

P.S. 165 Ida Posner

FINAL REPORT



Contents

- Introduction 1
 - About This Report 1
 - About P.S. 165 Ida Posner 1
 - Audit Process at P.S. 165 Ida Posner. 1

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

- Recommendations 5
 - Overview of Recommendations. 5
 - Recommendation 1: Instruction 6
 - Recommendation 2: Independent Reading 11
 - Recommendation 3: Classroom Management 15
 - Recommendation 4: Common Core 20

- References 24

Introduction

About This Report

This final report is the result of an external school curriculum audit (ESCA) of P.S. 165 Ida Posner conducted by Learning Point Associates, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research. This audit was conducted in response to the school being identified as in need of improvement (year 1) under the New York State Education Department (NYSED) differentiated accountability plan, pursuant to the accountability requirements of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as reauthorized by the No Child Left Behind Act. The utilized ESCA process was developed for and carried out under the auspices of the New York City Department of Education (NYCDOE) Office of School Development, within the Division of Portfolio Planning.

About P.S. 165 Ida Posner

Located in Brooklyn, P.S. 165 Ida Posner (K165) has 615 students in Grades PK–8. Eighty-three percent of the student population is eligible for free lunch, and 5 percent is eligible for reduced-price lunch.¹ The average attendance rate for the 2009–10 school year was 91 percent.

The school population includes 89 percent black or African-American, eight percent Hispanic or Latino, two percent white, and one percent Asian students. Students with disabilities make up 17 percent of the population; 1 percent of students are limited English proficient. Approximately 54 percent of the students are boys, and 46 percent are girls.

In 2009–10, P.S. 165 did not make adequate yearly progress (AYP) in English language arts (ELA) for all students, the black or African-American subgroup, students with disabilities, and economically disadvantaged students. In 2010–11, P.S. 165's state accountability status was designated as "Improvement (year 1)."²

Audit Process at P.S. 165 Ida Posner

The ESCA approach utilized at the elementary school level examines six topic areas related to literacy: student engagement, instruction, academic interventions and supports, professional learning and collaboration, curriculum, and assessments and their use. Data were collected at the school level through teacher surveys, administrator interviews, classroom observations, and an analysis of documents submitted by P.S. 165 Ida Posner. From these data, Learning Point Associates prepared a series of reports for the school's use.

These reports were presented to the school at a co-interpretationSM meeting on May 17, 2011. During this meeting, 13 stakeholders from the P.S. 165 Ida Posner community read the reports. Through a facilitated and collaborative group process, they identified individual findings and then developed and prioritized key findings that emerged from information in the reports.

¹ <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb-rc/2010/c4/AOR-2010-332300010165.pdf>. Accessed on August 19, 2011

² <https://www.nystart.gov/publicweb-rc/2010/c4/AOR-2010-332300010165.pdf>. Accessed on August 19, 2011

The remainder of this report presents the key findings that emerged from the co-interpretation process and the actionable recommendations that Learning Point Associates developed in response. Please note that there is not necessarily a one-to-one connection between key findings and recommendations; rather, the key findings are considered as a group, and the recommended strategies are those that we believe are most likely to have the greatest positive impact on student performance at P.S. 165 Ida Posner.

Key Findings

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

Critical Key Findings

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 1:

Some students are not actively engaged.

In two of the observed classrooms, almost none of the students were engaged in learning, including one classroom where only 6 of 14 students were on task during independent reading time, and another classroom where nearly all students were off task during almost the entire observation period. Random selection of students to read or respond to questions, a method to ensure engagement, was seldom observed. In 14 of 15 observed classrooms, teachers relied on raised hands to call on students and did not call on students who did not volunteer to answer.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 2:

In some classrooms observed, there was no evidence of teachers using the gradual release of responsibility model of instruction.

Critical Key Finding 2 is supported by information from classroom observations. The gradual release of responsibility model of instruction refers to a method of explicit instruction in which the teacher first explains and models the concept for students, and then has them practice it together or alone. However, only one teacher in one of the observed classrooms demonstrated use of the gradual release of responsibility model of instruction.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 3:

There is no systematic plan for helping students increase reading stamina.

Reading stamina, or the ability to read for long periods of time without causing or giving in to distraction, is an important skill for standardized tests and literacy. However, none of the classrooms observed showed evidence that the school has a systematic plan in place for increasing this stamina.

CRITICAL KEY FINDING 4:

A variety of interruptions adversely impact instructional time.

In six of the 15 observed classrooms, a variety of interruptions negatively affected instructional time. The time lost due to the interruptions was exacerbated by inefficient transitions and poor behavior management.

Positive Key Findings

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 1:

Teachers engage in a variety of professional development opportunities that are relevant and based on identified needs of teachers and students.

Positive Key Finding 1 is supported by information from the review of school-submitted documents and teacher survey results. By June 2011, 90 percent of the teachers will have completed a minimum of 20 hours of differentiated professional development. Nearly all (95 percent) of the surveyed teachers agreed or strongly agreed that professional development addressed the needs of their students and that professional development experiences were closely aligned with the school's goals.

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 2:

Teachers engage in a variety of collaborations on grade levels, across grade levels, with special education and general education teachers, and with other schools.

Positive Key Finding 2 is supported by information from teacher survey results. Of the surveyed teachers, 90 percent agreed or strongly agreed that they had opportunities to work with colleagues from their school. Special needs teachers share common planning time and professional development with general education teachers. All teachers surveyed agreed or strongly agreed that teachers seek each other out to learn new ideas.

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 3:

Teachers use multiple forms of data to assess students.

Positive Key Finding 3 is supported by information from school interviews, the review of school-submitted documents, and teacher survey results. All teachers maintain data binders. Teachers use Acuity, instructionally targeted assessments (ITAs), teacher assessments, unit tests, portfolios, and monthly data reports from computer programs. Of the teachers surveyed, 67 percent used data twice per week.

POSITIVE KEY FINDING 4:

As a pilot school for Common Core, Common Core has been implemented through the design team and study group.

Positive Key Finding 4 is supported by information from school interviews and the review of school-submitted documents. The entire school implements the Core Knowledge Curriculum. A study group of teachers across grade levels selects a focus and creates an action plan for integrating the Common Core state standards into lessons. A curriculum mapping team aligns the school's curricula with the standards. Professional development addressing the Common Core has been provided.

Recommendations

Overview of Recommendations

Participants at the P.S. 165 Ida Posner co-interpretation meeting prioritized critical key findings that identify the areas where the school's ELA program and instruction can improve, as well as several positive findings highlighting school strengths.

The first recommendation refers to instruction and addresses Critical Key Findings 1 and 2, which refer to student engagement and teachers not consistently using the gradual release of responsibility model of instruction. Student engagement also may be related to poor classroom management and an absence of classroom routines that help students stay on task (Critical Key Finding 4). The third recommendation addresses classroom management and provides suggestions for how teachers may maximize academic time and reduce the time students spend engaging in off-task behaviors.

One of the positive key findings builds on a current strength of the school: its status as a pilot school for the Common Core. P.S. 165 has a design team, a study group, and professional development that focus on the Common Core. The fourth recommendation addresses the challenges posed by the implementation of the Common Core standards, which all New York City schools must address.

THE FOUR RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. Develop and implement a plan to ensure challenging, engaging, and intentional instruction in every classroom.
2. Develop and implement with fidelity a schoolwide plan to increase the effectiveness of independent reading.
3. Develop and implement with fidelity a plan to ensure that the components of effective classroom management are evident in every classroom.
4. Develop a multiyear plan to align the school's curriculum, instruction, assessments, and instructional materials to the Common Core standards.

These four recommendations are discussed on the following pages. Each recommendation provides a review of research, online resources for additional information, specific actions the school may wish to take during its implementation process, and examples of real-life schools that have successfully implemented strategies. All works cited appear in the References section at the end of this report.

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

Recommendation 1: Instruction

Develop and implement a plan to ensure challenging, engaging, and intentional instruction in every classroom.

LINK TO RESEARCH

After reviewing hundreds of studies on teaching effects, John Hattie concluded that “it is teachers *using particular teaching methods*, teachers *with high expectations for all students*, and teachers *who have created positive student-teacher relationships* that are more likely to have the above average effects on student achievement” (Hattie, 2009, p. 126). Decades of research suggest that three behaviors distinguish highly effective teachers: challenging students, creating a positive classroom environment, and being intentional about their teaching.

Challenging Students. Highly effective teachers set high expectations for all students and challenge their students by providing instruction that develops high-order thinking skills. Rosenthal and Jacobson in their 1965 study coined the term “Pygmalion effect” to describe how teachers’ expectations of students affects the performance of the students. (See Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1992.) More than 600 studies conducted since have confirmed that teacher expectations can have a powerful effect on student achievement. Conveying expectations by praising students has minimal effects. Carol Dweck (2006) has determined that praising students by telling them they are smart may actually have a detrimental effect on their achievement.

Positive Environment. Setting high expectations for students is not enough. Teachers must create positive classroom environments and build strong relationships with students. Kleinfeld (1972) identified four types of teachers—traditionalists (teachers who set high expectations for students but offered little academic or emotional support to help students meet those expectations), sophisticates (teachers who were aloof and undemanding), sentimentalists (teachers who were warm but undemanding), and supportive gadflies (teachers who combined high personal warmth with high expectations for students). Researchers since 1972 have used the term “warm demander” to describe effective teachers who set high expectations while nurturing student growth.

Intentionality. Highly effective teachers are intentional about their teaching. Good teachers are clear about what they are teaching and have a broad repertoire of instructional strategies to help students accomplish their learning goals. They are intentional in selecting the most appropriate instructional strategy for each situation.

Research suggests that effective literacy instruction needs to be sequenced, systematic, intentional, teacher directed, and explicit, involving explanations, modeling, and scaffolding. These characteristics are evident in the “gradual release of responsibility” instructional model, introduced by Pearson and Gallagher in 1983 after they reviewed studies on reading comprehension instruction. These researchers found that learning occurred when it happened over time within a repeated instructional cycle that included explanation, guided practice, feedback, independent practice, and application. The gradual-release-of-responsibility model of instruction requires that the teacher shift from assuming “all the responsibility for performing a task...to a situation in which the students assume all of the responsibility” (Duke &

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

New York City Department of
Education (NYCDOE)
[http://schools.
nyc.gov/Teachers/
TeacherDevelopment/
TeacherDevelopmentToolkit/
PTS/Engagingstudents](http://schools.nyc.gov/Teachers/TeacherDevelopment/TeacherDevelopmentToolkit/PTS/Engagingstudents)

Pearson, 2002, p. 211). This gradual release may occur over a day, a week, a month, or a year. Pearson and Gallagher envisioned instruction that moved from explicit modeling and instruction to guided practice and then to activities that incrementally positioned students for becoming independent learners.

The gradual-release-of-responsibility model of instruction has been documented as an effective approach for improving literacy achievement (Fisher & Frey, 2007), reading comprehension (Lloyd, 2004), and literacy outcomes for English language learners (Kong & Pearson, 2003).

Related to the gradual-release-of-responsibility model is consistent and active engagement of students in their learning. Student engagement has long been recognized as the core of effective schooling (Marzano & Pickering, 2010). In her framework for enhancing student achievement, Charlotte Danielson (2007) describes exemplary instruction:

All students are highly engaged in learning and make material contributions to the success of the class by asking questions and participating in discussions, getting actively involved in learning activities, and using feedback in their learning. The teacher ensures the success of every student by creating a high-level learning environment; providing timely, high-quality feedback; and continuously searching for approaches that meet student needs. (p. 113)

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

In order to ensure challenging, engaging, and intentional instruction in every classroom, teachers should take the following actions:

1. Teach according to the principles of effective instruction.

The gradual-release-of-responsibility model of instruction enhances effective literacy instruction. Teacher-directed, explicit instruction of literacy skills and strategies involves explanation, modeling, guided practice, feedback, independent practice, and application.

