal and leadership team from the creation of a

customized strategic plan and time line, through implementation, to completion of the contract.

- ***Initial Training:*** The initial component of the Ventures Initiative and Focus system is a +two-day staff development session for all participants, generally held at the school site. The session helps participants learn to establish an environment that eliminates negative communication and promotes constructive interaction and thinking. Effective techniques are demonstrated through experiential exercises that facilitate collaboration among students.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** During the first year, the VESC staff developer makes at least five site visits to each teacher's classroom to ensure systematic transition from a traditional to student-centered approach. In addition, periodic review sessions are held. If a school contains a large teaching staff, VESC can prepare cohorts of teachers and administrators to serve as master trainers for the rest of the faculty.
- ***Networking:*** All VESC schools have shared their experiences with each other and serve as resources for schools just beginning the program. A VESC Web site is currently under development.
- ***Implementation Review:*** VESC's strategy for monitoring progress in implementation includes: a Strategic Plan/Blueprint for Implementation that describes the sequence of professional development activities for each year; the gathering of baseline data at the beginning of each school year, which is used as a yardstick to measure changes; monthly implementation forms completed and shared by school leaders; workshops on the item analysis of student performance on standardized tests; end-of-year meetings for self-evaluation; and interim and final reports prepared by VESC.

Costs

Pricing includes on-site training workshops, training materials, in-class coaching days, and offsite support. Costs for implementing the Ventures Initiative and Focus system include the trainers, days, materials, and the time it takes to prepare, plan, train, implement, coach, and monitor the progress of implementation on-site and off-site.

For one cohort (with a maximum of 25 people), the average number of days in a year of professional development and training ranges from 25 to 30 at an average cost of $45,000 to $53,250 per cohort. The number of cohorts that can be trained at one time is unlimited.

VESC costs do not include meals, refreshments, or rental of off-site facilities if such are required. Since workshops are normally held during school hours and are generally full-day sessions, schools may incur per diem expenses to hire substitute teachers. If workshops are held after school or on weekends, schools may be required to pay stipends.

Student Populations

VESC has worked with youngsters from culturally diverse, disadvantaged, and special populations in both urban and rural settings, as well as on the Navajo Reservation. The majority of students have been eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. Some of the published materials used by VESC for training in constructive communication and effective group process are available in Spanish.

Special Considerations

Although data collected by VESC may be disseminated through reports, such reports will at no time identify by name the teachers or students involved.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Ventures In Education, Inc. (1995). *Final report: Problem-based learning teacher training, West Alabama Ventures In Education (WAVE) for the grant period September 13, 1993-September 30, 1995.* New York: Author.

Ventures In Education, Inc. (1996). *Ventures In Science: Insuring opportunity now (V.I.S.I.O.N.)* (Interim report for NSF-sponsored grant HRD-93500545). New York: Author.

Independent Researchers

Bailis, L. N. (1995). *Evaluation of Walks of Life: Second annual report.* Waltham, MA: Brandeis University.

McKenzie Group. (1990). *Expanding horizons: A vision for our high schools.* Washington, DC: Author.

McKenzie Group. (1994). *Expanding horizons: Success in high school and beyond.* Washington, DC: Author.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Miami Jackson Senior HS 1751 N.W. 36th Street Miami, FL 33142 305-634-2621 Contact: Louis Allen, Jr.	527	mid-size city	5%	10%	9%	33%	43%	76%	30%	17%
Christopher Columbus HS 925 Astor Place Bronx, NY 10469 718-231-5000 Contact: Gerald Garlin	3,449	large city	30%	<1%	8%	50%	11%	82%	16%	16%
Robinson Elementary School 5101 Burg Jones Lane Monroe, LA 71202 318-322-1784 Contact: Toreatha Chisley	453	urban fringe of mid-size city	98%	0%	0%	0%	2%	89%	0%	10%
Middle School 127/Castle Hill 1560 Purdy Street Bronx, NY 10462 718-892-8600 Contact: Jeffrey Roth	1,232	large city	36%	<1%	12%	49%	3%	82%	16%	5%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Maxine E. Bleich, President
Ventures Education Systems Corporation
245 Fifth Avenue, Suite 802
New York, NY 10016

Phone: 212-696-5717
Fax: 212-696-5726
E-mail: mbleich@ventures.org
Web site: http://www.vesc-education.com

Reading/Language Arts Models

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Re-accepted February 2002
Description Updated August 2002

Carbo Reading Styles Program (K–12)

IN BRIEF Carbo Reading Styles Program	
Founder	Marie Carbo
Current Service Provider	National Reading Styles Institute
Year Established	1975
# Schools Served (6/1/02)	62 comprehensive sites
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	to increase literacy by accommodating students' strongest learning styles and interests
Main Features	• teachers diagnose students' strengths and accommodate them with a range of reading strategies • Carbo Recorded-Book Method • comfortable, relaxed settings • individual and small group work
Impact on Instruction	teachers learn to identify students' learning styles and adjust instruction accordingly
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	program is facilitated though grade-level planning, coaching, mentor teachers, and an on-site staff facilitator (recommended)
Impact on Schedule	block scheduling is sometimes used to facilitate cooperative planning and curriculum alignment
Parental Involvement	encouraged
Technology	one listening center and at least three tape players with headsets per classroom; one high-quality tape recorder for every five teachers; Reading Style Inventory must be scored on computer
Materials	Reading Style Inventory, colored overlays, multi-leveled Carbo Recorded Books and short stories

Origin/Scope

The Carbo Reading Styles Program (RSP) was developed in 1975 by Marie Carbo, founder of the National Reading Styles Institute. As of June 2002, the program had been implemented comprehensively in 62 elementary and middle schools. Hundreds of other schools have implemented it at a high level, and thousands of schools, including some high schools, have implemented it at a basic level and/or have used reading styles materials with students.

General Approach

The idea behind the Carbo Reading Styles Program is to increase student literacy by making the process of learning to read so easy and enjoyable that students become motivated, confident, fluent readers. The program is designed to provide teachers with a thorough understanding of each student's individual learning style for reading, or "reading style." Teachers also learn a range of reading methods and classroom management strategies that accommodate their students' strongest learning pathways and interests. For example, teachers learn that many poor readers are global, tactile, and kinesthetic, and that hands-on materials and assisted reading are often the most effective methods for such youngsters.

All materials needed to implement RSP are provided to teachers participating in the comprehensive program. For example, teachers receive and learn how to administer the Reading Style Inventory®, which helps identify students' learning strengths and weaknesses and recommends the best ways to teach them. Teachers also receive assessment kits of colored overlays designed to help reduce dyslexia, a classroom library of recorded books and stories, hands-on materials for students, and practical training materials. During training sessions, teachers practice new skills, plan together, and create their own classroom materials, including recordings that use the Carbo Method.

The Carbo Reading Styles Program is designed to be compatible with a variety of reading programs and materials, such as basal readers, that may already be in place in a school.

Results

Independent researchers, program implementers, and the developer have conducted a number of studies of the Carbo Reading Styles Program over the past two decades. In one study, model developer staff members and an independent evaluator compared one-year reading gains of students in classrooms where teachers used the Carbo Reading Styles Program with gains of students in classrooms where teachers used the existing district program. Overall, the study involved 15 matched pairs of teachers from six school districts in six states. Students in the RSP classrooms outgained control students in 30 of 34 comprehension, word analysis, and vocabulary subtests (Barber, Carbo, & Thomasson, 1998).

In another evaluation, 13 classes from two similar schools in the mid-South region of the U.S. were matched on reading ability, aptitude, socioeconomic status, ethnic background, and student-to-teacher ratio. Teachers from six classes (three third-grade and three sixth-grade) were trained by the lead author of the evaluation to use the Carbo Reading Styles Program; teachers from seven comparison classes used the district curriculum. The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test was used to evaluate students' reading skills. Over a six-month period, the mean gain for the Carbo group was 10.9 points; the corresponding gain for the comparison group was 6.4 points, a statistically significant difference (Oglesby & Suter, 1995).

The model's impact on special education students has also been evaluated. An independent researcher investigated the impact of Carbo Reading Styles Program on 40 learning disabled students in an elementary school in Washington state, using 48 learning disabled students in a similar school as a control group (LaShell, 1986). Over the nine months of the study, the Carbo group gained 15 months in reading while the control group gained four months, as measured by the Gray Oral Reading Test. This difference was statistically significant.

Reports on comprehensive RSP implementation also show positive results. For example, an elementary school in Texas adopted RSP schoolwide in the 1994-1995 school year. In spring of 1995, 75 percent of students at the school passed the TAAS in reading, compared to 46 percent the previous year (Skipper, 1997).

Little information is available regarding the impact of the Carbo Reading Styles Program on high schools.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The Carbo Reading Styles Program uses a core group of 10 full-time trainers and 30 part-time trainers.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** A 75 percent staff buy-in is required for the comprehensive program.
- ***Initial Training:*** Before training for the comprehensive program begins, a building team composed of the principal, two teachers, and a site facilitator (a recommended but not required position) visit an exemplary RSP School and work with the principal and faculty there. Then the team develops its initial school vision, school plan, and timelines for implementation. Teams are further trained at the National Reading Styles Conference and attend strands that accommodate their needs. The entire faculty also participates in four days of on-site training.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** During the first year of comprehensive implementation, RSP consultants provide eight days of technical assistance, including principal support, team

building, individual teacher feedback, and in-class demonstration lessons. Schools receive an additional eight days of technical assistance during the second year and six days during the third year. RSP consultants also train one or more members of the teaching staff to be reading styles facilitators so they can provide ongoing support.

- ***Networking:*** RSP offers regional seminars, an annual national conference, a Web site (including a discussion forum), and a regular national e-mail newsletter.
- ***Implementation Review:*** The primary RSP consultant assigned to a school offers continual evaluation of implementation to individual teachers and to the principal, both informally and formally through reports. In addition, a detailed checklist, the Degree of Reading Styles Implementation Checklist, allows teachers and schools to measure their own implementation. The checklist is used as a self-check and also as part of an outside evaluation of the program.

Costs

Costs for the comprehensive program are based on the specific plan upon which participating schools/districts and RSP agree. Specific costs depend on the number of teachers, number of schools, and level of involvement. Average costs are $45,000 to $65,000 for the first year and $35,000 to $50,000 for years two and three.

Year one fees cover classroom and training materials, four days of training, eight days of technical assistance, and evaluation. Building teams (the principal, two teachers, and a site facilitator if a school opts to have one) also receive two days of implementation training, registration for the National Reading Styles Conference, and a visit to a model school. Fees for Years Two and Three include training, technical assistance, materials, and registration for the National Reading Styles Conference for 10 staff members. Schools should allow an additional $10,000 to $15,000 per year for expenses related to staff travel, substitute teachers, and equipment.

State Standards and Accountability

Carbo Reading Styles Program consultants have analyzed reading standards from many states and identified those that most states have in common. These standards have been incorporated into the Carbo Reading Styles Program classroom materials. Carbo Reading Styles Program consultants use their knowledge of state standards to incorporate these goals into their trainings. In addition, the Carbo Reading Styles Program helps teachers learn how to identify students' weak areas on state and standardized tests and how to strengthen those areas through targeted instruction.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

The Carbo Reading Styles Program is highlighted in four categories: urban, rural, high poverty, and special education. It offers a number of features for students in each category:

- ***Urban:*** The program uses multi-sensory materials and multicultural books.

- ***Rural:*** The program offers flexible training, technical assistance to accommodate low numbers of substitutes, and training videos.
- ***High Poverty:*** Consultants provide guidance to schools in obtaining low- or no-cost materials and equipment and in setting up after-school reading programs.
- ***Special Education:*** The Reading Style Inventory can be used to develop Individualized Education Plans (IEPs). A special modification section is provided for mainstream teachers. Trainers work with staff on "push in" and "pull out" methods.

Special Considerations

The RSP program requires the following resources: Reading Style Inventory materials (test booklets and disks), Carbo Recorded Books, one listening center and at least three tape players with headsets per classroom, and one high-quality tape recorder for every five teachers. Teachers are encouraged to create comfortable reading environments for students.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Barber, L., Carbo, M., & Thomasson, R. (1998). *A comparative study of the Reading Styles Program to extant programs of teaching reading.* Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa.

Oglesby, F., & Suter, W. N. (1995). Matching reading styles and reading instruction. *Research in the Schools, 2*(1), 11-15.

Skipper, B. (1997). Reading with style: How one school district has turned its students low reading scores around. *American School Board Journal, 184*(2), 36-37.

Independent Researchers

LaShell, L. (1986). An analysis of the effects of reading methods upon reading achievement and locus-of-control when individual reading style is matched for learning-disabled students. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48,* 0362.

O'Tuel, F. S., & Holt, S. B. (1992). *Reading Styles Program for fifth and sixth grade elementary students: An evaluation of program development.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
O'Connor Elementary 3402 Bobolink Victoria, TX 77901 361-788-9572 Contact: Sherry Gorsuch	704	mid-size city	12%	0%	0%	72%	15%	62%	8%	13%
Pine Ridge Elementary (K-4) 1200 Mill Ridge Road Livingston, TX 77351 936-328-2160 Contact: Janel Poindexter-Sewell	928	small town	14%	1%	1%	11%	73%	53%	13%	10%
Jeannette Myhre Elementary 919 South 12 Street Bismarck, ND 58504 701-221-3430 Contact: Bill Demaree	433	mid-size city	1%	16%	1%	0%	82%	44%	5%	21%
Oakland Heights Elementary 601 59th Avenue Meridian, MS 39307 601-484-4984 Contact: Kim Benton	477	large town	74%	0%	0%	0%	26%	63%	1%	4%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Carol McLaughlin
Carbo Reading Styles Program
PO Box 737
Syosset, NY 11791
Phone: 800-331-3117 or 516-921-5500
Fax: 516-921-5591
E-mail: staffdev@nrsi.com
Web site: http://www.nrsi.com

Accepted for Inclusion July 2000
Description Written August 2000

CELL/ExLL (PreK–6)

IN BRIEF CELL/ExLL (California Early Literacy Learning/ Extended Literacy Learning)	
Founder	Stanley L. Swartz, Rebecca E. Shook, and Adria F. Klein of the Foundation for California Early Literacy Learning
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1994
# Schools Served (6/1/00)	527
Level	CELL PreK-3, ExLL 3-6
Primary Goal	professional development to support increased student achievement in literacy and content areas
Main Features	• increase emphasis on reading and writing across the curriculum • provide extensive professional development for teachers • use a balanced reading and writing program supported by research • align teaching methods within and across grades • support English language learners and facilitate inclusion of special needs children
Impact on Instruction	alignment of curriculum and instruction across grades; use of reading framework
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	increased priority to professional development and team building
Impact on Schedule	none
Parental Involvement	a special family literacy component is included
Technology	no special technology is required
Materials	readings for teachers; professional reading list; list of recommended instructional materials

Origin/Scope

California Early Literacy Learning (CELL) and Extended Literacy Learning (ExLL) were developed in 1994 by the Foundation for California Early Literacy Learning. The purpose is to provide extensive professional development for teachers to support improved literacy instruction. Over 500 schools have participated since the project's inception.

General Approach

CELL (PreK-3) and ExLL (3-6) organize research-based teaching methods into a framework for classroom instruction. The framework covers oral language, phonological skills, reading aloud, shared reading, guided reading, independent reading, interactive writing, independent writing, and oral presentation. Primary-grade teachers are encouraged to teach all subjects using the framework. Intermediate teachers focus on reading and writing in the content areas while recognizing that some children in these grades are still struggling readers.

CELL and ExLL emphasize skills development (e.g., phonemic awareness, explicit phonics instruction, word-attack skills, and spelling) within the context of high-quality literature and authentic reading and writing activities. Teachers learn a variety of assessment procedures that inform classroom instruction and focus attention on the needs and strengths of individual children. High-progress children are encouraged to continue their rapid growth. Low-progress children are provided continuous support and multiple opportunities to practice new strategies in a risk-free environment. As each student's grasp of literacy improves, the models encourage a gradual increase in student independence.

CELL/ExLL teaching methods are aligned within and across grades for both regular and special education, thus facilitating the inclusion of special needs children. Standardized test scores for each participating school are monitored, both in language arts and other content areas.

In addition, at the beginning of the school year, approximately six children chosen at random from each classroom are individually assessed. The same group takes a posttest at the end of the year, allowing schools to monitor learning at each grade level.

Results

Data from selected schools, while not gathered as part of methodologically rigorous evaluations, suggest a pattern of improved reading achievement across a variety of measures in schools adopting CELL/ExLL. For example, from 1992-93 through 1994-95, six Title I schools using Reading Recovery recorded minimal improvements in first-grade CTBS reading scores. After the first year of CELL implementation in 1995-96, the average score across the six schools increased from the 28th to the 45th percentile. At another Title I school implementing CELL, students in grades K-2 all improved their grade-equivalent scores on the Observation Survey by considerably more than a year from fall to spring. The second-grade class made over two years' improvement. From 1992-93 through 1994-95, four schools using CELL and Reading Recovery witnessed a drop in special education referrals from 3.2 percent of students to 1.5 percent. Over the same period, referrals at three comparison schools using just Reading Recovery stayed level, and referrals at three comparison schools using neither program rose from 3.2 percent to 3.7 percent.

Other data indicate that schools implementing CELL/ExLL to the fullest extent improve more than schools with partial implementation. Additionally, mathematics scores at some CELL/ExLL schools have risen along with reading scores.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The Foundation for California Early Literacy Learning, located in Redlands, California, maintains a staff of 13, including 10 full-time trainers. Another 50 part-time trainers are also available for working with schools.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** CELL and ExLL require no formal expression of faculty commitment. It is expected, however, that faculty and administration will reach a consensus before adopting the model.
- ***Initial Training:*** CELL and ExLL implementation have three phases: (1) A School-Based Planning Team (principal, reading specialist, special education teacher, and one teacher from each grade) participates in six one-day training sessions — one every other month. The teachers begin implementing the CELL/ExLL framework after the first session and receive feedback at subsequent sessions. This format allows schools to begin partial implementation and develop a resource for observation, demonstration, and support. The whole team also works together during the training days to develop a vision for future literacy instruction in their school. (2) A Literacy Coordinator is trained to support CELL/ExLL implementation and serve as a coach. Coordinators attend five week-long training sessions over the school year. They teach half-time and spend the rest of their time observing and working with teachers. (There is separate training for CELL and ExLL literacy coordinators.) (3) Schoolwide implementation begins. Teachers who were not part of the planning team receive training similar to that received by the planning team. They also visit a CELL/ExLL site at least three times. This phase can begin during the second or third year of implementation, depending on whether the first two phases proceed concurrently or consecutively.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** The three-phase training model is designed explicitly to build

capacity for demonstration, feedback, peer coaching, and sustained learning at the school site. The literacy coordinator supports the planning team, and both the coordinator and planning team members support other teachers in the school. Between training sessions teachers participate in bi-weekly guided meetings. After the first year, literacy coordinators continue to attend three professional development days annually for networking and program updates.

- ***Networking:*** As part of their initial training, all teachers attend either the West Coast Literacy Conference or a regional CELL/ExLL conference.
- ***Implementation Review:*** A professional review is conducted each year with the principal and the literacy coordinator. On-site reviews by CELL/ExLL training staff also are available.

Costs

Direct costs include training, materials, and conference fees:

School-based planning teams: eight member maximum per team; six one-day sessions (one every other month) provided at multiple sites across the U.S.	$5,000
Literacy coordinator: four weeks scheduled at CELL demonstration sites (in California, Wyoming, and Utah); one week at the West Coast Literacy Conference	$12,000
Schoolwide training: entire teaching staff; six one-day sessions (one every other month) provided at multiple sites across the U.S.	$45,000 ($15,000 per school if a minimum of 3 schools train together)
Professional books	$300 per teacher
Literacy conference	$195 per teacher

Schools also have to fund the literacy coordinator's salary (half-time) and travel and release time for teachers to attend training sessions. For schools adopting both CELL and ExLL, two literacy coordinators are required, one for the primary grades and one for the intermediate grades. In smaller schools it is possible for one literacy coordinator to support PreK-6, but this requires additional training.

Student Populations

The model has been successfully implemented in Title I, urban, and rural schools. It is designed to support English language learners in several ways. Some books on the recommended list are available in English and Spanish. Bilingual trainers and literacy coordinators participate in training sessions. Staff at CELL/ExLL schools have the opportunity to visit bilingual demonstrations sites. And a bilingual pilot site has been developed in Mexico City.

Special Considerations

Because of the in-depth professional development built into the model, schools must be willing to support considerable release time and some travel for teachers.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer
Data gathered by staff at CELL/ExLL schools and districts are collected in the following document:
California Early Literacy Learning/Extended Literacy Learning. (2000). Redlands, CA: Foundation for California Early Literacy Learning.

Independent Researchers
No studies available.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Parkview Elementary 12044 East Elliott Avenue El Monte, CA 91732 626-575-2297 Principal: Anamarie Sanchez	1,091	urban fringe of large city	1%	0%	4%	94%	1%	92%	84%	16%
Roscoe Elementary School 10765 Strathern Street Sun Valley, CA 91352 818-767-3018 Principal: Mary Kurzeka	1,045	large city	1%	<1%	4%	92%	4%	100%	82%	12%
Sagebrush Elementary 1685 Hillpond Sheridan, WY 88201 307-672-9059 Literacy Coordinator: Charlene Huntley	324	small town	0%	4%	1%	5%	90%	47%	0%	16%
Whittier Elementary School 1568 South 300 East Salt Lake City, UT 84115 801-481-4846 Principal: Patti O'Keefe	527	mid-size city	5%	10%	9%	33%	43%	76%	30%	17%

The data in this table are reported for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

The Foundation for California Early Literacy Learning
104 East State Street, Suite M
Redlands, California 92373
Phone: 909-335-3089
Fax: 909-335-0826
E-mail: amie@cell-exll.com
Web site: http://www.cell-exll.com

)RE (Consortium on Reading Excellence): K–8

IN BRIEF Consortium on Reading Excellence (CORE)	
Founder	CORE, Inc.
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1995
# Schools Served (6/1/00)	192
Level	K-8 (9-12 under development)
Primary Goal	to improve student reading achievement through research-based practices
Main Features	• use of scientific research to drive reading instruction • extensive literacy training including strategies, model lessons, coaching, and collegial reflection • explicit skills instruction and language- and literature-rich activities • ongoing assessment system and design of instructional interventions
Impact on Instruction	direct instruction (to whole class and groups) and student-centered activities; systematic code instruction, rich literature, and comprehension; assessment-driven decisions; some regrouping of students
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	schools encouraged to release at least one teacher half-time to serve as facilitator, and to provide time for full-staff collaboration
Impact on Schedule	K: 60-90 minutes daily; grades 1-3: 2-2 ½ hours for all language arts; grades 4-6: 2 hours; grades 7-8: 2 periods desirable
Parental Involvement	parent workshops and materials
Technology	e-mail and Internet desirable
Materials	books on reading research, instruction, and assessment for all teachers; recommended texts and materials for students

Origin/Scope

The Consortium on Reading Excellence (CORE) was developed in 1995 by Bill Honig, Linda Diamond, and other school reformers and reading researchers. To date CORE has trained teachers in 600 schools and 70 school districts in California, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Of that number, 29 districts have participated in sustained implementation, and 192 schools have committed to comprehensive reading reform.

General Approach

CORE's purpose is to improve student achievement in reading and increase teacher efficacy through the use of scientific research and best practices. To that end, the organization provides extensive professional development for grades K-3 and 4-8. The complete CORE model involves six days of training for all staff, regular site visits, classroom demonstrations, leadership and facilitator training, coaching, and collegial reflection.

Training focuses on practices that scientific research has shown to be effective in helping er become readers: phonemic awareness development, understanding of the alphabetic pl phonics, automatic word recognition and fluency, spelling and vocabulary skills, rehension strategies, text structure analysis, assessment and differentiation of instruction, e ing, and book discussions. Teachers learn a repertoire of strategies that combine it skills instruction with rich literature, along with multiple ways to track student progress agnose needs.

addition to providing professional development, CORE helps schools make systemic es to increase the capacity for ongoing success without prolonged outside assistance. es include assistance in (a) developing school and district leadership to support reform; (b) n implementing, and maintaining a comprehensive schoolwide literacy program; (c)

and up to three teacher facilitators, and a five-day institute for up to two facilitators. Each school is strongly encouraged (though not required) to release at least one facilitator from half- to full-time so he or she can receive extra training and gradually assume responsibility for on-site coaching.

- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** CORE instructors provide five to nine site visits over the first year, eight during the second year, and two to three the third year. During site visits, instructors demonstrate lessons, observe and coach teachers, solve problems with teachers, and analyze student assessment data. They also work with the site facilitator to prepare him or her to begin supporting teachers by the third year.
- ***Networking:*** CORE provides an annual leadership summit for leadership teams (principals and facilitators) from all full implementation schools. The summits showcase school successes, and school teams provide focused sessions for their colleagues. CORE also plans to host a listserv and chat room. In addition, facilitators from all schools participate in annual certification and re-certification seminars.
- ***Implementation Review:*** CORE staff monitor implementation using an observation tool and provide summaries from each site visit. Each school also receives a comprehensive implementation and system-monitoring packet that includes focus group questions for annual self-study, teacher pre- and post-surveys of knowledge and beliefs, observation surveys focusing on classroom implementation, and benchmarks over three years in each literacy component. Conferences are arranged to discuss progress and make adjustments.

Costs

Costs for training and teacher materials average about $50,000 the first year for an elementary school of 500 students. Including partial release time (0.5 FTE) for a facilitator and curriculum materials recommended by CORE (which average between $400 and $700 per K-3 class and $700 for intervention materials for intermediate grades), first-year costs average about $80,000, second year costs $50,000, and third year costs $25,000. If two or more sites within a district adopt CORE, costs for each site can be reduced by almost half. Schools also will have to budget for travel for CORE staff and stipends/release time for all staff members to participate in training.

Middle school costs average about $37,000 the first year for a school of 500, not including travel, staffing, release time, or materials (which average about $700 per grade).

Student Populations

CORE has been implemented in a range of schools including urban, suburban, and rural schools, Title I schools, affluent schools, schools serving large numbers of English language learners and disadvantaged students, and schools with diverse ethnic populations.

Special Considerations

It is critical that building leaders be committed to change, to supporting teachers during the change process, and to helping staff and students remain focused. Students with disabilities need to be included in regular classrooms as much as possible but also must have targeted instruction to meet their needs. Some of this instruction will take place in the regular program, some in small direct-instruction groups, and some in one-on-one tutoring sessions. CORE has a tutoring design in development.

Accepted for Inclusion January 1999
Description Written March 1999
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

Early Intervention in Reading (K–4)

IN BRIEF Early Intervention in Reading	
Founder	Barbara Taylor, University of Minnesota
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1989
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	214
Level	K-4
Primary Goal	to help struggling readers become competent and independent in reading
Main Features	• daily reading and writing sessions for small groups of struggling students • focus on strategies and independence • phonemic awareness training (K-2)
Impact on Instruction	builds the capacity of classroom teachers to provide effective reading instruction to all students
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	none
Impact on Schedule	20 minutes of daily instruction to groups of 5-7 students
Parental Involvement	parents are asked to listen to their child read at home
Technology	Internet capability strongly recommended
Materials	training notebook; assessment materials; curriculum materials to support school-purchased books

Origin/Scope

Early Intervention in Reading (EIR) was developed in 1989 by Barbara Taylor of the University of Minnesota. Since that time over 200 schools in Minnesota and throughout the country have used EIR with over 11,500 struggling readers in grades K-4.

General Approach

EIR is a daily, 20-minute small group supplemental reading program taught by the classroom teacher to a group of five to seven struggling readers. The goal of the program is to have students become confident and independent readers.

In grades one and two this program involves a three-day cycle of activities including:

- repeated reading of a story
- working with words/phonics instruction
- phonemic awareness training
- coaching for comprehension
- guided sentence writing to enhance phonemic awareness and understanding of the alphabetic principle
- coaching on the use of word recognition strategies to foster independence
- one-on-one reading practice

The third and fourth grade component involves a five-day cycle of activities, including repeated reading, decoding multi-syllabic words, coaching for comprehension, and writing to enhance comprehension. Students in the grade three or four program also serve as one-on-one reading buddies to first or second grade EIR students once a week.

The kindergarten program focuses on children's enjoyment of literature; discussion of stories related to their lives; creative dramatics; and development of phonemic segmentation and blending, rhyme, concepts of print, and letter-sound knowledge.

y-reading programs implemented in 27 elementary schools in a
ig concluded that students receiving EIR instruction outperformed
in the other three methods on all seven measures developed for the
ssed letter name identification, letter sound identification, segmenting
li ation skills, production of additional words, and word reading

res, students in the EIR program outperformed students in control
ud d in the early 1990s, 67 percent of low achieving first-graders who
ng at least at a pre-primer level at the end of the year, compared
eving students in the control group. In the second study (1994-95
d-grade students participating in EIR (which in this case included
were able to read second-grade material with at least 90 percent
none of the 12 students in the control group could do so.
cted across numerous urban, suburban, and rural districts
ools) over an eight-year period reveal that on average 80 percent of
IR program are reading independently at the end of first grade and
d grade. On average, 80 percent of second grade children in EIR
ng below a primer level are reading on a second grade level by the
s in schools where 70-90 percent of children participate in the
ate that after one year of using EIR, 55 percent of at-risk first
e end of first grade and 55 percent of second grade students who
eading at primer level are reading at grade level by the end of second
sively with second language (especially Hmong) students with
reading independently at the end of first grade.

ce

ning and support is provided during the school year by an EIR
-2 00 school year, four trainers will be available, each of whom can
horts of 36 teachers. Trained EIR teachers also can lead monthly
become trainers for new school districts. Participating
ected to designate a local site coordinator to act as liaison
the EIR trainer.
rmation sessions both at the University of Minnesota and off-site
loper. No formal buy-in is required, but participating teachers
g once-a-month training sessions during the first year of the
menting the program during the school year.
fers two staff development options for participating teachers, one
nal approach with an introductory workshop and follow-up
tilizing the Internet for follow-up. For option one, all teachers
ntroductory training session prior to beginning the program. A
ning readings, procedures, assessments, teaching materials, and
elated to the EIR program is provided to all participants. Under the
r district facilitator attends a two-day workshop in Minneapolis
ternet-based staff development program. The training notebook
purchased under this option.

ite	Free Lunch Elig.	ELL	Students with Disab.
%	83%	40%	9%
%	60%	2%	15%
%	32%	5%	10%
%	1%	0%	16%

lucation Statistics electronic database
school for the 1999-2000 school year.

Accepted for Inclusion July 1999
Description Written August 1999
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (K–12)

IN BRIEF Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction	
Founder	Ethna R. Reid
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1966
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	2,498
Level	K-12 (with primary focus on K-8)
Primary Goal	teach students to read, write, listen, and speak so they can communicate effectively
Main Features	• mastery learning approach to language arts instruction • individualized instruction • emphasis on expressive skills (writing and speaking) as well as receptive skills (reading and listening) • applications to other content areas
Impact on Instruction	three daily instructional components: skills, practice, and backup skills; considerable time devoted to small group and individualized instruction
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	educators evaluate possible re-deployment of current staff
Impact on Schedule	educators evaluate current schedules and use of time
Parental Involvement	ECRI materials address parent involvement
Technology	no new technology required
Materials	20 teacher texts required; teaching materials and mastery tests that correspond to student textbooks are provided

Origin/Scope

The Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI) has been teaching teachers since 1966 when Granite School District in Salt Lake City received a Title III grant. Ethna R. Reid has been its director since that time. Teachers from thousands of schools (mostly elementary and middle schools) in all 50 states have received ECRI training. Developers estimate that almost 2,500 schools have adopted ECRI as a schoolwide reading program.

General Approach

ECRI is a highly structured, teacher directed, mastery learning approach to instruction in language arts. Increased time on task, high expectations, individualized instruction, positive reinforcement, use of overt responses from students, and integrated instruction are all hallmarks of this approach.

Using reading materials currently in place at the school, ECRI-trained teachers follow dialogues, or scripts, as they move students through three daily instructional components: skills, practice, and backup skills. During skills time, teachers use a three-step process to introduce new material: modeling, prompting, and practice. Students sometimes respond in unison and sometimes individually to teacher prompts. ECRI teachers deploy a variety of instructional methods as they teach vocabulary, comprehension, literature, creative and expository writing, and study skills.

Practice time, when students learn to use the skills introduced in skills instruction, is devoted to three primary tasks: small group discussions, individual conferences with students, and individually administered mastery tests (oral or written performance-based tests). Teachers learn to develop mastery tests based on the curriculum and materials in place at the school. Students progress at their own pace as they demonstrate mastery of skills. Students also learn to keep records, diagnose problems, and judge when they are ready for mastery tests.

Backup skills time is reserved for instruction in penmanship, spelling, dictation, and proofreading. Throughout all components of instruction, ECRI stresses that expressive skills (writing and speaking) are more important than receptive skills (reading and listening). Therefore, ECRI students write and discuss daily.

Although the ECRI approach was designed for language arts instruction, it can be used in other content areas as well.

Results

A series of evaluations conducted from 1986 to 1990 demonstrated a significant positive impact of ECRI on student reading achievement. In Morgan County, Tennessee, for example, four schools implemented ECRI (1988-89) as their regular reading program in grades 2 through 7; one school retained its existing commercial reading program and acted as a comparison. All students were pre-tested in spring 1988 using the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), then post-tested in spring 1989 after a full year of instruction. All ECRI grades recorded significant mean gains in reading comprehension and vocabulary, averaging 10.0 NCEs for comprehension and 8.8 NCEs for vocabulary. All comparison group gains, with the single exception of sixth-grade vocabulary, were nonsignificant or negative.

Overall, the studies involved 2,274 students in 11 public schools in regular education, special education, remedial education, bilingual education, and Chapter I classes from coast to coast. Regular education students (n=1,733) gained an average of over 8 NCEs in total reading scores. Children with special needs (bilingual, Chapter I, and remedial) showed an average gain of 14 NCEs. Special education students showed an average gain exceeding 19 NCEs. All of these gains were statistically significant when compared with control and normative expectations.

Another series of evaluations conducted from 1990 to 1996 covered 6 sites in five states, involving 1,986 children. In one of the sites, a Chapter I school served as a comparison for two ECRI schools. At all six sites, ECRI students demonstrated significant gains on reading subtests of various standardized achievement tests. Average gains per class across all schools and groups ranged from 5.4 NCEs to over 26 NCEs.

At multiple sites not included in the studies described above (most of them elementary and middle schools), similar results have been demonstrated on a variety of standardized tests over the past 20 years.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** In addition to five full time trainers, ECRI has 58 certified trainers available to offer awareness sessions and seminars throughout the country and to assist teachers as they implement the program. As ECRI staff members work with schools/districts, they encourage educators to develop trainers on-site. ECRI holds an annual Invitational Conference for Teachers of Teachers.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** ECRI sends awareness materials (such as videotapes of ECRI classrooms) and/or offers awareness sessions on-site to interested educators. Names of schools/districts that are implementing ECRI are also provided. Visits to these sites are encouraged. No formal buy-in is required.
- ***Initial Training:*** A five-day initial seminar with one ECRI staff person for 35-40 teachers is desirable, followed by intermediate and advanced seminars. The seminars include lecture, practice sessions, and demonstrations with students. ECRI also offers

seminars for principals and other district administrators and encourages them to attend the seminars teachers are attending.

- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Periodic visits by ECRI staff to teachers' classrooms to demonstrate, model, and monitor are encouraged. After-school workshops and personal consultations are offered. Teachers also can videotape their teaching and evaluate their proficiency with ECRI-designed proficiency checklists.
- ***Networking:*** Through its conferences, newsletter, toll free telephone number, and Web site, ECRI provides information, answers questions, and encourages educators throughout the country to collaborate. ECRI teachers share materials they have developed, schedule visits to each other's sites, and participate in special events at Reid School and Reid Ranch in Salt Lake City.
- ***Implementation Review:*** During the initial seminar, teachers establish goals and benchmarks and outline steps to achieve them. They are introduced to observation checklists and proficiency evaluations that can be used as they videotape their classrooms. Ninety days following the seminar, teachers complete a self-assessment checklist. Administrators who attend the seminars are provided strategies for assisting teachers and monitoring student progress. Teachers move through four levels of proficiency, depending upon the seminar they have attended: Initial Level, Introductory, Intermediate, and Proficient. The specificity of the ECRI training makes it easy to analyze its implementation.

Costs

Each teacher in the initial seminar uses a set of ECRI texts that cost $268. A second set is required for the next level of training. For the seminar and additional follow-up days, the school/district pays an honorarium of $700 per day plus expenses for one ECRI trainer for up to 40 trainees. Schools/districts may also have to cover stipends or release time for teachers during training.

Existing district reading and content materials may be used. Supplies for teachers and students are those usually found in schools. No special staffing or facilities are required to implement ECRI. Awareness materials and a catalogue are available at no cost.

Student Populations

ECRI has been implemented and evaluated in rural, suburban, urban, and Title I schools across the country. Evidence demonstrates the program's positive impact on regular, special needs, bilingual, and special education students.

Special Considerations

There are no special considerations in adopting ECRI except those common to creating change within a school.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

ECRI Project. (1996). *ECRI validation reports.* Salt Lake City, UT: Reid Foundation.

Independent Researchers

Ferguson, C. L., Mangum, J., & Coffey, K. (1998). The South Louisiana Study. *Mastery Learning and the Teaching of Reading, 16*(1), 1, 3, 7.

Reid, E. R. (1986). Practicing effective instruction: The Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction approach. *Exceptional Children, 52*(6), 510-519.

Reid, E. R. (1997). Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI). *Behavior and Social Issues, 7*(1), 19-24.

(The latter two articles report evaluation data compiled by independent researchers.)

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Walker Elementary 145 Berkley Street Taunton, MA 02786 508-821-1285 Contact: Arthur Travers	250	urban fringe of large city	10%	0%	1%	2%	87%	33%	M	25%
Andrew Jackson Elementary PO Box 100 Halifax, NC 27839 252-583-2021 Contact: Vera Palmer	250	rural	99%	0%	0%	0%	1%	90%	0%	6%
Sojourner Truth School 1443 North Ogden Chicago, IL 60610 773-534-8121 Contact: Pernicia Pugh	485	large city	99%	0%	0%	0%	1%	100%	0%	1%
Reid School 2965 East 3435 South Salt Lake City, UT 84109 801-466-4214 Contact: Dr. Ethna R. Reid	200	urban fringe of mid-size city	1%	0%	3%	2%	94%	0%	1%	0%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M= Missing data.

For more information, contact:

Ethna R. Reid
Exemplary Center for Reading Instruction (ECRI)
3310 South 2700 East
Salt Lake City, Utah 84109
Phone: 801-486-5083 or 800-468-3274
Fax: 801-485-0561
E-mail: ereid@xmission.com
Web site: http://www.ecri.cc

children's language and literacy development. It provides continuity of assessment and teaching from year to year. And it creates a common language for teachers, principals, parents, and children regarding learning, assessment, and reporting.

Results

The initial evaluations of First Steps were conducted in Australia, where the model originated. In a series of studies, researchers examined the implementation and impact of First Steps at multiple schools.

In an early report, the Australian Council for Educational Research (1993) found little evidence of impact on the reading abilities of year 5 students and some evidence that First Steps was improving their writing abilities. The data for this study were too limited to draw firm conclusions, however.

In a later study, a researcher examined the impact of First Steps implementation on the reading and writing achievement of year 3 and year 7 students at 22 randomly selected schools in Western Australia. Teachers at the schools completed questionnaires regarding their use of First Steps, and students took the Monitoring Standards in Education (MSE) reading and writing tests, a standardized state assessment. After statistically controlling for gender, race, and native language, the researcher found a positive relationship between the extent of implementation of First Steps and student achievement, although the results were not statistically significant (Deschamp, 1995).

A third study involving 20 schools in the Northern Territory examined the impact of First Steps on reading, writing, and spelling achievement. From 1995 to 1997, student writing scores showed a considerable increase, student spelling scores showed a modest increase, and student reading scores showed a slight decrease. The researcher reported that writing was the area where First Steps practices had been implemented to the greatest extent, while implementation of reading practices was only at the beginning stages in many of the schools (Deschamp, 1999).

More recently, data on First Steps have been gathered in several U.S. districts. In Seminole County, Florida, for example, First Steps was implemented across the district in 1998. The percentage of third- and fifth-grade students mastering the reading comprehension portion of Abacus, a district-created test, were reported at a sample of nine schools for 1998 (baseline year) and 1999. Data were disaggregated for male, female, African American, Asian, and Hispanic students. Of 87 legitimate 1999 scores, 74 were higher than 1998 scores, many by a considerable margin. The study offered no group for comparison, however (Kearney et al., 2000). At a school in Colorado, third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade students whose teachers reported that First Steps had the highest impact on their teaching got better reading and writing scores on the Colorado Student Assessment Program than other students (Center for Resource Management, 2002).

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** Edith Cowan University Resources for Learning, located in Australia, is the managing agent for First Steps worldwide. In the U.S., Heinemann is authorized to deliver First Steps resources and training. The First Steps group, headquartered in New Hampshire, has a staff of 11, the majority of whom participate in training development and delivery. The First Steps group can also draw on the training resources of Heinemann and Edith Cowan.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** There is no formal buy-in process, although whole school participation is highly recommended. Information sessions are provided free of charge to facilitate

staff buy-in.

- ***Initial Training:*** First Steps can be implemented in a variety of ways to meet the needs of a school or district. The model offers on-site two-day school-based professional development courses for all staff for each of the four main components (reading, writing, spelling, and oral language). These components are often implemented over a period of two or more years. First Steps also offers an eight-day Tutor Training Course for selected teachers or district staff members. The first five days of the course are scheduled prior to implementation, and the final three days are held six months later. These courses not only provide local "tutors" with an indepth introduction to First Steps resources, principles, and practices, but also help them learn to conduct professional development sessions and provide support for colleagues. Finally, there is a one-day Principals' Workshop designed to help principals support schoolwide change.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** First Steps tutors provide ongoing support for classroom teachers as they implement the model. At the option of schools, consultants from Heinemann can provide additional follow-up support in the form of Strategy Workshops for all teachers or additional training of tutors.
- ***Networking:*** First Steps supports a Web site, e-mail assistance, toll-free phone assistance from consultants, a newsletter, video conferences, regional conferences, and periodic mailings from Heinemann.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Heinemann does not formally review implementation progress at participating schools. Teachers, schools, and districts are expected to continually monitor their own progress. Heinemann consultants can help schools develop their own strategies for evaluating the model.

Costs

The cost for each two-day school-based course is $325 per person (minimum 25, maximum 50 persons). The Tutor Training Course costs $3,300 per person (minimum 15, maximum 40), and the principal workshop costs $200 per person (minimum 20). The Developmental Continua and resource books are included with the training. Schools will have to cover staff time for two days of professional development per course and any release time necessary for local tutors to work with colleagues.

State Standards and Accountability

During First Steps school-based and tutor courses, methods for linking the Developmental Continua to state standards are discussed.

Special Populations/Focus

As part of the catalog Web site search mechanism, each model had an opportunity to apply to be highlighted for its efforts in serving selected student populations. The five categories were urban, rural, high poverty, English language learners, and special education. To qualify for a category, a model had to demonstrate (a) that it included special training, materials, or components focusing on that student population, and (b) that it had been implemented in a substantial number of schools serving that population.

First Steps did not apply for inclusion in any of the categories. However, it has been implemented across the U.S. in a wide variety of urban and rural settings with diverse student populations.

Special Considerations

None.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Kearney, J., and others. (2000). *Factors that influence literacy achievement.* Sanford, FL: Seminole County Public Schools.

Deschamp, P. (1995). *Student achievement: A study of the effects of First Steps teaching on student achievement.* Perth, Australia: Education Department of Western Australia.

Deschamp, P. (1999). *External evaluation 1995-97.* Darwin, Australia: Northern Territory Department of Education.

Freidus, H., McNamara, M., & Grose, C. (1999). *First Steps project summary: Year two project report.* New York: Bank Street College of Education.

Independent Researchers

Australian Council for Educational Research. (1993). *The impact of First Steps on the reading and writing ability of year 5 students.* Perth, Australia: Author.

Center for Resource Management. (2002). *First Steps research study: Final report.* South Hampton, NH: Author.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Barnes Elementary 13730 SW Walker Road Beaverton, OR 97005 503-672-3500 Contact: Brenda Lewis	594	urban fringe of large city	3%	0%	8%	35%	53%	30%	50%	7%
Superior Elementary 1800 South Indiana Drive Superior, CO 80026 303-543-9330 Contact: Holly Holcrin	683	rural	1%	<1%	8%	3%	87%	9%	3%	7%
Stephen Decatur Elementary 3935 Mooresville Road Indianapolis, IN 46221 317-241-0183 Contact: Cheryl Husted	582	large city	17%	0%	1%	1%	80%	47%	1%	M
Abraham Edwards Elementary 45 Rantoul Street Beverly, MA 01915 978-921-6123 Contact: Karla Pressman	239	urban fringe of large city	4%	0%	0%	10%	86%	33%	10%	19%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M = Missing data.

For more information, contact:

Julie Broz or Patricia Carls
First Steps
361 Hanover Street
Portsmouth, NH 03801
Phone: 800-541-2086
Fax: 603-431-7840
E-mail: firststeps@heinemann.com
Web site: http://www.heinemann.com/firststeps

Accepted for Inclusion August 1998
Description Written September 1998

Junior Great Books (K–12)

IN BRIEF Junior Great Books	
Founder	Great Books Foundation, Chicago
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1962
# Schools Served (May 1998)	9,500
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	teach students how to read with comprehension, think, and communicate as literate, responsible citizens
Main Features	• K-12 literature-based program using books and stories that are age appropriate • Shared Inquiry method of literary analysis and discussion
Impact on Instruction	teachers learn consistently to apply inquiry-based methods of instruction using questioning strategies of shared inquiry; methods are intended to be carried over to other areas of the curriculum
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	school appoints an on-site coordinator
Impact on Schedule	students participate in a minimum of three 45-minute sessions per week
Parental Involvement	at-home reading component
Technology	no computer equipment is required
Materials	includes grade-specific teacher guides, assessment strategies, student reading anthologies, student activity books, and audio tapes

Origin/Scope

One million students from kindergarten through high school participate in Junior Great Books (JGB) each year. Developed in 1962 by the Great Books Foundation in Chicago, the program is currently used in 9,500 schools in 50 states and eight foreign countries. In 1992, the foundation published a major expansion of JGB to increase its accessibility to the full range of students in the classroom.

General Approach

Junior Great Books is an inquiry- and literature-based program designed to develop the critical thinking and reading skills of students in grades K-12. The JGB Shared Inquiry method and materials provide a consistent, intensive focus on moving students beyond rudimentary, literal comprehension to reading for meaning—beyond passive information consumption to the critical and creative thinking that leads to understanding and intelligent action. The program cultivates a disposition to pursue ideas in depth and develops the skills needed to do so effectively.

Shared Inquiry serves as the core of JGB Program. Teachers engage students in interpretive discussions, encouraging them to search for answers to fundamental questions about the meaning of literary selections. Discussions begin with a question that challenges students to think critically about the reading assignment, develop their own interpretations, and support their ideas with evidence from the text. The teacher guides students toward developing their own text-based analyses by posing thought-provoking, open-ended questions for which there may be several reasonable answers. Because the answers are not stated explicitly in the text, students must grapple with and substantiate their ideas about the author's meaning. Throughout the discussion, the teacher models and nurtures thoughtful dialogue by asking questions to develop and build on students' responses.

The students' search for meaning begins with at least two readings of the selection, guided by close analysis of character development, the author's use of language, and other key elements of the piece. Shared Inquiry discussion provides a forum for students to articulate, support, and develop their interpretations, which are based on their own reading and on the ideas and evidence offered by their peers. Students are asked to further develop and support their ideas in persuasive and creative writing assignments following discussion.

JGB literature is age-appropriate and carefully selected to challenge and reward readers, encourage rigorous examination, and promote discussion. JGB students' early immersion in complex and multifaceted literature enables them to approach increasingly challenging selections in subsequent grades with confidence, curiosity, and thoughtfulness. For each reading selection, a sequence of interpretive strategies is suggested. The activities are designed to help students explore literature from their own point of view and develop and support their interpretations in oral and written contexts.

The JGB materials, strategies, and training equip teachers with the means to apply inquiry-based learning and produce results. JGB has been named as an exemplary program by the American Federation of Teachers, the National Javits Project for Language Arts Research, the Clark Foundation, the United States Department of Education's Program Effectiveness Panel for the National Diffusion Network, and the Texas Center for Educational Research.

Results

Studies by the Great Books Foundation and by independent researchers have documented student gains in critical reading and thinking skills, reading comprehension, use of evidence, and vocabulary.

In one study, for example, teachers in third-grade classes in 15 Chicago-area schools implemented the JGB program. The performance of students in those classes was compared to the performance of students in control classes in the same schools. After 18 weeks, students in the JGB classes supported interpretations of stories with evidence from the text more frequently than students in control classes. JGB students also outperformed control students on the reading vocabulary subtest of the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS). Another study compared a group of fifth graders using JGB with a group using basal readers. Over the course of a semester, the JGB group demonstrated significantly greater gains in critical thinking skills (as measured by the Ross Test of Higher Cognitive Processes) than students in the basal reader group. A third study found that low-ability students in a JGB discussion group scored higher on the reading comprehension subtest of the ITBS and improved more in inferential comprehension than low-ability students in the control group.

Additionally, some schools using JGB have witnessed impressive gains in test scores. For example, an elementary school in Chicago adopted the program on a wide scale in 1994. By 1996, the number of sixth grade students who met the ITBS reading standard had increased by 24%. Similar increases were reported in other grades.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The Great Books Foundation provides a training staff to conduct on-site beginning, intermediate, and advanced courses and consultation for implementing schools and districts. In addition, a local site coordinator receives instruction in program coordination/support techniques.

- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Teacher training is preceded by planning with school personnel to ensure effective practices and curricular fit. Implementation by all teachers in at least grades three through five is recommended.
- ***Initial Training:*** The foundation requires participating teachers to complete the two-day, 10-hour Basic Leader Training Course before using JGB. Participants receive a course manual, a grade-appropriate instructional guide, and various support pieces.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** The foundation offers a program of follow-up support for teachers and administrators to ensure successful implementation. On-site consultations and training are staged to provide teachers with guidance and feedback and to establish and review benchmarks for student performance. Schools implementing JGB are required to schedule a total of six contact days (training, classroom observations, demonstration, and coaching) for participating teachers during each of the first two years of implementation. At the end of the first year, lead teachers are identified for the following year and are given additional instruction.
- ***Networking:*** JGB provides ongoing professional development and support through a toll-free number with regional specialists and through the Internet (Web site, e-mail questions and answers, etc.).
- ***Implementation Review:*** The JGB consultant, along with the site coordinator, monitors implementation progress through regular observations, teacher surveys, and evaluation instruments. Recommendations are made by the consultant at regular checkpoints concerning the modification of implementation practices.

Costs

The total cost per participating teacher is approximately $2,100, which includes training, consulting, and level-specific materials (Teacher Editions, literature anthologies, activity books, and audiotapes). Cost is based on a class size of 30 students. Additional costs are teacher time for training and the appointment of a local coordinator.

Student Populations

Junior Great Books is designed as a practical curriculum component for a wide range of students including Title I, English language learners, minority, remedial, and advanced learners. The JGB program introduces higher-level skills into the reading program in a way that supports acquisition of basic skills for all students.

Special Considerations

Junior Great Books is based on Shared Inquiry instruction requiring the teacher to become guide and facilitator of ideas, rather than provider of facts. The approach emphasizes individual interpretation of texts and collaborative exploration and development of ideas.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Great Books Foundation. (1992). *The Junior Great Books curriculum of interpretive reading, writing, and discussion: A proposal submitted to the Program Effectiveness Panel for the National Diffusion Network of the U.S. Department of Education.* Chicago: Author.

Independent Researchers

Bird, J. J. (1984). *Effects of fifth graders' attitudes and critical thinking/reading skills resulting from a Junior Great Books program.* Ed.D. dissertation, Rutgers University, New Brunswick.

Heinl, A. M. (1988). *The effects of the Junior Great Books program on literal and inferential comprehension.* Paper presented at the National Reading Conference, Tucson, AZ.

Kelly, J., Benson, M., & Benson, D. (1996). *Junior Great Books: Summary of program implementation and evaluation.* Castleberry, TX: Castleberry Independent School District.

Sample Sites

No sample site data available.

For more information, contact:

Bill Siegel
The Great Books Foundation
35 East Wacker Drive, Suite 2300
Chicago, IL 60601
Phone: 800-222-5870, ext. 247
Fax: 312-407-0224
E-mail: bill.siegel@greatbooks.org
Web site: http://www.greatbooks.org

Accepted for Inclusion July 2000
Description Written September 2000

Literacy Collaborative (K–2)

IN BRIEF Literacy Collaborative	
Founder	Literacy Collaborative at The Ohio State University
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1993
# Schools Served (6/1/00)	535
Level	K-2
Primary Goal	to raise the level of literacy achievement of all kindergarten, first, and second grade students
Main Features	• students learn literacy skills during authentic reading and writing experiences • school literacy coordinators guide the on-going professional development of teachers through training courses and coaching • systematic observation and assessment are used to monitor student progress
Impact on Instruction	instructional decision-making guided by observation of student learning
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	establishes literacy leadership team consisting of literacy coordinator, principal, and teachers; requires release time for literacy coordinator to coach teachers; requires Reading Recovery teacher on staff
Impact on Schedule	uninterrupted daily 2-3 hour literacy block
Parental Involvement	KEEP BOOK program (take-home books) is available
Technology	currently developing online support for literacy coordinators; videotaping lessons an optional tool for reflection
Materials	multiple copies of leveled books for guided reading, professional resources, and training modules for literacy coordinators

Origin/Scope

The Literacy Collaborative, originally known as the Early Literacy Learning Initiative, originated in 1986 as a collaboration between staff members from The Ohio State University and Reading Recovery and classroom teachers from the Columbus Public Schools. This collaboration resulted in the development of a framework for literacy lessons and a model for staff development that is led by a school-based literacy coordinator. The program has been implemented in 535 schools in 27 states.

General Approach

The Literacy Collaborative is a long-term professional development program designed to provide a comprehensive, school-wide approach to literacy instruction in the primary grades. The goal is to increase literacy achievement for all students and to ensure that every child attains successful literacy levels by the end of second grade.

Theoretical Base: The program is based on the research of Marie Clay, Jerome Bruner, and Lev Vygotsky and maintains that a variety of classroom contexts for language and literacy learning challenge students and allow them to use their strengths as learners. Strong instruction, guided by systemic teacher observation of students, supports learning through direct teaching and independent student application.

Instructional Framework: Students learn literacy skills during authentic reading and writing experiences that include reading aloud to children, shared reading, guided reading, independent reading, shared writing, interactive writing, writing workshop, and independent writing. Teachers work with both heterogeneous and homogeneous groups of students depending on students' instructional needs. Reading Recovery is available for first grade students needing

additional help. A parent outreach program, KEEP BOOKS, includes small, inexpensive books that children first read in school and then take home for further practice.

Assessment and Research: Both formal and informal measures are used to monitor student progress, inform instruction, and facilitate reflective practice. A five-year data collection program analyzes changes in students' literacy learning and evaluates school change over time.

Implementation Phases:

- *Awareness and Planning:* The school staff investigates the Literacy Collaborative, develops a local plan, and submits an application for literacy coordinator training.
- *Literacy Coordinator Training and Start-Up:* The literacy coordinator undergoes training; the school-based literacy team begins to build a book collection and to collect baseline data.
- *School-Level Implementation:* The literacy coordinator provides the year-long training course for kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers; begins the home-school KEEP BOOK program; and provides demonstrations, coaching, and analysis of teaching.
- *Refinement and Independent Implementation:* The literacy coordinator continues to support teachers' implementation of the framework through coaching and professional development sessions and the analysis of student data.

Results

The Literacy Collaborative uses four measures to evaluate the program each year, including standardized test results from the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. Preliminary research results presented in 1998 compared the scores of second grade classes tested from the fall of 1995 to the fall of 1997. The study included five schools which had implemented the program for four or more years. Four of the five schools (80%) demonstrated NCE gains on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. The average NCE gain across schools was 5.6 NCEs in Reading Comprehension and 5.3 NCEs in Total Reading.

A 1999 research report compared the scores of second grade classes tested from the fall of 1995 to the fall of 1998. The study included 12 schools that had implemented the program for at least four years. Seven of the 12 schools (58%) demonstrated NCE gains on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. Evaluators found that achievement gains were greater for students remaining at the same school from kindergarten through second grade. Schools with mixed results tended to have weaker implementation across the school and within classrooms. Additional analysis of the data collected between 1995 and 1998 compared the distribution of student scores across quartiles, which are specified by the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test using national norms. The analysis revealed that a quartile shift occurred in 6 out of the 12 schools, resulting in fewer students in the lower quartile and a higher number of students in the middle and upper quartiles. A 7th school experienced a gain in mean scores but did not shift in quartile distribution.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The literacy coordinator training is available at six university centers, one regional center, and 14 district centers nationwide. Fifteen full-time and five part-time university trainers provide support to the literacy coordinators during their training and implementation years, continuing for as long as the schools are part of the Literacy Collaborative network.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** The school staff makes a five-year commitment to implementing the Literacy Collaborative at the time of application. A school literacy leadership team

(composed of primary classroom teachers, Reading Recovery teachers, Title I teachers, and the principal) develops a local plan and monitors implementation.

- ***Initial Training:*** Literacy team planning sessions are offered each year to schools interested in the model. A team of six to eight school personnel attends five full-day sessions. The school's literacy coordinator participates in a year-long course that includes seven weeks of training at one of the university or district centers.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Each literacy coordinator conducts a long-term school-based program of professional development that provides training and coaching for the school's kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers as they implement the Literacy Collaborative framework. University or district trainers make at least two site visits per year to observe the literacy coordinators in action—teaching students, and teaching and coaching fellow teachers. The literacy coordinator attends yearly professional institutes.
- ***Networking:*** Participating teachers may attend the annual Reading Recovery Conference, where many sessions address implementation of the Literacy Collaborative framework.
- ***Implementation Review:*** After the second year, each literacy coordinator prepares an annual research report summarizing the student data collected. The literacy coordinator leads the school faculty in setting new goals for the following year that will ensure greater student achievement in reading and writing. National data, collected and analyzed at The Ohio State University, provides information needed to support school-level implementation.

Costs

Team Planning Sessions: Optional team planning sessions ($3,000-4,000) are offered to schools in Phase 1.

Literacy Coordinator Training: The costs for training the literacy coordinator include the instructional fee ($12,500), materials fee ($3,000), and tuition (varies from site to site; at OSU, tuition is $1,800 in-state and $4,500 out-of-state). Literacy coordinator travel, lodging, and meals are extra.

Annual Charges: Charges in following years include: literacy coordinator institute registration fee ($300), data analysis fee ($100 per 250 primary-aged students), school affiliation fee ($20), and site visit fee ($500 per visit plus travel).

Release Time: Literacy coordinators need release time to attend training sessions, to observe and coach classroom teachers, and to collect data to monitor student progress.

Books: The school establishes a book room of multiple copies for teaching guided reading.

Student Populations

The Literacy Collaborative has been implemented in urban, suburban, and rural schools, including many Title I and several bilingual schools (Texas, Chicago, and Boston). Spanish versions of the assessment materials and benchmark books are available. The needs of special education students are served in the Literacy Collaborative teaching model.

Special Considerations

The goal of raising literacy achievement for all children may require teachers to adopt new teaching practices and dedicate an uninterrupted daily two-to-three hour block of time to literacy. The model requires one-to-one Reading Recovery tutoring for first grade students needing additional help.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Pinnell, G. S. (1998). *The Early Literacy Learning Initiative at The Ohio State University research report: January 1998.* Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Pinnell, G. S. (1999). *Literacy Collaborative 1999 research report.* Columbus, OH: The Ohio State University.

Independent Researchers

No studies available.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Hedges Elementary 176 Hedges Street Mansfield, OH 44907 419-525-6317 Principal: JoAnn Hipsher	384	mid-size city	50%	0%	0%	0%	50%	69%	0%	19%
Union Furnace School 17938 Main Street Union Furnace, OH 43158 740-385-5393 Principal: Carol Carr	205	rural	1%	1%	0%	0%	98%	32%	0%	33%
James M. Curley School 40 Pershing Road Jamaica Plain, MA 02130 617-635-8239 Principal: Kathleen Armstrong	327	large city	56%	0%	3%	23%	18%	M	0%	9%
Tilson Elementary 2100 Bixler Circle Decatur, GA 30032 404-241-5122 Principal: Davis Cooper	601	urban fringe of large city	99%	1%	0%	0%	0%	91%	0%	1%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M = Missing data.

For more information, contact:

Andrea McCarrier
Literacy Collaborative
The Ohio State University
807 Kinnear Road
Columbus, Ohio 43212
Phone: 614-292-1759
Fax: 614-688-3980
E-mail: mccarrier.1@osu.edu

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Description Written March 1998

National Writing Project (K–16)

IN BRIEF National Writing Project	
Founder	James Gray, University of California, Berkeley
Current Service Provider	National Writing Project at Cal-Berkeley
Year Established	1974
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	160 sites
Level	K-16
Primary Goal	improving the teaching of writing
Main Features	• teachers-teaching-teachers model of professional development • local and national networks of exemplary practitioners • professional development programs designed collaboratively with schools and districts to reflect local needs • writing promoted as a tool for learning across the curriculum
Impact on Instruction	provides strategies for linking instruction, curriculum, standards, and assessment in the teaching of writing
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	none required
Impact on Schedule	none required
Parental Involvement	professional development programs can be designed with parent engagement components
Technology	professional development programs can be designed with technology components
Materials	none required

Origin/Scope

The National Writing Project (NWP) began in 1974 at the University of California, Berkeley where its founder, James Gray, established a program for K-16 teachers called the Bay Area Writing Project. The NWP has now been replicated at 160 sites in 46 states and Puerto Rico.

General Approach

The NWP has three major goals: (a) to improve the teaching of writing at all grade levels, (b) to improve professional development programs for teachers, and (c) to improve the professional standing of classroom teachers. Writing Project sites are typically housed in universities and serve multiple schools and school districts. Local sites accomplish these goals by supporting a K-16 network of exemplary teachers of writing who are able to work with schools around their professional development needs.

In practice, each local site identifies and recruits exemplary teachers for an annual invitational institute on its campus. Most often held in the summer, this intensive institute convenes teachers to demonstrate and examine their approaches to teaching writing; consider strategies for using writing as a tool in all subject areas; learn about how to teach writing by writing themselves; study theory and research underpinning best practices in the teaching of writing; and prepare themselves to lead professional development programs in the schools during the academic year.

Writing project workshops in the schools, then, are characterized first by the fact that they are taught by credible teachers — the graduates of the invitational institutes. Second, these workshops are tailored to the needs of the contracting school or district. The local project works in concert with the school faculty to design full professional development programs with sessions matched to the school, teacher, and student context. Programs are conducted in a series, rather than as one-shot events, so that teachers can receive support as they make changes in their practices. Third, writing project programs can be designed to include features like peer coaching

or to work with regular school support structures like school improvement committees or grade level teams.

National Writing Project sites also provide an array of other programs to serve individual teachers and schools, such as open enrollment summer institutes, teacher research groups, assessment workshops, emergent literacy programs, a series on writing across the curriculum, support for new teachers, writing and reading conferences, young writer's programs, seminars and study groups, and parent workshops. Program offerings at local sites typically reflect the needs and interests of teachers in their service areas.

Results

The NWP has a number of studies of impact on student performance and behavior. In a current study, 770 students in the Santa Ana Unified School District (SAUSD) are participating in the UCI Writing Project's Pathway Project. The goal of the project is to enhance the reading and writing skills of second-language learners, who represent 72% of SAUSD students, and to prepare them to become college bound. In the pilot year:

- Pathway students had better attendance rates and higher end-of-year GPAs than comparable control students, and they had improved one-half to one full letter grade on a pre-and post-test analytical writing sample;
- 25% of graduates attending Santa Ana College placed in Freshman Composition as opposed to the overall SAUSD placement rate of 4%; and
- 12% of graduates were accepted at UC campuses as opposed to the SAUSD overall acceptance rate of 3-6%.

In Baltimore, the Abell Foundation sponsored an evaluation of the effectiveness of an NWP-sponsored program, Write to Learn. The evaluation study, which used a controlled comparison school design, focused on the effect of training experiences on the practice of teaching writing and whether student achievement in writing improves as a result. Students participating scored 18 points higher on a direct assessment of writing than comparison students and were much more likely to plan, revise, and edit their writing. In the study of teacher practices that relied on portfolios, self-report, and observation to identify teacher adoption of effective practices in the teaching of writing, language arts teachers scored 25% higher than their comparison colleagues on an assessment of practice, and content area teachers scored 40% higher.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** Each local site supports its own cadre of teacher leaders who develop and conduct programs suited to the needs of the community it serves. Overall, 10,312 teacher leaders conducted NWP programs in 1996-97 for 149,396 participants across the country.
- ***Faculty Buy-In***: Many programs are open to individual teachers or teacher teams at local sites. Schools can contract with writing projects to provide inservice programs according to faculty needs. There is no requirement for whole school participation.
- ***Initial Training:*** Teachers can receive initial training in approaches to the teaching of writing or in using writing as a tool for learning across the disciplines through open enrollment summer institutes and school year inservice programs. Many writing projects also sponsor conferences and weekend workshops.

- ***Follow-Up Coaching***: Follow-up programs, including coaching and action research, can be built into the inservice design at the request of the contracting school or district.
- ***Networking***: Nationally, the NWP hosts a yearly meeting as well as conferences and retreats for teacher leaders. The NWP publishes two journals, *The Quarterly* and *The Voice,* and a series of books on the teaching of writing. The NWP web site supports electronic networking among teachers across the 160 local sites.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Local sites conduct evaluations of all their programs. The NWP conducts an annual three-day review of every site. Forty reviewers read site reports and study site data collected by an independent evaluator, Inverness Research Associates.

Costs

Local NWP sites set the fees for their services. Teachers contribute $10 per year; host institutions of local NWP sites pay $150 per year; and contributing sponsorships make up a third funding category.

Student Populations

The NWP serves teachers across the country. Teacher leaders associated with a local site draw on experience with a wide range of students and school contexts. The NWP also supports specific networks for sites focused on professional development in urban schools and in rural schools, and programs for teachers in districts with a high proportion of students in poverty and for teachers of English language learners. National student data for the 1997 leadership cadre report 20.2% Title 1; 40.5% AFDC; 12.5% LEP.

Special Considerations

None.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Eidman-Aadahl, E. (1990). *Summary report: The evaluation of the Write to Learn Program, second year.* Baltimore: Abell Foundation. (Available from the Maryland Writing Project, Towson State University).

Independent Researchers

None available.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Western Middle School 2201 West Main Street Louisville, KY 40212 502-485-8345 Contact: Jean Miller	780	mid-size city	50%	0%	<1%	<1%	40%	73%	10%	25%
George C. Meade Elementary 1600 North 18th Street Philadelphia, PA 19121-3297 215-684-5062 Contact: Frank Murphy	519	large city	98%	0%	0%	0%	0%	97%	0%	4%

Pat Henry Elementary 1401 NW Bessie Lawton, OK 73507 580-585-6383 Contact: Lisa Robinson	600	mid-size city	34%	9%	2%	12%	45%	66%	9%	15%
Kemper County High School (7-12) PO Box 429 Dekalb, MS 39328-0429 601-743-5292 Contact: Emanuel Beat	658	rural	96%	<1%	<1%	0%	4%	80%	0%	2%
Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.										

For more information, contact:

Richard Sterling, Executive Director
National Writing Project
2105 Bancroft Way, #1042
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720
Phone: 510-642-0963
Fax: 510-642-4545
E-mail: nwp@writingproject.org
Web site: http://www.writingproject.org

Mathematics Models

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Description Written March 1998
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

Core-Plus Mathematics Project/ Contemporary Mathematics in Context (9–12)

IN BRIEF Core-Plus Mathematics Project/ Contemporary Mathematics in Context	
Founder	Core-Plus Mathematics Project
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	over 500
Level	9-12 (plus accelerated 8th grade)
Primary Goal	powerful mathematics for all students
Main Features	• integrated, connected strands • mathematical modeling and problem solving • core topics accessible to all students • collaborative group investigations • multi-dimensional assessment
Impact on Instruction	materials promote active learning, active teaching, and assessment; graphics calculators are used as tools for exploration
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	all teachers are encouraged to start teaching CPMP at Course 1 and move up a course each year
Impact on Schedule	• common planning periods for staff teaching same course (encouraged) • works well in block schedules and traditional two-semester schedules
Parental Involvement	encouraged early in adoption process
Technology	graphics calculators
Materials	calculator software, linkage strips for space-shape study

Origin/Scope

Research and development for the Core-Plus Mathematics Project (CPMP) was funded by a series of grants from the National Science Foundation. The project was directed by Christian Hirsch of Western Michigan University, Arthur Coxford of the University of Michigan, James Fey of the University of Maryland, and Harold Schoen of the University of Iowa. Each course goes through a three-year research and development process. Courses 1, 2, 3, and 4 have been published by McGraw-Hill/Glencoe/ Everyday Learning Corporation. The materials have been used in over 500 schools. (Note: The publisher's title for the materials is Contemporary Mathematics in Context [CMIC]. The two titles — CMIC and CPMP — are used interchangeably.)

General Approach

CMIC is a four-year integrated mathematical sciences curriculum for high schools: a three-year sequence for all students, plus a fourth-year course continuing the preparation of students for college mathematics. Its goal is to prepare students for success in college, careers, and daily life in contemporary society. CMIC content and pedagogy are based on the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics Standards. The curriculum builds on the theme of mathematics as sense-making. Through investigations of real-life contexts, students develop a rich understanding of important mathematics that makes sense to them and, in turn, enables them to make sense out of new situations and problems.

CMIC courses share the following mathematical and instructional features:

- ***Multiple connected strands:*** Each year of the curriculum features four strands — algebra and functions, statistics and probability, geometry and trigonometry, and discrete mathematics.

- ***Mathematical modeling:*** The curriculum emphasizes mathematical modeling, including data collection, representation, interpretation, prediction, and simulation.
- ***Access:*** The curriculum is designed so that topics are accessible to all students, with methods for accommodating differences in student performance.
- ***Graphics calculators:*** This technology allows for multiple representations — numerical, graphical, and symbolic — and a focus on goals in which mathematical thinking is central.
- ***Active learning:*** CMIC offers rich problem situations that involve students in investigating, conjecturing, verifying, applying, evaluating, and communicating mathematical ideas.
- ***Multi-dimensional assessment:*** Student progress is assessed through both curriculum-embedded and supplementary assessment procedures.

Results

Both CPMP Course 1 and Course 2 students in 33 schools in 11 states outperformed comparison students on the math subtest of the Iowa Tests of Educational Development. Compared to a nationally representative norm group, CPMP students also exhibited greater mathematical growth from the beginning of grade 9 to the ends of grades 9, 10 and 11. Course 3 students outperformed a representative sample of 12th graders on NAEP math assessments.

On project-developed post-tests focusing on algebraic and geometric skills, Course 1 and Course 2 students outperformed the comparison group on conceptual, application, and problem-solving tasks. On tasks assessing algebraic procedures, Course 1 students performed somewhat below the comparison group, but this difference had disappeared by the end of Course 2.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** Summer workshops for teachers are available for each course level at Western Michigan University (WMU) and at regional sites established by Everyday Learning Corporation.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Changes in content priorities and emphases, instructional materials, and assessment methods call for strong school and community commitment.
- ***Initial Training:*** Five-day summer workshops at WMU feature hands-on experience with curriculum materials and parent involvement strategies. Project staff and new CMIC teachers discuss initial implementation results at a weekend session in November. Customized on-site workshops can be arranged through the Everyday Learning Corporation. CPMP also hosts a professional development institute for math educators who provide professional development for districts implementing the CMIC curriculum.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Telephone consultation is provided to sites, most of which are in their first year, and participants are encouraged to attend the workshop for the next course. Many sites also receive support through local improvement initiatives.
- ***Networking:*** An annual conference brings participants together, and they also interact via e-mail. The publisher disseminates a newsletter called *Math Link.*
- ***Implementation Review:*** Field test sites and those involved in the project's longitudinal study are involved in implementation review with project staff.

Costs

For each of the four published courses, materials are $47 per student and $200 for teachers. Students need access to graphics calculators, and calculator software and software guide for each course costs $38. Programs may be downloaded to all student calculators, but the first download is from a computer utilizing a Linking connector.

In addition to transportation to Kalamazoo, Michigan, for training, each teacher's participation will cost $450 for a five-day workshop (including activities, materials, and lunches). Housing is available in dormitories as well as local motels. Many districts arrange for consultants to provide in-house professional development; experienced CPMP teachers available to conduct workshops can be reached through CPMP.

Student Populations

CMIC is now being used in schools in at least 39 states — schools that vary from urban to suburban to rural, from affluent to blue-collar to low-income/high unemployment, and from white- or Hispanic-majority to 89% African-American.

Special Considerations

Effective implementation requires study and planning time and provision for early involvement of all stakeholders. Contact the developer for recommended practices regarding stakeholder involvement, professional development, alternative assessments, technology, student placement, student grouping, and scheduling.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Schoen, H. L., & Ziebarth, S. W. (1998). *Assessments of students' mathematical performance.* Iowa City: University of Iowa, Core-Plus Mathematics Project Evaluation Center.

Schoen, H. L., & Ziebarth, S. W. (1998). *Mathematical achievement on standardized tests.* Iowa City: University of Iowa, Core-Plus Mathematics Project Evaluation Center.

Independent Researchers

None available.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Sitka High School 1000 Lake Street Sitka, Alaska 99835 907-747-3263 Contact: Cheryl Bach	459	small town	0%	28%	5%	3%	62%	82%	1%	3%
Bellevue High School 10406 SE Kilamock Street Bellevue, WA 98004 425-456-7111 Contact: Eric McDowell	1,192	mid-size city	2%	<1%	21%	3%	73%	M	9%	9%

Washington High School 2525 North Sherman Boulevard Milwaukee, WI 53210 414-444-9760 Contact: Eric Schluter	1,561	large city	89%	<1%	7%	1%	2%	71%	4%	7%
Sturgis High School 216 Vinewood Sturgis, MI 49091 616-659-1515 Contact: Craig Evans	897	rural	1%	<1%	1%	4%	93%	M	1%	5%
Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M = Missing data.										

For more information, contact:

Beth Ritsema, Professional Development Coordinator
Core-Plus Math Project
Math Department
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, MI 49008
Phone: 616-387-4562
Fax: 616-387-4546
E-mail: cpmp@wmich.edu
Web site: http://www.wmich.edu/cpmp

Accepted for Inclusion July 1999
Description Written August 1999
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

Growing with Mathematics (K–5)

IN BRIEF Growing with Mathematics	
Founder	Mimosa Publications
Current Service Provider	Wright Group/McGraw-Hill
Year Established	1990 (U.S.A.)
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	1,250
Level	K-5
Primary Goal	to build a strong foundation for thinking and reasoning, computation, real-world applications, and use of language in concept development
Main Features	• balances hands-on activities with computational reinforcement • develops concepts in depth • provides number sense activities to prepare students for success with computation • connects mathematics to other curriculum areas • is based on NCTM standards
Impact on Instruction	uses a wide variety of teaching strategies
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	none
Impact on Schedule	minimal impact: daily 45-minute mathematics block
Parental Involvement	parent video, parent workshops, home link letters, home link activities, note to parents on homework pages
Technology	no additional technology required; optional Internet and CD-ROM activities
Materials	complete classroom materials provided; supplementary materials available

Origin/Scope

Growing with Mathematics is based on research conducted by Calvin and Rosemary Irons at the Learning Assistance Center in Australia as well as the research that supported the development of the NCTM standards. Paul Trafton and Thomas Rowan, Chairperson and member of the K-4 committee that drafted the standards, were selected as authors along with the Irons. The K-2 model was published in 1990, and the K-5 version followed between 1995 and 1998. The program has been implemented in 1,250 schools across the U.S., several Department of Defense Dependent Schools, and over 15 foreign countries.

General Approach

The studies conducted by the Irons revealed the importance of building a strong foundation for thinking and reasoning skills, computational skills, the ability to apply mathematics, and the role of language in the development of mathematical concepts. Accordingly, Growing with Mathematics is an activity-based, problem-solving approach to learning mathematics that incorporates computation and skill development as a major component, thus maintaining a balance between concepts and skills. Through a complete series of hands-on activities that encourage interaction and discussion, students explore, discover, and build meaning for mathematical knowledge, with both teacher and parent guidance. Emphasis is placed on content that encourages thinking and problem solving, and there is in-depth development of concepts. Computation and practice of skills are included daily so that students have a strong basis of understanding.

Growing with Mathematics provides an integrated approach to learning. The program makes connections:

- between different areas of mathematics, such as patterns, relationships, and functions
- to other curriculum areas
- to the real world

- to the home, providing parent links in the materials and holding parent workshops

A major focus of the program is number sense, which is an integral part of all lessons on number and operations. A separate Number Sense strand builds from lesson to lesson through activities found at the beginning of each lesson. The program also provides tools that create a context for both oral and written communication to help develop understanding of mathematics concepts. Students often write to record information or explain their thinking. This emphasis on communication is designed to promote success in problem solving.

The program's learning goals are closely aligned with the NCTM Standards, both with respect to what and how students learn. Students' first encounter with learning goals is exploratory, involving use of materials, active engagement, and discussion of mathematical ideas. This kind of exploration makes the content goals accessible and provides the time and experiences necessary for students to learn successfully. Emphasis is placed on content that will help students become capable problem solvers and critical thinkers.

Results

Data from numerous schools and districts, drawn from a variety of national, state, and local tests, show consistent growth across multiple years for students exposed to the Growing with Mathematics program. For example, in the Cleveland (Ohio) school district, where all K-3 students have used the program since 1993, the percentage of students passing the fourth grade Ohio Proficiency Test for Mathematics rose steadily from 1995 to 1998. Cleveland was the only large school district in the state that demonstrated growth every year across that period. On the grade six Connecticut Mastery Test, the percentage of sixth-grade students in the Montville School District who met the statewide goal rose from 46 percent in 1994 to 68 percent in 1997. Over the same span, the percentage of students statewide meeting the goal rose only from 46 percent to 54 percent. (Montville elementary students had been using the program since 1991.) At an elementary school in Washington state that adopted the program for K-3 students in 1993, percentile scores for fourth grade students on the CTBS total math battery rose from the 54th percentile in 1993 (prior to student exposure to the program) to the 74th percentile two years later.

Similar results have been documented at schools and districts in Colorado, Kansas, New York, Pennsylvania, and other states on the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), and the Riverside Performance Assessment.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** Mimosa has a close association with INSIGHT, an independent training company that provides consultants nationwide who are trained in general mathematics education as well as Growing with Mathematics. Many of the INSIGHT consultants have used the program, so they are able to provide first-hand knowledge to new teachers. INSIGHT is also available for staff development training on different content areas of mathematics, and they can be contracted to train district trainers for ongoing help.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Although no formal buy-in is required, schoolwide buy-in obviously lays the foundation for success, since optimal results are achieved when students progress from one grade level to the next using the same program. Publisher's representatives will visit sites to speak to district mathematics coordinators and/or to conduct presentations to interested groups.

- ***Initial Training:*** For district-level adoptions, Mimosa provides days of training based on the amount of program materials purchased. Additionally, summer institutes are held for large adopting districts. For individual schools that adopt the program schoolwide, the company provides a minimum of five training days for teachers: two training days before the school year begins, and three training days during the first year, ideally spaced after 4, 8, and 12 weeks of implementation.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Beyond the three follow-up training days provided as part of the standard schoolwide implementation package, schools may schedule as many additional training days as they wish. Only consultant availability and site funds limit opportunities for continuous training.
- ***Networking:*** Mimosa maintains a list of current users nationwide who are available to discuss the program. The publisher also provides an e-mail address and toll-free number staffed with a program specialist who can assist users with post-training implementation questions. A Web site contains answers to frequently asked questions.
- ***Implementation Review:*** For sites that implement the program as a pilot, teachers complete a set of feedback forms and send them to the publisher. The publisher provides implementation support and makes recommendations for program improvement.

Costs

Materials cost under $1,000 per classroom for all levels except third grade, where the cost is $1,136 per classroom. The sets contain everything needed for complete program implementation. Yearly material replacement costs average $165 per classroom, based on a class size of 24. Optional consumable practice and homework books are available at an average cost of $205 per classroom of 24 students.

For schoolwide adoptions, two days of initial training and three days of follow-up are included at no extra cost to the school. Additional days of training may be purchased for $600 per trainer per day, plus expenses. Schools also need to figure in their own costs for professional development days for teachers.

Student Populations

The program was designed to meet the educational needs of all socio-economic levels, different ethnic and racial populations, and male and female students. It serves core classes, gifted and talented, Title I, special needs, ESL, LEP, and bilingual students. A complete parallel program of instruction is available in Spanish for K-2 along with math books in Spanish for K-3. The program is used across the U.S. and in several American schools in Europe. Singapore selected the program to be used in all government kindergartens. Topics are designed to appeal to a diverse student population.

Special Considerations

The content recommendations of Growing with Mathematics closely reflect the NCTM recommendations, current research on learning, and the experiences of schools in the U.S. and other countries. The program requires a strong commitment from teachers and more preparation than a traditional basal approach.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

[Cleveland City Schools: Ohio Fourth Grade Proficiency Test for Mathematics]. (1998). Unpublished raw data.

[Montville School District: Performance on Connecticut Mastery Test.] (1997). Unpublished raw data.

Unpublished data from other sites is available from the developer.

Independent Researchers

None available.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Denison Elementary School 3799 West 33rd Street Cleveland, OH 44109 216-741-2916 Contact: Jacki Underwood	816	large city	23%	1%	1%	14%	61%	80%	1%	5%
Willcox Elementary 501 West Delos Street Willcox, AZ 85643 520-384-4211 Contact: Sue O'Connell	531	small town	1%	1%	1%	43%	54%	57%	25%	10%
Head O'Meadow Elementary 94 Boggs Hill Road Newtown, CT 06470 203-426-7670	572	rural	1%	1%	1%	1%	96%	3%	0%	7%
Chambers Primary School 9101 56th Street West University Place, WA 253-566-5650 Contact: Kaycie Hersey	355	urban fringe of large city	11%	1%	13%	6%	69%	11%	3%	16%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Ed Gregory
Wright Group/McGraw-Hill
155 East 91st Street, #9A
New York, NY 10128
Phone: 800-831-1688 or 212-831-1688
Fax: 212-876-8273
E-mail: edward_gregory@mcgraw-hill.com
Web site: www.growingwithmath.com

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Description Written March 1998

MATH Connections®: A Secondary Mathematics Core Curriculum (9–12)

IN BRIEF MATH Connections	
Founder	Connecticut Business and Industry Association
Current Service Provider	MATH Connections Implementation Center
Year Established	1992
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	144
Level	9-12
Primary Goal	to provide a core curriculum that opens the concepts of higher mathematics to all students
Main Features	• 3-year core curriculum • thematic, concept-driven approach • integrates higher mathematics concepts • emphasizes connections between mathematics and other disciplines and between mathematics and the real world
Impact on Instruction	requires graphing calculators
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	must be implemented with at least two teachers working and planning together
Impact on Schedule	none
Parental Involvement	school districts are encouraged to introduce MATH Connections to parents at meetings facilitated by program facilitators
Technology	graphing calculators for students; one TI view screen master calculator
Materials	textbooks, teacher resources, blackline masters, and assessments

Origin/Scope

MATH Connections is a project undertaken with a five-year $4.1 million National Science Foundation grant awarded in 1992 to the Connecticut Business and Industry Association (CBIA) Education Foundation. As of May 2001, MATH Connections had been adopted by 144 schools.

General Approach

The overall mission of MATH Connections was to develop a core curriculum for grades 9-12 that opens the concepts of higher mathematics to all students and inspires new interest and excitement in mathematics for both students and faculty. MATH Connections was created by a diverse team of curriculum developers: mathematicians; scientists; educators in the fields of math, science, and technology; and business people.

MATH Connections is a three-year core curriculum, usually used in grades 9-11 or 10-12. The curriculum integrates the concepts of higher mathematics — such as algebra, geometry, probability, statistics and trigonometry — into a package that is interesting for all students. The project uses the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM) standards as a guide for student performance, teacher professional development, and alternative student assessment. Technology is integrated into the curriculum with graphing calculators and computers, which students use to investigate concepts in greater depth and breadth, make conjectures, and validate findings.

MATH Connections uses a common thematic thread that blends many mathematical topics that traditionally have been taught separately to emphasize the interconnectedness among mathematical ideas. The project is built around connections, including those between

mathematics and the real world of people, business, and everyday life; between mathematics and science; and between mathematics and other subjects such as history, geography and language arts. The project focuses on four aspects of mathematics: (1) mathematics as problem-solving, (2) mathematics as communication, (3) mathematics as reasoning, and (4) mathematics as making connections.

Each of the three years of the program is built around a general theme that serves as a thread for the topics covered. The three themes are Data, Numbers, and Patterns; Shapes in Space; and Mathematical Models. MATH Connections is divided into a series of six half-year-long textbooks. The 100+ assessments built into the curriculum include written, oral, and demonstration formats. In addition to assessing students' ability to perform standard procedures, such as solving equations, the assessments also measure students' approach to non-routine problems taken from the real world and their understanding of mathematics concepts and how they relate to each other.

Results

The first group of five schools field testing MATH Connections indicate increased student achievement and an increased positive attitude towards mathematics. One study compared two classes of students in a suburban high school whose mean test scores in eighth grade were essentially equivalent. By the end of tenth grade, MATH Connections students were found to have significantly higher scores. Another external evaluator found that 53% of MATH Connections students met or exceeded the state goal of 266 on the Connecticut Academic Performance Test, while 43% of non-MATH Connections students met the same goal. In a third study, MATH Connections was found to have a positive effect on students' confidence levels in learning mathematics and on their perceptions of its usefulness.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** MATH Connections' publisher, IT'S ABOUT TIME, is augmenting the present staff with a national corps of professional educators, trained by MATH Connections staff. They also are working with universities around the country to set up regional centers for teacher training in Leadership Institutes. These regional centers will be at teaching universities, working in conjunction with MATH Connections staff.
- ***Faculty Buy-in:*** During the field testing stage, MATH Connections has required buy-in from the superintendent, principal, and math chair. They also require a minimum of two teachers teaching two classes and having the same planning period. While they can work with more than two teachers per school, two is the minimum for the program to be successful.
- ***Initial Training:*** MATH Connections holds Summer Leadership Institutes, as well as institutes throughout the year, for teachers and administrators in schools adopting the MATH Connections curriculum.
- ***Follow-up Coaching:*** Follow-Up Academic Leadership Institutes are held on designated Saturdays throughout the school year to ensure that teachers receive instructors' support and opportunities to share their experiences with the curriculum. Regional centers also will provide support on an as-needed basis.
- ***Networking:*** A newsletter keeps administrators, teachers, and business partners apprised of events related to the project. All project teachers have access to the electronic communications network housed at the Talcott Mountain Science Center in Hartford,

Connecticut. E-mail, telephone, and an Internet Web site provide additional support by MATH Connections staff and provide for teacher-teacher interaction.

- ***Implementation Review:*** Site visits are conducted on a regular basis by MATH Connections staff and master instructors.

Costs

Textbooks cost $49.95 per student, plus $99.95 for the Teachers' Resource package, which includes the teachers' edition, teacher commentary (which provides professional development on mathematics), black-line masters, and a set of Form A student assessments. Additional costs include one classroom set of graphing calculators ($69-$89 per student), one TI view screen master calculator (approximately $300 per classroom), and one overhead projector (approximately $150 per classroom). There may be a cost (shared with the publisher) for professional development, depending on the number of teachers and administrators participating.

Ancillary materials are available, including additional student assessments ($91.90 per grade); supplemental problem-solving materials and skill activities ($99.90 per grade); student workbooks ($4.95 per student per year); test banks ($32.90 per grade); and Extensions, or collections of problems, simulations, and projects ($49.90 per grade).

Student Populations

MATH Connections serves a diverse population, having been field-tested in inner-city, urban, suburban, and rural school districts with African-American, Hispanic, and Caucasian students. Year I of the curriculum has served eighth grade honor students who then continue the program in high school. The program also has served students for whom English is a second language; special education students who have been mainstreamed; and, in one school, special education students in a self-contained class.

Special Considerations

The developers suggest that teachers and students have access to computers, e-mail, and the Internet.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer
None available.

Independent Researchers
Leinwand, S. (1996, July 6). Capturing and sharing success stories. *NCSM Newsletter, 25*(4).

Sample Sites

No sample site data available.

For more information, contact:

June G. Ellis
MATH Connections Implementation Center
750 Old Main Street, Suite 303
Rocky Hill, CT 06067
Phone: 860-721-7010

Fax: 860-721-7026
E-mail: mathconx@aol.com or jellis@mathconnections.com
Web site: http://www.mathconnections.com

Science Models

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Description Written March 1998

GALAXY Classroom Science (K–5)

IN BRIEF GALAXY Classroom Science	
Founder	EMG GALAXY Classroom
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1993
# Schools Served (Jan. 1998)	600+
Level	K-5
Primary Goal	improve science learning by all students through inquiry-based, "hands-on/minds-on" authentic curriculum
Main Features	• global interactive network of elementary schools linked by satellite, fax, and Internet • 15-minute video broadcasts • three one-year, theme-based science curricula • a one-year language arts curriculum
Impact on Instruction	teachers use technology, curriculum, and materials to engage students as scientists exploring phenomena, developing scientific thinking processes, and communicating findings
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	none
Impact on Schedule	schedule must accommodate satellite broadcasts
Parental Involvement	curriculum includes regular take-home component that teachers may use
Technology	satellite broadcast network, interactive audio conferencing telephone and fax technology
Materials	teachers' guide; student print materials, including bulletin featuring student input; science kits for hands-on investigations; bibliography of children's science literature

Origin/Scope

The GALAXY Classroom grew out of a 1990 initiative by GM Hughes Electronics, with later funding from the National Science Foundation, to create resources that would help teachers significantly improve learning in America's elementary schools. The effort combined an extensive array of telecommunications resources with many "best practices" in teaching and learning, including hands-on investigations using GEMS (Great Explorations in Math and Science) and FOSS (Full Option Science System) units originally developed at the Lawrence Hall of Science at the University of California, Berkeley.

In 1993-94, GALAXY Classroom began demonstration projects in 40 schools. As of January 1998, 600 schools nationwide are part of the GALAXY Classroom, with an additional 40 schools in Canada and two in Mexico.

General Approach

The GALAXY Classroom is an inquiry-based, student-centered curriculum and instructional approach supported by a global interactive network of elementary schools, which are linked by satellite and computer technologies. GALAXY Classroom Science curricula consist of three one-year units: Fixer Uppers for grades one or two, S.N.O.O.P.S. for grades four or five, and (new for 1998-99) Finders, Seekers, Science Keepers for kindergarten or grade one. There is also a one-year language arts unit called The House for grades three, four, or five.

GALAXY Classroom Science seeks to improve science learning for all students by giving teachers tools to create learning environments that stimulate and nourish inquiry-based learning. Through the "hands-on/minds-on" curriculum, students learn specified core science concepts and practice using scientific thinking processes (e.g., observing, communicating, organizing and comparing). The science units are organized around themes that follow the National Science Education Standards on science concepts and processes appropriate for

students at each level. Additional underlying principles include constructivist thinking, cultural diversity, authentic inquiry, relevance for all students, and connection to state and national standards to improve student performance.

The themes, such as Science Is Doing What-Ifs to Use and Compare Materials, are developed through television broadcasts and classroom hands-on activities. In each 15-minute video episode, a diverse group of children model for students how curiosity, observation, comparing, and problem-solving can help them construct knowledge about science from the content and context of their lives. Students in the classroom investigate questions posed by the episode and attempt to answer them through a variety of activities. Teachers facilitate and encourage student collaboration, open-ended exploration, testing of ideas, and active involvement in the process of discovery. Students then use fax or e-mail technology to communicate their findings to the television show and other students on the network. Student work is shared on the television show and in student bulletins sent to all GALAXY classrooms.

Results

Independent comprehensive evaluations conducted of the initial demonstration phases of both science units found them "highly successful initiatives." For grade levels K-2, students in the GALAXY classroom showed a significant growth in curiosity (central to the development of scientific thinking processes) compared to their non-GALAXY peers. Most GALAXY students understood the concepts of the two themes, with almost half the students answering questions about one theme without making a single mistake. Teachers' personal experience and confidence in teaching science improved over a comparison group, and time spent teaching classroom science more than doubled for GALAXY teachers compared to the previous year.

S.N.O.O.P.S. students (grade levels 3-5) outperformed comparison groups in the use of scientific thinking processes, surpassing the next grade level in tests on classification abilities. The majority of GALAXY students demonstrated they understood the curriculum's core science concepts and could apply them in new contexts. GALAXY students showed more positive attitudes towards participating in science class than their counterparts. Teacher attitudes towards science teaching also improved. Teachers reported an increase in students' teamwork, communication, and writing skills as a result of working collaboratively and crafting detailed accounts of investigations and findings to fax to the network.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** EMG GALAXY is the national center, located in Scottsdale, Arizona. There are also regional staff throughout the country and an extensive electronic network.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** No formal process. EMG GALAXY requires that teachers receive training and have access to the equipment and material (videos may be mailed if schools lack the satellite technology).
- ***Initial Training:*** Two-day training for all teachers using GALAXY Science. Training is usually conducted within 50 miles of a participating school. Teachers receive instructional guides as part of training.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** EMG GALAXY provides a variety of support mechanisms, including periodic on-site coaching from regional staff, weekly planning calendars, teacher newsletters, updated curriculum resources on its Web site, and a toll-free number for teacher support. Additional teacher training is available via the program's satellite network.

- ***Networking:*** The program has an extensive networking system, including the satellite network, audio conferencing telephone, Web site, listserv, newsletters, a fax/phone/e-mail directory of all teachers, and a toll-free number for teacher support. The program suggests specific ways for classes to interact with other schools every two weeks. Teachers are expected to use fax or e-mail to encourage student communication and interaction.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Regional staff review implementation as part of periodic site visits. The program also tracks classroom participation by monitoring fax responses. It follows up with schools not using the fax technology to determine why the program is not being utilized fully and to provide assistance.

Costs

The cost of GALAXY Classroom depends upon the number of enrolled schools and teachers. The average annual cost is $15,000 per school including program subscription, Web site enrollment, online teacher support, student interactivity, teacher development institutes, and hands-on kits for all classrooms. The mandatory introductory teacher institute is offered for all teachers new to the program. Schools need a television and VCR as well as a fax and several computers with Web connectivity.

Student Populations

GALAXY is designed to reach a diverse range of student populations to improve achievement in science by all students. In the pilot evaluation, 60%-70% of the GALAXY students were classified as "disadvantaged," with 20% Limited English Proficiency. GALAXY Science Classroom is broadcast in English, Spanish, and open-captioned for the hearing impaired.

Special Considerations

GALAXY Science Classroom requires a shift for some teachers to an environment in which the teacher facilitates learning by collaborating with students as mutual explorers.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

None available.

Independent Researchers

Guth, G., Austin, S., De Long, B., & Pasta, D. (1995). *Evaluation of GALAXY Classroom Science for grades K-2: Final report.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Guth, G., Austin, S., De Long, B., Pasta, D., & Block, C. (1995). *GALAXY Classroom Science evaluation for grades 3-5: Final report.* San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Ealy Elementary 1810 Commerce Road West Bloomfield, MI 48328 248-738-3310 Contact: Paul Drummond	530	urban fringe of large city	12%	1%	9%	1%	78%	5%	M	M
Craycroft Elementary 5455 East Littletown Road Tucson, AZ 85706 520-545-2628 Contact: Mike Bloker	455	rural	6%	2%	2%	60%	30%	M	M	M
Bill Arp Elementary 4841 Highway 5 Douglasville, GA 30135 770-920-4335 Contact: Sue Beck	486	urban fringe of large city	11%	1%	0%	1%	87%	24%	M	M
Marquez Elementary 16821 Marquez Avenue Pacific Palisades, CA 90272 310-454-4019 Contact: Laurie Wong-Farrell	653	large city	4%	6%	6%	8%	81%	7%	M	M

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M = Missing data.

For more information, contact:

Bill Schmitt
Teacher Universe GALAXY Classroom
2151 East Broadway Road, Suite 203
Tempe, AZ 85282
Phone: 800-303-9070, ext. 64
Fax: 480-449-9009
E-mail: bschmitt@GALAXY.org
Web site: http://www.galaxy.org

Accepted for Inclusion March 1999
Description Written May 1999

Iowa Chautauqua Program (K–12)

IN BRIEF Iowa Chautauqua Program	
Founder	Robert E. Yager
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1983
# Schools Served (1/1/99)	143 in Iowa, 67 in 17 other states
Level	K-12 (emphasis on 6-10)
Primary Goal	to alter instruction of science teachers to enhance student learning
Main Features	• year-long professional development sequence • use of National Science Education Standards • constructivist approach
Impact on Instruction	student-centered instruction; cooperative learning; active scientific inquiry; focus on depth of understanding; attempts to link science to students' prior experience and to local situations and materials
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	more teacher collaboration; more involvement of community
Impact on Schedule	collaboration in allotting time to meet school objectives; may lead to block scheduling
Parental Involvement	parents and others in community are identified as partners in learning
Technology	use of computer, Internet, and other advanced technology is encouraged
Materials	target curricula with reform goals and procedures

Origin/Scope

The Iowa Chautauqua Program was initiated in 1983 as part of a 17-state project sponsored by the National Science Foundation. Initially the program involved only middle school teachers; five years after its inception, it enrolled early elementary as well as high school teachers. Most of the validation effort, however, has focused upon grades 4-10. The program has been implemented in 143 schools in Iowa and 67 schools in 17 other states.

General Approach

The Iowa Chautauqua Program is a year-long staff development sequence designed to help K-12 science teachers align their curriculum, instruction, and assessment with the vision embodied in the National Science Education Standards. The standards establish eight content areas for science education:

1. Unifying Concepts and Processes
2. Science as Inquiry
3. Physical Science
4. Life Science
5. Earth and Space Science
6. Science and Technology
7. Science in Personal and Societal Perspectives
8. History and Nature of Science

The program prepares teachers to pilot test short teaching units during the fall based on content standards in these areas. After additional collaboration and training (including action research projects), teachers working in teams develop and pilot longer instructional modules adapting curricular materials developed nationally (often with federal support). The eventual goal is the creation of a unified schoolwide science curriculum and assessment plan.

The Chautauqua program prepares teachers to use constructivist instructional strategies in the classroom. This means less emphasis on lecture, demonstration, memorization, and rigid adherence to curriculum. It means more emphasis on discussion, teacher collaboration, active inquiry, cooperative learning, continuous assessment of student understanding, and use of student experience and local issues as vehicles for learning.

Results

The Iowa Chautauqua Program and its successor, the Iowa Scope, Sequence, and Coordination project, have been evaluated by outside evaluator teams, doctoral candidates, annual assessment reports, and studies in 10 states and 6 international settings. Most of these studies have focused on changes in teacher practice and attitude. Several, however, have examined student achievement in six domains of science learning: concepts, process skills, applications, creativity, world view, and attitude. In one study, for example, 15 lead teachers each taught one science class using the Chautauqua approach and another using a traditional textbook approach. Students (a total of 722) were randomly assigned to treatment and traditional classes. Pre-tests were given to students in September and post-tests in April. The type of test used varied from domain to domain. For example, the concept domain was assessed with multiple choice tests available from textbook publishers, the process domain with 13 skills identified by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the application domain by multiple choice items generated by program developers. The results revealed no difference between Chautauqua and control students in the concept domain (traditional science content); in the other five domains, however, Chautauqua students demonstrated significantly more growth than control students.

Other studies have found that female students in classrooms taught by Chautauqua teachers have more positive attitudes towards science than counterparts in traditional science classes. Studies have also demonstrated numerous positive effects on teachers, including better understanding of the nature of science and greater confidence in ability to teach it.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** Four full-time coordinators in Iowa are available to help initiate new Chautauqua centers, and 29 leaders outside Iowa can assist with other developing programs. In addition, there are mentor teachers (nearly 50 in Iowa and almost as many in other areas) who are vital partners (usually one for 10-15 new teachers). Finally, there are potential trainers for the model across the U.S.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** An Awareness Afternoon is usually planned. The program works best when initial teachers opt in on their own. These teachers are often able to engage the rest of the faculty.
- ***Initial Training:*** The program organizes a sequence of training events over a year-long period. First, there is a two-week Summer Leadership Institute, which may be held on-site (for large districts), at a central site (in states where several schools or districts are involved), or at the University of Iowa (for sites from diverse locations). In all cases, experienced Chautauqua teachers are invited to assist with training. Second, there is a three-week Summer Training Institute that introduces new teachers from a given site to Chautauqua instructional strategies and helps them plan a five-day science unit. Organized by the leaders involved in Leadership Training, these institutes are held in Iowa or on-site if there are 20 or more teachers involved. Third, after new teachers have

piloted the unit, there is a 2½-day fall short course (held locally) where teachers develop month-long science modules. Finally, there is a 2½-day spring short course (also held locally) where teachers amass assessment data, review experiences with the modules, and plan next steps for expanding the program.

- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** In addition to the fall and spring short courses, the local consultant for the project conducts two day-long sessions with the lead teachers during the year. Once a week, administrators, lead teachers, and parents from each building hold meetings for collection and consideration of assessment data. Throughout the year, lead teachers engage in action research projects.
- ***Networking:*** Throughout the first year, participating teachers have numerous opportunities at workshops and meetings to share experiences. Local consultants also provide a series of interim communications with central staff, lead teachers, and fellow participants, including a newsletter, special memoranda, and monthly telephone contacts. Finally, consultants plan a series of workshops to highlight pilot efforts as a way of interesting other schools and districts in the program.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Program staff conduct no formal implementation review. However, gathering data on teacher change and student achievement is built into the program. To help teachers with this process, program developers designed the *Iowa Assessment Handbook,* with sample assessment items addressing six domains of science.

Costs

Costs vary considerably based on numbers of teachers and schools involved, distance for lead teachers and teacher participants, and location of leadership workshops (i.e., on-site or at the University of Iowa). Every attempt is made to keep travel costs low.

The Summer Leadership Institute usually involves 20 persons, including grade level teachers, scientists, and curriculum leaders. After leadership training, teams are organized to work with teachers on-site — usually 30 teachers. It works best to have one lead teacher for each 10 to 12 teacher participants for the three-week Summer Training Institute and the two short courses. Costs include:

- Summer Leadership Institute: $10,500 for honoraria for the Chautauqua director, three experienced Chautauqua teachers, a scientist, and a state science consultant, plus expenses.
- Summer Training Institute: $15,800 for the director, three lead teachers, two scientists, two state consultants, and two national curriculum materials experts, plus expenses.
- Fall and Spring Short Courses: $8,500 each for honoraria for the director, two lead teachers, and a consultant, plus expenses.

Additionally, schools will need to cover expenses for teachers (including travel and substitutes).

It is possible to plan programs that involve fewer or greater numbers of teachers. It is important, however, that the program be viewed as continuous over a calendar year.

Student Populations

Teachers are prepared to function in heterogeneous, non-tracked classrooms and to pay particular attention to the needs of female, minority, and low-achieving students. Several studies have shown that female students in Chautauqua programs perform better and like science more than female students in traditional science courses.

Special Considerations

Teachers in the Chautauqua program must be open to constructivist teaching and learning principles. This means, among other things, that students work together, help define the content of programs, and are free to seek directions that interest them.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

None available.

Independent Researchers

Iskandar, S. M. (1991). *An evaluation of the science-technology-society approach to science teaching.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.

Mackinnu. (1991). *Comparison of learning outcomes between classes taught with a science-technology-society (STS) approach and a textbook oriented approach.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.

Spake-Blunck, S. M. (1993). *Evaluating the effectiveness of the Iowa Chautauqua Inservice Program: Changing the reculturing practices of teachers.* Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Windham School RR #1 Box 27 Newfane, VT 05345 802-365-7651 Contact: Orly Munzing	57	rural	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	M	M	M
Quaker Valley School 400 Chestnut Road Sewickley, PA 15143 412-749-3616 Contact: Dan Pellis	454	urban fringe of large city	6%	0%	1%	0%	93%	M	M	M
Sturgis Schools (K-9) 1230 Douglas Sturgis, SD 57785 605-347-2523 Contact: Barry Furze	27	small town	0%	2%	0%	2%	96%	94%	M	M
Charles City Comm. Schools 500 North Grand Avenue Charles City, IA 50616 515-257-6530 Contact: Janet Dunkel	461	rural	<1%	0%	1%	2%	97%	34%	M	M

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M = Missing data.

For more information, contact:

Robert E. Yager
Science Education Center
769 VanAllen Hall
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52242

Phone: 319-335-1189
Fax: 319-335-1188
E-mail: robert-yager@uiowa.edu

Other Models

Accepted for Inclusion March 1999
Description Written May 1999
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

ACCESS (PreK–1)

IN BRIEF ACCESS	
Founder	Primak Educational Foundation
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1982
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	3,117
Level	preK-1
Primary Goal	to provide a comprehensive early educational program that promotes intellectual, social, and language development utilizing a preventive approach to learning problems
Main Features	• curricula in four areas • individually paced learning • extended curriculum range • diversity of activities • mixed instructional modes • development of positive self-concepts
Impact on Instruction	small-group instruction, more adult/child interaction, better knowledge of student needs and growth, awareness of daily objectives
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	appropriate use of paraprofessional help; involvement of parents
Impact on Schedule	teacher and paraprofessional planning time
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	yes (particularly language, math, science, and perceptual-motor development)
Parental Involvement	parent workshops; parent involvement in home instruction; parent aides in classrooms
Technology	none required
Materials	teacher manuals; curriculum-based assessments; implementation kits including activities, manipulatives, picture files, video training tapes

Origin/Scope

The Primak Educational Foundation was formed in 1980 by a group of early childhood and special education professionals from West Chester University who had helped develop Project COPE (Cognitively-Oriented Pre-Primary Experience). The foundation was established to continue work associated with Project COPE, but as an upgraded program under a new name: ACCESS: A Comprehensive Curriculum for Early Student Success. The program has been implemented in more than 3,000 schools in 49 states, U.S. territories, and Department of Defense Dependents Schools in Europe.

General Approach

ACCESS is a sequentially programmed, pre-primary curriculum and management system that provides for individual growth and learning of basic skills. The program's wide range of activities and objectives makes it available for use with pre-primary children from varied socio-economic backgrounds and with varied learning needs. The program contains four main components: First Level Language (Kindersay), First Level Math (Kindermath), First Level Science (Kinder-Sci), and First Perceptions (Kindersee).

A curriculum-based assessment is used to determine each student's developmental level. Based on skills and development at entry, each child works through a series of activities to reach advanced objectives.

Understanding takes place through assimilation and the use of concrete objects rather than abstractions and rote memorization. With well-defined, step-by-step, closely sequenced levels and hands-on activities, the curriculum helps to determine children's needs and to

stimulate intellectual and language growth. Each level is a mini-lesson plan, complete with objective, materials, method, and evaluation. Children pursue the objectives through individualized, small group, and large group instruction as well as free inquiry situations. The program contains lessons in conceptual language, perceptual-motor, and math/science development, as well as in social studies, art/music, and health/safety. The oral language, perceptual-motor, and math materials are also available in Spanish.

Parents are encouraged to participate at home and as aides in the classroom, and parent workshops are strongly encouraged. Paraprofessionals and classroom volunteers can easily be trained to use the materials.

Results

Multiple evaluations of ACCESS's four main components have yielded considerable evidence of effectiveness:

- ***Kindersay:*** A total of 300 treatment and 97 comparison students, representing 25 classes from 18 different schools in five states, participated in evaluations of Kindersay over a seven-year period. Children who participated in the program consistently achieved statistically significant increases in scores on tests that measure language concept skills (Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test, and the Cooperative Pre-school Inventory). In contrast, children in comparison groups who did not receive Kindersay instruction evidenced average test score losses or only small gains.
- ***Kindermath:*** During the 1989-90 and 1991-92 school years, evaluations of Kindermath were conducted in three states, involving 13 treatment and six comparison classes. Children who participated in the program posted standard score gains of almost 10 points on the "How Much and How Many" scale of the CIRCUS Test, gaining 20 percentile ranks. Children in comparison groups posted gains of 7 points and lost a percentile rank.
- ***Kinder-Sci:*** The science materials were field tested in a rural site, a small city, and an urban area. A total of 288 students in 18 classes from nine schools participated. A pre-test, post-test treatment-comparison group design was used to gauge program effects. Children who received program instruction outperformed students who did not to a statistically significant and educationally meaningful degree on the Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery science test.
- ***Kindersee:*** Pre-kindergarten students who participated in Kindersee and Kindersay were individually tested on the Cooperative Preschool Inventory that included — in addition to basic information and vocabulary — concepts of size, shape, motion, and visual motor performance. The total group exhibited statistically significant gains averaging an increase of more than 16 NCEs from pre- to post-test. This gain translated into an increase of 10 percentile ranks.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The Primak Educational Foundation's national center provides services for initial planning. Training is provided by foundation staff who are experienced users of the program. Capacity building of local trainers is also a goal of the project.

- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Faculty buy-in involves: (a) an agreement to carry out the local implementation timeline developed during training; (b) participation in the evaluation of student growth using the program's curriculum-based assessment and standardized tests; and (c) establishment of parent workshop schedules, plans for developing instructional cooperation at home and school, and follow-up participation.
- ***Initial Training:*** Training is carried out in keeping with district/school needs and the number of program components to be initially implemented. Each component requires at least one full day, followed by three to four follow-up meetings/workshops during the first year. Teacher aides, parents, and program specialists who will assist with the program should participate in the workshops. Administrators should attend at least the overview so they can provide support during the implementation process.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Technical assistance is provided in the following areas: (1) additional training in classroom management (where needed); (2) curriculum-based assessment of children; (3) implementation evaluation; (4) parent and paraprofessional training; (5) training practitioners as trainers; (6) impact evaluation by an external evaluator. In addition to site visits, conference calls are provided. An on-site advocate is recommended for project facilitation. This individual is often an administrator or specialist who provides continuity over a period of several years.
- ***Networking:*** Networking begins at the initial training workshop. Discussion and role-playing activities encourage the exchange of ideas and solutions. Follow-up activities include staff of multiple schools/districts. The project's toll-free number allows for easy communication with those at the national center.
- ***Implementation Review:*** The project uses the following instruments for implementation review: implementation-concerns questionnaire, implementation timeline, key component checklist, key elements observation forms, and status of project year-end survey.

Costs

Training in all four curricular areas can be accomplished in three days at a cost of $1,800 for one trainer plus travel expenses. One-day training workshops for any single component cost $600 for the trainer plus expenses. A curriculum and materials kit is required for each classroom in each of the curriculum areas at a cost of $150 to $200 per kit.

Half-day awareness sessions cost $300 plus travel; daylong on-site follow-up sessions cost $600 plus travel.

Student Populations

ACCESS has been implemented in Title I urban and rural schools nationwide. Many of the schools serve large numbers of disadvantaged students and children with disabilities. The program also has been successfully used with hearing-impaired children in Texas and with autistic children in Mississippi. One implementation of the program, funded for three years by the U.S. Department of Education, involved children who were language delayed. Additionally, a number of schools, including several in the District of Columbia and Washington state, have found the materials useful for teaching English-language learners.

Special Considerations

It is important that staff receive assistance in classroom management so that small-group instruction can be implemented for part of each day.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer
None available.

Independent Researchers
Doino-Ingersoll, J. (1990). *First Level Language: A submission to U.S. Department of Education Program Effectiveness Panel.* Larchmont, NY: Magi Educational Services.
Doino-Ingersoll, J. (1994a). *Evaluation results of Kindersay & Kindersee in Hancock, NY.* Verona, NJ: Strategic Research.
Doino-Ingersoll, J. (1994b). *First Level Science: A submission to U.S. Department of Education Program Effectiveness Panel.* Verona, NJ: Strategic Research.
McKay, T., & Doino-Ingersoll, J. (1989). *First Level Mathematics: A submission to the Department of Education Program Effectiveness Panel.* Larchmont, NY: Magi Educational Services.

Sample Sites

Please contact the Primak Educational Foundation first (800-444-5729), and staff will arrange for requesters to contact these and other sites:

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Aberdeen Elementary School PO Drawer 607 Aberdeen, MS 39730 Contact: Cheryl Crosby	376	small town	85%	0%	0%	0%	15%	72%	0%	0%
Hancock Elementary School 16 Reed Street Hancock, NY Contact: Carol Daddazio	197	rural	0%	0%	0%	<1%	99%	40%	0%	10%
Anna Merritt Elementary School Early Childhood Center 389 Green Street Lockport, NY Contact: Ann Jackson	417	urban fringe of large city	16%	0%	1%	3%	80%	48%	4%	50%
Bancroft Elementary School 1755 Newton Street, NW Washington, DC 20010 Contact: Susan Williams	577	large city	20%	0%	13%	65%	2%	M	83%	15%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M = Missing data.

For more information, contact:

Mary A. Felleisen
Primak Educational Foundation
PO Box 701
Devon, PA 19333
Phone: 800-444-5729
Fax: 610-644-6789
E-mail: maf4access@aol.com

Accepted for Inclusion August 1998
Description Written September 1998
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

HOSTS: Help One Student To Succeed (K–12)

IN BRIEF HOSTS: Help One Student To Succeed	
Founder	Bill Gibbons
Current Service Provider	HOSTS Structured Mentoring
Year Established	1971
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	1,127
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	improve the performance of low-achieving students through individualized instruction
Main Features	• structured mentoring programs that involve community volunteers • personalized learning plans for participating students • computer database of resources and instructional strategies
Impact on Instruction	no necessary impact on regular classroom instruction; personalized learning plans for tutored students
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	master teacher recommended during training period
Impact on Schedule	participating students need at least 30 minutes per day four days per week for tutoring
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	language arts, math, Spanish
Parental Involvement	prepares parents and community members to deliver individualized instruction to students
Technology	teacher access to a computer and modem
Materials	detailed instructional resources and strategies provided

Origin/Scope

Founded in 1971 by Bill Gibbons, HOSTS (Help One Student To Succeed) has served 1,127 schools in the U.S. and El Salvador. The company has served more than 1,000,000 students over 30 years and involved over 500,000 mentors.

General Approach

HOSTS is a structured mentoring program through which trained community volunteers provide one-on-one instruction for low-achieving students in language arts, math, and/or Spanish.

Participating students meet with a mentor 30 minutes per day at least four days per week. For each session, the mentor is provided with an individualized lesson plan that addresses the student's instructional and developmental level, learning style, and learning objectives. Students practice using a variety of materials and strategies, and they are reassessed and given additional practice or new objectives as needed. Periodic review assures that newly gained skills are maintained.

Lessons are designed and monitored by each school's HOSTS facilitator or by classroom teachers with the assistance of a large electronic database of resources and instructional strategies. The database also organizes student and mentor data.

HOSTS recently has developed a Whole School Performance Model that combines its structured mentoring programs with two other strategies: InStruct and InSpire. InStruct enables regular classroom teachers to use HOSTS databases to align curricula and materials with local objectives and state standards. Diagnostic information is used to develop learning plans for whole classes as well as individuals. InSpire is a process for recruiting, training, recognizing, and retaining adult, peer, and cross-age mentors. A dozen schools have implemented HOSTS on a schoolwide basis, with six new sites being added in the fall of 1998.

Results

Two large scale studies, one completed in 1982 and the other in 1998, report substantial gains for students participating in the HOSTS language arts program. In the earlier study, 3,742 HOSTS students in grades one through nine from over 100 schools around the nation took either the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) or the California Achievement Test (CAT) in the fall and again in the spring. Results, reported as Normal Curve Equivalent scores (NCEs), showed that HOSTS students on average gained anywhere from 7 NCE points (grade six) to 16 NCE points (grade two). A gain of 7 NCE points is equivalent to approximately two grade levels of progress.

The 1998 study involved over 6,600 students at 136 schools in Delaware, Michigan, and Texas, with the largest concentration of students in grades two through four. The study reported average reading gains of 2.0 grade levels for the 1995-96 school year — double the expected gain — as measured by pre- and post-test scores on the Informal Reading Inventory. A follow-up study for the 1996-97 school year yielded similar results.

Neither of these studies involved control or comparison groups. However, data from Washington state, which is reported in the 1982 study, indicate that HOSTS students in that state achieved higher NCE gains than students participating in eight other reading programs. A more formal comparison study of the HOSTS language arts program in the Portland, Oregon, school district showed that, in each academic year of a four-year period (1981-82 through 1984-85), students in grades two through eight participating in HOSTS averaged larger gains on the CTBS and the Portland Achievement Test than Chapter 1 students not involved with HOSTS. The differences were not statistically significant, however.

Performance data for the current math program is limited because of revisions in the program. Anecdotal data reported in a profile of exemplary HOSTS programs indicate that students in nine schools in Texas and Oklahoma demonstrated substantial gains in scores on the HOSTS Math Placement Inventory or the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** HOSTS has a staff of 25 full-time trainers. In addition, consultant teacher/users are available to train and support new sites. With existing staff and field locations, programs can be implemented in several hundred sites in 1998-99.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** A HOSTS implementation does not require faculty buy-in, but teachers and administrators must have a strong desire to improve student achievement using one-on-one instruction.
- ***Initial Training:*** HOSTS provides three days of intensive training for a teacher coordinator and/or all classroom teachers participating in the program. There are a variety of implementation formats to choose from based on cost considerations and a school's approach to professional development. Formats available include training for trainers, lead teachers, and mentor recruiters.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Two on-site implementation and technical assistance visits are scheduled during the school year. Unlimited Help Line for technical assistance is included. A series of newsletters and memos remind HOSTS teachers and administrators of key implementation tasks.

- ***Networking:*** An annual three-day international conference and regional workshops provide continuous staff development and networking opportunities for teachers and administrators.
- ***Implementation Review:*** The HOSTS Success Indicators checklist allows staff to measure implementation progress against seven key characteristics of effective programs. The checklist may be used as a self-check or as part of an outside evaluation.

Costs

HOSTS Structured Mentoring pricing is based on a fee for each instructional program. The price per program (Language Arts, Math, or Spanish) is $34,900 for year one, $15,900 for year two, and $6,600 for year three and all subsequent years. HOSTS Language Arts Schoolwide, which includes a structured mentoring program license, is priced at $64,900 for year one, $28,800 for year two, and $10,900 for year three and all subsequent years. These fees cover standardized training, instructional materials, and software licensing. The implementation model and training can be customized, requiring modification in pricing.

Other expenses that schools may confront vary considerably from school to school and may include the purchase of supplementary materials, compensation for the HOSTS coordinator, substitutes for training days or funding for training when school is out of session, and teacher access to a computer and printer.

Student Populations

HOSTS works with all students in grades K-12 with a wide range of populations. Title I students have comprised a significant proportion of the students served over the past 27 years. The model is being used across the country in large, medium, and small districts from urban to rural schools. The HOSTS Spanish language arts program is specifically designed for K-3 Spanish-speaking students. The program is dual-language, transitioning students into English in six to eight months.

Special Considerations

Teachers must be willing to use trained mentors (community, peer, and cross-age) to provide one-to-one instructional opportunities for students. Teachers will need to have access to a computer.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Champions for children: 1996-97 school profiles of HOSTS exemplary programs. Dallas: HOSTS Corporation.

Independent Researchers

Bryant, H. D., Edwards, J. P., & LeFiles, D. C. (1995). The HOSTS program: Early intervention and one-to-one mentoring help students succeed. *ERS Spectrum, 13*(4), 3-6.

Holden, O. D., Simmons, C. W., Holden, J. (1998). *Structured Mentoring: Its impact on reading for students.* Austin, TX: Educational Performance Management.

Schlotfeldt, J. D. (1982). *HOSTS impact study: 1979-1982.* Unpublished manuscript.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Horace Mann Enrichment Center (PreK-5) 1105 NW 45th Oklahoma City, OK 73118 405-524-4885 Contact: Maxine McNeil	220	large city	48%	8%	0%	6%	38%	86%	10%	20%
Meadows Elementary School (PreK-5) 1600 Rigsbee Plano, TX 75074 972-519-8810 Contact: Naomi Beaty	579	urban fringe of large city	1%	0%	2%	49%	48%	76%	47%	10%
Central Middle School (6-8) 305 East Reardon Midland, MI 48640 517-923-5571 Contact: Gary Verlinde	642	mid-size city	3%	1%	1%	2%	93%	20%	5%	30%
Westside Middle School (7-8) 8601 Arbor Street Omaha, NE 68124-2149 402-390-6464 Contact: Susan Evanich	798	large city	3%	1%	2%	2%	92%	15%	1%	11%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Chad Woolery
HOSTS Structured Mentoring
1349 Empire Central Drive, Suite 520
Dallas, TX 75247
Phone: 214-905-1308
Fax: 214-905-1176
E-mail: cwoolery@hostscorp.com
Web site: http://www.hosts.com

Accepted for Inclusion February 1998
Description Written March 1998
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

HOTS: Higher Order Thinking Skills (4–8)

IN BRIEF HOTS: Higher Order Thinking Skills	
Founder	Stanley Pogrow, University of Arizona
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1981
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	3,100
Level	4-8 (can start in the middle of grade 3)
Primary Goal	to develop thinking and problem-solving skills in ways that transfer to gains in basic skills, academic performance, and social confidence
Main Features	• systematically designed higher-order thinking and problem-solving activities • use of computers in combination with Socratic dialogue
Impact on Instruction	HOTS eliminates lecture, drill, and worksheets and substitutes dialogue, coaching, and reflective Socratic discussion
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	requires specially trained teacher(s)
Impact on Schedule	can be done during the school day (35-45 minutes per day 4-5 days per week) or after school (140 minutes per week, 2-4 afternoons per week) for 1-2 years
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	parents are encouraged to visit evening demonstrations with their children; joint parent-student activities are discussed in a parent handbook
Technology	cluster of 7-12 Macintosh or Windows PCs
Materials	software, trade books, curriculum

Origin/Scope

Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) was founded in 1981 by Stanley Pogrow, Associate Professor of Education at the University of Arizona. As of May 2001, 3,100 schools had implemented HOTS.

General Approach

The HOTS program uses computer activities, specially designed curricular materials, and Socratic teaching strategies to enhance the thinking and problem-solving skills of Title I and learning disabled students in fourth through eighth grades. Participants in HOTS classes spend either 35-45 minutes a day, four to five days a week, or two to four afternoons a week after school, for one to two years in the HOTS program. Generally HOTS instruction takes place during the time that is traditionally devoted to Title I instruction and is delivered by teachers specially trained in the HOTS method. Teachers attend a week-long workshop that helps them to shift from traditional teaching approaches of lecturing, refereeing, and linear sequencing to more open-ended, Socratic coaching techniques. All traditional drill and practice activities are replaced in HOTS classes with systematically designed higher order thinking activities. No workbooks or worksheets are used. Instead, Socratic dialogues are conducted around specially designed HOTS computer activities. Computers are used because of their ability to enhance motivation and to respond immediately to students' ideas.

The first half of HOTS classes are teacher-led discussions during which teachers probe student responses in accordance with Socratic techniques. The discussions, specified in a detailed curriculum, are designed to develop the thinking skills of: (a) metacognition, (b) inference from

context, (c) decontextualization, and (d) information synthesis. These thinking skills are considered essential for success in the more complex and integrative curriculum in place after third grade.

After the discussion time, students are given a computer-based challenge to work out. The challenge involves developing a strategic method to achieve a goal using information about several factors. For example, students may be asked to land a hot-air balloon at a precise point taking into account information about altitude, wind direction, speed, terrain, and other flying objects, and how a hot-air balloon operates. Using the information on the computer screen in conjunction with strategic problem solving simultaneously develops reading comprehension and metacognition skills. Teachers monitor students' computer work. They work to stimulate student thinking by encouraging them to articulate their ideas and to explain why and how the computer reacts to their strategies. Continually pressing students to explore their strategies and results is intended to increase the sophistication of their language use — both in terms of comprehension and articulation. This expanded language use and comprehension enhances students' ability to learn all content at more sophisticated levels the first time it is taught.

Results

Over the past six years, HOTS has been thoroughly evaluated at several sites for its effect on student reading comprehension, grade point average, problem solving methods, metacognitive abilities, and writing abilities, as well as other achievement indicators. Though each study was unique in the design and instruments used, all indicated that students receiving HOTS instruction were performing better than or equal to control groups. For example, two separate studies, one based on Iowa Test of Basic Skills student scores, and one based on California Achievement Test student scores, found that HOTS students consistently made significantly greater progress in math and reading achievement than control groups did. (In one instance, fifth grade math students in both groups made substantial gains.) Another study that compared HOTS instruction to traditional Title I instruction for fourth and fifth grade students found that the HOTS program was effective in raising student self-concept, sequential synthesis, and higher order thinking skills for fifth grade students. It also found that both HOTS and Title I instruction raised student achievement scores.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** HOTS currently has the capacity to organize up to 80 trainings/year (multiple sites attend each training) around the country with its 21 national trainers. This enables the program to establish 500 new sites/year.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Total faculty buy-in is encouraged but not required. HOTS will provide training to any site (school, district, or area) with at least six registered participants.
- ***Initial Training:*** HOTS trainers provide sites with a five-day small group training for teachers and paraprofessionals. Principals and coordinators attend the training on one of those days.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Brush-up training and site visitations are optional with the HOTS program.
- ***Networking:*** HOTS supports an 800 phone line, e-mail technical support capabilities, and an informational Web site and provides low-cost updates on curriculum and software when appropriate.

- ***Implementation Review:*** HOTS surveys all sites every three years, and consulting services are available.

Costs

The one-time charge for implementing HOTS for the typical school, which includes all software, curriculum, five-day small group teacher training (including the trainer's expenses), trade books, ongoing support, and newsletter, is $6,600. There is a 10% discount for districts implementing the program in four or more schools in a given year. The optional schoolwide Socratic training workshop is $2,000 including expenses.

Student Populations

HOTS targets Title I and learning disabled students in grades four through eight.

Special Considerations

The HOTS program can be started in the middle of third grade for states that test in fourth grade.

HOTS offers (a) an optional schoolwide workshop in Socratic teaching techniques for all teachers grades K-8, and (b) Supermath math problem-solving supplements for grades 4-10. The developers also design customized CSRD schoolwide problem-solving-across-content interventions.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

None available.

Independent Researchers

Bushon, S. (1992). *Kenai Peninsula Borough School District.* Soldotna, AK. Unpublished study.

Corliss, W. (1993). *Detroit Public Schools.* Detroit, MI. Unpublished study.

Darmer, M. (1995). *Elvira Elementary School* (Sunnyside Unified School District). Tucson, AZ. Unpublished study.

Laboy, M. (1994). *Landis Intermediate School.* Vineland Board of Education, Vineland, NJ. Unpublished study.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Foster Elementary 505 East Foster Ludington, MI 49431 231-845-7303 Contact: Jerry Erikson	300	small town	<1%	1%	0%	7%	91%	43%	1%	14%
Hawthorne Elementary 8301 Rawles Avenue Indianapolis, IN 46219 317-532-3950 Contact: Phil Talbert	475	large city	38%	0%	0%	1%	61%	60%	1%	1%

Fallston Elementary PO Box 39, Gary Street Fallston, NC 28042 704-538-7341 Contact: Mary P. Frye	617	rural	16%	0%	0%	3%	81%	36%	3%	13%
Talbot Middle School 124 Melrose Street Fall River, MA 02723 (508)675-8350 Contact: Bruce Clark	789	small town	6%	<1%	11%	6%	77%	52%	4%	<1%
Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.										

For more information, contact:

Laurie Dagostino
HOTS Dissemination
PO Box 42620
Tucson, AZ 85733
Phone: 520-795-2143 or 800-999-0153
Fax: 520-795-8837
E-mail: info@hots.org
Web site: http://www.hots.org

Accepted for Inclusion September 1998
Description Written October 1998
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

Lightspan Achieve Now (K–6)

IN BRIEF Lightspan Achieve Now	
Founder	Lightspan Partnership
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1993
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	2,841
Level	K-6
Primary Goal	to increase time-on-task, promote family involvement in homework, and facilitate mastery learning and teaching
Main Features	• standards-based learning games that support retention and encourage practice for mastery • family participation in academic lives of children • PlayStation® game console loaned to families to attach to television • ongoing professional development for teachers and staff, and workshops for families
Impact on Instruction	standards-based teaching and learning in class and at home; increased time-on-task; frequent monitoring of student progress
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	must assign a Lightspan coordinator for each site; family involvement liaison (staff or volunteer) desirable
Impact on Schedule	time required for planning and professional development
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	yes (reading, language arts, mathematics)
Parental Involvement	program supports learning at home and two-way communication between school and home
Technology	CDs, multi-media computers, digital multiplayers, Internet
Materials	35 CDs for K-2, 36 CDs for 3-4, and 34 CDs for 5-6; teacher guides for each CD; progress charts; content correlations; assessment program

Origin/Scope

The Lightspan Partnership Inc. was founded in 1993. Lightspan Achieve Now was implemented in 16 schools in 1995-96. As of May 2001, 2,841 schools, serving students from a wide range of economic backgrounds, had used the model in classrooms and homes.

General Approach

Schools and classrooms committed to an aligned instructional program in reading, language arts, and mathematics use Lightspan Achieve Now to increase each student's engaged time-on-task, promote family involvement in homework, and create a learning environment designed around mastery learning and teaching.

The foundation of Lightspan is family involvement and increased learning through after school use of instructional video games, aligned with the school's curriculum, that teach critical targeted skills and strategies. Lightspan is centered around discipline-grounded, standards-based, curriculum-driven, interactive technologies. In addition, Internet activities facilitate communications, enhance family involvement, and make learning fun.

When a school signs on to use Lightspan, an overall plan aligns achievement goals; teachers, families, and staff are trained; and an Education Partnership Consultant from the national staff is assigned to help align the curriculum to the Lightspan program. When the correlation is completed, teachers start to use Lightspan in the classroom and as a homework replacement tool. Students are assessed and grouped accordingly, and then regrouped, if needed. The classroom teacher introduces a Lightspan game in the classroom. The teacher might then send the game home for students to complete over the next few weeks with their families. Families are trained so they understand their role and make the necessary commitment to support their child in completing homework.

Results

To date, no large-scale, systematic evaluations comparing student achievement in Lightspan schools with that in control schools have been published. However, Lightspan has contracted with nationally known researchers to conduct a rigorous three-year analysis of 22 Lightspan schools, focusing on student achievement and other variables. The study will employ an experimental design and incorporate multiple measures.

Preliminary results from these and other smaller-scale evaluations and case studies have yielded evidence of improved academic achievement in vocabulary development, reading comprehension, mathematics problem solving, and academic growth during summer programs. At Lansdowne Elementary School in Baltimore County, Maryland, 34 percent of students in grades K-2 moved from below grade level performance to performance at or above grade level versus movement of just 13 percent of students in a matched school, as measured by various standardized tests. In Mesa Public Schools (Arizona) during the 1997-98 school year, grade one and grade three students learning English as a second language showed significant gains over a control group. Students in three Title I schools in Wichita, Kansas, were compared to peers from three matched Title I schools within the district. Results from the Metropolitan Achievement Test, 7th Edition, showed reliable gains for the Lightspan group at all grades tested.

RMC Research surveyed over 2,000 families and 269 teachers over two years to measure Lightspan's impact on learning time, family involvement in homework, and student engagement and motivation. Eighty-eight percent of families reported that students spent 30 minutes or more per day on Lightspan homework. Seventy-two percent reported that time on Lightspan replaced time typically spent on non-educational television and video games. Sixty-six percent reported spending 30 minutes or more per day with their children using Lightspan. Sixty percent reported that total time spent with their children on schoolwork increased with Lightspan. Over 90 percent of teachers reported finding Lightspan useful for providing practice and reinforcement, encouraging cooperative learning, and meeting the needs of individual students.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** Headquartered in San Diego, California, Lightspan has over 40 Education Partnership Consultants throughout the country. This field staff is augmented by a headquarters team of three, a fully staffed Product Support desk, and a staff of curriculum experts who produce teachers' guides and national and state correlations.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** No formal vote is required for schools to start using Lightspan. Schoolwide buy-in is achieved as a collaborative process involving the principal as instructional leader, an assigned site coordinator (usually the assistant principal), the family involvement coordinator, and grade-level curriculum liaisons.
- ***Initial Training:*** Training begins with identifying school needs and reviewing the school action plan. It includes site coordinator training, curriculum training for grade level liaisons and classroom teachers including product exploration, an introduction to family involvement, and implementation strategies discussion. Additionally, families are trained before the program is sent home.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** During the first year of implementation, the Education Partnership Consultant will model integration techniques, assist schools in setting up the home use portion of the program, and develop a plan for follow-on Family Involvement Workshops. Finally, the consultant, in collaboration with school staff, conducts regular

program review activities to ensure successful implementation.

- ***Networking:*** This is facilitated through regular professional development events held year-round, throughout the country. Additional networking opportunities are provided through the FLASH newsletter and The Lightspan Network Web site.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Continual self-evaluation is built into the implementation process. All schools participate in the Self-Evaluation Process using tools developed for this purpose by RMC Corporation. Most schools also participate in School-Based Action Research using the Action Research Toolkit developed for this purpose by Interactive, Inc.

Costs

Lightspan is packaged in grade clusters: K-2, 3-4, and 5-6. Schools must buy an Achieve Now school package, teacher licenses, and student licenses for each grade cluster. A minimum of nine professional development visits is needed in order to ensure a successful Lightspan implementation.

A $2,000 school package must be purchased in a school's initial order and can only be purchased once per site. This package includes one set of site materials, one Lightspan Desktop Professional Development CD for coordinator training, three on-site professional development visits, and access to the Partner Line for 12 months ($500 per year succeeding the initial 12 months). A $2,650 teacher license must be purchased for each teacher using the program. The license includes one grade cluster curriculum license, one set of curriculum support and assessment materials, one Lightspan Desktop Professional Development Series, and one on-site professional development visit. Finally, a $600 student license must be purchased for each student who will use the program at home. If the program is used in an after-school, summer-school, or computer-lab setting, a student license is required for each school computer or PlayStation rather than for each student.

Optional online resources are available, including eduTest@School ($2,500 per year subscription), eduTest@SchoolPlus ($4,650 per year subscription), and The Lightspan Network ($3,000 per year subscription).

Student Populations

Lightspan Achieve Now is designed to increase learning opportunities and enhance achievement for all students. It has been successfully implemented in schools with high numbers of at-risk students, including Title I and ESL students. The content is full-motion video, completely audio supported, with contextual help. Written materials for families are also available in Spanish.

Special Considerations

Lightspan Achieve Now is a flexible instructional tool. Changes in teachers' classroom practice are incremental and based on needs identified in the school improvement plan. Lightspan is designed to be woven into classroom practice and assigned homework.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Baltimore County School District. (1997). [Lansdowne Elementary School]. Unpublished raw data.

Caldwell County School District. (1997). [Gamewell Middle School]. Unpublished raw data.

Duncanville Independent School District. (1997). [Central Elementary School]. Unpublished raw data.

Laurens County School District #56. (1997). [Clinton Elementary School]. Unpublished raw data.

Independent Researchers

Blanchard, J. (1998). *Eisenhower Elementary School, Mesa Unified School District, Mesa, Arizona.* Unpublished manuscript, Arizona State University, Tempe.

Godin, K. (1996-97). *Lightspan evaluation research.* (Available from RMC Research Corporation, Portsmouth, NH).

Shakeshaft, C. (1998). *The Lightspan Partnership, Inc. and the home-school connection in Adams County School District 50, Westminster, Colorado.* Unpublished manuscript, Hofstra University, Department of Administration, Policy & Literacy, Hempstead, NY.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Anderson Elementary School 2945 Victoria Street Wichita KS 67216 316-973-1900 Contact: Linda Imbler	539	large city	25%	3%	13%	15%	44%	74%	22%	13%
Turner-Howson Elementary 11183 West Second Street Box 246 Rudyard, MI 49780 906-478-3007 Contact: Gary Davis	266	large city	0%	26%	0%	2%	72%	53%	0%	9%
Whiteville Elementary School Highway 100 Whiteville, TN 38075 901-254-8013 Contact: Yvonne Allen	435	rural	82%	0%	0%	0%	18%	90%	0%	18%
East Salisbury Elementary School 1201 Old Ocean City Road Salisbury, MD 21804 410-749-3488 Contact: Leslie Hughes	518	small town	66%	0%	3%	5%	26%	65%	2%	17%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Bernice Stafford
Lightspan Achieve Now
10140 Campus Point Drive
San Diego, CA 92121
Phone: 888-425-5543, ext. 8563
Fax: 858-824-8001
E-mail: bstafford@lightspan.com
Web site: http://www.lightspan.com

Accepted for Inclusion January 1999
Description Written March 1999
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

Positive Action (K–12)

IN BRIEF Positive Action	
Founder	Carol Gerber Allred
Current Service Provider	Positive Action Company
Year Established	1977
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	over 7,500
Level	K-12
Primary Goal	to increase students' academic achievement and develop their potential
Main Features	• a universal philosophy • six program units that apply the philosophy in the intellectual, physical, and social/emotional areas • school-climate, counselors, and parent/community programs
Impact on Instruction	teachers use Positive Action method of instruction
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	committee representing administrators, faculty, staff, students, parents, and community members is planning and decision-making body; training coordinator recommended
Impact on Schedule	15-minute lessons 4-5 days/week (K-6), 2-3 days/week (7-8); ½-hour lessons 1 day/week (9-12); schoolwide climate activities
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no (program does list competencies in multiple subjects for grades K-6)
Parental Involvement	family lessons and materials; parenting classes; parents serve on decision-making committee
Technology	schools provide CD players and VCRs
Materials	teacher's kits for each grade K-8; drug-education kits for grades 5-8; text for grades 9-12; principal's, counselor's, and parents' kits

Origin/Scope

Carol Gerber Allred developed and taught Positive Action as a high-school social studies elective in Twin Falls, Idaho, from 1974 through 1977. From 1977 through 1982 she developed the program for elementary students. She founded Positive Action Company in 1982. The program has been used in over 7,500 schools in every U.S. state and several foreign countries. It is currently in about 2,500 schools.

General Approach

Philosophy: The Positive Action program is based on the belief that "you feel good about yourself when you do positive actions." In schools, families, and communities, positive actions are taught in the physical, intellectual, and social/emotional areas. They are practiced and reinforced all day, every day.

Mission and Goals: The mission of Positive Action is to teach individuals, families, schools, and communities principles that lead to success and happiness. Major Positive Action goals are: (1) to improve individuals, families, schools, and communities; (2) to increase positive behaviors among students, such as academic achievement, attendance, self-control, problem-solving skills, conflict resolution, and community service; and (3) to decrease negative behaviors like drug, alcohol, and tobacco use; actions leading to discipline referrals, suspensions, or expulsions; and delinquency and gang membership.

Processes: School administrators, with assistance from Positive Action Company, guide the adoption, implementation, and evaluation of the program. Upon adoption, the School Positive Action Coordinator (principal or designee) organizes the Positive Action Committee (of school, home, and community members). Together, they monitor and promote school activities and link the school, home, and community programs.

Central to the program are six Program Units used in student, school, parent, and community programs: (1) self-concept; (2) positive actions for your mind and body; and four units that teach social/emotional positive actions for (3) managing yourself responsibly; (4) getting along with others; (5) being honest with yourself and others; and (6) improving yourself continuously.

The school integrates the program units in a scoped-and-sequenced classroom curriculum and a school-climate program. *Teacher's Kits* contain a lesson manual and materials for each grade K-8 and a text for grades 9-12. The school-climate program (elementary and secondary *Principal's Kits* and a *Counselor's Kit*) encourages and reinforces the practice of positive actions schoolwide and extends the program to families and the community. The parent program includes a curriculum in a *Family Kit* and links the family to the school activities. The community program includes a *Community Kit* and combines with the school and parent programs to align all the environments (schools, families, and community) involved in the program.

Results

The premise of Positive Action is that academic achievement will improve as students' self-concept and behavior improve. Data from a number of different types of schools (rural, urban, and suburban; high and low poverty; small and large minority populations) have demonstrated improved student achievement following the implementation of the program. For example:

- An early study (1979) compared second and fourth grade Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) reading and math scores in a pilot Positive Action school to those in a control school. The researcher found that the mean improvement in reading scores in both grades was significantly greater for the Positive Action school than for the control. (However, students in the control school showed greater improvement in math.)
- At DiChiaro Early Childhood School (K-3) in Yonkers, New York, a downward trend in reading and math scores was reversed over a five-year period after the implementation of Positive Action. In 1992, the year prior to implementation, 56 percent of third-grade students scored above the state reference point in reading, 42 percent in math. Five years later, 89 percent of third-grade students scored above the state reference point in reading, 96 percent in math.
- The year after Positive Action was implemented at Sims Elementary School in Austin, Texas, the percentage of students in grades three through five who passed the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) increased from 25 percent to 67 percent in math, from 44 percent to 58 percent in reading, and from 62 percent to 85 percent in writing. Similar increases in test scores one year after implementation have been documented in several other elementary schools.

At the above-mentioned schools and numerous others, data also demonstrate improvements in self-concept and life-adjustment skills, increases in student attendance and parent involvement, and decreases in discipline referrals.

It is worth noting that all student achievement data for Positive Action and virtually all the attitude and behavior data come from elementary schools.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The company's capabilities include: (a) a training staff from company and regional headquarters; (b) program users who are master trainers; (c) a research-and-development department that continually revises and creates materials; (d) consultants in research and evaluation; and (e) a publications department.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** The Positive Action adoption workshop introduces faculty and staff to the program, assesses school needs, achieves faculty buy-in, and identifies and trains the Positive Action Coordinator and Committee.
- ***Initial Training:*** A half-day orientation workshop, conducted either by a Positive Action trainer or the local coordinator, introduces the program. Another workshop introduces the Positive Action philosophy, method of instruction, and program units.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Seven workshops spanning the first year of implementation cover individual components of the program in more detail. Before the first workshop, the faculty is divided into five teams. Each team is responsible for the implementation of one component. The teams prepare the workshops, oversee implementation, and serve as coaches for their respective components.
- ***Networking:*** The company encourages networking among schools by: (a) publishing a newsletter and a free Idea Exchange booklet; (b) disseminating a list of schools with successful programs and facilitating visitations; (c) hosting a national conference; (d) maintaining a Web site; (e) providing an e-mail address and toll-free telephone number; (f) presenting at major national educational conferences; (g) linking to researchers and evaluators; and (h) maintaining a customer-service department.
- ***Implementation Review:*** The company provides schools with plans to evaluate the effectiveness and fidelity of the program's implementation. The school can conduct a self-review or contract with outside reviewers (including Positive Action Company).

Costs

Materials Costs: School materials for the teachers, principal, and counselor of an average elementary school cost approximately $31.25 per student; for middle schools, $14.60 per student; and for high schools, $15.85 per student. Parent materials are $55 per family (one time per-family cost).

Training Costs: A Positive Action trainer costs $600 per day plus travel and accommodation expenses; the school provides the facility. Training workshop materials are $360 each; materials addressing implementation and continuation are $160 each.

Evaluation Costs: Costs for evaluation can vary greatly, from near nothing by utilizing existing school staff to as much as $4 per student for independent evaluations, depending on the level of the evaluation plan.

Additional Costs: The principal or principal's designee (5-10 percent time) is usually the Positive Action Coordinator.

Student Populations

Positive Action has been implemented in urban, suburban, and rural schools as well as in schools of all socioeconomic levels, Title I schools, schools with English-language learners and special-needs students, schools on Indian reservations, multicultural communities, and multiple countries.

Special Considerations

The program requires a Positive Action Coordinator, usually the principal or principal's designee; the allocation of teachers' time for teaching and coordinating; the reinforcement of positive actions throughout the day by all school personnel; and the use of trained persons to teach parenting classes.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

Allred, C. G. (1984). *The development and evaluation of Positive Action: A systematic elementary school self-concept enhancement curriculum, 1977-1983.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.

Allred, C. G. (1984). *The Positive Action program: An evaluation.* Honolulu: Honolulu School District, Royal School.

Allred, C. G. (1984). *The Positive Action program: An evaluation.* Hermiston, OR: Hermiston School District.

Independent Researchers

Stephenson, D. (1979). *Evaluation of the Twin Falls primary Positive Action program 1978-79.* Twin Falls, ID: College of Southern Idaho.

Woodward, J. R. (1996). *Improving academic achievement of fourth-grade students through a program of self-concept enhancement activities.* Unpublished doctoral practicum report, Nova Southeastern University, Jacksonville, FL.

Duvall, E. J. (1986). *Improving students' self-control through enhanced classroom management practices at Buckhorn Elementary School.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Nova University, Fort Lauderdale, FL.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
Valley View Elementary 17200 Valley View Avenue Cleveland, OH 44136 216-251-5873 Contact: Angela Zaceardelli	200	large city	35%	0%	0%	0%	65%	100%	1%	8%
Quarryville Elementary 211 South Hess Street Quarryville, PA 17566 717-786-2546 Contact: Kathleen Hood	484	rural	1%	1%	1%	1%	96%	1%	1%	3%
Noonan Elementary 701 West 3rd Street Alice, TX 78332 361-664-7591 Contact: John Jackson	400	small town	1%	0%	0%	88%	11%	85%	40%	11%
DiChiaro Elementary 373 Bronxville Road Yonkers, NY 10702 914-255-7470 Contact: Patricia Langan	331	urban fringe of large city	26%	0%	0%	37%	37%	46%	8%	11%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year.

For more information, contact:

Carol Gerber Allred
Positive Action Company
264 Fourth Avenue South
Twin Falls, ID 83301

Phone: 208-733-1328 or 800-345-2974
Fax: 208-733-1590
E-mail: callred@positiveaction.net
Web site: http://www.positiveaction.net/

Accepted for Inclusion November 1998
Description Written December 1998
Costs, Number of Schools, Sample Sites, and Contact Information Updated May 2001

The Responsive Classroom® (K–8)

IN BRIEF The Responsive Classroom	
Founder	Northeast Foundation for Children
Current Service Provider	same as founder
Year Established	1981
# Schools Served (5/1/01)	schoolwide implementation in 50 schools; partial implementation in 200 additional schools
Level	K-8
Primary Goal	improving instructional delivery by improving classroom organization, social climate, and collaboration among adults
Main Features	• morning meeting • guided discovery • rules and logical consequences • classroom organization • choice for students • reporting to parents
Impact on Instruction	influences teachers' approach to instruction
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	release time from classroom required; some school systems create district position for oversight and staff development
Impact on Schedule	for primary grades: first period changes for morning meetings; for middle schools: changes in homeroom, recess, and lunch schedules
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	no
Parental Involvement	parent goal-setting conferences; parental involvement in discipline plan and procedures
Technology	e-mail and Internet access
Materials	training manuals, books, audio and video tapes, research reports

Origin/Scope

The Responsive Classroom was co-founded in 1981 by Marlynn K. Clayton, Ruth Sidney Charney, Jay Lord, and Chip Wood of the Northeast Foundation for Children, Inc. Fifty schools are working collaboratively on schoolwide implementation as part of the Responsive Leadership Forum. Teachers from more than 200 other schools have implemented the model in their classrooms.

General Approach

The Responsive Classroom, developed over a 17-year period, is an approach to classroom management and instructional delivery that teachers use in their daily classroom practice. Based on research in social cognition, developmental psychology, and child development, the Responsive Classroom approach interweaves the teaching of academic and social skills throughout the school day.

The approach consists of six components designed to strengthen classroom management and increase instructional time while building a caring social community for learning:

*1. **Morning Meeting:*** Children have an opportunity each morning to practice greetings, listening skills, and conversations as they share stories and concerns. These meetings establish a positive tone for the day.

*2. **Rules and Logical Consequences:*** Classroom rules, developed jointly by teachers and students, become the cornerstone of classroom life.

*3. **Classroom Organization:*** Classrooms provide space for active interest areas for students and for displays of student work. There is an appropriate mix of whole class, group, and individual instruction.

*4. **Guided Discovery:*** Teachers foster children's interest in new learning experiences using a careful introduction to materials, areas of the room, curriculum content, and ways of behaving.

*5. **Academic Choice:*** Each day all children have an opportunity to take control of their own learning, both individually and cooperatively.

6. Assessment and Reporting to Parents: Teachers work to open multiple lines of communication with parents.

Results

A University of Wisconsin researcher is conducting a three-year study (1996-99) of the impact of the Responsive Classroom on social skills development and academic achievement in an urban Title I elementary school. The study addresses the question: "Does a classroom promoting social skill development enable higher academic functioning among its students over time?" In the first year of the study, first, second, third, and fourth grade students in one Responsive Classroom school and one non-Responsive Classroom school were assessed in three areas: (a) social skills, (b) problem behaviors, and (c) academic achievement (ITBS scores in math, language arts, and reading). The first assessment occurred in fall 1996 and the second in spring 1997. Teacher ratings showed significantly greater growth in social skills and greater reductions in problem behaviors for Responsive Classroom students than for non-Responsive Classroom students. Over the same period, Responsive Classroom students' ITBS scores increased substantially more than non-Responsive Classroom students' scores. These increases correlated statistically with the changes in students' social behavior.

Other formal evaluations of Responsive Classroom indicate statistically significant gains in cooperative behavior and reductions in problem behavior in classrooms as measured by the Social Skills Rating System.

Over 30 schools that are members of the Responsive Leadership Forum have provided anecdotal information indicating improvement in one or more of the following non-academic areas: school climate, parent involvement, tardiness, attendance, and referrals for discipline. Most noticeable are improvements in recess and lunchroom behaviors, two areas of great concern to many schools. Additionally, the Responsive Classroom laboratory school reported greater than normal growth in CTBS scores in math, language arts, and reading from fourth to eighth grade for three consecutive cohorts of students.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** The national headquarters of the Responsive Classroom is the Northeast Foundation for Children, Inc., a non-profit educational foundation located in Greenfield, Massachusetts. The headquarters site includes a K-8 laboratory school, a publishing division, and a consulting-teachers division that conducts workshops and training institutes nationwide. One hundred professional educators have been certified or are in the process of being certified as Responsive Classroom trainers. There is also a regional office in Minneapolis and agreements with state education agencies in New York and Pennsylvania.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** The Responsive Leadership Forum is open to schools interested in schoolwide implementation. To be considered for membership, a school must show that administration and staff are willing to try Responsive Classroom strategies, work together, participate in professional development over a period of years, develop specific schoolwide outcomes, and cooperate in research, among other obligations.
- ***Initial Training:*** Schools typically send teachers to a one-day introductory workshop or have such a workshop conducted at their buildings. Two leaders from each school also attend a weeklong summer institute.

- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** A Responsive Classroom Consulting Teacher (one is designated for each school) provides a minimum of eight on-site coaching days per year for three years. During this time, local teachers work to become certified trainers capable of sustaining change over time. Some systems have created part-time or full-time staff positions to provide coaching.
- ***Networking:*** Two newsletters are published quarterly. Schools are open to visitors in many areas of the country. There are regional refresher seminars for trainers. A Web site is under development.
- ***Implementation Review:*** Schools develop local evaluation instruments with the assistance of a research consultant contracted by the Foundation. The leadership forum creates new implementation review strategies annually.

Costs

The Responsive Leadership Forum membership fee is $3,000 annually, which covers attendance at a summer weeklong institute for two school leaders, quarterly newsletters, and planning consultation with headquarters staff. Local contracts are then developed with individual schools or districts, depending on size, need, and number of days. Annual contracts range from $15,000 to $25,000 per school. All training manuals are provided as a part of training at no additional cost. Ancillary resources — books, tapes, and videos — are available at unit and discount prices. On-site consultations are provided to individual schools for 6 to 10 days annually at a cost of $10,000 to $25,000 for schools engaged in initial professional development activity with the Northeast Foundation for Children.

For individual teachers and administrators, one-day introductory workshops are $130 per person, and summer weeklong training institutes are $450.

Student Populations

Over the past 15 years, the Responsive Classroom approach has been implemented in schools representing almost every conceivable mix of locale and student population, including an urban, largely Hispanic elementary school in Hartford, Connecticut; an urban, largely African American school in the District of Columbia; a suburban white school in Dover, New Hampshire; a low-income urban school in Springfield, Massachusetts, with Hispanic, African American, and white students equally represented; a small rural school in Vermont; and other urban, suburban, and rural schools in states across the nation.

Special Considerations

The Responsive Classroom is a model that helps change the structure, climate, and culture of a school community. This rarely happens without causing discomfort for those accustomed to more traditional models. The Responsive Classroom approach is to work voluntarily with those teachers and leaders at a site who are most eager to begin. Over time, other teachers observe and eventually join the effort. A core group of dedicated teachers is, therefore, critical to long-range sustainability. Parent education also is critical. Sometimes staff and parents view this approach as a social curriculum and worry about time spent "away from academics." It takes training to see that the Responsive Classroom's primary goal is to increase the integration of academic and social learning in all aspects of schooling.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer
None available.

Independent Researchers
Elliott, S. N. (1992). *Caring to learn.* Greenfield, MA: Northeast Foundation for Children.
Elliott, S. N. (1995). *The Responsive Classroom approach.* Washington, DC: District of Columbia Public Schools.
Elliott, S. N. (1998). *Does a classroom promoting social skill development enable higher academic functioning over time?* Greenfield, MA: Northeast Foundation for Children.

Sample Sites

School/Contact	*Size*	*Locale*	*Race/Ethnicity*					*Free Lunch Elig.*	*ELL*	*Students with Disab.*
			African Amer.	*Am. Ind./ Alaskan*	*Asian Amer.*	*Hisp.*	*White*			
B. F. Brown Middle School 62 Academy Street Fitchburg, MA 01420 978-345-3278 Contact: Bernard DiPasquale	724	mid-size city	6%	<1%	11%	25%	52%	53%	3%	10%
K. T. Murphy Elementary 19 Horton Street Stamford, CT 06902 203-977-4516 Contact: Larry Nichols	523	mid-size city	22%	1%	5%	32%	40%	38%	27%	4%
Penn Valley Elementary 180 Northtum Lane Levittown, PA 19054 215-949-6800 Contact: Karen Casto	378	urban fringe of large city	3%	1%	1%	2%	94%	23%	M	8%
Barton Open School (K-8) 4237 Colfax Avenue South Minneapolis, MN 55409 612-668-3580 Contact: Steven DeLapp	610	large city	25%	4%	13%	8%	49%	21%	4%	12%

Figures for school size, locale, race/ethnicity, and free lunch eligibility are taken from the National Center for Education Statistics electronic database (1997-98 figures). Figures for English language learners and students with disabilities were obtained from each school for the 1999-2000 school year. M = Missing data.

For more information, contact:

Chip Wood
Northeast Foundation for Children
71 Montague City Road
Greenfield, MA 01301
Phone: 800-360-6332
Fax: 413-772-2097
E-mail: chip@responsiveclassroom.org
Web site: http://www.responsiveclassroom.org

Accepted for Inclusion January 1999
Description Written March 1999

Success-in-the-Making (K–9)

IN BRIEF Success-in-the-Making	
Founder	Patrick Suppes and Mario Zanotti of Stanford University and NCS Learn
Current Service Provider	NCS Learn
Year Established	1967
# Schools Served (Jan. 1999)	16,000 schools have used SuccessMaker software
Level	K-9
Primary Goal	increased achievement in reading, language arts, and mathematics
Main Features	• computer-assisted instruction designed to meet individual learning needs • mastery learning model • balanced instruction focusing on basic skills and higher-order learning processes • multiple types of assessment and reporting embedded in the software
Impact on Instruction	data derived from students' use of software can inform regular classroom instruction
Impact on Organization/ Staffing	site coordinator is recommended
Impact on Schedule	at least one hour per student per week in both mathematics and reading instruction
Subject-Area Programs Provided by Developer	yes (reading, language arts, mathematics)
Parental Involvement	student progress reports and portfolios are shared with parents
Technology	stand-alone computers and peer-to-peer, LAN, and WAN networks; cable and Internet capabilities for at-home learning
Materials	over 5,000 hours of instructional material including software, authentic literature, multimedia, activities, projects, and other resources; teacher guides

Origin/Scope

The Success-in-the-Making approach was developed in 1967 by Patrick Suppes of Stanford University, and Mario Zanotti, a nationally renowned psychometrist, based on the belief that the use of technology in the classroom can accelerate student learning. Software based on the developers' approach has served more than 2 million students in 16,000 schools across the country.

General Approach

The core of Success-in-the-Making is the NCS Learn SuccessMaker® software, which provides computer-assisted instruction in reading, language arts, and mathematics from kindergarten through ninth grade. SuccessMaker adapts curriculum content for each user, evaluates student responses on problems and activities, and offers a management system for monitoring student progress.

Based on the mastery learning model, the software automatically determines each student's path through the material. Students are able to complete increasingly more difficult work, as measured by embedded assessments aligned to external testing objectives and state standards.

Consultants work with local educational leaders to develop implementation plans based on district and site goals. Typically, students complete individualized instruction several times a week; teachers then add individual or collaborative lessons and activities relating to classroom learning to achieve greater curriculum integration.

Data derived from student work can help teachers plan and improve both computer-assisted and regular classroom instruction. For example, reports show areas where students are having difficulty so that teachers can coach students in small groups. Data also can furnish information for program guidance at the school and district levels.

As part of the model's options, teachers can offer authentic literature, writing tools and process instruction, and open-ended tools-based mathematics for all levels. Schools can also provide Spanish-English bilingual and ESL content for various levels and components.

Results

Using SuccessMaker software to support student learning, multiple schools have documented gains in student achievement in reading and mathematics, as evidenced by standardized tests and state proficiency exams. For example, 13 schools in New York's District Six were selected to implement the model, based on low performance on the third-grade state-mandated reading test. After implementation, post-test results showed a higher percentage of these third-grade students reaching or exceeding the State Reference Point than third-graders districtwide. In Landisville, Pennsylvania, longitudinal data on over 500 students using the math software, tracked from third to sixth grade, showed the mean percentile of the group rising from the 70th percentile in third grade to the 80th percentile in sixth grade, as measured by the California Achievement Test. The percentage of students in the lowest quartile dropped from 12 percent to 6 percent, and the percentage of students in the top quartile increased from 41 percent to 59 percent. In Fort Worth, Texas, students using the software for one year at three schools with schoolwide Title I projects showed significant gains on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS). The mean gain from 1996 to 1997 for grades four and five was 8.0 Texas Learning Index units. Similar gains were reported for reading.

Additionally, survey results from multiple school sites indicate that students involved in Success-in-the-Making demonstrate an increase in self-esteem and a more positive attitude toward learning.

Implementation Assistance

- ***Project Capacity:*** This model is offered through four regional offices located across the United States, with 130 consultants providing professional development. Consultants also can prepare district staff to train teachers and support local programs through EdPro certification courses offered several times a year.
- ***Faculty Buy-In:*** Consultants encourage school and district processes that include teachers in selecting the program and making decisions on program options.
- ***Initial Training:*** Orientation and planning activities involving administrators or other leaders take a minimum of one day. Initial training for all teachers and instructional staff involved with the model generally includes three days to introduce content, tools, and basic management system functions; show participants self-help resources; and discuss initial program implementation issues, such as enrollment and scheduling.
- ***Follow-Up Coaching:*** Assistance in generating and interpreting reports is a standard follow-up component. Several days of site support are recommended each year for informal coaching and training. Consultants model new ways to teach — including multimedia teacher presentations and interactive group activities using technology — and share classroom and laboratory/center management techniques.
- ***Networking:*** Toll free numbers to reach consultants and technical support, e-mail addresses, program newsletters, and events for EdPro "graduates" help educators stay informed. Seminars enable schools to share information. Teachers and administrators also can communicate and collaborate through an educational Web site.

- ***Implementation Review:*** Model guidelines suggest a quarterly review of implementation, including review of summarizing reports. This review is usually conducted with the site administrator or governance group.

Costs

Costs vary depending on the size of the model due to volume discount pricing and the amount of professional development desired. Costs for a typical elementary school with computers in the classrooms range from $362 to $602 per student for a three-year program (or $121 to $201 per student per year). Lower costs are possible if schools have a computer laboratory, which can serve larger numbers of students for a given number of computers. Release time and budget for substitutes for two to three days of initial training at the beginning of the program and for new teachers in subsequent years also needs to be included.

Student Populations

The program provides instruction for diverse learning needs, including mainstream, gifted, special education, ESL, Spanish-English bilingual, and at-risk populations. Adaptive devices serve students who have difficulty using standard computer equipment.

Special Considerations

Helping administrators and teachers learn new ways of delivering and assessing instruction requires ongoing professional development and site support. Each school is advised to plan for a minimum of 15 days of professional development over a three-year period.

Selected Evaluations

Developer/Implementer

1997-98 Duval County CCC implementation overview and summary of findings. (1998). Sunnyvale, CA: CCC Research and Measurement Department.

Zanotti, M. (1997). *Fort Worth Title I, 1996-97.* Sunnyvale, CA: CCC Research and Measurement Department.

Zanotti, M. (1998). *Southfield Public Schools evaluation summary August 1997.* Sunnyvale, CA: CCC Research and Measurement Department.

Zanotti, M., & Smith, N. (1995). *Effectiveness of the CCC CAI Program: Philadelphia Parochial Schools global evaluation for 1994-95.* Sunnyvale, CA: CCC Research and Measurement Department.

Independent Researchers

Community School District Six Integrated Technology Reading Support Project: First year evaluation report 1995-96. (1996). New York: Metis Associates.

Laub, C. M., & Wildasin, R. L. (1998). *Student achievement in mathematics and the use of computer-based instruction in the Hempfield School District.* Landisville, PA: Hempfield School District.

Second year evaluation report 1996-97. (1998). New York: Metis Associates.

Underwood, J., with Cavendish, S., Dowling, S., Fogelman, K., & Lawson, T. (1994). *Integrated learning systems in U.K. Schools: Final report.* Leicester, UK: Leicester University, School of Education.

Sample Sites

No sample site data available.

For more information, contact:

JD Dyas
NCS Learn
5421 East Williams Boulevard, Suite 151
Tucson, AZ 85711

Phone: 888-627-5327
Fax: 520-615-7601
E-mail: paul.dyas@ncslearn.com
Web site: http://www.ncslearn.com

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT (OERI)

EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE (Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION

Title: CATALOG OF SCHOOL REFORM MODELS

Author(s): Mark Buechler

Corporate Source (if appropriate): Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

Publication Date: 8/02

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, Resources in Education (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche and paper copy (or microfiche only) and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the options and sign the release below.

CHECK HERE ➡ [XX] Microfiche (4" x 6" film) and paper copy (8½" x 11") reproduction

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory

(PERSONAL NAME OR ORGANIZATION, AS APPROPRIATE)

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OR [ ] Microfiche (4" x 6" film) reproduction only

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

(PERSONAL NAME OR ORGANIZATION, AS APPROPRIATE)

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits. If permission to reproduce is granted, but neither box is checked, documents will be processed in both microfiche and paper copy.

"I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction of microfiche by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries."

SIGN HERE ➡

Signature: David A. Wilson Jr. Printed Name: Dave Wilson

Organization: Director, Development and Communications, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory Position: ~~XXXXX~~

Address: 101 SW Main Street, Suite 500, Portland, OR Zip Code: 97204-3297 Tel. No.: (503) 275-9517 Date: 9/30/02

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (Non-ERIC Source)

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents which cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:

Address:

Price Per Copy: Quantity Price:

IV. REFERRAL TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER

If the right to grant reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address: