Part I: Cover Page – Organization Information

Organization Information		
Organization Name:	SchoolWorks	☐ **New or** ☒ **Continuation Submission**
Primary Contact:	Kim Perron	
Email Address:	kperron@schoolworks.org	
Phone Number:	978-921-1674	
Mailing Address:	208 College Highway, Box 7, Southwick, Massachusetts 01077	
Organization Category (select all that apply)		
☐ Charter Network, Charter Management Organization or Charter School ☐ Turnaround Leader Development Provider ☒ Management Partner ☐ Stakeholder Engagement Specialist		
Preferred Geographical Region(s) in Colorado to Work In (select all that apply)		
☒ Metro Denver ☒ Front Range (Colorado Springs, Ft. Collins) ☒ Rural / Mountain / Western Slope		

Indicate the school district(s) or BOCES your organization is willing and able to engage with:

District name	City	County name
ANY SCHOOL DISTRICT or BOCES A	ALL	ALL

SchoolWorks

Assessing Quality, Building Capacity

Colorado Department of Education

September 3, 2019

2019-20 Colorado School Redesign Request for Information

schoolworks.org

208 College Highway, Box 7
Southwick, Massachusetts 01077
T 978.921.1674

Narrative Responses

Provide an update on work and progress since the original RFI submission in 2018.

Since our 2018 submission, SchoolWorks has entered into many new and renewed engagements that support continuous improvement for turnaround schools. Our services continue to broaden and evolve as we engage more and more school and district partners in the processes of needs assessment, action planning, and the implementation of data-informed interventions.

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, Turnaround Site Visits: SchoolWorks was recently awarded a renewed contract to serve as one of two vendors managing the Turnaround Site Visit process on behalf of the Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. These 1.5-day visits to Level 3 schools were designed to engage school and district staff in the assessment of school improvement practices and to provide the school with information on strengths and areas for improvement in accordance with State turnaround practice areas: leadership, shared responsibility, and professional collaboration; intentional practices for improving instruction; student-specific supports; and school climate and culture. The visits include a facilitated action-planning process on day 2 of the engagement, during which school leaders coalesce to unpack review findings and develop a 3-to-6-month action plan toward improvement.

In executing this work, SchoolWorks has contributed to the development of the protocol and report template utilized in the current process, and has worked in close partnership with ESE to establish, facilitate and refine the process to meet the objectives of the Department and to generate analysis, feedback and support to recipient schools and districts in support of data-informed turnaround. Project oversight includes the staffing and training of a team of thirty (30) TSV reviewers and support personnel, and site visit implementation across a diverse range of schools and districts. Implementation included scheduling and coordination, onsite evidence collection, onsite prioritization with school teams, and report writing.

To date, SchoolWorks has conducted a total of seventy (70) TSVs, including twenty (20) repeat visits to participating schools and districts across the Commonwealth. As a testimony to the quality of the experience, SchoolWorks has been contracted to provide supplemental support services in several Massachusetts districts, including Chelsea, Framingham, Taunton, Pittsfield, and North Adams.

DeLaSalle Education Center, School Redesign: In 2018 SchoolWorks partnered with the not-for-profit education support agency SchoolSmart Kansas City (SchoolSmartKC) to support the redesign of DeLaSalle Education Center, the only alternative charter high school in Missouri dedicated to serving students who have fallen behind in their grade level and face overwhelming academic needs and personal challenges. With the objective of identifying and implementing a sustainable model for the school's continued operation, SchoolWorks created a comprehensive prospectus for the redesign of DeLaSalle. A dedicated SchoolWorks Project Manager and Alternative Education Specialist were assigned to work with the school team and designated community stakeholders to provide accountability and continuous strategic support toward the

implementation of the plan. DeLaSalle Education Center was relaunched in the Fall of 2019 under the leadership of a new Executive Director, identified and hired as part of the redesign effort. SchoolWorks continues to partner with SchoolSmartKC to provide ongoing support and oversight.

Detroit Children's Fund, Quality Reviews and Instructional Supports: In 2018, SchoolWorks entered into a partnership with the Detroit Children's Fund to support a cohort of three Detroit schools on the path to continuous improvement: Escuela Avancemos, Jalen Rose Leadership Academy, and Hope Academy. To begin this work, SchoolWorks conducted a School Quality Review at each school and facilitated an on-site action-planning session to help the schools develop actionable improvement plans with measurable outcomes. SchoolWorks is now providing year-long on-site coaching for each school to monitor and support plan implementation.

Reflective of the review findings, a major effort of SchoolWorks' engagement with the schools is focused on improving instructional quality. Toward that end, SchoolWorks provided training in research-based effective instructional practices to all administrative staff at the schools, certified administrators to use the SchoolWorks Classroom Visit Tool to independently conduct classroom observations at the schools, and supported the school teams in implementing a cycle of regular observations and feedback to classroom teachers. The cohort will enter its first full schoolyear implementing these interventions in 2019-2020.

Various School Partners, Instructional Supports: In 2018 and 2019, SchoolWorks contracted with several individual schools to elevate instructional quality using the SchoolWorks MORE System (Master, Observe, Rate, Elevate). The system is based on a cycle of observation and feedback that is rooted in SchoolWorks research-based *Classroom Visit Tool*. Through a combination of instructional training, standardized observations, progressive data evaluation, and feedback/professional development based on the *Classroom Visit Tool*; SchoolWorks helps educators gain a unified understanding of instructional expectations and elevate the use of effective instructional practices that are associated with positive student outcomes. [1] In 2018 and 2019, SchoolWorks began implementing the MORE instructional framework in Battle Rock Charter School in CO, Baystate Academy Charter Public School in MA, Carondelet Leadership Academy in MO, Heketi Community Charter School in NY, Highlander Institute in RI, Latino Youth High School in IL, and Paulo Freire Social Justice Charter School in MA.

State-Level Support: Lastly, although not directly related to this scope of work, SchoolWorks is pleased to have forged partnerships with the Indiana Department of Education, the Maryland State Department of Education, and the Tennessee State Board of Education to evaluate and support the implementation of best practice among charter school authorizers.

[1] In 2018, SchoolWorks partnered with service provider TORSH to offer digital tools for data collection and analysis. With access to an online dashboard, school and district leaders are able to view immediate trends in the data to inform professional development.

b. Describe any new work you have done or are doing in Colorado schools and districts since the original RFI submission in 2018.

SchoolWorks is honored to be a trusted thought partner to both the Colorado Department of Education and Denver Public Schools. Our engagements in Colorado since our 2018 submission include the following:

Colorado Department of Education, Accountability Supports: In 2019, SchoolWorks was once again awarded the contract to manage the State Review Panel on behalf of the Colorado Department of Education. In 2009, CDE established the State Review Panel to evaluate schools and districts placed on a five-year improvement timetable. Since 2014, SchoolWorks has supported CDE in the development and facilitation of this extensive school and district evaluation process. The work began with the development of a protocol that could be used to guide panelists through a document review and site visit process, using the critical evaluation factors laid out in the Education Accountability Act of 2009 as the central organizing principle.

As the contracted vendor for this work, SchoolWorks is fully responsible for the recruitment, hiring, and training of State Review Panelists, as well as communicating with districts and schools to coordinate their site visits. Review Panel site visits culminate in formal recommendations submitted to the Commissioner and State Board of Education for consideration. (The SchoolWorks-developed CDE State Protocols currently implemented as part of the framework are posted here: http://csi.state.co.us/uip/statereviewpanel.) In executing this work, SchoolWorks worked with the following Districts and schools in 2018-2019:

District	School
Adams 14	Adams City High School
Pueblo 60	Risley International
Pueblo 60	Heroes PK-5
Pueblo 60	Heroes Middle School
Denver	Montbello Career and Tech
Monte Vista	Bill Metz Elementary School
BOCES	Colorado Prep Academy Elementary School
BOCES	Colorado Prep Academy Middle School
Montezuma-Cortez	Mesa Elementary
Colorado Springs D11	Mitchell High School
Pueblo 60	Central High School
Aurora Public Schools	Virginia Court Elementary School

Denver Public Schools, Diagnostic Reviews: In 2018, SchoolWorks was also awarded a renewed contract with Denver Public schools to provide district wide diagnostic reviews – a service the company has provided for DPS since 2014. The DPS School Quality Review (SQR) process focuses on qualitative data on instruction, students' and educators' opportunities to learn, and leadership and community. Each SQR team spends two-and-a-half days on site collecting evidence through document review, interviews and focus groups, and classroom visits. This external review of current practices has supported schools in their school improvement planning, and simultaneously supplemented the district's existing school level accountability data.

SchoolWorks provides the district and school with a rubric-based rated report summarizing the claims and evidence. (These reports have been included as a source of evidence in the district's decision making on individual school accountability.) In executing this work, SchoolWorks worked with the following DPS schools in 2018-2019:

Collegiate Prep Academy	Godsman Elementary School
McGlone Academy (Middle School)	Academia Ana Marie Sandoval
McGlone Academy (Elementary School)	Columbine Elementary School
John F. Kennedy High School	Fairview Elementary School
North High School	Eagleton Elementary School
McGlone Academy (K-8)	Denver Discovery School MS
Manual High School	Place Bridge Academy
South High School	Ellis Elementary School
Swansea Elementary School	Colfax Elementary School
Abraham Lincoln High School	Noel Community Arts & Sciences
Joe Shoemaker Elementary School	Lake Middle School
Denver Montessori Junior/Senior High School	DS Innovation & Sustainable Design
Farrell B. Howell ECE-8 School	Kaiser Elementary School
Inspire Elementary	Garden Place Elementary School

Pueblo City Schools, District Review of Special Education System: In December of 2018, SchoolWorks contracted with Pueblo City Schools in Colorado to provide a diagnostic district-level review of special education programs and services. Pueblo City Schools serves approximately 17,000 students in Pueblo, Colorado attending a total of 32 schools: 18 elementary schools, 5 middle schools, 2 K-8 schools, 4 high schools, 3 magnet schools and 2 charter schools. The SchoolWorks review provided specialized insight into the effectiveness of the district's programs, processes and services for diverse learners. The review was facilitated via Classroom Observation Site Visits at six (6) Pueblo City Schools coupled with a review of district policies and procedures, and resulted in a detailed report of findings and recommendations.

Battle Rock Charter School, Instructional Supports: Battle Rock School in Cortez, Colorado recently celebrated its 100th year of continual operation as a one-room schoolhouse serving the children of McElmo canyon and the surrounding areas. In June of 2018, the staff at Battle Rock contracted SchoolWorks to assess overall instructional quality at the school. Based on the findings, SchoolWorks now provides targeted ongoing foundational support for the Battle Rock instructional team.

Capacity

SchoolWorks has the capacity to simultaneously serve multiple schools and districts throughout Colorado. As a highly successful service provider for over 20 years, SchoolWorks has developed and refined systems and structures to effectively schedule and simultaneously execute multiple

service contracts of varying levels of size and complexity. Because we staff projects through a combination of full-time SchoolWorks employees and vetted active SchoolWorks consultants with varying specialties, there are no specific limits to the types or number of schools that SchoolWorks can effectively support.

All SchoolWorks engagements are assigned a dedicated Project Manager, who acts as the main point of contact for the client. Project team members for each engagement are selected from the company's full cadre of staff and consultants by the Project Manager and in collaboration with the Director of Project Management based on several priorities, including the goals of the project, the scope of work, and individual availability. SchoolWorks maintains an active consultant pool of more than 100 individuals and is able to monitor their availability and workload through the use of Projector PSA – our project management software. SchoolWorks ensures that all project team members participate in training activities, become fully familiar with the scope of work and related tools or processes, and are prepared to deliver results, given the unique context of the work and the goals of the project. SchoolWorks continues to incorporate new talent into our pool on an ongoing basis, actively recruiting individuals with relevant expertise through ongoing networking and posted positions on our website.

Evidence of Track Record of Improved Student and School Outcomes

Provide concrete evidence of impact from three recent engagements with schools and districts (Colorado schools and districts are preferred, if available). Include a description of the criteria and the data that you use to determine the impact of your work. Highlight the context and location of where this work has occurred.

SchoolWorks and Battle Rock Charter School (Cortez, Colorado): In December 2016, Montezuma-Cortez Re-1 Board Members renewed Battle Rock's charter agreement with the district, providing a two-year charter with an option to renew for a third year. But due to a poor performance rating, the school landed on the State's accountability clock and was required to implement research-based strategies to improve student outcomes.

In September of 2018, SchoolWorks conducted an Instructional Inventory site visit at Battle Rock Charter School in Cortez, Colorado. The site visit team used *SchoolWorks Classroom Site Visit Tool* to conduct classroom observations and rate the effectiveness of overall instruction across the tool's ten indicators.

Following the visit, reviewers met with Battle Rock's leadership team to review the findings, prioritize areas for improvement, and discuss ways to address the identified areas for improvement: curriculum, school-wide data culture, assessments, focused instruction, and higher-order thinking. The group identified the need for a coherent, comprehensive, and aligned curriculum as the area for growth to prioritize.

The site visit team then worked with the lead teacher on updating the school's Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) and incorporated the identified area for growth in the updated plan. With support, the lead teacher reviewed and updated annual performance targets identified in the school's 2017-18 UIP. For instance, the school's annual performance target for 2017-18 in English language arts academic achievement was an overall score of 713.8 on the Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS). Upon review, the lead teacher noted that the school had not only exceeded that target (with a score of 729.3), but also exceeded the target of 727.8 that was established for 2018-19. Thus, a new annual performance target of 740.1 for middle school students (which is the 50th percentile for middle schools) was set for 2018-19. The lead teacher agreed to review 2017-18 CMAS scores and use those as a baseline for establishing new performance targets.

SchoolWorks Classroom Visit Tool

Dimensions	**Indicators**
Common Core Implementation	- Common Core Literacy Implementation - Common Core Math Implementation - Common Core Literacy Shift Alignment
Classroom Climate	- Behavioral Expectations - Structured Learning Environment - Supportive Environment
Purposeful Teaching	- Focused Instruction - Instructional Strategies - Participation and Engagement - Higher-order Thinking
In-class Assessment and Feedback	- Assessment Strategies - Feedback

Additionally, with support, the lead teacher identified three Major Improvement Strategies for the school's updated UIP:

- Improve alignment of math curriculum and resources;
- Improve Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs and instructional delivery; and
- Provide focused staff meetings on instruction and curriculum (primarily math)

SchoolWorks is now engaged with Battle Rock to provide professional development to support the development of effective instructional best practices, and measure their increased use through periodic monitoring observation.

SchoolWorks' *Classroom Visit Tool* acts as the defining criteria for all of these supports, providing valid and reliable data about the quality of research-based instructional practices the school at the time of a review. The tool features 4 dimensions and 10 indicators of instructional effectiveness, and is aligned with Common Core State Standards (CCSS) and with the instructional practices designed to develop the student skills and abilities articulated throughout the CCSS. Each dimension of the CVT includes prompts to assist the observer and ensure that s/he examines the entirety of the classroom and lesson, including the learning environment, student supports, and teacher-to-student/student-to-student interactions. A four-point scale provides nuanced ratings that distinguish between effective (4), partially effective (3), partially ineffective (2), and ineffective practices (1). CVT criteria and indicators are excerpted from SchoolWorks' School

Quality Criteria (SQC), each of which is directly linked to research that demonstrates a positive impact on student achievement and growth.

While this engagement is still underway, SchoolWorks current impact is demonstrated through the applied supports of 1) research-aligned needs assessment (instructional inventory), and 2) action planning (prioritization). These two supports resulted in the school's UIP update and commitment to ongoing professional development for teachers. SchoolWorks will collect evidence of the elevated use of instructional best practices as additional classroom observations are conducted over the course of the ongoing engagement.

SchoolWorks and Pueblo City Schools (Pueblo, CO): SchoolWorks was contracted to provide a district review of special education supports and services by Pueblo City Schools in Pueblo, Colorado on April 17-23, 2019.

The review placed a team of experienced educators from SchoolWorks in schools and the central office to collect and analyze data about school and district performance. The length of the review was five days in total and included site visits at six Pueblo City Schools middle schools, in which classroom observations and focus groups with staff were conducted. In addition, the site visit team conducted interviews and focus groups with district personnel to further understand programs and practices to support the diverse needs of students with disabilities. While the review focused on how the district's middle schools were serving students who receive special education supports and services, additional focus groups were conducted with, and surveys were administered to, other stakeholders across the district to gather additional data.

The review was based on a transparent, research-based set of standards organized into six main questions, including: General Education Intervention; Child Find; Individualized Education Program (IEP) Development; IEP Implementation; Free and Appropriate Education (FAPE); and Special Education Licensure, Training, and Coaching. Within the protocol, each main question is further defined by a set of key questions and corresponding indicators that are used to provide more specific information on variables central to each main area. These standards and indicators were used to guide evidence collection, team deliberation, and the development of findings during the site visit.

Domains	**Indicators**
Domain 1: General Education Interventions	1. Does the school identify, and target supports for all students and those who are at-risk?
Domain 2: Child Find	2. Does the school have systems and processes to effectively identify and locate students with disabilities?
Domain 3: IEP Development	3. Does the school follow District, State, and Federal IEP procedural guidelines? 4. Do IEP teams consider a variety of service delivery options with the least restrictive setting always at the forefront for all students with disabilities?

Domain 4: IEP Implementation	5. Is classroom instruction intentional and engaging, allowing students to access learning per their IEP goals? 6. Does the school effectively manage and orchestrate the special education program?
Domain 5: Free and Appropriate Education (FAPE)	7. Does the school provide a continuum of special education services to address the needs of all students with disabilities? 8. Does the school have processes that are executed when a parent disagrees with the IEP process, implementation, or offer of FAPE?
Domain 6: Special Education Licensure, Training, and Coaching	9. Does the school design and/or provide professional development and collaborative structures to sustain a focus on instructional improvement and programming for students with disabilities?

Evidence collection began with the review of the key documents that describe the district, the schools, and their students. Key documents reviewed by the site visit team prior to arrival on site included a description of the school's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) or Response to Intervention (RtI) system and students' Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). This provided the team with initial information about the school's and district's special education programming, services, and the students it serves. While on site, evidence collection continued through additional document review, classroom visits, and interviews with key school and district stakeholders. After collecting evidence, the team met daily to confirm, refute, and modify its hypotheses about school and district performance, and then communicated its progress to the district's leadership. At the end of the visit, the team provided a brief oral report to district leadership about its preliminary findings.

Following the visits, SchoolWorks analyzed all data and produced a report of findings for the district. The report provided a qualitative analysis of the current state of effectiveness, efficiency, and productivity of the district's special education programs and processes, in accordance with the protocol. Within the report, SchoolWorks made formal recommendations to the district that included: developing a district-wide Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) framework to improve the learning outcomes for all students, increasing resources and training to better support students' social emotional learning (SEL), and communicating a districtwide system to support IEP compliance with a focus on quality.

SchoolWorks' research-based Special Education Supports and Services Review Protocol and Classroom Visit Tool served as the defining criteria for the review. The domains and indicators of the protocol are aligned to research linked to positive student outcomes, as defined by *SchoolWorks School Quality Criteria.* The *Classroom Visit Tool,* described in detail earlier in this response, was used to apply a standardized lens to the evaluation of instruction within a sample of the district's schools.

SchoolWorks' impact in this engagement is demonstrated through the applied supports of 1) evidence-based needs assessment (district review of special education supports and services) and 2) the presentation of data-informed recommendations for interventions to address key

areas of need. To measure the impact of applied interventions, SchoolWorks has been contracted to provide a Monitoring Review of Pueblo City Schools in the 2019-2020 school year.

Martin Luther King, Jr. Charter School of Excellence (Springfield, MA): In 2014, Martin Luther King, Jr. Charter School of Excellence was facing the possibility of closure. The school ranked in the 9th percentile among Massachusetts schools, with performance that had declined for the previous three years. To achieve demonstrated academic progress in a 1-year time frame in order to obtain charter renewal, the school's Board and Executive Director contracted SchoolWorks to provide consultative supports.

To begin the engagement, SchoolWorks conducted a 1-day site visit to gain insight into the current state of the school. The SchoolWorks team then worked with school stakeholders to develop a Turnaround Plan that was informed by the site visit findings. The team then supported the school leadership team in the implementation of the Turnaround Plan by 1) establishing an instructional leadership team, 2) creating a comprehensive Instructors' Manual that established expectations for school staff, 3) administering a robust professional development program, and 4) monitoring progress via informal walk-throughs, formal observations, and intense analysis of student performance data. SchoolWorks' School Quality Review Protocol (fully aligned with *SchoolWorks School Quality Criteria*) provided the defining criteria for the review and the turnaround plan.

In 2018 (four years later) the school rose to the 61st percentile among Massachusetts schools, with 93% of students meeting targets. The 2018 State accountability rating for Martin Luther King, Jr. Charter School of Excellence is currently the highest in the district of Springfield, which is comprised of 61 schools. Alan M. Katz, Lead Founder and Former Executive Director of the school during this effort, credits SchoolWorks with the success of the effort. He stated, "The plan development and support services provided by SchoolWorks were the basis for the successful turnaround of this school. It was a pleasure to work with the SchoolWorks team."

Self-assess the evidence base for the interventions your organization provides using the following Evidence-Based Intervention (EBI) tiers. Which EBI tier best describes your work, and why?

In the engagements described above and in every scope of work, SchoolWorks services act as inputs that drive outputs (actions) of schools and districts, resulting in positive outcomes for students.

- **Inputs:** SchoolWorks inputs include: 1) the design of school accountability frameworks; 2) school/district reviews; 3) leadership supports; 4) instructional supports; and 5) school developer supports.
- **Outputs:** Outputs represent the actions taken by both SchoolWorks and the schools with which we engage. We believe that the quality of the outcomes depends heavily on choosing the right tools and processes at the right moment, based on the readiness of the schools and districts that support them. To that end, rather than employing a fixed process and solution

for all schools, SchoolWorks works with each school leadership team to create a specific project plan for each phase of the project.

- **Outcomes:** Providing systems for assessing progress according to outcomes is central to our commitment to delivering impact. But in the majority of our client relationships, SchoolWorks is contracted to provide a defined scope of services (accountability system design, school quality review, etc.), that concludes during the input phase.

Tier 4 Evidence Base: In order to ensure that our services are aligned to positive student outcomes during all phases of work, we utilize a research-based set of standards to guide all of our processes. In conjunction with a team from Harvard University Graduate School of Education, SchoolWorks developed the *SchoolWorks School Quality Criteria* to serve as a foundational set of standards that define effective school practices across four domains: Instruction; Students' Opportunities to Learn; Educators' Opportunities to Learn; and Leadership and Governance. Each criterion within the SQC is directly aligned to indicators that have demonstrated a positive impact on student learning and achievement via documented research. This set of criteria serve as the foundation for the *SchoolWorks School Quality Review Protocol* and the *SchoolWorks Classroom Visit Tool* – standardized tools that define the way school programs and practices are measured for their relative effectiveness in order to provide a baseline for feedback and intervention. SchoolWorks has begun conversations with researchers at Clemson University to determine the effectiveness of these tools in improving student learning and achievement, and is the process of securing the required sample size.

As *SchoolWorks School Quality Criteria* are comprised of documented well-designed and well-implemented randomized control experimental studies, we rate the evidence base as Tier 4 – Demonstrates a Rationale. A fully cited version of *SchoolWorks School Quality Criteria* is included with this submission.

SchoolWorks
Assessing Quality, Building Capacity

School Quality Criteria with Research

School Quality Criteria with Research Citations

SchoolWorks School Quality Criteria

Note: All indicators marked by asterisk (*) are also supported by research on special education
Note: All indicators marked by double asterisk (**) are also supported by research on English language learners
Note: All indicators marked by plus (+) are also supported by research on diversity, equity and inclusion

DOMAIN 1: INSTRUCTION

The instructional domain centers on the specific interactions between teachers and students around content. Research suggests that high quality instructional interactions require supportive classroom environments; involve purposeful teaching that is intentional, engaging, and challenging; and ensure student feedback and instructional adjustments in response to ongoing assessments.

Dimension 1.1 Supportive Classroom Climate[1]

Do classroom interactions and organization ensure a classroom climate conducive to learning for all students?

Criterion 1.1.1 Behavioral expectations are clear and understood by students*

- Behavioral expectations, class rules, and procedures are clearly communicated to students and are applied and implemented equally (e.g., visuals, verbal/physical cues, etc.)+ (Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering, 2003; Pianta, Hamre, & Mintz, 2010; Dowd & Green, 2016; Wright, 2015)
- Teachers provide consistent rewards for positive behavior and direct, concrete consequences for misbehavior* (Ghafoori & Tracz, 2001; Hattie, 2009; Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering, 2003; Nelson & Gfroerer, 2016; Hattie, 2012)
- Teachers anticipate and redirect misbehavior and classroom discipline is equitable[i]*+ (Pianta, Hamre, & Mintz, 2010; Wilson & Lipsey, 2006; Nelson & Gfroerer, 2016; Gregory et al., 2013; Wright, 2015)
- Students behave according to rules and expectations; disruptive behavior is minimal and does not interfere with other students' learning* (Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering, 2003; Pianta, Hamre, & Mintz, 2010; Wong, Wong, Jondahl & Ferguson, 2014)
- Classroom norms and routines support students sharing their learning and understandings, as well as making, then building from mistakes in front of their peers.* (Hattie, 2012; Institute for Research on Policy and Practice, 2010; Hattie, 2012)

Criterion 1.1.2 The learning environment is highly structured and learning time is maximized through effective planning and guidance[2]

- Teachers are prepared for their lessons and materials are readily available. (Pianta, Hamre, & Mintz, 2010; Saphier & Gower, 2017)
- Teachers maximize learning time and minimize transition time. (Pianta, Hamre, & Mintz, 2010; Saphier & Gower, 2017)
- Teachers share an agenda of the day's class activities and/or lesson with students. (Pianta, Hamre, & Mintz, 2010; Saphier & Gower, 2017)
- Teachers explain tasks clearly and provide choices for when tasks are complete (Pianta, Hamre, & Mintz, 2010); Wong, Wong, Jondahl & Ferguson, 2014)

Criterion 1.1.3 Classroom interactions are cooperative and conducive to learning

- Teachers are aware of, and responsive to, students' learning and emotional needs (Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2014; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009)
- Interactions between teachers and students, as well as among students are respectful, caring, and supportive. (Cornelius-White, 2007 cited by Hattie, 2009; Marzano, Marzano, & Pickering, 2003; Pianta, Hamre, & Mintz, 2010; Jennings & Greenberg, 2009; Dee & Gershenson, 2017)
- Students engaged in partner or group work are collaborative and focused on learning (Pianta, Hamre, & Mintz, 2010, Cohen & Lotan, 2014).
- Students are held accountable for contributions to partner or group work (Cohen & Lotan, 2014)

Dimension 1.2 Purposeful Teaching

Is classroom instruction intentional, engaging, and challenging for all students?

Criterion 1.2.1 Teachers provide students with clear learning goals and focused, purposeful instruction*

- Teachers clearly communicate learning objectives aligned to state and/or Common Core standards.* (Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; Hattie, 2009; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Institute for Research on Education Policy & Practice, 2010; Marzano, 2003; Pianta, Hamre & Mintz, 2010; Berger, Rugen & Woodfin, 2013)
- Teachers tie learning objectives to real-life application, larger concepts, and/or key questions (Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; Hattie, 2009; Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Institute for Research on Education Policy & Practice, 2010; Marzano, 2003; Pianta, Hamre & Mintz, 2010; Berger, Rugen & Woodfin, 2013)
- Learning objectives drive lesson activities (Berger, Rugen & Woodfin, 2013)
- All students know the purpose of, and expectations for, the lesson (Hattie, 2012; Berger, Rugen & Woodfin, 2013)
- Teachers demonstrate high expectations and hold students accountable for achieving learning goals (Hattie, 2012)
- Teachers communicate academic content, concepts, and procedures with depth, clarity, and accuracy* (Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; Institute for Research on Education Policy & Practice, 2010; Dean, Hubbell, Pitler & Stone, 2013)
- Teachers make explicit how and when to use given content or procedures* (Hattie, 2009; Pianta, Hamre & Mintz, 2010; Hattie, 2012)

Criterion 1.2.2 A variety of instructional strategies and materials support students' diverse learning needs.*

- All students can access grade level content through multi-sensory materials and modalities (e.g., visual, auditory, kinesthetic (Marzano & Pickering, 2011; Marzano, 2017)*
- Students use graphic organizers and other non-linguistic representation of academic content (e.g., mental images, physical models, role plays, concept maps, pictographs, charts). *, ** (Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; Hattie, 2009; Kim et al., 2004; Marzano, 2003; Pashler et al., 2007; Dean, Hubbell, Pitler & Stone, 2013; DeJong et. al, 2013)

- Learning tasks provide students with choices and opportunities for self-directed learning.* (Algozzine et al., 2001; Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; Pianta, Hamre, & Mintz, 2010)
- Teachers utilize varied groupings (whole-class, groups, partners, 1:1) to address students' learning needs (Cohen & Lotan, 2014)

Criterion 1.2.3: All students are actively engaged in learning.

- Students engage with teachers and peers in extended, content-focused discussions (Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; Institute for Research on Education Policy & Practice, 2010; Pianta, Hamre & Mintz, 2010; Nystrand, Gamoran, Kachur & Prendergast, 1997)
- Students engage with teachers and peers, and /or work independently, to complete the lesson activity (Burns, 2004; Institute for Research on Education Policy & Practice, 2010; Pashler et al., 2007; Swanson, 2001; Dean, Hubbell, Pitler & Stone, 2013; Gersten et. al, 2007)
- Students persevere and demonstrate stamina while engaged in the work of the lesson (Duckworth, 2016)
- The majority of students - rather than just the teacher and/or a few students - are engaged in the work of the lesson (Hattie, 2012; Sweller, Ayres & Kalyuga, 2011; Marzano, 2017)

Criterion 1.2.4 Instruction requires all students to use and develop higher-order thinking skills*

- Students are engaged in rigorous, challenging tasks that require skills such as analysis, interpretation, application, and synthesis – not just summary or recall (Marzano, 2003; Dean, Hubbell, Pitler & Stone, 2013; DeJong et al., 2013)
- Students apply new knowledge and skills to investigate open-ended problems and situations (Institute for Research on Education Policy & Practice, 2010; Marzano, 2003; Pianta, Hamre & Mintz, 2010; Fisher, Frey & Hattie, 2016)
- Students identify essential information and/or cite evidence from a larger body and share that information verbally or in writing (Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; Hattie, 2009; Marzano, 2003; Pashler et al., 2007; Dean, Hubbell, Pitler & Stone, 2013; DeJong, et al., 2013)
- Teacher questions require students to look beyond what is explicitly stated in source material for answers (Institute for Research on Education Policy & Practice, 2010; Marzano, 2003; Pianta, Hamre & Mintz, 2010; Swanson, 2001; Fisher, Frey & Hattie, 2016)
- Students ask meaningful questions related to the lesson's objective and/or content (Berger, Rugen & Woodfin, 2013).
- The majority of students - rather than just the teacher and/or a few students - are engaged in higher-order thinking (Marzano, 2017)
- Students explain their thinking and build on their own and others' thoughts (Goertz, Olah, & Riggan, 2009; Young & Kim, 2010; Hattie, 2012; DeJong et al., 2013)
- Students evaluate and reflect on their own thinking, progress, performance, and learning approach* (Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; Marzano, 2003; Dean, Hubbell, Pitler & Stone, 2013)

Dimension 1.3 In-class Assessment & Feedback

Do teachers regularly assess students' progress toward mastery of key skills and concepts, and utilize assessment data to provide feedback to students during the lesson?

Criterion 1.3.1 In-class assessment strategies reveal students' thinking[4] about learning goals.

- Teachers use informal or formative assessments to gauge the majority of students' prior knowledge and understandings **
  (CLASS, Hattie, 2009; Goertz, Olah, & Riggan, 2009; Heritage, 2007; Institute for Research on Policy and Practice, 2010; Young & Kim, 2010; Hattie, 2012; DeJong et. al, 2013)
- Teachers use formative assessments to gauge the majority of students' progress toward clear lesson, unit, and standards-based learning goals, not directions or procedures (Marzano, 2010; Fisher, Frey & Hattie, 2011)
- Students explain, write, or illustrate their thinking and understandings using evidence (i.e., from text, experiments, drawings, diagrams, research, data sets). (Goertz, Olah, & Riggan, 2009; Young & Kim, 2010; Pianta, Hamre, & Mintz, 2010; Hattie, 2009; Hattie, 2012)
- Students receive assessment accommodations that allow them to reveal their understandings[5]*, ** (Swanson, 2001; Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; DeJong et. al, 2013)

Criterion 1.3.2 Timely, frequent, specific feedback is provided throughout the learning process to inform improvement efforts[7]

- Teachers give students clear, descriptive, criterion-based feedback to about half of the class. (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Heritage, 2007; Institute for Research on Policy and Practice, 2010)
- Feedback tells students where they are in relation to the lesson goal(s), clarifies misunderstandings, and/or provides specific guidance regarding improvement. (Hattie & Timperley, 2007; Heritage, 2007; Institute for Research on Policy and Practice, 2010)
- The use of models and assessment tools (e.g., rubrics, worked examples, exemplars) focuses feedback and assessment on essential skills and knowledge.*
  (Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; Heritage, 2007; Marzano, 2003; Young & Kim, 2010;)
- Students demonstrate awareness of their progress toward learning goals (e.g., what they understand, where confused, etc.) when not engaged (Zimmerman & Schunk, 2001; Schunk, 2003; Berger, Lugen & Woodfin, 2014)
- Students revise their work and correct errors in response to teacher or peer feedback.* (Brown & Hirschfeld, 2008; Center for Applied Special Technologies, 2011; Marzano, 2003)

DOMAIN 2: STUDENTS' OPPORTUNITIES TO LEARN

Dimension 2.1: Students' Learning Supports

Students' opportunities to learn are influenced by the *school-wide learning culture*, or the norms, values, and relationships students experience at school each day, as well as the *school-wide practices and interventions* that support students' academic and social-emotional learning. Research suggests that students learn best when their schools have a culture of high expectations for behavioral and academic performance *in concert with* a culture of caring and support. This context is further bolstered when schools monitor students' academic and behavioral progress, identify students' in need of more targeted support, and ensure interventions and guidance for students at risk of disengaging or failing. Together, the school's culture and supports for learning contribute to students' attitudes, skills, and abilities to succeed in and beyond the classroom.

Does the school identify and support special education students, English language learners, and students who are struggling or at risk?

Criterion 2.1.1: The school has a process for identifying struggling and at-risk students and systematically monitors student progress and program effectiveness.

- The school monitors students' progress toward academic goals and uses this feedback to inform the level of students' academic support or intervention (Griffiths et al., 2007; National Center on RTI, 2010; Therriault et al., 2013; Frazelle & Nagel, 2015)

Educators collaborate to collect and review risk indicator data[6] to identify students in need of targeted academic supports and plan interventions.(Cromey & Hanson, 2000; Dynarski et al., 2008; Foley et al., n.d.; Ingram, Louis, & Schroeder, 2004; Lachat & Smith, 2005;; Therriault et al., 2013; University of Chicago, Consortium on Chicago School Research, 2014; Frazelle & Nagel, 2015; Rumberger et. al, 2017)

- The school monitors students' progress toward behavioral goals and uses this feedback to inform the level of behavioral support or intervention. (Horner et al., 2010; Sugai & Horner, 2009; Lewis et. al, 2017)
- Educators collaborate to collect and review risk indicator data to identify students in need of targeted behavioral supports and plan interventions (Cromey & Hanson, 2000; Dynarski et al., 2008; Foley et al., n.d.; Ingran, Louis & Shroeder, 2004; Lachat & Smith, 2005; Therriault et al., 2013; University of Chicago, Consortium on Chicago School Research, 2014; Frazelle & Nagel, 2015; Rumberger et al., 2017)
- The process for identifying and monitoring progress of struggling and at-risk students is transparent and understood by all stakeholders.

Criterion 2.1.2: The school implements appropriate supports for struggling and at-risk students.[5]

- The school provides basic in-class preventions[7] and supports to ensure academic growth, positive behavior and equitable treatment of all students[+] (Griffiths et al., 2007; National Center on RTI, 2010; Therriault et al., 2013; Krasnoff, 2016)
- The school implements specific, targeted academic and behavioral supports or interventions for identified at risk students (Griffiths et al., 2007; National Center on RTI, 2010; Therriault et al., 2013; Frazelle & Nagel, 2015)

- *[For high school students]* Dropout prevention programs combine academic support with social skill building and are taught by qualified staff, trained in the program's philosophy, strategies, and materials[8] (Dynarski et al., 2008; Hammond et al., 2007; Cook et. al, 2014; Rumberger et. al, 2017)
- *[For high school students]* Students have opportunities to learn about post-secondary options (e.g., workplace, internships, higher education) (Dynarski et al., 2008; Glaser & Warick, 2016; Rumberger et. al, 2017)

- The school provides struggling students with research-based programming designed to remediate gaps in skill or content knowledge (Griffiths et al., 2007; National Center on RTI, 2010; Therriault et al., 2013; Krasnoff, 2016).
- The school offers students tutoring or other supplemental services provided by school or external agencies (Chappell et al., 2011; Rothman & Henderson, 2011; Rumberger et. al, 2017)
- The school offers individual or small group support in test-taking, study habits, or in academic content areas that builds upon classroom curriculum and expectations (Dynarski et al., 2008; Rothman & Henderson, 2011; Cook et. al, 2014[ii]; Rumberger et. al, 2017)
- Qualified support staff offer one-on-one individualized support to students over a sustained period oftime[2] (Chappell et al., 2011; Rothman & Henderson, 2011; Heinrich et. al, 2014)
- Students have opportunities for credit recovery and new credits through afterschool, weekend, or summer programs; School offers face-to-face instructional support to complement online recovery options [iii](Dynarski et al., 2008; Taylor et. al, 2014; Rumberger et. al, 2017)

Criterion 2.1.3: The school provides appropriate supports for students with special needs.

- Educators collaborate to collect and review risk indicator data to identify **students with special needs**, and to plan appropriate interventions (Cromey & Hanson, 2000; Dynarski et al., 2008; Foley et al., n.d.; Ingram, Louis, & Schroeder, 2004; Lachat & Smith, 2005;; Therriault et al., 2013; University of Chicago, Consortium on Chicago School Research, 2014; Frazelle & Nagel, 2015; Rumberger et. al, 2017.
- The school implements specific, targeted academic and behavioral supports or interventions for **students with special needs**.* (Chappell et al., 2011,; Heinrich et. al, 2014)
- Qualified support staff deliver the supports for students with special needs.* (Chappell et al., 2011,; Heinrich et. al, 2014)
- The school monitors **students with special needs'**progress toward academic and behavioral goals and uses this feedback to inform the level of students' support or intervention. (Horner et al., 2010; Sugai & Horner, 2009; Lewis et. al, 2017)

Criterion 2.1.4: The school provides appropriate supports for students who are English language learners (ELLs). .

- Educators collaborate to collect and review risk indicator data to identify students who are ELLs, and to plan appropriate interventions (Cromey & Hanson, 2000; Dynarski et al., 2008; Foley et al., n.d.; Ingram, Louis, & Schroeder, 2004; Lachat & Smith, 2005;; Therriault et al., 2013; University of Chicago, Consortium on Chicago School Research, 2014; Frazelle & Nagel, 2015; Rumberger et. al, 2017.
- The school implements specific, targeted academic and behavioral supports or interventions for identified students who are ELLs. ** (Chappell et al., 2011,; Heinrich et. al, 2014)
- Qualified support staff deliver the supports for students who are ELLs. ** (Chappell et al., 2011,; Heinrich et. al, 2014)

- The school monitors students who are ELLs' progress toward academic and behavioral goals and uses this feedback to inform the level of students' support or intervention. (Horner et al., 2010; Sugai & Horner, 2009; Lewis et. al, 2017)
- Parents, families and community members are communicated with regularly and consistently about their child/children in a language and format that they can understand (O'Hara et al., 2016; Epstein, 2011))

Dimension 2.2: Students' Learning Culture[10]

Does the school foster a strong culture of diversity, equity, and inclusion?

Criterion 2.2.1: Diversity, equity, and inclusion are embedded in the school's mission, philosophy, and core values.

- The mission, philosophy and core values of the school reflect a strong commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion. (Hunt, Layton & Prince, 2015; Rock & Grant, 2016; Kern, 2016; Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014)
- All school stakeholders have a shared understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion and how it is central to the school's mission, philosophy, and core values. (Kern, 2016; Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014; Lindsey, Nuri-Robins and Terrell, 2009)
- The school's mission, philosophy, and core values reflect an understanding that race and gender have historically been seen as markers of diversity, equity, and inclusion; the school has updated its definition of diversity, equity, and inclusion to include such categories as socioeconomic background, religion, sexual orientation, gender identity, ELLs, and disabilities. (Banks & Banks, Eds., 2016; Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014)

Criterion 2.2.2: The school's leadership and staff are engaged, supported, and involved in a strong culture of diversity, equity, and inclusion.

- Leadership and staff have multiple professional learning opportunities focused on culturally responsive pedagogy. (Ladson-Billings, 2005; Gause, 2011; Banks & Banks, Eds., 2016; Kern, 2016; Skrla, McKenzie & Scheurich, 2009)
- leadershipLeadership and staff have a shared understanding how they can enact practices that support and value diversity, equity, and inclusion. (Gause, 2011; Banks & Banks, Eds., 2016; Kern, 2016; Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014)
- Leadership and staff have opportunities to contribute to the school's understanding and commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion, as evidenced by advocacy or affinity groups and leadership/collegial professional learning opportunities (Kern, 2016; Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014)
- leadershipLeadership and staff are rewarded and/or acknowledged for their work and contributions to the school's commitment to diversity, equity and inclusion (Kern, 2016).
- leadershiplLeadership and staff can effectively communicate with families, parents and students about student progress, differentiation, and academic and behavioral interventions (O'Hara et al., 2016; Kern, 2016; Epstein, 2011)
- Educators describe school climate as one that values teacher and student diversity, difference and multiple perspectives (Egalite and Kisida, 2016; Cromey & Hanson, 2000; Hattie, 2009; Means et al., 2009; Aguilar, 2016; Fisher, Frey & Pumpian, 2012)

Criterion 2.2.3: The school'spedagogy and data systems fosters a strong culture of diversity, equity and inclusion.

- Instructional materials and practices are culturally relevant and based in student prior knowledge and experiences (Gay, 2010; Education Alliance, 2008)
- Instructional materials and practices are values affirming, focusing on students' strengths sources of validation, creating more confident student learners (Shnabel et al., 2013; Education Alliance, 2008)
- The school's data collection and analysis are reliable and valid, designed to disaggregate data and uncover trends specifically targeted towards improving metrics in diversity, equity and inclusion (Kern, 2016; Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014; Skrla, McKenzie & Scheurich, 2009)
- School leadership and instructional interventions support the development of teaching and learning practices focused on improving outcomes and addressing gaps for diverse student populations, experiences, backgrounds and learning approaches (Kern, 2016; Skrla, McKenzie & Scheurich, 2009; Lindsey, Nuri-Robins and Terrell, 2009)

Criterion 2.2.4: Students encounter and are involved in a strong culture of diversity, equity and inclusion.

- All students are provided with ample opportunities to think critically about power and privilege, consider diverse perspectives and develop leadership skills (Education Alliance, 2008; Gay, 2016)
- All students share a sense of belonging and pride in the school community (Blad, 2017; Osterman, 2000; Falkmer, et al., 2017)
- All students have access to high quality and rigorous learning opportunities in school, afterschool, and extracurricular activities (Goss, Wimer & Little, 2008; Hattie, 2012; Epstein, 2011)
- All students encounter restorative justice and discipline practices and policies that are culturally responsive and implemented equitably (O'Hara et al., 2016; Wright, 2015; Gregory et al., 2014; Bridges et al., 2012)

Criterion 2.2.5: The school facilitates the participation of families, parents and community members in a strong culture of diversity, equity and inclusion.

- Parents and families of students that experience success gaps feel welcome in the school and are included in school events, meetings and strategic plans to eliminate success gaps (O'Hara et al., 2016; Bridges et al., 2012)
- Parents and families are informed regularly and involved consistently in their child's academic and social-emotional learning progress (O'Hara et al., 2016; Bridges et al., 2012; Epstein, 2011)
- All stakeholders feel welcome and involved in the school community, including being invited to school events, solicited for input on school policies, provided with leadership opportunities, and informed of student academic and social-emotional learning interventions. (Kern, 2016; Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014; Lindsey, Nuri-Robins and Terrell, 2009; Epstein, 2011)

Criterion 2.2.6: The organization's leadership and institutional supports are guided by strong principles of diversity, equity and inclusion.

- The school has a strategic plan for diversity, equity and inclusion that has been developed in consultation with a wide range of constituencies and stakeholders within the school community (Kern, 2016; Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2014; Skrla, McKenzie & Scheurich, 2009; Lindsey, Nuri-Robins and Terrell, 2009)
- The school has clear and comprehensive employee recruitment, retention and promotion systems that value and promote diversity, equity and inclusion ((Skrla, McKenzie & Scheurich, 2009; Tricoche, 2018; Schwartz et al., 2016)
- The school conducts diversity, equity and inclusion audits, eliminating policies, practices and procedures that may be perceived as barriers or discriminatory (Skrla, McKenzie & Scheurich, 2009; Bridges et al., 2012)

DOMAIN 3: EDUCATORS' OPPORTUNITIES TO LEARN[1]

Teachers' opportunities to learn are influenced by the *school-wide professional culture*, or the norms, values, and relationships teachers experience at school each day, and the *school-wide practices* that support teachers' ongoing professional growth and collaboration. Research indicates that a culture of mutual responsibility, trust, and collective efficacy provides an essential foundation for teachers' and leaders' focused collaboration around instructional challenges. This collaboration is further strengthened by well-designed, sustained, and job-embedded professional development, with beginning teachers receiving additional guidance from trained mentors. Together, this school-wide culture and the school's supports for professional learning and collaboration contribute to teachers' collective capacity to deliver high quality instruction, not just in individual classrooms, but across the school.

Dimension 3.1 Educators' Learning Supports

Does the school design professional development[2] and collaborative structures to sustain focus on instructional improvement?

Criterion 3.1.1 Professional development (PD) is designed to address school priorities, improvement goals, and/or identified areas of need.

- The school has designed PD that aligns to the school improvement plan, state standards, organizational goals, and school curriculum (Blank & De las Alas, 2009; Garet et al., 2010; National Staff Development Council /Learning Forward, 2009; Wei, Darling-Hammond, & Adamson, 2010; Darling-Hammond, Hyler, & Gardner, 2017)
- The school has designed PD that is informed by ongoing analysis of student performance, instructional data, and educators' learning needs (Garet et al., 2010; National Staff Development Council /Learning Forward, 2009; Wei, Darling-Hammond, & Adamson, 2010; Darling-Hammond, Hyler & Gardner, 2017)
- The school has designed PD that requires teachers to demonstrate their learned competency in a tangible and assessable way (Jeanpierre, Oberhauser & Freeman, 2005; Darling-Hammond, Hyler & Gardner, 2017)
- The school has designed PD that supports teachers in the effective use of assessments (Bennett, 2011)
- The school has designed PD that helps teachers translate student data into instructional changes and plans (Cromey & Hanson, 2000; Dolejs, 2006; Jimerson & Wayman, 2010; Park & Datnow, 2009)
- The school has designed PD that focuses on specific subject content differentiated for diverse learners*, ** (Blank & De las Alas, 2009; Garet et al., 2001; National Staff Development Council /Learning Forward, 2009; Wei, Darling-Hammond, & Adamson, 2010; Darling-Hammond, Hyler & Gardner, 2017; Gersten et. al, 2007)
- The school has designed PD that supports teachers in the effective use of instructional materials, resources, and technology (Ball & Cohen, 1996; Cohen & Ball, 1999; Newmann et al., 2001; Martin et al., 2010)

Criterion 3.1.2 Professional development (PD) is ongoing, aligned to daily work, evaluated and improved upon.

- PD engages teachers in active learning (e.g., leading instruction, discussing with colleagues, observing other teachers, developing assessments) (Garet et al., 2001; Wei, Darling-Hammond, & Adamson, 2010; Darling-Hammond, Hyler & Gardner, 2017)
- PD is embedded in teachers' daily work through coaching, collaborative planning, and reflection. (Blank & De las Alas, 2009; Garet et al., 2001; Jeanpierre, Oberhauser & Freeman, 2005)

- Trained coaches and/or colleagues with instructional expertise provide coaching and support around instructional planning and lesson design, pedagogy, assessment, and student engagement.
- PD provides follow-up sessions and on-going support for teachers' continued learning (Garet et al., 2001; Wei, Darling-Hammond, & Adamson, 2010; Yoon et al., 2007; Guskey & Yoon, 2009; Darling-Hammond, Hyler & Gardner, 2017)
- PD combines workshops, conferences and trainings (at least 14 hours) with the ongoing work of educators' learning teams (Jeanpierre, Oberhauser & Freeman, 2005; National Staff Development Council /Learning Forward, 2009; Darling-Hammond, Hyler & Gardner, 2017)
- The quality of professional development delivery is regularly monitored, evaluated, and improved (Garet et al., 2010; National Staff Development Council /Learning Forward, 2009; Guskey, 2002)
- The effects of professional development are assessed using data on teacher instruction and student achievement (Garet et al., 2010; Guskey, 2002)

Criterion 3.1.4 Educators collaborate regularly to learn about effective instruction and students' progress[5]

- Educators meet frequently, during regularly scheduled, uninterrupted times (e.g., staff, department, grade level meeting times) to collaborate, establish improvement goals, and make data-informed instructional decisions.[6]
  (Berry, Daughtry, & Wieder, 2009; Cromey & Hanson, 2000; Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996; Datnow, Park, & Wohlstetter, 2007; Halverson, 2010; Jimerson & Wayman, 2010; Lachat & Smith, 2005; DuFour, DuFour, Eaker & Many 2006; Bambrick-Santoyo, 2010)
- Educators' collaborative meetings have a clear and persistent focus on improving student learning and achievement (Bolam et al., 2005; Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996; Vescio, Rose, & Adams, 2006; Bambrick-Santoyo, 2010)
- Educators describe sharing knowledge and expertise among colleagues as essential collaborative activity for job success (Berry, Daughtrey, & Wieder, 2009; Bolam et al., 2005; Goddard et al., 2011; Goddard, Goddard, Tschannen- Moran, 2007; DuFour, DuFour, Eaker & Many, 2006; Gersten, Dimino, Jaynthi, Kim, & Santoro, 2010)
- Teachers are willing to talk about their own instructional practice, to actively pursue and accept feedback from colleagues, and to try new teaching strategies (Archibald et al., 2011; Berry Daughtrey, & Wieder, 2009; Costa & Garmston, 2016)
- School leaders ensure that staff and team meeting discussions are structured and facilitated to support the staff's reflective dialogue around data and instruction (e.g., attend to explicit group norms, use protocols) (Cosner, 2011; Leithwood, et. al, 2004; Park & Datnow, 2009; Carbaugh, Marzano & Toth, 2015).
- School leaders provide guidance to teacher teams (e.g., help to establish meeting routines; model and promote use of discussion protocols; ensure systematic monitoring of student progress; create focus on linking results to instruction) and ensures that teachers utilize tools and time well (Cosner, 2011; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Fullan, 2014; Aguilar, 2016).

Dimension 3.2 Educators' Learning Culture[8]

Does the school's culture indicate high levels of collective responsibility, trust, and efficacy?

Criterion 3.2.1 Educators' mindsets and beliefs reflect shared commitments to students' learning.

- Educators convey shared vision and values about teaching and learning and reference these to guide their instructional decision making (Bolam et al., 2005; Louis, Marks, & Kruse, 1996; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; Johnson & Fargo, 2015)
- Educators convey a shared commitment to the learning of all students in the school (Hattie, 2012; Fisher, Frey & Pumpian, 2012).
- Educators convey a belief that students' learning is their collective responsibility, regardless of students' personal or home situations. (Bolam et al., 2005; Evans, 2009; Goddard, Goddard & Tschannen-Moran, 2007; Lee & Smith, 1996; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; Conzemius & O'Neill, 2001)
- Educators convey that it is important not to give up on any students, even if it appears that they do not want to learn (Goddard et al., 2011; Goddard, Hoy, & Woolfolk Hoy, 2004; Printy & Marks, 2006; Saphier, Haley-Speca & Gower, 2008; Benson, 2014)
- Educators convey commitment to, and hold each other accountable for, collaboratively established improvement goals and tasks. (Weathers, 2011; DuFour, & Marzano, 2009; Conzemius & O'Neill, 2001)

Criterion 3.2.2 The school reflects a safe, trustworthy, and growth-oriented professional climate[9]

- Educators describe non-evaluative, "blame-free" norms for sharing data and solving challenging instructional problems
- Educators' concerns and decisions focus on students' learning and well-being (rather than on staff members' individual or competing preferences). (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; Aguilar, 2016)
- Educators convey that they are willing to share and discuss their own instructional practice, seek and accept feedback, and collectively experiment with new teaching strategies (Archibald et al., 2011; Berry, Daughtrey, & Wieder, 2009; Bryk & Scheider, 2003; Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008; Hall & Simeral, 2017)
- Educators describe colleagues and administrators as open, honest, well-intentioned, caring, and reliable (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Louis, 2007; Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010; Printy & Marks, 2006; Marzano, Frontier & Livingston, 2011)

DOMAIN 4: LEADERSHIP & GOVERNANCE

School governance and leadership support the essential work of teaching and learning in schools. *School leadership* influences every aspect of a school's culture, organizational practices, and academic programs. In the SchoolWorks Quality Criteria, school leadership functions are represented by two dimensions. The first – instructional leadership – emphasizes overseeing and guiding the school's collective focus on instruction and student learning. The second – organizational leadership – involves leading strategic conversations and planning and ensuring effective school operations to advance the school's mission and vision.

Governance is leadership that establishes and conveys the school's vision, values, and mission; ensures the organization's viability; and ensures that the organization meets its legal and ethical responsibilities. Governance is typically provided by a Board of Directors, school committee, or other oversight group. The *Chief Executive* is the one person the Board hires and oversees to administer the direction they set for the school. This person may be an executive director, superintendent, or other formally designated head of the organization.

Dimension 4.1: Instructional Leadership

Do school leaders guide and participate with instructional staff in the improvement of teaching and learning?

Criterion 4.1.1: School leaders establish a college-preparatory, career-ready academic vision, and set clear goals to meet that vision.

- School leaders establish an academic vision with a relentless commitment to closing the achievement gap and preparing all students for success in college and other post-secondary endeavors (Hattie, 2009; Herman, 2008; Nettles & Herrington, 2007)
- School leaders convey clear, high expectations for all stakeholders (Fisher, Frey & Pumpian, 2012; Fullan, 2014)
- School leaders set and communicate clear, measurable academic achievement goals that are aligned across the school's improvement efforts (e.g., school program, staff development, and curriculum implementation) (Fisher, Frey & Pumpian, 2012; Fullan, 2014)
- School leaders ensure that the school-wide focus remains on established academic goals and school priorities (Fisher, Frey & Pumpian, 2012; Fullan, 2014).
- School leaders regularly evaluate the academic program using data to monitor progress toward goals (Fisher, Frey & Pumpian, 2012; Fullan, 2014)

Criterion 4.1.2 School leaders ensure that the school has a coherent, comprehensive, and aligned curriculum.[30]

- School leaders ensure that the curriculum includes essential content and skills for all students to learn at each grade level, and is mapped across the school year with adequate instructional time allocated to teach it (Bryk et al., 2010; Dolejs, 2006; Marzano, 2003)
- School leaders ensure that curriculum, instruction, and assessments are aligned with state standards, aligned with each other, and coordinated both within and across grade levels (Bryk et al., 2010; Cromey & Hanson, 2000; Dolejs, 2006; Marzano, 2003; Newmann et al., 2001; Robinson,

Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Carbaugh, Marzano & Toth, 2015)

- School leaders monitor instructional plans for alignment with curriculum program[32] (e.g., periodic review of curriculum maps, unit/lesson plans, formative assessments, classroom observations) (Bryk et al., 2010; Dolejs, 2006; Marzano, 2003)
- School leaders ensure plans are informed by students' prior knowledge, current skills, and learning needs.
- School leaders ensure that instructional materials are selected and/or developed in accordance with a school-wide instructional framework[33] and aligned with established curriculum standards (Newmann et al., 2001; Cobb, Jackson, Henrick & Smith, 2018)
- School leaders ensure the curriculum is periodically reviewed and revisions are made accordingly (Marzano, 2003; Robinson, Lloyd, and Rowe, 2008)
- School leaders provide meaningful feedback on the quality of lesson and/or unit plans (Blanc et al., 2010; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Park & Datnow, 2009; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008; Fullan, 2014).

Criterion 4.1.3: School leaders ensure that teachers deliver high quality instruction.

- School leaders regularly observe the quality of instruction (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2016; Knight, 2018).
- School leaders provide regular, meaningful, and timely feedback that helps teachers improve their instructional practice (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2016; Knight, 2018).
- School leaders hold teachers accountable for applying feedback to their practice (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2016; Knight, 2018).
- Educators indicate that school leaders model high quality instruction (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2016; Knight, 2018)
- Educators convey that school leaders have sufficient knowledge of content/subjects and how they are taught effectively (Knight, 2018).

Criterion 4.1.4 School leaders provide conditions that support a school-wide data culture [24]

- Teachers have easy access to varied[25], current, and accurate student and instructional data (Cromey & Hanson, 2000; Foley et al., n.d.; Ingram, Louis, & Schroeder, 2004; Jimerson & Wayman, 2010; Lachat & Smith, 2005; Guskey, Roy & von Frank, 2014)
- School leaders ensure that teachers employ a regular cycle of interim assessments to gather data on student performance (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2012).
- Teachers are provided time to collect, enter, query, analyze, and represent student data and use tools that help them act on results[26] (Cromey & Hanson, 2000; Datnow, Park, & Wohlstetter, 2007; Ingram, Louis, & Schroeder, 2004; Jimerson & Wayman, 2010; Means et al., 2009; Guskey, Roy & von Frank, 2014)
- Teachers use results from interim or summative assessments to make adjustments to the organization of students in the classroom, pace of instruction, or content being taught (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2012; Berger, Rugen & Woodfin, 2014).
- Teachers use results from interim or summative assessments to identify students in need of remediation or acceleration, and assign students to appropriate supports (Bambrick-Santoyo, 2012; Berger, Rugen & Woodfin, 2014)

Dimension 4.2: Organizational Leadership

***Do school leaders guide facilitate intentional, strategic efforts to ensure the effectiveness of the school's program and the sustainability of the organization*?**

Criterion 4.2.1: School leaders effectively orchestrate the school's operations.

- Clear systems, structures, and procedures guide daily routines and school programs (Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005).
- Systems, structures, and procedures are aligned to a clear organizational vision and goals, are continually monitored, and are adjusted to ensure effectiveness (Bryk et al., 2010; Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005)
- School leaders target resources (e.g., funding, materials, time, staff) toward the school's instructional framework and goals; treat resources flexibly; avoid diffuse, scattered allocation of resources for improvement (Bryk et al., 2010; Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005)
- School leaders diagnose problems before implementing solutions (Bryk et al., 2010)
- School leaders distribute leadership responsibilities to appropriate individuals or groups (Bryk et al., 2010)
- School leaders ensure ongoing leadership development for emerging and current school leaders, and has developed a plan for leadership succession (Bryk et al., 2010; Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005)

Criterion 4.2.2: School leaders ensure effective communication and inclusive, transparent decision-making across the organization.

- Communications among all stakeholder groups are constructive, supportive and respectful (Cosner, 2011; Leithwood, et al, 2004, 2007; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Goodwin, Cameron & Hein, 2015).
- School leaders have established effective means of communicating with school staff (Schwanke, 2016; Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005)
- Communications between leadership and staff are fluid, frequent, and open (Leithwood, et. al., 2004; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Nettles & Herrington, 2007; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rose, 2008; Goodwin, Cameron & Hein, 2015; Bryk et al., 2010)
- The principal involves faculty and staff in planning and implementation of school policies.
- The principal provides opportunities for faculty and staff to make or provide input on important decisions (Cosner, 2011; Leithwood, et al, 2004, 2007; Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005; Goodwin, Cameron & Hein, 2015; Bryk, et al., 2010)

Criterion 4.2.3: School leaders create and implement systems to recruit and retain effective teachers and staff who can drive dramatic student gains.

- School leaders leverage a pipeline for teacher recruitment that includes partnerships with higher education institutions and nonprofit organizations (as well as other sources) to identify candidates (Sutcher, Darling-Hammond, Carver-Thomas, 2016).
- School leaders recruit and hire teachers with commitment to, and competence in, the school's philosophy, design, and instructional framework (e.g., trained and experienced with curriculum, certified/licensed to teach, qualified to teach a subject area (Jacob, 2016; Goldhaber, Grout & Klein, 2014).
- School leaders use multiple measures to assess each candidate's alignment with the skills required for the position, as well as core beliefs held by the school community (Jacob, 2016; Goldhaber, Grout & Klein, 2014).
- School leaders acknowledge and celebrate the accomplishments of teachers and other staff members (Kraft & Papay, 2014; Marzano, Frontier & Livingston, 2011).

- The school implements strategies to promote teacher retention and development (Rinke, 2014; Marzano, Frontier & Livingston, 2011; Marshall, 2013; Bryk et al., 2010).
- The school has strategies and career pathways to keep effective teachers engaged in, and committed to, their work (Rinke, 2014).

Criterion 4.2.4: School leaders evaluate all staff and dismiss those who do not meet professional standards and expectations.

- School leaders ensure the evaluation of all staff members (Marzano, Frontier & Livingston, 2011; Marshall, 2013; Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005).
- School leaders conduct constructive, reflective, growth-oriented educator supervision/evaluation conferences, based on multiple data sources, and connect conferences to district and school priorities, professional development, and student learning (Marzano, Frontier & Livingston, 2011; Marshall, 2013; Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005).
- School leaders use supervision and evaluation processes to identify and address persistently low-performing staff members (Marzano, Frontier & Livingston, 2011; Marshall, 2013; Marzano, Waters & McNulty, 2005).
- School leaders dismiss those staff members who do not meet professional standards and expectations (Chait, 2010).

Criterion 4.2.5: School leaders ensure that the school has established sound financial and operational systems and processes.

- School leaders ensure that the organizational structure supports essential school functions, and that roles and responsibilities of all individuals at the school are clear (Schwanke, 2016; Marzano, 2005, Bryk et al., 2010).
- School leaders ensure that the school meets all compliance requirements and deadlines set by the authorizer and the state, including the submission of annual reports, school improvement plans, financial statements, school audit, calendar, and student attendance (Schwanke, 2016; Sorenson & Goldsmith, 2018)
- School leaders effectively manage the school budget and cash flow, and there is a plan for long-term financial sustainability (Schwanke, 2016; Sorenson & Goldsmith, 2018)
- The school effectively manages operations, including food services, transportation, school facilities, etc. (Schwanke, 2016)

Dimension 4.3 Governance

Does the Board provide competent stewardship and oversight of the school? [1]

Criterion 4.3.1: The Board provides strong oversight over the effectiveness of the academic program.

- The Board describes priorities that are aligned with the school's mission and focus on preparing all students for college acceptance and completion or post-secondary success (prior SQC indicator).
- The Board conveys appropriate knowledge of academic performance of the full range of students in the school (prior SQC indicator).
- The Board conveys appropriate knowledge of the behavioral performance of students in the school (based on above SQC indicator).
- The Board describes school progress against accountability goals and strategic priorities based on a regular, data-based benchmarking process. (Brenner, Sullivan, & Dalton, 2002; Ranson, et. al., 2005; Hooge & Honingh, 2014)
- The Board's membership includes appropriate instructional expertise to provide oversight of the academic program (Hooge & Honingh, 2014).

- The Board has systems and structures that ensure questioning, scrutiny, and deliberation regarding academic performance, and monitors leadership efforts to address performance gaps (Hooge & Honingh, 2014).
- The Board describes school progress against priorities and other schools/districts based on a data-based benchmarking process (Brenner, Sullivan, & Dalton, 2002; Ranson, et. al., 2005; Hooge & Honingh, 2014)

Criterion 4.3.2 The Board provides strong financial oversight

- The Board maintains and monitors complete and accurate financial records, and, as well, ensures annual independent audit/review (Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015)
- The Board reviews and approves annual budget and monitors actual performance against budget (Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015)
- The Board ensures significant portion of budget is allocated to priority programs that advance its mission and goals; also, sufficient resources are allocated for effective administration (Brenner, Sullivan, & Dalton, 2002; Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015)
- The Board establishes clear, written policies for paying/reimbursing expenses to those conducting school business (Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015)
- The Board's membership includes appropriate financial expertise to provide oversight of the school's finances (Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015)
- The Board has systems and structures that ensure questioning, scrutiny, and deliberation regarding financial performance, and monitors leadership efforts to ensure financial health (Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015).

Criterion 4.3.3 The Board ensures legal compliance and public disclosure

- The Board ensures compliance with all local, state, and federal laws and reporting requirements. (Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015)
- The Board makes information about governance, finances, programs, activities, impact publicly available (Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015)
- The Board upholds formal code of ethics with all Board, staff, and volunteers (Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015)
- The Board adheres to conflict of interest, "whistleblower," document retention policies and procedures and assesses need for liability insurance (Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015)

Criterion 4.3.4: The Board maintains effective governance practices to ensure organizational viability, including the systematic selection and oversight of the chief executive.

- The Board systematically recruits, supports, and assesses chief executive; provides performance incentives and rewards (e.g., ensures leader professional development, meaningful feedback, and criterion-based evaluation).
  (Brenner, Sullivan, & Dalton, 2002; Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015; Alsbury & Gore, 2015)
- The Board engages in strategic planning with chief executive when conditions support likelihood of productive results (e.g., not during organizational crisis, when lacking support from key leaders or capacity to implement).
  (Brenner, Sullivan, & Dalton, 2002; Alsbury & Gore, 2015)
- The Board maintains clear and regular communications within the board, with chief executive, and with stakeholders. (Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015)
- The Board ensures questioning, scrutiny, and deliberation of school policies, budgets, and practices in relation to mission and vision. (Ranson, et. al., 2005)

- The Board establishes active, productive partnership with chief executive and with political and business leaders (Brenner, Sullivan, & Dalton, 2002)
- The Board engages in periodic board self-assessment and reflects on its role when frequent chief executive turnovers occur. (Brenner, Sullivan, & Dalton, 2002; Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015; Alsbury & Gore, 2015)
- The Board's membership reflects the necessary set of professional skills and expertise to ensure organizational viability (Panel for the Nonprofit Sector, 2015)

ENDNOTES

DOMAIN 1

[1]This dimension refers to the extent to which teachers' classroom-based interactions are responsive to students' socio-emotional needs. A positive classroom climate suggests healthy and cooperative connections between and among teachers, students, and their peers with little hostility or negativity. Teachers are aware of students' needs and they respond to support them. Emotional support also refers to the presence of explicit teaching and learning about social-emotional skills in the classroom

[2] Frank & Miles (2007) note, "A study by the Consortium on Chicago School Research (Smith 1998) documents that fragmented schedules, unnecessary interruptions, and poor classroom management result in a loss of academic time for students. In some schools, only about half of the scheduled instructional time is actually used for instruction (Smith 1998). One of the most consistent findings from educational research is that when students are held to high standards and taught well, more academic instructional time improves student achievement (Marzano 2003)" (p. 7).

[3] Frank & Miles (2007) write, "Effective use of resources does not necessarily require smaller class or group sizes for every subject and lesson or for all students. In elementary schools, the most effective reduction may be targeted or strategic temporary reduction of groups within classes (Slavin 1995; Loveless 1998). For instance, some high-performing elementary schools create small reading groups for part of the day by forming larger group sizes at other times of the day (Miles and Darling-Hammond 1998; Allington 2002). Researchers studying effective literacy teaching find that students with the most accomplished teachers of early reading spend nearly twice as much time each day in small groups—48 minutes—as compared to 25 minutes for students with teachers who are least effective (Taylor and Taxis 1999; Murphy 2004)" (p. 9). They further note that they are referring to "skills-based grouping," that involves "formally assessing students' skills by subject and creating small, flexible groups that change based on student progress assessed at regular intervals," rather than inflexible student "tracking or "ability groupings." Small, skills-based groupings can be achieved by using school-wide staff strategically. Frank and Miles describe one approach: "The "Success For All" model, which has demonstrated improved reading performance, brings all special education, bilingual, reading, and librarian instructors into the classroom for reading. Some models even include and train non-instructional personnel to get involved in the effort. As with all efforts to involve others in instruction, success requires careful supervision and explicit training" (p. 10).

[4] Teachers who assessed for conceptual understanding were more likely to use instructional change strategies (see 2.5.4) than those who did not (Goertz, Olah, & Riggan, 2009). Goertz and colleagues conclude, "If the central goal of formative assessment is the improvement of instruction, then it is critical to attend to those factors and processes that contribute to instructional change. Teachers who assessed for conceptual understanding were far more likely to employ instructional change strategies that those who did not. Further, teachers who focused on conceptual understanding using one type of formative assessment were more likely to do so for all types of assessment. This suggests that analytic or diagnostic capacity is the key to effective formative assessment, regardless of whether those assessments are embedded within instruction, developed by teachers, or externally designed. And while there is no doubt that the quality of assessment tools matters a great deal, it is worth noting that teachers with high capacity for analyzing formative assessment information were able to draw out ideas about students' conceptual understandings even using interim assessments that were poorly suited for such analyses" (p. 173).

[5] Examples of accommodations include: extra time, oral reading of directions, use of spell and grammar checkers, calculators, speech recognition software). All students benefit to some degree from accommodation; howevergains for students with disabilities and English language learners (ELLs) were greater than the gains of their general education counterparts. (Sireci et al., 2006); IEPs should be consulted.

[6] "Timperley and Robinson's (2001) research suggests that accessible alternative practice possibilities, which include new instructional methods and approaches to replace those identified as less efficacious, provide important lifelines for groups seeking to respond to instructional concerns uncovered through their analysis of student learning evidence" (as cited in Cosner, 2011, p. 793). This suggests the evidence-based collaborative work among teachers is enhanced in critical ways through complementary professional development and interactions with skillful colleagues or coaches.

[7] "Feedback is information with which a learner can confirm, add to, overwrite, tune, or restructure information in memory, whether that information is domain knowledge, meta-cognitive knowledge, beliefs about self and tasks, or cognitive tactics and strategies' (p. 5740)" (Winne & Butler, 1994, as cited by Hattie & Timperley, 2007, p. 82). Hattie & Timperly add, that "feedback is not only given by teachers, students, peers, and so on, but can also be sought by students, peers, and so on, and detected by a learner without it being intentionally sought" (p. 82).

Hattie & Timperley (2007) center their discussion on three central types of feedback questions: 1) *Where am I going?* This involves the information given to students and their teachers about the attainment of learning goals related to the task or performance; 2) *How am I going?* This involves providing information relative to a task or performance goal, often in relation to some expected standard, to prior performance, and/or to success or failure on a specific part of the task. This aspect of feedback could be termed the feedback dimension. Feedback is effective when it consists of information about progress, and/or about how to proceed; and 3) *Where to next?* This involves providing information that leads to greater possibilities for learning ,such as enhanced challenges, more self-regulation over the learning process, greater fluency and automaticity, more strategies and processes to work on the tasks, deeper understanding, and more information about what is and what is not understood.

Hattie & Timperley (2007) cite several studies that show that feedback is differentially received by students. For example, De Luque and Sommer (2000) found that students from collectivist cultures (e.g., Confucian-based Asia, South Pacific nations) preferred indirect and implicit feedback, more group-focused feedback, and no self-level feedback, whereas students from individualist cultures (e.g., the United States) preferred more direct feedback particularly related to effort, were more likely to use direct inquiry to seek feedback, and preferred more individual focused self-related feedback (p. 100).

Finally, Hattie & Timperley note that feedback is one, but not the only, powerful response to students' learning, with learners who have not yet mastered core concepts, for example, refined instruction is needed, rather than feedback. They write, "Feedback can only build on something; it is of little use when there is no initial learning or surface information" (p. 100). Further, they emphasize that classroom climates that foster peer- and self-assessment and that allow for learning from mistakes provide essential supporting conditions for teacher and peer-feedback.

[8] "Programmed instruction, praise, punishment, and extrinsic rewards were the least effective forms of feedback for enhancing achievement" (Hattie, 2009, p. 174).

DOMAIN 2

[1] Supplemental Educational Services (SES) are out-of-school tutoring services provided by public or private agencies. Chappell et al. (2011) note, "As a provision of No Child Left Behind (NCLB, 2001), Title I schools that have failed to meet adequate yearly progress (AYP) for 3 consecutive years are required to offer Supplemental Educational Service (SES) to students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch (Bathon & Spradlin, 2007; Stullich, Abrams, Eisner, & Lee, 2009)….Funds to pay for SES are allocated from districts' Title I funds and can account for up to 20% of these funds" (p. 1).

Berger et al (2010) found that, averaged across five districts studied, the overall association between students' participation in SES and achievement gains was statistically significant in both mathematics and reading, relative to non-participation (p. xviii). Similarly, a recent meta-analysis (Lauer, Akiba, Wilkerson, Apthorp, Snow, & Martin-Glenn, 2006) indicated that out-of-school programs positively affected the reading and math achievement of students at risk for school failure, regardless of whether they were offered after school, during summer months, or on weekends. Programs of moderate duration (45-85 hours) had the greatest impact on both reading and mathematics achievement and programs that focused on academics and social aspects were as effective as those that focused only on academics. Reading programs were found beneficial for both elementary and secondary students, whereas math benefits were found only at the secondary level. Further, one-to-one tutoring had the greatest positive effect on reading achievement, while small and mixed instructional grouping practices had the greatest effect on mathematics achievement. Additional studies help to refine these findings. One study, for example, found that volunteer tutors had a positive impact on students' reading performance, but little evidence was found for math. The type of volunteer (e.g., college student, teacher, parent) did not have a differential impact on student outcomes (Rothman & Henderson, 2011, pp. 2-3). Showing somewhat different results, Chappell et al. (2011) found statistically significant effects for both mathematics and reading achievement when providers employed only tutors with 4-year degrees, as well as offered special education services. Math effects were also associated with programs that offered English language learner services and provided both initial and sustained tutor training.

[2] Frank and Miles (2007) report that, "Of course one-to-one tutoring is the most costly and intense form of individual attention. Wasik and Slavin summarize studies of five different thoughtfully designed tutoring methods and find them all to have positive benefits on student achievement. The models studied include Reading Recovery, Success for All, the Wallach Tutoring program, Prevention of Learning Disabilities, and Programmed Tutorial Reading. Though the programs varied in reading models, curriculum, and amount of tutoring, the most successful programs shared two common characteristics. First, the most successful programs had comprehensive models of reading and more complete instructional interventions. Second, programs that used certified or highly trained instructors out-performed those that used paraprofessionals. It would make sense that tutoring programs most closely aligned with the ongoing classroom activities and approach would also be more effective, but only one of the models studied (Success for All), has an integrated design and higher performance effects (Wasik and Slavin 1993)" (p. 10).

[3] Dynarski (2008) notes that "Personal and academic needs can be addressed through a meaningful and sustained personal relationship with a trained adult. The adult should be responsible for addressing academic and social needs, communicating with the families, and advocating for the student. The adult and student should have time to meet regularly. Training for adult advocates is essential" (p. 17).

[4] Interventions are structured or sequenced activities designed to influence learning or behavior in some way. Interventions in schools may include curricular programs, student behavior programs, special education and guidance activities, and extracurricular activities (Halverson, 2010, p. 136).

[5] Response to Intervention (RTI) is one well-known evidence-based, multi-level prevention system for reducing student behavior problems and maximizing student achievement (see www.rti4success.org for more information about this approach and its three tiers of intervention). Under a multi-tiered model, "at risk" means that the progress monitoring data indicates that a student has not made progress under their current tier or intervention, and is therefore in need of more targeted support. A designation of “at risk” may also be locally determined, but should be evidence-based and defined by specific criteria.

[6] Risk indicator data should include attendance, behavior, and course performance. Similar to risk indicators, some researchers also note that leading indicators provide early signals regarding whether gains are likely in the future or whether corrective action may need to be taken (Foley, n.d.). Leading indicators may be identified locally, based on analysis of trends over time, or may be drawn from the broader literature and assessed at the local level. Some examples of leading indicators: age and credit accumulation, early/3rd grade reading proficiency, attendance and suspension rates, enrollment in algebra/pre-algebra.

[7] Basic classroom preventions are similar to the concept of primary prevention, the least intensive level of the RTI prevention framework. This typically includes the core curriculum and the instructional practices used for all students, such as:

- A core curriculum that is research-based
- Instructional practices that are culturally and linguistically responsive
- Universal screening to determine students’ current level of performance
- Differentiated learning activities (e.g., mixed instructional grouping, use of learning centers, peer tutoring) to address individual needs
- Accommodations to ensure all students have access to the instructional program
- Problem solving to identify interventions, as needed, to address behavior problems that prevent students from demonstrating the academic skills they possess

In addition to Tier 1 RTI (described here) some basic classroom preventions that promote the equitable treatment of all students include: 1) sufficient wait time 2) the use of cooperative learning and intentional small group work and 3) seeking multiple perspectives in whole and small group discussion 4) asking higher order questions equitably.

Further, students who require interventions due to learning difficulties continue to receive instruction in the core curriculum (National Center on Response to Intervention/RTI, 2010, p. 10). Researchers have documented the positive effects of primary preventions and targeted interventions on increased student achievement (see for example, Burns, Appleton, & Stehouwer, 2005), but comprehensive RTI and multi-tiered models are also studied as ways to reduce the number of inappropriate special education referrals and grade retentions and increase problem-solving using student data among educators (Griffiths et al., 2007).

[8] Historically it has been challenging to evaluate the effectiveness of dropout prevention programs on raising student achievement due to their complex program models and the scarcity of rigorous research on dropout prevention (Prevatt & Kelley, 2003). However, many components of effective dropout prevention programs identified in Dynarski et al. (2008) have been linked directly to improved student achievement, such as academic support given by qualified staff (Chappell et al., 2011) and social and emotional supports to encourage positive relationships (Payton et al., 2008). Effective dropout prevention programs have also been linked to increased

student engagement, attendance, and persistence in school (Dynarski et al., 2008). In addition, a recent meta-analysis (in press) found that high self-concept is related to high academic performance and vice-versa, and concluded that intervention programs should integrate self-enhancement and skill development (Huang, 2011).

[9] A recent meta-analysis of over 700 youth development, social-emotional learning, and character education studies revealed that evidence-based social and emotional learning programs had many significant effects, including improving students' achievement test scores by 11 to 17 percentile points (Payton et al., 2008; cited in Cohen & Geier, 2010; see also Durlak et al., 2011).

[10] This dimension relates to school climate that shows both high expectations and high support. A *supportive school climate*, which is based on patterns in how students experience everyday school life. Cohen and Geier (2010) write, "This climate includes norms, values, and expectations that support people feeling socially, emotionally, and physically safe. People are engaged and respected. Students, families, and educators work together to develop, live, and contribute to a shared school vision. Educators model and nurture an attitude that emphasizes the benefits of, and satisfaction from, learning. Each person contributes to the operations of the school as well as the care of the physical environment" (p. 1). See also Gregory, Cornell, & Fan (2011) for findings related Black and White suspension rates in schools with varied degrees of support and academic press.

Studies on school climate reflect a variety of definitions and assessments and suggest this construct is multi-dimensional; however, the majority of assessments examine three aspects of school climate: 1) order, safety, and discipline; 2) teacher-student relationship, and 3) fairness and clarity of school rules (Fan, Williams, & Corkin, 2011, pp. 631-632). In this SchoolWorks framework, criteria pertaining to order, discipline, and the fairness and clarity of school rules are included in the Leadership domain. While some of the indicators reference students' perspectives, they center on school leaders' responsibilities for ensuring a safe school climate.

A *culture of high expectations* is similar to the concept of academic press, meaning "the extent to which school members (teachers and students) experience a normative emphasis on academic excellence and conformity to specified academic standards" (McDill, Natriello, and Pallas, 1986, as cited by Lee et al., 1999, p. 912).

Lee et al. (1999) found a strong relationship between levels of school academic press and school average gains in reading and math achievement, noting, "[I]n schools where academic press was low, reading achievement rose on an average of 0.57 GEs (grade equivalents) (5.7 months) and math achievement rose 0.90 GEs (9 months). In schools were academic press was high, reading achievement increased an average of 1.37 GEs (1 year, 3.7 months) and math achievement increased an average of 1.64 GEs (1 year, 6.4 months)" (p. 15). They concluded that even when taking into account students' previous levels of achievement, students who attended schools with higher levels of academic press learn more than those who attend schools with low press.

[11] See Gregory et al. (2010) for a discussion of the importance of including both structure and support for students as preventative measures against school violence and bullying and to promote school safety. Additionally, recent research involving analysis of 5,035 ninth grade students' responses to a school climate survey, found that schools low in support and structures for academic and behavioral expectations had the highest school-wide suspension rates for Black and White students, as well as the larger racial discipline gaps (Gregory, Cornell, & Fan , 2011).

[12] School connectedness is "the belief by students that the adults and peers in the school care about their learning as well as about them as individuals" (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2009, as cited in Cohen and Geier, 2010).

Cohen and Geier, 2010, also write, "There is a growing body of research that suggests that *school connectedness* is a powerful predictor of and/or is associated with adolescent health and academic outcomes (McNeely,

Nonnemaker, & Blum, 2002; Whitlock, 2006; Ruus et al., 2007; Resnick et al., 1997), violence prevention (Karcher, 2001a, 2002b; Skiba et al., 2004), student satisfaction and conduct problems (Loukas, Suzuki, & Horton, 2006). Further, it is a protective factor against risky sexual, violence, and drug use behaviors (Catalano, Haggerty, Oesterie, Fleming, & Hawkins, 2004; Kirby, 2001)." This is if further supported by Akey (2006), who writes, "Although learning involves individual cognitive and emotional processes, student motivation is also significantly influenced by a *supportive network of relationships*. The likelihood that students will be motivated and engaged in school is increased to the extent that they perceive their teachers, family, and friends as supportive. Schools that engage students promote a sense of belonging by personalizing instruction and creating a supportive, caring social environment where adults show an interest in students' lives in and out of school. The research on belonging in educational contexts is relatively new, and the direction of causality has not been definitively established. Nevertheless, many correlational and nonexperimental studies have shown that students who report caring and supportive interpersonal relationships in school have more positive academic attitudes and values and are more satisfied with school. Such students also are more likely to attend school, learn more, and report that they are more engaged in academic work" (p. 5).

[13] Definitions of school bullying typically include three key elements: physical, verbal, or psychological *attack or intimidation* that is intended to cause fear, distress, or harm to the victim; *an imbalance of power* (psychological or physical) such that children or groups of children oppress less powerful children or groups; and *repeated incidents* between the same children over time. School bullying can occur in school or on the way to or from school (e.g., on the school bus, on school grounds) (Farrington & Ttofi, 2009, p. 9).

[14] For the past 10 years, GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network) has been documenting the school experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender (LGBT) youth: the prevalence of anti-LGBT language and victimization, the effect that these experiences have on LGBT students' achievement and the utility of interventions to both lessen the negative effects of a hostile climate and promote a positive educational experience. Recommendations from "The 2009 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools" include: (1) Advocate for comprehensive bullying/harassment legislation at the state and federal levels that specifically enumerates sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression as protected categories alongside others such as race, religion and disability; (2) Adopt and implement comprehensive bullying/harassment policies that specifically enumerate sexual orientation, gender identity and gender expression in individual schools and districts, with clear and effective systems for reporting and addressing incidents that students experience; (3) Support student clubs, such as Gay-Straight Alliances, that provide support for LGBT students and address LGBT issues in education; (4) Provide training for school staff to improve rates of intervention and increase the number of supportive teachers and other staff available to students; and (5) Increase student access to appropriate and accurate information regarding LGBT people, history and events through inclusive curriculum and library and Internet resources.

[15] Family engagement refers to a school's family outreach initiatives and includes creating a family-friendly school environment, assisting families in developing the knowledge and skills needed to understand and support their children's learning, communicating with families about school programs and children's progress, facilitating family participation in school events, and establishing alliances with supportive community organizations.

Several recent research syntheses and meta-analyses find a correlation between parent involvement and student achievement (Caspe et al., 2007; Henderson & Mapp, 2002; Jeynes, 2005, 2007; Kreider et al., 2007). Jeynes (2005), for example, in his meta-analysis of elementary school parent involvement studies concludes, "Results indicate a significant relationship between parental involvement overall and academic achievement. Parental involvement, as a whole, was associated with all the academic variables by about 0.7 to 0.75 of a standard

deviation unit. This relationship held for White and minority children and also for boys and girls" (p. 237). And similarly, in his follow-up 2007 meta-analysis, "The results indicate that the influence of parental involvement overall is significant for secondary school children. Parental involvement as a whole affects all the academic variables under study by about .5 to .55 of a standard deviation unit. The positive effects of parental involvement hold for both White and minority children"(p. 82). While some factors are not directly related to school efforts, there is evidence that school programs and practices aimed at engaging parents and families in their children's education are associated with student achievement. These SQC indicators represent school-based practices with the most evidence supporting that association.

DOMAIN 3

[1] Throughout the SQC, the term *educators* refers to all professional staff, including administrators, teachers, instructional coaches, curriculum specialists, special educators, and others professionally educated for their roles. The term *staff*, used occasionally in the SQC, refers to the full spectrum of people serving in the school, including but not limited to educators.

[2] The National Staff Development Council /Learning Forward (2009) defines professional development as a comprehensive, sustained, and intensive approach to improving teachers' and principals' effectiveness in raising student achievement that fosters a collective sense of responsibility for improved student performance and that may be supported by activities such as courses, workshops, institutes, networks, and conferences.

Research has determined effects of professional development on student achievement. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) conducted a meta-analysis of 16 studies that reported effect sizes of professional development on student achievement gains for a treatment group as compared to a control group. 12 of 16 studies were focused on analyzing mathematics teacher professional development and effects on student achievement in mathematics. The mean effect size for mathematics studies using a pre-post design was 0.21. The mean effect size for math studies using a post-test only design is 0.13, indicating that student achievement is higher for students of teachers receiving professional development in math education than for students of comparable teachers who did not participate in professional development. The analysis of effects showed a pattern of stronger effects at the elementary school level than for middle or high school teachers. (Blank & De las Alas, 2009)

Similarly, after reviewing a total of 1300 studies on professional development, Yoon, Duncan, Lee, Scarloss & Shapley (2007) at the Regional Education Lab (southwest), identified nine that met methodologically sound standards to provide evidence of the linkage between professional development and student achievement. With effect sizes over *d*=0.40 generally considered to show substantive instructional effects, they found an average effect size of 0.54, ranging from –0.53 to 2.39. The average effect size for the randomized controlled trials (5 studies) was 0.51, ranging from 0 to 1.11. The average effect size across all 9 studies in science was 0.51; in mathematics, 0.57; and in reading and English/language arts, 0.53.

[3] In-house development of assessments help faculty to examine relationships between standards, curriculum, and student performance and to discuss the essential ideas around which they would frame their instruction (Supovitz & Klein, 2003).

[4] "Theoretically, *induction* is intended for those who have already completed basic pre-employment education and preparation. These programs are often conceived as a "bridge" from student of teaching to teacher of students. Of course, these theoretical distinctions can easily become blurred in real situations. Although the overall goal of these teacher development programs is to improve the performance and retention of beginning teachers, parallel to the induction processes common to other occupations, induction theorists have identified multiple objectives and emphases such programs may hold (e.g., Feiman-Nemser, 2001; Ganser, 2002). Among them are teacher socialization, adjustment, development, and assessment. For instance, some programs are primarily developmental and designed to foster growth on the part of newcomers; in contrast, others are also designed to assess, and perhaps weed out, those deemed ill-suited to the job. Moreover, teacher induction can refer to a variety of different types of activities for new teachers—orientation sessions, faculty collaborative periods, meetings with supervisors, developmental workshops, extra classroom assistance, reduced workloads, and, especially, mentoring. *Mentoring* is the personal guidance provided, usually by seasoned veterans, to beginning

teachers in schools. In recent decades, teacher mentoring programs have become a dominant form of teacher induction (Britton, Paine, Raizen, & Pimm, 2003; Fideler & Haselkorn, 1999; Hobson, Ashby, Malderez, & Tomlinson, 2009; Strong, 2009); indeed, the two terms are often used interchangeably" (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011, p. 203)

"To support beginning teachers, most districts offer some form of teacher induction or mentoring, but they often provide a limited set of services in response to an unfunded state mandate and with modest local resources (Berry et al. 2002; Smith and Ingersoll 2004). We refer to this usual level of induction support as *informal or low-intensity teacher induction*, which may include pairing each new teacher with another full-time teacher without providing training, supplemental materials, or release time for the induction to occur.

One policy option in response to the problems of high turnover and inadequate preparation is to support teachers with a *formal, more comprehensive induction* program during their initial years in the classroom. Support that is intensive, structured, and sequentially delivered is sometimes referred to as "comprehensive" induction. It is often delivered through experienced, trained full-time mentors and may also include a combination of school and district orientation sessions, special in-service training (professional development), classroom observations, and constructive feedback through formative assessment" (Glazerman et al., 2010, p. xxiii).

"Overall, the studies we have reviewed provide empirical support for the claim that induction for beginning teachers and teacher mentoring programs in particular have a positive impact. Almost all of the studies we reviewed showed that beginning teachers who participated in some kind of induction had higher satisfaction, commitment, or retention. Likewise, for teachers' classroom practices, most of the studies reviewed showed that beginning teachers who participated in some kind of induction performed better at various aspects of teaching, such as keeping students on task, developing workable lesson plans, using effective student questioning practices, adjusting classroom activities to meet students' interests, maintaining a positive classroom atmosphere, and demonstrating successful classroom management. Finally, for student achievement, almost all of the studies reviewed showed that students of beginning teachers who participated in some kind of induction had higher scores, or gains, on academic achievement tests" (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011, p. 225-226).

"For teachers who received one year of comprehensive induction, there was no impact on student achievement. … For teachers who received two years of comprehensive induction, there was no impact on student achievement in the first two years. In the third year, there was a positive and statistically significant impact on student achievement. In the third year, in districts and grades in which students' test scores from the current and prior year are available, students of treatment teachers outperformed students of the corresponding control teachers on average. These impacts are equivalent to effect sizes of 0.11 in reading and 0.20 in math, which is enough to move the average student from the 50th percentile up 4 percentile points in reading and 8 percentile points in math" (Glazerman et al., 2010, p. xxv).

[5] Researchers have associated teacher collaboration with improved student achievement (Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen-Moran, 2007; Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2009; Lomos, Hofman, & Bosker, 2011). Teacher collaboration is positively related to difference among schools in student mathematics and reading achievement. Goddard et al (2007) surveyed 452 teachers in 47 elementary schools and after controlling for student characteristics and school social context, demonstrated that teacher collaboration was a significant positive predictor of differences among schools in student achievement. Teacher collaboration has also been shown to mediate the relationship between leadership and achievement in schools (Goddard, Goddard, & Tschannen-Moran, 2007).

A school-wide culture of collaboration is also a key aspect of a school's professional learning community. A professional learning community makes collaboration expected, inclusive of all staff, ongoing, and focused on critically examining practice to improve student outcomes (Seashore, Anderson, and Riedel, 2003, cited by Bolam et al., 2005). Louis and Marks (1998) found that student achievement was significantly higher in schools with the strongest professional learning communities and accounted for 85% of the variance in student achievement in their study. More recently, Lomos, Hofman, & Bosker (2011), in their meta-analysis of studies that explore the association between professional learning communities and student achievement, found an average effect size of 0.25.

[6] Frank and Miles (2007) write, "Even though many districts add resources to create instruction-free time for teachers during the school day, most schools do not create daily schedules that allow enough common planning time for teachers to systematically improve their instructional practice. Numerous studies cite the lack of teacher time to work together as a critical barrier to reform (Raywid 1993; Swaim 1999; Neufeld 2005). Research suggests that teachers need at least three hours a week to work together to make significant improvement in instruction (Bodilly and Berends 1995). Research by Rowan and associates analyzing student performance data over time, finds that common planning time along with teacher control over instructional decisions were the two most important work place predictors of student performance (Rowan and Guthrie 1989). Obviously, the existence of common planning time alone does not predict improved student performance. As the recent study by Williams and Kirst makes clear, teacher collaboration that improves student results revolves around learning and implementing curriculum materials and instructional strategies aligned with standards and using assessment data to improve instruction (Williams, Kirst, and Haertel 2005)." (p. 12).

Additionally, Cosner (2011) notes in his review of literature on school leadership practices that support evidence use in schools that, "Consistent with other research findings, Young's [2006] research suggests that the development of a collaborative and inquiry-oriented culture supports teachers' collaborative use of evidence" (p. 792). Further, this work suggests that collaborative cultures develop first, followed by the development of more specific evidence-based, inquiry-oriented cultures, suggesting that data use may help to shape the nature of the collaborative culture. This work points to potential mutual effects between school cultures and data use.

[7] "*Instructional coaching*, as a special type of educational coaching, takes place in teacher classrooms and targets teacher performance during instruction (Knight, 2004; Kowal & Steiner, 2007). An instructional coach can be a peer, a veteran teacher, or a consultant external to the system. … Knight (2009c) defines instructional coaching as a partnership between a coach and teacher, where there are commitments to (a) equality in the relationship, (b) teacher choice in the content and process of learning, (c) empowerment and respect for varying perspectives, (d) authentic dialogue, (e) reflection, (f) praxis (i.e., reflection and action), and (g) reciprocity of learning between the coach and teacher. Whereas mentors share expertise in one direction, sharing in coaching is 'characterized by parity and bidirectionality,' (Sherris, 2010, p. 1). In order to accomplish this type of partnership, a coach holds small group meetings for consensus building, unpacks and models specific and desired teaching practices, and then individually interviews teachers, observes teacher implementation, and engages in reflective conversations intended to analyze teacher performance" (Teemant et al., 2011, p. 685).

Although coaching is a popular intervention, research on the effects of instructional coaching, without respect to the nature or quality of implementation, shows mixed results, suggesting it may not be a solution for all schools (Lockwood et al., 2010). Studies that show positive effects, however, suggest aspects of coaching which are associated with changes in teachers' instructional practice. For example, Teemant et al. (2011) studied the effects of coaching in relation to a particular instructional model and found statistically significant teacher growth across

seven cycles of coaching, noting significant transfer of new teaching skills from workshop to classroom, “similar to studies on peer coaching” (p. 691).

[8] The SchoolWorks SQC criteria on professional learning culture reflect the staff’s collective responsibility for student learning, a concept first developed by Lee & Smith (1996). They note that collective responsibility, “includes several related ideas: teachers' internalizing responsibility for the learning of their students, rather than attributing learning difficulties to weak students or deficient home lives; a belief that teachers can teach all students; willingness to alter teaching methods in response to students' difficulties and success; and feelings of efficacy in teaching. We devoted considerable thought to naming this factor. Although several components are standard measures of self-efficacy, and so this name would be appropriate, we instead chose the label to reflect attitudes that focus on the teacher's willingness, interest, and care for how and what all his or her students learned” (Lee & Smith, 1996).

[9] Relational trust concerns the necessary interdependence among individuals in order to achieve a task or goal. After repeated interactions with others, individuals develop expectations that are specific to that particular person or group. These expectations are usually around four dimensions: respect, integrity, personal regard, and competence in core role responsibilities (Bryk & Schneider, 2003; Louis, 2007).

[10] This criterion reflects teachers’ collective sense of efficacy, a group-level attribute that represents the collective beliefs of the faculty as a whole. It is a judgment of whether the school has the capacity and capability to organize and execute a course of action to effectively meet goals and have a positive impact on students (Goddard et al., 2001). Goddard provides empirical evidence that collective efficacy was significantly and positively associated with both school mathematics (β = .39) and reading (β = .80) achievement. Further, Goddard et al. (2011) found that “differences among schools in student achievement were predicted directly by collective efficacy beliefs and indirectly by both instructional leadership and teacher collaboration.”

DOMAIN 4

[1] Criteria in the Governance Domain are based primarily in best practice guidance from the nonprofit sector because there is little research connecting school governance with student outcomes. Brenner, Sullivan, & Dalton (2002), for example, writes, "Empirical evidence linking school board practices with high levels of student achievement is so scant it is virtually non-existent."

[2] Teachers' perceptions in this area may temporarily falter when they perceive a second order change effort [a substantive break from the past that conflicts with prevailing values and norms and requires the acquisition of new kinds of knowledge and skills] (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

[3] This leadership behavior is especially important during second order change (see previous endnote) because staff may lose sight of how a major change initiative actually aligns with the shared purposes, vision, or values. Leaders may need to emphasize these connections and reasoning for staff during these periods (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

[4] This leadership behavior is especially important during second order change efforts [a substantive break from the past that conflicts with prevailing values and norms and requires the acquisition of new kinds of knowledge and skills] because staff need encouragement and support for taking risks with their learning (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty).

[5] This leadership behavior is especially important during second order change efforts (see previous endnote). The principal may need to take a strong and more visible stand to highlight the benefits of a particular change and his or her strong support for making it happen (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

[6] Teachers' perceptions in this area may temporarily falter when they perceive a second order change effort, (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

[7] Cosner (2011) notes the importance of "diagnostic and tactical" leadership in advancing collaborative, evidence-based work in schools. He writes, "Hackman (1987) suggests that diagnosis allows leaders to determine what aspects of organizational work 'are strongest and where improvement is most needed' (p. 332). In contrast, tactical leadership emphasizes short-term planning and acting that is strengthened through the practice of diagnosis (Sergiovanni & Corbally, 1986)." He notes that in their study, "principals and literacy coordinators increasingly engaged in formal and informal collaborative planning sessions to review qualitative data, consider emerging information, and contemplate tactical next steps that generally emphasized supporting either schoolwide or grade-level evidence-based development" (p. 815-816). He concludes by stating, "qualitative data collection and analysis figured prominently in the practices of these leaders. However, conceptions of 'data driven' leaders often emphasize the analysis of quantitative student achievement data. Findings from this study therefore point to the importance of expanded conceptualizations of what it means to be a data-driven leader" (p. 819).

[8] Some researchers argue that facilitating broad-based, ongoing, strategic conversations in schools complements or exceeds the effects of physical school improvement plans (Davies, 2006).

[9] Beyond gaining insights and collective commitments from teachers when they are involved in decision making, principals gain an additional benefit. Marks & Nance (2007) found that regardless of varied state accountability contexts, principals perceived their own influence in the domains of supervision and curriculum and instruction to be greater when teachers were actively involved in decision making, suggesting there may be mutual benefits in sharing school leadership.

[10] Fuller et al. (2010) found relationships between teacher quality and teacher licensing and certification. This finding is confirmed by Goe's (2007) research synthesis, which states, "The research highlighted in this synthesis

clearly suggests that licensing for mathematics teaching and a degree in mathematics are positively correlated with mathematics achievement in all grades but particularly in secondary school. However, social studies, science, and other important school subjects have not been the focus of as much research as has mathematics. It remains to be seen whether subject-specific degrees and licensing in these other areas are essential for high levels of student learning" (p. 43).

[11] Based on a large-scale study of more than 1,000 fourth and fifth grade teachers across 130 schools in New York City, Leana (2011) reports, "our results in New York City clearly come down on the side of teacher experience, showing that greater tenure in the classroom leads to higher student achievement gains. There is one caveat to this finding, however, and it concerns where that experience is gained. Students show stronger growth in math achievement when their teacher has spent more time teaching at the same grade level. The value of experience—and the growth in teacher knowledge that accompanies it—is found in what psychologists call contextualized learning or, in the case of elementary school teachers, learning how to teach children at a particular point in their chronological development" (p. 34).

[12] A common instructional framework "combines specific expectations for student learning with specific strategies and materials to guide teaching and assessment" (Newmann et al., 2001, p. 299). Newman et al. (2001) used survey and school observation methods to measure the level of "instructional coherence" in schools. They defined schools with instructional coherence as having three overarching conditions:

1. A common instructional framework that guides curriculum, teaching, and assessment.
2. Staff working conditions that support implementation of the framework including clear standards, hiring and induction procedures, teacher evaluation, and professional development.
3. Allocation of resources such as materials, time, and staff to advance the framework.

During a two year period, schools that improved their scores on these conditions of instructional coherence improved student performance more than twice as quickly as schools that did not improve these conditions.

[13] Frank and Miles (2007) write that research indicates that effective schools invest their resources in 1) changing the use and amount of student learning time, 2) organizing for individual attention, and 3) improving professional development and collaboration. Further, they note that *schools weave effective resource use through all aspects of their design*. This is reflected in the SchooWorks SQC in that these priorities are embedded in most of the major SQC domains (e.g., investment in professional development, collaborative structures, classroom instruction).

In particular, Frank and Miles (2007) note that high-performing schools organize resources around four key strategies and related specific practices:

1. Invest in teaching quality through hiring, professional development, job structure, and common planning time by:
   - o Hiring and organizing staff to fit school needs in terms of expertise, philosophy, and schedule.
   - o Integrating significant resources for well-designed professional development that provides expert support to implement a school's core instructional design.
   - o Designing teacher work schedules to include blocks of collaborative planning time used effectively to improve classroom practice.
   - o Enacting systems that promote individual teacher growth through induction, leadership opportunities, professional development planning, evaluation, and compensation.
2. Create individual attention and personal learning environments by:
   - o Assessing student learning to adjust instruction and support.
   - o Creating smaller group sizes and reduced teacher loads in high-need areas.

- o Organizing structures that foster personal relationships between students and teachers.

3. Use student time strategically, emphasizing core academics and literacy by:
   - o Maximizing time, including longer blocks of uninterrupted time that students spend on academic subjects.
   - o Varying time and instructional programs to insure all students meet rigorous academic standards.
4. Flexibly organize staff and other resources to maximize resources for instructional design by:
   - o Integrating teaching and support resources across categorical programs.
   - o Using flexible job definition, work schedules, and part-time staff.
   - o Investing to leverage expertise inside and outside the school organization.

Although the "Big Four" are focused on what strategies high-performing schools use, policies and systems that are put in place by a district significantly impact whether and how individual school leaders are able to leverage these principles" (pp. 13-14).

Extending these core principles, City notes in her dissertation study (2007) and subsequent book (2008) that people, time, and money are important resources in school improvement, but in her analysis of schools' effective resource use, "there were other elements not on my list of quantifiable indicators that kept cropping up. Those elements were vision, hope, trust, ideas and energy, and they seemed to matter at least as much as people, time, and money and to affect the use of those resources" (p. 12). This perspective is supported by Bryk & Schneider's (2002) work on trust in schools, which they concluded was "a core resource for improvement." As with trust as a core resource, City argues that schools often waste precious resources by investing in areas that are not aligned with the school's developmental needs (see endnote #49). In her two case studies, for example, City noted that school leaders invested in resources commonly cited in the resource management literature; however, as schools in their first year of making substantive change, educators were not yet ready to make use of those resources. City argues instead that cultivating vision, hope, trust, ideas, and energy would have proven a more useful investment of resources. She cites three main reasons that school leaders do not invest in these resources: the urgency of increasing student achievement *now*; lack of faith that investing in these cultural roots will translate to improved student outcomes; and lack of evidence around the pay off of investing in these ways.

[14] Some researchers argue that an explicit, clearly articulate theory of action, or a set of causal "if…then'' statements is important for improving schools (Argyris & Schon, 2001; City et al. 2009). School improvement plans are sometimes used as a proxy for theories of action, as they attempt to articulate the necessary resources and actions for school improvement.

School Improvement Plans (SIPs) are mandated by the federal government for schools officially designated as in need of improvement, but most schools in the nation now required formal SIPs with each state providing guides and templates for school assistance. Common aspects addressed across many of these guidelines require schools to: 1) directly addresses the problems that caused the school to be identified as a school in need of improvement; 2) incorporate improvement strategies based on scientific research; 3) establish specific and measurable objectives for progress and improvement; 4) identify who is responsible for implementation of strategies; 5) include strategies to promote professional development and parental involvement. There are few rigorous, methodologically sound studies with generalizable results that investigate the impact of SIPs on school performance. One correlational study (Fernandez, 2011) found that, despite common templates in use, the *quality* of SIPs varied widely in relation to 17 indicators gleaned from prior research. Three components emerged from analysis that differentiated the quality of SIPs:

1) Goals: how achievable, specific, relevant, and timely the improvement goals are in a SIP;
2) Implementation: how solutions will be implemented, how program implementations are supported by

specific action steps for professional development, and whether professional development is incorporated and sustained throughout the school's routine operations, and

3) Assessment: a detailed plan to evaluate if outcomes are meeting specified goals and explicitly describe how and how often monitoring of outcomes will take place

This study found that even when controlling for important socioeconomic characteristics of each school, the quality of SIPs was positively correlated to school improvement in math and reading scores and statistically significant. Confounding variables, however, may include the types of problems faced by schools and the experience level and/or skepticism of administrators and teachers in relation to school improvement, so further study needs to examine these and other influences on the effects of school improvement planning. These preliminary results suggest that either formal school planning improves school performance OR, at a minimum, a high-quality SIP represents some positive attribute of a school that is associated with a school's performance (Fernandez, 2011).

[15] Leithwood, et. al. (2004) note: "There is a rich body of evidence about the relevance to leaders of such features of the organizational context as. geographic location (urban, suburban, rural), level of schooling (elementary, secondary) and both school and district size. Each of these features has important implications for what it means to offer successful leadership. For example, successful principals in inner-city schools often find it necessary to engage in more direct and top-down forms of leadership than do successful principals in suburban settings. The curricular knowledge of successful elementary principals frequently rivals the curricular knowledge of their teachers; in contrast, secondary principals will typically rely on their department heads for such knowledge. Similarly, small schools allow for quite direct engagement of leaders in modeling desirable forms of instruction and monitoring the practices of teachers, whereas equally successful leaders of large schools typically influence their teachers in more indirect ways; for example, through planned professional development experiences" (p. 8).

In the What Works Clearinghouse IES Practice Guide, *Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools,* Herman et al. (2008) identify a *set* of four practices that, *together*, are associated with leading successfully in these particular turnaround contexts, which they note are distinct from Comprehensive School Reform contexts and more general school improvement initiatives where improvement is expected over three to five years or longer. The set of practices they identify include:

1) Signal the need for dramatic change with strong leadership. Schools should make a clear commitment to dramatic changes from the status quo, and the leader should signal the magnitude and urgency of that change. A low-performing school that fails to make adequate yearly progress must improve student achievement within a short timeframe—it does not have the luxury of years to implement incremental reforms.

2) Maintain a consistent focus on improving instruction. Chronically low-performing schools need to maintain a sharp focus on improving instruction at every step of the reform process. To improve instruction, schools should use data to set goals for instructional improvement, make changes to immediately and directly affect instruction, and continually reassess student learning and instructional practices to refocus the goals.

3) Make visible improvements early in the school turnaround process (quick wins). These can rally staff around the effort and overcome resistance and inertia.

4) Build a committed staff. The school leader must build a staff that is committed to the school's improvement goals and qualified to carry out school improvement. This goal may require changes in staff, such as releasing, replacing, or redeploying staff who are not fully committed to turning around student performance and bringing in new staff who are committed.

[16] A number of SchoolWorks SQC reflect internal accountability mechanisms. Newmann et al. (1997) write, "In some schools, strong internal accountability was accompanied by compatible external accountability, but in others, internal accountability existed without, or even in opposition to, external accountability requirements. These internally generated accountability systems constituted a major source of cohesion within the school. Thus, internal accountability can be seen not only as a building block of organizational capacity, but also as a result or product of high organizational capacity. That is, a school's commitment to monitor its progress and offer its own set of rewards and sanctions can lead to higher consensus and skill development among staff. Or, strong, clear consensus on a school's mission can lead to building an internal system of monitoring, with rewards and sanctions at the school" (p. 48).

[17] Building trust in schools can be understood as a developmental process whereby trust-building activities are designed to expand the levels of trust currently apparent in a school. Kochanek (2005) identifies three developmental levels of trust building activity: 1) *setting the stage for positive interactions* (communicating a vision of doing what is best for children/students and reshaping the faculty to create a cohesive, competent team), to 2) *fostering low-risk exchanges* (engaging staff in small, successful activities, promoting small group interactions to ease perceptions of vulnerability, using daily social interactions to ease vulnerability, modeling behavior to promote successful low-risk interaction, planning special events to promote positive low-risk interactions) and 3) *creating opportunities for high-risk interactions* (implementing formal structures of high-risk interaction, such as regularly scheduled, instructionally focused meetings where teachers' data and instruction are discussed or forming policy development committees, or promoting peer review and evaluation; pursuing a strategic plan of action; shifting control from administrators to teachers). Although many of the SchoolWorks SQC reflect assumptions of high levels of trust in a school, it is the head of school's, or principal's, responsibility to monitor the level of trust in the school and to select and promote developmentally-appropriate activities to improve school-wide relational trust as a foundation for school-wide improvement.

[18] This dimension requires that principals not only understand how to implement a quality supervision and evaluation process, but also understand its value for improving school-wide and classroom-based practices. Sartain, Steolinga, & Krone (2010) conclude from a first year study of principals' use of a high-quality evaluation framework that, "Successful implementation of a rigorous evaluation system requires changing the way practitioners and district leaders think about teacher evaluation. While introducing a high-quality teacher evaluation tool is an important step in revamping evaluation practices, changing the evaluation process also requires a long-term shift in the way people think about teacher evaluation. While the majority of principals in the first year were highly engaged and enthusiastic, a little less than half of the principals had more mixed or negative perceptions. Many of the more negative principals revealed attitudes and assumptions about evaluation (for instance, "just knowing" if a teacher is good) that need to be addressed if teacher evaluation practices are to improve. Truly transforming teacher evaluation relies upon finding ways to shift perceptions among principals who do not see the value in deeper evaluation practices" (p. 9).

Further, studies indicate that effective evaluation systems attend to both accountability and professional growth; however, current practices over-emphasize evaluation for accountability purposes at the expense of supporting educators' professional growth (Colby, 2002).

[19] This indicator relates to supervising the work of other school leaders. Distributing leadership does not absolve the principle of accountability for results; thus, the principal must invest in supervising other leaders, providing feedback, and if necessary, intervening in their efforts.

[20] In their study of teacher evaluation and professional learning, Tuytens & Devos (2011) found that teachers do undertake professional learning activities after receiving principal feedback and that most teachers perceived feedback from the school leader as useful. They conclude, "This finding might indicate that the tide is turning for teacher evaluation. Whereas Frase and Streshly (1994) suggest that the lack of useful feedback has been one of the major weaknesses of teacher evaluation, our study should encourage school leaders and teachers to be optimistic about teacher evaluation and its possible impact on teachers professional development."

[21] In their study of identifying effective teachers, Gordon, Kane, & Staiger (2006, as cited by City, 2007) argue that the least effective teachers not be promoted to tenure track positions and that teacher effectiveness be assessed through multiple means, including student achievement and principal, peer, and student evaluations.

Arguing for the removal of ineffective and oppositional teachers as a culture building strategy, Kochanek (2005) writes, "Trust is more easily built between people with similar interests. Thus, setting the stage for trust formation may include reshaping the faculty to bring together teachers with more compatible beliefs. For example, a faculty characterized by racial tensions has major barriers to building trust. Significant individual change would be necessary before trust could be built within the group. Trust is more likely to develop if the principal removes certain key individuals and hires more compatible personalities. In addition, the removal of oppositional personalities helps to rewrite or erase possible negative organizational histories so that new members are not socialized into the status quo but may move the organization forward by being open to new modes of interactions (Levitt March, 1988)" (p. 21).

[22] Tutyens & Devos (2011) write, "The concept of leadership content knowledge was first discussed by Stein and Nelson (2003) who believe that 'professional development for teachers is not sufficient to change instructional practice, especially across an entire system. . .(p)rincipals must not only be capable of providing professional development for their teachers, but also have the knowledge, skills and strength of character to hold teachers accountable for integrating what they have learned in professional development into their ongoing practice' (p. 425). Leadership content knowledge includes the knowledge of a school leader about an academic subject and the way this subject is taught and learned (Nelson & Sassi, 2005)…. Spillane and Louis (2002) argue that 'Without an understanding of the knowledge necessary for teachers to teach well - content knowledge, general pedagogical knowledge, content specific pedagogical knowledge, curricular knowledge and knowledge of learners - school leaders will be unable to perform essential school improvement functions such as monitoring instruction and supporting teacher development.' (p. 97)" (pp. 893-894).

[23] Tuytens & Devos (2011) note, "Studies show that feedback only leads to improvement and development when teachers perceive the feedback as accurate and useful (Feys, Libbrecht, Anseel, & Lievens, 2008; Kinicki et al., 2004), and then show in their own study that teachers' perceptions of the accuracy and usefulness of feedback from their supervision/evaluation conferences mediates teachers' subsequent professional learning.

[24] *Data* are empirical pieces of information that educators can use to make instructional and organizational decisions (What Works Clearinghouse, 2009). The term data in the SchoolWorks SQC refer to multiple and varied sources of classroom- or school-specific information. These data sources may include, but are not limited to, standardized student achievement data, curriculum unit test results, individualized assessment results, interim or formative assessment data, student work or performance results, teacher or parent observations, student or parent interviews, instructional practice data, or goal implementation data.

A data culture includes attitudes, values, goals, behavioral norms, and practices, accompanied by a school-wide vision for data use, that convey a group's appreciation for the important role that data plays in decision making. It includes the recognition that data collection and the use of data are an ongoing part of educators' responsibilities as they work to influence and inform instruction and school improvement (What Works Clearinghouse, 2009).

[25] Armstrong & Anthes (2001) found three primary categories of data in use: demographic (e.g., gender, ethnicity, years in district, attendance, teacher certification, school enrollment), achievement (e.g., student results on multiple types of assessments), and instructional-processes data (e.g., records of curriculum or programs, classroom practices, student grouping) (p. 38).

Results of descriptive case studies indicate that types of data collected determine types of decisions made (Mason, 2002, as cited in Lachat & Smith, 2005; Armstrong & Anthes, 2001). While a combination of demographic, achievement, education program, and perception data informed improvements at the school level (e.g., programs, curricula, goals), Pardini (2002) found that teachers were better able to modify their instructional strategies when they had current information about students' skill levels and proficiencies (Lachat & Smith, 2005, p. 335)

[26] Tools that support data-based action may include data analysis protocols, goal monitoring reports, assessment links to curriculum guides, state or district websites, banks of assessment items. Cosner (2011) notes that, "Research also suggests a variety of enabling organizational conditions that offer support for the substantive inquiry-oriented work embedded in evidence-based collaboration. The adoption and publication of an overarching inquiry model or process that broadly guides evidence-based work by making explicit the subtasks that underlie evidence-based collaboration proves to be an important roadmap to teachers as they embark on such work (Eylon et al., 2008; Lai & McNaughton, 2009; Timperley, Parr, et al., 2009). Like- wise, teacher training in inquiry processes (Lai & McNaughton, 2009; Tim- perley, Annan, et al., 2009) and the development of an inquiry-oriented schoolwide culture have also been found to play a role in supporting evidence- based teacher collaboration (Earl & Timperley, 2009; Nelson, 2008; Timperley, Annan, et al., 2009). Accordingly, Nelson (2008) argues, "teachers need support for both the processes of inquiry and for the creation of an environment that models, nurtures, and embeds an inquiry stance" (p. 579). Moreover, this literature tends to encourage the use of discussion protocols, conversational tools designed to direct collaborative, inquiry-oriented teacher conversations (Gallimore et al., 2009; Lai & McNaughton, 2009; Levine & Marcus, 2010; Little & Curry, 2009; Little, Gearhart, Curry, & Kafka, 2003). Such protocols "define relevant artifacts for scrutiny (student work, lesson plans, tasks and assignments, assessments) establish guiding questions for considering those artifacts, and structure both participants roles and the use of time" (Little & Curry, 2009, p. 30) in ways that "help groups get past cultural norms of privacy and non-interference" (Little, 2009, p. 110). That being said, there is also considerable agreement that discussion protocols should be used in flexible and creative ways (Little, 2009) and by skilled facilitators (Gallimore at al., 2009; Levine & Marcus, 2010; Little & Curry, 2009; Nelson, 2008)" (pp. 793-794).

[27] Multiple studies (Waters, Marzano, & McNulty, 2003; Owings, Kaplan, & Nunnery, 2005; Alig-Mielcarek, 2003) indicate that instructional leadership is correlated with student achievement, meaning as instructional leadership increases, student achievement also increases, and vice versa; however, studies have not established that instructional leadership causes or has direct effects on student achievement. Instead, researchers have shown that instructional leadership achieves indirect or mediating effects on student outcomes by influencing the quality of the school's professional community and culture.

Instructional leadership practices have substantive overlap with supervision practices and definitions have expanded from focusing only on the principal's role in instructional leadership to other school leaders' and colleagues' roles. For example, Glick, Gordon, and Ross-Gordon (2006) describe five overlapping tenets of instructional leadership and supervision (as cited in Glanz, Shulman, and Sullivan, 2007, p. 21):

- A collegial rather than a hierarchical relationship between teachers and formally designated supervisors.
- Supervision as the province of teachers as well as formally designated supervisors.
- A focus on teacher growth rather than teacher compliance.
- Facilitation of teachers collaborating with each other in instructional improvement efforts.
- Teacher involvement in ongoing reflective inquiry (Gordon, 1997, p. 116).

[28] Cosner (2011) notes in his review of leadership literature that, “From a planning and accountability standpoint, principals have also been found to support the development of evidence-based practices by setting organizational goals and expectations and creating press for using evidence (Supovitz & Klein, 2003)." (p.791). Here, he suggests that the principal exerts expectations and accountability for data use and a school-wide evidence-based culture. He also notes that, principal agenda setting, or “leadership in articulating rationale, setting expectations, and structuring time and teachers’ learning about data (Young, 2006, p. 523)” contributes to the development of a data culture in schools. Finally, he notes that in their study, to create “press for grade-level teams to initiate and work to strengthen over time their collaborative practices and outcomes” school leaders gave the full faculty, as well as teacher teams, “targeted feedback” and made evidence-based collaboration public to their colleagues across the school” (p. 804). This accountability function, he states, was typically provided by the school principal because this role had the necessary authority to create and press these expectations.

[29] Blanc et al. (2010) describe a wide range of skills needed for leading a data-driven culture and argue that school leaders need opportunities to develop this knowledge base and practice related skills: “As learning leaders, principals and teacher leaders need deep content knowledge and strong facilitation skills to lead the kinds of deliberative conversations that make discussions of interim assessment results opportunities for teacher learning. School leaders must ensure that the interpretation processes in instructional communities are rife with opportunities for teachers to question their understanding of the pedagogy embedded in curricular frameworks and instructional materials. They need to learn how to frame conversations about assessment data so that teachers understand the connections to larger school improvement priorities and to the school’s curriculum. They need to know how to pose questions in ways that invite teachers to talk openly about curriculum concepts, how their students learn best, what instructional practices have worked and those that haven’t, what additional curricular resources they need, what they need to learn about content, and where they might seek evidence-based instructional strategies that would address the learning weaknesses of their students. They also need to know how to steer teachers away from inappropriate use of data to predict performance on standardized tests. School leaders need opportunities to develop this knowledge base and practice these skills” (p. 223). They add, “In the absence of leadership and instructional communities that are able to engage deeply and reflectively with interim assessment data, interim assessments can all too easily—and incorrectly—be positioned as activities that provide simple information that will help students and schools succeed within an environment of high-stakes accountability.”

[30] While “curriculum” typically refers to the *content* of teaching or *what* students are taught, there are a variety of interpretations throughout the field regarding what that actually means in practice. Marzano (2003) explains three types of curricula identified in the Second International Mathematics Study (SIMS): the intended curriculum, the implemented curriculum, and the attained curriculum. “The intended curriculum is content specified by the state, district or school to be addressed in a particular course or at a particular grade level. The implemented curriculum is content actually delivered by the teacher, and the attained curriculum is content actually learned by students” (p. 23). He defines “classroom curriculum design as the sequencing and pacing of content along with the experiences students have with that content” (p. 107). He goes on to note the limitations of teachers relying too heavily on the design of textbooks for guidance in making those decisions.

Ball & Cohen (1996) argue that, “While ‘curriculum’ is often taken to refer strictly to the textbook or curriculum materials, the enacted curriculum [i.e., the implemented curriculum] is actually jointly constructed by teachers, students, and materials in particular contexts” (p. 7). They then explain: “As teachers enact curriculum in and with their classes, they work across five intersecting domains. First, teachers are influenced by what they think about their students, about what students bring to instruction, students' probable ideas about the content at hand, and

about the trajectories of their learning that content. Second, teachers work with their own understanding of the material, which shapes their interpretations of what the central ideas are, how they hear, evaluate, and respond to students' ideas, and how they decide how to focus and frame the material for students. Third, teachers fashion the material for students, choose tasks or models, and navigate instructional resources such as textbooks in order to design instruction. Fourth is the intellectual and social environment of the class. Teachers must keep their eye on the group, and on the ways of knowing, interacting, and working that seem possible. This requires attention to patterns and norms of discourse, the nature of tasks, and the roles played by the teacher and students. Finally, teachers are influenced by their views of the broader community and policy contexts in which they work, and by the expressed ideas of parents, administrators, and professional organizations. They variously apprehend and interpret messages about goals for instruction and about good teaching, and their interpretations play a role in the way they shape the curriculum."

The benefits of articulating a curriculum, in whatever form it takes, include ensuring that all students have equitable access to learning what is considered most important to educators and the communities they serve. At the district/school level, the curriculum, which is typically based on state standards, may be articulated in more detail through documents summarizing what is to be taught (i.e., the subject matter focus) at each grade level in each subject (e.g., content standards and benchmarks, learning expectations, curriculum frameworks, maps, or pacing guides) and/or a set of curriculum materials or instructional programs (e.g., texts, units, and other teaching resources) issued for each subject at each grade level, all of which may vary significantly in their specificity.

However, as Marzano (2003) and Ball & Cohen (1996) have articulated, in practice, the reality of what is actually taught is much more complex than such documents and materials would indicate. At the classroom level, the curriculum may include teacher-designed or adapted units and lessons that incorporate materials issued by the district or school, as well as additional instructional materials selected or created by the teacher. Even in the case of mandated, scripted curriculum, in the process of instruction, *what* is taught will differ across classrooms depending on the students, the teachers, and other contextual variables. Furthermore, the "what" and the "how" of teaching (i.e., curriculum and instruction) are inextricably linked and cannot be fully separated. For example, different questions or academic tasks focused on similar curricular goals will develop different skills, knowledge, and understandings among student learners, with inevitable individual variation in what is learned as well, depending on what students bring to their learning experiences. Thus, a view of "curriculum" as "what is taught when" should consider the implemented (or enacted) as well as the intended curriculum. And a continuous improvement process should also take into account the attained curriculum, as reflected by student performance data from a variety of formative and summative assessments.

[31] See Instruction domain for related description of engaging and challenging instruction.

[32] Researchers note frequent differences in the documented curriculum, or the written curriculum that is intended to be taught, and the enacted curriculum, or the curriculum as it is implemented or taught in the classroom (Kurz et al., 2010; Cohen & Ball, 1999; Marzano, 2003).

[33] See endnote 44 regarding instructional frameworks.

[34] This leadership behavior is especially important during second order change efforts

[35] This leadership behavior is especially important during second order change efforts. Marzano, Waters, & McNulty (2005) explain, "For example, assume that a school has decided to institute a standards-based report card. Additionally, the leadership team has determined that the staff perceives the initiative as second order in magnitude [i.e., is perceived as a break from the past, requires new knowledge, skills, and resources, conflicts with

prevailing values and norms, and may be resisted because it is perceived as unnecessary]. To effectively execute this responsibility, the school leader would carefully study how the new report card would affect the current curriculum. One thing she might discover is that the current curriculum, which consists of course outlines, provides teachers with wide latitude in the course content they may include and exclude. Implementation of a standards-based report card will greatly diminish this latitude. Because teachers will have to report on students' progress in certain areas of knowledge and skill, they will certainly have to address those areas of knowledge and skill in their classes. In effect the new report card will standardize the curriculum and influence how every classroom teacher executes instruction and assessment. Understanding the impact the new report card will likely have on curriculum, instruction, and assessment might be critical to developing strategies to ensure the success of the innovation" (pp.117-118).

[36] The effect of teachers' trust in the principal becomes less important when shared leadership and professional community are present (Wahlstrom & Louis, 2008); however, the development of shared leadership and a healthy and responsible professional community is usually the result of trust building over time (see endnote #43).

[37] This leadership behavior is especially important during second order change efforts and must be targeted toward the specific change being implemented; the goal is to stimulate the staff's curiosity about the change being implemented (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005).

[i] Robust research on school and classroom discipline shows that white teachers are more likely to evaluate the behavior of Black students, particularly black boys, as disruptive. Wright's research finds: "that African American students with more African American teachers are suspended less often, suggesting the underrepresentation of African-American teachers has important implications for black-white gaps in school discipline" (2015).

[ii] Cook et. al performed an RCT study in Chicago that assessed the impact of academic tutoring with social, cognitive skill development (self regulation, social information processing, conflict resolution and grit). This study was small but high quality, and it is supported by the work of Dobbie & Fryer, 2011.

[iii] Taylor et. al find that students in online recovery courses who had instructionally supportive face to face mentors had "higher credit recovery rates" and that credit recovery rates were similar to their face to face counterparts." (p. 7). In the study "instructionally supportive mentors were more likely to be certified (math) teachers and spent "20 percent or more of course time providing (face to face) instructional support."(p. 9)

Works Cited

Abedi, Jamal, et al. *English Language Learners and Math Achievement: A Study of Opportunity to Learn and Language Accommodation. Technical Report 702*. National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST), 2006. Print.

Abedi, Jamal. "Computer Testing as a Form of Accommodation for English Language Learners." *Educational Assessment* 14.3 (2009): 195-211. Print.

Adams, Curt M., and Patrick B. Forsyth. "The Nature and Function of Trust in Schools." *Journal of School Leadership* 19.2 (2009): 126-52. Print.

Adams, G., and D. Carnine. "Direct Instruction." *Handbook of Learning Disabilities.* Eds. H. L. Swanson, K. R. Harris, and S. Graham. New York, NY: Guilford Press., 2003. 403-416. Print.

Aguilar, Elena. *Onward: Cultivating Emotional Resilience in Educators*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2018. Print.

Aguilar, Elena. *The Art of Coaching: Effective Strategies for School Transformation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2013.

Aguilar, Elena. *The Art of Coaching Teams*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2016. Print.

Akey, Theresa M. *School Context, Student Attitudes and Behavior, and Academic Achievement: An Exploratory Analysis*. MDRC, 2006. Print.

Algozzine, Bob, et al. "Effects of Interventions to Promote Self-Determination for Individuals with Disabilities." *Review of Educational Research* 71.2 (2001): 219-77. Print.

Alsbury, Thomas and Phil Gore, eds. *Improving School Board Effectiveness: A Balanced Governance Approach*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2015. Print.

Anderson, Lorin W. "Curricular Alignment: A Re-Examination." *Theory Into Practice* 41.4 (2002): 255. Web.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. “Race, Equity and Inclusion Action Guide: Embracing Equity, 7 Steps to Advance and Embed Race, Equity and Inclusion Within Your Organization.” 2014. Web.

Archibald, Sarah, et al. *High-Quality Professional Development for all Teachers: Effectively Allocating Resources*. Washington, D.C.: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, February 2011. Print.

Argyris, Chris, and Donald Schon. *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley, 1978. Print. *Theory in Practice: Increasing Professional Effectiveness*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2001. Print.

Armstrong, J., and K. Anthes. "How Data can Help: Putting Information to Work to Raise Student Achievement." *American School Board Journal* (2001) Print.

Attewell, Paul, and Thurston Domina. "Raising the Bar: Curricular Intensity and Academic Performance." *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis* 30.1 (2008): 51-71. Web.

August, Diane, et al. *The Impact of an Instructional Intervention on the Science and Language Learning of Middle Grade English Language Learners*. Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2010. Print.

Ball, Deborah Loewenberg, and David K. Cohen. "Reform by the Book: What is--Or might be-- the Role of Curriculum Materials in Teacher Learning and Instructional Reform?" *Educational Researcher* 25 (1996): 6,8+14. Web.

Bambrick-Santoyo, Paul. *Getting Better Faster: A 90 Day Plan for Coaching New Teachers*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2016. Print.

Bambrick-Santoyo, Paul. *Driven by Data: Driven by Data: A Practical Guide to Improve Instruction*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2010.

Bambrick-Santoyo, Paul. *Leverage Leadership: A Practical Guide to Building Excellent Schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2012.

Bandyopadhyay, Sharmila, D. Cornell, and Timothy R. Konold. "Validity of Three School Climate Scales to Assess Bullying, Aggressive Attitudes, and Help Seeking." *School Psychology Review* 38.3 (2009): 338-55. Print.

Banks, James and Cherry McGee Banks, Eds. *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education; The Routledge International Companion to Multicultural Education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass, 2016. Print.

Barbour, Michael K., and Cory Plough. "Social Networking in Cyberschooling: Helping to make Online Learning Less Isolating." *TechTrends: Linking Research and Practice to Improve Learning* 53.4 (2009): 56-60. Web.

Barbour, Michael K., and Thomas C. Reeves. "The Reality of Virtual Schools: A Review of the Literature." *Computers & Education* 52.2 (2009): 402-16. Web.

Barley, Zoe, et al. *Helping at-Risk Students Meet Standards: A Synthesis of Evidence-Based Classroom Practices*. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning, 2002. Print.

Barrera, Manuel, et al. *Use of Chunking and Questioning Aloud to Improve the Reading Comprehension of English Language Learners with Disabilities. ELLs with Disabilities Report 17*. National Center on Educational Outcomes, University of Minnesota, 2006. Print.

Bear, George G., et al. "Delaware School Climate Survey--Student: Its Factor Structure, Concurrent Validity, and Reliability." *Journal of School Psychology* 49.2 (2011): 157-74. Print.

Benner, G., Nelson, J.R., Sanders, E., & Ralston, N. "Behavior Intervention for Students with Externalizing Behavior Problems: Primary-Level Standard Protocol." *Exceptional Children,* 78(2), (2012): 181-198. Print.

Bennett, Randy Elliot. "Formative Assessment: A Critical Review." *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice* 18.1 (2011): 5-25. Print.

Benson, Jeffrey. *Hanging In: Strategies for Teaching the Students Who Challenge Us Most*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2014. Print.

Berge, Zane L., and Tom Clark. *Virtual Schools: Planning for Success*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2005. Print.

Berger, Andrea, et al. *Supplemental Educational Services and Student Achievement in Five Waiver Districts*. Office of Planning, Evaluation and Policy Development, US Department of Education, 2011. Print.

Berger, R., Leah Rugen and Libby Woodfin, *Leaders of Their Own Learning: Transforming Schools Through Student-Engaged Assessment*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2014.

Berry, Barnett, Alesha Daughtrey, and Alan Wieder. *Collaboration: Closing the Effective Teaching Gap*. Carrboro, NC: Center for Teaching Quality, 2009. Print.

Beyer, Carrie J., and Elizabeth A. Davis. "Using Educative Curriculum Materials to Support Preservice Elementary Teachers' Curricular Planning: A Comparison between Two Different Forms of Support." *Curriculum Inquiry* 39.5 (2009): 679-703. Web.

Blad, Evie. "Students' Sense of Belonging at School Is Important. It Starts with Teachers." *Ed Week*, (June 20, 2017). Web.

Blanc, S., et al. "Learning to Learn from Data: Benchmarks and Instructional Communities." *Peabody Journal of Education* 85.2 (2010): 205-225. Print.

Blank, Rolf K., and N. de las Alas. *Effects of Teacher Professional Development on Gains in Student Achievement: How Meta Analysis Provides Scientific Evidence Useful to Education Leaders*. Washington, D.C.: Council of Chief State School Officers, 2009. Print.

Blomeyer, Robert. *Online Learning for K–12 Students: What do we Know Now?* North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL), 2002. Web.

Bohanon, Hank, et al. "Utilizing Positive Behavior Supports in High School Settings to Improve School Completion Rates for Students with High Incidence Conditions." *Exceptionality* 17.1 (2009): 30-44. Print.

Bolam, R., et al. *Creating and Sustaining Effective Professional Learning Communities*. 637 Vol. England: Universities of Bristol, 2005. Print.

Boneshefski, M., & Runge, T. "Addressing Disproportionate Discipline Practices within a School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports Framework: A Practical Guide for Calculating and Using Disproportionality Rates, "*Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions 16* (3), (2014): 149-158. Print.

Boogren, Tina. *Supporting Beginning Teachers*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Group, 2015. Print.

Borko, Hilda, Shelby A. Wolf, and Genet Simone. "Schools in Transition: Reform Efforts and School Capacity in Washington State." *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis* 25.2 (2003): 171-201. Web.

Borman, Geoffrey D., and N. M. Dowling. "Teacher Attrition and Retention: A Meta-Analytic and Narrative Review of the Research." *Review of Educational Research* 78.3 (2008): 367-409. Print.

Bottge, Brian A., et al. "Integrating Reform-Oriented Math Instruction in Special Education Settings." *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice (Blackwell Publishing Limited)* 22.2 (2007): 96-109. Print.

Bowers, Erica, et al. "Effective Strategies for Developing Academic English: Professional Development and Teacher Practices." *Bilingual Research Journal* 33.1 (2010): 95-110. Print.

Bradshaw, Catherine P., et al. "Altering School Climate through School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports: Findings from a Group-Randomized Effectiveness Trial." *Prevention Science* 10.2 (2009): 100-15. Print.

Brenner, T. C., G. L. Sullivan, and E. Dalton. *Effective Best Practices for School Boards: Linking Local Governance with Student Academic Success*. IPED Technical Reports. Paper 15 Vol. El Paso, TX: Institute for Policy and Economic Development (IPED), 2002. Print.

Bridges, Brian, Janet Awokoya, and Frances Messano. "Done to Us, Not with Us: African American Parent Perceptions of K-12 Education." Washington, DC: Frederick D. Patterson Research Institute, UNCF, 2012. Web.

Brookfield, Stephen and Stephen Preskill. *Discussion as a Way of Teaching: Tools and Techniques for Democratic Classrooms.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2005. Print.

Brookhart, S. "Expanding Views of Formative Classroom Assessment: A Review of the Literature." *Formative Classroom Assessment.* Ed. J. McMillan. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2007. 43-62. Print.

Brooks, Katie, and Linda P. Thurston. "English Language Learner Academic Engagement and Instructional Grouping Configurations." *American Secondary Education* 39.1 (2010): 45-60. Print.

Brown, Gavin, and Gerrit Hirschfeld. "Students' Conceptions of Assessment: Links to Outcomes." *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice* 15.1 (2008): 3-17. Print.

Brown, Kathleen M., et al. "Leading Schools of Excellence and Equity: Documenting Effective Strategies in Closing Achievement Gaps." *Teachers College Record* 113.1 (2011): 57-96. Print.

Bryk, A. S., and Barbara Schneider. "Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for School Reform." *Educational Leadership* 60.6 (2003): 40. Print.

Bryk, A. S., et al. *Organizing Schools for Improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press, 2010. Print.

Burke, M., Davis, J., Lee, Y., Hagan-Burke, S., Kwok,O. & Sugai, G. (2012). "Universal Screening for Behavioral Risk in Elementary Schools Using SWPBIS Expectations." *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 20*(1), (2012): 38-54. Print.

Burke, M., et al. "Integrating Universal Behavioral Screening within Program-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports." *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions* 18(1), (2015): 15-16. Print.

Burns, Matthew K., James J. Appleton, and Jonathan D. Stehouwer. "Meta-Analytic Review of Responsiveness-to-Intervention Research: Examining Field-Based and Research- Implemented Models." *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment* 23.4 (2005): 381-94. Print.

Burns, Matthew K. "Empirical Analysis of Drill Ratio Research: Refining the Instructional Level for Drill Tasks." *Remedial and Special Education* 25.3 (2004): 167-73. Print.

Burris, Carol Corbet, et al. "Accountability, Rigor, and Detracking: Achievement Effectsof Embracing a Challenging Curriculum as a Universal Good for all Students." *Teachers College Record* 110.3 (2008): 571-607. Web.

Calderon, Margarita, Robert E. Slavin, and Marta Sanchez. "Effective Instruction for English Learners." *Future of Children* 21.1 (2011): 103-27. Print.

Camburn, E. M., and S. W. Han. "Two Decades of Generalizable Evidence on U.S. Instruction from National Surveys." *Teachers College Record* 113.3 (2011): 561-610. Web.

Cameron, C. E., C. McDonald Connorb, and F. J. Morrisona. "Effects of Variation in Teacher Organization on Classroom Functioning." *Journal of School Psychology* 43 (2005): 61-85. Web.

Carbaugh, Beverly, Robert Marzano and Michael Toth. *School Leadership for Results: Shifting the Focus of Leader Evaluation*. West Palm Beach, FL: Learning Sciences International, 2015. Print.

Cardenas-Hagan, Elsa, Coleen D. Carlson, and Sharolyn Pollard-Durodola. "The Cross- Linguistic Transfer of Early Literacy Skills: The Role of Initial L1 and L2 Skills and Language of Instruction." *Language, Speech, and Hearing Services in Schools* 38.3 (2007): 249-59. Print.

Carrier, Karen A. "Improving High School English Language Learners' Second Language Listening through Strategy Instruction." *Bilingual Research Journal* 27.3 (2003): 383-408. Print.

Carroll, T. G., K. Fulton, and H. Doerr, eds. *Team Up for 21st Century Teaching and Learning: What Research and Practice Reveal about Professional Learning (Condensed Excerpts)*. Washington, D. C.: National Commission on Teaching & America's Future, June 2010. Web.

Carter, D. R., & Pool, J. L. "Appropriate Social Behavior: Teaching Expectations to Young Children." *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 40, (2012): 315-321. Print.

Caspe, Margaret, M. E. Lopez, and Cassandra Wolos. "Family Involvement in Elementary School Children's Education." *Family Involvement Makes a Difference: Evidence that Family Involvement Promotes School Success for Every Child of Every Age* 01/01 2007Web. <http://www.hfrp.org/publications-resources/publications-series/family-involvement-makes-a-difference/family-involvement-in-elementary-school-children-s- education>.

Casteel, Catherine J., and Keira Gebbie Ballantyne. *Professional Development in Action: Improving Teaching for English Learners*. National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition & Language Instruction Educational Programs, 2010. Print.

Castle, Sharon, Carla Baker Deniz, and Michael Tortora. "Flexible Grouping and Student Learning in a High-Needs School." *Education & Urban Society* 37.2 (2005): 139-50. Print.

Cavanaugh, Cathy S., Michael K. Barbour, and Tom Clark. "Research and Practice in K-12 Online Learning: A Review of Open Access Literature." *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning* 10.1 (2009): 1-22. Web.

Cavanaugh, Cathy, et al. *The Effects of Distance Education on K-12 Student Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis*. Learning Point Associates / North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL), 2004. Web.

Cavanaugh, Cathy. "Student Achievement in Elementary and High School." *Handbook of Distance Education.* Ed. Michael G. Moore. 2nd ed. Mahwah, N.J.: L. Erlbaum Associates, 2007. 157. Print.

Center for Applied Special Technologies (CAST). "UDL Guidelines, Version 2.0: Research Evidence." 2011.Web. <http://www.udlcenter.org/research/researchevidence>.

Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. *Developing a Positive School Climate*. Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2009. Print.

Centers for Disease Control and Protection. *School Connectedness: Strategies for Increasing Protective Factors among Youth*. Atlanta: GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2009. Print.

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Parent Engagement: Strategies for Involving Parents in School Health*. (2012) Atlanta: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Ceperley, Patricia E. *Linking Student Achievement to School, Family, and Community Involvement: A Review of the Literature*. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory (AEL) at Edvantia, 2005. Web.

Chait, Robin. "Removing Chronically Ineffective Teachers: Barriers and Opportunities." *The Center for American Progress*, March 2010.

Challis, Di. "Committing to Quality Learning through Adaptive Online Assessment." *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education* 30.5 (2005): 519-27. Web.

Chappell, Shanan, et al. "A Meta-Analysis of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Provider Effects on Student Achievement." *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk* 16.1 (2011): 1-23. Print.

Chard, David J., Sharon Vaughn, and Brenda-Jean Tyler. "A Synthesis of Research on Effective Interventions for Building Reading Fluency with Elementary Students with Learning Disabilities." *Journal of learning disabilities* 35.5 (2002): 386-406. Print.

Cheung, Alan, and Robert E. Slavin. *Effective Reading Programs for English Language Learners and Other Language Minority Students*. Success for All Foundation, 2005. Print.

Chin, C., and J. Osborne. "Supporting Argumentation through Students' Questions: Case Studies in Science Classrooms." *Journal of the Learning Sciences* 19.2 (2010): 230-84. Web.

Chin, J. M. "Meta-Analysis of Transformational School Leadership Effects on School Outcomes in Taiwan and the U.S.A." *Asia Pacific Education Review* 8.2 (2007): 166-177. Print.

Chitiyo, M., May, M., & Chitiyo, G. "An Assessment of the Evidence-Base for School-Wide Positive Behavior Support." *Education and Treatment of Children, 35*(1), (2012): 1-24. Print.

Cirillo, Michelle, Katherine Richardson Bruna, and Beth Herbel-Eisenmann. "Acquisition of Mathematical Language: Suggestions and Activities for English Language Learners." *Multicultural Perspectives* 12.1 (2010): 34-41. Print.

City, Elizabeth A., et al. *Instructional Rounds in Education: A Network Approach to Improving Teaching and Learning*. Harvard Education Press, 2009. Print.

City, Elizabeth A. "Resourceful Leadership: The Roots of School Improvement." Ed.D. Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2007. Print.

Clark, Richard E. "Reconsidering Research on Learning from Media." *Review of Educational Research* 53 (1983): 445-59. Web.

Cobb, B., et al. *Effective Interventions in Dropout Prevention: A Research synthesis—the Effects of Cognitive-Behavioral Interventions on Dropout for Youth with Disabilities*. The National Dropout Prevention Center for Students with Disabilities (NDPC-SD), 2005. Print.

Cobb, Paul, Kara Jackson, Erin Henrick and Thomas Smith. *Systems for Instructional Improvement: Creating Coherence from the Classroom to the District Office*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2018. Print.

Cohen, David K., and Deborah Loewenberg Ball. *Instruction, Capacity, and Improvement*. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE), 1999. Web.

Cohen, David K., Stephen W. Raudenbush, and Deborah Loewenberg Ball. "Resources, Instruction, and Research." *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis* 25.2 (2003): 119-

42. Web.

Cohen, Elisabeth and Rachel Lotan. *Designing Groupwork: Strategies for the Heterogeneous Classroom, 3rd edition.* New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2014. Print.

Cohen & Freiberg. "School Climate and Bullying Prevention," *National School Climate Center. 2013.* Research Brief. Print.

Cohen, Geoffrey, et al. "Recursive Processes in Self-Affirmation: Intervening to Close the Minority Achievement Gap." *Science*, 324(5925), April 2009: 400-403.

Cohen, J., and V. K. Geier. *School Climate Research Summary: January 2010.* New York, NY: National School Climate Council, 2010. Print.

Cohen, J., et al. "School Climate: Research, Policy, Practice, and Teacher Education." *Teachers College Record* 111.1 (2009): 180-213. Print.

Cohen, J., Terry Pickeral, and Molly McCloskey. "Assessing School Climate." *Education Digest* 74.8 (2009): 45-8. Print.

Colby, Susan A., Lynn K. Bradshaw, and Randy L. Joyner. *Teacher Evaluation: A Review of the Literature*. New Orleans, LA: paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Conference, 2002. Web.

Cole, Jane E., and Leah H. Wasburn-Moses. "Going Beyond "the Math Wars"." *Teaching Exceptional Children* 42.4 (2010): 14-20. Print.

Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning. *Effective Social and Emotional Learning Programs*. Chicago, IL: Author. Retrieved June 12, 2014, from http://static.squarespace.com/

Comer, James P. "The Yale School Development Program Theory of Change." 2009.Web. <http://childstudycenter.yale.edu/comer/about/change.aspx>.

Cosner, Shelby. "Supporting the Initiation and Early Development of Evidence-Based Grade- Level Collaboration in Urban Elementary Schools: Key Roles and Strategies ofPrincipals and Literacy Coordinators." *Urban Education* 46.4 (2011): 786-827. Print.

Conzemius, Ann and Jan O'Neill. *Building Shared Responsibility for Student Learning*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2001. Print.

Cook, P., et. al. "The (Surprising) Efficacy of Academic and Behavioral Intervention with Disadvantaged Youth: Results from a Randomized Experiment in Chicago." *National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series 19862, January 2014*. Retrieved May 22, 2018 from http://www.nber.org/papers/w19862. Web.

Costa, Arthur and Robert Garmston. *Cognitive Coaching: Developing Self-Directed Leaders and Learners*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2016. Print.

Council of Chief State School Officers, the National Conference of State Legislatures, and the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices. *Supporting Student Success: The Promise of Expanded Learning Opportunities*. NGA Center for Best Practices, 2010. Print.

Cromey, A., and M. Hanson. *An Exploratory Analysis of School-Based Student Assessment Systems*. North Central Regional Educational Laboratory: Learning Point Associates, February 2000. Print.

Cummings, Katrina, Samantha, Addante, Jami Swindell, and Hedda Meadan. "Creating Supportive Environments for Children Who Have Had Exposure to Traumatic Events." *Journal of Child and Family Studies*. Vol. 26, Iss. 10, (Oct 2017): 2728-2741. Web.static/513f79f9e4b05ce7b70e9673/t/526a220de4b00a92c90436ba/1382687245993/2013-casel-guide.pdf. Web.

Cybulski, Timothy G., Wayne K. Hoy, and Scott R. Sweetland. "The Roles of Collective Efficacy of Teachers and Fiscal Efficiency in Student Achievement." *Journal of Educational Administration* 43.5 (2005): 439-61. Print.

Darling-Hammond, Linda, Maria Hyler, and Madelyn Gardner. "Effective Teacher Professional Development." *Learning Policy Institute*, May 2017. Web.

Datnow, A., V. Park, and P. Wohlstetter. *Achieving with Data: How High Performing School Systems use Data to Improve Instruction for Elementary Students*. University of Souther California: Center on Educational Governance, 2007. Web.

Davidson, Marcia R., Matthew K. Fields, and Jiaxiu Yang. "A Randomized Trial Study of a Preschool Literacy Curriculum: The Importance of Implementation." *Journal of Research on Educational Effectiveness* 2.3 (2009): 177-208. Web.

Davies, Brent, and Barbara J. Davies. "The Nature and Dimensions of Strategic Leadership." *International Studies in Educational Administration (Commonwealth Council for Educational Administration & Management (CCEAM))* 38.1 (2010): 5-21. Print.

Davies, Brent. "Processes Not Plans are the Key to Strategic Development." *Management in Education (Education Publishing Worldwide Ltd)* 20.2 (2006): 11-5. Print.

Davis, Elizabeth A., and Joseph S. Krajcik. "Designing Educative Curriculum Materials to Promote Teacher Learning." *Educational Researcher* 34.3 (2005): 3-14. Web.

Dean, Ceri, Elizabeth Ross Hubbell, Howard Pitler and BJ Stone. *Classroom Instruction That Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement, 2nd Edition*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2012. Print.

Dee, T. and S. Gershenson. "Unconscious Bias in the Classroom: Evidence and Opportunities." Mountain View, CA: Google Inc, 2017. Retrieved May 23, 2018 from http://goo.gl/06Btqi. Web.

DeJong, Ester J. & Harper, Candace. "Preparing MainstreamTeachers for English Language Learners: Is Being a Good Teacher Good Enough? *Teacher Education Quarterly,* 32(2). 101-124. Print.

Deussen, Theresa et. al. "What Teachers Know about Instruction for English Langugage Learners: A Report to Washington State," pp. 7-8. Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. Nov. 2008. Retrieved May 24, 2018. http://educationnorthwest.org

Digital Learning Council. *Digital Learning Now!*. Foundation for Excellence in Education, 2010. Web.

DiPietro, Meredith, et al. "Best Practices in Teaching K-12 Online: Lessons Learned from Michigan Virtual School Teachers." *Journal of Interactive Online Learning* 7.1 (2008): 10-38. Web.

DiPietro, Meredith. "Virtual School Pedagogy: The Instructional Practices of K-12 Virtual School Teachers." *Journal of Educational Computing Research* 42.3 (2010): 327-54. Web.

Dobbie, Will and Roland Fryer. "Getting Beneath the Veil of Effective Schools: Evidence from New York City." National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper Series 17632, December 2011. Retrieved May 22, 2018 from http://www.nber.org/papers/w17632. Web.

Dolejs, Chris. *Report of Key Practices and Policies of Consistently Higher Performing High Schools*. National High School Center: National Center for Educational Accountability, 2006, October. Print.

Dowd, Heather and Patrick Green. *Classroom Management in the Digital Age: Effective Practices for Technology-Rich Learning Spaces*. Irvine, CA: EdTech Team Press, 2016. Print.

Duckworth, Angela. *Grit: The Power and Passion of Perseverance.* New York, NY: Scribner, 2016.

DuFour, Richard, Rebecca DuFour, Robert Eaker and Thomas Many. *Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press, 2006. Print.

DuFour, Richard, and R. J. Marzano. "High-Leverage Strategies for Principal Leadership." *Educational Leadership* 66.5 (2009): 62-8. Print.

Dugan, J. J., R. B. Cobb, and M. Alwell. "The Effects of Technology-Based Interventions on Academic Outcomes for Youth with Disabilities." (2006)Print.

Durlak, Joseph A., et al. "Effects of Positive Youth Development Programs on School, Family, and Community Systems." *American Journal of Community Psychology* 39.3 (2007): 269-86. Print.

Durlak, Joseph A., et al. "The Impact of Enhancing Students' Social and Emotional Learning: A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Universal Interventions." *Child Development* 82.1 (2011): 405-32. Print.

Durlak, Joseph A., and Roger P. Weissberg. "Promoting Social and Emotional Development is an Essential Part of Students' Education." *Human Development (0018716X)* 54.1 (2011): 1-3. Print.

Dweck, Carol S. *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. 1st ed. New York: Random House, 2006. Print.

Dynarski, Mark, et al. *Dropout Prevention. IES Practice Guide. NCEE 2008-4025*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, 2008. Print.

Earl, Lorna and Steven Katz, Eds. *Leading Schools in a Data-Rich World: Harnessing Data for School Improvement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2006. Print.

Eby, Lillian T., et al. "Does Mentoring Matter? A Multidisciplinary Meta-Analysis Comparing Mentored and Non-Mentored Individuals." *Journal of vocational behavior* 72.2 (2008): 254-67. Print.

Education Alliance. "Culturally Responsive Teaching: Educators Sharing and Learning Together." 2008. *Retrieved June 15, 2018 from http://knowledgeloom.org*. Web.

Egalite, Anna and Brian Kisida. "The Many Ways Teacher Diversity May Benefit Students." *Education Next*, August 2016. Retrieved from May 23, 3018 from educationnext.org/the-many-ways-teacher-diversity-may-benefit-students/#. Web.

Ehri, Linnea C., et al. "Systematic Phonics Instruction Helps Students Learn to Read: Evidence from the National Reading Panel's Meta-Analysis." *Review of Educational Research* 71.3 (2001): 393-447. Print.

Elbaum, B., and Sharon Vaughn. "For which Students with Learning Disabilities are Self- Concept Interventions Effective?" *Journal of Learning Disabilities* 36.2 (2003): 101-108. Print.

Englehart, Joshua. "Attending to the Affective Dimensions of Bullying: Necessary Approaches for the School Leader." *Planning and Changing*, 45 (1-2), (Spring 2014): 19-30. Print.

Epstein, Joyce L. "School/Family/Community Partnerships: Caring for the Children We Share." *Phi Delta Kappan* (2010) 92(3): 81–96.

Epstein, Joyce Levy, and Susan L. Dauber. "School Programs and Teacher Practices of Parent Involvement in Inner-City Elementary and Middle Schools." *Elementary School Journal* 91 (1991): 289-305. Web.

Evans, Andrea. "No Child Left Behind and the Quest for Educational Equity: The Role of Teachers' Collective Sense of Efficacy." *Leadership and Policy in Schools* 8.1 (2009): 64-91. Print.

Fan, Weihua, Cathy M. Williams, and Danya Marie Corkin. "A Multilevel Analysis of Student Perceptions of School Climate: The Effect of Social and Academic Risk Factors." *Psychology in the Schools* 48.6 (2011): 632-47. Print.

Fan, Xitao, and Michael Chen. "Parental Involvement and Students' Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis." *Educational Psychology Review* 13.1 (2001): 1-22. Web.

Farrington, David P., and Maria M. Ttofi. *School-Based Programs to Reduce Bullying and Victimization*. Oslo, Norway: The Campbell Collaboration, 2009. Print.

Fernandez, Kenneth E. "Evaluating School Improvement Plans and their Effect on Academic Performance." *Educational Policy* 25.2 (2011): 338-67. Print.

Firestone, William A. "Accountability Nudges Districts into Changes in Culture." *Phi Delta Kappan* 90.9 (2009): 670-6. Web.

Fisher, Douglas, Nancy Frey and John Hattie. *Visible Learning for Literacy, Grades K-12: Implementing the Practices That Work Best to Accelerate Student Learning*, 1st Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2016. Print.

Fisher, Douglas, Nancy Frey and Ian Pumpian. *How to Create a Culture of Achievement in Your School and Classroom*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2012. Print.

Fletcher, Stephen, Michael Strong, and Anthony Villar. "An Investigation of the Effects of Variations in Mentor-Based Induction on the Performance of Students in California." *Teachers College Record* 110.10 (2008): 2271-89. Print.

Foley, E., et al. *Beyond Test Scores: Leading Indicators for Education*. Providence, RI: Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University, ND. Print.

Francis, David J., et al. *Research-Based Recommendations for Instruction and Academic Interventions. Practical Guidelines for the Education of English Language Learners. Book 1 of 3*. Houston, TX: Center on Instruction, University of Houston, 2006. Print.

---. *Research-Based Recommendations for Serving Adolescent Newcomers. Practical Guidelines for the Education of English Language Learners. Book 2 of 3*. Houston, TX: Center on Instruction, University of Houston, 2006. Print.

---. *Research-Based Recommendations for the Use of Accommodations in Large-Scale Assessments. Practical Guidelines for the Education of English Language Learners. Book 3 of 3*. Houston, TX: Center on Instruction, University of Houston, 2006. Print.

Frank, Stephen, and Karen H. Miles. *District Resource Allocation Modeler (DREAM): A Web- Based Tool Supporting the Strategic use of Educational Resources*. Working Paper 19 Vol. Education Resource Strategies, 2007. Print.

Frazelle, S. and Ainsling Nagel. "A Practitioner's Guide to Implementing Early Warning Systems," (REL 2015–056). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Northwest, January 2015. Retrieved May 22, 2018 from http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs. Web.

Fredricks, J. A., P. C. Blumenfeld, and A. H. Paris. "School Engagement: Potential of the Concept, State of the Evidence." *Review of Educational Research* 74.1 (2004): 59-109. Print.

Fullan, Michael. *The Principal: Three Keys to Maximizing Impact*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2014. Print.

Frey, Bruce B., and Vicki L. Schmitt. "Coming to Terms with Classroom Assessment." *Journal of Advanced Academics* 18.3 (2007): 402-23. Print.

Fuller, E., M. Young, and B. D. Baker. "Do Principal Preparation Programs Influence Student Achievement through the Building of Teacher-Team Qualifications by the Principal: An Exploratory Analysis." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 47.1 (2010): 173-216. Print.

Gallagher, H. A. "Vaughn Elementary's Innovative Teacher Evaluation System: Are Teacher Evaluation Scores Related to Growth in Student Achievement?" *Peabody Journal of Education* 79.4 (2004): 79-107. Print.

Garcia, Shernaz B., and Brenda-Jean Tyler. "Meeting the Needs of English Language Learners with Learning Disabilities in the General Curriculum." *Theory into Practice* 49.2 (2010): 113-20. Print.

Garet, Michael S., et al. "Making Professional Development More Strategic: A Conceptual Model for District Decisionmakers". *Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association.* April 10, 2011, New Orleans, LA. Web. 2011.

Garet, Michael S., et al. "What Makes Professional Development Effective: Results from a National Sample of Teachers." *American Educational Research Journal* 38.4 (2001): 915-45. Print.

Gause C.P. *Diversity, Equity, and Inclusive Education: A Voice from the Margins*. The Netherlands: SensePublishers, 2011. Print.

Gay, Geneva. *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice: Multicultural Education Series*, 2nd Edition. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2010. Print.

Gersten, Russell, Joseph Dimino, Madhavi Jayanthi, James S. Kim, and Lana Edwards Santoro. "Teacher Study Group: Impact of the Professional Development Model on Reading Instruction and Student Outcomes in First Grade Classrooms." *American Educational Research Journal*, 47, 3 (2010). 694–739. Web.

Gersten, Russell, and Scott Baker. *Effective Instruction for English-Language Learners: A Multi-Vocal Approach Toward Research Synthesis*., 1999. Print.

Gersten, Russell, Lynn S. Fuchs, and Joanna P. Williams. "Teaching Reading Comprehension Strategies to Students with Learning Disabilities: A Review of Research." *Review of Educational Research* 71.2 (2001): 279-320. Print.

Gersten, Russell; Baker, Scott K., et. al. "Effective Literacy and English Language Instruction for English Learners in the Elementary Grades," pp. 6-30. U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences. Dec 2007. Retrieved May 24, 2018. http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/pdf/practiceguides/20074011.pdf. Web.

Ghafoori, Bita, and Susan M. Tracz. *Effectiveness of Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy in Reducing Classroom Disruptive Behaviors: A Meta-Analysis*. No. ED 457 182 Vol. ERIC Reproduction Services, 2001. Print.

Glanz, Jeffrey, Vivian Shulman, and Susan Sullivan. *Impact of Instructional Supervision on Student Achievement: Can we make the Connection?* Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), Chicago: Online Submission, 2007. Print.

Glaser, Elizabeth and Carrie Warick. "What Does the Research Say About Early Awareness Strategies for College Access and Success?" *National College Awareness Network*, 2016. Retrieved May 22, 2018 from www.collegeaccess.org/EarlyAwarenessPolicy. Web.

Glazerman, Steven, et al. *Impacts of Comprehensive Teacher Induction: Final Results from a Randomized Controlled Study*. NCEE 2010-4027 Vol. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education., 2010. Print.

Glover, Todd A., and James C. DiPerna. "Service Delivery for Response to Intervention: Core Components and Directions for Future Research." *School Psychology Review* 36.4 (2007): 526-40. Print.

Goddard, Roger D., et al. "A Social Cognitive Perspective on Collective Efficacy and Goal Attainment in Schools: The Roles of Principals' Instructional Leadership and Teacher Collaboration". *Annual Conference of the American Education Research Association.*
April 11, 2011, New Orleans, LA. April 2011. Print.

Goddard, Roger D., Wayne K. Hoy, and Anita Woolfolk Hoy. "Collective Efficacy Beliefs: Theoretical Developments, Empirical Evidence, and Future Directions." *Educational Researcher* 33.3 (2004): 3-13. Print.

Goddard, Roger D., Laura LoGerfo, and Wayne K. Hoy. "High School Accountability: The Role of Perceived Collective Efficacy." *Educational Policy* 18.3 (2004): 403-25. Print.

Goddard, Roger D., Srena J. Salloum, and Dan Berebitsky. "Trust as a Mediator of the Relationships between Poverty, Racial Composition, and Academic Achievement: Evidence from Michigan's Public Elementary Schools." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 45.2 (2009): 292-311. Print.

Goddard, Roger D. "Collective Efficacy: A Neglected Construct in the Study of Schools and Student Achievement." *Journal of Educational Psychology* 93.3 (2001): 467-76. Print.

Goddard, Yvonne L., Roger D. Goddard, and Megan Tschannen-Moran. "A Theoretical and Empirical Investigation of Teacher Collaboration for School Improvement and Student Achievement in Public Elementary Schools." *Teachers College Record* 109.4 (2007): 877-96. Print.

Goe, L. *The Link between Teacher Quality and Student Outcomes: A Research Synthesis*. Washington D.C.: National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2007. Web. August 5, 2011.

Goertz, L. E., L. N. Olah, and M. Riggan. *From Testing to Teaching: The use of Interim Assessments in Classroom Instruction*. # RR-65 Vol. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE), December 2009. Print.

Goldhaber, Dan, Cyrus Grout, Nick Huntington-Klein. "Screen Twice, Cut Once: Assessing the Predictive Validity of Teacher Selection Tools." CALDER Working Paper No. 120, 2014. Print.

Goldstein, Jennifer. "Easy to Dance to: Solving the Problems of Teacher Evaluation with Peer Assistance and Review." *American Journal of Education* 113.3 (2007): 479-508. Print.

Gonzalez, Jorge E., et al. "Rational Emotive Therapy with Children and Adolescents: A Meta- Analysis." *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders* 12.4 (2004): 222-35. Print.

Goodwin, Bryan, Greg Cameron and Heather Hein. *Balanced Leadership for Powerful Learning: Tools for Achieving Success in Your School*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2015.

Goodwin, Bryan. *Changing the Odds for Student Success: What Matters most*. Denver, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (MCREL), 2010. Web.

Goss, Claire Brown, Christopher Wimer, and Priscilla Little. "After School Programs in the 21st Century: Their Potential and What it Takes to Achieve It." *Harvard Family Research Project*, (February 2008). Print.

Graham, S., and K. R. Harris. "Students with Learning Disabilities and the Process of Writing: A Meta-Analysis of SRSD Studies." *Handbook of Learning Disabilities.* Eds. H. L.Swanson,

K. R. Harris, and S. Graham. New York, NY: Guilford Press, 2003. 323-344. Print.

Greene, Jay. "A Meta-Analysis of the Rossell and Baker Review of Bilingual Education Research." *Bilingual Research Journal* 21.2-3 (1997): 103-22. Print.

Greene, Michael B. "Reducing School Violence: School-Based Curricular Programs and School Climate." *Prevention Researcher* 15.1 (2008): 12-6. Print.

Gregory, A., et al. "Authoritative School Discipline: High School Practices Associated with Lower Bullying and Victimization." *Journal of educational psychology* 102.2 (2010): 483-96. Print.

Gregory, A., D. Cornell, and Xitao Fan. "The Relationship of School Structure and Support to Suspension Rates for Black and White High School Students." *American Educational Research Journal* 48.4 (2011): 904-934. Print.

Gregory, Anne, Kathleen Clawson, Alycia Davis and Jennifer Gerewitz. "The Promise of Restorative Practices to Transform Teacher-Student Relationships and Achieve Equity in School Discipline." *Journal of Educational and Psychological Consultation*, 26:4,(2014), 325-353. Print.

Griffiths, Amy-Jane, et al. *Response to Intervention: Research for Practice*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc., 2007. Web.

Grissom, Jason A., and James R. Harrington. "Investing in Administrator Efficacy: An Examination of Professional Development as a Tool for Enhancing Principal Effectiveness." *American Journal of Education* 116.4 (2010): 583-612. Print.

Guskey, Thomas. (2002). "Does it Make a Difference? Evaluating Professional Development." *Educational Leadership*, 59(6) (2002), 45-51. Print.

Guskey, Thomas and Kwang Suk Yoon. "What Works in Professional Development?" *Phi Delta Kappan*, Vol 90, Issue 7, (March 2009). 495 - 500. Print.

Guskey, Thomas, Patricia Roy and Valerie von Frank. *Reach the Highest Standard in Professional Learning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin and Learning Forward, 2014. Print.

Hall, Pete and Alisa Simeral. *Creating a Culture of Reflective Practice: Capacity-Building for Schoolwide Success*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2017. Print.

Hall, Tracey, Charles A. Hughes, and Melinda Filbert. "Computer Assisted Instruction in Reading for Students with Learning Disabilities: A Research Synthesis." *Education and Treatment of Children* 23.2 (2000): 173-93. Print.

Hall, Tracey. *Explicit Instruction*. Wakefield, MA: National Center on Accessing the General Curriculum (NCAC), 2002. Web.

Hallinger, P., and R. H. Heck. "Collaborative Leadership and School Improvement: Understanding the Impact on School Capacity and Student Learning." *School Leadership & Management* 30.2 (2010): 95-110. Print.

---. "What do You Call People with Visions: The Role of Vision, Mission, and Goals in School Leadership and Improvement." *Second International Handbook of Educational Leadership and Administration.* Eds. P. Hallinger and R. H. Heck. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002. 9-40. Print.

Hallinger, P. "Instructional Leadership and the School Principal: A Passing Fancy that Refuses to Fade Away." *Leadership and Policy in Schools* 4.3 (2005): 221-239. Print.

Halverson, R. "School Formative Feedback Systems." *Peabody Journal of Education* 85.2 (2010): 130-146. Print.

Hammond, Cathy, et al. *Dropout Risk Factors and Exemplary Programs: A Technical Report*. Clemson, SC: National Dropout Prevention Center, Communities In Schools, Inc.,2007. Print.

Hanover Strategies. *"Closing the Gap,"* Research Brief. 2017. Retrieved May 24, 2018 from https://www.hanoverresearch.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/Equity-in-Education_Research-Brief_FINAL.pdf. Web.

Hansen-Thomas, Holly. "Sheltered Instruction: Best Practices for ELLs in the Mainstream." *Kappa Delta Pi Record* 44.4 (2008): 165-9. Print.

Harris, Laura, and Daniel Princiotta. *Reducing Dropout Rates through Expanded Learning Opportunities*. Natinonal Governors Association Center for Best Practices, 2009. Print.

Hattie, John, and H. Timperley. "The Power of Feedback." *Review of Educational Research* 77.1 (2007): pp. 81-112. Print.

Hattie, John. *Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2009. Print.

Hattie, John. *Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning*. New York, NY: Routledge, 2012. Print.

Heinrich, Carolyn J., Patricia Burch, Annalee Good, Rudy Acosta, Huiping Cheng, Marcus Dillender, Christi Kirshbaum, Hiren Nisar, and Mary Stewart. "Improving the Implementation and Effectiveness of Out-of-School-Time Tutoring." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 33(2), (Spring 2014): 471-494. Print.

Henderson, Anne T., and Karen L. Mapp. *A New Wave of Evidence: The Impact of School, Family, and Community Connections on Student Achievement (Annual Synthesis)*. Southwest Educational Development Lab, 2002. Web.

Heritage, Margaret, et al. "From Evidence to Action: A Seamless Process in Formative Assessment?" *Educational Measurement* 28.3 (2009): 24-31. Print.

Heritage, Margaret. "Formative Assessment: What do Teachers Need to Know and do?" *Phi Delta Kappan* 89.2 (2007): 140-5. Print.

Herman, J. L. *Coherence: Key to Next Generation Assessment Success*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, 2010. Print.

Herman, Rebecca, et al. *Turning Around Chronically Low-Performing Schools*. NCEE 2008-4020 Vol. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, 2008. Web.

Herrington, Jan, Thomas C. Reeves, and Ron Oliver. "Online Learning as Information Delivery: Digital Myopia." *Journal of Interactive Learning Research* 16.4 (2005): 353-67. Web.

Hinchey, Patricia H. *Getting Teacher Assessment Right: What Policymakers can Learn from Research*. National Education Policy Center, 2010. Print.

---. *Getting Teacher Assessment Right: What Policymakers can Learn from Research*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center, 2010. Web.

Hinnant, J. B., Marion O Brien, and Sharon R. Ghazarian. "The Longitudinal Relations of Teacher Expectations to Achievement in the Early School Years." *Journal of educational psychology* 101.3 (2009): 662-70. Print.

Hirumi, Atsusi. "The Design and Sequencing of E-Learning Interactions: A Grounded Approach." *International Journal on E-Learning* 1.1 (2002): 19-27. Web.

Holdheide, Lynn R., and Daniel J. Reschly. *Teacher Preparation to Deliver Inclusive Services to Students with Disabilities*. National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality, 2008. Web.

Hooge, Edith and Marlies Honingh. "Are School Boards Aware of the Educational Quality of Their Schools?" *Educational Management Administration and Leadership.* 42. (2014). 1-16. Print.

Hoover, John J., and James R. Patton. "Differentiating Curriculum and Instruction for English Language Learners with Special Needs." *Intervention in School and Clinic* 40.4 (2005): 231-5. Print.

---. "Differentiating Standards-Based Education for Students with Diverse Needs." *Remedial and Special Education* 25.2 (2004): 74-8. Print.

Hord, Shirley M. *Professional Learning Communities: Communities of Continuous Inquiry and Improvement*. ED410659 Vol. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1997. Print.

Horn, Michael B., and Heather Staker. *The Rise of K-12 Blended Learning*. Innosight Institute, Inc., 2011. Web.

Horner et. al. "Is School Wide Positive Behavior Support an Evidence-Based Practice?" *Positive Behavioral Intervention Supports Technical Assistance Center*, April 2015. Retrieved May 22, 2018 from https://www.pbis.org/research. Web.

Horner, Robert and George Sugai, G. "School-wide PBIS: An Example of Applied Behavior Analysis Implemented at a Scale of Social Importance." *Behavior Analysis in Practice*, *8*(1), (2015): 80–85. Web.

Horner, Robert H., George Sugai, and Cynthia M. Anderson. "Examining the Evidence Base for School-Wide Positive Behavior Support." *Focus on Exceptional Children* 42.8 (2010): 1-14. Print.

Howland, Jane L., David Jonassen, and Rose M. Marra. *Meaningful Learning with Technology (Fourth Edition)*. Boston: Pearson, 2011. Print.

Hoy, Wayne K., Scott R. Sweetland, and Page A. Smith. "Toward an Organizational Model of Achievement in High Schools: The Significance of Collective Efficacy." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 38.1 (2002): 77-93. Print.

Huang, Chiungjung. "Self-Concept and Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Relations." *Journal of School Psychology* (in press) (2011)Print.

Hunt, Vivian, Dennis Layton and Sara Prince. "Why Diversity Matters." *McKinsey & Company*, 2015. Retrieved June 15, 2018 from https://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/why-diversity-matters. Web.

Implementers' Blueprint and Self-Assessment: Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, 2010. Web.

Ingersoll, Richard M., and Michael Strong. "The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers: A Critical Review of the Research." *Review of Educational Research* 81.2 (2011): 201-33. Print.

Ingram, Debra, K. S. Louis, and Roger G. Schroeder. "Accountability Policies andTeacher Decision Making: Barriers to the use of Data to Improve Practice." *Teachers College Record* 106.6 (2004): 1258-87. Print.

Institute for Research on Education Policy & Practice. *PLATO, Protocol for Language Arts Teaching Observations*. Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, 2010. Web.

Instructional Conversations and Literature Logs. what Works Clearinghouse Intervention Report. What Works Clearinghouse, 2006. Print.

Jackson, C. K., and E. Bruegmann. *Teaching Students and Teaching each Other: The Importance of Peer Learning for Teachers*. 15202 Vol. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, July 2009. Print.

Jackson, Linda A., et al. "A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Internet use and Videogame Playing on Academic Performance and the Roles of Gender, Race and Income in these Relationships." *Computers in Human Behavior* 27.1 (2011): 228-39. Web.

Jacob, Brian. "The Power of Teacher Selection to Improve Education." *The Brookings Institute*, March 2016.

James-Ward, Cheryl, Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey and Diane Lapp. *Using Data to Focus Instructional Improvement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2013. Print.

Jeanpierre, Bobby, Karen Oberhauser, and Carol Freeman. "Characteristics of Professional Development that Effect Change in Secondary Science Teachers' Classroom Practices." *Journal of Research in Science Teaching* 42.6 (2005): 668-90. Print.

Jennings, Patricia and Mark Greenberg. "The Prosocial Classroom: Teacher Social and Emotional Competence in Relation to Child and Classroom Outcomes." *Review of Educational Research* (2009). 491. Print.

Jeynes, William H. "A Meta-Analysis of the Relation of Parental Involvement to Urban Elementary School Student Academic Achievement." *Urban Education* 40.3 (2005): 237-69. Web.

---. "The Relationship between Parental Involvement and Urban Secondary School Student Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis." *Urban Education* 42.1 (2007): 82-110. Web.

Jimerson, J. B., and J. C. Wayman. "Helping Educators "do" Data: Toward a Framework for Data-Related Professional Learning". *University Council for Educational Administration.* New Orleans, LA. 2010. Print.

Johnson, Carla and Jamison Fargo. “A Study of the Impact of Transformative Professional Development on Hispanic Student Performance on State Mandated Assessments of Science in Elementary School.” *Journal of Elementary Science Teacher Education* (2014), 25. 845–859. Web.

Jussim, Lee, and Kent D. Harber. "Teacher Expectations and Self-Fulfilling Prophecies: Knowns and Unknowns, Resolved and Unresolved Controversies." *Personality & Social Psychology Review (Lawrence Erlbaum Associates)* 9.2 (2005): 131-55. Print.

Kern, Nora. “Intentionally Diverse Charter Schools: A Toolkit for Charter School Leaders.” *Safal Partners*, 2016. Web.

Kieffer, Michael, et al. "Accommodations for English Language Learners Taking Large-Scale Assessments: A Meta-Analysis on Effectiveness and Validity." *Review of Educational Research* 79.3 (2009): 1168-201. Print.

Kim, A., et al. "Graphic Organizers and their Effects on the Reading Comprehension of Students with LD: A Synthesis of Research." *Journal of learning disabilities* 37.2 (2004): 105-18. Print.

King-Sears, Margaret, and Mary Bowman-Kruhm. "Attending to Specialized Reading Instruction for Adolescents with Mild Disabilities." *Teaching Exceptional Children* 42.4 (2010): 30-40. Print.

King-Sears, Margaret. "Facts and Fallacies: Differentiation and the General Education Curriculum for Students with Special Educational Needs." *Support for Learning* 23.2 (2008): 55-62. Print.

Knight, Jim. *The Impact Cycle: What Instructional Coaches Should Do to Foster Powerful Improvements in Teaching*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2018. Print.

Kochanek, Julie Reed. *Building Trust for Better Schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, 2005. Print.

Kosciw, Joseph G., et al. *The 2009 National School Climate Survey: The Experiences of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Youth in our Nation's Schools*. Gay, Lesbian and Straight Education Network (GLSEN), 2010. Print.

Kowal, Julie, and Lucy Steiner. *Instructional Coaching*. Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2007. Print.

Kozma, Robert B. "Learning with Media." *Review of Educational Research* 61 (1991): 179-211. Web.

Kraft, M. A., & Papay, J. P. “Can professional environments in schools promote teacher development? Explaining heterogeneity in returns to teaching experience.” *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* 36(4), 2014: 476–500. Print.

Krasnoff, B. “Culturally Responsive Teaching: A Guide to Evidence-Based Practices for Teaching All Students Equitably.” Education Northwest, March 2016*. p. 21.* Retreived May 24, 2018. http://educationnorthwest.org/sites/default/files/resources/culturally-responsive-teaching.pdf Web.

Kreider, Holly, et al. *Family Involvement in Middle and High School Students' Education. Involvement Makes a Difference: Evidence that Family Involvement Promotes School Success for Every Child of Every Age*. Number 3, Spring 2007 ed. Harvard Family Research Project, 2007. Web.

Krüger, Meta L., Bob Witziers, and Peter Sleegers. "The Impact of School Leadership on School Level Factors: Validation of a Causal Model." *School Effectiveness & School Improvement* 18.1 (2007): 1-20. Print.

Kunsch, Catherine A., Asha K. Jitendra, and Sheetal Sood. "The Effects of Peer-Mediated Instruction in Mathematics for Students with Learning Problems: A Research Synthesis." *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice* 22.1 (2007): 1-12. Print.

Kutsyuruba, Benjamin et. al. “Relationships Among School Climate, School Safety, and Student Achievement and Well-Being: A Review of the Literature,” June 2015. *Review of Education* 3(2), 103-135. Print.

Ladson-Billings, Gloria and David Gilborn (Eds). *The Routledge Falmer Reader in Multicultural Education*. London, UK: Routledge Falmer, 2004. Print.

Lachat, M. A., and S. Smith. "Practices that Support Data use in Urban High Schools." *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk* 10.3 (July 2005): 333-349. Print.

Lawless, Kimberly A., and James W. Pellegrino. "Professional Development in Integrating Technology into Teaching and Learning: Knowns, Unknowns, and Ways to Pursue Better Questions and Answers." *Review of Educational Research* 77.4 (2007): 575-614. Web.

Leana, C. R. "The Missing Link in School Reform." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* (Fall 2011): 30-35. Print.

Lee, Valerie E., et al. *Social Support, Academic Press, and Student Achievement: A View from the Middle Grades in Chicago.* . Chicago, IL: Improving Chicago's Schools. A Report of the Chicago Annenberg Research Project, 1999. Web.

Lee, Valerie E., and Julia B. Smith. "Collective Responsibility for Learning and its Effects on Gains in Achievement for Early Secondary School Students." *American Journal of Education* 104 (1996): 103-47. Print.

---. "Social Support and Achievement for Young Adolescents in Chicago: The Role of School Academic Press." *American Educational Research Journal* 36.4 (1999): 907-45. Web.

Leithwood, K., et al. *How Leadership Influences Student Learning*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation, 2004. Web. March 20, 2011.

Leithwood, K., et al. "Distributing Leadership to make Schools Smarter: Taking the Ego Out of the System." *Leadership and Policy in Schools* 6.1 (2007): 37-67. Print.

Leithwood, K., and B. Mascall. "Collective Leadership Effects on Student Achievement." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 44.4 (2008): 529-561. Print.

Leithwood, K., S. Patten, and D. Jantzi. "Testing a Conception of how School Leadership Influences Student Learning." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 46.5 (2010): 671-706. Print.

Levine, Thomas H., and Alan S. Marcus. "Closing the Achievement Gap through Teacher Collaboration: Facilitating Multiple Trajectories of Teacher Learning." *Journal of Advanced Academics* 19.1 (2007): 116-38. Print.

Lewis, T., et. al. "Schoolwide Systems of Positive Behavior Support: Implications for Students at Risk and with Emotional/Behavior Disorders." AERA Open 3(2), May 2017. Retrieved May 22, 2018 from http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/2332858417711428. Web.

Li, Qing, and Xin Ma. "A Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Computer Technology on School Students' Mathematics Learning." *Educational Psychology Review* 22.3 (2010): 215-43. Web.

Lindsey, Randall, KiZanza Nuri-Robins, and Raymond Terrell. *Cultural Proficiency: A Manual for School Leaders*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2009.

Lockwood, J. R., Jennifer Sloan McCombs, and Julie Marsh. "Linking Reading Coaches and Student Achievement: Evidence from Florida Middle Schools." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 32.3 (2010): 372-88. Print.

Loeb, S., L. Darling-Hammond, and J. Luczak. "How Teaching Conditions Predict Teacher Turnover in California Schools." *Peabody Journal of Education* 80.3 (2005): 44-70. Print.

Lomos, Catalina, Roelande H. Hofman, and Roel J. Bosker. "Professional Communities and Student Achievement: A Meta-Analysis." *School Effectiveness & School Improvement* 22.2 (2011): 121-48. Print.

Lösel, F., and A. Beelmann. "Effects of Child Skills Training inPreventing Antisocial Behavior: A Systematic Review of Randomized Evaluations." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 587.1 (2003): 84-109. Print.

Louis, K. S., Beverly Dretzke, and K. L. Wahlstrom. "How does Leadership Affect Student Achievement: Results from a National U.S. Survey." *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 21.3 (2010): 315-36. Print.

Louis, K. S., et al. *Learning from Leadership: Investigating the Links to Improved Student Learning*. New York, NY: Wallace Foundation, 2010. Web.

Louis, K. S., H. M. Marks, and S. D. Kruse. "Teachers' Professional Community in Restructuring Schools." *American Educational Research Journal* 33 (1996): 757-98. Print.

Louis, K. S., and H. M. Marks. "Does Professional Community Affect the Classroom? Teachers' Work and Student Experiences in Restructuring Schools." *American Journal of Education* 106.4 (1998): 532-75. Print.

Louis, K. S. "Trust and Improvement in Schools." *Journal of Educational Change* 8.1 (2007): 1-24. Print.

Maccini, Paula, Candace A. Mulcahy, and Michael G. Wilson. "A Follow-Up of Mathematics Interventions for Secondary Students with Learning Disabilities." *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice* 22.1 (2007): 58-74. Print.

Mackey, Katherine, and Michael B. Horn. *FLorida Virtual School: Building the First Statewide, Internet-Based Public High School*. Innosight Institute, Inc., 2009. Web.

Mandinach, Ellen B. "The Development of Effective Evaluation Methods for E-Learning: A Concept Paper and Action Plan." *Teachers College Record* 107.8 (2005): 1814-35. Print.

Manthey, George. "Collective Efficacy: Explaining School Achievement." *Leadership* 35.3 (2006): 23. Print.

Marks, H. M., and Jason P. Nance. "Contexts of Accountability Under Systemic Reform: Implications for Principal Influence on Instruction and Supervision." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 43.1 (2007): 3-37. Print.

Marshall, Kim. *Rethinking Teacher Supervision and Evaluation: How to Work Smart, Build Collaboration and Close the Achievement Gap*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley, 2013.

Martin, Wendy, et al. "Connecting Instructional Technology Professional Development to Teacher and Student Outcomes." *Journal of Research on Technology in Education* 43.1 (2010): 53-74. Web.

Marzano, Robert. *The New Art and Science of Teaching: More Than Fifty New Instructional Strategies for Student Success (Teaching Methods for Competency-Based Education)*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree Press, 2017. Print.

Marzano, Robert. *Formative Assessment and Standards-Based Grading: The Classroom Strategies Series (Designing an Effective System of Assessment and Grading to Enhance Learning)*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory, 2010. Print.

Marzano, Robert and Debra Pickering. T*he Highly Engaged Classroom: The Classroom Strategies Series (Generating High Levels of Student Attention and Engagement)*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory, 2011. Print.

Marzano, Robert, Tony Frontier and David Livingston. *Effective Supervision: Supporting the Art and Science of Teaching*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2011. Print.

Marzano, R. J., J. S. Marzano, and D. J. Pickering. *Classroom Management that Works: Research-Based Strategies for Every Teacher*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2003. Print.

Marzano, R. J., T. Waters, and B. McNulty. *School Leadership that Works: From Research to Results*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2005. Print.

Marzano, R. J. "Instructional Strategies (Chapter 9)." *What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Action.* Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development, 2003. 78-87. Print.

---. A New Era of School Reform: Going Where the Research Takes Us. Aurora, CO: Mid-Continent Research for Education and Learning (MCREL), 2000. <http://www.mcrel.org/topics/SchoolImprovement/products/81/>.

---. *What Works in Schools: Translating Research into Action*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2003. Print.

Masgoret, A. M., and R. C. Gardner. "Attitudes, Motivation, and Second Language Learning: A Meta-Analysis of Studies Conducted by Gardner and Associates." *Language Learning* 53 (2003): 167-210. Print.

Matsumura, Lindsay Clare, Helen E. Garnier, and Lauren B. Resnick. "Implementing Literacy Coaching: The Role of School Social Resources." *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis* 32.2 (2010): 249-72. Print.

Mattingly, Doreen J., Radmila Prislin, and Thomas L. McKenzie. "Evaluating Evaluations: The Case of Parent Involvement Programs." *Review of Educational Research* 72.4 (2002): 549-76. Web.

May, H., and J. A. Supovitz. "The Scope of Principal Efforts to Improve Instruction." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 47.2 (2011): 332-352. Print.

Mayrowetz, David. "Making Sense of Distributed Leadership: Exploring the Multiple Usages of the Concept in the Field." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 44 (2008): 424-435. Print.

McCombs, Barbara L., and Donna Vakili. "A Learner-Centered Framework for E-Learning." *Teachers College Record* 107.8 (2005): 1582-600. Web.

McDuffie, Kimberly A., Margo A. Mastropieri, and Thomas E. Scruggs. "Differential Effects of Peer Tutoring in Co-Taught and Non-Co-Taught Classes: Results for Content Learning and Student-Teacher Interactions." *Exceptional children* 75.4 (2009): 493-510. Print.

Means, B., et al. *Implementing Data-Informed Decision Making in Schools: Teacher Access, Supports, and use*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, 2009. Print.

Means, B., et al. *Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning: A Meta-Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies*., 2009. Web.

Mid-Content Research for Education and Learning (McREL). *Final Report: High Needs Schools - what does it Take to Beat the Odds?* Denver, Co: Mid-Content Research for Education and Learning (McREL), 2005. Print.

Milam, A. J., C. Furr-Holden, and Philip J. Leaf. "Perceived School and NeighborhoodSafety, Neighborhood Violence and Academic Achievement in Urban School Children." *Urban Review* 42.5 (2010): 458-67. Print.

Mishra, Punya, and Matthew J. Koehler. "Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A Framework for Teacher Knowledge." *Teachers College Record* 108.6 (2006): 1017-54. Web.

Moughamian, Ani C., Mabel Rivera, and David J. Francis. *Instructional Models and Strategies for Teaching English Language Learners*. Houston, TX: Center on Instruction, University of Houston, 2009. Print.

Murawski, Wendy A. Weichel, and H. L. Swanson. "A Meta-Analysis of Co-Teaching Research: Where are the Data?" *Remedial and Special Education* 22.5 (2001): 258-67. Print.

Murphy, Joseph, and Coby V. Meyers. "Rebuilding Organizational Capacity in Turnaround Schools: Insights from the Corporate, Government, and Non-Profit Sectors." *Educational Management Administration & Leadership* 37.1 (2009): 9-27. Print.

Murphy, Joseph, et al. "Academic Press: Translating High Expectations into School Policies and Classroom Practices." *Educational Leadership* 40.3 (1982): 22-6. Web.

Murphy, Joseph. "Nine Lessons for Turning Around Failing Schools." *Phi Delta Kappan* 91.8 (2010): 93-7. Print.

---. "Turning Around Failing Schools: Policy Insights from the Corporate, Government, and Nonprofit Sectors." *Educational Policy* 23.6 (2008): 796-830. Print.

National Center on Response to Intervention. *Essential Components of RTI: A Closer Look at Response to Intervention*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education Programs, National Center on Response to Intervention., 2010. Print.

National Mathematics Advisory Panel. *Foundations for Success: The Final Report of the National Mathematics Advisory Panel*. US Department of Education, 2008. Print.

National School Climate Center. "Comprehensive School Climate Inventory (CSCI)." 2002.Web. <http://www.schoolclimate.org/climate/practice.php>.

National Staff Development Council. "Definition of professional development." 2009.Web. July 6th, 2011 <http://www.learningforward.org/standfor/definition.cfm>.

Nelsen, Jane and Kelly Gfroerer. *Positive Discipline Tools for Teachers: Effective Classroom Management for Social, Emotional and Academic Success*. New York, NY: Harmony Press, 2017. Print.

Nettles, Stephen M., and Carolyn Herrington. "Revisiting the Importance of the Direct Effects of School Leadership on Student Achievement: The Implications for School Improvement Policy." *Peabody Journal of Education* 82.4 (2007): 724-736. Print.

Newmann, Fred M., M. B. King, and Mark Rigdon. "Accountability and School Performance: Implications from Restructuring Schools." *Harvard Educational Review* 67 (1997): 41-74. Print.

Newmann, Fred M., et al. "Instructional Program Coherence: What it is and Why it should Guide School Improvement Policy." *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis* 23.4 (2001): 297-321. Web.

Norris, John M., and Lourdes Ortega. "Effectiveness of L2 Instruction: A Research Synthesis and Quantitative Meta-Analysis." *Language Learning* 50.3 (2000): 417-528. Print.

Nystrand, Martin, Adam Gamoran, Robert Kachur, and Catherine Prendergast. *Opening Dialogue: Understanding the Dynamics of Language and Learning in the English Classroom*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1997. Print.

O'Connor, Rosemarie, et. al. "A Review of the Literature on Social and Emotional Learning for Students Ages 3-8: Characteristics of Effective Social and Emotional Learning." *Regional Educational Laboratories*. Mid-Atlantic, 2017. REL 2017-245. Print.

Ohanian, Susan. *The K12 Virtual Primary School History Curriculum: A Participant's-Eye View*. EPSL-0404-117-EPRU Vol. Tempe, AZ: Education Policy Studies Laboratory, Education Policy Research Unit, Arizona State University, 2004. Web.

O'Hara, Nancy, Tom Munk, Kristen Reedy, and Cesar D'Agord. "Equity, Inclusion, and Opportunity: Addressing Success Gaps White Paper, Version 3.0." *IDEA Data Center*, Rockville, MD: Westat (May 2016). Web.

Olah, L. N., N. R. Lawrence, and M. Riggan. "Learning to Learn from Benchmark Assessment Data: How Teachers Analyze Results." *Peabody Journal of Education* 85.2 (2010): 226-245. Print.

Olson, Carol Booth, and Robert Land. "A Cognitive Strategies Approach to Reading and Writing Instruction for English Language Learners in Secondary School." *Research in the Teaching of English* 41.3 (2007): 269-303. Print.

Osterman, Karen. "Students Need for Belonging in the School Community." *Review of Educational Research*, 70, no. 3 (2000). 323-361. Print.

Padamsee, Xiomara, Becky Crowe, et al. "Unrealized Impact: The Case for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion." *Foundation Working Group*. July 2017. Print.

Pape, Liz, and Matthew Wicks. *National Standards for Quality Online Programs*. International Association for K-12 Online Learning, 2009. Web.

Park, V., and A. Datnow. "Co-Constructing Distributed Leadership: District and School Connections in Data-Driven Decision-Making." *School Leadership and Management* 29.5 (2009): 477-494. Print.

Pashler, Harold, et al. *Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Learning*. National Center for Education Research, 2007. Web.

Patrick, Susan, Allison Powell, and International Association for K-12 Online Learning. *A Summary of Research on the Effectiveness of K-12 Online Learning*. International Association for K-12 Online Learning, 2009. Web.

Payton, John, et al. *The Positive Impact of Social and Emotional Learning for Kindergarten to Eighth-Grade Students: Findings from Three Scientific Reviews. Technical Report*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning, 2008. Print.

---. *Peer-Assisted Learning Strategies. what Works Clearinghouse Intervention Report*. What Works Clearinghouse, 2007. Print.

Peterson, Kenneth. "Research on School Teacher Evaluation." *NASSP Bulletin* 88 (2004): 60-79. Print.

Pianta, R. C., B. K. Hamre, and S. L. Mintz. *CLASS-Upper Elementary Manual*., 2010. Print.

Porowski, Allan, and Aikaterini Passa. "The Effect of Communities in Schools on High School Dropout and Graduation Rates: Results from a Multiyear, School-Level Quasi- Experimental Study." *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)* 16.1 (2011): 24-37. Print.

---. *Practices that Support Data use in Urban High Schools*. The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2006, October. Print.

Prevatt, Frances, and F. D. Kelly. "Dropping Out of School: A Review of Intervention Programs." *Journal of School Psychology* 41.5 (2003): 377-95. Print.

---. *Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice: A Guide for Charities and Foundations*. Panel on the Nonprofit Sector, 2007 (October). Print.

Printy, S. M., and H. M. Marks. "Shared Leadership for Teacher and Student Learning." *Theory Into Practice* 45.2 (2006): 125-32. Print.

Printy, S. M. "Leadership for Teacher Learning: A Community of Practice Perspective." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 44 (2008, December): 187-226. Print.

---. "Principals' Influence on Instructional Quality: Insights from U.S. Schools." *School Leadership & Management* 30.2 (2010, April): 111-126. Print.

Public Education Leadership Project (PELP) at Harvard University. "PELP coherence framework." 2010.Web. <http://www.hbs.edu/pelp/framework.html>.

Quick, Heather E., Deborah J. Holtzman, and Kassandra R. Chaney. "Professional Development and Instructional Practice: Conceptions and Evidence of Effectiveness." *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk* 14.1 (2009): 45-71. Print.

Ranson, Stewart, et al. "Does Governance Matter for School Improvement?" *School Effectiveness and School Improvement* 16.3 (2005): 305-25. Print.

Reeves, Thomas C. "Storm Clouds on the Digital Education Horizon." *Journal of Computing in Higher Education* 15.1 (2003): 3-26. Web.

Reid, Karen M., Yvette Aqui, and LeAnn G. Putney. "Evaluation of an Evolving Virtual High School." *Educational Media International* 46.4 (2009): 281-94. Web.

Reinke, Wendy M., et al. "Combining School and Family Interventions for the Prevention and Early Intervention of Disruptive Behavior Problems in Children: A Public Health Perspective." *Psychology in the Schools* 46.1 (2009): 33-43. Print.

Rice, Kerry Lynn. "A Comprehensive Look at Distance Education in the K-12 Context." *Journal of Research on Technology in Education* 38.4 (2006): 425-48. Web.

Richards, H., A. Brown & T. Forde. "Addressing Diversity in Schools: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy." National Center for Culturally Responsive Educational Systems, *2006, p. 4.* Retrieved May 24, 2018. http://www.nccrest.org/Briefs/Diversity_Brief.pdf. Web.

Rinke, Carol. *Why Half of Teachers Leave the Classroom: Understanding Recruitment and Retention in Today's Schools*. New York, NY: R&L Education, 2014

Roach, Andrew T., Bradley C. Niebling, and Alexander Kurz. "Evaluating the Alignment among Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessments: Implications and Applications for Research and

Roberts, Greg, et al. "Evidence-Based Strategies for Reading Instruction of Older Students with Learning Disabilities." *Learning Disabilities Research & Practice* 23.2 (2008): 63-9. Print.

Robinson, V. J., C. A. Lloyd, and K. J. Rowe. "The Impact of Leadership on Student Outcomes: An Analysis of the Differential Effects of Leadership Types." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 44.5 (2008, December): 635-674. Print.

Robinson, V. J., and H. Timperley. "The Leadership of the Improvement of Teachingand Learning: Lessons from Initiatives with Positive Outcomes for Students." *Australian Journal of Education* 51.3 (2007): 247-262. Print.

Rock, David and Heidi Grant. "Why Diverse Teams Are Smarter." *Harvard Business Review*, (November 2016). Retrieved June 15, 2018 from https://hbr.org/2016/11/why-diverse-teams-are-smarter. Web.

Rolstad, Kellie, Kate Mahoney, and Gene V. Glass. "The Big Picture in Bilingual Education: A Meta-Analysis Corrected for Gersten's Coding Error." *Journal of Educational Research & Policy Studies* 8.2 (2008): 1-15. Print.

---. "The Big Picture: A Meta-Analysis of Program Effectiveness Research on English Language Learners." *Educational Policy* 19.4 (2005): 572-94. Print.

Ross, John A., Anne Hogaboam-Gray, and Peter Gray. *The Contribution of Prior Student Achievement and School Processes to Collective Teacher Efficacy in Elementary Schools*., 2003. Print.

Rothman, Terri, and Mary Henderson. "Do School-Based Tutoring Programs significantly Improve Student Performance on Standardized Tests?" *RMLE Online: Research in Middle Level Education* 34.6 (2011): 1-10. Print.

Ryan, Joseph B., Robert Reid, and Michael H. Epstein. "Peer-Mediated Intervention Studies on Academic Achievement for Students with EBD: A Review." *Remedial and Special Education* 25.6 (2004): 330-41. Print.

Saçkes, Mesut, Kathy Cabe Trundle, and Randy L. Bell. "Young children's Computer Skills Development from Kindergarten to Third Grade." *Computers & Education* 57.2 (2011): 1698-1704. Print.

Saphier, Jon, Mary Ann Haley-Speca and Robert Gower. *The Skillful Teacher: The Comprehensive Resource for Improving Teaching and Learning, 7th edition.* Acton, MA: Research for Better Teaching, 2018. Print.

Sartain, Lauren, Sara Ray Stoelinga, and Emily Krone. *Rethinking Teacher Evaluation: Findings from the First Year of the Excellence in Teaching Project in Chicago Public Schools. Policy Brief*. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research, 2010. Print.

Sato, Edynn, et al. *Accommodations for English Language Learner Students: The Effect of Linguistic Modification of Math Test Item Sets. Final Report. NCEE 2009-4079*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, 2010. Print.

Schleicher, A. "Lessons from the World on Effective Teaching and Learning Environments." *Journal of Teacher Education* 62.2 (2011): 202-21. Print.

---. "Lessons from the World on Effective Teaching and Learning Environments." *Journal of Teacher Education* 62.2 (2011): 202-221. Print.

Schmidt, Raquel J., Mary S. Rozendal, and Gretchen G. Greenman. "Reading Instruction in the Inclusion Classroom: Research-Based Practices." *Remedial and Special Education* 23.3 (2002): 130-40. Print.

Schwanke, Jen. *You're the Principal! Now What? Strategies and Solutions for New School Leaders*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2016. Print.

Schunk, Dale. "Self-Efficacy for Reading and Writing: Influence of Modeling, Goal Setting, and Self-Evaluation." *Reading & Writing Quarterly,* Vol. 19, Iss. 2, (April 2003): 159-172. Print.

Schwartz, Robert, James Weinberg Dana Hagenbuch and Allison Scott. "The Voice of Non Profit Talent: Perceptions of Diversity in the Workplace." *CommonGood Careers and Level Playing Field Institute*, n.d. Web.

Shore, Jane R., and John Sabatini. *English Language Learners with Reading Disabilities: A Review of the Literature and the Foundation for a Research Agenda. Research Report. ETS RR-09-20*. Educational Testing Service, 2009. Print.

Shouse, Roger C. *Academic Press and School Sense of Community: Sources of Friction, Prospects for Synthesis*., 1995. Web.

Shnabel, Nurit, Valerie Purdie-Vaughns, Jonathan E. Cook, Julio Garcia, and Geoffrey L. Cohen. "Demystifying Values-Affirmation Interventions: Writing About Social Belonging Is a Key to Buffering Against Identity Threat." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, Vol 39, Issue 5, (2013), pp. 663 - 676. Print.

Silverman, Rebecca, and Sara Hines. "The Effects of Multimedia-Enhanced Instruction on the Vocabulary of English-Language Learners and Non-English-Language Learners in Pre- Kindergarten through Second Grade." *Journal of educational psychology* 101.2 (2009): 305-14. Print.

Sireci, S. G., S. Li, and S. Scarpati. *The Effects of Test Accommodation on Test Performance: A Review of the Literature*. 485 Vol. Amherst, MA: Center for Educational Assessment, 2006. Print.

Skrla, Linda, Kathryn Bell McKenzie and James Joseph Scheurich. *Using Equity Audits to Create Equitable and Excellent Schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2009. Print.

Slavin, Robert E., et al. "Reading and Language Outcomes of a Multiyear Randomized Evaluation of Transitional Bilingual Education." *Educational Evaluation & Policy Analysis* 33.1 (2011): 47-58. Print.

Smith, Page A., and Wayne K. Hoy. "Academic Optimism and Student Achievement in Urban Elementary Schools." *Journal of Educational Administration* 45.5 (2007): 556-68. Print.

Smith, Rosina, Tom Clark, and Robert Blomeyer. *Computer-Based Technology and Learning: Evolving Uses and Expectations*. Learning Point Associates, 2005. Web.

---. *A Synthesis of New Research on K-12 Online Learning*. Learning Point Associates / North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL), 2005. Web.

Sorenson, Richard and Lloyd Goldsmith. *The Principal's Guide to School Budgeting*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin, 2018. Print.

Spillane, James P., Kaleen Healey, and Leigh Mesler Parise. "School Leaders' Opportunities to Learn: A Descriptive Analysis from a Distributed Perspective." *Educational Review* 61.4 (2009): 407-32. Print.

Squires, David A. *The Relationship between Aligned Curriculum and Student Achievement*. Charleston, WV: Appalachia Educational Laboratory at Edvantia, 2005. Web.

Staker, Heather. *The Rise of K-12 Blended Learning: Profiles of Emerging Models*. Innosight Institute, Inc., 2011. Web.

Steinberg, Matthew P. "Educational Choice and Student Participation: The Case of the Supplemental Educational Services Provision in Chicago Public Schools." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 33.2 (2011): 159-82. Print.

Subban, P. "Differentiated Instruction: A Research Basis." *International Education Journal* 7.7 (2007): 935-947. Print.

Sugai, George, and Robert H. Horner. "Responsiveness-to-Intervention and School-Wide Positive Behavior Supports: Integration of Multi-Tiered System Approaches." *Exceptionality* 17.4 (2009): 223-37. Print.

Supovitz, J. A., and V. Klein. *Mapping a Course for Improved Student Learning: How Innovative Schools Systematically use Student Performance Data to Guide Student Learning*. Philadelphia, PA: Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE), 2003. Print.

Sutcher, Leib, Linda Darling-Hammond, and Desiree Carver-Thomas. "A Coming Crisis in Teaching? Teacher Supply, Demand and Shortages in the U.S." *Learning Policy Institute*, September 2016. Web.

Supovitz, J. A., P. Sirinides, and H. May. "How Principals and Peers Influence Teaching and Learning." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 46.1 (2010): 31-56. Print.

Swanson, H. L. "Research on Interventions for Adolescents with Learning Disabilities: A Meta- Analysis of Outcomes Related to Higher-Order Processing." *Elementary School Journal* 101.3 (2001): 331-48. Print.

Sweller, John, Paul Ayres and Slava Kalyuga. *Cognitive Load Theory: Explorations in the Learning Sciences and Performance Technologies*. New York, NY: Springer, 2011. Print.

Tamim, R. M., et al. "What Forty Years of Research Says about the Impact of Technology on Learning." *Review of Educational Research* 81.1 (2011): 4-28. Web. March 2, 2011.

Taylor, Suzanne, et. al. "Getting Back on Track: The Role of In-Person Instructional Support for Students Taking Online Credit Recovery." American Institutes of Research, 2018. Print.

Taylor, E. S., and J. H. Tyler. *The Effect of Evaluation on Performance: Evidence from Longitudinal Student Achievement Data of Mid-Career Teachers*. 16877 Vol. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 2011, March. Print.

Teemant, Annela, Joan Wink, and Serena Tyra. "Effects of Coaching on Teacher use of Sociocultural Instructional Practices." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 27.4 (2011): 683-93. Print.

Thapa, Amrit, Jeffrey Cohen, Shawn Guffey, and Ann Higgins-D'Alessandro, A. "A Review of School Climate Research." *Review of Educational Research, 83*(3), (2013): 357.

Therriault, Susan Bowles, et al. "Early Warning System Implementation Guide: For Use with the National High School Center's Early Warning Indicator Tool." Washington, DC: National High School Center, *American Institutes for Research*, 2013. Print.

Therriault, Susan Bowles, et al. *Early Warning System Implementation Guide: For use withthe National High School Center's Early Warning System Tool v2.0*. Washington, DC: National High School Center, American Institutes for Research, 2010. Print.

Thurlow, Martha, et al. *Delphi Study of Instructional Strategies for English Language Learners with Disabilities: Recommendations from Educators Nationwide. ELLs with Disabilities Report 21*. University of Minnesota: National Center on Educational Outcomes, 2008. Print.

Tomlinson, C. A., C. Brighton, and H. Hertberg. "Differentiating Instruction in Response to Student Readiness, Interest, and Learning Profile in Academically Diverse Classrooms: A Review of the Literature." *Journal for the Education of the Gifted* 27.2/3 (2003): 119-145. Print.

Tricoche, Ester. "Ed Tech Hiring Toolkit." *NewSchools Venture Fund*, April 17, 2018. Retrieved June 15, 2018 from https://www.newschools.org/ignite/resources/ed-tech-hiring-toolkit/. Web.

Tschannen-Moran, Megan, and Marilyn Barr. "Fostering Student Learning: The Relationship of Collective Teacher Efficacy and Student Achievement." *Leadership and Policy in Schools* 3.3 (2004): 189-209. Print.

Tschannen-Moran, Megan, A. Woolfolk Hoy, and Wayne K. Hoy. "Teacher Efficacy: Its Meaning and Measure." *Review of Educational Research* 68.2 (Summer, 1998): 202-248. Print.

Tuytens, Melissa, and Geert Devos. "Stimulating Professional Learning through Teacher Evaluation: An Impossible Task for the School Leader?" *Teaching and Teacher Education: An International Journal of Research and Studies* 27.5 (2011): 891-9. Print.

University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research. "Selecting Effective Indicators." *College Readiness Indicator Systems Resource Series.* Seattle, WA: Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2014. Print.

Vaughn, Sharon, et al. *Enhancing Social Studies Vocabulary and Comprehension for 7th Grade English Language Learners: Findings from Two Experimental Studies*. Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness, 2010. Print.

Vaz, Sharmila, Marita Falkmer, Marina Ciccarelli, Anne Passmore, Richard Parsons, Melissa Black, Belinda Cuomo, Tele Tan, Torbjorn. "Belongingness in Early Secondary School: Key Factors that Primary and Secondary Schools Need to Consider." *PLoS ONE*, *10*(9), (September 15, 2015). Print.

Veenman, M. V. J., R. Kok, and A. W. Blöte. "The Relation between Intellectual and Metacognitive Skills in Early Adolescence." *Instructional Science* 33.3 (2005) Print.

Vescio, Vicki, Dorene Ross, and Alyson Adams. "A Review of Research on the Impact of Professional Learning Communities on Teaching Practice and Student Learning." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 24.1 (2008): 80-91. Print.

Villar, Anthony, and Michael Strong. "Is Mentoring Worth the Money? A Benefit-Cost Analysis and Five-Year Rate of Return of a Comprehensive Mentoring Program for Beginning Teachers." *ERS Spectrum* 25.3 (2007): 1-17. Print.

Waasdorp, T., Bradshaw, C., & Leaf , P. "The Impact of Schoolwide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports on Bullying and Peer Rejection: A Randomized Controlled Effectiveness Trial**."** *Archive of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine,* 2012;166(2):149-156. Print.

Wahlstrom, K. L., and K. S. Louis. "How Teachers Experience Principal Leadership: The Roles of Professional Community, Trust, Efficacy, and Shared Responsibility." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 44.4 (2008): 458-95. Print.

Walker, Allan, and Clive Dimmock. "Preparing Leaders, Preparing Learners: The Hong Kong Experience." *School Leadership & Management* 26.2 (2006): 125-47. Print.

Wallace, M. R. "Making Sense of the Links: Professional Development, Teacher Practices, and Student Achievement." *Teachers College Record* 111.2 (February, 2009): 573-596. Print.

Wang, J., Sandra J. Odell, and Sharon A. Schwille. "Effects of Teacher Induction on Beginning Teachers' Teaching: A Critical Review of the Literature." *Journal of Teacher Education* 59.2 (2008): 132-52. Print.

Wang, J., and Sandra J. Odell. "Mentored Learning to Teach According to Standards-Based Reform: A Critical Review." *Review of Educational Research* 72.3 (2002): 481-546. Print.

Wang, P., and J. C. Rode. "Transformational Leadership and Follower Creativity: The Moderating Effects of Identification with Leader and Organizational Climate." *Human Relations* 63.8 (2010): 1105-1128. Print.

Ware, H., and A. Kitsantas. "Teacher and Collective Efficacy Beliefs as Predictors of Professional Commitment." *The Journal of Educational Research* 100.5 (May/June 2007): 303-310. Print.

Waters, T., R. J. Marzano, and B. McNulty. *Balanced Leadership (TM): What 30 Years of Research Tells Us about the Effect of Leadership on Student Achievement*. Denver, CO: McREL, 2003. Web. March 2, 2011.

Watson, John, and Butch Gemin. *Socialization in Online Programs*. North American Council for Online Learning (NACOL), 2008. Web.

---. *Using Online Learning for at-Risk Students and Credit Recovery*. North American Council for Online Learning (NACOL), 2008. Web.

Watson, John, et al. *Keeping Pace with K-12 Online Learning: An Annual Review of State-Level Policy and Practice*. Evergreen Education Group, 2010. Web.

Watson, John. *Blended Learning: The Convergence of Online and Face-to-Face Education*. North American Council for Online Learning (NACOL), 2008. Web.

Weathers, John M. "Teacher Community in Urban Elementary Schools: The Role of Leadership and Bureaucratic Accountability." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 19.3 (2011)Print.

Wei, Ruth Chung, L. Darling-Hammond, and Frank Adamson. *Professional Development in the United States: Trends and Challenges. Phase II of a Three-Phase Study*. Dallas, TX: National Staff Development Council, 2010. Web.

Weiner, Cornelia. "Key Ingredients to Online Learning: Adolescent Students Study in Cyberspace--the Nature of the Study." *International Journal on E-Learning* 2.3 (2003): 44-50. Web.

Weisman, Evelyn Marino, and Laurie E. Hansen. "Strategies for Teaching Social Studies to Elementary Level ELLs." *Education Digest* 73.4 (2007): 61-5. Print.

What High Quality Education Research Says about Teacher Performance Evaluations. Denver, CO: Mid-coast Regional Education Lab (McREL), 2011. Web. September 13, 2011.

What Works Clearinghouse. *ClassWide Peer Tutoring: What Works Clearinghouse Intervention Report*. Princeton, NJ: What Works Clearinghouse, 2010. Print.

---. *Dropout Prevention: What Works Clearinghouse Topic Report*. What Works Clearinghouse, 2008. Print.

---. *English Language Learners: What Works Clearinghouse Topic Report*. What Works Clearinghouse, 2007. Print.

---. *Peer Tutoring and Response Groups. what Works Clearinghouse Intervention Report*. What Works Clearinghouse, 2007. Print.

---. *Using Student Achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision Making*. Eds. L. Hamilton, et al. NCEE 2009-4067 Vol. What Works Clearinghouse: U.S. Department of Education, 2009. Web. June 21, 2011.

Wicks, Matthew. *A National Primer on K-12 Online Learning (Version 2)*. Version 2 ed. International Association for K-12 Online Learning (iNACOL), 2010. Web.

Wiest, Lynda R. "Problem-Solving Support for English Language Learners." *Teaching Children Mathematics* 14.8 (2008): 479-84. Print.

Wilson, Sandra Jo, and Mark W. Lipsey. *The Effects of School-Based Social Information Processing Interventions on Aggressive Behavior, Part I: Universal Programs*. Oslo: Norway: Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2006. Print.

---. *The Effects of School-Based Social Information Processing Interventions on Aggressive Behavior, Part II: Selected Or Indicated Pull-Out Programs*. Oslo, Norway: Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2006. Print.

Witzel, Bradley S. "Using CRA to Teach Algebra to Students with Math Difficulties in Inclusive Settings." *Learning Disabilities -- A Contemporary Journal* 3.2 (2005): 49-60. Print.

Witziers, Bob, Roel J. Bosker, and Meta L. Krüger. "Educational Leadership and Student Achievement: The Elusive Search for an Association." *Educational Administration Quarterly* 39.3 (2003): 398-425. Print.

Wong, Harry, Rosemary Wong, Sarah Jondahl and Oretha Ferguson. *The Classroom Management Book*. Montain View, CA: Harry K. Wong Publications, 2014. Print.

Wright, Adam. "Teachers' Perceptions of Students' Disruptive Behavior: The Effect of Racial Congruence and Consequences for School Suspension." November 2015. Retrieved May 23, 3018 from https://aefpweb.org/sites/default/files/webform/41/Race%20Match,%20Disruptive%20Behavior,%20and%20School%20Suspension.pdf. Web.

Yoon, K. S., et al. *Reviewing the Evidence on how Teacher Professional Development Affects Student Achievement*. 033 Vol. Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest, 2007. Print.

York-Barr, Jennifer, Gail Ghere, and Jennifer Sommerness. "Collaborative Teaching to Increase ELL Student Learning: A Three-Year Urban Elementary Case Study." *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)* 12.3 (2007): 301-35. Print.

Young, Viki M., and Debbie H. Kim. "Using Assessments for Instructional Improvement: A Literature Review." *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 18.19 (2010): 1-40. Print.

Zhao, Yong, Jing Lei, and Bo Yan. "What Makes the Difference? A Practical Analysis of Research on the Effectiveness of Distance Education." *Teachers College Record* 107.8 (2005): 1836-84. Web.

Zimmerman, Barry and Dale Schunk, Eds. *Theories of Self-Regulated Learning and Academic Achievement: An Overview and Analysis*. Mahwah, NJ, US: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2001. Print.

Zullig, Keith J., E. S. Huebner, and Jon M. Patton. "Relationships among School Climate Domains and School Satisfaction." *Psychology in the Schools* 48.2 (2011): 133-45. Print.