

NYSED/NYCDOE JOINT INTERVENTION TEAM REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

DBN:	17K352
School Name:	Ebbets Field Middle School
School Address:	46 McKeever Place Brooklyn, NY 11225
Principal:	Margie Baker
Restructuring Phase/Category:	Restructuring (year 1) - Focused
Area of Identification:	English Language Arts- Students with Disabilities
Dates of On-site Diagnostic Review:	January 10 - 11, 2012

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

Community and School Background

Ebbets Field Middle School serves 354 students in grades 6 through 8. The school enrollment is less than one percent Asian, 18 percent Hispanic, 78 percent Black and two percent White students. Of these students 24 percent are English language learners (ELLs) and approximately 18 percent are students with disabilities.

The administrative team consists of the Principal and two Assistant Principals (APs). The Principal and APs have served the school in their current positions for 6.5 years. There are 36 teachers on staff; three percent have been at the school for less than one year and 16 percent for fewer than three years. Ninety -two percent of teachers are highly qualified. The rate of teacher turnover is 11 percent.

PART 2: ASSESSMENT OF THE SCHOOL’S EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM

A. Performance on Key Indicators of Student Achievement Trends and School Progress

Positive or Negative Indicator (+/-)	School Performance Indicators	
	NYSED Quantitative Performance Measures	
-	Negative trend data for one or more identified subject/areas and subgroups for the past two consecutive years, as indicated by a decrease in the percentage of students performing at or above Level 3 and/or a decrease in the Performance Index.	✓
-	School is ten or more points away from meeting its Effective Annual Measurable Objective (EAMO) for one or more identified subgroups in subject/area(s) of identification.	✓
-	Performance data for the school on NYSED Accountability Overview Reports (AOR) for the past two consecutive years indicate an increase in the achievement gap between identified subgroups and the All Students subgroup in one or more identified subject/area(s).	✓
	NYCDOE Quantitative and Qualitative Performance Measures	
+	Most recent NYC Progress Report Grade of B	✓
+	NYC Quality Review Score of Well-Developed	✓

B. School Strengths

- The facility is well maintained and is secure.
- The school administration and teachers have established effective two-way communication to keep parents informed of school events and student academic progress.

C. Key Findings and Recommendations

Summary of the key issues (causal factors), and other areas of concern, identified during the on-site diagnostic review that are negatively impacting student achievement in identified areas, as well as recommendations, as related to the seven JIT Indicator Categories:

I. Curriculum

Findings:

- The lack of a well-developed English language arts (ELA) curriculum is negatively impacting the quality of teaching and learning in ELA for all students in the school. The ELA curriculum is repetitive from grade to grade. The curriculum consists of the same concepts, skills and strategies for each grade level without specific goals for each grade level. The ELA curriculum does not include differentiation strategies to address the needs of ELLs. Students with disabilities are placed in one class that spans two grade levels, but there is no curriculum guide to assist the teachers to deliver two distinct curricula in one class.
- Scope and sequence and pacing calendars are inadequate and do not provide teachers with a clear plan to teach a progression of skills from grade to grade, thus students are under-engaged in most classrooms. The scope of the ELA curriculum documents is narrow as content and skills are repeated year after year. The written curriculum for grade six is virtually identical to the plans for grade seven and grade eight.
- The quality of lesson plan objectives is inconsistent. Lesson plan objectives are not consistently measurable and activities do not consistently align with the objectives posted in classrooms.

Recommendations:

- School leaders and coaches should work with the Network or outside support on the development of curriculum in all core areas and ensure that it is clearly aligned with the current New York State (NYS) Learning Standards. The curriculum must be aligned to the new P-12 Common Core Learning Standards (CCLS) in ELA, literacy and mathematics to prepare for implementation in school year 2012-13. Curriculum should be vertically developed to avoid redundancy from grade to grade. The reading and writing curriculum should be aligned and supportive of each other in content and pacing. All curricula should be developed by knowledgeable and trained individuals (national, State or local) who understand the key elements of curriculum development and necessary scaffolds and differentiation for struggling students and subgroups.

All teachers and administrators should participate in professional development (PD) on how to plan and implement a curriculum with rigor, as well as on delivery methods that are student-centered. The curriculum should be relied upon as the basis for assessing individual student mastery and progress. Walkthroughs and formal evaluations should include how well the teacher knows and implements the curriculum for the subjects being taught.

- School leadership, with Network support, should develop and monitor scope and sequence documents to check for full alignment with State Standards and grade level expectations and ensure that all staff implements these along with pacing calendars for all content areas.
- The leadership should identify key elements for lesson plans that emphasize the importance of clear and relevant objectives aligned with current NYS Standards and provisions for small group instruction.

II. Teaching and Learning

Findings:

- Lessons are not effectively planned. Most instruction is teacher directed. Many teachers rely on whole groups lecture and independent practice. Students have insufficient opportunity to engage in small group discussion or work in pairs. The lack of an effective range of instructional strategies is negatively impacting student engagement and academic performance.
- Few examples of strategic differentiated instruction were observed in classrooms. There is little evidence that data is used to group students or to match tasks to the differing ability levels of the students. Students report being in the same groups for most lessons. Most groups work on identical tasks. Students are grouped for leveled placement into Regents classes by grade but experience the same or very similar instruction as the other levels.
- Small group differentiated instruction is not present in most classrooms. Teachers are neither regularly planning for differing skill groups nor are different groups using different materials. There is no evidence that ELLs and students with disabilities have access to differentiated materials or tasks. In some classes where different tasks were planned, students cycled through each task; thus the impact of differentiation is non-strategic. Student grouping in some special education classes is inappropriate, as the skill gap in these classrooms is too vast. For example, reading levels span from first through fourth grade in one class.
- Effective questioning is not occurring consistently to support higher-level thinking. Teachers are not strategically integrating questioning into instruction because planning for higher level questioning is not part of the lesson planning process. Most questions posed to students are knowledge and recall only, and students rarely are asked to elaborate or defend responses.
- Students are not adequately engaged in rigorous academic work. Much of the work required of students does not have the appropriate impact and, therefore, minimizes the students' opportunity to engage in higher order thinking and problem-solving. For example, students are expected to respond to simple writing prompts and complete generic journal entries without specific requirements to include specified content vocabulary or to incorporate the schoolwide word of the day, which is randomly chosen from a dictionary by the literacy coach.
- The quality of feedback on student work is inconsistent and includes simple evaluative comments, such as "Nice job," and does not consistently provide detailed suggestions for improvement. The rubric used most includes a simple four-point scale and is not modified to contain the language of the standards and fit the unique features of the student task.
- The quality of classroom management is poor across the school creating a disorderly environment in some classes and common areas. The school leader reports that implementing parts of the Chancellor's code of conduct is not possible since parents want their children to have access to cell phones during the day, thus the school only loosely implements the no cell phone policy. Students

are observed using cell phones and other electronic devices in classrooms and in the cafeteria. The presence of staff in hallways is inconsequential, as some students ignore requests to move quickly to classes. There is no systematic process for managing disruptive students in classes. Some students are sent out of classes to deans who are not documenting low level but frequent incidents of class disruptions.

- Instructional time is lost in many classrooms and is not adequate to engage all students, increasing the need for some teachers to prioritize behavior management over instruction. Teachers inappropriately use increased volume to speak over the students, creating loud and chaotic learning environments in some classes. Although most teachers post agendas, time allocations are not followed. The 'Do Now' activity in many classes is extended and becomes the primary activity. Many teachers are not providing for a structured end of class summaries and closures. Instruction ends abruptly with the passing signal.
- Teachers and students underutilize interactive technology to increase student motivation, productivity and achievement. Some teachers have access to SMART Boards, but only in a few classes is this technology used interactively or with links to the web or to other resources. The school is equipped with laptop carts, but these carts are not used daily by students or by teachers.
- Some teachers and service providers are not fully prepared to serve students with special needs. They do not have full access to Individualized Education Programs (IEPs) and express uncertainty about service delivery requirements. Special education staff members are unclear about the purpose and process involved in providing consultation services to students.
- Co-teaching and team teaching strategies are ineffective and are not consistently and effectively contributing to student learning. In classes where co-teaching was observed, one teacher assumed primary responsibility for delivering instruction while the second teacher carried out non-instructional duties such as arranging materials and organizing supplies.
- There is no clear grading policy in use in the school. The grading policy produced by the school leader differs from the policy published in the student handbook. The point value assigned to various aspects of the grading policy differs between both documents.

Recommendations:

- The school, with Network support, should provide PD to introduce teachers to a wider range of instructional strategies that can be used in the classroom to promote greater student participation in the learning process. Teachers should be expected to plan for and implement these strategies. School leaders should monitor the effectiveness and provide additional PD for teachers when necessary.
- The school leaders should provide PD for teachers on instructional strategies to promote targeted differentiated instruction for classes with one teacher and teachers in the co-teaching model. The school leaders, with Network support, should focus PD on the use of data to drive lesson planning and instruction and ensure that tasks match the academic needs of identified subgroups. The school leaders should regularly monitor teacher' planning and instructional practice in the classroom to ensure that differentiated activities are in place throughout the school. Ongoing PD should be provided for teachers who struggle with using data to match work to the individual needs of students.
- School leaders should provide PD on the implementation of flexible grouping based on formative, interim, and summative data. Students should be provided with tasks and activities that address

their specific learning needs without loss of rigor. Teacher planning and instruction should be supported to ensure that data is used to group students and becomes common practice in all classrooms. Ongoing support for teachers that struggle with flexible grouping should be provided. Network experts should be used in designing, conducting and supporting PD. Special education classes should be assessed and configured to group students with similar needs.

- The school should work with the Network to provide PD to teachers to increase their capacity to use a variety of questioning techniques aimed at building critical thinking and problem solving skills. These skills should specifically support teacher effectiveness for students with disabilities and ELLs with Individualized Education Programs (IEPs). The questioning techniques identified in PD should be implemented in daily instruction and become a focus for observation of teaching.
- The leadership should provide PD to teachers to develop lessons that require students to apply critical thinking and problem solving skills. School leaders should specifically support teacher effectiveness for staff members who work with students with disabilities and ELLs with IEPs. School leaders should ensure that strategies identified in training are implemented in daily instruction.
- The school should use rubrics consistently as an integral tool in planning and assessing assignments. All teachers should participate in PD to deepen the understanding of the value and use of rubrics in improving student performance. School leaders should provide ongoing support to ensure the quality of feedback that is provided helps students improve and move to the next level of student achievement.
- School leaders should establish, communicate and enforce a clear code of student conduct with high expectations for student behavior and specific and enforceable consequences. Incentives to reinforce appropriate behaviors should be planned and implemented. School leadership should conduct focused informal observations and walkthroughs to ensure that staff members consistently promote and enforce high behavioral expectations for all students.
- Teachers and staff should work with the Network to effectively plan for optimal instruction and pacing a 90 - minute literacy block. Pacing of lessons should be a focus for walkthroughs and observations.
- The school should seek Network support to provide teachers with the skills and competencies to effectively integrate technology, including laptop computers and SMART Boards, into instruction. The school leaders should ensure that strategies learned in PD are fully implemented in the classroom so that technology is routinely integrated into teaching and learning.
- The school should seek Network support to provide all teachers with the necessary and relevant information contained in IEPs to ensure that all students receive appropriate service. School leaders should follow up with service providers to ensure they fully comprehend responsibilities within the special education continuum.
- The school leadership should engage the Network in the development of the co-teaching model used throughout the school. School leaders should frequently observe co-teaching and provide focused feedback to ensure that students benefit from having two teachers in the classroom.
- School leaders and teachers should establish a schoolwide grading policy across all grades to ensure that there is clarity and one policy in use. It should be posted and easily accessible to students to ensure they are aware of their academic progress and what the next steps are for

them to make adequate progress. School leaders should monitor its successful implementation through observations and walkthroughs.

III. School Leadership

Findings:

- The entire leadership team has been in place since the formation of the middle school and has not identified levers to move the school forward. Leadership attributes the current status of the school to socio-economic challenges faced by the student population and non-participatory families. There are no strategic systems to support progress towards establishing challenging and achievable goals. Goals set by the school leadership are too low to ensure that the school will make needed and dramatic improvements. School leadership does not set high expectations for the performance of all students and staff. Informal and formal observations reveal a lack of adherence to expectations for differentiated instruction and higher order questioning; however, teachers receive satisfactory ratings. School leaders do not expect and do not require students to conform to behavioral expectations.
- There are no systems to support programs or improvements to overcome the school's historic academic achievement challenges. There is no comprehensive assessment and data management system in place. There is no effort to systematically plan and assess the quality of PD. There is no effort to document minutes, outcomes, and next steps of cabinet and common planning meetings. There is no use of data to assess the quality of interventions or the impact of teaching on student outcomes. There is no systematic implementation of a code of conduct.
- The management of human resources does not translate into an effective and efficient learning environment. Staffing assignments are not based on qualified expertise and the needs and readiness of students and staff. The school leader's response to staffing the school during a period of declining enrollment has been to have teachers and teacher leaders increasingly add important and competing responsibilities regardless of their level of preparedness or expertise. The literacy coach is also assigned as the data specialist and test coordinator and has little experience with data management tools or action planning based on data. The special education coach teaches full-time and has limited time to observe and coach. Teachers are rotated through assignments, i.e., teachers who teach the top tier of students in each grade level are rotated into this position to equally share in the teaching of the top group regardless of a demonstrated record of accomplishments. Some teachers who teach Academic Intervention Services (AIS) classes have been unsatisfactorily rated. The Principal and APs meet regularly, but the impact of these meetings is not producing strategic action or improvement initiatives. The school's library is not staffed with a certified librarian.
- The APs are assigned to oversee departments and observe teachers. However, focused feedback in the highest areas of need throughout the school is not consistently provided on the observation of teachers. The APs report that the quality of teaching throughout the school is very low (the equivalent of level 1 and 2), yet the vast majority of teacher evaluations conducted by them result in satisfactory ratings.
- Common planning meetings are not effectively used to advance school improvement initiatives or increase student achievement. There are no systems to document actions and next steps for teams of teachers who meet regularly. The school leader initially reported that common planning meetings are used for inquiry work but later reported that there is no inquiry work happening at the school.

- In-house PD is ineffective. A new internal PD initiative on multiple intelligences has recently begun without regard to the most pressing needs of the staff to improve their skills at managing student behaviors, use data to plan differentiated instruction or incorporate higher order questioning into instruction. Teachers are encouraged to view PD videos but there are no clear expectations that the strategies learned will be applied by teachers in their classrooms.
- Continuous school improvement is not enhanced by the work of the School Leadership Team (SLT) that reviews the school's progress towards its goals just one time per year. The SLT has limited knowledge and understanding of student achievement trends. Goals are not created through a process of detailed data analysis. School leaders have not provided the SLT with the tools and information necessary to strategically set ambitious goals. The school relies heavily on computer based intervention programs but does not collect and examine student growth to determine the effects of the programs on student outcomes. Teacher members of the SLT report being satisfied with programs because students like them. SLT members reported being unaware of the impact that Comprehensive Educational Plan (CEP) action steps have on increasing student achievement and are unaware of where they might get such data.

Recommendations:

- School leadership and the Network should develop the CEP to create an effective schoolwide plan to improve achievement. The school leaders and staff should articulate a clear vision and strategic plan that drives the school towards high student achievement and clearly outlines the responsibilities of staff and leaders. The plan should include goals, action plans, PD, and should use all resources available through the Network. The implementation of the plan should be monitored carefully and its impact on student achievement measured.
- The school leadership's management of the school's organization, operations and resources should be addressed to resolve weaknesses in creating an effective learning environment. There should be increased accountability by all staff towards continuous improvement.
- The Network should work closely with the school leader to urgently address the school leadership's management of staffing assignments. Staffing should be commensurate with the capacity to lead improvement efforts. Staff skills and experience should be aligned to key leadership and instructional support roles.
- The school leadership should implement a classroom observation schedule to monitor more closely the quality of teaching and learning across the school. Written feedback should be provided for all formal, informal and walkthrough observations, including clear targets for improvement. Follow-up observations should be included in the schedule to check on progress. The school should seek support from the Network in developing lesson observation protocols, including training for administrators in writing effective teacher feedback. The outcomes of lesson observations should provide a focus for the school PD plan.
- Leaders should improve the effectiveness of common planning time by establishing expectations for the use and purpose of weekly meetings and institute procedures to document actions and next steps. Inquiry action research as an activity should be incorporated into common planning time.
- School leaders should ensure that all PD is relevant, directly connected to identified areas for improvement and fully reflects the need of most of the teachers to increase their capacity to

manage adolescents and engage all students in rigorous standards-based academic skill development.

- The school leaders should seek assistance from the Network to provide training to SLT members to ensure that CEP goals are ambitious and based on data, and that planned action steps are based on an analysis of the effectiveness of programs that have been selected to support student growth.

IV. Infrastructure for Student Success

Findings:

- There is no comprehensive assessment system in place at the school. There are no effectively established systems for identifying at-risk students, and support for at-risk students is underdeveloped. The school relies on summative annual State test scores as its primary tool to identify students for academic support services. Teachers have designed weekly tests and quizzes that are used to identify students for optional extended day support.
- There is no evidence of a systematic process to identify students who need social/emotional and psychological supports and to provide the necessary service and interventions to adequately support students with behavioral challenges. There is no documented evidence that the behavior intervention plans recommended by the school-based support team are implemented or monitored. Such records are not kept.
- The school library does not provide students with ample access to quality books, materials and equipment. The collection is outdated, and the school leader reported that there is a very low circulation rate. The library is not staffed with a certified librarian, which negatively impacts the quality of the collection and the use of the library materials to improve the quality of teaching and to increase student achievement.
- The school leadership has neither adopted nor implemented an effective code of conduct and does not maintain detailed and complete records of referrals and interventions. Clear expectations for students are neither communicated nor consistently enforced. Students are late for classes and do not experience consistent consequences. Although teachers are expected to contact families to inform them of misbehaviors as a first attempt to hold students accountable, there is no school-based response that is preventative or an effective deterrent.
- Transitions within the school are ineffective and result in loss of instructional time. Some students are released from class late and some teachers arrive to classes after bells have signified the beginning of the next period. There is an expectation that student will sign a late book if they arrive late to class, but this is not implemented or monitored. Signing of the late book theoretically means that teachers will call parents.

Recommendations:

- The school leader should obtain assistance from the Network to ensure student data collected is used to effectively design, implement, and use a comprehensive assessment system to identify at-risk students, including students with disabilities and ELLs for remediation or intervention support.
- School leaders should seek the support of the Network to implement a plan to ensure that students with significant behavioral challenges are considered for the full range of behavioral supports, including special education behavioral supports as necessary.

- School leaders should seek the support of the Network in obtaining grants and supplemental funding to evaluate and upgrade the collection of resources, including technology, to improve the volume of books that are available to students. The media center should be staffed with a librarian/library media specialist to encourage and reinforce reading and research for all students.
- School leaders should adopt and implement a written policy/code of conduct designed to promote responsible behavior. The policy should include: student responsibilities and clear expectations for student behavior throughout all areas of the school, and a continuum of consequences that uses removal from class as an absolute last resort. The policy should be publicized, explained to all students and provided in writing to all parents on an annual basis. The policy should clearly describe the roles of teachers and administrators in the execution of the policy. School leaders should monitor for consistent implementation of the policy and expectations for student conduct.
- The school should more effectively monitor the management and flow of students in classrooms and throughout the building to maximize the use of instructional time. Leaders should develop a schoolwide plan for the efficient, orderly and safe passing throughout the school.

V. Collection, Analysis and Utilization of Data

Findings:

- There is no system to assess student achievement and teacher effectiveness, which seriously impacts the school performance status and the achievement of its students. There is no comprehensive system to conduct, administer and analyze reliable interim, formative or summative assessments beyond the administration of the State test. Teachers have limited student performance data to collect and assess. The school is unable to accurately identify schoolwide priorities for improving student achievement and informing the school's continuous improvement cycle.
- The school staff does not regularly analyze schoolwide and grade level student performance trend data by subgroup to assess the effectiveness of current educational programs, and makes no effort to conduct an audit of the impact that its intervention programs are having on student achievement. Data management tools are not effectively used, and support is not adequately provided to teachers to conduct item analysis and create action plans.

Recommendations:

- The school leader should request Network support in developing a system to use data to drive instruction. The school should consider the following:
 - establishing and/or redefining inquiry focused teacher teams and the benchmarked deliverables for each team;
 - dedicating time in teacher schedules for regular team meetings; developing an interim assessment calendar;
 - creating and administering interim assessments;
 - completing an interim assessment analysis worksheet delineating the error and distractor analyses of the assessment data; and
 - developing, implementing, and monitoring action plans to instructionally address learning deficits as indicated by the analysis of the assessment data.

- School leaders should assign responsibilities for data analysis to a qualified educational and assessment specialist. They should immediately seek the assistance of the Network to electronically collect and analyze the impact that the computer-based intervention programs are having on increasing student achievement. School leaders should use this analysis to determine if the programs are having the intended and needed impact on student achievement. PD should be provided to teachers on how to conduct item analysis and use this data to group students for targeted skill development in the classroom.

VI. Professional Development

Findings:

- A comprehensive PD plan has not been fully developed. The PD offered is not clearly aligned with the stated goals of the CEP. There is neither a clear plan on how to incorporate the recent initiative on Multiple Intelligences into classroom instruction nor a vision on how struggling teachers will use this information to improve their effectiveness.
- Inquiry and action research does not occur at the school. The establishment of Inquiry Teams has not been accomplished and is negatively impacting the school's collective awareness of the effectiveness its initiatives.
- There is a lack of professional accountability across the school. There is no system in place to hold teachers accountable for implementing PD initiatives. Teachers are not held accountable for incorporating practices learned during PD into their instruction. Reviewed observation summaries lack reference to PD initiatives and recommendations to watch videos do not provide teachers with expectations about what should be implemented as a result of viewing the videos.
- Staff is not provided with sufficient PD to meet the needs of ELLs, students with disabilities and all at-risk students. The special classes (self-contained bridge classes) are ineffective delivery models because the appropriate support is not provided to administer two grade level curricula or sufficient opportunities to remediate skills. The current PD provided for staff has insufficient focus on the development of effective ELA teaching strategies for students with disabilities and ELLs.

Recommendations:

- The leadership should develop a comprehensive PD plan with the involvement of the Network based on specific student and teacher needs that is also closely aligned with the goals identified in the CEP. The plan should have as its primary focus improving teaching, learning and student achievement by providing teachers with successful pedagogical practices that can be implemented by struggling teachers.
- School leaders should establish and maintain an Inquiry Team process. They should seek the support of the Network to train all staff members to effectively involve all staff in the examination of best practice through an inquiry-based action research process. School leaders should ensure that the work of the inquiry team filters into the classroom and positively impacts student learning and achievement.
- School leaders should institute follow-up observations after PD sessions to ensure that teachers incorporate the strategies learned into professional practice. They should develop detailed recommendations and specific next steps in teacher observation reports and focus on these in the next observation.

- School leaders should engage the support of the Network to review the PD program and include sessions on how teachers can more effectively meet the specific learning needs of students with disabilities and ELLs. The supervisor with responsibility for special education should effectively monitor and evaluate the teaching and learning of classes with students with disabilities and ELLs who are also students with disabilities. Clear instructional guidelines for all teachers of these groups of students should be developed.

VII. District Support

Finding:

The Network does not yet support the school in identifying priorities that will improve its academic program in the identified areas and is not effectively monitoring the progress the school makes towards addressing its pressing priorities. The primary support person assigned to the school does not have ELA or special education expertise.

Recommendations:

- The Network should Identify Network staff with proven expertise in improving student outcomes in ELA for all students and for students in identified subgroups. The school leaders should be provided with ongoing support and guidance on establishing instructional priorities that will lead to an increase in student achievement.
- The Network should support the school in the implementation of the Joint Intervention Team (JIT) recommendations.

PART 3: JOINT INTERVENTION TEAM OVERALL FINDING AND RECOMMENDATION

A. Overall Finding

Reference	Review Team Finding	✓
(c)	The school has not made sufficient progress in identified areas, and is unlikely to make AYP under the current structure and organization.	✓

B. Overall Recommendation

Reference	Review Team Recommendation	✓
(c)	Develop and implement a School Restructuring Plan that includes significant <u>changes in staff, organizational structure, leadership and/or configuration</u> to address issues that continue to negatively impact student academic performance in identified areas. The School Restructuring Plan must also include one of the restructuring options required under NCLB and further defined by the DOE.	✓

C. In the space below, include specific information to support the District in determining how the above JIT recommendation should be implemented.

- Develop and implement a Restructuring Plan that clearly outlines the staffing needs for leadership and coaches.
- Identify and provide external support for the restructuring of the special education program to support the needs of special education students and ELLs with IEPs.
- Ensure that curriculum, instruction, and assessment experts are involved in the creation of a comprehensive curriculum, the identification of assessment tools, an implementation plan and the selection of academic intervention programs.