2. Guide students in setting personal goals and in monitoring their progress.

Marzano and Pickering (2010) suggests that self-efficacy is possibly the most important factor affecting student engagement. Self-efficacy is commonly defined as the belief in one's capabilities to achieve a goal. Students with a strong sense of efficacy are more likely to challenge themselves with difficult tasks and be intrinsically motivated. One approach for developing student self-efficacy is to have students chart their progress on a specific learning goal. Using percentage scores works well when the assessments address a very specific skill area, such as spelling or using a specific type of punctuation. In most situations, however, a rubric or scale is a better way to help students track their progress. Having students set personal goals for their individual progress and think about what they will do to accomplish their goals influences student engagement.

3. Provide feedback to students that emphasizes the link between effort and improvement.

Because it is important for students to attribute their success or failure to their effort and not luck or ability, teachers may have students use a scale to track their effort and preparation along with their academic progress. The oral feedback teachers give students should focus on the effort students make.

4. Use active learning strategies.

Teachers can use techniques such as *turn and talk* or *think-pair-share* to engage students. Cooperative learning structures described by Spencer Kagan (2010) also are effective in engaging students. Other approaches are *peer partners*, where on-task partners check to see whether their partner is following the direction of the teacher; *response partners*, who are taught to “look, lean, whisper” when discussing with their partner; *response cards* that provide students with prepared response cards labeled true and false or a, b, c, and so on, which allows all students respond to teacher questions; and *writing answers*, according to which each student writes answers on a individual whiteboard or slate.

5. Vary instructional strategies.

It is important to use a variety of *instructional strategies*.

6. Use interactive reading techniques.

Interactive reading techniques are helpful for engaging students. Examples are Say Something; Read, Cover, Remember, Retell; Partner Jigsaw; Two-Word; and Reverse Think-Aloud.

7. Use questioning strategies that make all students think and answer.

Teachers should ensure that students’ opportunity to respond is high. The opportunity to respond is positively related to achievement because the more opportunities students have to respond or practice a skill, the better their understanding. Ways to increase opportunities to respond include making sure all students are called on, not calling on volunteers to respond, using choral response techniques, and calling on students randomly to respond. Teachers can facilitate active involvement by providing cues and prompts that lead students to correct answers, sequencing instruction so that high rates of accuracy are achieved, and asking frequent questions.

8. Provide students with choices whenever possible.

Managed choice is an effective way to engage students. Students should be given opportunities to choose books that interest them, and whenever possible, students should have some choice about assignments.

9. Use processing activities.

Instructional strategies such as think-pair-share and quick writes are ways to engage students in the lesson and have them process the content of the lesson.

10. Select materials and tasks that are at a correct level of difficulty.

Recognizing the difficulty of doing this in a classroom of students with diverse learning needs, it still is important to do so as much as possible. Matching the reading levels of the materials students are asked to read and the reading levels of the students is critical. This is not possible all the time, particularly with the new demands of the text complexity of the Common Core, but it is critical that students are reading at their independent and instructional levels at least part of the day.

11. Foster a culture of achievement.

A culture of achievement is fostered in classrooms where instruction is challenging, students feel comfortable asking questions, and students are expected to do their best. High-quality instruction—instruction that is rigorous, aligned with standards, and uses instructional strategies to meet the needs of all students—helps promote a culture of achievement in the classroom. Clear, high, yet attainable expectations for all students ensure that students feel challenged and not bored or discouraged. Students need both high expectations and support for learning.

12. Build relationships with students.

One of the strongest correlates of effective teaching is the strength of relationships teachers develop with students. When students feel valued, honored, and respected, they tend to be more engaged. Teachers should create positive classroom environments.

DOING WHAT WORKS: Examples From Real Schools

Catalina Ventura in Phoenix, Arizona, is a K-8 school with more than 1,300 students. The school is an inner-city school with a 75 percent poverty rate. During the past five years, teachers at Catalina have been trained in using Kagan cooperative learning structures in their classrooms. Dr. Spencer Kagan devised several generic, content-free cooperative learning techniques that can be used to increase student engagement. Numbered Heads Together, Corners, Think-Pair-Share, and Line-up are examples of these structures. At Catalina Ventura School, a new Kagan structure was taught monthly to the entire staff at staff meetings. The principal attributes the dramatic improvement in test scores at the school to teachers using these structures in their classrooms and having students more engaged as a result. (More information about the Kagan structures is available at www.KaganOnline.com. The video *Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures for Success* is available on www.youtube.com.)

TESA (Teacher Expectations and Student Achievement) is a professional development program designed to help teachers interact equitably with all students. TESA raises the awareness of teachers about how their expectations affect student performance. Teachers reflect on their interactions with their students in their questioning and feedback and the effects on student self-esteem. Teachers observe each other to provide feedback on whether they treat some students differently from others. Results of the program include improvement in student academic performance, increases in attendance, decreases in discipline problems, and improvement in classroom climate. Information about the professional development program is available from the Los Angeles County Office of Education at <http://www.lacoe.edu/orgs/165/index.cfm>.

Recommendation 2: Independent Reading

Develop and implement with fidelity a schoolwide plan to increase the effectiveness of independent reading.

LINK TO RESEARCH

The goal of reading instruction is to have students read with volume, stamina, and fluency.

Volume. The amount that students read in and out of school significantly affects the development of reading rate and fluency, vocabulary, general knowledge of the world, overall verbal ability, and academic achievement. The amount of reading is a strong predictor of reading comprehension, outweighing intelligence, economic background, and gender. The New York City performance standards address volume of reading by specifying that by the end of the fourth grade, elementary students should be reading 25 books a year. The standards for California schools specify that fourth-grade students should be reading 500,000 words a year.

Stamina. Reading stamina is the ability to read for a sustained amount of time without getting distracted or distracting others. Research shows that reading stamina will gradually increase with the amount of time spent reading. Lack of reading stamina is becoming a problem. Students are losing their ability to read for long periods of time. This is important for many reasons but especially when one considers the amount of time students have to read for the state tests.

Fluency. Reading fluency has three components, accuracy, speed, and expression. Fluent readers are characterized by the ability to read orally with speed, accuracy, and proper expression (National Reading Panel, 2000). In order to build students' reading fluency, teachers model good oral reading through the daily read-aloud, teach students phrasing, offer many opportunities for students to practice with guidance and support (repeated reading, choral reading, echo reading, buddy reading, recorded reading, reader's theater, poetry readings), and assess and track students' fluency over time.

Reading is a skill that requires practice. Students need to read in order to become better readers. There is a great deal of research that shows a very strong correlation between the amount of time spent reading and a student's progress as a reader. Reading for Change, the report issued by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development OECD in 2002, states that reading proficiency is closely linked to the amount of time students spend reading in their free time and the diversity of materials they read. The report makes the claim that finding ways to engage students in reading may be one of the most effective ways to leverage social change—to equalize learning across disadvantaged and middle class youth. The report makes the following statement:

Fifteen-year-olds from disadvantaged backgrounds who read a lot get higher average reading scores than those whose parents are of high or medium occupational status but who have little interest in reading. (p. 6)

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

The 2 Sisters (Website)
<http://www.the2sisters.com/>

Emma Eccles Jones
Center for Early Childhood
Education
www.coe.usu.edu/ecc

Classrooms that provide more reading time yield higher reading achievement among students. The amount of independent silent reading students do in school is significantly related to gains in reading achievement. It is during successful independent reading practice that students consolidate their reading skills and strategies. Without extensive reading practice, reading proficiency lags. Research has not yet confirmed, however, whether instructional time spent on independent silent reading with minimal guidance and feedback improves reading achievement and fluency. The research of Reutzel, Fawson, and Smith (2008) and Reutzel, Jones, Fawson, and Smith (2008) shows promise in terms of how to structure independent reading so that it does affect reading achievement.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

It is extremely important that students are reading books at their independent reading level.

1. Help students select books.

Teaching students how to select “just right” books using the five-finger rule or a similar technique is critical. Students cannot develop stamina using reading materials that are too hard for them. Book boxes and bins with books at an appropriate level should be easily accessible.

2. Hold students accountable.

Holding students accountable for their independent reading is important. Students should keep reading logs in which they record the number of pages they have read in their book. Teachers should be aware of how long it should take a child who reads at one reading rate or another to read books of different levels. In this way, a teacher has some idea of the progress that a student can be expected to make through books. Another way to hold students accountable for their independent reading is to provide time for them to share with a partner or the whole class what they have read.

3. Monitor student engagement.

Teachers can monitor student engagement during independent reading and help students who are having trouble, perhaps because they are reading a book that is too hard for them.

4. Communicate purpose and expected behaviors.

Teachers need to teach focus lessons on reading stamina and help students understand what it is and why it is important. The class might use a T-chart to brainstorm what they should be doing during independent reading. Behaviors discussed should include reading the whole time, staying in one spot, reading quietly, and getting started right away. The teacher should model these behaviors for the students, and students should then be given an opportunity to practice these behaviors.

5. Build reading stamina.

The teacher might start with a very short reading session on the first day and then gradually increase the time as students show they are able to read and not get distracted.

The goal would be to read at least the amount of time required for the state reading test. At the end of the reading time, students can assess how well they did. Throughout the year, students should review the behaviors using the anchor chart and constantly assess themselves on how well they are doing.

Several conditions or resources have a positive impact on reading stamina:

- Book selection. The more interest in the book, the better the stamina. Teachers can administer an interest inventory to the students and then be sure that there are books available in the classroom to meet the interests of the students.
- Comfort. Students should be comfortable and free from distractions while reading independently.
- Teacher enthusiasm. If the teachers are enthusiastic and knowledgeable about books and the students are surrounded by good books they can read, the goal of increasing independent reading is more easily met.

6. Scaffolded silent reading for students.

Reutzel, Jones, et al. (2008) identify the problems with traditional Sustained Silent Reading (SSR), which is that teachers fail to teach, monitor, interact with, and hold students accountable for their time spent in reading practice. Reutzel, Jones, et al. propose an alternative to traditional SSR—Scaffolded Silent Reading (ScSR). Research on this approach to independent reading has shown promise.

The ScSR model includes support, guidance, structure, appropriate text difficulty, accountability and monitoring. First, the teacher teaches explicit book selection strategies so that students are able to select books appropriate to their level. Second, the ScSR period begins with the teacher explaining and modeling a strategy for five to eight minutes and then directing the students to read independently for 20 minutes. Third, the teacher conducts individual monitoring conferences with four or five students per day during the reading time. During these conferences, the teacher listens to the student read aloud from the book he or she is reading for one to two minutes. The student retells what he or she has read and then the teacher and the student have a two-minute discussion about the book. The teacher helps the student set a goal for the date to finish the book and the student also decides how to share the book. Students use a genre wheel to ensure wide reading across different genres.

DOING WHAT WORKS: Examples From Real Schools

Joan Moser is a K-2 multiage teacher in the state of Washington. She implemented a structure in her classroom to help her students develop daily habits of reading and writing. Her students have five literacy tasks to complete daily. As students read, the teacher meets with small groups or confers with individuals. These five tasks are (1) read to self, (2) read to someone, (3) work on writing, (4) do word works, (5) listen to reading.

During the “read to self” task, students work on increasing their stamina. Students start with three minutes of independent reading and then add one to two minutes a day until they reach the target of 30 minutes a day for primary students and 45 minutes a day for intermediate students.

Moser and her sister, Gail Boushey, who is a literacy coach, have written the book *The Daily Five* (2006), which describes this structure for having students read independently in a productive way.

Recommendation 3: Classroom Management

Develop and implement with fidelity a plan to ensure that the components of effective classroom management are evident in every classroom.

LINK TO RESEARCH

Studies of effective teachers, effective reading programs, and productive schools show that management at the classroom level is critical to ensuring that time is used well and that reading achievement is maximized (Fountas & Pinnell, 1999; Samuels, 1981). In classrooms taught by skilled teachers, more of the available learning time “is spent in activities with academic value” (Anderson, Hiebert, Scott, & Wilkinson, 1985).

Routines. Classroom routines positively affect students’ academic performance as well as their behavior (Vallecorsa, deBettencourt, & Zigmond, 2000). Teachers in schools with high levels of student literacy “maximize every instructional minute” (Briggs & Thomas, 1997). Well-managed classrooms are the hallmark of effective teachers. Research shows that students learn more in classrooms that are well organized and that good classroom management results in more and better student engagement.

There is a substantial body of research showing “that time allocated for academic instruction in a school day can easily slip away when a teacher cannot keep the transitional time, wait time, and behavioral problems to a minimum” (Berliner, 1981). In “unsuccessful classrooms, time is wasted because routines are not established and there are often interruptions brought about by discipline problems” (Samuels, 1981). Even in many average classes, “there is a lack of attention to classroom management that results in considerable inefficiency and reduced achievement on standardized tests of reading” (Berliner, 1981).

In contrast, when teachers are effective managers, the classrooms are characterized as “being orderly because less time is wasted on discipline problems and giving instructions on routine matters, such as passing out books and transitions from one activity to another” (Samuels, 1981) and because there are routines for ensuring that learning activities run smoothly (Anderson et al., 1985; Briggs & Thomas, 1997). The great portion of class time is devoted to the lesson at hand (Rutter, 1983).

Self-Regulation. Research shows that effective teachers foster self-regulation in their students. Self-regulation includes and is related to children’s capacity to focus attention upon, engage in, and persist at learning tasks; their ability to manage both positive and negative emotions in a group setting; and their capacity to plan and follow through on their plans. Warmth, organization, and predictability are factors that improve self-regulation in the home and also seem to be important in classrooms.

Preschool children with good self-regulation have higher levels of school readiness. Good self-regulation in preschool predicts children’s academic success in primary grades better than children’s IQ, their socioeconomic background, or their preschool knowledge of mathematics and literacy (Blair, 2011). Self-regulation continues to be a strong predictor of academic achievement in elementary school and middle school. Low-income students consistently demonstrate lower levels of self-regulation and higher incidences of behavior problems than their middle-income peers (Evans & Rosenbaum, 2008).

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

New York City Department
of Education

<http://schools.nyc.gov/Teachers/TeacherDevelopment/TeacherDevelopmentToolkit/PTS/>

*Creating Classroom
Routines and
Procedures*

http://teacher.scholastic.com/classroom_management_pictures/index.htm

Tools of the Mind program

<http://www.toolsofthemind.org>

Promoting Alternative
Thinking Skills program

<http://www.channing-bete.com/prevention-programs/paths/paths.html>

Classroom Environment. A school behavior plan has an indirect influence on student achievement and is not as important in affecting student achievement as classroom environments, which have a more direct and immediate impact on achievement. Clearly articulating and enforcing rules of behavior at the school level has a moderate influence on student achievement (Marzano, 2000). Decreasing disruptive behavior in the classroom, however, and employing effective classroom management strategies have a strong influence on student achievement (Hattie, 2009). Because of this, the focus of this recommendation is on the classroom rather than the school. The school should assess whether schoolwide behavior problems warrant adopting schoolwide strategies.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

1. Establish routines.

Teachers should establish routines and procedures that minimize disruptions and provide smooth transitions within and between lessons. Establishing consistent and predictable routines let students know what to expect and what is expected of them. Routines set guidelines for acceptable and unacceptable behavior. In many classrooms, a significant proportion of class time (about 25 percent on average) is spent on transitions such as collecting and putting away materials, listening to nonacademic directions, and waiting for help or for the next activity to begin. Teachers can minimize the time lost by preparing carefully for transitions and warning students about the close of one activity and the beginning of another, providing brief but clear directions, having materials immediately available, actively monitoring and reinforcing appropriate student behavior, and beginning a new activity quickly and enthusiastically.

Routines are procedures for handling both daily occurrences (e.g., taking attendance, starting a class period, turning in assignments) and minor interruptions of instruction, such as the class phone ringing. Teachers should develop routines for three types of recurring and predictable classroom events.

- Establish administrative procedures for recurring events such as storing coats or books, using the restroom, sharpening pencils, taking attendance, making announcements, and dismissing students.
- Establish behaviors that support instruction and learning to make teaching and learning as effective as possible. The routines include how to get students to pay attention such as a nonverbal signal or a countdown, how students should respond to teacher questions (hand raising or random choice of which students will answer), when and how individual students can get extra help from the teacher, and what to do when students finish tasks ahead of the rest of the class.
- Establish routines for working in groups. Routines should be established for how to participate in discussions, how to behave in groups, and how to work with a partner.

Consistency and practice are critical to making classroom routines effective. Teachers need to consistently follow through and actively explain the routines and the reasoning behind them. They then must model routines consistently and persistently. Teachers

have to teach the classroom routines in the same way they teach academic subjects and need to be proactive in keeping students focused on successful routines. Teaching the routines is particularly important at the start of the school year.

2. Foster self-regulation.

Teachers help students' ability to self-regulate by providing an organized classroom environment and by removing elements in the environment that might trigger impulsive behavior. Students begin school with a set of self-regulation skills that are a product of their genetic inheritance and their family environment. Teachers, however, can have an effect on the students who come to school without good self-regulation by improving planning and organization, making classroom management more consistent, and facilitating students' independent and small-group work. Teachers should address three factors that create problems for self-regulation—negative emotions, lapses, and cue exposure.

- Correct and redirect negative emotions. Negative emotions reduce the ability to self-regulate. Many misbehaviors—fighting, teasing, breaking rules—are associated with negative emotions such as anger or frustration. When addressing negative emotions, teachers can give students who act impulsively a correction and redirection rather than a rebuke, which makes the students feel bad (negative emotion).
- Help students to put lapses behind them. Lapses (“falling off the wagon”) can lead to people more or less giving up their attempts to self-regulate. When a student has a lapse, the teacher should encourage the student to put the lapse behind and resolve again to behave according to expectations the student is well aware of.
- Eliminate cues that prompt student distraction. Cues (subtle or overt reminders of the appeal of the thing to be avoided) can make self-regulation difficult. Teachers should get rid of the cues—remove the distraction—rather than counting on students to ignore cues.

3. Modify the learning environment.

There are several ways teachers can modify the learning environment and decrease problem behavior. Three effective strategies:

- Assign attainable academic tasks. When there is a mismatch between a student's ability level and the difficulty and/or length of an academic task, inappropriate behavior is more frequent (Umbreit, Lane, & Dejud, 2004). Teachers should increase opportunities for academic success—for example, by providing opportunities for students to answer questions correctly. Teachers should pay careful attention to the difficulty of reading assignments and support students as they are learning to read. Every student has an independent, instructional, and frustration reading level, and teachers should ensure that students are not being asked to read materials at their frustration level. Literacy activities should be challenging but attainable with effort. Teachers can boost students' confidence, which increases students' intrinsic motivation to read, by working with students to set goals, monitoring their progress toward those goals, and providing frequent positive feedback on their performance.

- Use engaging instruction. Engaging instruction is a prevention tool for problem behavior. Adapting or varying instruction to promote high rates of student engagement and on-task behavior decreases problem behavior. Instruction delivered at a brisk pace contributes to higher levels of student engagement. Instruction that includes modeling, guided practice, and independent practice also increases student engagement.
- Form positive relationships. Forming positive relationships with students is another prevention tool against problem behavior. Students need to know the teacher cares about them and their learning.

As part of the NYC Citywide Instructional Expectations for 2011–12 for strengthening teacher practice, many schools will be using Charlotte Danielson’s *Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching* (2007). Danielson divides the complex activity of teaching into twenty-two components clustered into four domains of teaching responsibility. One of these domains is instruction, which includes engaging students in learning. Danielson identifies and provides guidance on many instructional variables that influence student engagement: the way content is represented, activities, assignments, grouping of students, instructional materials and resources, and structure and pacing, among others.

The Teacher Development Toolkit, provided online by the NYC Department of Education, addresses the Professional Teaching Standard of *Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning*. The toolkit offers guidance in five areas that support learning and engagement:

- Connecting students’ prior knowledge, life experiences, and interests with learning goals
- Using a variety of instructional strategies and resources to respond to students’ diverse needs
- Promoting self-directed, reflective learning for all students
- Facilitating learning experiences that promote autonomy, interaction, and choice
- Engaging students in problem solving, critical thinking, and other activities that make subject matter meaningful

Improving Self-Regulation in Children

An example of a curriculum designed to improve self-regulation in children once they enter school is *Tools of the Mind*, an early childhood program composed of 40 activities intended to improve self-regulation, working memory, and cognitive flexibility. The *Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS)* program for preschool and elementary students is another program designed to help develop self-regulation while focusing on social and emotional learning. These two programs have some evidence of effectiveness but more research is needed.

Scholastic, the educational publisher, has launched a Keep Cool in School campaign against violence and verbal abuse. The program is founded on the work of Bruce D. Perry, M.D., Ph.D., an expert on brain development and children in crisis. Perry has identified six core strengths that children need to be more resourceful, more successful in social situations, and more resilient. Self-regulation is one of the core strengths. The six core strengths include attachment (being a friend), self-regulation (thinking before you act), affiliation (joining in), awareness (thinking of others), tolerance (accepting differences), and respect (respecting yourself and others). A child who can form and maintain healthy emotional relationships, self-regulate, join and contribute to a group, and be aware, tolerant, and respectful of himself and others will rarely become violent and will recover more quickly when exposed to violence.

Developing Self-Regulation Strategies

Explicit instruction to develop self-regulation strategies is necessary for some students. These self-regulation strategies are included as part of Self-Regulated Strategy Development (SRSD). SRSD has been used in spelling, reading, writing, and mathematics.

For example, fourth- and fifth-grade teachers in the Montgomery County Schools in Maryland used SRSD during writers' workshop to teach their students a five-step writing strategy for writing a story and to teach the self-regulation procedures of goal setting and self-monitoring through a series of extended minilessons. They found that this had positive effects on the writing of their students with and without a learning disability.

SRSD, developed by Harris and Graham (2008), is an approach to teaching writing that includes the development of self-regulation strategies. With the SRSD approach, students are explicitly taught strategies for specific writing genres as well as general writing strategies. In addition, they learn how to use self-regulation strategies, including goal setting, self-monitoring, self-reinforcement, and self-instructions, to help them manage the writing strategies and tasks and to obtain concrete and visible evidence of their progress. Students learn to use these writing and self-regulation strategies during the writing process.

Recommendation 4: Common Core

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

LINK TO RESEARCH

The Common Core State Standards Initiative coordinated by the National Governors Association Center for Best Practices and the Council of Chief State School Officers with the involvement of 48 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands identified what American students need to know and do to be successful in college and careers. These standards are based on best practices in national and international education as well as research and input from numerous sources including scholars, assessment developers, professional organizations, and educators representing all grade levels from kindergarten through postsecondary. These standards are comparable with other countries' expectations and are grounded in available evidence and research.

The state of New York adopted the Common Core State Standards on July 19, 2010.

IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

1. **Align curriculum to the NYS P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy.**

A P.S. 165 Ida Posner design team and study group have been implementing the Common Core as a function of P.S. 165 being designated a pilot school for the Common Core. The work of these educators provides a strong foundation for the broader implementation of the Common Core and its concomitant impacts on curriculum, instruction, and assessment at P.S. 165.

The adoption of the Common Core provides an opportunity for teachers at P.S. 165 Ida Posner to work in collaborative teams to identify what they are currently teaching through a curriculum mapping process. It will be essential for teams to identify redundancies and gaps between what they should be teaching according to the Common Core and what they are teaching.

Teachers in teams should look closely at current student work to determine the discrepancy between that work and the level of performance that the Common Core demands, and then plan the steps needed to close any discrepancies.

Instructional Expectations for 2011–12 require teachers to work together to engage all students in rigorous tasks, embedded in well-crafted instructional units and with appropriate supports. For ELA, these tasks include:

- Teachers of prekindergarten through Grade 2 are expected to engage their students in at least one literacy task aligned to the Common Core Reading Informational Text Standards 1 and 10 and Writing Standard 2 (written response to informational texts through group activities and with prompting and support).

QUICK LINKS: Online Sources for More Information

Common Core State Standards

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

Provides pertinent information about the state learning standards for ELA and literacy and the Common Core standards

<http://www.p12.nysed.gov>

Common Core resources

<http://schools.nyc.gov/Academics/CommonCoreLibrary/default.htm>

Resources for strengthening teacher practice

www.arisnyc.org

Common Core Curriculum Mapping Project

<http://commoncore.org>

Partnership for the Assessment of Readiness for College and Career (PARCC)

www.parcconline.org

- Teachers of Grades 3–8 are expected to engage their students in at least one literacy task aligned to Common Core Reading Informational Text Standards 1 and 10 (written analysis of informational texts) or Common Core Reading Informational Text Standards 1 and 10 and Writing Standard 1 (written opinion or argument based on an analysis of informational texts) .

These tasks are to be embedded in Common Core-aligned curricula and include multiple entry points for all learners, including students with disabilities and English language learners. Through the work of implementing these performance tasks, teachers will use the inquiry cycle to adjust their curriculum and instruction to help all students meet the expectations of the Common Core. Because standards are not curriculum, teachers will need a curriculum to assist them in helping students meet the Common Core standards. The New York State Education Department is developing curriculum modules to help teachers develop curriculum that is aligned to the Common Core. These curriculum modules will be available to schools during the 2012–13 school year.

2. Align instructional materials to the Common Core.

Another task related to the Common Core standards is for schools to ensure that the texts for each grade align with the complexity requirements outlined in the Common Core. Schools need to select complex texts that are grade level appropriate and meet the text complexity requirements of the Common Core. These levels of text complexity are significantly higher than the level of texts currently being used in most schools. The expectation of the Common Core is that students have extensive classroom practice with texts at or above grade level. It is the expectation of the Common Core that students who are not reading on grade level should be given the support they need to read texts at the appropriate level of complexity rather than be given less complex texts. Many students will need careful scaffolding to enable them to read at the level of text complexity required by the Common Core.

The Common Core places a great emphasis on informational text, and expects students to read informational text 50 percent of the time and literary text 50 percent of the time. Schools need to ascertain whether enough informational text is available at all grade levels and is being used instructionally.

3. Align instruction to the expectations of the Common Core.

As part of the work outlined in the Citywide Instructional Expectations for 2011–12, teachers need to begin to adjust their instruction to help all students meet the higher expectations of the Common Core. In order to help students meet the standards outlined in the Common Core, several changes in literacy instruction will be necessary.

Literacy Instruction. One of these changes is the focus of literacy instruction. The focus of literacy instruction reflected in the Common Core is careful examination of the text itself, which requires close and careful reading. Schools must provide all students, including those who are behind, with extensive opportunities to encounter and comprehend grade-level complex texts, as required by the standards. Students can access complex texts through read-alouds or as a group reading activity. Schools

should consider carefully their read-aloud selections. Students whose decoding ability is developing at a slower rate also need opportunities to read text they can read successfully without extensive extra assistance. All students are expected to have daily opportunities for independent reading. Reading materials should include newspaper and magazine articles and websites.

Type of Questions. Another change is the type of questions teachers ask of students. Eighty to ninety percent of the standards require text dependent analysis.

To help students meet the standards outlined in the Common Core, teachers should ask high quality text dependent questions. Text dependent questions are those that can be answered only by careful scrutiny of the text, with students specifically referring to evidence from the text itself to support the answer and not referring to information or evidence from outside the text. The questions are grounded in the text, and students must think carefully about what they heard or read and draw evidence from the text in support of their ideas about the reading.

Strategy Instruction. Another change in literacy instruction is the role of strategy instruction. The Common Core standards necessitate a reconsideration of the role of reading strategies. Strategies should be embedded in the activity of reading a text rather than being taught separately from texts.

Writing Instruction. Changes in writing instruction may be necessary to help students meet the Common Core standards. Thirty percent of writing instruction should be devoted to opinion pieces, 35 percent to informative/explanatory texts, and 35 percent to narratives. Students should be given extensive practice with short focused research projects.

4. Redesign assessment to reflect the expectations in the Common Core.

During the 2012–13 school year interim assessments based on the Common Core standards will be administered. In addition, items developed by the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), of which the state of New York is a member, will be field tested. The PARCC assessments will be operational during the 2014–15 school year. Presently, the PARCC assessments include two summative assessments, which will measure the full range of the Common Core State Standards at each grade level. One required component that counts toward the summative score includes performance-based assessments in grades 3–8 administered as close to the end of the year as possible.

Priorities in ELA/literacy will include focusing on writing effectively when analyzing text. Another component that is required and counts toward the summative score includes end-of-year assessments comprised of computer-based machine-scorable items focusing on reading and comprehending complex texts in ELA/literacy. A third required assessment of listening/speaking can be administered at any time of the year. With this in mind, schools need to examine assessments they currently use to determine if they are aligned with the Common Core.

DOING WHAT WORKS: Examples From Real Schools

The Common Core Curriculum Mapping Project provides teachers with a roadmap for translating the Common Core into instruction and resources for developing more detailed curriculum and lesson plans. For most grades, there are six English Language Arts (ELA) Curriculum Maps, each of which contains a list of focus standards taken from the Common Core, specific student objectives, an overview of skills and content the unit will cover, and sample student activities and assessments. Each also includes an essential question that frames the unit, suggested texts (including Common Core exemplar texts), a list of key terminology, and links to additional instructional resources. Future iterations of the maps will include sample student work and scoring rubrics to help teachers who would like to use the sample activities as formative assessment tools.

References

- Anderson, R. C., Hiebert, E. H., Scott, J. A., & Wilkinson, I. A. G. (1985). *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the Commission on Reading*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Institute of Education.
- Berliner, D. C. (1981). Academic learning time and reading achievement. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews* (pp. 203–226). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Blair, C., Protzko, J., & Ursache, A. (2011). Self-regulation and early literacy. In S. B. Neuman & D. K. Dickinson (Eds.), *Handbook of early literacy research* (vol. 3, pp. 20–35). New York: Guilford.
- Boushey, G., & Moser, J. (2006). *The daily five*. Portland, ME: Stenhouse.
- Briggs, K. L., & Thomas, K. (1997). *Patterns of success: Successful pathways to elementary literacy in Texas Spotlight Schools*. Austin: Texas Center for Educational Research.
- Danielson, C. (2007). *Enhancing professional practice: A framework for teaching* (2nd ed.). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Duke, N. K., & Pearson, P. D. (2002). Effective practices for developing reading comprehension. In A. E. Farstrup & S. J. Samuels (Eds.), *What research has to say about reading instruction* (3rd ed., pp. 205–242). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset*. New York: Random House.
- Evans, G. W., & Rosenbaum, J. (2008). Self-regulation and the income-achievement gap. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 23(4), 504–514.
- Fisher, D., & Frey, N. (2007). Implementing a schoolwide literacy framework: Improving achievement in an urban elementary school. *Reading Teacher*, 61(1), 32–43.
- Fountas, I. C., & Pinnell, G. S. (1999). What does good first teaching mean? In J. S. Gaffney & B. J. Askew (Eds.), *Stirring the waters: The influence of Marie Clay* (pp. 165–185). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Hattie, J. (2009). *Visible learning: A synthesis of over 800 meta-analyses relating to achievement*. New York: Routledge.
- Kagan, S. (2010). *Cooperative learning*. San Clemente, CA: Kagan.
- Kirsch, I., deJong, J., Lafontaine, D., McQueen, J., Mendelovits, J., & Monseur, C. (2002). *Reading for change: Performance and engagement across countries*. Paris: Organisation for Economic and Co-operation and Development.
- Kleinfeld, J. (1972). *Effective teachers of Indian and Eskimo high school students*. Fairbanks: University of Alaska, Institute of Social, Economic, and Government Research.
- Kong, A., & Pearson, P. D. (2003). The road to participation: The construction of a literacy practice in a learning community of linguistically diverse learners. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 38(1), 85–124.
- Lloyd, S. L. (2004). Using comprehension strategies as a springboard for student talk. *Journal of Adolescent and Adult Literacy*, 48(2), 114–124.
- Marzano, R. J. (2000). *A new era of school reform: Going where the research takes us*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning.
- Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. J. (2010). *The highly engaged classroom*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory.
- National Reading Panel. (2000). *Teaching children to read: An evidence-based assessment of the scientific research literature on reading and its implications for reading instruction*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.
- Pearson, P. D. & Gallagher, M. C. (1983). The instruction of reading comprehension, *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 8(3), 317–344.
- Perry, B. D. (n.d.). Keep the cool in school: Promoting non-violent behavior in children. Retrieved August 17, 2011, from <http://teacher.scholastic.com/professional/bruceperry/cool.htm>

- Reutzel, D. R., Fawson, P. C., & Smith, J. A. (2008). Reconsidering silent sustained reading: An exploratory study of scaffolded silent reading. *Journal of Educational Research, 102*(1), 37–50.
- Reutzel, D. R., Jones, C. D., Fawson, P. C., & Smith, J. A. (2008). Scaffolded silent reading: A complement to guided repeated oral reading that works. *Reading Teacher, 62*(3), 194–207.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1992). *Pygmalion in the classroom*. (Exp. ed.). Norwalk, CT: Irvington.
- Rutter, M. (1983). School effects on pupil progress: Research findings and policy implications. *Child Development, 54*(1), 1–29.
- Samuels, S. J. (1981). Characteristics of exemplary reading programs. In J. T. Guthrie (Ed.), *Comprehension and teaching: Research reviews* (pp. 255–273). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.
- Umbreit, J., Lane, K. L., & Dejud, C. (2004). Improving classroom behavior by modifying task difficulty: Effects of increasing the difficulty of too-easy tasks. *Journal of Positive Behavior Interventions, 6*(1), 13–20.
- Vallecorsa, A. L., deBettencourt, L. U., & Zigmond, N. (2000). *Students with mild disabilities in general education settings: A guide for special educators*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

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

22 Cortlandt Street, Floor 16
New York, NY 10007-3139
800.356.2735 | 212.419.0415
www.air.org

Copyright © 2011 American Institutes for Research. All rights reserved.

This work was originally produced in whole or in part by Learning Point Associates, an affiliate of American Institutes for Research, with funds from the New York State Education Department (NYSED). The content does not necessarily reflect the position or policy of NYSED, nor does mention or visual representation of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement.